Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

OF

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
LAW LIBRARY
CENTRAL OFFICE

VOLUME LVIII—PART 2

JUNE 13 TO JUNE 30, 1919

(Pages 1069–2142)

48031

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1919

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *June 13, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Out of the fullness of the soul and with unfeigned love, we would approach Thee, our Father in heaven, with gratitude welling up in our hearts for Thy goodness and for Thy wonderful works to the children of men.

As the heavens declare Thy glory and the firmament showeth Thy handiwork, so may we, in thought and deed, reflect Thy glory and thus glorify ourselves and all mankind. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PURCHASE OF REAL ESTATE BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules and will later move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in the consideration of H. R. 5227, being a bill making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, it shall be in order for the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider without the intervention of a point of order, when offered as an amendment to said bill, at the end of line 2, page 52, of said bill, the following: *"And provided further*, That no part of any of the appropriations made herein, nor any of the unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made, for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment, shall be expended for the purchase of real estate, or for new construction at Army camps and cantonments."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] if we can have an understanding as to the time of debate on the resolution?

Mr. GARRETT. I have had requests for about 40 minutes since I was talking with the gentleman a few moments ago. There is no disposition, let me say to the gentleman, to delay action upon this matter. We realize the importance of getting this bill through as promptly as possible. This, however, is an important matter as a rider.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if we can agree that the previous question may be ordered if the time for debate is extended somewhat?

Mr. GARRETT. I will say to the gentleman this, with this understanding: I understand that under the precedents germane amendments will be offered when this matter comes up for consideration when we go into Committee of the Whole. With that understanding, we have no disposition at all to resist the previous question, and there will be no trouble about agreeing that the previous question shall be considered as ordered if we can get the debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman will want 40 minutes?

Mr. GARRETT. I have requests for 40 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If the time for debate under the five-minute rule is liberally extended, would that accommodate gentlemen who are asking for time?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I have not discussed that phase of it with the gentlemen who have spoken to me in regard to time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that if we can get an agreement on an hour, I think I can give him 10 minutes out of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. I will say it is my purpose under that arrangement to yield to gentlemen who may be in favor of the rule as well as to those against it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the resolution be limited to one hour—one-half of the time to be disposed of by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and one-half by myself—and that the previous question shall be considered as ordered at the close of the debate on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the debate on the resolution be limited to one hour—one-half to be disposed of by him and one-half by the gentleman from Tennessee—and that the previous question shall be considered as ordered at the close of the debate on the resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a point of order, sustained at the conclusion of the debate on the bill yesterday afternoon, made the pending resolution necessary in order to enable the Committee on Military Affairs to get before the House an amendment that it desires to this appropriation bill.

The rule is not an unusual one when the House finds itself confronted with a condition that makes it impossible to accomplish what the majority of the House desires under the rules of the House as they stand, and this rule is offered here at this time in order to enable the majority of the House in an orderly way to do what a majority desires to do. The discussion here yesterday afternoon disclosed the fact that many tracts of land are now being purchased or have recently been purchased by the War Department, all since the armistice was signed. It is the desire of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I am sure the desire of the House, to prevent additional expenditures where these expenditures are not absolutely necessary.

The rule is for the purpose of enabling the Committee on Military Affairs to get properly before the House an amendment to prevent the expenditure of unexpended balances of lump-sum appropriations that were available to the War Department, which it has been using in its discretion in the purchase of large tracts of land and the construction of cantonments since the emergency under which the appropriations were made has passed.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to use some of his time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I confess that I have been handicapped in arriving at a conclusion as to just what should be done with reference to making this legislation in order upon this appropriation bill by reason of lack of information as to the facts in the case.

It is quite evident, I think, that all Members of the House are agreed that in every place where it is legitimately possible the expansion of the Army camps should stop. At the same time it is important that we protect subsisting rights and see that legislation is not passed which violates contracts entered into in good faith and under authority of law by the agents of the Government of the United States. We have in our Federal Constitution a provision that no State shall pass a law interfering with contracts. While there is no provision that Congress shall not do so, I take it that impliedly Congress should not and certainly ought not to do that.

And that which has troubled me has been the failure to be able to get at the facts in this situation so as to know whether subsisting contracts are being interfered with. Now, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from California, the gentleman from California very kindly laid before the Committee on Rules, when this resolution was under consideration, a letter which had been received by him from the Secretary of War. It seems to me that it is fair, if the gentleman does not object, that that letter should be laid before the House. If the gentleman from California will permit, I will ask him to read it, or have the Clerk read it in my time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to having it read, as it is an official communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 11, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In the last section of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920 (H. R. 5227), as reported by the Military Committee to the House, appears the following proviso:

"That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate."

Your attention is invited to the fact that under the authority contained in the appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the War Department is now purchasing certain real estate for different camps and flying fields needed for military purposes. In all these cases contracts of sale have been made and signed, and although only about 50 per cent of the money is actually paid out, the Government is obligated to purchase them all, either through contracts of sale or by reason of the institution of condemnation proceedings.

It is therefore evident that if the proviso quoted above becomes law it will have the effect of prohibiting the War Department from carrying out obligations which it incurred under a specific act of Congress. The War Department has no objection to Congress prohibiting the purchase of any real estate from the funds appropriated by this bill (H. R. 5227), but to forbid at this time the expenditure of money for the purpose for which it was appropriated a year ago will result in great embarrassment to the War Department and will subject the entire Government to untold criticism.

It is therefore requested that this proviso be modified so as to eliminate the prohibition with reference to unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made.

Very truly, yours,
NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of that official statement coming from the Secretary of War, it did seem to me that this legislation, if it is to be enacted, ought to have more careful consideration and more hearings than it is possible to have presented in brief arguments under the five-minute rule, bringing it in order as a rider on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Suppose the gentleman was in favor of not expending any more money of the appropriations here and was in favor of a provision as mentioned in the letter of the Secretary of War, how would the gentleman vote on this rule?

Mr. GARRETT. If this rule is adopted, germane amendments will be permitted. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in view of the somewhat extravagant, and I might say reckless, statements made on the floor of the House yesterday afternoon, I feel that I may be justified in occupying a few moments of the time of the House this morning in reference to the effect this provision, if adopted, would have upon Fort Benning, Ga.

In the early stages of the war and soon after Gen. Pershing reached France he began to send cablegrams to the War Department urging the importance and necessity of training our boys in the technical use of small arms. At that time, and for some years previous, a small-arms school of that character had been functioning at Fort Sill, Okla. That institution was inadequate for the needs as they then existed.

Hence the War Department had inspections made in different sections of the United States with a view of selecting a suitable location for the establishment of a school of arms. After diligent investigation, the department determined that the tract of land coming out of the counties of Chattahoochee and Muscogee, Ga., was the most available and best adapted of any place that had been inspected. This was true because of the climatic conditions of that section; this was true because of the soil of that section; this was true because of the waters which were upon that land; this was true because of the topography of the land and because of the transportation facilities at Columbus, Ga.

Hence that place was selected. And bear in mind that it was selected before the armistice was signed. The first plans contemplated a very large school on account of the existence of hostilities. After the armistice was signed the plans were very much modified and the project reduced by one-half. In the meantime the department had gone forward in the purchase of real estate, in constructing buildings there, and constructed a railroad, and at the time the armistice was signed, or within a short time thereafter, the department had expended one and one-half million dollars in the purchase of real estate and the construction of buildings and the railroad.

Soon after signing the armistice the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the House and sought advice from that committee as to whether they should proceed with the project as well as other projects on hand. The Military Affairs Committee of the House declined to advise the Secretary of War. Then they went before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. At first it was unanimously voted by the committee to suspend operations at Fort Benning, but later on it was reconsidered, and on the last vote the committee divided evenly, seven to seven. Thereupon the Secretaray of War ordered the work to proceed at Fort Benning. I wish to read to the House a letter received from Gen. Jervey, which shows the situation at Fort Benning:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, June 6, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM C. WRIGHT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Yesterday your secretary, Mr. W. C. Tucker, came to this office and left with me your questions concerning Camp Benning, Ga.

Your first question was, When was the Infantry School of Arms established at Fort Sill and under what authority?

In January, 1913, the commanding officer at Fort Sill organized a school for small-arms firing. By War Department Bulletin No. 19, June 9, 1913, this school was recognized and established as the School of Musketry. Reorganizations of the school were effected by General Orders, No. 58, War Department, September 30, 1913, and by General Orders, No. 28, May 18, 1915. On July 23, 1917, the school was again reorganized by order of the Chief of Staff and was designated as the Infantry School of Arms.

Your second question was, When was order issued to move school to Camp Benning and by what authority?

The Infantry School of Arms at Camp Benning was organized October 11, 1918, and by the same order the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill was transferred to Camp Benning. The order was issued under authority conferred by sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of Congress authorizing the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, approved May 18, 1917, and act of Congress approved July 8, 1918. The order was issued by direction of the Secretary of War and by authority of the President.

Your third question was, Is any such school now being functioned at Fort Sill, and what use is being made of Fort Sill?

There is no Infantry School of Arms now at Fort Sill. It is being used as an artillery firing center. Even if the Army is not increased beyond that authorized by the national-defense act of 1916, Fort Sill will be needed as an artillery firing center.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state who writes this letter?

Mr. WRIGHT. Gen. Jervey.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, they have a school of musketry there and have had for years.

Mr. WRIGHT. It has been moved. Gen. Jervey further says:

Your fourth question was, How many different schools or activities are now being functioned at Camp Benning and from what points were they moved to Benning?

There are now at Camp Benning the Infantry School of Arms, moved from Fort Sill October 11, 1918; the Small-Arms Firing School, transferred from Camp Perry, Ohio, December 6, 1918; and the Machine Gun School, transferred from Camp Hancock March 14, 1919.

Your fifth question was, How many officers and men are now at Camp Benning and for about how many is it being built?

On May 1 there were 302 officers and 1,510 enlisted men at Camp Benning. It is being constructed to accommodate 1,240 officers, of whom 240 will be administrative officers and instructors and 1,000 officer students, and 3,800 enlisted men, a total of 5,040.

Your sixth question was, How has the work advanced at Camp Benning and how much has been spent?

The area being constructed for enlisted men is 80 per cent completed; the stables and corrals are 80 per cent completed; the warehouses are 70 per cent completed. Eleven miles of railroad leading into Camp Benning has been constructed. The foundations for 40 per cent of the officers' quarters have been laid. The sewers are 30 per cent completed; the water supply, 40 per cent; the electric wiring and equipment, 20 per cent completed.

Two million eight hundred thousand dollars has been spent or obligated for land, $1,700,000 has been spent for labor and for material. Material to the value of $2,000,000, which was salvaged at other camps, is now at Benning.

Yours, very truly,
HENRY JERVEY,
Major General, United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Staff, Director of Operations.

Mr. WRIGHT. Now, as to the status of real estate, the department has bought and is under binding contracts to buy 71,000 acres. There is tied up in court to correct title, and so forth, 12,538 acres. There is condemned and waiting action 13,791 acres, making a grand total of 97,329 acres.

Now, gentlemen of the House, these are the facts as they exist at Fort Benning to-day; and, by the way, this morning I submitted these figures to Col. Whelen, of the War College, as to the progress of the work, and he says that they are very conservative; that, as a matter of fact, the work of construction has materially advanced since that report was made; and that by the 15th of this month the houses for the boys will be ready for their occupancy.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman know what the average assessed valuation of this land in Georgia was?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not know. I presume though that it will range from $18 to $20 an acre.

Mr. SANFORD. I was informed that the average assessed valuation was approximately $10 an acre.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think it would exceed that.

Mr. SANFORD. I got the information from a man who has made searches of the records. Does the gentleman know what the average price is that the Government paid?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not.

Mr. SANFORD. Approximately $100 an acre, I am told.

Mr. WRIGHT. Oh, nothing like that. There were some very valuable tracts of land embraced in this, and some lands that perhaps are not suitable for anything except a military camp.

Mr. TOWNER. In some letters which have come to my attention the statement is made that the Government had paid approximately $42 an acre for the land that it had already purchased.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am sure that is in excess of what they paid. My idea is that the average value will be from $18 to $20 an acre.

Mr. TOWNER. Not the average value, but the average price paid.

Mr. WRIGHT. The average price paid by the Government.

Mr. TOWNER. Now, I want to ask about the amount of money that has been actually paid.

Mr. WRIGHT. By way of further explanation it is perhaps proper to add that before the armistice was signed the Government instituted what is known as a blanket condemnation proceeding as to the lands embraced in the Fort Benning area, and upon the filing of this proceeding, the Government, as it had a right to do, reduced most of the lands embraced in the area to actual possession, and used them for the purpose of functioning the school of arms. The officers notified the owners and occupants of these lands to vacate, and as a result, as well as of purchases made by the Government, about three-fourths of the occupants of the territory moved away. It was and is the policy of the department, notwithstanding the condemnation proceeding, to acquire the lands by friendly negotiation, and this, of course, has and is being pursued. In purchasing the lands in this manner the lands purchased are not all contiguous, growing out of the fact they were purchased from time to time in different parts of the entire area as agreements could be reached with owners as to price.

As to why the school of arms was moved from Fort Sill to Benning, as before stated, Fort Sill was not large enough to conduct a school of the size desired, and besides, it was and is the policy of the department to maintain at Fort Sill an artillery firing center, and it is impracticable to maintain an infantry school of arms and artillery firing center in the same area.

After the signing of the armistice, and the War Department had under consideration whether the Fort Benning project should be abandoned, the most careful consideration and study of the subject was given by the War College, the General Staff, and by Secretary Baker and Assistant Secretary Crowell. Many elements entered into this consideration. It was a serious question as to whether the Government having filed the condemnation proceeding and taken possession of the lands, the Government was not thereby obligated to pay for the lands, even if abandoned; a large sum of money had already been expended at Benning, approximating one and one-half million dollars, in the purchase of lands, the construction of buildings, and a railroad; Benning was and is the ideal site for the school of arms and the other institutions being functioned there; even if the Government was not obligated to pay for the lands, almost endless claims for damages would be presented. Careful consideration was given to Fort Bragg, with a view of determining whether it would be available for the school of arms, but a careful investigation disclosed that the expense of making preparations for the school at Bragg would almost equal the expense of completing the project at Benning, and besides Bragg is not near so desirable as Benning. Under all of the circumstances, I insist that the War Department acted wisely in proceeding with the project at Benning. An infantry school of arms is considered by the General Staff and War College as a military necessity, and such a school should be functioned not only in time of war but in peace as well. To have an army we must have men, and they must be armed with guns, and to effectively use these guns they must have technical training in their use. It is contemplated officers of National Guard will be trained at Benning as well as civilian riflemen.

Under all of the circumstances would it not be false economy, and indeed folly, to abandon Fort Benning and thereby cause the Government to sustain a loss of millions of dollars? It would be like an individual who needed a dwelling to proceed at great expense to erect one, and when about three-fourths completed to abandon it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to print in the RECORD with my remarks a letter from Hon. HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, to the Secretary of War on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. In March last Senator HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, addressed to Secretary Baker a letter on the subject of Fort Benning, and this letter is so comprehensive I submit it as a part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1919.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to bring to your attention the recent action of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and what I consider to be the attitude of that committee and of the Military Affairs Committee of the House with reference to the establishment of certain technical schools at Camp Benning, near Columbus, Ga.

Early in January, I think upon the 7th, the subject of certain camp activities was before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. At that time the scope and necessity for technical training in the Army, outside of Artillery, was not, in my opinion, fully appreciated by the committee. It certainly was not fully appreciated by me. This was due—certainly on my part and, I think, on the part of others—to the lack of that definite information as to what technical training meant and as to its great importance developed by the war with Germany.

At that time it was suggested that the Senate committee pass a resolution requesting the department to stop work on Camp Benning, and, on motion of Senator MCKELLAR, the committee unanimously voted not to proceed further with the work at Camp Benning, Ga.

At that time, also, the Camp Benning project was one which it was expected would cost upward of $14,000,000. Additional information was obtained and submitted to the committee; plans were revised to reduce the expense to less than half of the original amount. The original plan involved the use of 17,000 acres of land immediately adjoining the city of Columbus. The necessity for this land was in part due to the pendency of the war, to the large number of men who would be trained at Camp Benning, and to the importance of extending military regulations over the city of Columbus.

This situation does not now exist, and the chamber of commerce of Columbus has agreed to protect the Government from loss on the 17,000 acres if Benning is established.

On February 2 the subject came up again before the committee, and the original resolution advising the War Department "it is the sense of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that the Fort Benning project be abandoned" was reconsidered; but subsequently, about the same time, a resolution was passed to the effect that the Committee on Military Affairs disapproved the Fort Benning project. I think it was then the opinion that some other equally satisfactory tract might be used, where buildings had already been constructed, and the expense greatly lessened.

The only other available place with land sufficient, and located at a point where the transportation charges of the officers to and from the camp would be reasonable, and where climatic conditions would permit all-year training, was Camp Bragg.

The importance of technical training for the Infantry, for the Cavalry, for the tanks, and for the machine guns, operating together in a single field, had been urged by military experts, and Gen. Pershing had impressed the importance of such work as a result of his experience in France.

Under your direction Camp Bragg was studied. The result of this study showed that it would cost nearly as much to prepare for the school at Camp Bragg as to complete it at Camp Benning. By going on at Camp Benning we would have the Artillery School retained at Camp Bragg—so much urged by the Chief of Artillery—and we would also have Camp Benning for the technical training of Infantry, Cavalry, tanks, and machine guns and the best of facilities for both Artillery and these schools.

The report upon Camp Bragg also shows that the character of the land fails to give the opportunity for training in the schools, other than Artillery, which is really required, and that Camp Benning, selected by experts on account of its great variety of topography, will give an ideal site for these schools.

Under these circumstances, on Tuesday morning, March 4, I brought the subject to the attention again of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and asked for reconsideration of the disapproval of the Camp Benning project. Two votes were had. On one the vote stood 6 to 6. On the last the vote stood 7 to 7. While the vote was not an aye-and-nay vote, I attach a certified statement from the assistant clerk of the committee showing who were present. There were 15 Senators present. I am quite sure Senator WARREN did not vote, and that Senators CHAMBERLAIN, HITCHCOCK, WEEKS, NEW, FRELINGHUYSEN, and JOHNSON voted nay, while Senators FLETCHER, MYERS, BECKHAM, REED, KIRBY, and myself voted aye. Senator THOMAS was not present. Senator THOMAS has since by letter expressed to Mr. Crowell, and through him to the department, his preference for Camp Benning over Camp Bragg, if the school is to be established. Senator WARREN has also orally discussed the subject with Mr. Crowell, and I believe I am justified in saying that he preferred Benning to Bragg.

In the meantime the subject was before the House Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee declined to take any action, thereby leaving it entirely in the discretion of the War Department.

I submit that the final action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by a vote of 7 to 7 of those present divided the committee equally, and thereby left the subject to the War Department. Senator THOMAS having definitely expressed in writing his preference for Benning, and Senator WARREN having in effect taken the same position orally, a majority of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs carry to you an expression in favor of Benning over Bragg.

I discussed the subject with Senator CHAMBERLAIN, chairman of the committee, on yesterday, and acquainted him of my purpose to bring these facts to your attention in the manner that I am presenting them. He expressed no dissent from the course I am taking, and stated that it was not his purpose to take any action in opposition. I have also conferred with Senator MCKELLAR, who originally offered the motion condemning the project, and I find his position much modified by the new facts which have been developed, and I am quite sure he will not further oppose the project.

Under all these facts, I feel justified in urging that the subject is up to the War Department for action without advice from either of the Committees on Military Affairs in the House or the Senate.

My own thorough study of the question has convinced me of the absolute necessity to conduct a technical school for Infantry, Cavalry, tanks, and machine guns, where cooperation and individual work may be taught, if we have an Army of any size and make it really proficient.

I am sure this conviction will grow on all as the subject is understood, and I do not hesitate to urge a completion of the Benning project.

In addition to the foregoing reasons, it is certainly worthy of consideration that the procedure of condemnation instituted last fall before the armistice was signed, coupled with the assumption of immediate ownership and possession by the Government of the area involved in the project, caused from 75 to 85 per cent of the residents of 115,000 acres of land to vacate their homes, to move to other sections, and to assume in many instances contracts which they can not perform unless the Government completes its action by paying for their land. They are suffering now from the failure to have received prompt payment.

A knowledge of their condition may have at first prompted my close investigation of this project. Now, I am thoroughly satisfied of the necessity for the school, the wisdom of the selection, and the good judgment used by the department in the action which it took.

Very cordially, yours,

(Signed) HOKE SMITH.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. GARRETT. And I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I felt sure I foresaw in May, 1918, in advance of all this, that this error was about to be committed, and I protested with as much earnestness as I had, and I wrote with as much limited ability as I had protesting against, first, the removal of a school of this kind, adequate in all its particulars in peace time, and then abandoning it in the middle of the war, delaying the training of the officers about a year, and placing it somewhere else. I have here two short letters that I wrote to the Secretary of War on this subject which I would like to have read at the desk. The letters disclose the facts as I then understood them——

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letters will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAY 20, 1918.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of your letter of May 15 regarding Fort Sill; also the memorandums from Brig. Gen. Brown and Brig. Gen. Snow.

I can not but feel that time will disclose that a serious mistake is being made at Fort Sill. The military reservation proper contains 56,000 acres. There is a forest reserve adjoining it, any part or all of which could be annexed by Executive order of the President merely by the stroke of a pen, without any additional law or legislation. This would give ample room not only for the School of Fire, School of Small Arms, but the cantonment as well.

To construct a cantonment at an expense of $2,300,000 and then abandon it in the midst of a World War, and go out buying and renting land, establishing new cantonments and acquiring new areas seems all wrong to me. Again, the School of Small Arms which was established in 1915, prior to the war, with all the time and money expended thereon, is now being abandoned and held for naught. This, too, seems wrong. I wish I knew something to say or something to do to spare you this mistake.

The press reports are to the effect that all other cantonments are being used to the limit, even large additional expenditures are being made for them. Large prices are being paid for material and lands to acquire and construct new cantonments and maintain the ones already constructed. In the face of this condition of affairs, to abandon Fort Sill seems to me to be poor economy, and seems to me to be a mistake which we might now avoid. I have, however, in person appealed to you regarding the matter. I have filed written data and bills of particulars as I understand them to exist. I would, if I knew how, do anything else I could or make any kind of an appeal possible to prevent this mistake, and what to me seems surely false economy. I repeat, if I knew anything else to do or say, if I knew any other appeal I could make to you or any of the generals who have brought this about, I would make it.

With great respect, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

——— ———.

MAY 27, 1918.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was good of you to write me your good letter of May 24 and to give me a chance to be heard on this matter. It is good of you to have a second investigation made about it.

That reservation down there is so large and so beautiful that to utilize it during the first year of the war and abandon it thereafter and go out and buy land, it does seem that somewhere along the line we should find some one to appreciate it and to recognize the necessity of using land that belongs to the Government and not go out and buy or rent land that is less valuable.

I had not intended to trouble you with this matter any further. I had intended to let it go, but your good, warm, and friendly letter makes me bold enough to again urge you when the second investigation is made to investigate the advisability of utilizing the 65,000-acre forestry reserve that lies immediately adjoining the Fort Sill military reserve. That entire reserve is barren of timber. It has a little herd of buffalo on it, but they consume such a small part of it that it is negligible, and the rest is only used for grazing cattle.

If the military authorities need more room, under the withdrawal act of June 25, 1910, known as the Pickett bill, the President can with the stroke of a pen withdraw this area or, rather, transfer and use any or all of it without disturbing any governmental function. This would afford a range large enough to carry on, without paying any rent, without buying an acre of land, and at the same time not sacrifice three or four million dollars of expenditure that has already been made there, but on the contrary could utilize it.

Again, I repeat, that I had not intended to bother you further with this, but when I see a mistake being made that I am sure is a mistake, I have felt it my duty to tell you about it rather than wait until a shower bath of trouble comes down on us when it is too late. In other words, if I seem impatient or appear overzealous and almost bordering on a nuisance to you, it is in an effort to make certain that you do not abandon and fail to utilize Government property that could be economically utilized, and further to avoid mistake.

With great respect, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

——— ———.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 24, 1918.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: I have received your letter of the 20th. I know how earnest you are in your view of the situation at Fort Sill, and I know also how intimately acquainted you are with conditions; therefore I am asking the Chief of Staff to reexamine the question so as to make doubly sure that no considerations are left unexamined in the final determination of the question. There does seem to be a very strong concurrence of opinion among the military men on this subject, and, as you have no doubt observed, the determinations so far made seem to have been largely by Infantry officers, so that the possible desire of the Artillery officers to secure this reservation for that corps does not seem to have played any part in the matter.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, Mr. Speaker, that, in substance, is what I urged on the Secretary before this move was made.

That post at Fort Sill was established away back in the sixties. It is one of the old forts in this country. This school was established prior to the war, prior to the haste and distress of war. They owned the land; it was theirs; they did not have to buy it. They have a reservation there of 56,000 acres, and Gen. McCain and others in the War Department who know the facts have told me that it was the most admirable Artillery post in the United States, and I felt keenly about having the small-arms school taken away. I did not know then that they expected to spend $7,000,000 or $10,000,000 in buying land at $42 an acre somewhere else, but I was afraid that might happen, and I protested as earnestly as I could then, I wrote as earnestly as I could then, hoping we might be spared this mistake. Now that the mistake has been made, I do not know what is best to do about it. I have no quarrel with the Georgia Members. It is not a party matter; it is not a selfish matter; it is not a delegation matter; it is not a State matter.

I would have made a similar appeal had I known the facts about a matter coming up anywhere else. The point is that when the Government had land that was selected in peace times, when there was no controversy about it, land that did not then cost them a cent and that does not now cost them a cent, they ought not to abandon it and go somewhere else and pay fabulous prices for land. [Applause.]

Of course I have no disposition to embarrass the War Department. I want to help them, as every other Member does. I did not want to embarrass Secretary Baker, and I know that no one in the House does. We all want to help them, but I am so afraid that if something like this limitation is not put in somewhere Army officers will continue to want to create new establishments and corresponding new jobs and new ranks, that I feel the necessity of clamping down on this thing somewhere. [Applause.] I know of no better way to do it than this.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I have not very much time, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has made the statement that no one in the House desires to embarrass Mr. Baker. Is it not the tendency of the House, as at present constituted, to assist Mr. Baker so that he can not continue to err? [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. Well, the gentleman can adopt his own rule with regard to that. I accord to every man the same right that I myself have. I felt then an error was about to be committed. I feel one has been committed. I am not picking flaws; I am not complaining; and the fact that this establishment was moved out of my State into the State of Georgia does not matter. That is of no general concern or importance, but the matter of abandoning a great reservation that was selected and utilized in peace time, and the matter of establishing a school in peace time and then abandoning it in the middle of the war and delaying the training of officers is a matter that concerns more than a few of us locally.

I feel, under the circumstances, knowing the facts as I do, I feel I must object to it and oppose it. I am going to vote for this rule; I am going to vote for this limitation. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Kansas proceeds, may we get some sort of understanding about the time additional, so as to help me out of an embarrassing situation. I proceeded upon the theory that we would have 40 minutes, and as a matter of fact only 30 were assigned. According to my count, I have used 21 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 21½ minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How much time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has 22 minutes left, and the gentleman from Tennessee 9½ minutes left.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, with the general proposition involved in this rule I am in accord. I was not present at the meeting of the committee when this language was adopted. I feel sure that if this rule be adopted, it will create a great deal of embarrassment to the War Department and will be unfair to many individuals with whom the War Department has dealt. If gentlemen in the House are opposed to the location of this particular school of fire at Columbus, Ga., why not limit the proposition to that particular project? Why carry language in the bill that will involve every other transaction into which the Government has entered? I have been told by the War Department that there are some transactions into which the Government has entered, but in regard to which the Government has expended only about one-half of the purchase price because the title is involved. There are minors interested in the title to the land and the Government has instituted condemnation proceedings in order to perfect the title. If this provision in the broad language as it appears in the bill is adopted, when those condemnation proceedings are at an end, those minors can not receive the money and the Government can not get a perfect title to the land. Therefore I hope that this House will seriously consider this proposition and the results that it is likely to lead to if the language is adopted as broadly as it appears in the bill and as reported by the rule.

Mr. Speaker, last winter the Secretary of War and the ranking Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and stated that they had authority under the law as it then existed, and as it now exists, to make purchases of these various camps throughout the country, and that as a business proposition they thought that the Government ought to purchase this property even if it was not used for military purposes, but to be resold. They asked the advice of the Committee on Military Affairs as to what they should do. I took the position then, and the committee sustained the position that I took, that it was no part of the business of the Committee on Military Affairs to advise the executive branch of the Government as to what it should do in the matter of the administration of the law.

Subsequent to that time I was informed by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, that he had proceeded to purchase this property in accordance with the plan. They have made that trade; they have driven people off the land; the people have moved away; minors' interests are involved; and if you adopt the language of this resolution, then you are going to be unfair to thousands of people in this country, and you are going to embarrass the War Department in contracts they have entered into in good faith. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Has the committee a schedule of the purchases undertaken by the department?

Mr. DENT. That is in the hearings; yes. My recollection is that of the 32 camps established throughout the country there are about 16 that are going to be purchased. That information is in the hearings. All of those 16 are involved in this language in the bill, and I submit in all fairness that this is not a partisan proposition. I am sure that I have no interest in its location in Georgia, because I want to say frankly that I have been criticized by some of my constituents, because, being chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Georgia has got more than Alabama has out of the War Department. I have no interest in this proposition. It is a matter of fairness—fairness to the Government and fairness to the people with whom the Government has contracted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, did not the Secretary of War——

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, my time has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in this matter. I think this rule should be adopted by this House unanimously. Before the committee in January or February the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, appeared on this very item. He had not bought this land. He came before that committee and sought advice. We did not think he had authority after the armistice to go ahead and buy this land. Why, 130,000 acres of land in Georgia has been purchased since the armistice was signed, even after January and February of this year, 1919. That is the reason the Military Committee has seen proper to put on this bill this mandatory provision to prevent any of the officials of the War Department from going out helter-skelter and spending the people's money. Thirteen million dollars on this one project after the armistice. [Applause.] The Government ought to live up to its contracts, but we can not afford to let every Tom, Dick, and Harry connected with the War Department take $13,000,000 of the people's money after the war is over, three or four months after the armistice is signed, after coming before the Committee on Military Affairs and hinting that they did not think they had authority, but suggesting that they had, and buy lands and erect buildings. I say we can not afford to permit such things, and I think it is time to put this absolute inhibition and prohibition against this kind of conduct. The Chair correctly ruled yesterday on a technical point of order that this is subject to a point of order, and it is now up to the House to vote for this rule making it in order, then vote the provision into this bill. The Committee on Military Affairs in good faith put it into the bill, not as against the War Department but in the interest of the American taxpayer. [Applause.] That is what this is for. If this provision goes through we will stop it, and we can not stop it any other way. I have confidence in the War Department, but we know that they want to put up all the buildings on as much land for military establishments in times of peace in this country as they can, and this gentleman, Mr. Crowell, said if we had universal military compulsory service in peace times this land and buildings would be used for that purpose.

For many years the Government has owned 121,000 acres of land at Fort Sill, Okla., which had been used by the War Department for target practice, rifle ranges, and so forth. Why did they abandon this at the close of the war and arrange for this vast expenditure down in Georgia?

Who in this House wants to go out and buy property and waste money on a supposition of that kind? The proposition is as plain as can be. I do not care if it was in my district, I would be against it. I do not believe the taxpayers of this Government, whether in my section or anywhere else, would think of allowing the officials of this Government to go here in time of peace, after the war is over, and buy land and put up buildings when they are already burdened to the limit in order to raise money to carry out the legitimate expenses of this war. Gentlemen, this rule should be adopted, and when we get back in the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union this provision should be put on this bill like the committee brought it [applause], and it should be kept there. There is no mistake in the minds of the American people at this time. Do not think for a minute that the American people in any section of it are going to favor such useless expenditures as this. The taxpayers of this country want the Congress of the United States to curtail the expenses of the Government as low as they can be instead of allowing unnecessary expenditures to be carried on, as we know have been done in many instances. The facts are in plain black and white as to not only the purpose of these expenditures but as to the time it was done. If it was before the armistice, it would be a different proposition, but they had simply filed a petition to condemn some of this land gentleman speak about; it had not been condemned; people had not been run off their farms. They have done this plainly since the armistice has been signed, and I do not believe this Congress ought to vote to sustain it, and if any man has been deprived of money rights, he can come with a valid claim to the Government afterwards and get his damages. For one, I am here to vote for this rule. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How many more speeches has the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GARRETT. I have three.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman use some time?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, in the last paragraph of the bill making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1920, as reported by the Military Committee, appears the following:

And provided further, That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate.

When this provision was reached just before adjournment on yesterday Mr. CRISP, of Georgia, made a point of order against it, which was sustained by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. We now have under consideration a resolution from the Committee on Rules to make it in order.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] stated on yesterday that it was not the purpose of the Committee on Military Affairs, and certainly not his purpose in favoring the foregoing provision, to do any injustice to any citizen of this country or injure any citizen in his rights. If that provision of the bill is not amended, the effect of it will be to do very great injustice to many of the property owners of the country. If this resolution from the Committee on Rules is adopted, and it is very evident that it will be, I shall offer an amendment at the proper time, so as to authorize the War Department to carry out and pay for real estate contracted for for military purposes prior to the 11th day of November, 1918, when the armistice was signed.

I take for granted that there is no Member of the House who would support a provision the effect of which would be to prevent the War Department from carrying out contracts made with citizens for the acquirement of real estate during the war for military purposes with which to aid in winning the war. I am not prepared to believe that this House will adopt the provision which was stricken out heretofore on a point of order without very material changes and modifications. I shall have something further to say when this provision is taken up under the five-minute rule for amendments.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, while the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] was speaking, I attempted to secure recognition from the Speaker for the purpose of asking him a question, and as the gentleman from Oklahoma is now on the floor I would appreciate if he would in my time answer a question. I have no desire to embarrass the gentleman from Oklahoma, because he is always so courteous and fair and frank to his colleagues in the House, but I would like to suggest, if it would not embarrass him, that he place in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of War written to him in reply to his first letter. That would make complete the record for the House. As it now stands there are two letters from the gentleman from Oklahoma to the Secretary of War and none in reply.

Mr. FERRIS. I will be very glad to do that. I sent for them, but they did not get over here. That is the only reason they did not get in.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, during the progress of the war the Committee on Military Affairs of this House voted unlimited power and funds to the War Department for the prosecution of the war. We do not in this rule propose to question any part of the expenditure of that money for purposes of the prosecution of the war. What we do propose to do is to question here an expenditure of what I think will be, if they are permitted to go ahead with it fully, $20,000,000 of the money which we appropriated for the conduct of the war and now being unwarrantedly used for the construction of new buildings and new camps for the Army which we are now reorganizing on a peace basis.

When the Secretary of War came before our committee last January he stated that he did not believe he had the full right to spend that money for the purpose of the construction of this great camp in Georgia unless he had the advice and indorsement of our committee agreeing that it was proper to go ahead with it. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] said, our committee decided that it was not in our province to give advice to the War Department, but the very next day, acting upon instructions of members of the Military Committee, I introduced a resolution into the House which stipulated that no money appropriated for the conduct of the war should be expended for the acquirement of new camps or new construction without the specific authority of Congress. That was notice to the Secretary of War and to the War Department of the opinion of our committee. But what happened? Disregarding the advice which was really tendered in that resolution, and since the armistice was signed, the War Department has proceeded with the expenditure of $13,000,000 in the acquirement of land and the construction of a camp intended for the use of the Army in time of peace and located way down in the backwoods of Georgia.

What we propose to do is to demand that the War Department shall hereafter come to Congress for explicit authorization when it desires to expend a sum of that great magnitude. [Applause.]

I think all will agree that that is the proper business basis upon which this Government should be administered.

That the War Department knew that in what it was doing it might be doing wrong is shown clearly in the hearings which were held before our committee in January. I want to read for the information of the House, on page 16, as follows:

Mr. MCKENZIE. Why ask us to put these three great camps in, and spend these hundreds of millions of dollars, unless we know the number of men you want to have in them, and what purpose you are going to put them to? In brief, what is the policy behind the proposition?
Mr. CROWELL. In a general way, I will say we are not asking for legislation, but merely presenting these matters to you for consultation and advice. We have all the legislation now that we need.
Mr. MCKENZIE. Oh, that is your proposition?
Mr. KAHN. Have you the money with which to buy these things?
Mr. CROWELL. Yes.
Mr. KAHN. Well, now then, it is not legislation at all you are asking, nor appropriations?
Mr. CROWELL. No.
Mr. KAHN. But you are asking for the advice of the committee?
Mr. CROWELL. Exactly.
Mr. KAHN. Well, now, then again——
Mr. ANTHONY (interposing). You have money to spend for war emergencies, as I understand it?
Mr. CROWELL. Yes.
Mr. ANTHONY. But you could not conscientiously spend that money on a peace program? That is your idea, is it, when asking our advice?
Mr. CROWELL. I understand that we can spend money for military purposes. Isn't that right, Gen. Jervey?
Gen. JERVEY. I think so, but we felt we should have the advice of the committee.
Mr. CROWELL. We would not have come up here had we felt we could go ahead without your advice, I might add.
Mr. ANTHONY. Your idea is to prepare the Army for a peace basis?
Mr. CROWELL. Yes.
Mr. GREENE. How would our advice amount to anything in the absence of definite information as to your general plans and purposes? We are not constitutionally authorized to give you advice. We only have the right to legislate.

Yet, gentlemen, these people go ahead in spite of the fact that we refused to give these appropriations our sanction, and we believe the House will be doing the right and proper thing to-day in cutting off extravagances of this kind. And let me say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], who wants the people of that section, whose lands have already been taken, properly looked after, that the Committee on Military Affairs will take care of any reasonable proposition that is advanced to give their land back to these people and pay any reasonable damages, and restore that part of the country to the condition it was in before this unwarranted action was taken.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. DENT. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas if he will support an amendment striking out the word "unexpended" and substitute therefor the word "unobligated"?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I will not. My purpose is, once and for all, to stop this enormous expenditure and continued wild extravagance. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute and a half to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for two years and a little more, but this is the first occasion on which I have ever taken any of the time of this Congress. To my mind the Government of this great Nation ought to regard its contracts as sacredly as an individual does. [Applause.] I have not heard any Member of this body state that the War Department did not have the legal authority to enter into these contracts. If it had the authority, we will be placed in the position of repudiating a legal, binding contract, and I do not think the Government of the United States can with good grace do so.

In a number of cases these citizens, relying on the Government carrying out its contract, have abandoned their premises and have entered into contracts and purchased homes elsewhere. How are they to be protected if this amendment is adopted? I do think it would be a great mistake and would not reflect any credit upon this Congress to be placed in the attitude of violating a valid, legal contract. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE].

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, I live in that portion of Texas in which San Antonio is included. Since the establishment of San Antonio, 200 years ago, it has always had a military establishment, first under Spain, then under France, and under Mexico

and Texas, and finally under the United States. It has been so because of its climatic advantages and its proximity to the Mexican border and the Gulf.

I want to direct the attention of the House to this situation. Prior to the armistice and while we were at war with the Imperial German Government the Government purchased what is known as Kelly Field No. 1, San Antonio. They also took an option of purchase upon the adjoining tract of land known as Kelly Field No. 2, adjacent to No. 1, and erected buildings thereon that were used during the war for the training of soldiers and aviators for service in France. The option of purchase is now being exercised by the Government and deeds are passing. They also took an option of purchase upon what is known as Brooks Field, near Kelly Field, and opened it during the progress of the war to also train the aviators for the purposes of the war. Thousands of young men went to France from these fields. They also purchased a great tract of land known as Camp Travis as a permanent camp. They are now seeking to purchase a small portion of land for the erection of a hospital. If this rule goes through without amendment you will have millions of dollars worth of property erected by the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Army before the armistice ever occurred upon land that you now turn back to the owners.

What are you going to do about it? How can it be fixed? The owners have purchased land somewhere else. They have moved their homes elsewhere. The Government to-day is instituting condemnation proceedings against some of the owners of that land who would not come to reasonable terms. But I want to emphasize this: I do not think the War Department ought in time of peace, as a general proposition, to purchase one acre of land without the authority of Congress. But to repudiate these purchases would be an absolute injustice, because the options were taken before the armistice. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I shall move to amend the amendment which is to be proposed under the rule by striking out the word "unexpended," in line 4 of the bill as it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "unobligated."

On yesterday afternoon I inquired of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. KAHN] if such an amendment would meet his objection. I recall the answer—and I see it in the RECORD this morning—that such an amendment would not meet with objection from him.

Mr. KAHN. I said personally it would not.

Mr. LEVER. Yes, personally. Now, gentlemen, in reply to that suggestion, let me say that we ought to deal with this matter in a very personal way. Members of Congress acting for their Government can not afford to violate the faith of the Government. Members of Congress acting for their Government can not afford to put the Government of the United States in the attitude of violating a solemn obligation to its citizens. And yet, under the broad language proposed in this amendment, you make it mandatory upon the Government of the United States to say to the citizen of South Carolina who owns land which has been taken over for military purposes——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I can not now. You make it mandatory upon the Government to say to the citizen who owns land which has been taken for military purposes at Camp Jackson, who has moved his family, who has had his barn torn down, who has had to purchase property elsewhere, whose land has been wrecked and scraped and shot to pieces by artillery fire, whose land is now not suitable for the purposes to which he devoted it before it was taken over—you say to him, "The strong arm of the Government will break its faith to you, and you can not come back; or if you do come back, you come back to a piece of worthless property."

That is all there is in this situation; absolutely so. I agree fully with all these gentlemen in the conviction that the Government of the United States ought not to spend one single, solitary cent more for land for military purposes, except to carry out the faith of the Government and make good the obligations of the Government, and for this one other purpose, to which I will call attention, to see to it, if possible, that the Government shall protect itself in a business way in the salvage of this property.

Most of these camps have been built on leased land, and a great many of these lands will be returned to the owners, and the improvements, of course, will go to the original owners. I want to read to you what Assistant Secretary Crowell says. There is no politics in this, gentlemen. I hope there is no sectionalism in it. Assistant Secretary Crowell, who makes this statement, is, as I understand, a very, very influential Republican from the State of Ohio. I have never had the pleasure of meeting the gentleman. Here is what he said before the committee:

> Now, all these leases, of course, make us liable for damage to land. The estimated damage that we will have to pay is $2,933,000. Understand, that is for damage to land. The damages to improvements for which we are liable under these leases is $1,254,000. Adding together these three liabilities, rental, damage to land, and damage to improvements, on these 14 camps makes a total of $5,443,500, that we will have to pay, and get nothing but the use of the land and salvage.

Then he goes on further:

> Against that we can buy the land on which these camps are located for $9,654,000. Deducting our liabilities from the cost of this land leaves a net payment of $4,206,400. In other words, the net cost of these lands would be $4,000,000.

In other words—and this is important, gentlemen—

> The net worth of these lands, figuring no value for those which have been used, for instance, for parade grounds, from which the fertility has been drained away, is $6,717,000. So that, taking these 14 camps as a whole, it would seem that by paying $9,650,000 we avoid a liability of $5,443,000, and will own the property worth $6,717,000, thus showing a profit of $2,500,000 on this bare transaction.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for four and one-half minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the facts of this case, because it has been investigated by the Committee on Appropriations and investigated by the Senate. I can not read all of the testimony, but I want this committee to know the attitude that we were in at the adjournment of Congress and what the people in Congress believed about this matter. Omitting all that part of the testimony leading down to the conclusion, Mr. Baker, who was before the Committee on Appropriations early last year, after the signing of the armistice—omitting the first part of his statement and getting down to the conclusion, he says:

> When we went before the Senate Committee, however, these Senators who were present expressed pretty confident judgment that it was wiser not to go forward with the Columbus, Ga., camp—

That is, this Bennings camp.

Mr. GARRETT. Whose statement is the gentleman reading?

Mr. SISSON. The statement of Mr. Baker, Secretary of War—

> which involves very large acreage, but the amount already purchased being exceedingly small. There had been no large construction actually carried out there, and it was more nearly at the beginning than the other two. For that reason, when Mr. Crowell and I talked about it afterwards, we came to the conclusion that it was pretty clear from the Senate committee's attitude that they did not look with favor on the purchase of the Columbus, Ga., camp, and therefore have entirely discontinued any purchases at Columbus, Ga.
>
> Mr. GILLETT. That was the one this committee refused to appropriate for, was it not?
>
> The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sherley). Yes.

Now, in order that you may know the attitude of the War Department at the time we took the matter up, a little later in the hearings, I will read a statement showing the exact attitude with reference to Bennings at the time that Congress thought it was abandoned.

> The CHAIRMAN. Now, at Camp Bennings, what has been done there in the way of land?
>
> Mr. WOODS. At Camp Bennings the expenditures for land aggregate $29,818.75, and the acceptances are $118,975.75.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What is it contemplated that the land would cost if the project was carried out?
>
> Mr. WOODS. The estimated cost at Camp Bennings, as I now recall, was $3,500,000 for an area of about 115,000 acres.
>
> Mr. CANNON. At how much per acre?
>
> Maj. HOLDEN. About $30 per acre, roughly.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate that it would cost the Government to get out of that area?
>
> Mr. WOODS. Probably from $300,000 to $400,000.
>
> Mr. CANNON. You have not much in the way of construction there, have you?
>
> Mr. WOODS. There is a substantial amount of construction, but not the amount that has been done at either Bragg or Knox.
>
> Mr. CANNON. The construction has been largely in the matter of a railroad, has it not?
>
> Mr. WOODS. They have some barracks and buildings completed, and there are some under construction.
>
> Maj. HOLDEN. I think that Mr. CANNON'S statement about this particular project is more or less correct, and that the building of a railroad was the big expenditure there.

That was the statement of the War Department officials who appeared before the committee at that time. I will not weary you by reading any further; but your Committee on Appropria-

tions investigated this matter, and it was then agreed and understood that this project at Bennings was to be entirely abandoned, and I was amazed when this military bill came in and I found that they had gone on with the Bennings project after they had agreed to abandon it. I do not know just how it was done.

Now one word in reference to the criticism of this proviso. No man who has entered into a contract with the Government will under the present law lose a single dollar. [Applause.] It is the prospective sellers of land who will be affected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. KAHN the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, H. R. 5227, with Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KAHN: Page 52, line 2, after the word "appropriations," insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That no part of any of the appropriations made herein, nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment, shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments."

Mr. LEVER. I offer an amendment to the amendment to strike out the word "unexpended" and insert in lieu thereof the word "unobligated."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVER: Strike out the word "unexpended" in the amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "unobligated."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 641. An act to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes";

S. 122. An act authorizing a commission to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate $500,000 therefor, and for other purposes;

S. 643. An act to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia;

S. 1274. An act making it unnecessary to secure permits from any governmental agency for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account, except for alien enemies or alien enemy countries; and

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents and other material to the State of Wisconsin for National Army Encampment to be held in Milwaukee, Wis.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] does not desire to speak, I should like to have recognition on the amendment.

Mr. KAHN. I do not care to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CRISP. He told me he did not care for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina yields the floor. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes if I should use that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not think there is a finer body of men anywhere in the world than the Members of the House of Representatives. I think as a rule you want to do justice, want to do what is right, but we are all human, and sometimes I fear that our prejudice sweeps aside our judgment and that we determine to do a thing whether it is right or wrong. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that is the condition and frame of mind that this House is now in. Therefore I approach the discussion of this matter with little hope of influencing or changing the committee at all, but still I want to present certain cold facts to the committee, and let them ponder them if they will before they make up their judgment on this question.

I am here advocating and supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], which provides that funds heretofore appropriated shall not be used in payment for any land the Government is not now obligated to buy.

Gentlemen, if the officials of the War Department did not have authority to buy the land in the first instance, then under the amendment the Government is under no obligation to pay for it. But if the War Department officials did have authority to buy the land and the Government is obligated for it, will this Congress repudiate the solemn obligation of the Government?

I do not believe that one of you would repudiate your private obligations. Now, you are acting for the Government. Can you in good faith vote for the Government to repudiate its authorized obligations?

Gentlemen, you are on record as to this proposition. This week, in one day's time, you voted to appropriate $750,000,000 for the railroad corporations. Why? Because you said that the Government had contracted for certain machinery, railroad equipment, and therefore it would not be honest not to pay for it. In the last Congress, just before we adjourned, we passed a bill authorizng the Government to pay $3,000,000,000 for inchoate, incomplete contracts, because you said in the stress of war public officials had entered into these obligations, and it would work hardships on citizens who acted in good faith with the Government for the Government to repudiate the debts, and that it would not be honest not to pay for them.

In the last Congress we also passed an appropriation of $7,000,000, or so much as was necessary, to be used to pay certain gentlemen who had gone out prospecting for minerals, because Congress said Government officials had asked the people to increase the production of those minerals needed for war purposes, and as they incurred expenses for the Government the Government should pay the bill.

What is the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina? It is not to tie up the hands of the Government in paying for lands that the Government, acting within the letter of the law, has contracted for.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman state the date upon which these contracts for land were made, whether it was before or after the armistice?

Mr. CRISP. I hold no brief for Fort Benning, and that seems to be the one that all this is leveled at. I hope there is nothing sectional in this; but if there is, why not limit the proposition to Fort Benning and not cover 16 or 18 other propositions throughout the United States? Answering the gentleman, as I said, Fort Benning is not in my district. I am not familiar with the facts in the case, but the Representative from that district [Mr. WRIGHT] has advised me that there were a good many thousand acres of land purchased before the armistice, and that this school was established by the War Department at Fort Benning on the 11th of October, 1918, which was prior to the armistice.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want to suggest to the gentleman, as he has invited it in his remarks, that the land purchased prior to the armistice is provided for in payment by the act to which the gentleman refers for settling up old war claims when the armistice came. What we are questioning is the use of money appropriated to build up a regular peace establishment.

Mr. CRISP. The amendment that I support only authorizes the expenditure of money heretofore appropriated for the payment for land that the Government had the authority to obligate itself to buy, and where the Government has obligated itself, whether the contract was wise or unwise.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I decline to yield now. I know that the House is against me; I know I am not going to change a vote; but I want to put the cold facts before you and let them go in the RECORD.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Does the gentleman know whether or not these contracts that have been entered into by the Government had the right of recision by the Government?

Mr. CRISP. I do not; I never saw any of the contracts. I hold no brief for the War Department, but during the war the great majority of the House has voted everything the officials of the War Department asked, and it was almost treason to question any act of the department. I believe that the Army officers and officials of the War Department are honest men. I do not believe there are any crooks among them. They are honest and able and performed their duty faithfully, and I think, on the whole, efficiently, and I do not see why now these same men's acts are questioned as if they did not honestly and faithfully perform their duty.

As I said, I hold no brief for Fort Benning. If that is what this proviso is aimed at, why not specify it?

The War Department to-day advised me that if this proviso becomes a law it will affect legal contracts made by the War Department for the purchase of land for the following Army camps: Dodge, Iowa; Custer, Mich.; Grant, Ill.; Sherman, Ohio; Lee, Va.; Taylor, Ky.; Travis, Tex.; Benning, Ga.; Pike, Ark.; Gordon, Ga.; Jackson, S. C.; Devens, Mass.; Dix, N. J.; Upton, N. Y.; Meade, Md.

That, in addition to these camps, it will interfere with the Government in executing contracts made for land for several aviation camps bought, and buildings erected thereon, and men trained for the Air Service, long before the armistice was signed. In addition to this, the Government has entered into valid contracts for land to be used for other governmental purposes, and these contracts will be seriously affected by the proviso. The department states that with this provision a law innumerable citizens throughout the United States having legal contracts with the Government for the sale of their land will be forced to go into the Court of Claims to establish their claim against the Government and then appeal to Congress to make appropriation to pay the same. The Secretary of War wrote the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee that this proviso would seriously interfere with the Government.

Gentlemen of the House, will you place this great burden and hardship upon patriotic citizens of the United States, who have turned over their homes to the Government of the United States to be used for war purposes when many of them were forced to move out over their protest? Will you be so unjust to these citizens as to require them to go into the Court of Claims to establish their claim against the Government, when you have passed laws appropriating billions of dollars to let manufacturers and other contractors be paid by the Government for illegal contracts entered into by Government officials with them for sundry supplies? Illegal contracts, because under the law contracts made by the War Department for the purchase of supplies for the Army to be binding must be reduced to writing, the officer making the contract must attach to it an affidavit that he has no interest therein, and this contract must be filed with the Secretary of the Interior. You are well aware that contracts of this character, totaling over a billion of dollars, were made by the War Department, and you have passed an act of Congress validating those contracts and appropriating money to pay them, without requiring those citizens to go into the Court of Claims. I appeal to you, gentlemen, to give the citizens who entered into binding contracts with the Government for the sale of their land as square a deal as you give the manufacturer.

If the Government officials acted within the authority conferred upon them by law, having entered into the obligations and contracts to purchase land, why should we treat these gentlemen differently from what we are treating those who entered into the contracts to furnish chemicals, or differently from what we would the obligations of the Railroad Administration. All I am asking is that they all be treated alike.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. These appropriations that the gentleman has instanced as parallel to this were projects of breach of contract and not the fulfillment of contracts at all, but the covering of damages. The amendment the gentleman supports is an amendment for the completion of a contract, the payment of contract money.

Mr. CRISP. What is the difference in principle in the payment of what you are obligated to pay and the payment of damages for breach of the obligation?

Mr. ELSTON. The two are not parallel at all.

Mr. CRISP. That is a difference of opinion.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will pardon me, we obligated ourselves to pay for spring wheat, and that is parallel to this.

Mr. CRISP. That is parallel to this proposition, and I thank the gentleman.

As I said, I know nothing of this Fort Benning proposition. I am advised by my friend from Connecticut, Mr. TILSON, that he has gone over it, and he told me that there was no better place in the United States for a school of that kind than this camp. He said there were hills and dales, woods and water—that the topography was varied, and that the camp was ideally located for the purpose intended. I know nothing about it, but I do know this: The War Department officials, whom we trusted with the conduct of the war while we were at war, deliberately investigated this proposition. They made one investigation and recommended Camp Benning, and our good friend, Mr. FERRIS, questioned their action in that recommendation and asked the Secretary of War to again investigate it. The officials again investigated it, and they again decided that the public interest would be best served by moving that camp to Columbus, Ga., and I have no doubt but that they acted wisely. I hope the amendment to the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. ALMON: Page 52, line 4, after the word "the," strike out the word "unexpended" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "unobligated prior to the 11th day of November, 1918."

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, the substitute which I have offered for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] simply authorizes unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army, or the Military Establishment, can be expended in carrying out obligations made by the War Department for the purchase of real estate prior to the 11th day of November, 1918, the date of the armistice. Last Congress authorized the Secretary of War to acquire real estate and erect such military establishments as was necessary for the prosecution of the war.

The letter from the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Military Committee which was read a few moments ago states that many contracts were made by the War Department for land to be used for military purposes which had not been closed out, and that the passage of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California would very much embarrass the War Department. We all know and fully realize what a stupendous undertaking the War Department had in connection with its duties during the recent war. We are all justly proud of the record made by the department, and we can not now afford to do anything that would interfere with it in carrying out just and honest obligations made during the war. Members of the House have cited numerous instances where the proposed amendment would work a very great hardship upon the individual citizen and at the same time cause heavy loss to the Government. Many others could be cited.

The failure of the Government to carry out its obligations with its citizens would be indefensible. I am not prepared to believe that there is a single Member of this House who would knowingly favor and vote for a measure which would prevent the War Department from carrying out its obligations made during the war.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to the statement made by the Assistant Secretary of War January 3, 1919, to the effect that none of these lands had been acquired before the armistice was signed.

Mr. ALMON. I presume the gentleman refers to lands at Camp Benning in Georgia. I know nothing about transactions pertaining to that camp and have had nothing to say about it. My amendment only provides for carrying out contracts for the purchase of lands made prior to the time the armistice was signed.

I do not know what construction will be placed upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], but the adoption of my substitute would remove any doubt and would authorize the War Department to carry out contracts made for land for military purposes prior to the 11th day of November, 1918.

I am as much in favor of economy as any Member of the House, but I am not in favor of economy at the expense of honesty and principle. At the last session of Congress we passed, by an almost unanimous vote, a bill authorizing the War Department to adjust and make payments justly due under contracts which were invalid for the reason that they were not made in accordance with law. We also authorized the payment of certain expenditures which had been made for the development of certain minerals which it was thought would be needed in the prosecution of the war, although contracts for same had not been made in accordance with the United States statutes. I call attention to these things for the purpose of showing that Congress did not want the Government to take advantage of any of its citizens on account of the irregularity of war contracts, but that it was the purpose of Congress as far as it could to see that all of its citizens were protected, and that all of the Government's obligations would be carried out in good faith.

The proposed action of the House at this time is the first intimation, to my knowledge, of any act on the part of Congress which would have a tendency to repudiate obligations made by the Government during the war.

Neither this Congress nor the last Congress has done anything that would have a tendency to repudiate contracts made by the War Department or any other department of this Government during the prosecution of the war. If you pass this provision without amendment, much injustice will no doubt be done, and the rights of many citizens will be violated and in many cases the rights of the Government would be interfered with, because the Government has acquired property which has not been paid for because the titles have not yet been passed on by the Department of Justice, and valuable improvements have been put upon some of the lands. It would be to the interest of the Government, as well as the citizens, to have such contracts carried out. Good faith and common honesty demand that it should be done.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this entire question depends upon two facts, which ought to be ascertained. First, did the War Department have the right to make the contract? If the War Department had the right to make the contracts, then, without question, it follows logically that the Government is responsible for the execution of those contracts. Second, was there a clause in the contracts giving the right to the Government, through the War Department, to rescind these contracts? That question has not been answered, although I asked the question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. If that question is answered in the negative, and the Government had no right to rescind the contracts by reason that there was no clause giving the right of recision, then, again, it follows that the Government is responsible for the execution of the contracts.

Next, suppose this proviso is adopted. Then it follows again, logically, that the Government will not expend any money for the completion of those contracts, to wit, for the purchase of this property. Then what follows? Then it follows again clearly, and as a matter of law, that if the Government does not complete the contracts, and the department had the right to make the contracts, and there was no power of recision in the contracts, then the Government must pay damages.

Therefore you are up against this proposition: You have either to abide by the contracts as made or you have to pay damages, and it is as broad as it is long, except in one instance you have litigation and the other you have not.

The amendment suggested by the gentleman sitting at my right is this: That money shall not be expended, except obligated prior to the date, November 11, 1918, which clearly foreshadows and means this: That no money other than obligated money for the purposes of these contracts shall be expended in pursuance of any future obligation which was made by the Government for the future purchase of lands.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. No; I will not be interrupted by the gentleman as I am trying to reason this thing out legally and logically. Therefore, it strikes me that this amendment covers the ground which is contemplated by the proposers of this proviso, to wit, that you can not expend any money except that which the Government obligated itself to pay. Adopt the proviso as it now is and you will not pay any money at all, but you will land in a lawsuit and you will have to pay money in damages. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that Members of the House will not feel there is any disposition on the part of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, especially upon this side of the House, to make out of this matter a partisan question. The fact of the matter is that the first question I asked the Secretary of War when he appeared before our committee was whether or not he had expended any large amount of money for such purpose since the signing of the armistice. He said that they had not. I stated to him that my question was prompted by a statement that I had seen in the newspapers that they were about to expend $100,000 in the construction of a permanent improvement at Camp Grant, in the State of Illinois, and I want to say to you now that as far as I am personally concerned I am just as much opposed to the expenditure of public money unnecessarily at Camp Grant as I am at Camp Benning or any other camp within the United States.

Another thing I want to mention before taking up the argument is this: I hope that no man again will take the floor in the argument of this question and appeal to our sympathies for the widows and the orphans whose title to the land in question might be involved.

Surely no man would advocate a proposition that would rob the widows and the orphans of Georgia or of Illinois, and that is only begging the question here to-day. That is not the proposition of this amendment, to defeat any individual citizen in his rights. And I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that if these people have a legitimate and legal right it will be respected by the Congress of the United States in the same manner that we recognize the rights of the men who have entered into contracts with the Government to furnish materials, to furnish ore, and different metals for the manufacture of munitions of war.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE (continuing). And an amendment to the law can be easily enacted that will take care of that proposition. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALMON. Does the gentleman think those citizens ought to be subjected to the trouble and expense and delay of coming before the Court of Claims or the Congress for their money?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that it is sometimes even necessary for the individual citizen to suffer perhaps some inconvenience for the benefit of all the citizens of the country. [Applause.] I want to say furthermore that when they are talking about the Government of the United States keeping its obligations and not repudiating its contracts, no man stands for that more strongly than I do, and I want to say to the gentleman that it is not a question of repudiating our legal contracts and our legal obligations.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman question the right of these persons to make the contracts prior to the 11th of November, 1918?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT. He questions the right?

Mr. McKENZIE. I question the right of some of these contracts.

Mr. GARRETT. I wanted to obtain the gentleman's point of view.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say very frankly to the gentleman from Tennessee that in the legislation enacted for the carrying on of the war it was only intended that the War Department should provide sufficient cantonments and camps for the training of the size Army that we proposed to put in the field. Under that law they established 16 National Guard camps; under that law they established 16 cantonments for the training of the National Army; under that law they established 16 flying fields for the training of aviators in the Air Service of this country besides numerous other little side camps. These camps had a capacity to take care of the size Army that we proposed to put into the field, and when any official in the War Department would go out to any section of this country and enter into a contract with the people for the purpose of buying real estate and establishing unnecessary camps, unnecessary for the military uses and purposes of this country, I deny his right to bind the people of this country to pay for that thing. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will yield first to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would like some information, if the gentleman can furnish it, in reference to the provisions of the contract under which these purchases were made. It has been suggested here privately that these contracts carried a provision under which the Government had the option not to make the purchase. I have no information about it, and I hope some member of the committee will give some information in regard to it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I wish to say I have not seen a copy of the contract.

Mr. AYRES. Is it a fact that most of this land was acquired by condemnation proceedings?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think not, and I will get to that in a moment. I was speaking about the acquiring of a greater amount of land than was necessary. We gave them no authority to do that, and I have no objection to every obligation on the Government that is founded upon right and justice and law. I think we ought to observe it, and it will be observed, there is no question of that, and if you read the testimony of the hearings, beginning with the 3d and 4th of January, you will find on the last page of those hearings they were simply bolstering up this proposition on the ground that they had the right to go out and purchase these camps for military purposes, and they had no special appropriation giving them the power to do so, but they used the money which was appropriated for barracks and quarters and out of that fund they have been paying these bills. Now as to the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If these obligations are right, if they are founded on law, if there is any authority of Congress behind the acts of those gentlemen in the War Department—and I care not whether Republicans or Democrats; it is immaterial to me whether Mr. Crowell is a Republican or a Democrat; I do not care from what State he may come or what his politics may be; it is not a question of politics—if they can show that there is any authority of law, then this House will not deny an appropriation of money to take care of this proposition. If there is not warrant of law, then the only refuge or recourse that these citizens have is to come before Congress and collect the damages to which they are justly entitled, and I am sure that they will get them.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I understood the gentleman to say in response to an inquiry from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that he questioned the right of the War Department to make these contracts.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENT. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: If the War Department has no authority in law to make the contracts, then why is it necessary to put any provision in this bill giving them authority to pay for an unauthorized obligation?

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to put a provision in this law that will be so plain that even the officials of the War Department will understand it. [Applause.] If you put in the word "unobligated," then some one passes upon the question arising under each of these individual contracts, Is this or that obligation proper and lawful? And who passes on it? The gentlemen down in the War Department. I want the Congress of the United States, which is the representative body of the people and which is part of the Government, to pass a law and make it so plain that there will be no question about the legality of the contracts.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield for just one other question?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman certainly does not mean that the War Department passes on the question of whether they have the authority to do it or not. I thought that was done by the Comptroller of the Treasury.

Mr. McKENZIE. Well, even so; I think the gentleman is perhaps correct on that—the question of law—but I am not willing to leave it with any one individual to pass on these matters. It is a simple duty that we owe to the people of this country to say now that we are going to stop further expenditure in the purchase of land and the erection of useless buildings for the Army in peace times, when we have plenty of buildings and cantonments and camps in which to take care of an Army of three or four millions of men.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am in sympathy with the general position, and I ask this question for information: If you adopt this amendment do you not make it impossible to use money of the Government to pay for land that has been legally contracted for?

Mr. McKENZIE. Possibly, but I want to say to the gentleman from Texas, even if that is true, those people who have just claims will have only to appear and present their claims.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that in all such cases all that will be necessary is to submit that proposition to the Congress of the United States and an appropriation will be made to take care of the legal obligations of the Government. To my mind there is no question about that. But this amendment will stop now and for the future any further obligations, legal or otherwise, for the purchase of land.

And I want to say another thing now in conclusion. With Camp Benning and Camp Bragg, I think it is, and one other camp in Kentucky—with the three camps—they came before us to ask our opinion as to going on and spending money, and we declined to give our indorsement to that proposition; and although they admitted that none of the land had been purchased when the armistice was signed, they went on deliberately involving this Government in such expenditures as we now have to meet. And I want to ask the gentleman from Texas, or any other gentleman of this House, if he does not believe that it is the province of the Congress of the United States to say how large the Military Establishment of this country shall be; how many men we shall have in it; how many ports we shall have; how many camps we shall have; how many firing fields we shall have? Do you not believe it is about time the Congress was asserting its right to say those things in the interest of the people rather than letting a few men—and I do not accuse them of anything dishonest, but it is their judgment which I question—go on and involve this country in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars uselessly?

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] well said that there was no excuse for abandoning Fort Sill. I have been at Fort Sill. I have looked out at those barren mountains, and I have thought what a magnificent place for an artillery firing field. There is no better place on the face of the earth. Go up into Pennsylvania, at Tobyhanna, where we have one, and we have another up at Sparta, Wis. In God's name, is it necessary to go into the State of Georgia or any other part of this country and establish another artillery firing field in peace times, when in all the years gone by we have not taken care of these fields that we now have?

Gentlemen, I hope the amendment will be adopted without a single addition made to it. It is our duty to the people to do it.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman, of course, knows that down in New Mexico, at Fort Wingate, we practically have 115 square miles in one military reservation.

Mr. McKENZIE. And that is not all. In this field in Georgia you will find, if you read the hearings, they are taking over 30,000 acres of cultivatable land, agricultural land, driving the farmers off of it, and putting it into an artillery firing field, when we have millions of acres of barren public land in the West that could be utilized for this purpose.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. Did the War Department, in the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois, have the legal authority to enter into this contract or obligation?

Mr. McKENZIE. I have just said that I do not think so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman from Illinois construe this proviso to mean that the War Department will be prohibited from turning any money into real estate out of this fund, even if the purchase were legal?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think if it becomes the law it will be stopped until they come to Congress and get an authorization.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, the gentleman sustains the proposition that if a contract was made for the purchase of real estate, even before the armistice, in good faith no money still unexpended could be had for a payment of that sort?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think that is a fair conclusion. But I want to ask the gentleman if he noticed a little item in the paper a few days ago, I think last Saturday, where they paid $1,000,000 for the settlement of one camp? I want to let the people of the country know that the Congress of the United States puts its brand of disapproval on this character of work. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, the gentleman from Illinois admits he would be willing to advocate a proposition

which prohibits the Government of the United States from paying a legal contract entered into before the armistice was signed?

Mr. McKENZIE. Not at all. I do not think that is a fair assumption.

Mr. IGOE. Did the gentleman from Illinois ever try to get a claim bill through the Congress?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are three amendments pending.

Mr. KAHN. I move that all debate on the three amendments be closed in 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves——

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have three minutes.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, it was understood that liberality would be allowed under the five-minute rule, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE] desires five minutes to speak in support of an amendment. He is a new Member, and I think his desire ought to be granted.

Mr. KAHN. If we can ascertain how much time is desired, possibly I can change my request. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire five minutes?

Mr. ALMON. No; it is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE].

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the pending amendments be closed in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments be closed in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I presume the time will be given to the ones indicated a moment ago?

Mr. KAHN. I presume the Chairman of the committee noticed the gentlemen who desire the time and will yield it accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has taken note of the Members who were to be recognized. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman's request to be to close debate at the expiration of 20 minutes on the amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. KAHN. No; on the pending amendments to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think there is a possibility of misunderstanding as to what the chairman proposes to do. Does he propose to close debate on the pending amendments in the plural?

Mr. KAHN. On the pending amendments to the amendment. I understand there are three pending amendments to change the verbiage of the amendment. It is those I refer to.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You identify the amendment as what language?

Mr. KAHN. One is to strike out the word "expended" and substitute the word "obligated."

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; what amendment are these amendments pending to?

Mr. KAHN. The amendment that I offered to the paragraph.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. There was some confusion here, and I did not understand before.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I dislike very much, as a new Member, to impose myself on the committee, especially when the committee is anxious to get to a vote. But the sense of fairness that does prevail among men eventually asserts itself.

This proposition under the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON] merely provides that where these contracts have been entered into prior to November 11, 1918, the Government shall carry them out.

Now, what are the facts about this matter? We went, in April, 1917, into the untried and uncharted sea of the greatest war in the history of the world. It was not believed by any man in this country or any man in any portion of the world that the Imperial Government of Germany would be brought to its knees in defeat earlier than 1920, or, at least, until the latter part of 1919. The Government of the United States, preparing for this stupendous struggle, started out with the building up of a great army. The Congress of the United States gave the Government absolute power in the premises. They went into it with that purpose in view, and the fact that on November 11, 1918, this war was brought to a close was due to the magnificent valor and courage of the American soldier [applause], and the American people ought not now, because that was done, to be put in the position of seeing their Government repudiate a contract honestly entered into.

As I said a moment ago in the brief time that was allotted to me, in the city which I have the honor to represent, the Government purchased Kelly Field No. 1, and took an option on Kelly Field No. 2, and erected millions of dollars' worth of buildings on these two properties, owning one and exercising the option to purchase the other. If you do something here to prevent that result, it will cost the Government of the United States more money to remove the buildings away from there than it would cost it to purchase the 1,400 acres of land it now has. It is the same way at Brooks Field, taken during the war to train the men that went to France and brought glory and honor to the flag and glory and credit to this great Nation of ours.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my friend from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] says the former owners can present their claims hereafter. Yes; and I predict that a hundred years from now, if you adopt that form of procedure, the descendants of Members now in this Hall will see a committee of Congress, known as the "committee on German war claims," as we now have a Committee on Revolutionary War Claims. There is no chance of obtaining speedy redress from a committee on claims. The facts are that before November 11, 1918, this Government was at war; you authorized the expenditure of the money; you ought not to repudiate that which was done prior to that time.

I appeal to this House, I appeal to the sense of fairness of the Members, outside of the question of what will become of the people who have sold this land and moved to other places and made their homes elsewhere and who can not live there any longer, but for the credit of the Government and for the honor of the Government, not to repudiate a contract honestly entered into.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. Suppose at the end of the war the Government had been obligated under a legal contract to buy $30,000,000 worth of shells, on which contract no work had been commenced. That would be a contract legally entered into, binding on the Government and binding on the manufacturer. Does the gentleman contend that as to such a contract, uncompleted prior to the armistice, the Government should go right on and have such a contract completed? The gentleman knows that that was not done as to provisions, ammunition, and other war materials. The Government did not go ahead because it was obligated on those contracts. It did not say, "We feel that we must manufacture all this material and then dump it in the sea." As a matter of fact, all such contracts were canceled, and Congress has made appropriations to cover the damages suffered by the manufacturer. The gentleman gets no parallel whatever from the past acts of Congress on this subject—that a contract with respect to the purchase of land which may now seem imprudent shall be completed, although we will never need the land, is contrary to past practice and to common business sense. There is no immorality involved in canceling such a contract if all reasonable damage is paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BEE. Inasmuch as the gentleman has been using my time, I will ask unanimous consent for five minutes in which to reply to the gentleman's speech.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but the time has been limited by agreement.

Mr. BEE. Then I find myself in this situation, that the gentleman has made my speech for me on the opposite side of the question. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the resolution presented from the Committee on Rules early in the day I stated that I had been greatly handicapped in reaching a conclusion as to what should be done by reason of our inability to obtain any accurate information as to the situation. This discussion has been illuminating, not so much in the presentation of facts as because it has brought us face to face with a plain, simple, easily to be understood proposition of law. It does not require a lawyer to understand it. The most ordinary layman who has any sense of justice or right can understand the proposition. That is simply whether the moral right exists on the part of this body to pass legislation retroactive in its character and prevent the carrying out of contracts confessedly legal. I fear that my good friend from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], for whom I have the

greatest respect, has diverted the minds of some of the Members from the proper view of this situation by criticism of the officials of the War Department who entered into these contracts. That is not the question, gentlemen. Criticism of the wisdom of their contracts may be justified, but what are the rights of those persons from whom this land was purchased or whose land has been condemned under authority of law? The desire to criticize the judgment of men who entered into what some may call improvident contracts should not blind us to the rights of those who in many instances were helpless in the face of the negotiations that were carried on by the Government's agents. Men have been torn from their homes under condemnation proceedings carried on legally in the courts of the country, and it is proposed now to pass an amendment that will deny payment to those people. Why, gentlemen, surely the Congress will not do that. What objection can there possibly be to adopting one of the amendments proposed, either that of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] or that proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON]? It preserves the rights of those whose property has been taken. It preserves the honor and the integrity of the Congress in carrying out the obligations of the Government. It stops the expenditures for the future, which is the end that gentlemen desire to obtain. It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that in all good conscience and in all good faith one of these amendments to the amendment ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the situation with reference to those owners and tenants whose homes and places of living have been taken away by the Government. I read from the testimony of Assistant Secretary Crowell before the Military Affairs Committee, on page 26:

All owners and tenants have been notified that their lands would be taken over by the Government, and in many instances they have arranged to go elsewhere and in many instances have actually moved. All were notified they could not raise a crop this coming year on these lands. In some instances the tenants have purchased elsewhere, making a small payment and giving notes for the balance, relying upon the receipt of their money from the Government for their present holding to pay for the new lands acquired. The lands on which condemnation proceedings have not been filed and on which agreement had not been made with the real-estate unit, were in a status undergoing adjustment or agreement for price between the owner and the real-estate unit. It is believed that in many instances in these cases condemnation proceedings will be necessary. Of the cultivated land a greater portion of it was holdings of small families who of necessity must secure payment from the Government before they can acquire lands elsewhere.

Here the Government has gone into a community and has said to persons living on the land, "You can not plant any crop this year on that land, because the Government desires to use it for military purposes." It has said to the tenant farmer, "You must move to another place." It has said to the small landowner, "The Government needs your property for military purposes, for the training of your boys, for rifle ranges, and the like of that. Therefore you must get out of your home, go elsewhere, either become a tenant or buy, if you can." The testimony of Assistant Secretary Crowell is that many of these small owners have purchased small tracts of land, made small payments upon them, and are now awaiting the Government's fulfillment of its solemn obligation to pay for the property taken. I say to you gentlemen in all seriousness, as a man talking to men, as a man who tries to fulfill his personal obligations, talking to men who try to fulfill their personal obligations, I do not believe there is a man here who can afford to write it into the statute of his Government that his Government, though he be an honest man, shall deal dishonestly with its citizens in the fulfillment of its solemn obligations. [Applause.] That is absolutely all there is to this proposition, except the business proposition. I want to submit that to you for a moment. Assistant Secretary Crowell gave us the reasoning and the figures, and his conclusion is that by the purchase of this land, in the saving of damage suits, in the saving of various and sundry things, he can save to the Government of the United States on these 14 cantonments $2,500,000. Now, I do not know whether the Assistant Secretary of War knows what he is talking about or not. I have had little to do with military matters, but he testified to it. It is in the hearings. It is not controverted. There has not been a man here to-day favoring this proposition who has stood upon the floor of the House and denied the correctness of the Secretary's statement. So I must take it at its face value. Can we afford, in these days of large expenditure and heavy taxation, to turn aside from the proposition to save $2,500,000, which we can save by adopting the amendment I have offered?

Now, gentlemen, let me call your attention to this fact: When I was in charge of the wheat-guaranty bill here the question was raised as to whether or not the Government owed an obligation to the spring-wheat growers of this country. Although they do not raise wheat enough in my district to make biscuits three times a week, I stood here, believing I was representing the honor and integrity of my Government, and I stood for that complete guaranty on spring wheat because it was a Government obligation. [Applause.] Can you now afford to do less in this case? [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] seem to be disturbed lest the Government shall fail to meet its obligations in some instances. In my opinion, the gentlemen are not in fact disturbed in that regard. They know, and we all know, that the Federal Government will meet all its obligations eventually, and we hope promptly, and will make all payments that may be due to anyone whom the Government owes or whom the War Department has agreed to pay for any property that has been taken. Eventually I have no manner of doubt, and I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina has no manner of doubt, the Government will not only go so far as to fulfill all of its legal obligations, but it will fulfill all of its moral obligations, and in doing so it will give the benefit of this doubt to the people who have claims against the Government for property it has taken or proposed to take.

It is a condition that confronts us and not a theory—a condition growing out of the fact that the War Department has refused to pay any attention to the expressed will of Congress relative to the building of camps and cantonments. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Secretary of War, when he knew that Congress had refused to appropriate, after due consideration, for the purchase or approve the building of a certain camp, proceeded to take other funds that were available, or that he thought were available, and use them for such purposes. We will meet the Government's obligations; there is no question about that; but if we are to stop the reckless expenditure of Federal money in these days of peace, for the purchase and building of camps and cantonments, Congress must take the matter into its own hands. [Applause.] And it can only take the matter into its own hands by a provision such as is now before the House. [Applause.]

I regret to say that it is my opinion that if you leave a hole in this ironclad provision the size of a gimlet the War Department would not hesitate to pull a ten-million camp or cantonment through it. [Laughter and applause.]

It is because of that fact we must pass this amendment unamended. Congress is going to be in session for some time. Some gentlemen think that we will recess soon; I do not. In my opinion we will be in session some months, and after this provision becomes law the War Department will let us know speedily and promptly what its obligations are, and we will meet them. But we want to create a condition under which Congress shall determine what is to be done in the matter of the extension of camps and not the War Department. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my substitute be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 4, after the word "the," strike out the word "unexpended" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "unobligated prior to the 11th of November, 1918."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALMON) there were 57 ayes and 151 noes.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now arises on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEVER) there were 77 ayes and 140 noes.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment. I will read it myself, as it is not very plainly written. It is as follows:

Page 52, line 7, after the words "real estate," add the following: "except for the payment of the purchase price of real estate contracted for or in which condemnation proceedings were instituted by the Government prior to November 11, 1918: *Provided*, That such contract or condemnation was authorized by law prior to November 11, 1918.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that very probably the patience of the House has become exhausted by the recent debate. I want to say that I have not a particle of personal interest in this

proposition. I represent a district that has no cantonment, no aviation field, no Government activity, in it. The sum total of the activities of the people in my district has been for her people to subscribe to Government obligations, have her sons die, and sacrifice themselves on the field of battle or in the camps.

But, my friends, here is a proposition, it seems to me, involving a far graver concern and interest than any special interest that may arise from the location of these improvements. That matter is the proposition whether or not the Government of the United States shall refuse and shall be instructed by this proviso to refuse to pay the solemn, binding, legal, ascertained obligations incurred by the Government of the United States prior to the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918.

In answer to a question propounded by me to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], he admitted that the purpose and effect of this proviso would be to prevent and prohibit the collection by any citizen of the United States of a debt legally incurred or a contract entered into by a citizen of the United States, even though that contract were valid and unquestioned and authorized by law, if it has not been already paid out of the unexpended funds of the War Department. That presents a serious proposition to both sides of this House. The remedy suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] and adhered to doubtless by those on that side of the House, that even though that were true, even though it were admitted that a citizen, wherever he may come from in this country, has a just and unquestioned honest obligation and debt owing to him by the Government of the United States, is that he would be prohibited by the plain terms of this proviso from collecting it, but that he could be remitted to the remedy of coming to a committee of Congress to secure an appropriation for the collection of his honest obligation.

Are you willing to assume that position? Aside from the mere material questions involved in the discussion and in the proviso, are gentlemen on the other side of the aisle willing to assume the attitude that any citizen of the Republic, even the humblest and the most obscure, shall be denied the payment of honest debts legally incurred by the War Department in the prosecution of this war and for Government purposes prior to the signing of the armistice? I am sure that it is a matter that ought to appeal to your reflection and to your sound common sense. You have an opportunity here by the adoption of this amendment to say that none of these unexpended funds shall be paid for the purchase of real estate except for the payment of debts legally contracted prior to the signing of the armistice.

I believe that is all I want to say on the proposition. I merely desire to call the attention of the committee to the solemnity of the proposition, because I admonish you it will plague you in the future in the filing of innumerable claims which ought to be adjusted now.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, conceding the importance of every word the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] said, the hour has come when we must have an inventory of the obligations created by the War Department and every other department of the Government. [Applause.] If we owe these obligations we will pay them. There will be no opportunity to get this inventory if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I can not yield. The time has come when we must say on behalf of the American people that no department of the Government shall have the power to obligate the Government to the payment of any debts without getting specific authority from the Congress. [Applause.]

There is no justification for what the War Department has already done. They have abandoned 56,000 acres of land in Oklahoma owned by the Government. They have undertaken to purchase 140,000 acres of land to substitute for that; and does anyone undertake to say that in the face of this piece of brazen audacity on the part of the War Department, there ought not to be somebody somewhere who can call a halt? Now is the time to call it, and this is the way, and there is no thought on the part of those who are calling that halt to prevent the payment of any legitimate obligation to any citizen of the Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD), there were—ayes 71, noes 150.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 7, after the word "estate" insert:

"*And provided further*, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and the completion thereof, or of the movements of such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this bill be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this provision has been in the Army appropriation bill for the last two or three years, and therefore I do not make the point of order, and I hope it will be adopted. I suggest, however, that it follow the last word of the amendment that was previously adopted, instead of coming after the word "estate."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that it will follow at that point. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 20, after the word "plant" insert:

"*And provided further*, That no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that at the time of the proposed acquirement can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government arsenals of the United States for a sum less than they can be purchased or secured otherwise."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, do I understand that this is the same provision that has been put into the bill heretofore when the bill was up on the floor of the House in previous sessions of Congress?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is the same provision that was put on the bill when it passed the House at the last session. It was also put on the fortifications appropriation bill in the Senate, and is now law. I do not think it is necessary to take up the time of the House arguing what is very evident that this amendment will tend to economy and save money, and that it is therefore in order, and should pass.

It is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 50, at the place where the amendment was adopted providing for the term of enlistment in the National Guard, and to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to return to page 50 for the purpose of offering an amendment which the Clerk will report. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Let us have the amendment reported first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, at the end of the amendment adopted providing for the term of enlistment in the National Guard, add the following:

"That enlisted men in the National Guard of the several States now serving under contract providing for a six-year period of enlistment—three years in an active organization and the remaining three years in the National Guard Reserve—shall be afforded an opportunity to enlist for the periods specified above, and upon entering into the new contract of enlistment for the period of three years under this authority shall be given credit for the period served under the old enlistment contract."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity of studying the provision. I think it serves a very useful purpose and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the amendment offered to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with amendments, to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a motion to recommit. I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs with instructions to strike out the figures "$1,000,000" on page 31, line 15, making appropriations for the purchase of horses for Cavalry, Artillery, and so forth, and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000"; and I would like to ask unanimous consent——

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the motion. The gentleman from Texas makes the motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have three minutes in which to read the testimony before the committee with reference to the need of the purchase of these horses, which testimony shows that they now have 83,000 horses and mules, and that this number is sufficient for all the present needs of the Army; in fact, that the Army has recently sold 162,000 horses and mules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES of Texas moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs with instructions to that committee to report the same forthwith with the following amendment: Page 31, line 15, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be recognized in due time. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. In there objection?

Mr. KAHN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The gentleman from California has moved the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to recommit the bill with instructions.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Texas) there were—ayes 54, noes 180.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Army appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, commonly known as the naval appropriation bill, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say it has been the unanimous judgment of the Committee on Naval Affairs that we should proceed at once with the consideration of this bill item by item. It was agreed among us that we should ask this House to dispense with all general debate under this bill, and that we should immediately proceed [applause] to discuss this bill under the five-minute rule item by item, when we will endeavor to answer all questions which gentlemen of this House may put to us and have Members submit good faith amendments if they see proper. I make this request, I repeat, at the direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

RATIFICATION OF SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the secretary of state of the State of Illinois and the State of Wisconsin, respectively, informing the Congress of the ratification by those States of the amendment relating to woman suffrage.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates to preside over the House to-morrow, in the absence of the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, did the House agree to dispense with general debate?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the general debate be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5608, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, if it is now in order, I will ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. General debate has been dispensed with by order of the House. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commissions and interest; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers while traveling under orders in the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees, and for mileage to midshipmen at 5 cents per mile while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen; for actual traveling expenses of female nurses; actual expenses of officers while on shore patrol duty; mileage to officers of the Naval Reserve Force traveling under orders of the Secretary of the Navy; hire of launches or other small boats in Asiatic waters; for rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards, including the rental of offices in the District of Columbia; expenses of courts-martial, prisoners and prisons, and courts of inquiry, boards of inspection, examining boards, with clerks, and witnesses' fees, and traveling expenses and costs; expenses of naval defense districts; stationery and recording; religious books; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising for the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); copying; ferriage; tolls; costs of suits; commissions, warrants, diplomas, and discharges; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; quarantine expenses; reports; professional investigation; cost of special instruction at home and abroad, including maintenance of students and attachés: *Provided*, That this appropriation and the appropriation "Pay, Marine Corps," shall be available for special allowances for maintenance to officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps serving under unusual conditions; information from abroad and at home, and the collection and classification thereof; all charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus for ice for the cooling of drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals), telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams, cablegrams, and postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; and other necessary and incidental expenses: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $400,000, and for necessary expenses for the interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction; in all, $5,100,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay the amounts due in all claims for damages (other than such as are occasioned by vessels of the Navy) to and loss of privately owned property occurring subsequent to April 6, 1917, where the amount of the claim does not exceed $500, for which damage or loss men in the naval service or Marine Corps are found to be responsible, all payments in settlement of said claims to be made out

of the appropriation "Pay, miscellaneous": *Provided further*, That all claims adjusted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I notice upon page 4, in the proviso beginning on line 4, that the committee have reported language which would make permanent law an authorization to the Secretary of the Navy to determine and settle claims for damages where the amount does not exceed $500. I would like to ask an explanation of that.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRAUS], a member of the committee, to make the explanation that is required by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. KRAUS. Mr. Chairman, we already have a provision in the law treating claims of this character arising abroad in this way. In other words, so far as claims to property are concerned, arising abroad, the department has authority to adjust them and pay them in the event they do not exceed the sum of $500. In this respect we are not treating our own citizens on the same basis as we do citizens of other countries where men in our Navy may inflict injuries to property. These claims are not strictly legal claims, but are moral ones. And we compel our own citizens to go to the Committee on Claims instead of giving the department authority to settle them. And in this connection I will send to the Clerk's desk a letter which I desire to have read. As a matter of fact, the claims now pending aggregate in number about 50, and the average amount is $50. In other words, the purpose is to relieve one of the committees of Congress in a very minor matter.

Mr. WALSH. How did you fix the amount at $500?

Mr. KRAUS. Arbitrarily. As a matter of fact, we even made it less than the proposition, so far as foreign citizens are concerned.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the gentleman appreciates the fact with respect to foreign claims that there is a likelihood upon the fleet's return from abroad of those claims being adjusted and wound up within a definite period after peace is declared. My objection to this language is that you make it permanent law with respect to claims amounting to not more than $500, occurring in this country. The Secretary is given authority to adjust them and settle them. I do not think that is a wise policy upon which to embark. If you desire to confer authority for claims arising out of the war because of the increase in the number of vessels which were under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy, that might well be done. But I doubt the expediency of giving executive officers permanent authority to settle and adjust claims when the amount in the aggregate might run up to a very considerable sum. And I have no objection to limiting this authority to claims which may arise out of war activities. But to write it into the permanent law I think is unwise at this time, and I should be inclined to make a point of order on the word "hereafter."

Mr. PADGETT. Will not the gentleman waive his point of order and just move to strike out the word "hereafter"?

Mr. WALSH. I suppose we could reach the same result by making a point of order on the word "hereafter."

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the gentleman to let us have it for this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order on the word "hereafter," in line 4, page 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order on the word "hereafter," in line 4, page 4.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If that means the abandonment of the point of order on the paragraph, I wish to reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman from Massachusetts is sustained. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to reserve a point of order against the paragraph?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee or some member of it with reference to the provision on page 3, line 10, as follows:

Provided, That this appropriation and the appropriation "Pay, Marine Corps," shall be available for special allowances for maintenance to officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps serving under unusual conditions.

May I inquire whether that is the law at this time, and whether the department is authorized to make allowances within its discretion to officers and men serving under unusual conditions, and whether there is any limitation on that authority?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say, and my friend from Tennessee, Mr. PADGETT, will bear me out that it is the law, and it was put into that paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. The language to the effect that this appropriation shall be available for special allowances for maintenance of officers and enlisted men of the Navy serving under unusual conditions is carried in the current law. It is just simply an enlargement of it to the appropriation for pay of the Marine Corps. It puts the Marine Corps on the same basis as the Navy.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What is the limitation on the discretion?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing but what you see in this.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In other words, there is no limit on the discretion?

Mr. PADGETT. It is a very small item. It amounts to very little. For instance, a man may be sent out on special duty. The whole thing amounts to only a few hundred dollars a year.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And the department can give him anything it sees proper?

Mr. PADGETT. No. It is simply where a man goes out and can not get his board within the limitation of commutation of rations, and things of that kind. It amounts to very little. It amounts in the aggregate in a year to only a few hundred dollars.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will say to the gentleman that if this is already the law, as applicable to the officers and men of the Navy——

Mr. PADGETT. It is——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have no objection to extending it to the Marine Corps. But I do think it is very bad public policy to have any such provision with reference to any branch of the public service. The practice of giving a wide-open commission to the officers of a department or bureau to give anybody connected with that bureau whatever and anything the officer may choose for them to have is manifestly improper.

Mr. PADGETT. There has been no abuse of it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do not know that the gentleman is warranted in saying that. If true, it is the only instance I have known where wide-open authority was given and it was not abused. It is always abused. It is necessarily abused. We ought to have some limit on it. I commend that point of view to the consideration of the gentlemen of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BUTLER. We shall be very glad to bear in mind the gentleman's point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which meets the wishes of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUTLER: Page 2, line 12, commencing with the word "and," strike out all down through and including the word "midshipmen," in line 16, same page, and substituting the following: "And for mileage at 5 cents per mile to midshipmen entering the Naval Academy subsequent to June 1, 1919, while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, this is simply to cover the class just admitted to the academy. It was thought by all of us while considering this paragraph that it was only fair to the young men who were entering the academy while we were considering a measure that would be useful to the next class to include this present class. This will permit a number of young men who will not receive their usual mileage or expenses, unless this amendment is adopted, to receive it. This amendment has the approval of every man on the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aviation, Navy: For aviation, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft, establishment and maintenance of aircraft stations, for experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, and for the purchase or manufacture and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes, $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service for aircraft stations shall not exceed $300,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than

six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of aeroplanes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress on the first day of the next regular session a joint report of aircraft under their respective jurisdiction on November 1, 1919, showing the number, type, and cost of all aircraft built, building, and under contract to be built; the number and type of aircraft to be constructed in Government plants for which material has been delivered, is in course of delivery, or is on order; and showing in detail what facilities of every kind are maintained wholly or in part by each, and where, for procuring, producing, constructing, inflating, operating, supplying, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft, indicating as to such as occupy rented property the area and annual rental.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso in the paragraph, which reads:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order on the proviso indicated.

Mr. BUTLER. That is permanent law—"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider," and so forth. I do not want to state anything but what is absolutely accurate, but my impression is that it is permanent law. "The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occured or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft."

Mr. BLACK. Well, if that is just carried in a previous appropriation bill it would not make it permanent law. We have heretofore limited these authorizations to settle damages to a certain specific amount. In the paragraph to which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] made the point of order a while ago it was limited to $500. I would not object to this paragraph if there was a limit of that kind put upon it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; surely.

Mr. BUTLER. I will thank gentlemen if they will be a little patient. I find I was mistaken. It is only for a year. I am willing, if the gentlemen of the Committee on Naval Affairs will join with me, to accept the limitation of $500.

Mr. BLACK. Well, Mr. Chairman, with that understanding I offer the following amendment. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, and on line 21, after the word "aircraft," I move to strike out the colon and add the following language: "where such claim does not exceed the sum of $500."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 6, line 21, after the word "aircraft," strike out the colon and insert a comma and the words "where such claim does not exceed the sum of $500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRIGGS: Page 6, line 23, after the word "than," strike out the word "six" and insert the word "nine."

Mr. BRIGGS. That provision of the bill, Mr. Chairman, refers to the number of heavier-than-air stations that may be operated and maintained by the Navy. There are a great many more than six stations already in operation and under construction. It is going to require the abandonment of some of the stations in order to conform to that provision.

The hearings before the committee reflect the fact that in some cases some stations, costing over $1,000,000, will have to be abandoned. The main question to be determined will be, which are the best stations to keep, which are those that ought to be kept. The Government is now constructing at Galveston, Tex., a heavier-than-air naval station. The General Board of the Navy has recommended that that station be completed.

It not only included that station in the number of stations along the continental coast that should be constructed, but only recently in reviewing the number of stations that should be kept it has insisted that the station at Galveston be constructed and maintained, because it is the only station on the Gulf coast now classified as a heavier-than-air station.

There is only one other naval air station upon the Gulf coast, and that is at Pensacola. That station has been used during the war as a training station for naval aviators.

But I am told by members of the general board and others that the value of the station at Galveston is that it is strategically the most important station upon the Gulf coast in the event of any difficulty with the Republic of Mexico. Now, I hope we are not going to have any difficulties with the Republic of Mexico. I must say that Mexico does try our patience, and try it sorely, very often. Right now a fishing vessel owned in my district has been seized outside of Mexican waters, or if in Mexican waters, there by chance, charged with being suspected of smuggling arms; and when it was found that the vessel had no arms, then they held it on the ground of suspicion of fishing in Mexican territorial waters; and when they found that the fish in the hold of that vessel were red snappers and that they were caught in the deep sea and not in territorial waters, they procrastinated and took four weeks of time in an investigation and coming to some conclusion; and the only conclusion they have reached up to this time is that they have got to start the investigation all over again.

This station at Galveston is strategically the most important along the whole Gulf coast.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRIGGS. I have only five minutes. If the gentleman will get me some more time, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am sure the gentleman can secure more time. I was fearful that the gentleman was under the impression that there was something in this bill that would prevent the Navy Department from continuing this station at Galveston.

Mr. BUTLER. There is nothing whatever.

Mr. BRIGGS. It does it in this way: The Navy Department have told me, and it appears from the hearings, that the stations they have on the Atlantic coast and the one at San Diego, Calif., with the one at Pensacola, will probably use up all six which are allowed under this limitation, and may deny the construction of the station at Galveston.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I feel quite sure from what the gentleman says about the advantage of this Galveston station strategically, that the Navy Department will be able to take care of it among the six.

Mr. BRIGGS. I hope that the gentleman is correct; but my information from the Navy Department is that with the investments which have been made elsewhere and necessities of the service they do not know whether they can do any such thing as that; that the chances are against it. I do not know whether the gentleman was on the subcommittee before which Capt. Cravens testified, but Capt. Cravens in many ways indicated uncertainty as to just what stations were going to be retained, though indicated that most of those along the Atlantic coast north of Florida would probably be retained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McARTHUR. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. The Navy Department told me that they could not be assured that Galveston would be retained as a naval heavier-than-air station unless this limitation was removed and the number increased to at least nine. It might be that if increased to seven it might be kept, but they were not certain of that. The chairman of the General Board of the Navy told me that there is no question that Galveston is strategically the most important place for patrolling the coast and patrolling trade lines between the United States and Mexico in the event of any serious differences between those countries, and he told me that they were greatly interested in that strategic situation being maintained; that the distance between Pensacola and the coast of Mexico was so great that it would hamper operations in that service in the event of any difficulty requiring the use of that branch of the service. The air-line distance from Pensacola to Vera Cruz is approximately 800 miles, and between Pensacola and Tampico 700 miles, and this officer of the Navy stated that it was not a feasible proposition to utilize any such service as that without rest stations, and that they could not find convenient ones on the waters of the Gulf of Mexico; but from Galveston they were only 200 miles to Brazos Santiago, near the dividing line between Texas and Mexico; that they could have a rest station there, and then they were only 200 miles from Tampico, and that this station ought not to be abandoned.

I am not asking for an increase in the appropriation carried by the bill. I appreciate that under this provision the Navy Department will be authorized to apportion these stations to the best advantage according to their own wisdom, but when they say they are circumscribed and hampered, and that one of the greatest strategic points in the United States will probably suffer and be abandoned, not because they want to abandon it but because the Congress of the United States says they will have to, not realizing the conditions, then I insist that if this Government means to keep up the heavier-than-air service as an aid to the Navy it ought to retain this station and to adopt this amendment that I have offered.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and in doing so I want to say that it is in all kindness toward Galveston or any other place that I appeal to the House to vote against the amendment offered. There is nothing in this bill in any word or line of it which says where any of these stations shall be located or which ones shall be maintained; neither is there anything mandatory for the abandonment of any site or the discontinuance of any station. It is very true, as the gentleman says, that if we have only six stations some stations must be put out of commission; that is the very object sought to be accomplished by limiting the number, so that some stations shall be abandoned, but we do not say which ones are to be discontinued; that is a matter for the General Board to decide. We have at the present time 12 stations, 4 schools, and 1 experimental station, in which the personnel approximates 4,000 officers and men.

According to the estimates of the Navy Department, to keep these stations and schools in operation on a peace basis would cost $7,905,000 per annum. The committee in viewing this subject felt at this time, when we have not established a definite policy so far as the development of aircraft is concerned, that it was the part of wisdom, good judgment, and efficiency that there should be a concentration in our naval aviation activities, and especially that we should defer the making of large appropriations until the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy present Congress with a detailed inventory of all the material they have on hand in their respective departments and offer a definite plan of what they suggest for experimental development, as well as outline a policy for the future.

The appropriation we have in this bill of $15,000,000 for naval aviation is a small appropriation. We all realize that and are cognizant of the fact that it will retard our work. There are some gentlemen on this committee who honestly feel that this appropriation is too small, and we can respect their judgment and their opinion, for they are sincere in their convictions. I can only say to my colleagues in Congress that our object in making this seemingly small appropriation is not because of lack of sympathy with aviation, not because we have not faith in its development or doubt its promise of accomplishment, but because we feel at the present time, when our country is struggling under the burdens of war, there should be a curtailment in Government expenditure. We look upon this appropriation, Mr. Chairman, only as a carry-over appropriation until such time as the Committee on Naval Affairs will have had an opportunity to make investigation and outline a broad-gauge policy which may take under consideration the various aviation activities in every branch and every department of the Government.

There is not a member of our committee who does not look upon aviation, both in its commercial aspect as well as an arm of military service, without conviction that the triumphs of to-morrow will be heralded from the air. The range of possibilities is well-nigh limitless. We have conquered the land and the sea. The arteries of trade and communication, spanning continents and bridging oceans, carry the commerce, the intelligence, and the thoughts of nations all bound together by the genius of the human mind.

The realm of the air, with potentialities untouched, beckons the man of imagination and the student, the man of business, and the dreamer. Aviation, with a past as brief as its future is vast, with traditions yet in the making, links scientific theory with industrial practicability, speculation with achievement, and points the way to an empire awaiting its conquest by the daring and the energy of men of vision.

There is no Member of Congress who does not laud the ability of American engineers, the skill of American mechanics, and the bravery of American officers which carried forward to a successful termination the first trans-Atlantic flight in history.

The navigation of the air between the New World and the Old has brought fame to our country, prestige to our service, and honor to those associated in the enterprise. Let us remember with gratitude and pride that it was the Navy of the United States that achieved this triumph.

I noticed, Mr. Chairman, in to-day's New York Herald an article headed "Death knell to aviation," and which then states that owing to the reductions made in both the Army and Navy bills all hope for development has ceased.

While I realize that our expansion will be retarded and that some time will be lost, I can not subscribe to the pessimism of that article or let the statement pass unchallenged. Scan the estimates of the department and you will see that provision is made for the full equipment of 19 battleships, at a cost of $3,000,000. A large part of this material would be obsolete before it was installed. Ten million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars is asked for the construction of hangars, the erection of an operating station, and the purchase from abroad of dirigibles, all for lighter-than-air craft.

Owing to the short life of dirigible envelopes, practically all of these foreign ships would be worthless before the hangars intended for their reception could be completed. While the hangars themselves and the shops connected with them would be permanent, I fail to see the urgent necessity of constructing them at this moment.

Nearly $8,000,000 was asked for to continue in operation the stations already established. I believe that most of these stations should be abandoned and the work concentrated in a few central points. The Government owns or has leased land in every part of the country. I feel strongly, in the interest of the taxpayer and for the benefit of the service, both Army and Navy, that we should turn back to their owners most of these sites and sell those we can not use without entailing high charges for maintenance. To me it seems unbusinesslike to spread our energies and our resources over so many locations. Here is another item calling for $8,400,000 to continue experiments and development work for all types of aircraft.

This is a field in which I feel most of our work should be done, and I anticipate that a large part of the appropriation carried in our bill will be used for this purpose. But is it not feasible, now that we are starting on this great enterprise, laying the foundation not for this year but for the years to come, that before we embark on a project which will consume millions we should survey the field? With the Army, the Navy, the Post Office, and other departments operating or contemplating the operation of aircraft, should not some effort be made to coordinate these activities, thus avoiding a duplication of overhead charges and losses incident to experiments along similar lines? I can not divorce myself from the thought that in the Army there must be vast quantities of material suitable for Navy uses, and probably the Navy has material of value for the Army. Why can not an exchange of this material take place without the purchase of new material?

Perhaps only a small quantity can be utilized. But until a survey is taken and an inventory made no one can tell. In a few months we will be able to take this subject up and give it the attention it deserves, and I can assure my colleagues and those in the service, whose work is most commendable, that our committee will lend its hearty support to aviation and give it the encouragement it deserves.

SOME FACTS AND FIGURES.

Naval aviation personnel.

NAVY.

Previous to the war:	
Officers	38
Enlisted men	163
Nov. 11, 1918:	
Officers and students	6,917
Enlisted men	35,667
June 1, 1919:	
Officers	542
Enlisted men	6,431
Contemplated:	
Officers	563
Enlisted men	4,630

MARINE CORPS.

Nov. 11, 1918:	
Officers	269
Enlisted men	2,009
June 1, 1919:	
Officers	127
Enlisted men	720
Contemplated:	
Officers	100
Enlisted men	1,000

Stations and costs.

Station.	Area.	Title.	Probable purchase price.	Cost of station.	Per cent completed.	Number of planes.	Kite balloons.	Dirigibles.	Remarks.
	Acres.								
Akron				$1,000,000					School.
Chatham	69½	Lease for war	$45,000	1,282,000	96	15	3	2	
Montauk	39	Lease	25,000	207,000	94	5	2	1	
Rockaway	60	State	785,000	875,000	90	22	29		
Marginal Parkway	12	City	(?)	101,000	90				Kite station.
Cape May	349	Acquired by proclamation	150,000	1,011,000	85	20		3	Appropriated for by Congress.
Anacostia	20	Public		268,000	60	14			Experimental.
Hampton Roads	200	do		3,658,000	80	57	11	3	
Morehead City	50	State		246,000	85	13			Purchase price not known.
Brunswick	41	No lease	224,000	224,000	75	15			
Miami	25	Lease	200,000	1,620,000	99	226			
Key West	39	do	295,000	1,051,000	98	44	2	2	
Pensacola		Public		2,455,000	95	159	4	4	School.
Galveston	30	No lease	15,000	1,176,000	15				
Coco Solo		Acquired by proclamation		244,000	85	18	3		
San Diego	524	do		1,909,000	65	125			Probably owned by Government.
Great Lakes		Public				6			School.
Total						739	54	15	

Also, five stations of Marine Corps—Paris Island, Quantico, Haiti, San Domingo, San Diego.

PLANES IN MARINE CORPS.

Total number of machines available for use in good condition, 35; 57 others used at times, but should not be used as they are not in good condition. Total number of machines, 92.

Admiral Knapp has reported that the Navy aviation aircraft is credited with having attacked or destroyed 18 German submarines. The stations established in Italy were done so without cost to the United States, and the stations in France have been practically all closed out, probably not over 100 men being detailed there at the present time. Most of the material has been and is being shipped to this country. Some $3,000,000 of public property has been disposed of for about $1,600,000. In England practically all of the stations are closed. At stations in this country not yet completed work is being held up except in one or two stations, the pilots and mechanics being engaged in storing the planes out of commission.

To the Hon. F. C. HICKS, in compliance with his request for data on activity of aviation abroad:

A query which will be raised in the future—already it has been suggested—as to whether or not the vast expenditure of funds and the tremendous amount of labor involved in the creation of these bases in Europe were worth while. These will probably remain mooted points which can never be satisfactorily and definitely determined. When considering the financial side of the question, the fact that the expense of the project was vastly reduced by the liquidation of practically all materials and equipment received from the United States (except aeronautical materials) at nearly their original cost in the United States should be kept in mind.

Positive results would seem to indicate that expenditures of money, effort, and time have not been wasted. In the records which have been compiled and which appear in this report, it will be noted that previous to the establishment of this great aviation activity on the French coast, submarines frequented these waters. The losses of shipping were considerable from the effects of torpedo, gunfire, and exploding mines. With the establishment of the United States aviation stations, the submarine ceased its work of destruction near the shores and only sporadic and generally ineffective hostile activity on the part of these vessels occurred in coastal waters. Aviation, of course, can not claim full credit for this result. It will share, however, with the adoption of a daylight system of convoys, and the improved methods for escort by surface craft, the credit of having eliminated the enemy from this, a former fertile field for his endeavors. After the establishment of the United States naval air stations not a single convoy, escorted by aircraft, either French or American, has been successfully attacked by a German submarine on the western shores of France. The number of allied vessels lost through submarine agency on the French coast during this period has been insignificant. One can not measure properly the success of aviation in this neighborhood by the number of submarines sighted or sunk. A better standard is that based on the number of ships which have not been destroyed by the enemy. Certainly aviation has produced tangible and direct results when measured by this criterion.

Another and perhaps equally important feature has been the moral influence, upon the enemy as well as upon the allies, of the successful prosecution of this tremendous enterprise. There is every reason to believe that the Central Powers were fully aware of what was being undertaken. Our allies were kept well informed of what was going on. The knowledge that the work was being pushed with determination and that the United States had the firm resolve to make the naval aviation force a powerful and aggressive influence must have been a potent factor. Everywhere in the neighborhood of stations a change became noticeable in the attitude of local inhabitants as our centers sprang into existence and grew in response to the efforts of the hundreds of enthusiastic and active men making up their crews. There can be no doubt that this moral influence was enormous. That it had a positive effect upon the result of the war there can be no question.

It is true that money could have been saved had the enterprise been cast in a smaller mold, and had it been prosecuted less vigorously. At the time of its conception no one had an idea that the force of our enemies could collapse as it did, and stations were erected with the view that hostilities might continue for a much longer period of time than proved to be the case. Success was achieved and the results desired obtained. Of this there is certainty. What might have been had other plans been followed must always remain mere surmise. When the matter of the expense of the vast aviation project is being considered, thought should be directed toward how much of this money might have been saved had our preparation been more complete upon our entry into the struggle. Many millions were thrown away and wasted because of the failure to supply funds previous to our entry into the conflict, which would permit the development of our forces. It became at once urgently necessary to have a naval aviation service. Regardless of cost we then were forced to a tremendous outlay—we had to buy experience as well as materials. We had to find out suddenly under the stress of war conditions what we should have learned deliberately and thoroughly in the exercises of peace.

The number of machines sent abroad during the war is as follows:

Seaplanes	388
Airplanes	140
Kite balloons	42
Total	570

Distribution of seaplanes sent abroad is as follows:

French unit	207
English unit	181
Total	388

During the course of the war, naval aviation sent abroad the following officers and men:

Officers	1,237
Enlisted men (aviation ratings)	8,215
Enlisted men (aviation duty, miscellaneous ratings)	8,072
Total	17,524

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I do not quite agree with my distinguished colleague from New York that this item is too small. I had contemplated moving to reduce it to $10,000,000. However, I conferred with my distinguished colleague from New York, and I am going to endeavor to persuade him to amend it and abide by the decision of the committee.

In the first place, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Navy and to say that the Army aviation takes off its hat to the Navy aviation. The Navy has accomplished in recent days a gallant and brilliant record for this country. Of course we all wanted America, the United States, to be the first to cross the ocean. My only regret is, Mr. Chairman, that the Army did not accomplish it.

I also want to say that I have a very wholesome respect for the Naval Aviation Service. I will say frankly that I believe the naval aviation in overseas work had a better organization than the Army. It seems to be in closer touch with doings at home, and its cooperation and coordination with the department and production in this country was better than ours. It had a smaller service, it is true, but there were very good men in charge of the work.

Now, I am very serious when I say that $15,000,000 is a lot of money to expend this year, because we are now in that period of transition that we can not spend very much money in improvement. Both the Army and the Navy has a large surplus of material, obsolete planes, obsolete motors, which we must dispose of. It is indeed encouraging to hear my distinguished colleague from New York say that the time has arrived when it is necessary to formulate a constructive aviation program in this country. That is exactly what I am trying to do. I will ask the gentlemen of the committee to carefully read the testimony of Capt. Craven, the officer in charge of naval aviation. He makes a splendid statement and knows his subject

thoroughly; but when he is pinned down to the question whether the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and Postal Department and the Interior Department should all be united in one service he lets his military training get the better of him, and he says "No."

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. My good friend from New York in February voted for $15,000,000 appropriation for the aviation in the Navy. So I presume he is as much in favor of $15,000,000 to-day as he was in February.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It was my motion that reduced it from $25,000,000 to $15,000,000. Now, the Army appropriation at that time was $35,000,000. This session, in the bill just passed by the House, we brought it down to $15,000,000. With that in mind, I suggested that the naval aviation allowance might be further reduced. You have a service of 563 officers and 4,630 men. We have in the Army 4,700 officers and 12,000 men plus 21,000 men still overseas. You have appropriated much more in proportion than we did in the Army bill. We brought it down to $15,000,000. We are both trying to do the same thing. I hope the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs will get together and study this problem, even though the Army and Navy refuse to do it. We have arrived at a point now where we can create a splendid and gigantic aviation service, not only military but commercial and industrial.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman agree to answer a question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MCARTHUR. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is aware of the original amount asked for by the Secretary?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; over $46,000,000.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Does not the gentleman think that is quite a reduction which we have made?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But we reduced ours from $83,000,000 to $15,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The Secretary recommended $35,000,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is correct in the estimate submitted. The first estimate submitted by the Secretary was $46,000,000. He then reduced that estimate and submitted a new one for $35,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I want to leave this idea with the committee. The air industry of this country has really never had a chance; never had any real encouragement. When we started to appropriate large sums of money—$640,000,000 for the Army; I do not know what the Navy appropriated the first year of the war—that money was spent in certain limited quarters. Millions and millions were spent on swamp lands, millions were spent for building purposes, large amounts were spent for planting castor beans, so that really a not very large sum of money has gone into the aviation industry. The Chief of the Air Service of the Army testified before our committee the other day that there was an excellent pursuit machine in this country, and a splendid observation machine, and the Martin bomber, all of which they were anxious to acquire. They have finally learned that we can produce good flying machines in this country. We can also produce good motors in this country, if the motors are given a chance. It has cost us about half a billion dollars to learn that it is impossible to create one motor to serve all purposes. That can not be done. It cost us half a billion dollars to learn that, but finally we have learned the lesson. If the motor industry is given a chance in this country, we will develop a real aviation motor. England is ahead of us to-day in motors, and so are France and Italy; but I do not despair. I am hopeful for the future.

Mr. HICKS. Perhaps my colleague will be interested in knowing, though I do not doubt he does know now, that Great Britain has appropriated this year for her joint army and navy air service $300,000,000, and France $200,000,000, so that our $30,000,000 for the Army and Navy does not seem large.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Except this, that we will waste more out of our $30,000,000, as we are going along at the present time, having these various services, where there is an overlapping of work, than England will waste out of her $300,000,000. England has a separate united service. It is a success. England has gone through the trouble we are having to-day. When we have a separate service where we can concentrate all of these activities, where we can take care of the postal lines and the geodetic work, and the patrol work for the Department of the Interior, I know this House will appropriate the money we need, and we will then be able to see real progress. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Naval Committee on its logical and businesslike views in the matter.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the committee saw fit to report $15,000,000. In the bill reported in February last the committee allowed $25,000,000 for this service, and, on motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], the House reduced it to $15,000,000. The committee this time reported the amount that the House then fixed.

Speaking for myself, I am one of the number to whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] referred, who believe that $15,000,000 is wholly inadequate. I sincerely believe that limiting it to $15,000,000 is going to very seriously embarrass and cripple the air service. In the distribution of the work between the Army and the Navy, to the Navy has been assigned the development of the lighter-than-air machine—the dirigible. Some of these dirigibles cost as much as two or three million dollars each, and the hangars are very large. We have in this country no facilities for the manufacture of dirigibles. If we have any dirigibles, they must be purchased abroad, for we have no appropriation yet available for that purpose.

I simply wanted to speak my own sentiments here, believing that in this limitation to $15,000,000 we are going to very seriously hamper and cripple the air service in this country.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, in further reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], I have very serious doubts as to whether or not we are not pursuing a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy. My views about this matter are in no way influenced by any interest that my district may have in questions of aviation or aviation fields, because we have none now and are not likely to have.

We learn that several countries are developing aerial torpedoes by which an aeroplane, possibly five or ten thousand feet up in the air, descending at the rate of possibly 200 miles an hour, can upon close approach to a battleship or a line of battleships discharge its torpedo and suddenly rise again to a great height; that practically such is the speed of these airships that it is impossible for any battery of a battleship to protect it. I do not know, but it may be that in the development of aeronautics it may be proved that the great battleships, costing twenty-five or thirty million dollars each, will be obsolete. They can have no protection except a corresponding defensive aerial fleet to overcome the aerial fleet of the enemy before it can make an attack on the great vessel. If any such development as this is possible—and I mention it simply as a possibility—it is certainly to the advantage of the United States to find it out as soon as possible. It is folly to continue building superdreadnoughts that cost twenty-five or thirty million dollars when possibly it would be discovered, if proper steps were taken, that within a year or two that type of vessel will have become practically obsolete. At this stage of the development of aerial warfare it is practically impossible, in my judgment, to tell what is the wisest thing for any country to do in the way of naval developments.

So it is imperative that we should know, and know at the earliest possible date, just what aerial warfare development is capable of, so that we can determine at the earliest possible moment its probable future development and shape our course accordingly. So money must be invested, because you can not do things without money, to put the best minds of the country at work in investigation and experimentation. Some of it may be wasted. Of course, I suppose some of it would. All governments waste money; they always have, they always will; but it is the part of wisdom to find out what aerial development is capable of, and that at the earliest possible date. Officers tell us that $15,000,000 is not sufficient to carry on this work, and some of us think that it is not a wise policy, because there is a clamor and a desire for retrenchment, to adopt a policy that possibly, though penny-wise, is pound-foolish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I do that, Mr. Chairman, in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a question. This bill was introduced on yesterday, reported yesterday, and of course no Member could get a copy yesterday. I tried and found it could not be done, so that very few Members have even so much as read the bill, not to speak of understanding its provisions. I rise to ask the gentleman to refer me and the committee to

the provision in the bill, if any, which gives relief to those men who after the declaration of war enlisted for four years, that being the only way that they could get accepted?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; that is in the bill.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman refer us to it?

Mr. BUTLER. Well, we will come to it directly under the head of navigation. I want to say to my friend from Alabama that it is expressly written in this bill that men who enlisted between the declaration of war and the armistice for four years shall be construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war merely.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is page 21.

Mr. BUTLER. It is found on page 21. It is expressly written that with the permission of the Secretary of the Navy——

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman might state that he is to offer an amendment so as to carry the same provision carried in the last bill.

Mr. BUTLER. We have that legislation all prepared to offer the amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I thank the gentleman; I am glad to know that provision is in the bill. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have permission to insert in the RECORD, in connection with this item of the bill, a letter written me by a distinguished naval officer, Capt. Craven, Director of Naval Aviation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the material indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause,] The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, June 13, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. OLIVER: In reply to your request with regard to the needs of naval aviation, I have to advise you as follows:

As you well understand, the Great War, which has just ended, furnished a tremendous impetus to the development of aviation. In the United States we had no such intensive stimulation until 1917, and upon our entrance into the struggle we found ourselves very much behind. In heavier-than-air craft the progress has been remarkable. In 1909 the feat of crossing the British Channel in an airplane propelled by a single motor of about 22 horsepower was almost miraculous. It excited the wonder of the world. In 10 years we have developed multiple-engined heavier-than-air machines capable of flying across the Atlantic, and it is beyond the ability of any man to say how far progress is to continue with this type of machine.

During the recent war aircraft have been found of an inestimable value to fleets. American aircraft operating abroad are credited with having attacked and possibly damaged or destroyed 15 submarines. We now see aircraft carried on the battleships of the British Fleet capable of flying directly off the turrets.

Reliance is based on these machines for spotting (control of gun fire), and fleets in the future will be accompanied by airplanes capable of carrying spotters, and these planes in turn will be attended by others to drive off the enemy in the air. Great numbers of bombers and probably torpedo planes will accompany our fleet at sea.

In our recent maneuvers in the Carribean we have confirmed our views with regard to these matters, and there have seen the airplane used to sight the enemy and to lead the submarine to the attack.

The matter of developing a lighter-than-air program seems to me to be of the greatest importance. The initial output necessary for the construction of the huge hangars necessary for the erection and housing of immense rigids is very great, but without this initial outlay nothing can be done. England has many such ships now in commission and is building others. During the recent war vessels of this class merely demonstrated their value. Admiral Jellicoe, in his book, "The Grand Fleet," stated that in his opinion a single rigid was worth two light cruisers. It is reported that the escape of the German Fleet after the battle of Jutland may be ascribed to the observations of the British movements gained by their aircraft, particularly the lighter-than-air craft.

We are informed that in the near future the British rigid, *R-34*, will make the attempt to cross the Atlantic in one flight. There is every reason to suppose that this flight will be successful and that the ship will reach our shores without difficulty. Unfortunately her stay must be very short, and the curtailment of her visit is due to the fact that on this continent there is no hangar large enough to accommodate this great vessel.

In brief, Mr. OLIVER, from my point of view, it is exceedingly necessary at the present time that naval aviation continue the development of—

(a) Large multimotored seaplanes.
(b) The light plane which can be carried on board ships and perhaps dismounted and stowed below.
(c) The double-seater for reconnaissance purposes.
(d) The torpedo plane.
(e) The bomber.

In lighter-than-air craft the necessity for the beginning of a rigid program would seem to me to be self-evident if the United States is to attain a position abreast of the leaders in the art of aviation or to hold her own in commercial progress or in national preparedness. In the development of small lighter-than-air craft we have still considerable progress to make. We must develop the means for mooring these vessels out, and perhaps for towing dirigibles.

Most of what I have stated above pertains to the use of aviation in war. It is difficult to predict precisely with regard to its use in time of peace at the present moment. We know, however, of certain definite uses for naval aviation at the present time for the furtherance of a peaceful mission. Among them are the following, and I confidently expect others to be suggested from day to day:

(a) We are now in communication with the Chamber of Commerce of Gloucester, Mass., as that body has requested the assistance of our aviation branch in discovering and reporting schools of mackerel as they move up the coast.

(b) We are now developing a plan with the Coast and Geodetic Survey by which our aviation stations can cooperate with that branch of the Government in the survey of our shores.

(c) For communicating we have constant demands for aircraft from many sources.

The above are three purposes which have become apparent since the signing of the armistice, and, as I say, in them we are already making progress.

With best wishes, I am, faithfully, yours,

THOS. T. CRAVEN,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director of Naval Aviation.

Needless to say, Mr. OLIVER, I believe that aviation at this time is a matter of national interest and importance. The curtailment of the appropriation for the furtherance of naval aviation I would regard as a serious calamity.

T. T. C.

Hon. WILLIAM B. OLIVER,
Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rehabilitating the island of Guam on account of typhoon of July 6, 1918, to be paid to and expended in the discretion of the governor of Guam, $50,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I would like to have some explanation.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will state it is subject to the point of order. These people out there at Guam are in a very bad condition—are sick and are hungry owing to a dreadful storm which occurred. My friend will appreciate it is the worst place in the world to live, anyhow; it is the home of the sick. It is one of the wards of the Government and it has fallen to the lot of the Navy Department to take care of it. They had a great storm out there, which ruined the crops of these sick and almost helpless people. These people have not any money, they have not anything, they have not even hope, and we unanimously agreed to write a provision in this bill to ask this House to consent that the Governor of Guam might have at least $50,000 to expend to help these people get their crops into the ground, purchase seed, and take care of them.

Mr. WALSH. What is the population of the island?

Mr. BUTLER. I wish I could tell my friend. The gentleman behind me says 5,000, but I do not think it is as many as 5,000. There are not a very great many.

Mr. WALSH. Well, $50,000 for 5,000 inhabitants would buy quite a lot of food.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the gentleman this, in reply, and that is all I can say: We did not go over this matter very fully in detail; I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]—but here is a letter, by the way. Will the gentleman permit me, if I am to make a reply to him, to ask the Clerk to read this letter? It is a pretty long one. This letter was laid before the committee. This is a question of mercy, that is all, and I would really rather have the amount taken out of some other item than out of this.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman permit? It is my impression that the gentleman from Massachusetts has merely reserved the point of order to the last sentence of this paragraph providing for the rehabilitation of the island and the expenditure of $50,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will say that that sentence is a Senate amendment added to the bill as it passed the House in February this year. In July of last year a typhoon swept the island of Guam and destroyed a great deal of property, and this $50,000 was inserted in the bill by the Senate at the request of the Secretary of the Navy and the Governor General of the Island of Guam, who is a naval officer. I know a little something about the inhabitants there, as I have been at Guam——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman will permit an interruption. When this appeared first in the bill in the Senate it was in the nature of a loan to the people of Guam, and I do not think the Government wanted to go into the matter of loaning money to help rehabilitate that island, because it probably would establish a precedent for other places, and inasmuch as those people were in great distress we thought we had better give it to them outright, and that is the idea of putting it in this bill in this form.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me add before the gentleman concludes——

The governor out there, under the date of September 11, 1918, gives the reason why he asked for this money. He says native shacks were uncovered; many private buildings of Spanish construction were entirely destroyed; growing crops were destroyed; there are no seeds; the seeds for the next crop would have been obtained from the present crop; the natives have no reserve supplies of food.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the chairman of the committee will permit further, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy said that this money would be used for farming implements, for tools, for animals, for agriculture on Government-owned land, and not on private lands. These people are in a very sad state and should be helped out to this extent.

Mr. WALSH. How have they managed to get along since last July until this time, with the failure of the bill in February and March? And have you any information upon the need of this money now?

Mr. BRITTEN. They have merely managed to exist. They do not "get along" in the true definition of the word. They only exist. They are poor, unfortunate individuals who are our charges, and we ought to take care of them. I think this amendment ought to be left in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask my friend from Massachusetts not to press the point of order but allow it to stand, and in the meantime he can look at this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to pass over the item and return to it when desired. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Outfits on first enlistment: Outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment at not to exceed $100 each; for civilian clothing not to exceed $15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, or inaptitude; in all, $9,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to inquire if the committee gave any consideration in the matter of these outfits of civilian clothing to the greatly increased cost of clothing in the market? You have increased salaries in the establishment of rates of compensation and increased a great many minor allowances. You have increased the outfit for the enlisted men and eliminated the provision for the officers that has heretofore been carried in this paragraph. But for the men that have been discharged you give them a civilian outfit——

Mr. BUTLER. Men who have been discharged only for bad conduct, I will say to my friend. These are men who have been punished and are under punishment. They are released. But their offenses are not great offenses. Nevertheless, they are infractions of the law and regulations of the department. Their uniform is taken from them and civilian clothing given to them so that they may return to their homes. Fifteen dollars for a suit was considered enough. There was no request made of us that the amount should be increased. I will say in candor toward my friend that we did not consider increasing it under the circumstances.

Mr. WALSH. This is only for men who have been punished?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; under charges for bad conduct.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps it is fair to make a part of the punishment the allowance for a cheap suit of clothes. I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to the fact that the classes of men named here may not mean necessarily those who have been punished or who have been guilty of misconduct. For instance, a boy 16 years of age who enlists in the Navy on representation that he is 18 years of age, without consent of his parents, is discharged as "undesirable." In other words, recruiting officers can go out and rope in a boy 16 years of age and take him off to some naval station, and when, in the course of his training, his mother begins to cry for him and brings his minority to the attention of the department, the discharge given that boy is as an "undesirable." I know of two cases of that kind which have occurred within the last few days. That is the kind of boy that it is proposed to send home to his mother in a $15 civilian outfit. His parents have go. to pay his transportation and maintenance home. That kind of boy we propose to send home with a $15 suit of clothes, including a hat and a pair of shoes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think the gentleman from Alabama is in error in his remarks.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I trust the gentleman will not express a mere opinion on a subject concerning which I have actual knowledge. I have handled two cases of that kind within the last few days. I corresponded with the department yesterday about them, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the uniform taken away from the boy?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. His first outfit?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Of course.

Mr. BRITTEN. What is the character of his offense?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Being only 16 years old and being roped in by a recruiting officer.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did he commit forgery when he enlisted?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. BRITTEN. He must have done it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, no. He was not punished—the Navy Department did not have the face to say to the boy that he had committed a crime and ought to be put in jail for it, but simply discharged him as "undesirable."

I want to call this practice to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], so that he may know there is no mistake about it, that that is the kind of boy considered "undesirable," and to whom a $15 suit of clothes is given. We know that small amount will not purchase any kind of a suit of clothes, including a hat and shoes, to send him home in.

And I want to say further that the fault lies with the recruiting officer when a boy under 18 years of age is enlisted. The fault does not lie with the boy. The boy has notions about serving his country or going to sea, and he is roped in and haltered. The recruiter who solicited him to enlist and succeeded in roping him in frequently knows the boy's age and conspires with him to conceal it. I personally know of cases where boys have assured me that they had told the petty officer, or whoever it was that solicited them, their ages, and he cautioned them, "You will have to say that you are 18 years old." I believe that this is frequently done.

I say that the blame usually rests on the recruiting officer who enlists a boy under 18. Many of them are obviously under 18 years of age. Reasonable precautions ought to be adopted by the authorities to insure that boys are not buncoed and practically shanghaied into the Navy. And when they get them there they ought to be treated decently, and when they are sent home to their folks they should be clothed in a decent suit of clothes.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not understand how the young men referred to by the gentleman got into the service. I have no doubt the gentleman states the facts correctly. Of course, young men do sometimes go into the service when they are only 16 years old, when the age limit is fixed at 18 years old. I do not understand how the young man the gentleman refers to could have gotten in.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. He said he was over 18.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, then, he did not tell the truth. What are you going to do about it?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. He ought to be treated, a boy of that kind, as any immature boy should be treated. When these smooth-faced boys come up and present themselves the recruiting officer ought to assure himself that they are of proper age. The duty is on the recruiting officer before he takes one of these smooth-faced boys into the Navy to ask for a birth certificate. Also he ought to ask for the consent of the parents. It is an outrage on both parents and boy to enlist an 18-year-old boy without the consent of his parents. Mere boys have not sufficient discretion to decide such an important matter for themselves. It is a blemish upon the law, a blemish upon our public policy, that we should take in a boy under 21 without giving his parents the opportunity to express themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has now read the letter, and he will now ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph to which he reserved the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph on page 8, beginning with line 1. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station, Great Lakes: Maintenance of naval training station: Labor and material; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and piers; street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; motor-propelled vehicles, wagons, carts, implements, and tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle and one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; fire apparatus and extinguishers; gymnastic implements; models and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and material, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting, and repairs to power-plant equipment, distributing mains, tunnel, and conduits; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; washing; packing boxes and materials; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; and all other contingent expenses: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $6,000; in all, naval training station, Great Lakes, $850,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I will withhold until the gentleman reserves the point of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That it is new legislation.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; it is a regular training station—the Great Lakes Station.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is exactly as it was last year and as recommended by the House in 1919. The amount is considerably higher than last year, but otherwise it is as it was passed by the House this year. There is no new legislation in it, not a word.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of securing some explanation from the committee as to the substantial increases in both of these items for training stations, both in Rhode Island and on the Great Lakes. Is it proposed to train a great number of naval reserves there, or is it because of the expansion which has resulted from the war?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman ask the question of me?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I will be very glad, indeed, to answer as nearly as I can in a line or two, and then I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who knows more about it than I do, to give the details.

We endeavored as nearly as we could to ascertain what was necessary to maintain these stations during the next year. We did not promise anybody that they would remain at this figure. We did not promise ourselves that between this and the first of next July we would ascertain what it would cost to maintain these stations and what it would be absolutely necessary to expend upon them in the next fiscal year, beginning July 1. But I will tell the gentleman what we did do. We did not have time to go into the matter fully. We worked for 17 days and parts of the night and endeavored to report a bill which, in our judgment, was nearly right, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts on the whole will say it is nearly right.

They have now 20,000 men at these training stations. The gentleman will notice that later on in another paragraph than this it is our purpose to reduce the number of men in these stations. Nevertheless we could not go into details and to figure after figure to ascertain what we should allow, and therefore we took largely the same figures that the House had agreed to last February in the February bill. We had made up to that time, I will say to my friend, a good deal of examination, and had given the subject a good deal of thought, and we concluded that the figures were about right then, and we were simply forced by reason of pressure for time, the time being short, and our inability to go more fully into this examination, to adopt substantially the figures we already had. We thought this would be about the right figure for the next year.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] can answer more fully in detail.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the chairman of the committee has said, I would like to suggest that both of these stations have been materially enlarged since the appropriation of last year was made by the House. The increase in the amount at the Great Lakes is about $125,000. Since that time the station has probably been enlarged 60 per cent. This item is for maintenance only, electric lights, all sorts of carrying expense, and clerical hire, besides the regular increase in maintenance that would come in the case of a growing institution. They have established schools of aviation and schools of instruction in other lines at both the Great Lakes and at the Rhode Island station, all requiring additional help. With reference to the Great Lakes situation alone I will say to the Members of the House that the commandant of that station desired $2,085,000. The committee felt that his estimate was based very largely on an assumption that a great many more men would be maintained at that station than will really be maintained because of the great reduction we have made in the bill and the desire for economy in the Navy in practically all of its branches. So we reduced the amount from $2,085,000 to $850,000, which I do not think will be sufficient to maintain the station during the next fiscal year.

We provided a little new legislation in another part of the bill, so that in case their maintenance amount is not sufficient, they may go to the Bureau of Yards and Docks and one other account for help in carrying on that institution.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. May I say just a word in addition? The fixing of the amount of the appropriations for these training stations was one of the most difficult things that the committee had to do, for the reason that it was quite impossible to determine what the needs for training would be during the coming year, because of the unsettled condition in which the Navy finds itself and will find itself after this bill becomes a law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FESS). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Now, as I was saying, it is quite impossible to tell how many men we will be called upon to train at these stations. Under legislation which we have put in this bill practically the entire Navy, except 76,000 men, will be demobilized, so that these training schools will be called upon during the next year to train probably 125,000 men in order to fill up the Navy again.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Were these two institutions used for training the Navy personnel or the Naval Reserve?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They are used in training the Navy personnel, both regular and reserve. These are regular training schools for the Navy. During the war these establishments were very greatly expanded. It may be that if the number of men should drop down and the training be confined to what it was before the war these sums could be very materially reduced, because we would not need to keep up these temporary additions which were put up during the war, or any portion of them. We might close them down, but, on the other hand, because of the large problem of training, we felt that a considerable portion of these temporary buildings at Chicago, Hampton Roads, and Newport would have to be used this year to take care of the extra number of men we will be called upon to train by reason of the fact that we are permitting practically three-quarters of the entire Navy to leave when this bill becomes a law.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Am I to understand that in the enlistment of men for the Navy they are not taken directly aboard naval vessels, but have to undergo a period of training at these institutions?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman's idea is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Is that a recent innovation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no. They are taken to these training schools and kept there from one to six months, according to the urgency of the service in which they are to engage.

Mr. BUTLER. And according to the character of the men.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. I want to say, too, in this connection that because of the uncertainty as to the number of men these schools will be called upon to train during the coming year, and the difficulty, therefore, in arriving at the item of maintenance, we have provided in another part of the bill that the Bureau of Yards and Docks may help out in case of need.

Mr. BUTLER. They may be turned over.

Mr. IGOE. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Michigan a question. In these training stations they have a great many men who perform work that could be done by civilians. Now, we have had a great deal of difficulty in procuring the release of many of these men. We are constantly told that they can not be replaced, and I should like to ask the gentleman whether an appropriation has been made to cover that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that we have a provision in the bill for the elimination from the enlisted personnel of about 9,000 people who are doing civilian work.

Mr. BUTLER. And turning that work over to civilians.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And there is an appropriation for the employment of civilians to do that work.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HICKS was given leave to extend his remarks on the naval appropriation bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., pay of employees: One secretary, $2,000; 1 foreman mechanic, $2,000; 1 superintendent of grounds, at $1,080; 1 steward, at $1,200; 1 store laborer, at $660; 1 matron and office assistant, at $720; 1 beneficiaries' attendant, at $480; 1 chief cook, at $660; 1 assistant cook, at $540; 1 assistant cook, at $480; 1 chief laundress, at $420; 2 laundresses, at $360 each; 3

laundresses, at $300 each; 1 chief scrubber, at $420; 3 scrubbers, at $360 each; 1 head waitress, at $480; 4 waitresses, at $360 each; 4 waitresses, at $300 each; 1 kitchen attendant, at $540; 7 laborers, at $600 each; 5 laborers, at $540 each; 1 stable keeper and driver, at $660; 1 master at arms, at $900; 2 house corporals, at $600 each; 1 barber, at $600; 1 carpenter, at $1,200; 1 painter, at $1,200; 1 painter, at $1,020; 1 engineer, $1,080; 4 laborers, at $720 each; 3 laborers, at $840 each; 1 laborer, at $600; 1 chauffeur, coal truck, at $960; 1 chauffeur, small truck, at $840; 1 chauffeur, governor's car, $840; total for employees, $40,420.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph and direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that in line 6, page 15, the word "chief" is misspelled. I ask unanimous consent that the spelling may be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Now, on the point of order, I notice that in nearly all of these positions there has been an increase in the salary or compensation. Do I understand that this is an institution maintained by the Government and paid for out of the Treasury?

Mr. BUTLER. This provision has been carried in the bill always. The governor of the home, after consulting with those men there and finding out what their needs are, sends to the Navy Department an estimate of what they ought to have. The estimates were sent out, and we accepted them. There are no increases here; this is the same provision carried in the February bill. We did not make any further examination.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman advise me whether or not the compensation of these men is subject to the provision of law giving bonuses to Government employees?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman has asked me a very hard question, and I do not know that I can answer. They say that they are allowed the bonus, that it is discretionary with the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Discretionary? I do not understand how there is any discretion. The bonus law provided for a flat increase.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow a little time to get that information? I do not want to guess at it.

Mr. WALSH. I am not making the inquiry to embarrass the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. It is never any embarrassment to me to confess my ignorance of the matter inquired about.

Mr. WALSH. You increase the compensation for a secretary, and then he gets the bonus, and it seems to me that that is not right, especially where you are appropriating out of a fund contributed to by the personnel of the Navy, and we ought at least to be careful about it.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Tennessee is perhaps more familiar with this. Will the gentleman from Tennessee state whether or not these men are entitled to the bonus?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that they are; I have not investigated it. These men are paid out of the interest on the naval fund, which was created many years ago by the sale of naval prizes and the money put in the Treasury in a trust fund.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will agree that the mere fact that the money is being paid out of the pension fund would not justify us in giving an unwarranted increase to an employee there. I suppose we act as trustees.

Mr. PADGETT. The committee did not think there was any increase given that was not warranted.

Mr. WALSH. If you give a secretary an increase of $200 in salary and then this $240 bonus——

Mr. PADGETT. We raised his pay from $1,800 to $2,000, and then he gets the $240 bonus, and that would make but $2,240, which I think is not too much.

Mr. BUTLER. With the consent of the gentleman from Tennessee, I will ask the committee that this go over until we can get the information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to pass the paragraph temporarily.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, before this is passed I would like to read the legislative provision governing the payment of the bonus. It is found on pages 27 and 28 of the pamphlet which I hold, entitled "Acts and Resolutions Relating Chiefly to the Navy, Navy Department, and Marine Corps."

Provided further, That where an employee in the service on June 30, 1918, has received during the fiscal year 1919, or shall receive during the fiscal year 1920, an increase of salary at a rate in excess of $200 per annum, or where an employee, whether previously in the service or not, has entered the service since June 30, 1918, whether such employee has received an increase in salary or not, such employees shall be granted the increased compensation provided herein only when and upon the certification of the person in the legislative branch or the head of the department or establishment employing such persons of the ability and qualifications personal to such employees as would justify such increased compensation: *Provided further*, That the increased compensation provided in this section to employees whose pay is adjusted from time to time through wage boards or similar authority shall be taken into consideration by such wage boards or similar authority in adjusting the pay of such employees.

Under that provision the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to grant or withhold the bonus, and I think has withheld it in the case of navy-yard employees, and I think he would in this case.

Mr. PADGETT. I gather from the reading of the paragraph that that is satisfactory information to the gentleman from Massachusetts and he does not want to pass over the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to get a little further information to show whether this is the class of employees entitled to the bonus.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to my friend from Tennessee that I have made a request for the information from the Secretary's office, and we will return to the paragraph to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the paragraph will be passed over temporarily.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The total authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased from 131,485 during the period from July 1, 1919, to September 30, 1919, to 241,000 men, and from October 1, 1919, to December 31, 1919, to 191,000 men, and from January 1, 1920, to June 30, 1920, to 170,000 men, and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to call to or continue on active service on strictly naval duties, with their consent, such numbers of the male members of the Naval Reserve Force (other than commissioned and warrant officers) as may be necessary to supply deficiencies to maintain the total authorized strength for the periods herein authorized. The foregoing total authorized strength shall include the hospital corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court-martial to discharge, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, those under instruction in trade schools, and members of the Naval Reserve Force so serving. That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, no member of the Naval Reserve Force shall be recalled to active duty for training or any other purpose except as hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That the total number of officers of the line, permanent, temporary, and reserve, shall not exceed at any time, during the periods aforesaid 4 per cent of the total temporary authorized enlisted strength of the Regular and Temporary Navy and members of the Naval Reserve Force (other than commissioned and warrant officers) on active duty, and the number of staff officers shall be in the same proportion as provided under existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as affecting the permanent, commissioned, or enlisted strength of the Regular Navy as authorized by existing law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. This seems to set forth or establish a policy of the department for the future, or at least for the coming year. I have not had time to read the hearings except hastily, and I trust some member of the committee will give us some explanation.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the gentleman from Michigan, who is at the head of the subcommittee on personnel, to make the explanation.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the section of the bill which fixes the number of men and the number of officers for the coming year. When the armistice was signed, as I recollect it, there were about 510,000 men in the Navy. That number has been reduced from month to month, and it is expected by the 1st of July that there will be 250,000 men in the Navy.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What is the number of men now in the Navy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Probably 260,000; slightly above 250,000, so that it is thought that the 250,000 mark will be reached without any difficulty by the 1st of July.

The Navy Department recommended that the strength of the Navy be fixed for the coming year at 250,000. The Secretary of the Navy recommended that it be fixed for three months at 250,000 and 200,000 for the balance of the year. Those figures included about 9,000 persons who were enrolled in the naval service but who were performing strictly clerical duties and who ordinarily should not have been enlisted.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman means enrolled, not enlisted.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Enrolled. They came from the Naval Reserve. The language is enrolled rather than enlisted. We deducted the 9,000 enrolled people from the Navy personnel and have made provision for clerical hire in another place in the bill sufficient to cover all of the clerks the Naval Establishment will need for the coming year. That reduces the 250,000 down to 241,000 to start with.

It was testified before the Naval Committee by the Secretary of War that the bulk of the transport service would end about the middle of August, and the Navy Department advised us that there were 49,000 men on the transports, and 5,000 men on shore

duty in Europe, connected with the transport service, and an indefinite number on shore duty in this country on account of that service, so that we were certain there were something like 54,000 men that could be dropped out of the Navy when the transports leave the hands of the Navy Department. We wanted to be sure that ample opportunity was given the Navy Department to get rid of these transports before reducing the personnel. There are 133 of them. Of course, it might not be that the troops could be gotten back by the middle of August, as expected, or, if they were, there would be some little time that the Navy Department would have these transports to take care of, and we would have to keep a complement of men on them until they could be disposed of. Some of these ships belong to foreign Governments and will have to be taken home and the personnel brought back to this country. So we allowed 241,000 men for the first three months covering the period when the transport service will still be in existence, and a little time beyond in which to get rid of these 133 transports. We thought we were doing only what was about fair by the Navy in allowing that extra time, or until October 1, at which time 50,000 men must be let out.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What is the maximum enlisted strength of the Navy at this time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Permit me to proceed right along, and I think I will answer everything the gentleman has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So that we fixed the strength of the Navy for three months at 241,000 men. Then we provided for 50,000 dropping out October 1, leaving 191,000 for the next three months, from October 1 to December 31. The Secretary of the Navy did not want us to go below the 191,000 for the entire balance of the fiscal year, but we fixed the number at 191,000 from October 1 until January 1, and at 170,000 from January 1 to July 1, 1920.

When the transport service ends naturally there will be a good many shore establishments that will have to be demobilized, and there are shore establishments not connected with the transport service that will be demobilized also, but just how many men there are that can be spared nobody can say with any certainty at this time, but we figured that we could cut off at least 21,000 men on the 1st of January by reason of the discontinuance of certain shore activities.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. IGOE. I have read these hearings and I am just a little bit curious to know whether the gentleman from Michigan is now convinced that the Navy really needs 250,000 men for the first three months of the next fiscal year?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have not any doubt at all as to the needs for the first three months. We will start off with 241,000 men on the 1st of July, and when the transport service is over it is evident that 50,000 men can go out, and that brings it down to 191,000 on October 1. I am perfectly satisfied that during the next three months after that we can take off the other 21,000, bringing the number down to 170,000 men for the last half of the year. There is a difference of opinion as to the number of men that the Navy Department will require after January 1 for the ships of the Navy and the necessary shore stations, but there was not very much difference of opinion as to what the Navy would require from July 1 until January 1.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How many men did the Navy have before we went into the war—78,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We had 55,000 men, as I recall.

Mr. MADDEN. That would give 115,000 more than you had before we went into the war after the 1st of January, would it not, the last half? A hundred and seventy thousand less 55,000 would give 115,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; more than we had before we went into the war.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman answer my question as to what the maximum enlisted strength of the Navy now is?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think—perhaps the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] may know the enlisted regular strength separately from the Reserves. It is about 260,000 Regulars and Reserves, but just how it is divided I do not know. I think about 180,000 Regulars and 80,000 Reserves.

Mr. PADGETT. Under existing law the permanent enlisted strength of the Navy is 131,485 plus 6,000 apprenticed seamen and plus sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent for the Hospital Corps. That percentage is based upon the enlisted strength and the commissioned personnel strength.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have it here. On the 1st of May there were 194,000 in the regular service, including officers, and 91,000 Reserves.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman from Tennessee has given me the information.

Mr. MADDEN. The question I want the gentleman to answer is, What emergency exists or is likely to exist after the 1st of January that will require the employment of three times as many men as were occupied in the naval service before we went into war?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the ships of the Navy have greatly increased in number since the time when we had a personnel of 55,000 men. For instance, we have added at least 300 destroyers to the Navy during the last year. I am inclined to think if the destroyers were all kept in commission that they alone would require as many men as we had in the Navy at the time the gentleman speaks of; but it is not proposed by the Navy Department and it is not provided in this bill that any such number shall be kept in commission, and the number that is recommended for commission, as I recall, is 164——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, 115,000 additional men means twice——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. A hundred and fifteen million dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. Means three times 55,000. In other words, the Navy personnel would be three times as great after the 1st of January as it was before we went into the war; but, of course, I do not want in any wise to cripple the Navy——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that when we had 55,000 men in the Navy we did not even have enough men to man all the ships we had at that time, and since that time we have added to the fleet along all lines—battleships, destroyers, submarines, and everything else.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, is it proposed to keep them all in the service?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; the Bureau of Operations has submitted a detailed plan of operation to the committee showing exactly what they propose to keep in commission for the next year; and while there is some difference of opinion in the committee as to the wisdom of all of it, yet when we finally disposed of the matter there was a unanimity of opinion that the number of men fixed was not excessive to fairly conduct the business of the Navy through this period of transition. It would be too many, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, for a permanent establishment for the number of ships we have now, but the gentleman will appreciate that during the war a large expansion on shore occurred as well as on the sea, and it will be some little time before we can demobilize these shore stations and let the men go and turn over these activities to some other regular branch of the service. One thing more before I forget it. We had to provide also quite an increase in personnel in order that there might be during this coming year a larger number of men in the training schools, because the legislation which we propose here will let out the men who enlisted during the war, either for the period of the war or for four years, and will take 125,000 Regular Navy men out of the Navy at once. The Navy Department must begin at the bottom, fill up the training schools, and get a new personnel again. So we had to provide for an extra large number for training to fill the vacancies caused by such large numbers going out.

Mr. MADDEN. And I see that the necessity for letting the men out will also create the necessity for keeping more men in during the training period.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. One more question that I would like to ask—perhaps there is not much significance to the questions I ask——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, yes; there is. It is the meat of the whole bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, I am not sure of how many men the English Navy consisted before the war.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think it consisted of 200,000 to 225,000.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask one more question, then. While we are reducing the personnel of the Navy down to 170,000, with a possibility later, I assume, of reducing it still further, is the clerical force connected with the Navy Department being reduced in proportion?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Now, I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. MADDEN. That is a very important item. And let me add this to the question, and the gentleman can answer them all at once. The so-called yeomen, whether men or women, are paid a certain compensation, and are permitted their allotments, and thereby having their pay added to. Is that abuse going to be done away with?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that the Navy Department, as the Members of the House know, like every other department in Washington, does not get its appropriation for clerical hire from the Naval Committee, but that comes through the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BUTLER. That is, for the District of Columbia?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; for the District of Columbia. But for some reason—I do not know just why—the Secretary of the Navy failed to get the appropriation to take care of the extra clerk hire required during the war—whether or not he asked for it I am not quite clear at this time——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to get a little information.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The question the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has asked me is enough for a minute or two, and then I will come back to my friend from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Therefore the Navy Department, not having obtained an appropriation from the Committee on Appropriations for this extra force, did what they had a perfect right to do, they used enrolled reservists, both men and women, to perform this clerical work. The number performing that work has varied at different times during the war and since the armistice. I think during the war the number was as high as 20,000, and at the present time it is about 9,000. We have provided in this bill that reservists shall not be continued for more than 30 days after July 1 in these clerical positions. That is, the uniforms will have to be given up, as well as the allowances and all the privileges that naturally go with enlisted people, and in place of that they will draw the usual pay that civil-service employees receive for like services.

We have provided a lump sum in this bill to pay for this civilian clerk bill. I think for the first six months we allowed for the whole number they have at the present time about 9,000, for the reason that during the period of demobilization the number of clerks can not very well be reduced. In fact, the clerical work during the demobilization of the Navy will probably increase, inasmuch as so many discharges have to be issued and correspondence is very heavy. And for the last six months we allowed the appropriation on the basis of 5,000 extra clerks for the entire Naval Establishment. So that gets rid of whatever discrimination has existed during the war in the Navy Department growing out of the fact that some people were doing a certain kind of work and were carried as civil-service employees, and other people, both men and women, doing the same kind of work and were carried as yeomen. We think we have handled the situation equitably and satisfactorily, and at the same time preserved the efficiency of the clerical force of the Navy Department. Does that answer the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the number included in these items include those under instruction in trade schools?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As a member of the Committee on Education and of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries that item interests me, and I would like to get some information as to how these schools are conducted.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They are conducted mostly in connection with the regular training schools. The young men stay a longer time, perhaps a year or maybe six months, and they are assigned from the ships to these schools for special instruction in engineering, mechanics, and all that kind of thing.

Mr. PADGETT. They are mechanics.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; mechanics.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This does not impinge in any way on the activities of the vocational rehabilitation service?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. These men are assigned from the ships when they show special aptitude for mechanics. They are assigned for further instruction in these schools, and when they have finished they go back to the ships.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How many are provided for?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We have allowed in this bill for them on the basis of 14,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] make the point of order against the whole paragraph?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will reserve the point of order against the whole paragraph.

Mr. BUTLER. It is not subject to a point of order. It is a reduction. It carries retrenchment on its face.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Further, it is in order on the regular naval appropriation bill to fix the number of men in the service. The Navy is an exception to the general rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama on the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman wants to discuss the point of order seriously, I have no objection to make.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph is clearly subject to a point of order. It is a change of existing law. It authorizes the retention of a certain enlisted strength in the Navy which the existing law does not authorize. After the passing of the present emergency, when peace is proclaimed, the enlisted personnel of the Navy must be reduced to a certain number, about 131,000 men. If this paragraph is left in the bill, peace having been proclaimed, the enlisted personnel need not be reduced to what the existing law requires. It need only be reduced to the figures given in this paragraph.

My purpose in reserving a point of order on this paragraph is to do all that in me lies to secure as quickly as possible the discharge of men who enlisted for the duration of the war or who enlisted during the war for a period of four years, that being the only way they could get themselves accepted. I am bent and determined on that, and in line with that I shall make the point of order to the paragraph, but not until I have expressed the views that I have on the subject.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not quite hear the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman still reserves his point of order, and is proceeding now under the five-minute rule, under the reservation.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not know whether he had made it conditional or not.

Mr. PADGETT. He said he was going to make it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. If the gentleman is going to make the point of order, he ought to make it. He ought not to reserve it unless he proposes to make it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I reserved it while gentlemen on the other side have expressed themselves fully.

Mr. MADDEN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HUDDLSETON. About 10 minutes. We have had no general debate on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will recognize the gentleman under the usual five-minute reservation.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, under the law as it now stands men who enlisted for the duration of the war will not, as a matter of law, be entitled to their discharges until peace is proclaimed. This bill, I am glad to say, extends that privilege, meager and insufficient as it is, to those who enlisted during the war under the only terms under which they would be accepted—that is, for four years. Technically and legally those men can be held in the Navy. They will be discharged only when peace is proclaimed.

When will peace be proclaimed? The treaty of peace has not yet been signed. I do not know, and nobody else knows, when it will be signed, or whether it will ever be signed. The indications are in some ways unfavorable. After the treaty has been signed it will be submitted to the Senate of the United States for approval. Who knows when it will be ratified? It is being criticized on every hand. A very determined and important element of the American people are bitterly dissatisfied with the treaty. Hardly anyone approves it in its entirety. That it will meet with bitter opposition in the Senate must be conceded. In all human probability it will be months before it will be finally acted upon in the Senate. It may never be ratified. Peace can be proclaimed only when that treaty is approved by the Senate, and that means that these boys who have enlisted for the duration of the war may be held in the Navy indefinitely, consistent with the terms of this bill.

I criticize this bill, and particularly this paragraph of it, because it contains nothing affirmative which will force those boys

out of the Navy, which will insure to them an opportunity to go home to their folks. Seven long months have expired since a state of real war existed. The armistice was signed on November 11. During these seven months we find that only about 230,000 of the enlisted men of the Navy have been discharged. We still have two hundred and seventy-odd thousand men in the service. Why, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it takes longer to discharge a man from the Navy than it does to enlist him. They are much slower about it, and they are going on and on in this slow process, holding men for the Navy's peace purposes who enlisted to fight for their country. Well, that is being done under the excuse of an emergency; that they need them to help bring the boys back from Europe. That has been a valid excuse up to this time, and will be for perhaps two months longer, but not beyond that time. Last month we brought home nearly 350,000 of our soldiers. At the same rate we will have all the men back from France, every man back upon his home shores, by the 1st of August. Then there will remain no emergency and no reason why these men should be held longer, and I insist that they be discharged, those who have enlisted for the emergency. It is a duty that we owe them. The faith of the American people is pledged to these boys who enlisted in the Navy for the duration of the war. This is our opportunity to redeem that pledge that we made.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman said a while ago that he had not had a chance to read the bill. I think he will find the language he is looking for at the bottom of page 20 and the top of page 21.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I explained just a moment ago that the "duration-of-the-war" privilege is to be extended by this bill to the four-year men who enlisted since the war began. That is not the issue at all. I am talking about the "duration-of-the-war men" as well as the others. Both of these classes of men have their rights, but they are not protected by this bill, but may be held under it until peace is finally proclaimed. That may be done within the terms fixed here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Now, I do not insist on a summary turning out of these men and what might be called crippling the Navy. But I do insist on some provision being put in this bill that will let these men out when they have finished bringing our soldiers home from France, so that they may go home to their folks. They should have the absolute moral right to do that, these boys who enlisted for the war, when the war is over and the emergency past. Of course, if we do not want to bring our soldiers home from France, then there is no need to keep these men in the transport service. If we do want to bring them home, we ought to go on and bring them home, and have them all back by the 1st of August. So let us not rest on that flimsy excuse for keeping the men in the Navy any longer.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is not really serious, is he, when he suggests that if we want to bring our men home we ought to go over with transports and bring them back by August 1?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I say if we want these boys home we can bring them home by August 1, and if we do not want them home there is no excuse for keeping the men in the Navy to bring them home.

Mr. BRITTEN. Experts say it is physically impossible to bring all the men home by August 1. What provision would the gentleman suggest to get them home?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. How many men have we over there? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not know.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Then why does the gentleman venture an opinion based upon that fact? I will give the gentleman some information which may be of value to him later. I say that proceeding at the rate at which we are going now we can bring home every soldier by August 1. I do not want to argue that with the gentleman. I am making a statement of fact for his information.

Mr. BRITTEN. You are making a statement of guess now.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would prefer that some one said that who had some knowledge on the subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that excuse being gone, what are we keeping these men in the Navy for? We are keeping them there for naval purposes, for peace purposes, not as an incident to carrying on the war but to enable the Navy to man a vastly expanded fleet that has been assembled on account of the war. I am not willing to force men to remain in the service who enlisted to serve their country during the war, to serve a policy of the Navy, a peace policy which has no relation to the war.

Now, if I had it in my power to write into the bill a provision which would insure that as soon as the real emergency of bringing our soldiers home has passed every man who enlisted for the war only might go home discharged, I would not insist on the point of order. But I can not do it. I have only one way to assert myself. I have only one way in which I can insist upon the rights of these boys. I have only one time when I can come to their defense, and that time is now, and that way is the way I am doing. I insist that if the whole fleet should be dismantled as the result of my point of order, the fault would not lie with me but upon the committee, who have failed to bring in a fair measure to meet the situation.

I insist that the Navy go out and recruit the men for its peace program. I insist that it shall be on a peace basis. I insist that unfair advantage shall not be taken of the patriotism of the boys who went into the Navy to serve their country in time of war.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman has stated that the war is over. I see by the evening papers that the American forces are fighting in Russia. It may be that if we are to have war against Russia it will be necessary not only to keep the Army and the Navy that we have but to conscript more. Hadn't we better wait until after the Commander in Chief either inquires of the Congress whether we want war in Russia, and be prepared?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will say to the gentleman that the only duly constituted authority which may declare war against Russia is Congress, and I, for one, shall refuse to vote to keep in the Army or Navy any patriotic volunteer or conscripted man on account of the Russian situation. I say that we have whipped the enemy that we declared war against—Germany and Austria-Hungary—and the plain people at home want their boys brought back to the United States. We ought to get out of this muddy and dangerous European tangle and come back to our own shores. [Applause.] The people of America want that done, and with that patriotic desire of the people I am proud to be in hearty accord. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That the paragraph increases the permissible strength of the enlisted personnel of the Navy after the war emergency has passed and changes existing law.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order. Mr. Chairman, let us get some facts before us and call attention to the legislation that is here. At the present time, under existing law we have three branches in the naval service. There is the permanent enlisted strength of the Navy, there is also the temporary enlisted strength of the Navy, and then there is the reserve forces of the Navy.

You will notice that this legislation combines the permanent, temporary, and reserve, and limits them to the figures that are stated, 241,000 up to a certain date, 191,000 from that date to another date, and then for the remainder of the fiscal year 170,000. These numbers are made up of the permanent, the temporary, and the reserves.

Now, what is the current law? Under existing law the permanent strength of the Navy is, as I stated to the gentleman a moment ago, 131,485, plus 6,000 apprentice seamen, plus sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the enlisted personnel and the commissioned personnel. That brings it up to about 143,000 in round numbers.

Now, then, the enlisted temporary strength is 50,000 by July 1. Provision was made that the permanent strength was increased temporarily, and I read from the law—

That the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased from 131,485 to 181,485.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Not now. I am arguing the point, and I want to get these matters consecutively to the chairman. I will answer the gentleman's questions later. That is temporary, added to the permanent, making 50,000 and 181,000, plus the apprentice seamen, 6,000, plus the hospital corps, sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent upon the enlisted personnel and the temporary. In addition to that, we have the reserves that are unlimited. There is no limit upon the reserves. The effect of this legislation is to consolidate them for the coming year, and to limit the aggregate of all of them to the figures that I have just stated.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Not until I get through with my statement. It will be seen that the minimum, the number of permanent and the temporary, is 181,485, plus 6,000 apprentice seamen, which makes 187,485, plus sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent for the hospital corps, based upon that and also the commissioned personnel, which is a number of thousands in addition. Also, as I stated a moment ago, the reserves which under the law are unlimited and which as a matter of fact on the 1st of May, if I remember the figures, were something like 90,192, may be further added. So it will be seen that the effect of this legislation is in positive terms to reduce the number and to fix it at a number less.

I want to call attention to a further provision of existing law. In addition to the 181,000, the President is authorized in his discretion to add 50,000 more to the temporary personnel, so that instead of the temporary personnel being 50,000 above the permanent personnel, the President under existing law has authority to increase the number by 50,000, and that discretion is limited and taken away by this legislation by fixing the total to comprehend the permanent, the temporary, the reserves, the hospital corps, and all, so that under the Holman rule this legislation on its face reduces expenditures and reduces the number provided by law, and upon that ground it is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman please answer a question? It is clearly intended to be legislation? There can be no doubt about that?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it must come under the Holman rule to be in order.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Not necessarily.

Mr. PADGETT. There is another provision which the gentleman from Michigan will argue to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman address himself to the language of the bill, which says that the total authorized strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased from a certain number named to a certain larger number named?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman explain that which on the face of the bill is ambiguous?

Mr. PADGETT. I am very glad that the Chair has called attention to that. That is verbiage for the purpose of definition. As I stated a moment ago, the permanent enlisted strength is fixed at 131,485, the number that is mentioned in the act, plus, as I said, these apprentice seamen and the Hospital Corps. Under existing law the temporary force has heretofore been increased from 131,485 to 181,485.

Now, as I said, there is an addition of the apprentice seamen, 6,000, and there is also an addition of the Hospital Corps, amounting to some 7,000 or 8,000, under the permanent strength of the Navy, the permanent strength being something like 143,000 or 144,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is the word "increase" bothering the Chair?

Mr. PADGETT. The word "increase" here is for the purpose of adding and expressing the addition of the temporary and the permanent authorized strength, but under existing law the temporary force is greater than is provided for here in this provision of the law, so that under existing law we have 187,485, and under existing law, in addition to that, we have the Hospital Corps, and in addition to all that we have the reserves, and in this legislation, as I stated in the beginning, we are combining the permanent, the temporary, and the reserves into one and reducing the aggregate of all of them very largely and very substantially, so that the effect of the legislation, and that is upon what the rule is decided, is to reduce the number provided under existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman explain the words "the total authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy"? What does that include? Does that include all the different elements to which the gentleman has just referred?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; because the words below, the Chair will notice, where it says:

> The foregoing total authorized strength shall include the Hospital Corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court-martial to discharge, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, those under instruction in trade schools, and members of the Naval Reserve Force so serving.

So that everything in the enlisted personnel of the Navy is embraced in the figures "241,000," "191,000," and "170,000," whereas under existing law the total of those is far above those figures and far above the number that are provided by existing law.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The authorizations under the act of July, 1917, were temporary merely. With what period do they expire?

Mr. PADGETT. For the enlisted men there is no limit.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Do not they expire on the proclamation of peace?

Mr. PADGETT. They do not.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Are they enlisted for the emergency?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they were not.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Then, it is permanent?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is temporary.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What is the period of time?

Mr. PADGETT. And it only expires whenever Congress sees fit. Under it the time of the officers is limited to not exceeding six months after the declaration of peace, but for enlisted men there is no limit for expiration except the will of Congress.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. So that we can maintain an indefinite number of men until Congress acts, although peace be proclaimed?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; until the President should discharge them.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] says is entirely correct, that this provision reduces the strength of the enlisted personnel and effects a reduction of expense. But there is another reason why it is in order. Under an exceptional ruling it has been held in order to fix the number of men in the Navy in an appropriation bill for the Navy. I call the Chair's attention to volume 4, paragraph 3723, of Hinds' Precedents. The Navy is an exception to the usual rule regarding the fixing of personnel. It can not be done for the Army in the Army appropriation bill; it can not be done for the Marine Corps; but an exception was first made in the case of the Navy by permitting an authorization of ships on the Navy appropriation bill, and then that was followed logically, of course, by permitting the authorization of men to man the ships. It has been held that if it is in order to authorize a new ship on a Navy appropriation bill, a ship that had not been previously authorized by law, the only logical thing was also to permit an appropriation for the men to man the ships. The strength of the Navy can therefore be changed in an appropriation bill, and this paragraph is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman say that the same rule applies to various other provisions in this paragraph, such as calling of reserves to service and the percentage of commissioned officers and enlisted personnel and all these other provisions?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The provision relating to the calling of the reserves is certainly not subject to a point of order, as it will save the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars, thus falling within the Holman rule. Of course it is legislation, but is permissible because it reduces expenses.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Including a different manner of calling them into the service than that now provided by law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And not only that, but that is fixed in current law.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, just one word. The position taken by these gentlemen, if correct, leaves the Committee on Naval Affairs with a wide-open commission to propose anything they choose to the House——

Mr. BUTLER. As to the enlisted men only, I will say to my friend.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And they hold it will not be subject to a point of order. It is not necessary that the chairman should hold that this means a reduction or an economy. The fact that we have solemn statutes of the United States in conflict with this bill is immaterial, according to their contention. They can introduce anything they want to relating to the period of enlistment, the number of men that may be enlisted, the kind of men that may be enlisted, the number of officers, and all that is collateral to these subjects, which includes sustenance, transportation, and anything else they would choose to imagine—equipment of ships, stores, and supplies, and anything necessary to the Navy. They would have the right to bring them in. I know there is a decision that the number of ships may be provided in such a bill, but I do not think a decision can be found going to the lengths insisted on by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

I would like to have the chairman's attention particularly to various other clauses in this bill, not relating merely to the increase in enlisted personnel. For instance:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to call or continue in active service on strictly naval duties, with their consent, such numbers of the male members of the Naval Reserve Force (other than commissioned and warrant officers) as may be necessary to supply deficiencies to maintain the total authorized strength for the period herein authorized.

Also:

That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, no member of the Naval Reserve Force shall be recalled to active duty for training or any other purpose except as hereinbefore provided.

This last clause repeals the law that we have on the books, but it is just as reasonable to argue that that is proper as to increase the number of men in the Navy. The paragraph also provides that the total number of the officers of the line shall not exceed at any time 4 per cent of the enlisted men, and so forth.

Mr. PADGETT. That is in a different section.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is in a different sentence, but it is in the same paragraph. There are other provisions just as far-reaching, and clearly many changes in existing law are made. Unless the Committee on Naval Affairs has a wide-open commission to propose anything they like—that they may consider for the betterment of the Navy—then this paragraph is bad on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Alabama prepared to offer anything in support of his contention as to the law cited by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman from Michigan did not refer to any law, but he merely referred to a precedent of parliamentary practice in the House. His precedent, according to my recollection, relates to the number of ships of a certain kind that might be proposed in the bill. There is no law on the subject at all.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The ruling of the Chair has been that on a naval appropriation bill it is in order to fix the number of men as well as the number of ships, and the citation is from volume 4, paragraph 3723, of Hinds' Precedents.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, it is now half-past 5, and we have been making good time. Possibly the Chairman would like to have time to consult the Precedents.

The CHAIRMAN. A number of points have been raised, and if the committee intends to rise the Chair would like to satisfy himself on a number of the provisos in addition to the ones that have been discussed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HERNANDEZ, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Second Lieut. Etienne de P. Bujac (H. R. 8132, 1st sess., 64th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KITCHIN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 122. An act authorizing a commission to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate $500,000 therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 643. An act to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1274. An act making it unnecessary to secure permits from any governmental agency for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account except for alien enemies or alien enemy countries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 641. An act to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents and other material to the State of Wisconsin for an encampment of veterans of the Army of the United States to be held in Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 5312. An act to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

H. R. 2480. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, June 14, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Labor to enable the department to comply with the provisions of House resolution No. 65, requesting certain information as to the employees of the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Justice to enable the department to comply with the provisions of House resolution No. 69, requesting certain information as to employees under the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation to pay a claim for damage by collision, river and harbor work, which has been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 240) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the east branch of the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 38), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 242) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the east branch of the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham to the township of Salen, in Pennsylvania, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 39), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 85) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish the House the number of commissioned officers on duty in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 40), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3854) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 42), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 5690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate and deliver to the village of Wittenberg, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5691) authorizing the Secretary of War to date and deliver to the village of Ogdensburg, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the North Western Military and Naval Academy, of Lake Geneva, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to St. John's Military Academy, of Delafield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 5694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orleans, in the county of Orange, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5695) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Leavenworth, in the county of Crawford, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 5696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ada, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5697) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sand Lake, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rockford, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kent City, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lamont, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 5701) exempting honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines from certain provisions of the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 5702) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the South Brooklyn Board of Trade, borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, two captured cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 5703) to amend an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 5704) to provide for the incorporation of certain companies engaged in foreign trade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5705) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Long Point, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 5706) to authorize the Secretary of War to loan tents, cots, and other suitable equipment to organizations of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines for their reunions and encampments and requiring him to take a bond for the safekeeping and return of such property; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 5707) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 5708) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards of classification for fertilizer, to regulate the sale and shipment thereof in interstate and foreign commerce, to prevent deception with reference thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5709) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Rushville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Greenfield, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5711) providing for the extension of the post office and public building at Richmond, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5712) providing for the completion and the purchase of an addition to the site of the post office at Shelbyville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 5713) for the erection of a Federal building at Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 5714) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the feasibility and desirability for reclamation by irrigation, including the making of an official survey, of the lower North Platte project, in Nebraska, and authorizing an appropriation to help defray the expenses thereof; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 5715) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ionia, Mich., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 5716) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sherburne, N. Y., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5717) to provide for marking the carcasses of goats with the words "goat meat"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 5718) in reference to a national military park on the Plains of Chalmette, below the city of New Orleans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 5719) to declare the people of the Philippine Islands free and independent; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 5720) for the purchase of a post-office site at Lawrenceburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5721) for the purchase of a post-office site at Dickson, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5722) granting preference in civil-service appointments to persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service and their widows; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 5723) to provide transportation, storage, and marketing facilities for and to regulate commerce among the States in live stock, meats, and other products derived from live stock or the slaughtering of live stock; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 5724) to create a department of public health, to authorize the appropriation of money for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money for Federal cooperation with the States in the encouragement and support of public-health work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5725) fixing the responsibility of a common carrier, railroad, or transportation company receiving property for transportation and delivery from another common carrier, railroad, or transportation company, where original contract of shipment is to carry or transport such property from a point in one State, Territory, or District of the United States to a point in another State, Territory, or District of the United States, and for liability to lawful holder of receipt or bill of lading, as provided, for loss, damage, or injury to such property in certain instances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5727) to donate to Beaver Crossing, Nebr., one or more obsolete (though not disabled) or captured German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 5728) regulating the method of keeping mortality statistics by the Census Bureau and providing for tabulating and rating separately white and colored people, and that the mortality rates of cities to be based upon deaths of those residing in the city, and nonresident deaths or deaths of transients be tabulated separately; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5729) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) to provide for a site and public building at Mansfield, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) to provide for a site and public building at Homer, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Shreveport, La., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5733) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Benton, La., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5734) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Minden, La., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5735) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Homer, La., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5736) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Arcadia, La., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5737) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Coushatta, La., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5738) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Mansfield, La., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) authorizing the erection in the city of Boston, Mass., of a cold-storage warehouse for the reception of fish and other commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAGO: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring pension legislation for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Memorial from the Legislature of Massachusetts, urging Congress to provide necessary legislation for establishment of a national food commission, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENSON: A bill (H. R. 5739) granting a pension to Howard E. Tolson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) granting a pension to William N. Pugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5741) granting a pension to Effie Flynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) granting a pension to William Mason Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 5743) providing for the promotion and the retirement of Lieut. John Elmer Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 5744) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Dr. John H. Blackburn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 5746) for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Lighthouses; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5747) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 5748) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Ranger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to Agnes Eugene Dinsmoor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5750) for the relief of H. B. Walley for injuries sustained; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Robert J. Baylis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 5752) for the relief of the heirs of Lemuel J. Draper; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of the legal representatives of William B. Dodd, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5754) for the relief of the legal representative of John Boyle, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5755) to correct the military record of Quincey Christian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5756) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Smithmeyer and Pelz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5757) granting a pension to Mary S. Langston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5758) for the relief of William Henry Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5759) for the relief of Seth J. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5760) for the relief of Jimmie Lou Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5761) for the relief of Mary Holloman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) granting a pension to James W. Ledford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 5763) granting a pension to Mary T. Barnard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 5764) granting a pension to Lillie C. Marvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5765) granting an increase of pension to William U. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 5766) granting a pension to Albert V. Lawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 5767) granting a pension to Ottilie Carrol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 5768) granting a pension to Anna Efner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 5769) granting an increase of pension to Walter E. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5770) granting a pension to Mary Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5771) granting a pension to Miriam Catherine Hone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) granting a pension to Abram Branum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5773) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Rhoades, alias Vankirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5775) granting an increase of pension to John Bagent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 5776) granting a pension to William J. Linn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 5777) granting an increase of pension to Abner L. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5778) granting a pension to Mary Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 5779) granting a pension to Margaret L. Cassady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5780) granting a pension to Andrew F. Welfley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5781) granting a pension to Gilbert Adams, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5782) granting a pension to Fannie A Inglis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5783) granting a pension to Matilda Cora Gallion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5784) granting a pension to Miranda Q Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5785) granting a pension to Thanie Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5786) granting a pension to John D. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5787) granting an increase of pension to Myers Silvers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5788) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5789) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Cartwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5790) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Paxson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5791) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5792) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Funk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5793) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Goe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5794) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5795) granting an increase of pension to Magdalena O. Shanks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5796) granting an increase of pension to John P. Rounds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5797) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) granting an increase of pension to Delila Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5800) granting an increase of pension to Robert McMartin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5801) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fetters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5802) granting an increase of pension to Barney Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5803) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Studley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5804) granting an increase of pension to John Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5805) granting an increase of pension to John Ham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5806) granting an increase of pension to Frances L. Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5807) for the relief of John T. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 5808) granting a pension to Ida C. Huston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5809) granting a pension to Henry G. Mechling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Westfield Board of Trade, Westfield, Mass., urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of mass meeting of Irish citizens at Chicago, opposing the league of nations and asking that it be separated from the peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of city council of the city of Chicago, urging that no increase in rates of telephone service is necessary or reasonable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in United States, assembled at St. Louis, Mo.; the Women's Presbyterian Missionary Society of Boston, Mass.; and Presbytery of Providence, R. I., protesting against any repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of sundry citizens of Atlantic City, N. J., for repeal of tax on soda water and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry employees of the Lumberton Shoe Co., Lumberton, N. J., in re enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce, San Antonio, Tex., urging adequate provision for the Federal Employment Service, with adequate appropriation for same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of San Antonio, Tex., urging steps for the relief of the Jews in Poland, Roumania, Galicia, and other eastern European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Antonio, Tex., urging the establishment of a commercial air fleet in connection with the merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Alamo Post, No. 2, American Legion, San Antonio, Tex., condemning bomb outrages and denouncing Bolshevism, Industrial Workers of the World, and anarchy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of San Antonio, Tex., urging the repeal of the tax on soda water, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A petition from the citizens of York, Pa., petitioning for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of National Pickle Packers' Association, Chicago, and Crockery Board of Trade of New York, urging retention of zone rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Adam Eidam garage and Charles J. Kirscham garage, Hazleton, Pa., opposing manufacturers' tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Isaac Long, Harry F. Stern, and numerous citizens of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., urging prompt repeal of luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of sundry citizens from New York, for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, local No. 558, Sheffield, Ala., relating to nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Association Opposed to National Prohibition, demanding repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Two petitions from 103 citizens of Foster, Bates County, Mo., asking for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Petition of Charles S. Clark, superintendent of schools of Somerville, Mass., and others, in favor of the principles of education bill, House bill 7, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of La Salle, Oglesby, and De Kalb, Ill., concerning the Jugo-Slav-Italian situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Lodge No. 4, Slovenic Progressive Benefit Society and Planina No. 57, S. N. P. J., asking for justice on Jugo-Slav questions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of residents of the village of Deposit, N. Y., and vicinity, for the repeal of the tax on soda water, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of Local 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of Orland Unit Water Users' Association, of Orland, Calif., urging support of national soldiers' settlement act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, protest of Mrs. Nellie A. Freeman, Riverside, Calif., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Fifty-second Annual Convention of California State Sunday School Association, convened at Sacramento, Calif., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of San Bernardino, Calif., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the Free Methodist Church, of Brawley, Calif., against repeal of prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of McComas Dry Goods Co., Summers Manufacturing Co., and Klein Norton Co., all of Los Angeles, Calif., against repeal of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of A. D. Edwards & Son, of Los Angeles, Calif., against repeal of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of Slavic Society of Milwaukee, the Slavic Society Sloga, and the Croatian Society Nada, in reference to territorial claims of Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Soda Fountain Association of New York, N. Y., against tax on soda, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, for law exempting from Federal income taxes the interest from investments not exceeding $40,000 in mortgages on real estate in the United States owned by any taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Worsted and Woolen Spinners, New York City, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Bernard C. Steiner, John E. Auld, Joseph A. Lachte, A. William Roehner, Harry W. Coe, Loyd V. Hendrickson, William G. Wetherall, all of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of Baltimore, Md., protesting against luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John J. Greer & Co. (Inc.), Baltimore, Md., opposing repeal of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Keturah Baldwin, secretary American Home Economic Association, favoring measure for home economics education, to improve conditions of living in the home, the institutional household, and the community; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the League of the Friends of Korea, relating to the freedom of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of National Association of Manufacturers in New York City, in reference to United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Messrs. Durkin & Condell and other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., asking for the repeal of the tax on sodas, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James L. Perkins, William F. Bingel, W. C. Dambach, and Ellis T. Lathbury, asking for the repeal of the tax on patent medicines and toilet articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Kensington Church of Christ, Buffalo, N. Y., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Soda Fountain Association of New York (Inc.) and numerous citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. M. Anthony and Michael Strozzi, Buffalo, N. Y., asking that the luxury tax on medicine and toilet articles be repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of the fourth congressional district asking for the early repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of Onondaga and Cortland Counties, N. Y., asking the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Elmer J. Yerdon and other residents of Euclid, Onondaga County, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of residents of Munnsville, N. Y., and others for repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Dairyman's League, of New Woodstock, N. Y., for the repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolution by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, indorsing President Wilson's recommendation for the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of Polk County Council of Defense, favoring a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of many thousand citizens of New York, Brooklyn, and vicinity, asking for repeal of luxury taxes, especially sections 902, 904, 905, and 907; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of S. S. Kresge Co., Detroit, Mich., several hundred citizens and workers of store No. 29, Brooklyn, N. Y., for the repeal of tax on soft drinks, sodas, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of Methodist Church, Petersburg; 70 citizens of Brown County; Methodist churches of Hamburg, Summit Grove, and Betterview, all in the State of Illinois, against modifying war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of Trades and Labor Council of Kenosha; Cigar Makers' Union, of Racine; Belle City Lodge, No. 437, Machinists, of Racine; Brewery Workers, of Racine; Kenosha Local, No. 34, I. A. of M., of Kenosha; Plumbers' and Steam Fitters' Local No. 413, of Beloit; Bartenders' League Local No. 523, of Kenosha; Bakers' and Confectioners' Local No. 228, of Kenosha; Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of Racine; Cigar Makers' Union of Kenosha, all in the State of Wisconsin, and 66 other organizations, requesting repeal of the war-time prohibition act and that words "intoxicating liquor," etc., when used in Federal statutes shall be construed to include only those liquors containing more than 3 per cent of alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of Trinity United Evangelical Church of Frankville, Pa., and Sabbath school, urging the enforcement of war prohibition and opposing any repeal of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also petition of Lewiston Grange, No. 1639, Tamaqua, Pa., opposing daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSE: Petition of members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Bellwood, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Resolutions adopted by Old Kentucky Lodge, No. 1359, Loyal Order of Moose, Covington, Ky., against Bolshevism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Edward J. Jones, New York City, relating to salary of special clerks in post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Adolph Lewesohn & Sons, New York National Association of Worsted & Woolen Spinners, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. W. Berry, Albany, N. Y., recommending a provision to supply deficiencies in appropriation for the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Board of Temperance of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, for enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William J. Cronin, Brooklyn, N. Y., for repeal of war prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Richard F. Murphy, vice president of Association of Western Union Employees, for reimbursing employees of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the First Baptist Church of Alabama, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war prohibition law and urging the enactment of laws rigidly enforcing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the congregation of the first Presbyterian Church of Byron, N. Y., unanimously urging the passage of adequate legislation for the enforcement of the prohibition law effective July 1, and protesting against any discrimination in favor of beer and light wine in the rigid enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition by citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois in behalf of the Government ownership of railways in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of residents of Norway, N. Y., favoring legislation to enforce national prohibition and protesting against repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of United Slovenians, of Little Falls, N. Y., for a just and satisfactory division of territory in Europe for the establishment of a republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of First Presbyterian Church of Columbus Grove, Ohio, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of First Evangelical English Lutheran Church and Sunday School, protesting against any change or modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the creation of a national food commission to investigate and punish acts of storage, hoarding, speculation, and profiteering in staple necessities of life; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of Lorimer, Iowa, asking for a repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Croatian Society of Brazil, Iowa, by their officers, asking for recognition of the claims of Jugo-Slavonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Trojan Grange, No. 157, Troy, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Surry Grange, Surry, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Farmers and Mechanics' Club of Rindge, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Sullivan Grange, Newport, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *June 14, 1919.*

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by Mr. WALSH as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, our heavenly Father, the inspiration of all that is truest and best in man, we lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee for the glorious anniversary of our national ensign, which came down a precious heritage from our fathers a hundred and forty-two years ago to-day.

We thank Thee that it floats in triumph over this great Capitol and throughout the length and breadth of our land, to cheer and inspire all true Americans with patriotic zeal for the great prin-

ciples it represents—the individual, the home, the State, the Nation.

If it could put into history the past and present, it would exceed all history in interest. If it could put its experience into an epic, it would surpass all poems; into song, its story would be the greatest anthem that has ever been sung. Its requiem for the dead who have died that it might live would wring tears from every true heart. Its place is fixed, its life immortal. Thanks to Thee for the brave, the pure, the true. It lives for those who love it, and those who love it will never die. To the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FOSTER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence on account of important business.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Herald appears the following:

SALARIES PROBE ANNOYS CABINET—DEPARTMENT HEADS DECLARE BLANTON RESOLUTIONS ARE NUISANCE.

Under the leadership of Secretary of Commerce Redfield, Cabinet officers have determined upon a united policy with reference to Blanton resolutions, passed by the House, requiring all Federal employees to inform Congress whether they have any means of income other than Uncle Sam's pay roll, and whether they have any relatives working for the Government.

They have decided to ask Congress for a special appropriation for the expense involved in collecting and compiling this information. Through Secretary of the Treasury Glass, they are asking for additional funds to the extent of $2,500 for each department. A larger amount may be asked if this sum does not prove sufficient.

The Cabinet officials make no secret of the fact that they regard the Blanton resolutions as a nuisance, and that they are not in sympathy with a probe of the kind called for. The salary reclassification commission is gathering all the legitimate information in connection with the work of Federal employees and their remuneration, they say.

I call the Chair's attention especially to the following:

The Cabinet officials make no secret of the fact that they regard the Blanton resolutions as a nuisance.

Now, I have three distinct questions of personal privilege to present to the Chair.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has risen to state a question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Chair agrees with me, I expect to use not all the time allotted to me by the rules of the House but just as little time as possible and to save time by discussing all three at the same time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that he has not yet stated his question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Concerning this first item, I will state that these resolutions, whatever their merit or demerit, were resolutions passed by this House by at least a vote of 2 to 1, which is an overwhelming vote of the House. The first five of these resolutions were passed by this House by acclamation, if you please, without even a division being called for by any Member of this House. In the face of that fact they are denominated, not by one Cabinet officer, if the Chair pleases, but by the alleged concerted action of the Cabinet of the United States, as "a nuisance." In other words, the Cabinet of the United States does not direct a criticism merely against one Member of the House, to wit, the author of the resolutions, but it is alleged that the Cabinet of the United States agrees upon the statement, if the Chair please——

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman does not present a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken and that the gentleman from Texas has not stated a question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, then, duly respecting the Chair's ruling, I proceed to the second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas rises to a question of personal privilege, which he will state.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, concerning the remarks made by me upon several occasions on the floor of this House concerning lawlessness in labor unions, in this morning's Washington Post appears a communication from Atlantic City, purporting to repeat remarks made by the president of the American Federation of Labor at Atlantic City yesterday concerning my speech and concerning myself, wherein he is charged with using this language:

He then took occasion to refer to Representative BLANTON, of Texas, as "Bleating BLANTON" for remarks the Congressman recently made.

[Laughter and applause.]

Oh, some of you gentlemen may laugh and clap, but you are going to have to answer some of these days to the yeomanry of the country when you go to your districts and face elections in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. It is added, "Will be left at home," Mr. Gompers said, and then it goes on and says:

"As time goes on," said Mr. Gompers, "BLANTON will be eliminated or left at home, as others of his stamp have been."

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the Chair that where a Member of Congress makes a speech upon the floor of the House and details certain facts that exist in the Nation, part of which he is attempting to represent, whether ably or not, if those facts are not warranted any man has the right to deny them and to criticize the person who makes them, even though he be a Member of Congress. But because facts stated on the floor of this House which are uncontroverted, which are admitted, which are not denied——

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is not discussing any privileged question. He has not stated any question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas must first state his question of personal privilege before proceeding further.

Mr. BLANTON. My question is based upon this fact, Mr. Speaker: That where any person in the United States, instead of denying statements made by members of a legislative body, indulges in cheap abuse of the persons making them, Members of Congress, by calling them names and saying, "Men of his stamp"—what does that mean, if the Chair please?—"men of his stamp will be eliminated or left at home," does not that bring into question the good name and good character of a Member of Congress by calling him names and in that connection saying, "Men of his stamp shall be left at home"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman send his clipping to the desk?

Mr. BLANTON. I have underscored the part on which I base my question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the reference to the gentleman from Texas in the newspaper article as "a man of his stamp," in the Chair's opinion, does not present a question of personal privilege. The reference to the gentleman from Texas as "Bleating BLANTON" might be considered a reference which would hold the gentleman up to ridicule and contempt, and, although the question is rather close, the Chair is inclined to rule that the gentleman has stated a question of personal privilege in the characterization of the article as referring to him as "Bleating BLANTON." The gentleman will proceed and confine his remarks to that characterization.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair hear me on the third point, which I desire to present as a question of personal privilege?

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has stated one question of personal privilege, and it is not in order to make a second one until he discusses the first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to address the Chair on his question of personal privilege?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, Mr. Speaker; but to save the time of the House I would like to discuss both questions of personal privilege at the same time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman's other question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I read the following letter from the editor of a daily paper published in the capital of my State:

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 7, 1919.*

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Rather odd situation when a department of the United States Government would use its official press-agent matter to discredit a Congressman, as per attached letters received by the Austin American.

Very truly, yours,

EDITOR OF THE AUSTIN AMERICAN.

Attached to that letter are various communications headed "Department of Labor, United States Employment Service," and signed by H. W. Lewis, Federal director of that department, and sent out under the signature of the Federal director of one of the departments of the United States Government, wherein he sends out especially prepared editorials for the papers of Texas, written by him, as follows. I read only the part on which I base the question of personal privilege:

Asserting that Congressman BLANTON has broken faith with his constituents, and, despite his promises to support an appropriation for the United States Employment Service, he has killed it in the House on a point of order—

And so forth.

There are other set editorials for the Texas daily newspapers specially prepared by Federal Director H. W. Lewis, and I call attention to the four-page one he sent to the editor of the Ballinger Ledger, A. W. Sledge, who says he "gets an armful of this dope in every mail and presumes some high-salaried clerks in the Department of Labor are kept busy sending it out, and that it is a waste."

The article tends to show that I had broken faith with the people whom I represent in the House of Congress. I submit to the Chair that that is a question of privilege in all earnestness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman is not reading the original communication.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; they are editorials prepared by H. W. Lewis, over his signature as Federal Director of the United States Employment Service, as a branch of the Department of Labor, but to be published in the papers as editorials, with no mention of Lewis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair took it that the gentleman was reading from some extract sent to him.

Mr. BLANTON. No; those are the words of H. W. Lewis, Federal Director of United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And the gentleman has those words over the signature of Mr. Lewis?

Mr. BLANTON. I will send them to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The words charge the gentleman with a breach of faith, and the Chair thinks the gentleman has presented a question of personal privilege, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, I regret as much as you do the necessity of now using the time of this House on questions of personal privilege. I take it that there is not a man in this House who will deny to his fellow colleagues the right to defend any assertion against his good name, in the newspapers or otherwise.

The only bleating I have made, to which the president of the American Federation of Labor refers, is in placing in the RECORD from the floor of this House the uncontroverted facts connected with certain portions of the war record of labor unions in this country. I have not attacked the unions for properly organizing for their protection; I have asserted many times that I am in favor of lawful unions. I have asserted many times that I heartily favor all of the labor principles in the peace treaty, and if union labor will purge itself of anarchy and purge itself of the disregard of law I will be its strongest friend in this House of Congress. But the only bleating I have made is that unless Mr. Gompers purges the unions of this country of the disregard of law and of anarchy I shall fight them as long as I am a Member of this House.

I asserted that the disregard of law, the preaching of anarchy, the display of the red flag, the singing of the red flag anthem, the protests against the law and against lawful authority, the inclination to Bolshevism, if you please, lately so prevalent throughout our country from the East to the West, are fostered and countenanced by the unions of this country, and, without disproving or even denying my assertions, this great master and dictating autocrat of organized labor resorts to cheap personal abuse by designating me "Bleating BLANTON," and threatens me again with political defeat by predicting that I shall be eliminated by being left at home after the next election.

Thank God, the position of Congressman of the seventeenth district of Texas is controlled by 300,000 Texans who have not yet become Gomperized. I shall stay at home only when my constituents say so. Just as the unions of Washington have threatened all union members here with fines, prohibitionists and all, unless they attend the protest meeting at this Capitol to protest against the constitutional law of the land, just so will Mr. Gompers find some means of forcing some union men in my district to oppose me in the next election, but there are many, many brave, loyal, patriotic citizens in my district who are members of unions, whom he will never control or influence against me, for they have confidence in me and know that I am conscientiously trying to do my duty.

Was I bleating when I called the attention of this Congress to the fact that on the same night that deadly anarchistic bomb was exploded on General Palmer's premises all the labor unions of Washington met here and entertained Mrs. Rena Mooney, the wife of the convicted bomb thrower of California, and applauded her address, when her whole mission here was to go behind the judgments of courts and to circumvent the law? And on this same night these unions voted to fine all members who refused to attend to-day's protest against prohibition and prohibition laws. I called attention to the fact that if it were traced down, the bomb throwers in Washington, who in the dead hour of night would place on the doorstep of your Attorney General of the United States a deadly bomb, specially prepared to kill, would be connected up with some membership in some union; and the same newspaper in Washington which this morning says that the president of the American Federation of Labor denominated me as a bleating Congressman brought you the intelligence that the only man the efficient Secret Service of this Nation has yet been able to arrest in connection with the bomb throwing on the Attorney General's doorstep in the midnight hour is Max Holder, the business agent of the waiters' union of Washington. That is the kind of bleating I have been giving you. And it was this same waiters' union that paid barkers $25 per week, from March 11 until shortly after I made my speech against it on May 24, to stand at all of the entrances to the Raleigh Hotel and tell every woman who entered there, your wife and mine, if you please, that she was "not decent," because she was entering a "scab hotel." With Mr. Gompers and his unions all of the other 107,000,000 people in the United States are "scabs."

I am going to tell you something you do not know about the "bleating" Congressman from Texas. I came very near being the "bleeding" Congressman from Texas. Last Sunday morning, knowing that a good father in my district had died, that his widow was in debt, about to lose her little home, that she had one son on the battleship *Pennsylvania* and her only other son was still in France serving his country, and realizing that it was absolutely necessary for that woman to have one of her boys at home, I sent a telegram to Annapolis, wiring the captain of the *Pennsylvania* that I wanted to get that boy out. I sent another telegram to a party in Annapolis, stating that I would be there that day in my automobile and to arrange for a boat to take me out to the *Pennsylvania*. My family wanted to go with me, my wife and five children. I took them with me. I attended to my business, and when we were coming home, leaving Annapolis late at night, along the road just the other side of Upper Marlboro, something that I thought was a missile hit my car, and immediately following, within a few seconds, a rifle ball came through both the side doors of my automobile, shattering glass upon my own face and upon the faces of two of my children. After discussing the matter with Mr. J. W. Pumphrey, who was driving a car just ahead of me and who lives about 2 miles from Marlboro and who heard the shot and further up the road stopped his car, I reluctantly concluded that it was not an accident, though, of course, it could have been, even at that late hour—after 11 o'clock. I do know that coming from Altoona, Pa., I have received three different threats through the United States mail anonymously, which said that there were 10,000 members of the brotherhood in Altoona who had marked me specially for suffering, and they had not only marked me but they had marked the members of my family.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, my good friend, I wish to God every member of unions was like this good man from Ohio——

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not believe in anything of this kind. If they were all as true and loyal as he is, God bless him, there would be no room for criticism. He is one man in Congress who has had the courage, even though he is a member of a brotherhood of 400,000 railroad men, who has had the manhood and the courage to stand up here in Washington and say that when they attempt to raise a flag over this Capitol in the name of the United States this afternoon, in behalf of accursed saloons and protesting against the fundamental law of this land and the Constitution, he does not agree with them. And he is a member of a body of men who in 1915 had the manhood to stand up in their convention and say that they were in favor of making this Nation dry. That is the kind of a man the able and distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] is, and I take pleasure in yielding to him.

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe the gentleman from Texas wants to be misquoted.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly not.

Mr. COOPER. And that is the reason I have interrupted him. Did the gentleman say he received a letter from the Brotherhood of Railroad Men threatening his life?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; it was anonymous. I said that; but it said that the writer was one of 10,000 members of the brotherhood of Altoona; and in another one of these letters from Altoona the writer called me the awful appellation which I have heretofore placed in the RECORD. I have received a wastebasketful of such letters of abuse and threats from all over the United

States; threats not only against myself, because I am not afraid of them, but threats against my beloved wife and children, concerning whom I am afraid. A man would be an infamous liar if he were to tell you he was not afraid concerning his family when they are threatened. I want to say to my good friend from Ohio that there are thousands of good men in unions who are as pure as gold, who are loyal and patriotic citizens, who do not approve of the viciousness that is found in their organizations. I want to say to the bunch of cutthroats who have been sending me these threats that I have a wife who was born and raised in west Texas and she is not afraid of the devil. [Applause.] When I told her to get on the train and take my children to Texas on her father's ranch, where she would be safe, she said, "No; I will not do anything of the kind. I will never run from danger." Yet I am called the "Bleating BLANTON," from Texas, and even a few of my Democratic friends on this side began to clap and applaud because that appellation was placed upon me in the newspapers. I had rather be right, even though I am all by myself, than be the President of the United States. I had rather be right and be in a minority of one in this House than be wrong and have every Member with me on a proposition. Now, it would be fair if Mr. Gompers could show that I had stated a single thing in that record against unions that was not a fact. I challenged him on two different occasions, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and through my speech on the floor of this House. I challenged him and every member of the labor organizations to deny and disprove one single fact that I have placed in the RECORD. Not an attempt has been made to disprove or even deny a single fact, but I am subjected to abuse and to criticism. Ten years from now the very men who sat over there and clapped their hands when they heard me called a bleating Congressman may say, back in their homes, "BLANTON is still serving his people in Congress and doing his duty despite the threat of Mr. Gompers that he is going to be eliminated and kept at home." As an evidence of the fact that the people are waking up, read the following editorial from the San Antonio Daily Express, issue of June 11, 1919, published in San Antonio, Tex., one of the leading labor-union cities of my State, to wit:

IS THIS AN EXAMPLE OF MR. GOMPERS'S PRECEPT OF "COOPERATION"?

Addressing the convention of the American Federation of Labor in Atlantic City two days ago, President Samuel Gompers said:

"If any employer believes that industrial autocracy or despotism is going to prevail in America he counts without his host."

Very good. But what about the autocracy or despotism of employees, or, more specifically, of any union into which labor is organized?

A strike of electrical workers was called lately in San Antonio, and the "walking delegate," or some other union authority, has been busy, not "constructively," as the president of the American Federation of Labor would say, but destructively.

For example, he has seen the foreman of the Express Publishing Co.'s electric equipment system, and has given the foreman orders to quit, to walk out, to strike, because other electrical workers in San Antonio are striking for more pay!

Now, the foreman of this branch of the Express plant does not want to strike. He does not want to quit. He is quite satisfied with his job. He says as much. He has not asked for an increase of wages. He receives his pay check week in, week out, whether the ordinary course of his employment requires of him much work or little during the week. The demands of other electrical workers of this city upon their employers are not his demands. But he is a member of the union, and he is ordered to walk out and be idle while other workers and other employers contest the wage scale.

The fact that he is a foreman and is not engaged in commercial work for the public, in line with the conditions of the local strike, is not considered by the union as rendering his case separate and exceptional.

Is this an example, a San Antonio example, of President Gompers's precept of "cooperation" between those who earn and those who pay wages, for the good of organized labor, and of capital, and of the American public?

If it is, the words of organized labor are infinitely more respectable than their deeds.

It is exactly such unjust, intolerable, indiscriminate interference as this with the honest and proper relations of employer and employee that creates and maintains "open shop" movements.

It is the strike that disrupts satisfactory relations between employer and employee, the "sympathetic" strike that ties up necessary industry and separates from the pay roll men and women who have no grievance whatsoever against their own employers, that does more than anything else to arouse antagonism to the practices, and thereby to the principles, of organized labor.

The Express Publishing Co. will employ another foreman of its electrical plant, of course; it must have one on the job steadily. It employed this union man as foreman, in the first place, because it preferred to, not because it was in any way required to do so. Whenever it has been necessary to employ electrical workers to assist the foreman union men have been called in as a matter of choice. The entire plant of the Express Publishing Co. is unionized in every department for which there is a local union. But the sort of procedure resorted to by the union in the case of this foreman may force the company to employ a nonunion man.

The people of this Government are going to wake up some day. The more than 70,000,000 of the proletariat of this country, who for years have been ground and bled and have paid the price of the war between the few capitalists and the 3,000,000 labor-union members, are going to wake up some day, and they are going to say to this tail which has been wagging the dog so long, "Mr. Tail, we are going to cut you off, because the dog is going to do some of the wagging from now on." I say this to you, good Congressmen, whom Mr. Gompers, through the threat made by Secretary Morrison here in the Keating banquet, told to our faces, through every newspaper in Washington, that he was going to put out of Congress every man who did not support the labor-organization program—he thus threatened to our faces that he was going to put us out and send us home and replace us with men carrying union cards—that he may send you home, but the only home that he can send me to is not my Texas home but my eternal home above. He will never send me home to Texas, because my people, even though there are thousands of members of labor unions in my district, have confidence in me because of the eight years' service I gave them as a circuit judge, when I cleaned up every docket in their country and made law apply to the big and the little alike. I have no more to say about Mr. Gompers just now.

How about this reference that has been sent out broadcast by H. W. Lewis, the Federal Director of the Employment Service—sent to every daily newspaper in my State? On the 5th there was a four-page article, and on the 7th another, and on the 9th of this month another, all propaganda, and attacking me. He made one prophecy that has proved true. He said that although BLANTON had gone back on his constituency, although BLANTON had broken faith with the people he represents, because he knocked out by a point of order an appropriation for the Employment Service, yet notwithstanding that, just to sit steady in the boat, for the appropriation was going to come anyway, because the Senate was going to put it on. So the other day, when I showed you good colleagues of mine a statement signed by one of the honest auditors of this country, an auditor now honored in the Shipping Board with a position there to audit millions of dollars of accounts—when I gave you a statement from a man like Mr. Burroughs, telling you that out of $5,500,000 we have given to this service three and a half million has been wasted and misapplied, that the service was so rotten and that the administration of affairs was so absolutely disreputable that he could not stay with it and voluntarily resigned and got another position, I told you what was the fact, and I want to read you excerpts from his resignation. This is what he says in his resignation:

MAY 5, 1919.

Mr. J. B. DENSMORE,
Director General United States Employment Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I herewith tender my resignation, effective May 15. I regret very much to leave the service with the transportation in the condition that it is, but it is absolutely useless for anyone to attempt to straighten out the entanglement under the antagonistic supervision that has existed since the early part of December.

I will give you a brief outline of the difficulties that I have experienced since entering this service, that no one can discredit, unless they make false statements, which appears they have been accustomed to doing.

Prior to my entering this service, I was in the general office of a railroad company for the past 20 years as division chief in charge of accounts, also handling Government transportation, issued by all branches of the service, at a salary of $2,700 per year.

After carefully going over the situation * * * I immediately proceeded to draft a general letter of instruction which received the approval of those that were interested. This proposed letter was held up by one of the officials—and my repeated efforts for action were fruitless. In the meantime transportation requests were being issued and a great majority of them cover no charge, and many of the charges incorrect.

I am frank in saying that this is my first experience in being associated with men of so little ability and principle. They are simply bluffing their game through.

For your information this transportation is in very bad condition.

And this man in his statement showed you that on the 4th day of last July Miss Janette Densmore, the sister of the Director General, carrying a book of transportation in her pocket, out of which he could issue requisitions for transportation from one side of the United States to the other, got transportation and Pullman reservations for three different people on July 4, from New York to Atlantic City, the watering place known to many Members of Congress, and on July 7 she got transportation and Pullman reservations for herself from Atlantic City back to New York. I have another authentic statement showing that on September 3 last she started on a trip in the United States, and when she came back she collected on a voucher—and he gave the voucher number, so that there can not be any mistake about it—$700 of the people's money for expense accounts.

I have shown you in such statement where hundreds of thousands of dollars of this department have been wasted. The other day when I asked you to hold up the $272,000 given this service by the Senate through amendment 49 on the deficiency bill there were just two men who voted for it—one besides myself. Not another Democrat here can go home and say that he was that second one, because the one man who voted with me to save the $272,000 was a Republican sitting right

over there. So you good Democratic colleagues of mine, who laughed when I was called a bleating Congressman, you go home to your constituents and look them square in the face and say to them that you were put upon reasonable notice from the statement of the auditor, a signed statement published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from this honored auditor of this Government, that more than half of the millions of appropriations that we have given this department were wasted and misapplied, and just because you did not like Mr. BLANTON passing some wholesome resolutions over you with some Republican aid to help him, you sat in your seats and voted against a good measure, and permitted this $272,000 to still remain in that bill, placed there by a Senate rider. And if you do not vote later to take it out, it is going to be wasted, because I have affidavits there in my little satchel to show that Mr. Densmore has put employee after employee on what he calls a dollar basis, just waiting for this $272,000 to come in, and then he will adequately shower them with Government money according to his notion, from $6,000 a year down, and according to that auditor he transfers and details them about from place to place so that they can draw in addition to their big salaries $4 a day expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of a good employment service. I am in favor of an honest one, and I hate to criticize a department of my Government. I said in the beginning it was not a Democratic institution. Three of the main men who have wasted much money in that department are prominent Republicans and I can name them, yet I am placed in the attitude by some of my colleagues of wanting to go over to the Republican side. I want to say to you that I am as loyal a Democrat as sits in this House, but above Democracy I am an American citizen first.

And anything that I find out in my Government that is wrong, I do not care whether a Democrat or a Republican is responsible for it, I am going to stand here and fight it and try to vote it out of this Government, whether it be by a Democrat or a Republican, and I know the President in France will respect me for it and will be glad of it even if some Cabinet officers do try to make it appear that it will cost about ten times as much as is actually necessary to carry out my resolutions. One word or two and then I am done.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Why does not the gentleman give the names of the Republicans.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I will do it; the gentleman is sure he wants them?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will give them to the gentleman. Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Stewart.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Who are they?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Mason and Mr. Stewart, down in the Employment Service, are Republicans, and you can not deny it. They have been rendering much valuable service to the Republican Party for years.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. What is the charge against them?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman certainly has not read the statement I put in the RECORD from Mr. Burroughs; if he had he would not ask that question. Let us see concerning these resolutions. Mr. KITCHIN, the great Democratic leader and chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee in the Sixty-fifth Congress, on this side (page 698 of the RECORD):

> I agree with the gentleman from Texas and also as expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that the first and second paragraphs or sections are all right, and that there is no objection to them, but if I were the gentleman I would strike out section 3.

And following his advice I struck out section 3 in each resolution.

Mr. GARRETT, of Tennessee, another great Democrat, said they were all right, and all of my good Democratic friends on this side sat here during the passage of the first five resolutions and permitted every one of them to pass by acclamation, without even asking for a division, and on the first test vote that was had in this House, called for by my good friend from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], I was supported on that matter by a vote of 311 to 8, which will be found on page 705 of the RECORD, and yet——

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. BLACK. My recollection is that was the vote on the previous question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but it was the first test roll-call vote we had.

Mr. BLACK. I would hardly think it would be accurate to state that that was a test vote.

Mr. BLANTON. That was a test vote on the previous question, called for by a Democrat, and the vote was 311 to 8. As I said, Mr. KITCHIN, the great Democratic chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the Sixty-fifth Congress, said that the resolutions we passed were all right, and he put his stamp of approval upon them, as also did Mr. GARRETT, of Tennessee, another great man, another great Democratic leader, and yet I am a nuisance and my resolutions are a nuisance. You have seen these padded reports of this Employment Service about the thousands and thousands of men that they have put into occupations and positions. I have here the weekly reports made out by Miss Margaret Mitchell, the head of this replacement work in Washington, who in February gave these reports out as reports of their work.

I wrote to the Public Printer, at the Government Printing Office, asking for an estimate of the cost to the Government of both paper and printing to print the proposed questionnaire necessary to be used in putting such resolutions into effect.

He advised me in writing that by using colored writing paper, which is a good, heavy paper, even of better quality than I expected, 25,000 would cost, printing and paper, $58.81, and that 100,000 would cost $189.38.

The act approved March 1, 1919, known as Public, No. 314, creating the Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, contains the following provisions:

> SEC. 9. That a joint commission is created to be known as the "Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries," which shall consist of three Senators, who are now Members of the Congress, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Representatives, who are now Members of the Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker. * * *
>
> The heads of the various governmental services and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall furnish office space and equipment, detail officers and employees, furnish data and information, and make investigations whenever requested by the commission in connection with the purposes of this section.

When said act was passed I understood that the members of this commission would be Members of Congress, and would therefore not receive extra salaries, yet, notwithstanding the act was not approved until March 1, 1919, and the Sixty-fifth Congress adjourned March 4, 1919, all three members of this commission from the House were selected from the list of retiring Members, and they now each draw $625 per month for their services.

The second paragraph of this act shows that it was intended by Congress that the present clerical force of the various departments should do the work in procuring this data for Congress.

I want to commend our very efficient Civil Service Commission, which has notified me that it is having the questionnaires mimeographed on its own machines in the office, and that it will procure this data under its resolution without expense to the Government.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. McARTHUR. I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the question of personal privilege, but he is reading reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will confine himself to the question of personal privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair will remember the statement made by the Federal Employment Service in Texas, that I have broken faith with my people in striking appropriations out on points of order, and I am discussing that question, which involves a great deal of latitude and a great deal of facts. Here is this good woman, who is getting a sufficient salary to board at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington—and you men who have boarded there know what it costs per week and per month. She is furnished with a private secretary and a suite of offices for her department, and here in Washington, where it has been stated there were lots of clerks let out in February, even after the armistice was signed in November, for the week beginning February 8 and ending February 14 she placed only five persons—placed only five persons, and they were placed all in one day. Here is the week beginning February 15 and ending February 21, and there were placed only four persons, and two of them were placed on February 15 and two on February 17; and yet this system, which has wasted over five and a half million dollars in a very short time, can make no better showing than that here in Washington. I can show you the report from 17 different private service concerns in the East—I do not have to go to the South or the West but to the East—where, when this service was first inaugurated, this Federal service said to them, "If you put men in employment we will close down on you; we are the Federal Government," and they stopped them. What did those people do? They could not place the laborers they had, the laborers they wanted. This Employment Service used every single one of these private agencies to go out and work and find employment for them, and kept quiet when they agreed to turn their entire list of laborers placed over to the Employment Service so it could get credit for that employment. I can show you the statement of numbers of them over

this country, and we men sit here in this House being hornswoggled by a department that has been wasting the people's money, and we stand for it and let the Federal director in the States send these prepared editorials to every paper of this Nation, and you have not heard a protest against it in any paper—these prepared editorials that are sent to every paper in this country and the thousands of telegrams that have been sent out that have furnished this propaganda that is putting Congressmen on this side of the Capitol asleep and Senators on the other side of the Capitol asleep.

You are going to stand for that $272,000? I will vote for $100,000,000 if it will get an honest service run in the interest of all laborers alike. But when that conference report comes back I am going to make a motion to recommit it to the conference with instructions to our conferees to insist on the elimination of that $272,000 until a proper investigation has been made. And you Democrats and you Republicans, if you want to, can vote against it, but I want you to go home and explain to your constituents why you did it. You can go home and say, "I did not like BLANTON because he tried to push resolutions on the House, even though Mr. KITCHIN and Mr. GARRETT approved them, and even though the House passed them by acclamation. I do not like BLANTON; I am jealous of him because he is a new Member, and I do not like a new Member to push himself forward in the House. And for that reason I voted against his motion to save that $272,000." But you had better hunt up a different excuse, because your constituents are not going to swallow that.

Am I against my President because I fight graft? If my President is in favor of graft in any department of the Government, I am against him. If the Cabinet of this Government, composed of great men though it is, stands for graft in any particular, I am against the Cabinet.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to know if the gentleman is aware of how the President stands on the question of continuing the appropriation for this Employment Service?

Mr. BLANTON. The President is just like I am; I am in favor of a proper employment service; he is in favor of it. The President has not any dream that any dishonesty exists or that money has been misapplied in this department. The President has not any dream that thousands and thousands of the people's money, in war time, when they have been so tax burdened, have been spent in trips to watering places from Atlantic City to San Francisco. If the President had the facts before him, as I have them before me, he would not ask you to vote a dollar for that department until it has been audited and cleaned. But he would come in here, like I have come in resolution 91, now pending before the Accounts Committee, like a good Democrat who believes in honest government, who believes in properly safeguarding the people's money, and he would ask the Congress not to vote a dollar until this Employment Service has been audited, and he would ask for it, too, like I have done in House resolution 91. When that resolution No. 91 comes up are you going to vote for it?

Mr. DENISON. What does the resolution provide for?

Mr. BLANTON. It provides that an auditor shall go down here to this Employment Service on a salary not of $625 per month but on a salary of $400 a month—I limit it—and within four months he must audit every account in that department and report back to Congress. And I will guarantee, if you pass that resolution and you name the auditor that I suggest to you, he will get some evidence that will send some men to Leavenworth Penitentiary. I will guarantee it. I know the auditor. I told you that as circuit judge I once appointed that man to investigate some county affairs, and he helped to bring before the grand jury evidence that showed that a county judge had embezzled over $100,000 of the people's money——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have not any desire to interrupt the gentleman, and, of course, I do not rise for that purpose. I understood when the gentleman first sought recognition he wanted only 20 or 30 minutes, and I would like to ask him how much more time he wants.

Mr. BLANTON. About two minutes more.

Mr. BUTLER. Thank you, very much.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish I had time to give Congress the benefit of the evidence I have gathered on this subject. I wish I had time to put it before all honest Members of Congress, and I believe that all my colleagues are honest. Every one of them believes in upholding the people's rights in this country. I wish you knew the facts as I know them. But I can not take further time from the great naval bill that is to come up and has to be discussed and passed.

I hope the Committee on Accounts will do what I requested the chairman to do, to grant me a hearing and let me bring the witnesses before them and let those witnesses be sworn and give testimony of what they know against this infamous, vicious, and iniquitous department of this Government, and then I will guarantee that we will have no trouble in getting resolution 91 voted out and passed. [Applause.]

REPRESENTATIVES TO WORLD COTTON CONFERENCE.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution No. 73.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution which the Clerk will report. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BUTLER. What is this?

Mr. DUPRÉ. I will state to the gentleman that I have had this matter under consideration with the Speaker pro tempore, with the Speaker himself, with the minority leader, and with the majority leader, and I assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, whose bill properly has the right of way, that if it is going to provoke a discussion beyond 5 or 10 minutes I will withdraw it.

Mr. BUTLER. That is so generous that I will raise no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 73, authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive.

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to all other nations of the world interested in the manufacture or raising of cotton to appoint delegates or representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1919: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted for the expenses of such delegates or for any other expenses incurred in connection with said conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of House joint resolution No. 73.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is a unanimous one, be read for the information of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Is the gentleman asking unanimous consent now?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes, sir. Indeed, I have already secured same.

Mr. CANNON. Does this give authority to invite people from all over the world and pay their expenses?

Mr. DUPRÉ. On the contrary, it expressly disclaims any such intention as is implied in the latter portion of the gentleman's inquiry. The resolution specifically declares that no expense will be incurred on the part of the Government at all. It is simply a courtesy that will be extended through the State Department to the various nations interested in this cotton conference to send representatives to it. It will be held regardless of the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Is it intended in the future to seek appropriations?

Mr. DUPRÉ. No; unlike the gentleman from California—we all remember the Panama-Pacific Exposition legislative aftermath—there is no intention to repudiate our word, and I here assert that no request will hereafter be made for any appropriation to cover the expenses incurred in this conference. The Government will be put to no expense whatever. The localities in interest and the delegates will bear all expenses.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I understood from the reading that no appropriations would be asked. Does the gentleman know if the President could use any money out of his contingent fund for this purpose?

Mr. DUPRÉ. I do not know; but such a course is not contemplated at all. I can assure the gentleman that all of us are interested in it; it is not a sectional matter in any sense, because the people of New England are as much interested in it as are the people of the South, and everybody understands that the Government will be put to no expense whatever. I thought and hoped that that had been made clear in the resolution itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the reading of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, having had under consideration H. J. Res. 73, authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive, reports the same back to the House without amendment and with the recommendation that it be agreed to.

The resolution reads as follows:

"That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to all other nations of the world interested in the manufacture or raising of cotton to appoint delegates or representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1919: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted for the expenses of such delegates or for any other expenses incurred in connection with said conference."

Attention is specially called to the concluding proviso of this resolution, namely:

"That no appropriation shall be granted for the expenses of such delegates or for any other expenses incurred in connection with said conference."

There are many precedents for this resolution, which was drawn after consultation with the State Department. The importance of a conference on the subject of cotton, following the war, will be at once recognized and understood. A committee of representative citizens from all parts of this country is now in Europe, inviting the European nations to send representatives to such a conference. It is believed that official recognition of this gathering, such as is contemplated by this resolution, will be extremely helpful to this committee, because it gives a formal and official status to the conference.

In this connection it may be stated that the conference will be composed of all persons interested in cotton. The grower, the ginner, the manufacturer, the exchanges—all will participate. In other words, the conference will be truly representative of the great cotton industry, in all its phases and ramifications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of House resolution 105, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3. I have talked with the minority leader about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that House resolution 105, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, be referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY.

Mr. RANDALL of California. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a motion that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn in honor of the American flag and in honor of the day that has been set aside in which to pay respect to the American flag.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I hope in the motion to adjourn, when the House adjourns, that that be the order, but I think there could be nothing more appropriate for the House to do on Flag Day than to stay here and transact public business, so that when the House does adjourn I ask to move that it adjourn in honor of Flag Day and the American flag.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn in honor of Flag Day and the American flag. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5608, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5608, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5608, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the House adjourned yesterday a point of order was pending against the paragraph beginning on page 16, line 15. The Chair is now ready to rule.

Mr. BUTLER. All right, if the Chair is ready to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] has made a point of order against the entire paragraph beginning on page 16, line 15, and ending on line 19 of page 17.

The first question relates to the fixing of the strength of the Navy. It is contended that, in consonance with a ruling made in the Fifty-third Congress (4 Hinds' Precedents, 3723), it is in order to fix the strength of the Navy in an appropriation bill. An examination of that single ruling, characterized accurately, as the present occupant of the chair thinks, by Mr. Hinds as "an exceptional ruling," impels the Chair to the belief that a decision should not be founded upon that ruling. In the judgment of the Chair such a ruling would not be in harmony with the best line of decisions of the House, and therefore on that point alone the Chair would be unable to sustain the paragraph.

It is also contended that the Holman rule applies to this case. A casual reading of the paragraph would indicate to the contrary, because it is stated that "the total authorized enlisted strength in the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased" from a certain number to another number. Upon a closer examination of the paragraph and an examination of the existing law covering the subject matter, it appears that a much larger number than the number here indicated is authorized by existing law and that such larger number is now in the Navy. In other words, the highest number mentioned here is much less than the present number now in the Navy. Therefore the necessary effect of this provision would be to reduce the number of men in the Navy——

Mr. BUTLER. By 300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this necessary reduction in the number of men to be paid out of appropriations carried in this bill brings the provision in question under the Holman rule and therefore overrules the point of order to this portion of the paragraph.

The point of order is made against the entire paragraph, so that in accordance with the rules of the House, if a single portion of the paragraph is held to be out of order, the entire paragraph must go out.

What appears to be a second distinctive proposition begins on line 20:

And the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to call to or continue on active service on strictly naval duties, with their consent, such numbers of the male members of the Naval Reserve Force (other than commissioned and warrant officers) as may be necessary to supply deficiencies to maintain the total authorized strength for the periods herein authorized.

This is clearly legislation and does not appear to be necessarily connected with the matter preceding it.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit me a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will gladly hear the gentleman from Tennessee on this point, because it was not discussed on yesterday.

Mr. PADGETT. That legislation is for the purpose of combining and bringing down the total number within the 241,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Let it all go out.

Mr. PADGETT. I want the Chair to rule correctly. This is legislation, and the only question is whether it is pertinent legislation, establishing the number. It is permissible as legislation because it carries out reduction under the Holman rule.

Mr. BUTLER. I know it does.

The CHAIRMAN. It may lend itself to that end, but it does not appear on the face of the bill that that will be the necessary result, and it has been repeatedly held that unless it appears affirmatively in the bill that the legislation results in retrenchment it can not be held in order.

Mr. PADGETT. If the Chair please, it appears in this very paragraph that the total number is limited to 241,000, 191,000, and 170,000, respectively, and that provision is only for the purpose of using out of the reserve the difference between 241,000 or 191,000 or 170,000 and whatever may be the permanent enlisted strength. It can not under any circumstances exceed those numbers, and that is only providing that the difference between the enlisted strength in the permanent and temporary Navy may be made up out of the reserve and all of them embraced within the 241,000 or the 191,000 or the 170,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question, to see if I heard him correctly. There can be no doubt that if this paragraph does not stay in the bill the Government is authorized to keep 500,000 or 600,000 or 700,000 men?

Mr. PADGETT. There is no limit.

Mr. BUTLER. There is no limit whatever?

Mr. PADGETT. There is a limitation on the permanent and on the temporary, but no limit on the reserve.

Mr. BUTLER. No limit on the reserve?

Mr. PADGETT. And this is only to bring it within the number provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is convinced that the first part of this paragraph fixes the number of men in the Navy at a less number than there are at the present time, and therefore

would be willing to hold that part of the paragraph in order; but the part of the paragraph under consideration does not appear to have anything to do with fixing the number at all.

Mr. PADGETT. There is the point, if the Chair will permit.

The CHAIRMAN. This seems to be an authorization that—

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to call to or continue on active service on strictly naval duties, with their consent, such numbers of the male members of the Naval Reserve Force (other than commissioned and warrant officers) as may be necessary to supply deficiencies to maintain the total authorized strength for the periods herein authorized.

Mr. PADGETT. If the Chair will permit, the very purpose of that language is that in order to keep it up to 241,000 or to keep it up to 191,000 or to keep it up to 170,000 the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to call in a certain number of the reserves to add to the permanent strength, to make the number 170,000 or 191,000 or 241,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the very reason the Chair hesitates to hold it in order, because it is a legislative provision providing how these men may be brought into the service or kept in it.

Mr. PADGETT. But proper legislation for the purpose for which it is intended is in order. All germane legislation is in order to carry out the purpose; that is, to reduce the expenditure.

Mr. BUTLER. I know; and it all bears in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order. Under the provisions of the Holman rule, which require retrenchment in expenditure, if the paragraph was written so as to retrench expenditures it might permit several pages of legislation. providing the effect of the paragraph and the provisions which are germane to each other is to retrench expenditures. I think the difficulty that is troubling the Chairman is whether or not this authorization of the calling of men into the active service is germane to that provision which fixes the total authorized strength of the active list, and it would seem to me that fixing the manner in which this active list shall be constituted is certainly germane to a provision limiting the authorized strength of the active list; and even though it be new legislation it is germane to the provision in the paragraph which retrenches expenditure, and even though it is new legislation it comes clearly within the provisions of the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not appear to the Chair that it is necessarily connected in any way with the first provision of the bill, and if it is a distinct proposition, unless it conforms to the Holman rule it must go out.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Chair permit a further observation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. I know that the Chair is familiar with the provisions of law respecting the military branch of the service and the manner in which men in active service are retired and men on the retired list are retransferred into active service. Now, I think the Chair might take judicial notice of the fact that there are provisions of law permitting the recall of men on the retired list into the active service, and that this is simply a modification of existing law of which the Chair can take judicial notice, to permit their being called from the retired list into active service with their consent; and although it may change existing law it is so germane to the former provision of the bill which retrenches expenditures that I respectfully submit it comes within the Holman rule.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, may I say a word on this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York further.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, you have held, and I think properly so, that the first part of this proviso commencing on line 15 is in order. The point that the Chair had to decide was not a question of diction or of verbiage; it is what will be the result financially if the proviso is adopted. Whereas the word "increased" is mentioned here, and that naturally is construed as demanding additional expenditures, the fact is that it does not increase expenditures, but reduces them despite the wording, and therefore comes in order under the Holman rule. I think that was the thought that was the basis on which the Chair ruled in the first part of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HICKS. The second part now under discussion provides for filling up to a prescribed strength the first part. If the Chair holds that the first part is in order, why is not the second part in order which directly relates to the first part and makes it operative by providing for a specific number of men? It does not increase the number, because the first part does not increase it, as the Chairman has decided, and the second part merely fills up the first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman contends that it is not a distinctive proposition?

Mr. HICKS. It is the same proposition. The second part is so closely related to the first part that you can not divorce it. If the first part is in order, the second part must be, because the second part shows how the first part is to be maintained, and I contend is in order under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. If this is a part of the first paragraph, the first part would carry it. The Chair read it and had a first impression that it was a distinctive proposition, and that unless it was a part of the first provision it should go out.

Mr. HICKS. It is a part of the first provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The language is not very clear and is somewhat technical. Upon second thought, the Chair is inclined to agree with the gentleman from New York that this is connected with the first part, and if so, it is brought under the Holman rule, and therefore should be held in order. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the Chair that to bring the provision within the Holman rule it must of itself obviously and clearly provide for a reduction of expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is convinced of that. The number of men is much larger than is here provided for.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It does not clearly appear from that provision that it will involve a reduction. It is not obvious and the mere statement of the gentleman that it will work out in that fashion is a matter of opinion. It may work out in various ways. We do not know what may be the result. To come within the Holman rule it must appear to the Chair that it will necessarily result in a reduction of expenditures. Not merely that it may possibly do so, that it could do so, but that it must do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the existing law on this matter and is convinced that the existing law provides for a number much larger than the number herein provided for, and that the necessary result of the adoption of this paragraph will be to reduce the number of men in the Navy.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is to say, the first portion of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. And all parts that are substantially connected with it and a part of it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is not obvious, clear, and inevitable from the language we are discussing that in connection with the other language that provision will effect a reduction of the forces. That is a mere conclusion.

Now, I beg the Chair to indulge me for a moment further, so that I may refer to the first portion of the paragraph, on which the Chair has already expressed an opinion. The law as it now stands permits a much larger number of men to be in the Navy than is provided by that paragraph, but only until the end of the war or the close of the present emergency.

Let us suppose that peace is proclaimed to-morrow. Then what is the result? The Navy must return to a strength of 131,000 men plus some small additional numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already given attention to the matter the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If, as I say, peace is proclaimed to-morrow, the authorized strength will revert to its peace basis, which will not leave the matter wide open and unlimited, and so the language in the bill will not involve a reduction.

Now, gentlemen are assuming in their argument that peace will not be proclaimed. It must be said that if peace is not proclaimed this will involve a reduction, but if peace is proclaimed it will involve an increase.

I do not want to take up time to discuss that; I ground my point of order chiefly on the language the Chairman called attention to touching these reserves and other matters of new legislation in the bill that I referred to yesterday, referring to what shall be done with the Naval Reserve Forces, providing the number of officers of the line, and legislating along other lines.

Now, those provisions do not obviously and necessarily involve a reduction in expenditures and can not be defended as being within the Holman rule. They do not appear to be necessarily incident to other matters referred to in the bill. I submit, for these reasons, the point of order ought to be sustained.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one observation. Under the Holman rule the House has a right to legislate in an appropriation bill, provided the legislation meets certain conditions. The question here is whether or not there is as a matter of fact a reduction in the number of men in the Navy, and that is admitted, I think, from a reading of existing law.

The next question is whether or not under the Holman rule Congress, in passing the legislation which reduces as subsidiary and auxiliary to the legislation of reduction, has the right to adjust the reduction to the needs of the country, and it seems to me that this right must be admitted, as illustrated in this case. Here we have a large war-time Navy. It has seemed fitting in the wisdom of Congress to reduce the number of men, because the public necessity does not now demand so great a number, and yet you have various conditions in the service. For instance, you have certain men who have enlisted for four years because they could not enlist in any other way, but who have a moral right to go out of the Navy, because they really enlisted and really intended to enlist only for the duration of the war. Congress has seen fit to fix the number of men at 241,000 for the first three months of the year, with a gradual reduction through the year. In other words, we have come down from a large number to a smaller. We have certain conditions to meet in the service. Conditions are such that it is necessary, if we can, to get a certain number of men out of these reserves who would consent to continue in the service of the Navy to take the places of such of the four-year men who choose to go out. In other words, this legislation was to make the reductions possible and do it in such a manner as not to destroy the efficiency of the Navy, but to keep the Navy up to the strength which the needs of the country require. If you hold that under the Holman rule we can simply say that the Navy shall be so large, without taking into consideration the methods by which the reduction is to be worked out and that number kept up, then that interpretation of the Holman rule says that this Congress in making the reduction is prohibited from passing the auxiliary legislation that makes the reduction with the least harm to the public and the least harm to the public service. The language of the bill itself shows that it was intended to be auxiliary to the legislation of reduction. The bill says:

And the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to call to or continue on active service on strictly naval duties, with their consent, such numbers of the male members of the Naval Reserve Force (other than commissioned and warrant officers) as may be necessary to supply deficiencies—

And so forth.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENABLE. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The language in line 25, on page 15, and in line 1, page 17, makes what the gentleman says clear:

To maintain the total authorized strength for the periods herein authorized.

Mr. VENABLE. I was just coming to that.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If that were transposed to line 20, perhaps where it would be more logical, it would be perfectly clear.

Mr. VENABLE. Perfectly clear; and to show further that this manner of calling in these reserves was part of the adjustment after reduction, as was called to the attention of the Chair by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], it goes on to say in line 24:

As may be necessary to supply deficiencies—

Caused by the reduction—

to maintain the total authorized strength for the period herein authorized.

So that it clearly appears that this is linked with the other and is simply auxiliary legislation to make the proper and necessary adjustment made necessary by the legislation of reduction. It seems to me that the Holman rule should receive an interpretation not only which permits a reduction but which permits a reduction under those conditions and regulations that makes the reduction to the best interests of the country.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me just one word further?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HICKS. It seems to me there can be no doubt of the relationship of these two sections, and unless we provide the second section the first will be inoperative. The language in line 25 is:

To maintain the total authorized strength for the periods herein authorized.

To do that we are going to take from the reserves a number of men and include them as provided in the provision in the first part, thus reducing the total number, and we can not reduce that total number unless we add to it from the reserves and maintain the strength as authorized; therefore I feel that the relation between the two provisions is so close and so dependent one upon the other that you can not divorce them, and that if the first proviso is in order then the second is also.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, just one word. I do not want to take up the time of the House by repetition, but I would like to know how much of this paragraph is now objected to. I want to know when the Chair rules how much of the paragraph is to be affected.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Alabama has leveled the point of order at the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. If any portion of the paragraph is out of order, the whole goes out.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman from Tennessee, but I understand that the Chair is now considering certain language in this paragraph, not the whole of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has said that the first part comes under the Holman rule.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the Chair going to rule on the whole paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Absolutely; there is no choice in the matter. The gentleman from Alabama raises one point that has not been touched by any member of the committee, and yet it is the point to which the Chair gave considerable thought. That is the point as to the war being declared at an end within the year, and by reason of that the number of the Navy being reduced more than is authorized in this particular reduction. The Chair, upon examination of that question, can not believe that it is within the province of the Chair to speculate as to contingencies, as to what might happen, but that he must take the law as it exists under facts as they are at present.

Therefore, he would not be able to take into consideration the fact that something else might occur hereafter which would make this not a reduction but an increase. Upon the face of the bill and upon the laws as they now exist this is a reduction and the Chair is prepared to hold that under the Holman rule this is in order. The remainder of the paragraph is more or less descriptive, as beginning at the top of page 17 it describes the classes making up the total, and, so far as the Chair is able to see, is not repugnant to the rule of the House, and the point of order, therefore, is overruled.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 13, after the word "Navy," insert a comma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 19, after the word "law," insert "*Provided further*, That no enlisted man of the Navy who enlisted between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, shall be retained in service without his consent after August 15, 1919."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order; I think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McARTHUR. I make the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. This is not germane to this paragraph. There is a provision relating to it later on in the bill, where that is all provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that a similar amendment on a prior occasion has been ruled out as not being germane at this point.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the Chair will pardon me, I think the Chair is misinformed on that point. I submit that the Chair upon investigation will find that we have had no parallel——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was informed by the parliamentary clerk.

Mr. HUDDLESTON (continuing). For this legislation. We have had nothing similar in substance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the various items of this paragraph provide who shall be in the Navy after this bill is adopted. It provides what shall be the strength of the enlisted personnel; it provides how that strength shall be composed; it provides that the strength shall "include the Hospital Corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court-martial to discharge, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, those under instruction in trade schools, and members of the Naval Reserve Force" so serving. Those are affirmative provisions already in the paragraph. My amendment constitutes a negative provision. It provides who shall not be included in the authorized enlisted personnel. The substance and meaning of my amendment is that no man shall be included within the numbers authorized by this bill who enlisted at a certain time and under certain conditions and who does not want to remain. It is just as germane to this paragraph as the provision that it shall include "the Hospital Corps" or the "apprentice seamen." It might well

have been added next after "apprentice seamen" that it shall not include such and such classes of men as are named in the amendment.

It can not be said the amendment is not germane. If it be germane to say what classes of men shall be included in the Navy enlisted strength, it is undoubtedly germane to say what classes shall not be so included. If "male members of the Naval Reserve Force," as provided in line 23 on page 16, may be called into service and may be included within this authorized number, if that is proper as a germane provision, as the Chair has held to be proper and germane, then it is also proper to say that those classes mentioned in my amendment shall not be included. If it means to reduce expenditures to say that these men retained in the service shall be composed of certain individuals, it means just as certainly—nay, more, it means with absolute certainty—that a reduction of expenditures is provided for when it is provided that certain men who are now in the Navy shall not be in at a given future time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This provision we are discussing now is a provision fixing an authorization for the Navy and making provision for keeping it to that size——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And providing who shall compose the Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Let me ask the question, I have not finished——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman did not state the provision fully; it comprises who shall compose the Navy and mentioning the number; while I by this amendment go further and say that it shall not include others.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is not listening to my question.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I see what the gentleman is trying to get at.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I want to know of the gentleman if he thinks that inasmuch as the provisions of this section were intended to create a Navy whether an amendment to take everybody out of the Navy would be in order?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman's side of the question has argued continually that this paragraph means a reduction in expenditures and a reduction in the Navy. They have founded all their argument on that, and on that ground they have induced the ruling of the Chair that the paragraph is in order within the Holman rule. Now, if the arguments made upon the other side of the question are sincere and well founded, certainly it follows that where we still further reduce the enlisted strength such an amendment is germane and is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It is clear that this is legislation, and it is not claimed that it is brought under the Holman rule by necessarily reducing expenditures——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the Chair indulge me just for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I fear that I have been very obscure in the remarks I have been making for the last five minutes, for I have been insisting all that time that that is exactly what my amendment would do, that it would reduce expenditures. I would not have presumed to interrupt the Chair except for the Chair's submitting the idea that it was not contended it would be a reduction.

It is contended that it will be a reduction. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but I want to say that I know personally it will cause a reduction, because these men whose discharges I am trying to get are not going to be in the Navy. These numbers of men provided for, if these boys that enlisted during the duration of the war are given their discharges, as provided by this amendment, will be greatly reduced. I know that, and every Member of the House knows it, and that is why the fight is being made on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose it should be decided that the number of men indicated in this provision must be kept in the Navy. If the gentleman's amendment should pass, and under it certain men can not be kept in, it might become necessary for the Navy to go out and advertise, at great expense, in order to get the number of men to fill up the number indicated. The Chair can not speculate as to those things. The necessary result of the gentleman's amendment——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am perfectly willing the Chairman should reach his own conclusions, but I do not think the Chair could reach that conclusion from my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has drawn his conclusion that the gentleman's amendment does not appear affirmatively to reduce expenditures, and therefore does not bring itself under the Holman rule.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, or some other member of the committee, as to these men who have enlisted for the duration of the war in the Naval Reserve—how long the department thinks it will be necessary to retain them, even though that treaty is not signed within many months?

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to give him my best impressions of what we have learned on this point? There are three characters of service in the enlisted force. We have the regulars, amounting to 76,000 men; the reserves, amounting to more than 100,000 men; and then we have the men in the Navy enlisted during the war. I presume the gentleman inquires concerning the last two?

Mr. IGOE. I am anxious to take care of some of these boys whose parents are writing me and saying that they want the boys home.

Mr. BUTLER. The Secretary of the Navy informed me that he had already discharged during this month 23,000 men belonging to two of the classes of this service. Of course the regulars remain. The men who enlisted between the time that we declared war and the time that the armistice was signed, if they did enlist for four years, are considered by the department, and it is written into legislation—and I am approaching the answer which I propose to make—as having enlisted during the term. The Secretary of the Navy has said repeatedly, and stated to us, that it is his purpose not to retain any of these men for six months after the peace is declared, but that they will all leave the service except the regulars, and it was with that in view that we have made this bill, I will say to the gentleman. We anticipate that all of these men except the regulars, 76,000 in number, will leave the service or will be permitted to leave the service immediately.

Mr. IGOE. What does the gentleman mean by immediately?

Mr. BUTLER. At once. I may say that within one month they can demobilize them.

Mr. IGOE. From this date?

Mr. BUTLER. After peace is declared.

Mr. IGOE. After peace is signed. Now, that may be a long time.

Mr. BUTLER. I know it is uncertain when that will be, I will say to my friend. I do not know that I have any more information about that than the gentleman has. We can only reckon upon this, that when the peace is signed it is the purpose of the department not to keep these volunteers for the six months which the law would entitle the department to keep them, but allow them all to go at once.

Mr. IGOE. Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who during the hearings interrogated the officials of the department very closely, ascertained that in about 60 days after the beginning of the fiscal year we could dispense with all the men who are now engaged in transporting work.

Mr. BUTLER. Fifty-five thousand.

Mr. IGOE. And you have fixed the amount for the 1st of October at 191,000 men, and then you reduce it to 170 000. Now, what I am anxious to find out is how many of those 170,000 men that are in the Navy or authorized to be in the Navy by the 1st of next January will be men who went in for the duration of the war? Because, as I understand it, you are enlisting men probably at the rate of about 5,000 a month.

Mr. BUTLER. That is high water; that is the maximum.

Mr. IGOE. It seems to me that something ought to be done to provide for the release of these men, because their parents are unable to understand why they should not be returned. I understand you do not intend to commission the destroyers they have. But it seems to me they must be keeping a great many men on ships and at stations that might be spared, because the estimate made prior to the war was that 135,000 men, as I remember——

Mr. BUTLER. One hundred and thirty-one thousand four hundred and eighty-five.

Mr. IGOE. Should remain in the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have more time.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. IGOE. If I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly, all these boys may hope that, if peace is signed, that in the extreme limit of time, within six months after it is signed, they can return home? That is the only thing they can offer?

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to say something somewhat personal? My youngest son is affected by this, and I confidently expect him home within one month after peace is declared. I have that in mind. The Secretary of the Navy is a man of very great candor, and I have always found him to be absolutely reliable in his word. And now it is his purpose that, immediately upon the declaration of peace, immediately upon the signing of the peace, if that is using the proper term, all of these young men will come out of the service or have the privilege of coming out except 76,000 who belong to the regular service.

Mr. IGOE. I know, I will say to the gentleman, that the officials up at the Navy Department here have been very considerate and courteous, but I can not say as much for some of the commanding officers on the ships. Some of them do not seem to know how to write an answer to a letter and do not recognize the propriety or necessity of paying attention to a request of any kind. The clerical force on board the ships seems to have disappeared when these letters arrive.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate the truthfulness of the gentleman's statement. I wish I could give the gentleman more definite information, but I have given him my impression and I have given him the statement of the Secretary of the Navy, on whom I rely.

Mr. IGOE. I hope the gentleman's committee has provided enough money to enable the Navy Department to inaugurate a very vigorous recruiting campaign.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; we have that in view. We have increased the sums of money necessary, so that they may with vigor and expedition recruit the Navy to a sufficient number and maintain it.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; and I will make an effort to answer it.

Mr. WHALEY. I would like to know why they are keeping all these sub chasers, with men on them anxious to get out of the service?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know. If I had my way about it all the sub chasers would be chased up and tied up and these young men would be sent home. I do not believe in keeping these sub chasers, or the men on them. We have provided for their honorable discharge here. We have provided a paragraph in this bill which, in my judgment, ought to recommend the bill to every Member of this House, a paragraph to the effect that the young men who are discharged from the service prior to the expiration of their terms of enlistment shall have honorable discharges the same as men who have served out their terms, and therefore it is anticipated by the Secretary of the Navy, and everything in this bill is written with a view of having these men leave the service the minute the declaration of peace is written.

Mr. WHALEY. Does not the gentleman think that the officials of the Navy Department should answer as to why these young men are not turned out of the Navy, when letters are written to them? Is there any lack of clerical force?

Mr. BUTLER. They would not reply to me any more quickly than they would to you. In some instances I have told them to go to a place that I can not speak of in this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. As I understand, you have stated that Secretary Daniels has stated to you that he expects to discharge these enlisted men immediately after the signing of the peace treaty over yonder——

Mr. BUTLER. The declaration of peace by the President——

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Or the declaration of peace by the President?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I understand the Secretary of the Navy proposes to discharge all the men, except the regulars, and give them honorable discharges, if this provision stays in the bill, immediately upon the declaration of peace, which I understand will be when the Senate of the United States ratifies the treaty. I wish we could hasten it, but I do not see how we can. I do not see how we can fix any other time. The law would permit the department to keep these men six months after that period, but it is not the purpose of the Secretary of the Navy to do it; and, basing this bill on his statement, we would like to have the House to understand that it is a perfect fixture, built up on that alone. Every preparation is made for the separation of these young men from the department after the declaration of peace has been made, except the regulars.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Just one word more. I think I understand——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes. I have taken up too much of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I think I understand what the chairman has sought to convey to the House, that Secretary Daniels has agreed to discharge the enlisted men immediately after the declaration of peace, when the President should issue his proclamation that peace was attained?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. The gentleman will recall that at the end of the Civil War the declaration of peace did not come until about 15 months after the war had ended.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. The public understanding is that when peace has been signed—I think the gentleman used that expression in one of his statements—when peace has been signed, when the allies of Germany have signed the peace treaty, the war is expected to end. But Secretary Daniels, as I understand, does not expect to release these enlisted men at the end of the war, but has only promised to release these enlisted men when the declaration of peace has come from the Executive authority of the Nation. Am I right about that?

Mr. BUTLER. Let me not answer by yes or no, if my friend please, but let me give you my understanding a little further.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. That is what I want.

Mr. BUTLER. We are making appropriations for only so many men. They can not be kept for over a certain period after peace is declared. We have made the reductions here on a sliding scale. We have made it with the perfect consent of the Secretary of the Navy. He, I am pleased to say, was with us all the time with his advice and counsel. It is not his purpose to keep these young men. He has stated it publicly to us that he desires to let them go—these young men who have volunteered for the service—and it was for the express purpose of carrying out his own view that we prepared this bill in the form in which it appears; and after a certain time, as the gentleman well knows, by October, 50,000 men will go out, and later on they must come down to 170,000 men. Therefore you can take it from that that it is the purpose of the Secretary of the Navy to discharge these men at the very earliest moment possible.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I understand; but so far as the promise is made, it is only after the declaration of peace.

Mr. BUTLER. We have not provided that that money should go further.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will say, in further answer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON], that all the appropriations for recruiting and all that sort of thing have been based upon the idea that the men who have enlisted for the period of the war and those who enlisted for four years after April 6, 1917, and before November 11, 1918, will all go out. We have made all the provisions of the bill on the basis of 125,000 men going out at a very early date.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. I was endeavoring to see how far the Secretary of the Navy has gone. I think I understand the attitude of the members of the committee and the attitude of Congress, because all of us are getting letters repeatedly from parents and friends of these boys in the Army and Navy, and that tendency will be intensified after peace is signed abroad.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman state again, if he has not already stated, the number of regulars?

Mr. BUTLER. The number of regulars on the 10th of May was 76,000 men.

Mr. PADGETT. No; about 142,000.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not understand the gentleman. If the gentleman wants the exact number, there are 131,485, I think.

Mr. PADGETT. Plus 6,000 and then plus 5,000 or 6,000 more.

Mr. BUTLER. We have 6,000 boys in training, and 5,000 or 6,000 men belonging to the Medical Corps, making in all 143,000 regulars. But I thought the gentleman wanted to know how many enlisted men there are, and there are only 76,000. We are 70,000 short of regulars.

Mr. HAMILTON. I understood the chairman to say none of the regulars would be discharged.

Mr. BUTLER. They will not be. They are the men who enlisted prior to the declaration of war for four years.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make the statement a moment ago that the Secretary of the Navy had assured him that those boys who enlisted in the

Navy for the duration of the war would be discharged upon the signing of the peace treaty. I subsequently understood the gentleman, however, to make the statement that that discharge would only be upon the ratification of the peace treaty.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to my friend from Texas that I hardly know what to say about that. We have, however, constructed this bill upon the theory that it means when the Senate of the United States ratifies the treaty. However, not waiting for that, not being able to anticipate when the Senate will ratify the treaty, we have provided step by step how these men must go out, notwithstanding the treaty may not be ratified.

Mr. BRIGGS. There is a provision in the bill a little further on that anyone who enlisted for the term of four years may be discharged upon his own request.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. That if he is not discharged on or before the 1st day of September he shall be discharged immediately. Might not that operate to discharge men who had enlisted for four years and hold in the service men who had enlisted only for the duration of the war?

Mr. OLIVER. Has not the gentleman misread that? It provides that they shall be held and construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war.

Mr. BRIGGS. The provision which I refer to is on page 21.

Mr. OLIVER. If they make application on or before September 1, they are to be held and construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war.

Mr. BRIGGS. And shall be granted an honorable discharge as soon as the circumstances of the case shall permit, provided that a man is otherwise entitled to an honorable discharge.

Mr. BUTLER. It was agreed in the Committee on Naval Affairs that when this provision was reached in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union we would ask to have these discretionary words stricken out, so that there will be no discretion left.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me see if I understand this situation. When the war closed we had 510,000 men in the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. About that number.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, we expect to have 241,000 on the 1st of July.

Mr. BUTLER. We do.

Mr. MADDEN. We expect to reduce the number by the 1st of October to 191,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And then on the 1st of January to reduce the number to 170,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In the meantime this bill provides for the enlistment of a sufficient number of men who are to be trained to take the places of the men who are going out. Is that it?

Mr. BUTLER. Absolutely. That is what we do, and we ask for sufficient money to provide for their enlistment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRIGGS] to page 20 of the hearings, where he will find the statement made by the Secretary when this question was before the committee, in which he expressly declared—

It is our purpose to give a discharge to everybody who enlisted for the duration of the war as soon as we have gotten the soldiers home.

Mr. BUTLER. That will the middle of August.

Mr. BRIGGS. That may be true that that is the intention of the Secretary, but I have been confronted too many times with answers from the Navy Department that they were not able to discharge these men, because they could not operate the boats without men.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That service will be over then.

Mr. BRIGGS. The statement was that the men who enlisted for the duration of the war had to be held because they had to have men, and the enlistments were not encouraging; that at the present time they were very discouraging. Now, this bill—I am sure the gentleman misunderstood me—provides that those who enlisted for four years shall be regarded as duration-of-the-war men and entitled to their discharge on or before September 1.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And all treated alike.

Mr. BRIGGS. It does not say anywhere in the bill that those enlisted for the duration of the war shall be entitled to be discharged up to the 1st of September of this year. It says the four-year men shall have that privilege.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman misapprehends the force of the language with reference to the 1st of September. Under existing law if a man is discharged before his enlistment expires, he can not obtain an honorable discharge. And so, in order to fix it so that the four-year men who are discharged before their enlistment expires can get an honorable discharge, we put that provision in, and they have until the 1st of September. It does not mean that anyone can get out by the 1st of September.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, there is no necessity for the provision as to men enlisted for the period of the war, because they go out anyway and get an honorable discharge. If this provision was not in the bill, men enlisted for the four-year period could not get an honorable discharge.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield, the proviso about September was put in the bill so that the Bureau of Navigation could be thoroughly informed as to the needs of their department in the future. It gives them a chance to make plans for the future.

Mr. BRIGGS. Would it not also be wise to inform them that all the boys enlisted for the duration of the war ought to be discharged as promptly as possible?

Mr. HICKS. I think they know that already.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They can receive an honorable discharge, but the four-year men going out before their time of enlistment expires could not get it.

Mr. BRIGGS. The bureau seems to think that these are all four-year men. You can hardly get an answer from the Bureau of Navigation when you ask for a discharge of a man who enlisted for the duration of the war.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is about as far as we can go in the way of legislation at this time. It is about all that we can do now.

Mr. BRIGGS. Well, we will have to rely on the Secretary for the discharge.

The Clerk read as follows:

Members of the Naval Reserve Force and Marine Corps Reserve who accept such temporary civil appointments shall be given an opportunity to qualify by a civil-service examination for certification in accordance with civil service rules to fill such vacancies as may occur, in cases where they are not already eligible for appointment or reinstatement. All temporary appointments made hereunder shall terminate not later than June 30, 1920. For pay of reservists so transferred to the civil establishment, $8,613,220, their pay prior to transfer to be charged to the appropriation "Pay of the Navy," and the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress on the first day of the next regular session a statement showing the number and designation of the person employed hereunder and the rate of compensation paid to each: *Provided*, That no employee paid under the provisions of this paragraph shall receive annual compensation in excess of $2,000 for services rendered in the Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 21, after the word "establishment," insert "or civil-service employees appointed in lieu thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Does this apply to the female reservists?

Mr. BUTLER. That amendment is proposed at the request of the department. I have word that they fear they will not be able under the paragraph as at present drawn to obtain all the assistance necessary. They have reason for believing that many of the reservists will refuse to accept civil employment, making it necessary to go to the civil-service list. This amendment permits them to employ either reservists as civilians or civil-service people. If one-half or two-thirds of the reservists go out the department will not have sufficient civil employees to do the work, and therefore the department wishes this inserted so that they might not be without adequate help.

Mr. WHALEY. This requires all female reservists to stand a civil-service examination?

Mr. BUTLER. Within one year they must if they wish. It is not compulsory, but they can not continue in employment in a noncivil-service status for longer than a year.

Mr. WHALEY. Why?

Mr. BUTLER. Because the Civil Service Commission has expressed itself to the committee as opposed to blanketing them into the civil service, and the committee concluded that it would abide by the commissions' views, but give the reservists a year to qualify for a civil-service appointment.

Mr. PADGETT. The Civil Service Commission requested one year because taking it all over the country if they required an examination at once it might break up the organization, and you would break up the whole organization of the departments everywhere.

Mr. WHALEY. The gentleman mistakes my position. I think they all ought to be covered into the civil service just as the employees in the Navy are. The Civil Service Commission has ruled that where a man has been an employee of the navy

yard he could not be made to stand his examination later, but he is covered into the service.

Mr. BUTLER. I held the same view as the gentleman at first, as the members of the committee know, but I am now convinced that this is the best we can do.

Mr. WHALEY. Why can not they be covered into the civil service?

Mr. BUTLER. The commissioners will never consent to it.

Mr. WHALEY. The navy yard employees are covered in.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman from South Carolina must remember that these employees, or nearly all of them, are temporary. The chances are that they will get out of the service during the life of this bill, and there will be little use of covering them into the civil service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. On page 19 there is a proviso in the paragraph which limits the amount that can be paid to reserves here in Washington to $2,000. Why should not that limitation of amount have a general application?

Mr. BUTLER. I want to say to my friend, who is of an inquiring mind, that I can not answer that. I am not married to any of these propositions. I would rather that some other gentleman would answer the question.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I can tell the reason why. In the navy yards and stations they have expert draftsmen of high attainments performing expert work in the drafting of plans for ships, for instance, in the navy yard at New York or Mare Island, where we are building ships. Those expert men are paid large sums of money, and you could not limit this so as to have it apply everywhere. This is to reach the clerical force where the large body of it is, here in Washington.

Mr. BLACK. Then, the gentleman thinks it would be unwise to make a general extension of that limitation?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

The Clerk read as follows:

The provision of existing law which requires the Secretary of the Navy to make computations semiannually as of July 1 and January 1 of each year and to convene the boards to select officers of the line and of the staff corps for promotion are hereby amended so that said computations shall be made and said boards shall be convened at least once each year and at such times as the Secretary of the Navy may direct, and the boards shall recommend for promotion such number of officers as may be necessary to fill vacancies then existing and which may occur during the next period of time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a pro forma amendment. The word "are," in the tenth line, should be "is." I move to amend by substituting the one for the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 10, strike out the word "are" and insert the word "is."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force and of the Marine Corps Reserve, other than commissioned and warrant officers, who have performed active duty during the war, may, upon their own application, be transferred to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, respectively, to serve the unexpired term of their enrollment in such rating or rank as they may be found qualified under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe: *Provided*, That men so transferred should have at least one year to serve in the Regular Navy or the Marine Corps before the expiration of their current enlistment: *Provided further*, That such transfers may be made not in excess of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy or Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That enrolled men so transferred shall be entitled to and receive the same pay, rights, privileges, and allowances in all respects as now provided by existing law for men regularly discharged and reenlisted immediately upon expiration of their full four-year enlistment in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, on page 20, line 4, I move to strike out the word "should" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct. It is to correct the grammar.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 4, strike out the word "should" and insert the word "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I offer and which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 7, change the words "may be made not" to "may not be made."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

All enlisted men of the Navy and Coast Guard who have served in the war with the German Government and who may hereafter be discharged or who have been discharged from the service since November 11, 1918, and before the expiration of their full enlistment shall receive, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, an honorable discharge and shall be furnished with transportation to their homes with subsistence and transfers en route: *Provided*, That the records of such men warrant such honorable discharge.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 22, strike out all after the word "be" down through and including the words "en route" and substitute the following: "entitled to mileage allowance, in accordance with existing law in all cases where sea travel is not involved."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, that is simply to make the paragraph conform to existing law.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he wants to give these men the same rates that they are given under the act of February 28, 1919.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. But the gentleman provides that that relief shall not be granted where sea travel is involved?

Mr. BUTLER. It is not my purpose to deny them any allowance which they now receive.

Mr. BLACK. It strikes me that the language if strictly construed would mean that wherever an enlisted man had traveled by a boat to some land point he could not collect his land travel from there on.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly, because the Government carried him through and he ought not to have any pay for it.

Mr. BLACK. I understand what is intended to be accomplished by the amendment, that in that case he should receive only the mileage when he traveled by land, but if I understand the language it would absolutely prevent his being paid anything for the land travel.

Mr. BUTLER. I would not have offered it if I thought that.

Mr. BLACK. I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. It should provide except that part of the trip involving sea travel.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a substitute for that.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. If this travel pay is to be allowed in all cases where sea travel is not involved, then if sea travel is involved it is not to be allowed.

Mr. BUTLER. As I said before, my purpose in offering the amendment was to give to the men the allowance which the law now provides they shall receive.

Mr. REAVIS. But the language of the amendment does not confine the free transportation to ship travel. It provides that they shall be entitled to land transportation in all cases where sea travel is not involved.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. If sea travel is involved, then they are not entitled to land transportation.

Mr. BUTLER. As I understand the amendment, it provides that wherever the sailor is carried to his proper place by sea in our own ships he would not be entitled to mileage.

But when they land him, and he goes from place to place on land, or from town to town, he would be entitled to his mileage.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. Suppose a portion of that journey was made by sea travel and a portion by land. Now, sea travel is involved in the journey, and under the language of the amendment where sea travel is involved he is not entitled to land travel.

Mr. BUTLER. That is not the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. REAVIS. That is the way it reads.

Mr. BUTLER. I will withdraw it then.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman allow me? Take for instance the case of a man under the gentleman's amendment who

is discharged and who is going up to Alaska. Would it not exclude him from getting transportation expenses reimbursed for the sea part of his journey?

Mr. BUTLER. That may be, in view of what has been said here. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to withdraw this amendment until I have time to study it, so that we can have it exactly right. I will ask permission to return to this paragraph later on to offer this or a modified amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to pass temporarily the paragraph. Is there objection?

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. Will that prevent me from offering my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to pass over this item temporarily?

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that, but can I offer this amendment now and dispose of it without interfering with the gentleman's right?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if the paragraph is passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope to be able to return to the paragraph in a short time.

Mr. IGOE. I do not know whether I would be here.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not wish to detain the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Let us have the gentleman's amendment read.

Mr. IGOE. I will offer it as a separate paragraph in the hope that the gentleman will not make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this as a separate paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a separate paragraph:

"*Provided*, That any man who shall have served in the Navy, Naval Reserve, or Marine Corps between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and who has been discharged therefrom since November 11, 1918, or may be hereafter discharged because of having enlisted under age, shall receive an honorable discharge and be entitled to transportation, bonus, and other benefits provided by law for honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines."

Mr. BUTLER. I reserve the point of order, and I want to ask the gentleman this question: What will the gentleman accomplish by this—that young men who are under the age prescribed by law who enlisted and went into the service and changed their ages for that purpose shall be honorably discharged? I will never object to that. If they had lowered their age to keep out, I would object; but if they raised their age to get in, I would not.

Mr. IGOE. This amendment is prompted by actual cases that I have had where young men entered the service during the war, and after the armistice was signed their parents were anxious to have them come home and filed affidavits stating that they had enlisted under age without their consent, and the department has released them or discharged them and given discharge certificates which recited that they enlisted under age. These discharges, to all intents and purposes, are dishonorable discharges. These boys are deprived of all the rights and privileges and benefits that are given by the laws of the United States to men who served honorably in the war and who are discharged.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. IGOE. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. They go even further than that. When the parent—mother or father—sends in an affidavit that their son was 16 years of age and that when he enlisted he was told it would be all right for him to state he was 18 years of age, the Navy Department now, through its officers, threaten that parent that if they do not withdraw their request for discharge they will give their son a dishonorable discharge, and lots of boys have been kept in the service that way.

Mr. IGOE. But I am concerned about the boys who have been actually released. It seems to me where they have served through the war and rendered such honorable service that these boys have done everything in their power that the Government has required and that they ought to give them the privilege of an honorable discharge.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. I will.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman's amendment specify any length of service?

Mr. IGOE. It provides they shall have served during the war and have been discharged since November 11, 1918.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But does the gentleman's amendment provide that they shall have an honorable discharge regardless of their conduct?

Mr. IGOE. It provides where they are discharged because of under-age enlistments.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does it say that?

Mr. IGOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question only for me, please—not for the other people?

Mr. IGOE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. Where did the gentleman get this paragraph from?

Mr. IGOE. I introduced a bill and sent it to the gentleman, and received a very courteous letter saying that he thought the committee would take action that would please me; but I regret to say I could not find it in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Did I make a statement to the gentleman?

Mr. IGOE. I have a letter from the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. I am very glad I had occasion to write the gentleman a letter. I had forgotten it, and I am obliged to the gentleman for calling my attention to it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. IGOE. I will.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does not the gentleman really think that there should be some limitation on the length of service of young men of this character? In other words, the gentleman provides where a young man comes into the service who makes a misstatement about his age, and after he has been in the service one, two, three, or four days he finds the work is a little hard, and he goes to the superior officer and says that he lied about his age, and he is under age, and he wants the bonus of $60, railroad fare, and the $100 first outfit, does not the gentleman think there should be some limitation for length of service?

Mr. IGOE. The limitation was placed by the circumstances of the case. The war ended on the 11th of November, and that boy when he went in intended to stay for the war. After the 11th of November this amendment provides when the discharge takes place, after the war was over, and only in those cases, shall this honorable discharge be given. Now, there are men getting $60 bonus who served only two days in the Army and three days in the Navy. There was no limitation placed on the length of time. But I will say I am more concerned in getting that honorable discharge for these boys, that they may have it in the years to come and their children after them, than I am for the $60 bonus.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman think that the $60 bonus should be paid under the circumstances just stated? I have a number of such cases in my district.

Mr. IGOE. If the Congress wanted it they would have placed a restriction that it should not apply to men who had served only one day in the Army. But in the cases I have in mind these boys would have stayed six months if the war had lasted. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can take an isolated case here and there and attempt to make general legislation. This opens the door to granting discharges in cases of fraud practiced on the Navy Department. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the services of the gentleman who offered this amendment, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and with his permission I will offer it as a committee amendment, and will give him the credit for it. It is much better than the one offered over on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 20, lines 21 and 22, after the word "discharge," in lines 21 and 22, strike out the balance of lines 22 and 23 down to the word "*Provided*," in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Shall receive 5 cents per mile from the place of his discharge to his actual bona fide home or residence or original muster into service, at his option: *Provided*, That for sea travel on discharge transportation and subsistence only shall be furnished to enlisted men."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any enlisted man of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, who, since April 7, 1917, and before November 11, 1918, enlisted for the period of four years shall upon his application made to the Secretary of the Navy on or before September 1, 1919, be held and construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war and shall be granted an honorable discharge as soon as the circumstances of the case shall permit: *Provided*, That said enlisted man is otherwise entitled to an honorable discharge: *Provided further*, That the return home of the American

Expeditionary Forces shall not be hereby delayed: *Provided further*, That any enlisted man who takes advantage of the provisions of this paragraph to secure a discharge from the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and thereafter reenlists within four months in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, under conditions as now prescribed by law, for a period of four years, shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the gratuity pay provided by existing law for reenlistments.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Page 21, line 7, after the word "discharge," strike out all down to and including the word "permit," in line 8 of the same page.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have one other amendment which I would like to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Page 21, line 7, after the word "shall," insert the words "when discharged."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That clears up a misapprehension.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment here that has been handed to me. Let the Clerk report it, and then I will ask to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 21, line 8, after the word "permit," insert the following: "and upon the taking effect of this act shall be notified by the Secretary of the Navy of his right to file such application."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there can be any objection to that. It simply provides that the men shall be notified. It is offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], and I think it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Texas. There is just one thing, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Reading Clerk informs me that the second amendment strikes out some of the language inserted by the first amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] struck out all down to and including the word "permit." The amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is inserted after the word "permit," which has been stricken out.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is what I wanted to change, and put it after the word "discharge."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in the proviso which says "that the return home of the American Expeditionary Forces shall not be hereby delayed," I move to strike out the word "hereby" and substitute the word "thereby."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. PADGETT: Page 21, line 11, strike out the word "hereby" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thereby."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129), granting under certain conditions to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only who are serving in the field as part of the American Expeditionary Forces under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do so for the purpose of asking the chairman a question in reference to the pay of commissioned officers—those who are afloat and those who are serving on land. If I understand it correctly, according to the existing law and regulations, men who are serving in the Navy on short duty are given subsistence and quarters, while the men who are at sea have been allowed during the war the same provisions, in addition to the 10 per cent increase in pay; and if this paragraph which has just been read is made the law it will mean that those commissioned officers who are at sea will be penalized to the extent of about $270 per year for an ensign, $403 for a junior lieutenant, $559 for a lieutenant, $675 for a lieutenant commander, $800 for a commander, and $893 for a captain—a penalization of about $75 per month. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if it would not be possible to so amend this paragraph as to remove that discrimination?

Mr. BUTLER. The retention of this paragraph in the bill will save the Government between $6,000,000 and $8,000,000. The officer on shore is getting his quarters. At sea and on foreign shore duty he gets 10 per cent more of pay. He also is paid while he is abroad on shore duty certain allowances which enable him to get even more than the usual per diem allowance for subsistence.

This language, of course, operates to the disadvantage of the married officer at sea, but the law in the first instance was intended to apply primarily to the men on expeditionary duty abroad. We reported this provision at the previous session, and I think it is right. You understand that practically every man in the Navy and Marine Corps and in the Army has been advanced beyond his permanent rank or grade. Next winter, if we find that any injustice has been done, I will ask that my colleagues join with me in recommending a provision to correct it, but by reason of all these allowances that have been given and the raises of grade I do not think this provision should be changed at this time.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then this matter has been gone into very fully?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I have already asked Gov. KELLEY, who will be the chairman of the subcommittee on personnel, to look into it and see to it whether these men have had what they ought to have and whether they have been discriminated against, so that Congress can give them relief if that should be found necessary.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will also add that the committee desires to have new personnel legislation to present to the next session of Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; but not on an appropriation bill, I will say to my friend. But he will be here, and we will see whether or not these men have been unfairly discriminated against.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do not think the man at sea should be given less pay than the man on shore.

Mr. BUTLER. I agree with the gentleman, and I will say to him that the inquiry he has made will bear fruit, and the whole subject will be examined with care.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. I understand that a lot of marines are now in Santo Domingo. I doubt if this paragraph ought to be in here.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that the marines serving in Santo Domingo get double pay—not only the pay provided for by act of Congress, but a like amount is paid to them by the Santo Domingo Government.

Mr. PLATT. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I am positive of that.

Mr. BUTLER. I am under the impression that the government down there pays them, and this Government, of course, pays them, and they thus get double pay. I think we passed a provision to that effect, submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], last winter. The men at Santo Domingo get double pay.

Mr. PLATT. It seems to me this is the place to correct it.

Mr. BUTLER. I made the promise just now that we will have the matter examined to see if the discrimination is unfair to these men.

Mr. PLATT. Of course, the cost of living is great.

Mr. BUTLER. I realize that.

Mr. PLATT. This looks to me as though it were really a discrimination against the officers at sea.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to repeat what I said, that if, after we have examined into all the facts, we have discovered that we have been unfair and unjust to the men at sea, I promise my friend to vote with him to set it right.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from New York evidently voted for this same provision when it was presented in February of this year.

Mr. PLATT. I do not know whether I did or not.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think the gentleman did.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

George E. Maynard, Arthur B. McCrary, Axel Lindblad, Seldon L. Almon, and William E. O'Connor shall be regarded as having been appointed ensigns in the United States Navy on the 28th day of June, 1917: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said officers to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask some member of the committee for some explanation of this special legislation whereby certain men are appointed to the Navy as of a certain date?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The explanation of the necessity for this legislation is this: For some reason or other the examination papers of these boys were lost in transit, or at least delayed in reaching the department, and did not arrive in time to be certified with the examination papers of the other boys, and on that account these boys lost their positions in the list, and this legislation puts them where they belong.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. This is merely to put them in their proper grade?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Merely to put them in their proper place on the list, as though the papers had gone through on time.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

Ordnance and ordnance stores: For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material; for the armament of ships, for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance Department; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and proving grounds; for maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and naval ordnance plants, and for target practice; for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations, and for the pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $2,900,000; in all, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That all former Government employees who have entered the military or naval service of the United States in the war with the German Government shall be reinstated on application to their former positions if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania with reference to the last proviso on page 26, for the reinstatement of the Government employees who receive honorable discharges?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Does that mean that those who have been employed in the places of the men in the service will be discharged?

Mr. BUTLER. This provision of the bill was inserted as an amendment on the floor when the bill was considered last February. I understand that a similar provision went into the fortifications bill and the Army appropriation bill, and we took the language just as we found it there.

Mr. GARRETT. It is not objectionable at all if it can be done properly; but will its ultimate effect be to leave upon the rolls a large number of people who are not needed?

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to allow me to answer that?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is not the intention at all. Of course the language is very clear, and does just exactly what the gentleman thinks it will do. If a returning soldier who was formerly a civil employee in any department desires his old position back, which position has since been taken by some one else, under this provision he can get that position back.

Mr. GARRETT. And that will discharge the other employee?

Mr. BRITTEN. That will discharge the other employee. I think that is the intention of the amendment, and it is the language of the bill that was passed by the House in February of this year.

Mr. GARRETT. I think it is a very proper thing to do, but we do not want, by any legislation that is not clear, to load the pay rolls down with unnecessary employees.

Mr. BUTLER. We will not make any provision to pay two people for the same place.

Mr. GARRETT. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to advance to the Kittery Water District, a corporation of the State of Maine, from the unexpended balance of the appropriation made by the act of July 1, 1918, making appropriations for the naval service, under the title "Emergency expenses, Bureau of Yards and Docks," the sum of $150,000, to be expended for the extension and improvement, under the supervision of the Navy Department, of the water system owned and operated by said Kittery Water District and supplying water to the navy yard, Portsmouth, N. H.: *Provided*, That the said Kittery Water District shall, by contract, with bond equal to the amount advanced, undertake to refund to the United States the said sum of $150,000 in an installment each month of an amount equal to 50 per cent of the amount of the bill rendered against said navy yard for water received during the preceding month, until the end of the month following the declaration of peace, and thereafter in such installments as the Secretary of the Navy may approve: *Provided further*, That all deferred refund payments shall bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and that all refunds of the principal and payments of interest shall be deposited in the Treasury as "Miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of making an inquiry as to the necessity for this legislation. It seems to be rather unusual, but I assume that the interests of the Government are properly safeguarded.

Mr. PETERS. This provision does not make any new appropriation. It authorizes the payment out of funds appropriated last year—an amount which was set aside by the Navy Department for improvement in the water system, furnishing water for fire and other purposes to the Kittery Navy Yard.

It seems that in the development of the yard on account of the war the water supply of the Kittery Water District was found inadequate, and at the request of the Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks the company undertook large improvements, costing $200,000. Upon the faith of a letter written by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in August, 1918, the water district went ahead and spent $150,000, and will spend up to $200,000, the bureau having promised to loan them $150,000 to facilitate the progress of the work.

This provision is to carry out the agreement between the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the company or the water district made during the war. It seems that the solicitors of the Navy Department had some question as to the right of the paymaster to draw a check after the declaration of the armistice. This legislation is asked for to quiet that technical doubt as to the authority of the paymaster to make the payment.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand that the extension and improvement was for the benefit of the Kittery Navy Yard?

Mr. PETERS. Almost entirely. Had it not been for the necessity of the added improvements for the navy yard this would not have been undertaken.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if these improvements have all been made.

Mr. PETERS. Up to the amount of $150,000.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Have they up to this time been completed sufficiently to take care of the extra needs of the navy yard?

Mr. PETERS. No; the information I have from the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks is that the whole improvement contemplated is necessary for the adequate supply of water for the use of the navy yard and for protection of Government property from fire.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What is the assurance we have that if the money is advanced they will complete the improvements to meet the necessities of the Government?

Mr. PETERS. Not only by contract——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. They have such a contract?

Mr. PETERS. Yes. But without that the necessities of the case will make it almost imperative for the company to complete the improvement. The improvement consists in raising a dam and building a new main or water pipe. Unless it is entirely completed the company will not get the full benefit of the operation. So the circumstances require them to complete it.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriations "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," and "Repairs and Preservation" shall be available for the maintenance of naval training stations where the regular appropriations for the maintenance thereof are found to be insufficient.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph. Might I ask why this provision is made?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This is the language I called the gentleman's attention to yesterday when we were discussing the question of training stations. The gentleman will recall that I stated at that time that all of the training stations have been greatly enlarged to take care of the war needs. The necessities for training growing out of legislation in this bill is going to

be very great. It is quite likely that a part of the buildings put up for war needs will have to be used the coming year. We could not determine at this time to what extent, and so we have given the Bureau of Yards and Docks authority to help out in the maintenance wherever it is found necessary to use temporary buildings to an extent not now contemplated. We did not want to increase the appropriation for maintenance of buildings, because we did not know whether they would need it or not, and so we lodged discretion in the Bureau of Yards and Docks to help out the training schools if necessary.

Mr. WALSH. Is it true that some items that may have been estimated for and appropriations asked have not been included in the bill because of this language?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; all of these training schools asked more for maintenance and repairs than we allowed.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to accept from the San Diego Chamber of Commerce, San Diego, Calif., free of all encumbrance and without cost to the United States Government, 135 acres of land situate on the Bay of San Diego, San Diego County, Calif., for the purpose of establishing a naval training station thereon, providing that the city of San Diego will donate to the United States Government free of charge the tide lands in the Bay of San Diego adjoining said lands to the bulkhead line. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to have prepared and submit detailed plans and specifications for the construction of a suitable naval training station on said land and to report at the next regular session of Congress the total estimated cost of said station, with an itemized cost of all necessary buildings and improvements thereon and the estimated annual cost of maintenance of said station.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if we have a naval station on the Pacific coast, and if so, where it is?

Mr. BUTLER. This is in San Diego, Calif., where it is proposed to establish a naval station some time in the future. When it will be established the Secretary of the Navy does not know. It is the purpose of the department to establish at this most desirable point on either coast a naval training station for the young men who are to go into the Navy to complete their training. It is the purpose of the department, as gentlemen will discover, to divide our fleet. Heretofore we have had one fleet, and it has always been insisted upon by the Pacific coast that part of the fleet should be on the Pacific Ocean. Nearly all of us who have sat on the committee for years have insisted that the Secretary of the Navy should place one-half of the fleet on the Pacific. Now the Secretary of the Navy has determine that one-half of the fleet shall go to the Pacific coast, and it becomes necessary to make provisions for that one-half of the fleet. No provision is made there except in the general way for ships. We propose to take but little money out of the Treasury in this bill. I think my friend will bear me out in this statement. There is no training station on that coast where men can be trained as they should be, and it is our duty to establish at San Diego a training station. I want to say to my friend that I am not the agent for any man for anything in this world. I speak for myself only, but I have never known any place as desirable and I have never known anybody as generous toward the public as are the people of San Diego. They have offered this great piece of ground to us, and I suppose it may be worth $500,000.

Mr. OLIVER. With the water privileges it is worth $1,500,000.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman says $1,500,000. That will give us the opportunity of putting at the most desirable place I know of this naval training station, surrounded by the most desirable people, I believe, we have or quite as desirable as can be found on either coast. This costs the Government not one cent, and we wrote it in the bill so that the people of San Diego and that community might know that the Government was willing to accept this land so that they might in the future so arrange in regard to their provisions and arrangements for the control of municipal management. It is subject to the point of order, but I hope the gentleman will not make it.

Mr. PADGETT. I just want to say to what has been already said, that we have at the present time Yerba Buena, a little island.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, that will not do.

Mr. BLACK. And Goat Island.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, Goat Island is a high rocky bluff that goes up into the air.

Mr. BUTLER. That is impracticable.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

Mr. BUTLER. I know it is dangerous to accept anything for nothing, but this is a most exceptional case.

Mr. BLACK. We should always beware of the Greeks bearing gifts and that is what I have in mind. If we already had a naval training station on the Pacific coast that was suitable, we ought not to accept this.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not at all suitable.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no.

Mr. BLACK. The explanation is satisfactory to me and I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to waive liquidated damages for delay in the completion of fixed-price public works contracts under which final payment has not been made to the extent that such delay is ascertained to be due to delay in the delivery of material owing to priorities or embargoes established by Government agencies, and with the consent of the contractor to increase the amount of such contracts to the extent of any increase in the cost of materials, labor, and freight established by Government agencies after the dates of such contracts: *Provided*, That such adjustments shall be limited in each case to such amount as is ascertained to be necessary to prevent loss under the contract. Such sum as may be necessary to provide for the increased cost of contracts owing to such adjustments is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress on the first day of the next regular session a detailed report of all adjustments made in pursuance of this paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the paragraph. Is there any reason why this should not be stricken from the bill?

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the chairman of the committee, I suggest that this paragraph is subject to the point of order. It was inserted in the bill to care for a particular case—for instance, the contractor for certain construction work at Pearl Harbor, Hawaiian Islands. The Government, as soon as the war was declared, took over the transportation lines, and it increased the transportation rates. It established embargoes; it placed a specific price on the cost of cement which went into that particular construction. The contractor in the premises had a fixed price in the contract, a specific price being fixed by the Government for certain work he was performing. The Government is responsible for complete loss to the contractor in the amount of the increased cost of transportation and in the amount of the increased cost for cement and other materials that went into the construction. This amendment merely cares for cases of that kind where contracts were based on a fixed sum, where a positive loss is shown by the contractor to the Secretary of the Navy, and if it is not left in the bill it will probably put completely out of business any number of contractors all over the United States, simply because of the Government having taken over the transportation lines and having established embargoes on material going into construction work where there were fixed prices under contract.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that this is a very dangerous provision in the bill. I think that such a clause might be written, either now or later, if it is not already provided in another law, authorizing an adjustment of the losses that may have occurred as a result of the conditions described, but I am not willing that this discretion should be left in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy at this time without further consideration.

Mr. BRITTEN. Before the gentleman makes his point of order, I suggest to my colleague that this amendment now in the bill was inserted by the Senate in March of last year and passed by the House at that time. Unless a provision of this kind is carried in the bill now, it is likely to put out of business hundreds of contractors all over the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. I think myself that before any legislation of this sort is enacted the subject of the legislation ought to be given very careful consideration and the details of the obligations rather definitely ascertained, and after we have ascertained definitely what these obligations are we ought to provide them, but in the meantime there ought not to be any legislation, and therefore I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph is clearly out of order. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

Medical Department: For surgeon's necessaries for vessels in commission, navy yards, naval stations, Marine Corps, and for the civil establishment at the several naval hospitals, navy yards, naval medical supply depots, Naval Medical School and Dispensary, Washington, and Naval Academy, including one bookkeeper at $1,600 and one clerk at $1,400 at the naval medical supply depot, Brooklyn, and toward the accumulation of a reserve supply of medical stores, $7,500,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, in the use of medical supplies a great deal of wool is used, and I have a little statement in reference to the uses of reworked wool and the possibilities of the supply of wool from sheep, and I would like to have unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD. I will not take up the time to read it, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

A STATEMENT RELATING TO CONSERVATION OF WOOL BY-PRODUCTS AS REPRESENTED BY REWORKED WOOL OR WOOL SHODDY.

The industry of reclaiming and reworking wool ranks of necessity very high as a conservation measure, as the very existence of the world's people depends in large measure upon its products. It is the purpose of this paper to set forth in a new and proper light the conservation of wool by-products as represented by the manufacture of reworked wool, commonly called wool shoddy, and to dispel the popular belief that shoddy is an inferior article of cotton composition. In dealing with this question, and in view of the fact that probably 90 per cent of the production of reworked wool is manufactured of materials which are commercially all wool, or from which any cotton present has been wholly eliminated by chemical process, the facts presented will be discussed in that light.

The following discussion will endeavor to bring out these conclusions:

A. That the manufacture of reworked wool or wool shoddy is a conservation industry of the greatest importance; that it is necessary for the existence of great numbers of people, because the sheep of the world produce but a fraction of the wool needed to clothe the inhabitants of the temperate and cold climates.

B. That reworked wool or wool shoddy is wool and contains no cotton and is used with the addition of virgin wool for the manufacture of warm, strong, and serviceable fabrics for all purposes.

C. That there is less danger from infections in handling woolen rags and reworked wool than from wool; and that germs which may be in wool, reworked wool, woolen rags, or other textile material can not be found in cloth made from these raw materials, as manufacturing is a certain and thorough process of purification.

D. That a wool fabric should be judged by what it is, not by the name given to the wool of which it is made. Some reworked wools or wool shoddies are intrinsically of higher value than some of the wool coming direct from the sheep as employed for use in clothing and other textile fabrics.

It will aid greatly in freeing ourselves from prejudice against reworked wool or wool shoddy and other wool by-products if we keep clearly in mind the fact that the use of these materials is necessary for the existence of prebably more than half of the people who now live outside of the Tropics—that is, in temperate and cold climates. Wool fabrics are required to protect the body against cold, damp, and sudden changes of temperature, and no other textile material provides this protection.

WOOL SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

Let us consider the many forms in which wool is now used for protecting the body: Clothing, such as dresses, coats, vests, trousers, sweaters, overcoats and cloaks, underclothing, hosiery, hats, caps, and blankets. In addition to these uses of wool for protecting the body, a large quantity of wool is used for a variety of other purposes, such as rugs, carpets, carriage and motor cloths, felts, upholstery, horse blankets.

The raw material for these products comes originally from the sheep, and the sheep of all countries yield approximately 1,468,000,000 pounds (scoured weight) of wool each year. This in the aggregate is a large quantity, but there is a loss of about 30 per cent in manufacturing scoured wool into cloth, so that the wool grown throughout the world each year would produce 1,027,600,000 pounds of wool cloth ready to be made into clothing. This also is a large quantity, but let us consider how many there are to use it. The people living outside of the Tropics number approximately 1,169,000,000, and these people must have the protection of wool, regardless of age, sex, or occupation. If the 1,027,600,000 pounds of cloth made from the annual production of wool were divided equally among the people living outside of the Tropics, each person would receive 14 ounces per year, equal to a piece of lightweight cloth 44 inches square, about enough to make a respectable girdle.

Let us keep in mind this yearly allowance of 14 ounces of cloth and then consider the approximate weight of the wool portion of various articles used for protecting the human body:

	Ounces.
Man's suit	56
Man's coat	28
Man's vest	8
Man's trousers	20
Man's overcoat	50
Bed blanket	80

REWORKED WOOL A PRIMARY NECESSITY OF LIFE.

At the rate the world's flocks produce wool a man would have to wait four years for enough cloth to make a suit of clothes. When we consider the large amount of wool materials now used not only for the protection of the body, but for the other uses already mentioned, and the disproportion between that amount and the annual yield of wool for each person, it becomes plain that the existence of most of the people now living in temperate and cold climates depends on a supply of wool material in addition to that which comes directly from the sheep. This extra supply is obtained both by reclaiming the wool from articles of wool that have already been used for clothing or other purposes and from other wool by-products of the textile industry. This reclaimed wool, which is known as reworked wool or wool shoddy, is then employed with the addition of virgin wool in suitable amounts for the manufacture of cloths and other wool goods. Thus we find that not only the health and comfort of all the people living outside of the Tropics, but the existence of the great majority of them depend on the use of reworked wool, which is but another name for wool. If wool were not reclaimed, it would be more expensive than silk and the price of all virgin wool clothing would be beyond the reach of the average consumer.

AS A CONSERVATION NECESSITY.

The greatest efforts of the present industrial age are to prevent waste and recover by-products. Molasses is a by-product of the sugar industry; stock feeds are a by-product of flour milling; Portland cement is a by-product of the steel industry; dyestuffs are a by-product of the explosive industry. All of these by-products are responsible for the large successes of various industries. Waste these by-products and thousands of men will be thrown out of employment, millions of capital invested will be destroyed, and the cost of every material of commerce will be increased.

REWORKED WOOL A BY-PRODUCT OF WOOL.

The material for the manufacture of reworked wool or wool shoddy is secured by the reclamation of the wool by-products of the woolen and worsted and the clothing industry. It includes the clippings and woolen rags from every textile manufacturing process. The industry gives value to household woolen rags. It takes the worn-out garments, a worsted suit for instance, thoroughly sterilizes it, cleans it, and subjecting it to the cleansing effect of acids, destroys the cotton and recovers the wool in the garments, returning it to the woolen mills in clean workable condition. The reworked wool industry recovers hundreds of millions of pounds of material in this way which would otherwise be wasted.

WOOLEN RAGS AS A SOURCE OF INFECTION.

The question has arisen in the minds of many as to whether the danger of infection in handling woolen rags is not a serious factor, but we are confronted by testimony of health officers from such centers of the woolen-rag industry at Batley and Dewsbury, England, to the effect that these towns are practically without industrial disease, being much freer from such ailments than towns like Bradford, where rags are not worked at all, but only wool.

CLOTH MANUFACTURING IS A PURIFYING PROCESS.

If we examine the methods by which reworked wool is reclaimed from used goods and with the addition of virgin wool again manufactured into clothing, we find processes of sterilization and purification as certain as those provided by nature for the purification of the water we drink. Let us follow a lot of wool rags from the time they are collected until they are manufactured into cloth for wool garments.

They are first sorted into about 50 different grades, according to color and quality, after which one of the first operations is to carbonize the rags to remove cotton and other vegetable material. This consists in soaking the rags in a solution of sulphuric acid and then baking them at a temperature of 212° to 250° F.

Frequently the next process is to color the rags, although in some cases this is done after the rags have been opened into the original fiber known as reworked wool or shoddy, or after the material has been made into cloth. In the process of dyeing the material is boiled for an hour or more, this boiling being repeated in the case of many colors. One of the most thorough and reliable methods employed by surgeons for sterilizing their instruments consists in boiling in water, the boiling temperature of 212° F. destroying all disease germs. Thus we find that the rags or reworked wool which have been completely sterilized by the carbonizing process are subjected to one and sometimes two additional sterilizing operations, consisting of boiling in solutions of chemicals and dyestuffs, during the process of manufacturing into cloth. Furthermore, wool goods are thoroughly scoured with soap, alkali, and warm water, so that the material, sterilized by repeated boilings, is freed from all impurities and foreign matter before leaving the mill.

REWORKED WOOL ON ITS MERITS.

The value of wool fibers as raw material for manufacturing depends not on whether they have or have not been previously used in the manufacture of wool goods, not on whether one is called "virgin wool" and the other "wool shoddy," but on what the material actually is, on its length, strength, fineness, flexibility, luster, lack of luster, felting quality, lack of felting quality, in fact on that indefinite number of characteristics which make wool fibers suited for producing the inexhaustible variety of products required to supply the necessities and gratify the whims of men and women. Varying as these raw materials do, they are selected on their intrinsic merits and used with the admixture of virgin wool for manufacture into wool goods.

If a fabric fails to protect the wearer against cold and damp, hangs badly in the garment, wears shiny, becomes threadbare, lacks durability, or is defective in any way, the cause of the defect is to be found, not in the fact that the raw material has been used once, twice, or more times in the manufacture of clothing, not that it was called waste, noils, shoddy, or wool, not on the proportions in which those materials were used or mixed with other textile materials, but on the intrinsic value of the raw materials irrespective of their previous condition and on the way in which they were converted into the finished product. Poor cloth is often made of new wool as well as reworked wool. Good cloth is made by an admixture of reworked wool, noils, waste, and wool by-products, as well as virgin wool.

To illustrate this point an Army officer who had seen service on the western front was asked by a member of this association what his experience had been in regard to the warmth and wearing qualities of the various articles of uniform furnished the soldiers. His reply was that the suitings were not so well liked as the overcoats, owing to the fact that, in his estimation, the suiting contained shoddy. He was amazed when told that the uniform suiting was all pure virgin wool, but that the overcoating contained 35 per cent of reworked wool or wool shoddy. It appears, therefore, that fabrics should be judged on their merits, and not so much on their content of virgin wool or reworked wool or both.

The manufacturing and retail clothier often lays great emphasis in advertising to the public that his goods are "all wool," which does not necessarily mean, however, that they contain no reworked wool or wool shoddy. What he does mean to bring out is the fact that the goods contain no cotton, and being "all wool" are, in his estimation, warm, strong, and serviceable.

AFTERWORD.

The entrance of this country into war has made the foregoing remarks especially applicable, particularly as regards the industry in the light of conservation. It has been estimated that a soldier requires for outfits and replacements about 65 pounds of wool per year, which reduces still further that available for civilian requirements.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bringing home remains of officers, etc., Navy Department: To enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transferred to their homes the remains of officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, of members of the Nurse Corps, of civilian officers and crews of naval auxiliaries, and of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers and the Naval Reserve Force when on active service with the Navy, who die or are killed in action ashore or afloat, and also to enable the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to cause to be transported to their homes the remains of civilian employees who die outside of the continental limits of the United States, $700,000: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be available for payment for transportation of the remains of officers and men who have died while on duty at any time since April 21, 1898, and shall be available until June 30, 1921.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting a little information from the chairman of the committee. I would like to ask the chairman if the Secretary of the Navy has provided up to date any regulations for the return of the remains of the men affected by this section?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the information officially, but I think the Secretary of the Navy will adopt the same program that the Army has adopted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is that?

Mr. BUTLER. It is to bring back the remains of the soldiers and sailors who died abroad.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When is that system going to be put into operation?

Mr. BUTLER. I understand—I do not know it officially—that it will be this fall or this winter, after peace is declared, that the remains of the soldiers, sailors, and marines who died abroad will be returned to this country for burial where request is made by their next of kin.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I understand this appropriation covers only the remains of men of the Navy. Now I imagine the Marine Corps when serving in the Army will be another matter, and that this does not refer to anything except what has been the usual practice always in the Navy of bringing back the dead.

Mr. OLIVER. If the gentleman will permit, all the Navy men serving in the Navy who died have already been brought back.

Mr. BUTLER. I think a few were buried at Brest.

Mr. OLIVER. Only those who died on the ships.

Mr. BUTLER. Those who died after they were landed. Some sailors who landed there have been buried somewhere along the coast, and their remains will be brought back.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a prohibition contained in the French law that prohibits the return of those buried on shore.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to make a statement as to that. Under the law of France disinterment can not take place under six years from the date of death. I am informed the War Department has been negotiating with the French Government to try and make an arrangement to shorten that period of time so that our soldiers and men buried over there can be returned.

Mr. MADDEN. I saw them disinterred, 26,000 bodies, and transferred to a national cemetery, when I was in France a little while ago.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know under what arrangement that was made.

Mr. OLIVER. Those were soldiers.

Mr. MADDEN. Soldiers; yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that the Government was negotiating with the French Government to make some arrangements to have the period of time shortened so that arrangements could be made to transport the remains of our soldiers and sailors back to the United States, but nothing has yet been done in reference to that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of the statement of my colleague from Alabama, that all the men in the Navy——

Mr. OLIVER. Who died in the war zone.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Have been brought back, why is it necessary to appropriate $700,000 for this purpose?

Mr. PADGETT. Sickness and deaths are anticipated larger next year. We have got men over there in the hospitals yet, and deaths may take place, and the Surgeon General stated to us that it is necessary possibly to have a larger sum available for the next year.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to state to my friend from Alabama that this language pertaining to the bringing home of the officers and enlisted men of the Navy is the same language that has always been carried in the naval appropriation bill, without any change whatever. It is not new language because of existing conditions in France.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will ask the gentleman in reference to this placing the date here as of April 21, 1898. I imagine from that there were possibly some bodies of sailors who died during the Spanish-American War which are sought to be brought back?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is the language that has always been carried in the bill during the past three years.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in sympathy with the provisions of the bill, and I was merely seeking information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to secure some information from the chairman or somebody who possesses the information. I would like to know how the Navy proceeds in bringing back these bodies. Is it a matter of letting it by contract, or does the Navy perform this service with some of its own force?

Mr. BRITTEN. As I understand it, the Navy performs this duty with its own enlisted personnel, and the language in here merely applies to the Navy and Marine Corps. This is current law, and it does not take into account the thousands of soldiers who are buried on the other side.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I understand; but I was interested to know how they were able to expend this money.

Mr. BRITTEN. The bodies will be brought back, and when they are brought back they are brought in American ships manned by the enlisted personnel of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

Pay of the Navy: Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, and the pay of midshipmen shall hereafter be $780 per annum, $35,863,989; officers on the retired list, $3,442,918; commutation of quarters for officers, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, pay clerks and mates, naval constructor and assistant naval constructors, $1,946,272, and also members of Nurse Corps (female), $44,200; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, $25,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, $585,000; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, $525,570; interest on deposit by men, $30,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineers' force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools; and pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, $87,507,405; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, $1,836,000, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, $4,694,400; pay of the Nurse Corps, $1,392,600; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, $55,800; retainer pay and active-service pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force, $15,371,176; payment of $60 discharge gratuity, $9,953,780; in all, $163,274,110; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That hereafter the Pay Corps shall be called the Supply Corps.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would ask the chairman of the committee the reason why the change of language in reference to the appointment of machinists?

Mr. BUTLER. I did not know it had been changed, I will say to the gentleman. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to answer the question?

Mr. WALSH. Does this give the President authority to appoint as many machinists as he may deem necessary to appoint? Is that the regular language that has been carried?

Mr. PADGETT. That is my recollection as to the language carried all the while.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not know that there had been any change in it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that here is the existing law:

And as many machinists as the President from time to time may deem necessary to appoint.

Mr. WALSH. And the following line——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Twenty-four thousand apprentice seamen at training stations and on board training ships.

Mr. WALSH. The number of apprentice seamen under training and training stations has heretofore been specified?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. This time we could not do that very well, because we wanted as many as we could get to fill up the Navy on account of so many going out.

Mr. WALSH. Now, I wanted to ask in reference to the pay of the midshipmen. How much of an increase is granted there?

Mr. BUTLER. We fixed it at $100 a year.

Mr. PADGETT. Six hundred dollars is the current law, and we have increased it to $780, the same as to cadets at West Point.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation, but direct attention to line 12, page 39, where the word "apprentice" is misspelled in the bill that I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation is withdrawn. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling referred to.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I renew the reservation for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a

question. There is an item appearing in line 4, page 39, of $30,000 to pay interest on deposits of the sailors. Now, what I want to know is, what use is made of that money? Is it put in the Treasury and is it subject to the Government's use, or how is the money utilized?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is so very familiar with that subject that I will refer it to him.

Mr. PADGETT. The men on board ship are encouraged to save their money and they deposit it with the Government and the Government pays them interest upon it while it is deposited in the Treasury.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is a general fund subject to the use of the Government?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; and to encourage thrift and saving among the men. And it has been carried for years.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Gentlemen of the committee, I want to call attention, if the committee pleases, to a progress of legislation that I think is unparalleled in the proceedings of Congress. This happens to be the anniversary of our national emblem and probably we will adjourn pretty soon. I therefore rise at this time to make this observation, that the country may know just what is taking place. I want to call attention to the fact that we are now considering the eighth appropriation bill of the special session of Congress. Seven of these appropriation bills are through this House and now over at the other end of the Capitol awaiting consideration, which will be given without delay. The urgent deficiency, the first bill to receive final action after we convened, passed the House on the 22d of May. The House went in session on the 19th of May. That means that the organization was completed and all the preliminaries gotten rid of and an emergency measure immediately taken up for consideration, and on the fifth day this bill was brought in and passed, to relieve a situation in which over 700,000 families were denied allowances, due to the failure to call Congress in session immediately after the 4th of March.

This unfortunate situation was not unknown to the President, according to our information.

Secretary Shouse, of the Treasury, in a hearing before the Appropriations Committee, in reply to a question of Mr. BYRNS, said:

Mr. BYRNS. Have you made an effort to get money from the President to pay those allowance checks?

Mr. SHOUSE. I can, perhaps, tell more about that than Mr. Macfarlane can. We advised the President by cable about the 20th of March the situation in which the War Risk Bureau was as the result of the failure of the several appropriation bills; we told the President in that cable that after the 1st of May we would be without money to pay the allowances, and we again cabled the President calling his attention to that situation about the 1st of May. As a result the President called Congress in session, his fund being, as I understood, practically exhausted.

Mr. BYRNS. That is what I wanted to ask you. Do you know that it has been exhausted?

Mr. SHOUSE. Well, yes; I know the status of the President's fund. At the time he gave us this appropriation from his fund it consumed almost everything that was in his fund, and we could only get that from him by having other departments which had borrowed from him pay him the money, as he did not actually have the money, and the Treasury Department had to get the various departments that had borrowed from his fund to pay it in in order to permit him to make that appropriation.

The Indian appropriation bill was passed in the House four days after the final vote on the deficiency bill. The Agricultural bill was passed on the 4th of June. Another deficiency bill was passed on the 29th of May, just 10 days after Congress convened; the District of Columbia appropriation bill on the 7th of June; the railroad deficiency bill, carrying $750,000,000, on the 10th of June; the Army bill, carrying a fraction over $800,000,000, but yesterday, and the naval bill we are half way through now, and may pass it before the days ends. The passage of these bills is not the important feature that I wanted to call to the attention of the country. Four of these appropriation bills—the deficiency, Army, railroad, and Navy—carry appropriations by at least $1,000,000,000 less than was carried by the same bills that passed at the last session, when our Democratic friends had control. It must also be remembered that all of those bills were considered after the armistice was signed, and passed the House. Of these four bills—and I will be specific, if the Members would like to have it—one, the urgent deficiency bill, is $5,000,000,000 less; the Army bill was reduced heavily from the original estimates by the committee, and then the House further reduced it nearly $100,000,000, making a cut of about $500,000,000 on the Army bill from that of last session. The Navy is making a cut of at least $140,000,000. The railway bill was cut $450,000,000, on the belief that such an amount was all that was needed. I want to be perfectly fair about that. We may have to make another appropriation for the railway administration, because it is possible that the $750,000,000 will not be sufficient, in view of the tremendous drain under Government operation, but it was thought wise, and I think justifiedly so, not to vote more than appeared upon the face of the estimates. Therefore, it was cut from $1,200,000,000 to $750,000,000, a saving of $450,000,000.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will wait until I give the sum total, then I will yield.

These four savings will amount to $1,095,000,000. That is a saving in 24 days of legislation that will amount to $46,000,000 a day. This would not have been saved in legislation if the bills had been passed at the close of the last session as we passed them in the House. And while I am not holding a brief for anybody for legislation, anyone can see that in the exigencies that followed since we adjourned on March 4 there has been opportunity for this amount of saving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. And yet all the saving is not apparent on the face of these bills. No one can estimate the saving that we made in yesterday's contest, where after three hours of contest it was forbidden to employ additional means to further purchase land and also where we forbade new construction in cantonments and war camps. For all of us know that the money in any department legitimately voted and thus authorized, the tendency is to spend it. And I am not saying that to criticize a department. It is the practice of all bureaus. They must make a showing.

During the war—and I am not offering this at all as a suggestion that anybody here needs any lecturing—it is not that—but during the war there sprung up so many agencies that were attached to the war machine that seemed to do, and probably did, such good work in the conduct of the war that they are now, when the war is over, insisting upon continuing enlisting all possible influences to impress the public of the tremendous importance of their activities. My office, as is yours, is besieged every day by young and old, by people in office and out of office, by persons in Washington and out of Washington, by personal visitation and by letter and telegram, declaring that if we do not continue this agency and that agency we are going to turn the clock of progress backward. Every Member has been told that a refusal proves that he is not willing to be as progressive as was suggested by the needs of the war. Many of these agencies are conducting systematic propaganda, now running at high speed, with tremendous pressure as that being brought upon their behalf by heads of bureaus. These agencies that have in their possession money that was authorized under the stress of war will not hesitate to use all they have. We can see at once the ease with which the money already appropriated or at least authorized would be applied in peace time, although it was authorized for war purposes. In the light of the fabulous drains upon the Treasury, which reaches over $1,000,000,000 per month, our first duty is to use the knife. That duty is more imperative and even important than expedition in legislation.

This inhibition we wrote yesterday in the Army bill is, in my judgment, the greatest saving of all the sources with which we have had up to date to deal, and I think I am not going afield when I say that this Congress this hour has deserved well from the public. In only 24 days, under the direction of the majority and not retarded by the minority, it has given the country a suggestion of what can be done in legislation.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman says, "Not retarded by the minority." I want to ask the gentleman if the minority has not been cooperating with the majority?

Mr. FESS. I think the minority has been cooperating with the majority. There have been times when certain features were contested, but I do not think ever for the purpose of filibustering or for any other purpose than to get all there is out of a measure that is proposed, and for that reason I find no fault. I think we sometimes sympathize, all of us, with our inability to prevent extraneous matters taking the time that should be consumed on legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he did not vote for the measures in the last Congress on which he says we have saved so much at this session?

Mr. FESS. I voted, I think, for all the measures, under the pressure that then existed, when we took the estimates that were brought to us.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to ask the gentleman a further question.

Mr. FESS. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman says that by these bills coming over at this session we have saved a good deal of money. Do I understand the gentleman to approve the filibuster that was carried on in the Senate?

Mr. FESS. Oh, the filibuster, if there was a filibuster, was conducted by three or four people individually and was not confined to any one particular party. I will say that to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman approve that and stand sponsor for that now?

Mr. FESS. I have always conceded the right to an individual, his claim to present his case, just as I suggested to my friend from Kansas a while ago; always. Whatever the cause of failure of legislation last session, we on this side of the aisle are not responsible for the delay of calling Congress together, which should have convened after the 4th of March to take care of the deficiency measures. The big item in the progress of this Congress is the saving of $46,000,000 per day on an average for the 24 days we have been in session. I know this achievement will be approved by the country, which expects it from the party now in control of Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but I saw that the Chairman had his gavel raised, and I wanted to ask the committee to permit our friend from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] to take the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor in the interest of the day. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. I recall, Mr. Chairman, how generously this committee complied with my request the other day that there be no general debate. I knew that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] desired a little time, and I said he should have it if I knew of any way to obtain it for him. Now, I am going to ask the committee to permit Mr. UPSHAW to speak for 10 or 15 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia proceed for 10 or 15 minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the fact that the House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union makes it not inopportune, I hope, for me to speak briefly on three questions now challenging the interest of the American people—labor, liquor, and the peace of humanity. [Applause.]

The demonstration before the Capitol to-day, purporting to be the voice of American organized labor in behalf of "lager beer" in general and protesting against war-time prohibition in particular precipitates this utterance on the floor of the House. [Applause.] This is Flag Day. I love the Stars and Stripes with a new devotion. I love to sing "America" and "The Star-Spangled Banner," whose inspiring strains have been floating to us on the breeze from the demonstration just outside the Capitol. But the stars lose part of their beauty and the stripes a part of their glory and the inspiration of the Star-Spangled Banner is decidedly abridged when these patriotic songs and our national emblem are employed, as they are to-day, to help continue the baleful influence of German brewers in America and to encourage the alcoholic debauchery of the workingmen of this country. [Applause.] As the proven friend of the workingman I am utterly unwilling for this "wet" demonstration to be made anywhere in America, and especially on the steps of the Capitol of my country, without registering my vigorous protest. Speaking for the labor men whom I have the honor to represent, from one of the largest districts in the South, or even the Nation, I here and now indict the scenes enacted on the Capitol grounds to-day, not as a labor demonstration, but a "libel demonstration" in favor of the workingman's greatest enemy. No workingman was ever made a better laborer, a better husband and father, or a better citizen of our country by his personal or his political acquaintance with a liquor shop or a beer saloon. And I have several statements and a telegram here proving that this demonstration, led by Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, does not represent the native-born, sober workingmen of the section from which I come. The following telegram speaks for itself:

ATLANTA, GA., *May 24, 1919.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. UPSHAW, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Organized labor here stands unitedly opposed to the Gompers-Wilson proposal on wine and beer. Public sentiment feels that the world has been dominated long enough by beer-drinking Huns and wine-drinking Austrians. Gompers does not represent the conscience of the native-born laboring man of America on this question.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. Certainly.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman failed to give the name of the sender of that telegram.

Mr. UPSHAW. It was purely an oversight. I am delighted to do so. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. The telegram was sent by John W. Ham, pastor of the Baptist Tabernacle, one of the most influential "people's churches" in the South.

Mr. BRITTEN. Most of the members of the committee understood the telegram was from some labor leader or some labor organization.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Ham is the declared and proven defender of organized labor in Atlanta. [Applause.]

And since this demonstration in favor of beer saloons comes from the same source that opposed the national banishment of liquor saloons on the same specious ground of "personal liberty," I give here several statements affecting the attitude of union labor on the general question of prohibition:

STATE OF WASHINGTON.

I was opposed to the passage of the prohibition act in this State. To the great body of our workingmen, however, the law has been a distinct blessing.

H. P. MARCH,
President Washington State Federation of Labor.

COLORADO.

I voted against prohibition. I am now irrevocable opposed to the saloon. You could not dig up a corporal's guard of trade-unionists who would vote for a return of the saloon.

WILLIAM C. THORNTON,
President Denver Trades and Labor Assembly.

ARIZONA.

Arizona workers are certainly better morally and financially than they were before prohibition was adopted.

JOHN L. DONNELLY,
President Arizona State Federation of Labor.

OREGON.

Since the bone-dry law went into effect, "a rich man's law" is seldom referred to. I might say that if the question of repealing the present law in Oregon and going back to the saloons was left to a vote of the union men only, that the State would be so dry that none in 100 years would try to "wet" it up again.

W. B. SOMERVILLE,
Oregon Labor Leader.

Now, allow me to say, gentlemen of the committee, that I honor Mr. Gompers as a great patriotic American—that I have genuine admiration for his proven qualities of leadership; but I count it very unfortunate for him to thus oppose a wholesome law intended to guard the homes and the sobriety of American citizenship—a law that has fought its way to victory after more than 50 years of consecrated effort, and which has been put on the statute books of the Nation by the overwhelming will of the American people. Democracy has spoken. The demonstration which he heads to-day can have but one effect, and that is to discourage the enforcement of a law which won through the channels of genuine democracy and which is as constitutional in its enactment as it is safe and righteous in its effect. [Applause.]

I love the cause of labor too well to see the rank and file of the sober workingmen of this country misrepresented on this great moral and economic question. Permit me to say that I was elected to Congress on the platform of "a square deal to labor and capital" and that many labor leaders in my home city of Atlanta came to me unsought and offered me their support because they said that they felt they could trust a man who had given 25 years of work with tongue and pen to the cause of human uplift. I expect to redeem that faith by my every vote on the floor of this House. Openly and everywhere I took the position in my campaign that a square deal to labor and capital meant a deal that would cut both ways—absolute squareness and fairness to employer and employee.

I am a friend of regulated capital because I am a friend to humanity, because it requires capital to compensate labor and turn the wheels of commercial, moral, and civic progress. But I make apology to no man for saying that if the time ever comes when I am compelled to struggle in an effort to see my duty while even-handed justice is hanging in the balance between labor and capital, like the hero of Scotia's bard, "Whose failings leaned to virtue's side," my natural and legislative sympathies will always be for the man in overalls and the man between the plow handles as twin builders of our civilization. I reaffirm the undisputed fact that if wealth has a right to or-

ganize for its own increase and protection, certainly labor which produces all wealth has an equal right to assemble its only capital—"the horns on its hands and the beads on its brow"—to guarantee its own safety in any hour of stress or challenge. But even as no man has a right to coerce labor, I contend from the equal principle of American freedom that organized labor has no right to coerce any man who elects, in the exercise of his full-orbed American liberty, not to join the ranks of organized labor. Mistaken as he may be, he has the full right to enjoy the fruitage of his mistake and to work for an honest living whatever opportunity offers. And in vindication of this fundamental principle of freedom I deny the right of any lodge in Washington or anywhere else to fine any member for not attending this lager-beer demonstration to-day on the Capitol grounds, as was recently published in one of the Washington papers. The whole position of Mr. Gompers and his "wet" comrades in protest is nothing less than a restatement of the old worn-out doctrine of "personal liberty and regulation" concerning the liquor traffic, and over against it we answer that "personal liberty ends where public injury begins." To that "personal liberty" that demands a license for personal and public debauchery we offer the incontestible supremacy of organized law over individual liberty. The law has spoken in America, let liquorized protests forever cease. [Applause.] And the stock argument about "regulation" has been shot to pieces on a thousand forums and proven futile in 10,000 communities in America, where the outraged people have risen in the glory of their democracy and demanded not the regulation and protection but the extermination of an evil that prospers only on the downfall of its most constant patrons. Two and three-quarter per cent beer saloons would prove all over America what we found them to be in Atlanta—the rendezvous of idleness and drunkenness and the unblushing cloak of stronger intoxicants. Near-beer saloons became real beer saloons and a few "personal liberty" locker clubs multiplied speedily into "Eagles and Owls and Beavers and Buzzards" [applause], where the young manhood, and, alas, sometimes the young womanhood, of the city and the State were debauched in defiance of law both day and night. For six or seven years the wet minority thus defied the dry majority until we were compelled to call a special session of the legislature and break every jug and burst every bottle and roll every barrel of beer into the sounding sea. Talk about regulating a drinking saloon, you might as well try to regulate a polecat in a Maryland swamp or a Georgia forest. [Applause.] There is just one way to regulate the liquor traffic, you must regulate it like you would regulate a rattlesnake, smash its head forever more with national constitutional prohibition, and then leave not one camouflaged beer saloon on the American continent as an open door for all the evils of drink, a saloon that will rob labor of its honest toil, strike the crust from the lips of many a starving child, drive the roses from the cheeks of a one-time happy wife and mother, stifle the music in countless thousands of American homes, and then seek to continue its defiant wreckage by corrupting our politics and making cowards of the politicians that stand sponsor for its trail of slime and crime. [Applause.]

The friend of the continuance of beer saloons under our national prohibition law is—unwittingly, perhaps, but none the less in reality—the friend of the German brewers, who have proven themselves without either patriotism or character in the hour of our national crisis. Labor for the most part was grandly loyal to the American flag in our battle with a foreign foe, and I call for an everlasting divorcement between the American workingman and the German brewers in this country. This is national Flag Day, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, and it is fitting that all patriotic men and women should stand without equivocation for the undisputed supremacy of "a stainless flag."

NONPARTISAN FELLOWSHIP IN A COVENANT OF NATIONS.

And just as the guardianship of sobriety and justice to the workingman are nonpolitical in essence and in spirit, even so we should likewise have nonpartisan fellowship in our humanitarian efforts to guarantee the happiness of humanity in the peace of the world. The spirit of Americanism and broad humanity which caused William Howard Taft and Woodrow Wilson to walk arm in arm on the same platform and blend their efforts for the peace of humanity is surely ready to believe and declare in all honesty and frankness that America's great President has done his best—his tireless best—for the safety of the United States of America and the peace and happiness of mankind. [Applause.] In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of extending my remarks by incorporating a very cogent and comprehensive analysis of the international ethics involved in a covenant of nations to guarantee peace. This nonpartisan digest is made by Hon. Alex. W. Smith, a great lawyer, publicist, and patriot of my home city, Atlanta, and, irrespective of political lines of cleavage, every man who loves America and America's mission to humanity will find himself enriched by this scholarly and patriotic utterance:

A LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(By Alex. W. Smith, Atlanta, Ga.)

(A) ITS PHILOSOPHY.

On December 10, 1915, I had the pleasure of publicly expressing my appreciation of the address to Congress made shortly before that date by the President. In this connection I ventured to describe President Wilson as a "herald and prophet of a new age." His subsequent career has amply justified this appellation, and in nothing more completely than in his ideal conception of a league of nations.

War, in a sense, legalizes killing, so as not to constitute murder; it recognizes destruction of property as a necessity of war; practices imprisonment without legal proceedings; and, by some nations, indulges in robbery without admitting crime. So-called rules of war are based on the hope of mitigating its horrible possibilities, but in all times such rules have been honored in the breach rather than the observance.

Without going into details, the general statement is justified that the inherent defect in all previous efforts to form leagues of nations has been the recognition therein of the legality of war. The present movement, in its essence, differs from all previous movements in that direction in that it seeks to make war itself unlawful. In this lies the secret of its merit and the prophecy of its success.

Hitherto, in recognized war, exemption from the legal and moral infamy of murder and robbery extends to the combatants on both sides. The result of conflicts under the league of nations would make the acts of rebellious and recalcitrant members unlawful, and lower them from the plane of combatants to the level of outlaws and criminals. The analogy is complete between such a combat and the conflict between a mob and the organized forces of government.

For illustration, in an unorganized community feuds between factions, resulting in bloodshed, frequently occur and participants on both sides are killed, and neither the odium nor the punishment of murder attaches, although all the moral elements of crime may exist. But when the community establishes some form of government by law, such conflicts may still occur, but members of the mob faction incur the results of criminal act and intent, and are dealt with accordingly, while the forces of law (or posse comitatus) are exempt from the imputation of crime. So when the organized forces of society suppress a mob, within the jurisdiction of a State or a nation, regardless of its size, it is a misnomer to describe such a conflict as "war."

In its essence, the ideal league of nations will extend this principle to the nations of the world, and when established, future conflicts between the nations, as such, can no longer be denominated war, but will be the suppression of outlawry by the organized forces of society.

This ideal condition involves the premise that all the organized States and nations of the earth will be parties to the league. Pending that hopeful consummation, outstanding nations would occupy the relation to the league of communities living, as it were, outside the corporate limits of a municipality. So long as they behave themselves they would not be molested, but otherwise they would be subject to the condemnation of the decent opinion of mankind, and if they assaulted the welfare of the world should be dealt with in the same way individual disturbers of the peace would be dealt with, and with such force and coercive measures as the circumstances required to restore order.

A conflict thus brought about could not rightly be denominated "war" any more than the suppression of an outbreak of a lawless mob invading the peaceful confines of a city could be called "war."

It is not to be expected that an ideal league of nations can be attained at one step. All human progress, both material and spiritual, is evolutionary, and all systems of law not promulgated by an autocratic tyrant are made up of a series of compromises advancing from stage to stage. In the spiritual world it was a long step from Abraham to Moses and from the Ten Commandments and the Mosaic law to the Sermon on the Mount.

In our own country we have advanced from the edicts of the British Crown through the colonial organizations, the Declaration of Independence, and the Articles of Confederation to the Constitution of the United States, and 18 amendments have been tacked on to that, with more to come in all probability. Yet it would be a strange position for one to have objected to all these forward movements because the goal was not reached at the first bound. Let us hope that it is not yet reached. Fortunately for mankind, our great leader, the President, does not think so, but is standing on the bridge of the Ship of State, with clear vision and faithful heart, steering straight ahead toward the haven of world-wide law and order and universal justice, freedom, and equality of opportunity. Beside him and behind him all good men will take their stand.

(B) OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSED LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Objects:

To promote international cooperation;

To secure international peace and security;

To prescribe open, just, and honorable relations between nations;

To establish international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments;

To maintain justice and respect for all treaty obligations.

No sane, self-respecting, and law-abiding man can consistently object to any of these objects as applied to individuals. Since nations are but the aggregations of individuals, no self-respecting and law-abiding nation can consistently object to any of these objects.

To effectuate these objects a representative body of delegates is created and a permanent secretarial organization provided for. Representation in this body is limited to members of the league, and when once organized, new members are admitted only on approval of two-thirds of the charter members, and then only under effective guaranties of sincerity of purpose to support the objects and purposes of the league.

An executive council is created, the majority control of which is vested in the five principal nations composing the Allies in the World War.

The territorial integrity and political independence of all members are to be respected and preserved, and the league is obligated to resist all aggression, or threat of aggression, upon such territorial integrity or political independence. Any breach of international peace, or threat thereof, directly or circumstantially, is made a matter of concern to the league, whether immediately affecting its membership or not, and it has the right to take wise and effectual measures to safeguard the peace of nations. No conflict over differences unadjusted by ordinary

diplomacy shall be had without inquiry or arbitration, and not at all if one of the disputants complies with the recommendation of the league or the award of the arbitration.

A permanent court of international justice is authorized and given jurisdiction over international disputes. If, after submission of a dispute and its disposition in the orderly ways prescribed, a member of the league fails to comply with the final judgment awarded, it shall be treated as an outlaw against society and to have declared war (in the common acceptance of the word) against all other members, and it shall at once be boycotted financially and commercially and all intercourse with it terminated both by the nations in their corporate capacity and by their respective citizens. If this outlawry does not reduce the recalcitrant nation, armed force shall be used against it in order to protect the covenants of the league, precisely as an individual who becomes an outlaw is driven into submission to the rules of law and order. If such an armed conflict ensued, it could not be called "war" in the sense that word has been hitherto understood. It would be the forcible suppression of inexcusable disobedience to law, and the forces of law and order would be justified in the use of force, while the outlaw nation would be under condemnation from the beginning of the conflict as undeniably as a natural person would be under similar circumstances in resisting a lawful judgment which the courts of law had duly rendered against him.

In case of a dispute between a member nation and one not a member, or between two nations, neither of which is a member, the outsiders will be invited to accept the obligations of membership for the purpose of such disputes, and if the invitation is accepted the machinery of the league will be available to prevent conflict. If the invitation is not accepted, the outsider is to be subjected to the boycott and, if necessary, the armed forces of the league to prevent a breach of international peace and the continued operation of the rules of law and order throughout the world.

By reason of the disruption of anti-world war allegiance and boundaries produced by the great conflict, provision is made for placing on their feet the several colonies and territories thus dissevered from their former connections and safeguarding their peoples in their freedom of conscience or religion, in their opportunities for trade and commerce, and in their general welfare as it is involved in the maintenance of public order and morals, till such time as they can by self-determination established civilized and stable governments of such character as will entitle them to take their several places among the nations of the earth.

HUMANE CONDITIONS FOR LABOR.

The league shall endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend; just treatment of territorial nations; general supervision of drug and white-slave traffic; trade in arms and munitions; freedom of communication and transit for commercial purposes, especially in devastated regions; and take steps to prevent and control disease.

The league shall control all international bureaus now or hereafter established, if the parties thereto consent, and every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any State, member of the league, shall be forthwith registered with the secretary general and as soon as possible published by him, and no such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

Just as individuals are prohibited from carrying concealed weapons, so the league will regulate the matter of fortification and armament by its members. Since organized society among individuals has enabled them to retire their rifles and revolvers and leave to the police department the job of protecting them from unlawful attack, so the league proposes to make parallel arrangements for the organized units of society, known as states or nations, to lay down the great burden of continual preparation against attack. The world of nations seeks relief from the unrest, figuratively sleeping, on its arms, just as the pioneer peoples of the world have relieved themselves literally in that respect.

Commissions, to be composed of experts, are provided to work out the details of disarmament of all nations and the supervision of undeveloped peoples, and this will take time and develop slowly in the process of evolution from the former state of undetermined international law into that higher and better state of a system of laws by which all nations of the earth must be governed.

The foregoing outline embraces all the fundamentals of the constitution of the league of nations now before the world for consideration, and, as far as practicable, is in its exact language. Constitutions can, of necessity, deal with principles only and leave detail to the machinery they provide for the purpose. The framework, mechanism, and controlling devices of this machinery are arousing criticism and debate in some quarters, but it is unnecessary to minutely describe it in such a general sketch as this. The present purpose is fully accomplished if a clear conception of the fundamentals of the great project may be imparted in language sufficiently untechnical to be easily understood.

(C) CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PROPOSED LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Savage attacks have been launched against the proposed league of nations on the ground that the United States Government can not join it without violating the Federal Constitution, abdicating its sovereignty, and abandoning the Monroe doctrine. Eminent Senators and lawyers learned in black-letter law books have argued at length that the constitution of any league of nations is an iridescent dream. Others of equal learning and ability have endeavored to help along the movement by intelligent, conservative, and constructive criticism of the document as drawn. The general public should be told in the plain language of the street of certain principles which lie beneath the phraseology of all constitutions in order that they may not be alarmed in their warm-hearted indorsement of the objects and purposes in view. Hoping to do this, the writer will try to speak with clearness rather than erudition; with simplicity rather than eloquence; with earnestness rather than satire. Let us return to the analogy between an ordinary natural person and the entity, or artificial person, created when a nation is formed. To visualize it, let us deal with the United States Government in relation to this subject as Uncle Sam, with his high hat and tight breeches, and imagine that his lifelike and benevolent personality for the time being is quickened by the same pulse beats that throb in the hearts of his people. How did he come into existence? "We, the people" of the United States, created him and endowed him with all his powers through the instrumentality of the Constitution. We all have constitutions—some strong, some weak, some good, some bad. So he has a Constitution which he can no more abuse without injury to his well-being than is the case with any one of us. One of the attributes of his Constitution is the ability to fight—that is to say, to declare and prosecute war. Most of his citizens have by nature the same power. Well, the most frequent criticism of the proposed league of nations is that it would take away the power of Uncle Sam to declare war. Does it? When our magnificent western Territories were being settled pioneer communities clustered here and there about this fertile valley or that rich mine and set about the foundations now lying beneath some of the finest cities in the world. They usually had the power to fight, and to fight hard, and to facilitate the exercise of this power were accustomed to strap huge revolvers on their hips. To call them into use needed little provocation and less time, and vast satisfaction suffused the natural constitutions of these rugged men when no waste of ammunition was required to make corpses of their antagonists. In due time it became necessary to curb the impetuous pugnacity of these hardy pioneers, notwithstanding the lasting benefits their courage bestowed in advancing the wave of civilization across the continent. Many of them, no doubt, felt that the organization of government by law and not by force of their good right arms was an invasion of their constitutions, in that their practice of uncontrolled dealing with antagonists by the hairtrigger method was no longer permissible. But their logic was faulty. Under their natural constitutions they had as much power to shoot as before, but they could not exercise that power without committing an unlawful act. So, as matters now stand between the nations of the earth, Uncle Sam can, under his constitutional power to declare war, draw his 16-inch guns and blaze away at any other artificial personality known as a nation (just as Mr. Hohenzollern did at poor little Belgium and La Belle France) and, save for the loss of the decent respect of mankind, our dear old uncle would violate no man-made law. Critics of the proposed league of nations say this is a sovereign right, and Uncle Sam's sovereignty must not be impaired. Isn't sovereignty, in that sense, out of date? If I would appear learned, I would ask, "Is not 'sovereignty' an anachronism?"

THE MONSTROUS FICTION, "THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG."

The word is handed down from monarchs, wearing crowns, and the monstrous fiction went with it that "The King can do no wrong." Is that true since the King of Prussia drew his sword in the summer of 1914? Hasn't the world gotten beyond that? Is it not true to say: There is no sovereign right to do wrong? After Uncle Sam joins the league of nations, like the two-gun man when he became a citizen of his incorporated town, he retains as much power to draw on an antagonist as before, but in the exercise of that power he will incur the penalties following the infraction of a fixed rule of conduct where none existed before. Of course, in either case, self-defense justifies vigorous offense, and nothing in the league of nations deprives any of its members of the right of self-defense. On the contrary, all members are pledged to each other to assist in repelling all aggressions on any, even the weakest and most defenseless, member.

MONROE DOCTRINE NOT PART OF CONSTITUTION.

But the critics say that Uncle Sam's Monroe doctrine would be eliminated if he joined the league of nations. The Monroe doctrine is no part of the Constitution. It is a principle announced to the world during President Monroe's administration, which may be expressed in the language of the street as "keep off the grass." Having established himself comfortably on the North American Continent and fixed his boundaries on the two oceans and surveyed the struggles of his neighbors to the south to evade the cupidity or ambition of the then monarchial Governments of Europe, he notified the latter, in very polite but firm language, that he would consider any aggressive effort on their part to extend their influence into his neighborhood unfriendly, to say the least of it. The bald eagle of the west simply warned the black eagles (sometimes called buzzards) of the east that he had a large young brood growing up and did not care to have any disturbance about his nest.

If the league of nations means anything at all, it means that there shall be no "poaching on the preserves" of any member by anybody, whether a member of the league or not, and if such aggression is attempted, arrest of the movement is made common cause of all. It is therefore strictly accurate to say that the Monroe doctrine originated by Uncle Sam and applied by him to the Western Hemisphere will be extended over the whole world by the league of nations. By amendment its continued operation in this hemisphere is not to be disturbed.

GREAT NATIONS WILL KEEP THE FAITH.

Much of the fear expressed by critics of the league has no foundation unless the good faith of all parties to it, except that of Uncle Sam, is impugned. Of course, if the whole thing is a mere conspiracy to entrap Uncle Sam, it becomes a mere fraud, and, independently of the two-year secession clause, its obligations would be immediately released upon such a development. It will be a mere contract, and fraud voids all contracts. It can not be intelligently discussed on such a premise. Yet the ultraconservative objection to disarmament is without foundation on any other premise. When the frontiersman dismantled his private arsenal he retained his trusty Winchester and a pair of Colts within easy reach for use in individual emergency and to equip himself for the discharge of his duty as a member of the posse comitatus when a lawless outbreak required some addition to the regular forces of law and order. But these weapons are kept and carried in the open. Concealed weapons are barred by law-abiding citizens. So Uncle Sam will have full voice in the matter of armament and will keep the faith himself and have no fear of his ability to exact like treatment from others.

Such is the common sense of the proposition. Such is the vision of President Wilson translated into everyday language. His transcendent thought and classic expression have clothed the principles of universal peace and justice in fitting garb. No more exalted conception has quickened into life since the Sermon on the Mount. It may be reverently said that the latter was no greater advance in the spiritual world than the former will prove to be in the material world. In each the foundation rests on the ultimate truth and faith of the innermost conscience of mankind. If that is not right, then might must prevail. All the incalculable sacrifice of the World War is vain. Let the Hohenzollerns resume their throne, and spring the guillotine on Truth as she stands on the scaffold. Efface the Ten Commandments, blot out the Bible, and leave the maddened peoples of the earth to drown themselves in their own blood. No sane man can commit himself to this view. On the contrary, the world is awake to the dangers of unrestrained human "sovereignty," and, as surely as the Great Sovereign of all created this world and holds it in the hollow of His hand. He will establish right over might. He has been preparing for it through all the ages. He has raised up His apostles and prophets and equipped them for their task through all time, and none of them has been more truly inspired in His work than President Woodrow Wilson. Uncle Sam himself was established in a new world and gently reared in isolation until his strength and spirit were equal to the task of rescuing the Old World from self-destruction, and in the fullness of his power and the purity of his purpose he is now engaged in "blazing out the path and making clear the way up which all the nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time."

By unanimous consent, Mr. FESS was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For fuel; the removal and transportation of ashes and garbage from ships of war; books, blanks, and stationery, including stationery for commanding and navigating officers of ships, chaplains on shore and afloat, and for the use of courts-martial on board ships; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters for ships; packing boxes and materials; interior fittings for general storehouses, pay offices, and accounting offices in navy yards; expenses of disbursing officers; coffee mills and repair thereto; expenses of naval clothing factory and machinery for the same; laboratory equipment; purchase of articles of equipage at home and abroad under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith, and the manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; musical instruments and music; mess outfits; soap on board naval vessels; athletic outfits; tolls, ferriages, yeomen's stores, safes, and other incidental expenses; labor in general storehouses, paymasters' offices, and accounting offices in navy yards and naval stations, including naval stations maintained in island possessions under the control of the United States, and expenses in handling stores purchased and manufactured under "General account of advances"; and reimbursement to appropriations of the Department of Agriculture of cost of inspection of meats and meat food products for the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storemen, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $3,000,000; in all, $13,571,200.

Mr. BUTLER. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUTLER: Page 42, line 13, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,700,000."

Mr. BUTLER. They want a little more money in that bureau.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not increase the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. BUTLER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and transportation: Coal and other fuel for steamers' and ships' use, including expenses of transportation, storage, and handling the same; maintenance and general operation of machinery of naval fuel depots and fuel plants; water for all purposes on board naval vessels; and ice for the cooling of water, including the expense of transportation and storage of both, $12,000,000: *Provided*, That the United States Shipping Board shall not require payment from the Navy Department for the charter hire of vessels furnished or to be furnished from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, for the use of that department when such vessels are owned by the United States Government: *Provided*, That $1,000,000 of the appropriation "Fuel and transportation, 1919," or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby continued and made available for use, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, in mining coal or contracting for the same in Alaska, the transportation of the same, and the construction of coal bunkers and the necessary docks for use in supplying ships therewith; and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to select from the public coal lands in Alaska such areas as may be necessary for use by him for the purposes stated herein.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. On page 43, line 5, is that the second proviso or is it a subdivision?

Mr. BUTLER. It is the second proviso; the word "further" should be added after the word "*Provided*" in line 5, page 43.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Do I understand that under the existing practice the Shipping Board has been charging the Navy Department rental for vessels that belong to the United States, and that this proviso was put in to stop it?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; to the extent of about $3,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not think they have paid it, but they have made the charge.

Mr. BUTLER. They have made the same charges against the Army.

Mr. WALSH. For vessels owned by the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Transferring the funds of the Navy to the credit of the Shipping Board for use as rentals of property belonging to the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 5, after the word "provided" insert the word "further."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to clear up the matter which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] was talking about. That really is only a matter of bookkeeping; it is in no sense a saving to the Government.

Mr. BUTLER. No; but we do not want it loaded on us.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill from page 43, line 21, down to and including page 45, line 15.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if he means to finish the bill to-night without a quorum. It is Saturday afternoon, and nearly half past 4, and time to adjourn.

Mr. BUTLER. If my friend will allow us to step along a little further, I supposed that we would finish the bill by 4 o'clock, but we did not start as early as I anticipated. I will admit that I am tired and would like to quit. The Members present seem to approve the different features of the bill.

Mr. PLATT. If the gentleman is tired, and as long as it is Saturday afternoon, there is no reason why we should not quit and finish the bill on Monday.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman will have no difficulty in persuading me, but let us read a page or two more.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

Engineering: For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, distilling and refrigerating apparatus; repairs, preservation, and renewals of electric interior and exterior signal communications and all electrical appliances of whatsoever nature on board naval vessels, except range finders, battle order and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; searchlights and fire-control equipments for anti-aircraft defense at shore stations; maintenance and operation of coast signal service, including expenses of office of Director of Naval Communications and the purchase of land as necessary for sites for radio shore stations; equipage, supplies, and materials under the cognizance of the bureau required for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; purchase, installation, repair, and preservation of machinery, tools, and appliances in navy yards and stations, pay of classified force under the bureau; incidental expenses for naval vessels, navy yards, and stations, inspectors' offices, the engineering experiment station, such as photographing, technical books and periodicals, stationery, and instruments; instruments and apparatus, supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work in radiotelegraphy at the naval radio laboratory: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $2,500,000: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for the purchase of land for a site for a radio shore station at Otter Cliffs, Me., shall not exceed $30,000: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of radio stations in whole or in part used for the transmission or reception of commercial messages: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to cause to be prepared in the Office of Communications, Navy Department, a publication known as the Shipping Bulletin, and to publish and furnish the same to the maritime interests of the United States and other interested parties, at the cost of collecting and publishing the information, including the cost of printing and paper and other necessary expenses, the money received from the sale of such publication to be returned by the Secretary of the Navy into the Treasury of the United States, to be used in the future preparation of the publication referred to, publication of which is authorized until such time as the publication may be self-supporting. Twenty thousand dollars of this appropriation, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be applied to the purposes hereof; in all, engineering, $30,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the last proviso. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee about this Shipping Bulletin which has been published during the war. It is not set forth in this proposed legislation just what information this bulletin is to contain. I have read the hearings, and I understand the only publication like it is the bulletin issued by Lloyd's, of London, England.

I can not quite see why a bulletin such as that should be issued by the Navy Department. I appreciate the fact that they have some jurisdiction, perhaps, over vessels having radio apparatus, but if this is to be a bulletin containing information similar to that published and distributed by Lloyd's, I can not see why the Navy should issue it. We have a Bureau of Navigation in the Department of Commerce, a Shipping Board, and an Emergency Fleet Corporation, and various and sundry other branches that are just running wild publishing some kind of a bulletin. This, I see, is to be limited to maritime interests and other interests, and it is assumed from the language of the paragraph that some day in the near and happy future it will be self-supporting; but even though it is, I submit there is no justification for it unless it can be shown that there is some demand for the information. What information is it proposed to publish?

Mr. LUFKIN. Mr. Chairman, I will say that this publication was started by the Division of Communication of the Navy Department during the war for the purpose of keeping the Navy Department supplied with information as to the movements and whereabouts of ships, both in the Navy and in the merchant marine.

Recently, with the reduction of activities, the department had about made up its mind to discontinue the publication of this bulletin, but the demand from various parts of the country that it be continued, because it was so extremely valuable, was so great that the head of the Division of Communication, Admiral Bullard, came before our committee and asked for this provision. I understand that it is the only publication of its kind issued in this country, and, outside of Lloyd's Register, is the only publication of its kind issued in the world. The newspapers and the various shipping interests are all anxious to have it continued and are willing to pay for the cost. The Navy Department now having the machinery established to continue its publication, it seems only reasonable that this Department should be the one to continue to carry on the work.

Mr. WALSH. What information does the bulletin contain? I see from the hearings that it has been kept in secret archives during the war.

Mr. LUFKIN. That was during the war; but to-day it is issued as a daily bulletin to all parts of the country, and, as I understand, it contains the daily movements of all ships.

Mr. WALSH. Of all ships that are equipped with radio. Of course, it can not keep track of ships that are not equipped with radio unless they send naval ships with radio to ascertain the whereabouts of these craft.

Mr. LUFKIN. I would say to the gentleman that it is my impression that it is issued on information compiled not only by the Navy Department but by the Department of Commerce as well. The Division of Information also have an arrangement, I understand, by which information is exchanged with Lloyd's Register.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state what information this bulletin is to contain outside of the whereabouts of ships?

Mr. LUFKIN. I think that is all; but I understand that is very important information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I further reserve the point of order. I think if the maritime interests will read the columns of the various dailies of the great cities they will get the information they want. Of course, the newspapers are perfectly willing that the United States Government should acquire this information and turn it over to them at 39 cents a copy, because it saves newspapers a great many hundreds of dollars; but in many respects it would be a duplication of publication, and I make the point of order against the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order against the proviso indicated. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of Coast Guard vessels: For the completion of five Coast Guard cutters within the limit of cost, namely, $3,500,000, fixed by the act of March 28, 1918, $2,850,000.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ascertain some information in respect to these Coast Guard vessels. Where are these Coast Guard vessels being built?

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask Mr. HICKS to answer.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will permit, these Coast Guard vessels are now under construction at Everett, in the State of Washington. There are five under contract and are from 10 to 15 per cent completed. They were authorized in the Naval appropriation bill of August 29, 1916, or, at least, two of them were authorized, to cost $350,000 each. The Naval appropriation act of March 4, 1917, increased the limit of cost of these Coast Guard vessels to $450,000 each, and, in addition, it authorized the construction of three more cutters, at $450,000 each.

Mr. GOULD. Would it not be possible to use some of these surplus vessels that the Government may now own in work of this sort?

Mr. HICKS. I can say to the gentleman from New York that Admiral Badger, of the General Board, thought these cutters were so essential to the service that he made a personal matter of it with the Secretary of the Navy, and most urgently asked that the cutters be constructed as soon as possible. They are specially made, and there is a great need of them on the Pacific coast. We have 21 in the service now, having lost 2 during the war. The *Tampa* was lost in foreign waters, with everyone on board. That was one of the heaviest losses sustained by the Navy—the sinking of the *Tampa* through an attack of a German torpedo. There is the greatest need for these cutters at the present time.

Mr. GOULD. Is the Government building them?

Mr. HICKS. No; a private concern at Everett, Wash. The contract was let in January last, and it is expected they will be finished by April, 1920. We are endeavoring to coordinate our needs, and Navy boilers are to be placed in these ships.

With my colleague's permission, I will make a general statement in regard to them, and I ask that Congress remember that at the present time the Coast Guard is operating under the Navy Department, as provided by law. After these ships were authorized the increase in cost of shipbuilding was so rapid that we were unable to obtain proposals to build them within the limit of cost. The General Board of the Navy considered the matter and urged the Navy Department to have the limit of cost of these vessels increased to $700,000 apiece, and in response to the recommendation of the General Board the Secretary of the Navy asked that the limit of cost be increased, and thereupon the Appropriations Committee of the House increased the limit of the cost of these vessels to $700,000, making the total amount authorized for the construction of the five cutters $3,500,000. This limit of cost was increased in the general deficiency act of March 28, 1918. It seemed, however, difficult to keep pace with the increased cost of shipbuilding, and, although we obtained many proposals for the construction of these ships, it was always on the cost-plus plan, which we did not approve of and which the Secretary of the Navy would not approve of. Finally, after the signing of the armistice, we obtained a proposal for a fixed sum and within the limit of cost of these five cutters, and the contract was awarded for the construction of these cutters on January 16, 1919, and they are now being constructed by the Norway-Pacific Construction & Dry Dock Co. I may say that the General Board, and Admiral Badger particularly, were very urgent that these ships be built and made repeated recommendations to the Secretary that the matter be expedited, and Admiral Badger went before the Appropriations Committee of the House on the particular subject of having the limit of cost increased. These five cutters are to replace Coast Guard cutters which had been worn out or had been lost some time prior to the war, and estimates had been submitted to Congress to replace these vessels; and, as I have already stated, two were lost recently, which makes the need of these five all the more urgent.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of ordnance and gunnery: For leading ordnance men, ordnance men, ordnance helpers, and electricians, $16,776.80.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask some member of the committee what the idea is of bunching this appropriation, also increasing it from $11,560 and eliminating the salaries heretofore fixed by law for these officials?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that a part of the employees carried under the head of machinists, mechanics, and laboratorians were formerly statutory—the salary was fixed.

Mr. WALSH. In the next paragraph?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That falls under the same head, that is the same proposition, that part of those were carried as statutory and a part were employed on a per diem basis fixed by the wage adjustment boards. There was a constant trouble there between people doing exactly the same work, some having a statutory salary and some having their wages fixed by this board, and in order to hold all doing exactly the same work on the same basis we did away with the statutory salaries and put them all under the wage adjustment board's wage scale.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will permit, that language was adopted and passed by the House in the last bill in February.

Mr. WALSH. I know.

Mr. PADGETT. And the statement was made then, and it holds good now, that the statutory per annum employees were simply used as a lever to increase the bulk of the appropriation every year. For instance, in the bill which became a law on July 1, 1918, the House authorized increases in the regular statutory employees. As soon as the bill passed the House they had a meeting of the wage board, and they raised the per diem men again, and they went over to the Senate and got an increase in the same bill, and the conferees had to agree to it.

Mr. WALSH. But you are not saving any money by eliminating salaries; you increase this appropriation some $5,666?

Mr. PADGETT. That is an increase because of the increased number. The gentleman will remember that the next midshipmen will be 2,200 or 2,300 instead of 1,400 or 1,500, and that has necessitated the employment of many more men to discharge the duties, but I want to call the attention of the gentleman to this: The purpose of the committee in putting them all on the same basis was that if there should come a time of readjust-

ment, and there should be an effort then to reduce the per diem men, having served now as a lever to lift, will not be a clog to prevent reduction whenever it goes down.

Mr. WALSH. I do not agree with the gentleman there. I think if you have a number of the statutory men with their salaries fixed by law and there comes a period of readjustment, the men to drop are the per diem men, and if you want to reduce the salaries of the per diem men you are at liberty to do it, and if they will not work you do not need to employ them, but where salaries are fixed by law those men know what they are going to get. Now, you are permitting this lump sum to be paid to these men and they can vary the compensation from time to time.

Mr. PADGETT. It is like it is in all the yards. Wherever there is an industrial yard in any part of the country the law provides for the fixing of their compensation by wage boards, and the great bulk of those employees are under the operation of that law, so that the few statutory men who are constantly rising up hereafter will operate as a clog by adopting this policy, and the House upon a full explanation last February approved it without a dissenting vote.

Mr. MUDD. It was done simply to prevent discrimination between these different laborers.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. And they do identically the same work and receive precisely the same pay.

Mr. Chairman, last year, after much consideration, the committee decided to put all of these men under a lump sum. Endless confusion was caused by troubles arising from contests between the statutory and per diem men, who do the same work. Therefore to prevent discrimination and to do justice to all, we put them all on a per diem basis.

Mr. WALSH. I further reserve the point of order for the purpose of stating that I think this is a most unwise policy to pursue to lump these sums. I can see that it is confined in this bill to the Naval Academy, where, apparently, the Macy Board has a good deal to do with the employees, but I think it would be unwise to embark upon the policy at this time. I am aware of the fact, if the point of order is made now, the chairman will have to prepare an amendment to conform to the language of existing law, and I am going to ask him, if he has no objection, to pass this paragraph over temporarily, if he has not the amendment prepared. It is possible, if it is passed over, that I will withdraw the point of order after further consideration.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will just listen to me a minute. I do not know anything about this appropriation to the Naval Academy; and I have not paid any attention to it at all.

Mr. WALSH. It is very difficult, I will say.

Mr. BUTLER. It is difficult, when they ask for one wage one year and another wage another year. I am in favor of the Naval Academy. It is of high standing. But these things coming up year after year, they escape my mind. What would the gentleman have me do?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the information that has come to me, I will withdraw the reservation. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. That is the first time that ignorance ever won fairly. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I want to ask him if he has any information about this. I have received complaints from the citizens of Annapolis—although it is not in my district—that the members of the band of the Naval Academy are engaged in shoemaker work, and doing business in competition with the residents of that city.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; and they cut their own hair.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is there any way of stopping that?

Mr. BUTLER. What? Making shoes?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; in engaging in business in competition with the residents of Annapolis?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know anything at all about it. I understand these men repair shoes, are good shoemakers, and good bandsmen. Of course, they do not play in the band when they are mending shoes. They get some money from the Government.

Mr. MUDD. There are 75 members of the band——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We appropriate pay for these men who are engaged in other work.

Mr. MUDD. The band is composed of 75 members. From time to time and from day to day it is split into two or three parts in order to accommodate the midshipmen in their drills. The band has not any time to do more than one thing, and that is to play. The band has been recommended by the superintendent of the academy to receive an increase in thei pay upon the same basis as the military band at West Point is paid. They have not received this increase, but I think it should be granted. I mention that incidentally, if the gentleman from New York will permit, and wish to say that they do not do any work except to perform their duty as bandsmen.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not approve of this proposition of their going into the city of Annapolis and engaging in business in competition with citizens of that city?

Mr. MUDD. I do not believe in that, and I hardly think that statement is correct. It is my desire that the band be made a permanent institution, the personnel of which should not be changed from year to year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It has been practiced.

Mr. MUDD. The bandsmen have not time to practice it.

Mr. BUTLER. We want to pay this band. It is engaged there nearly all the time. The gentleman from Maryland says it is divided into three parts. I think the band should be paid enough by the Government to enable the members to live decently and not have to go into competition with other men.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It does not meet with your approval?

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that they are enlisted men and paid out of the pay of the Navy. They are not cared for out of any appropriation for the Navy.

Mr. MUDD. There is not anything in this bill to increase the salaries of the band, and I would like to introduce an amendment to that effect, in accordance with the recommendation of the superintendent of the academy.

Mr. BUTLER. Do not introduce it here. [Laughter.]

Mr. MUDD. It seems to me that they should receive the same pay as the members of the band at West Point, and I am not sure that I can accept the advice of the chairman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rent of buildings for the use of the academy, and commutation of rent for bandsmen, at $15 per month each, $13,500.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUDD: Page 53, after line 5, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Naval Academy Band: The Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader, with pay and allowances of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; 1 second leader, with a base pay of $81 per month; 45 musicians, first class, with a base pay of $51 per month; 27 musicians, second class, with a base pay of $44 per month; 1 drum major, with a base pay of $57.20 per month; and the said leader of the band, second leader of the band, drum major of the band, and the enlisted musicians of the band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are or may hereafter become applicable to other officers or enlisted men of the Navy."

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want to add to what I stated a few moments ago. I insist that the band under present conditions is even inadequate to supply the needs of the midshipmen; that it is necessary to split it up into two or three parts during their daily work, and they have never enjoyed the privileges and emoluments of the men at West Point. They have for years received inadequate pay and have sought relief. By this amendment they will simply receive the pay that is given to the members of the band at the Military Academy to which they are justly entitled. The increases in this amendment are taken from the almost identical language of the bill providing for the Military Academy last year, and I think, Mr. Chairman, the proposition is entirely reasonable.

I want to say, further, that this legislation has been recommended by the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, and there is no objection on the part of the Navy Department. Opposition against such legislation would be manifestly unfair, inasmuch as its defeat would result in a discrimination of a most serious character against men who perform the same duties.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better pass this amendment and vote on it. It provides the same pay as is given to the band at West Point.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I would yield, but I would like to have a vote on this amendment. I will move that the committee rise in a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to say a word on this amendment. I want to get this statement considered.

Mr. GARNER. You are liable to defeat the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I do not want to defeat it. We are granting an increase in salary with the distinct understanding that these men should not engage in private occupations outside?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. This band should be paid at the same rate as the band at the Military Academy at West Point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Naval Academy, exclusive of public works, $2,007,646.60.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WALSH, having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted for printing, under the rule, the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri reserves all points of order on the conference report.

ADJOURNMENT IN HONOR OF FLAG DAY.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move, in honor of the day, known as Flag Day, that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves, in honor of Flag Day, which we celebrate, that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2847) providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 43), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5810) providing for the payment of accrued pension to the estate of a deceased pensioner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5811) to increase the compensation of folding-machine and gathering-machine operators in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 5812) for the erection of a public building at Glendive, Mont., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) for the purchase of a post-office site at Harlowton, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 5814) to pension soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JUUL: A bill (H. R. 5815) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5816) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cripple Creek, Teller County, in the State of Colorado, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 5817) providing for an additional judge for the eastern district of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 5818) for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 5819) providing for the appointment of two additional judges in the northern district of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5820) providing for issuance of Army equipment to Boy Scout officials for use on the hikes and at the camps of said scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 5821) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lynch, Nebr., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 5822) for the construction and erection of a post-office building at Modesto, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 5823) to increase the compensation of pressmen in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri.: A bill (H. R. 5824) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5825) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Far Rockaway, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5826) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 5827) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of philosophical, scientific, and laboratory apparatus in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 5828) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules and regulations to govern the payment of insurance to persons standing in the same relation as parents to deceased soldiers, sailors, or marines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5829) to repeal section 907 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5830) to repeal section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5831) to provide for a site and public building at Lansdowne, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 5832) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Holdenville, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 5833) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Garfield, county of Pawnee, Kans., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 5834) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sapulpa, Creek County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5835) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shawnee, Pottawatomie County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5836) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Prague, Lincoln County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5837) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Weleetka, Okfuskee County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5838) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Drumright, Creek County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5839) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coalgate, Coal County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5840) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tecumseh, Pottawatomie County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5841) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chandler, Lincoln County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5842) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seminole, Seminole County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5843) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tishomingo, Johnston County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5844) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wewoka, Seminole County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5845) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ada, Pontotoc County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5846) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wetumka, Hughes County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5847) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holdenville, Hughes County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5848) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lehigh, Coal County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5849) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Okemah, Okfuskee County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5850) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bristow, Creek County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5851) granting preference in civil-service appointments to persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service, and to their widows and wives in certain cases; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Resolution (H. Res. 109) requesting the Clerk of the House of Representatives to address a communication to the insurance commissioner of each State in the Union, asking that he secure from every life insurance company in his State certain information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 110) requesting the State Department to report to the House of Representatives all the facts available relating to the reported detention in Cairo, Egypt, by British authorities of Dr. William T. Ellis, an American citizen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 114) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and report regarding insurance against unemployment, invalidity, and old age; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) providing for the printing as a House document of 6,000 additional copies of the reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission from January 1, 1917, to October 31, 1918, inclusive; to the Committee on Printing.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial advocating a national program of forestry to insure future timber supplies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts advocating the creation of a national food commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5852) granting an increase of pension to George F. Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5853) for the relief of David Housel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5854) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Donald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5855) granting an increase of pension to Catharine M. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5856) granting a pension to William F. W. Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5857) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5858) granting a pension to Alvin Studtmann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5859) for the relief of J. P. Littell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5860) to reinstate Fred H. Gallup to the rank of captain of Field Artillery in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 5861) for the relief of Sophia Moran; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5862) granting an increase of pension to Noah Ruhl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 5863) granting a pension to Henry A. Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 5864) granting an increase of pension to Elisha J. Melton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5865) granting a pension to George W. Gouge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5866) granting a pension to Caroline Pemberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5867) granting a pension to Hettie Quigley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 5868) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5869) granting a pension to Louis Becker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 5870) for the relief of the legal representative of Nathaniel F. Cheairs, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5871) granting an increase of pension to William H. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5872) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Christy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5873) granting an increase of pension to Roy R. Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5874) granting a pension to Tom S. Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 5875) granting a pension to Roberta R. Havelick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5876) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fetters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5877) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5878) granting an increase of pension to Levi L. Martz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5879) granting an increase of pension to Earl W. Soper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5880) granting an increase of pension to James M. Hundley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5881) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Juday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5882) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Hine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5883) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Hester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5884) granting an increase of pension to John F. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5885) granting an increase of pension to John G. Heck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5886) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5887) granting an increase of pension to John Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5888) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson O'Hara; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5889) granting an increase of pension to James H. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5890) granting an increase of pension to Girard C. Geisse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5891) granting a pension to Inger Nass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5892) granting a pension to Nellie L. Benton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5893) granting a pension to Anna Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5894) granting a pension to Thomas R. Tracy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5895) for the relief of John M. Green; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5896) for the relief of Michael Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5897) for the relief of Ellen McNamara; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5898) for the relief of Anna Kennedy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5899) for the relief of Kenneth S. Cook, storekeeper, second class, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5900) for the relief of Wilson Warford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 5901) granting a pension to Matilda H. Starbuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Barney Rogge Association, Union, N. J., against the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Mrs. Laura Morris, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union; J. M. Roberts, superintendent of Sunday school, Kirby, Pa., for enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of New York Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends; Chicago District Union, Young People's Alliance; General Conference of the Free Methodist Church, Greenville, Ill.; and Jersey City Epworth Union, urging against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Local Union No. 4, Journeymen Bookbinders Union, condemning anarchism as a menace to the country's peace and welfare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of Layland Grange, No. 1768, of Granville, Ohio, opposing the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Memorial of Moultonboro Grange, No. 197, Moultonboro, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Franklin Simons & Co. and members of the National Garment Retailers' Association of New York, against section 904 of the revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Board of Aldermen of city of New York, protesting against the removal of pneumatic tubes, etc., from Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of Methodist Church of Hampshire and Burlington, both in the State of Illinois, against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of Church of the Brethren, Rock Hill, Mo., as citizens of Missouri, for the retention of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of citizens of city of New York, requesting repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of quarterly conference Methodist Episcopal Church, at Mount Sterling; 52 members Men's Congregational Church, Third Lutheran Church, Calvary Lutheran Church, the First Congregational Church, and members and friends of Lagonda Avenue Congregational Church, all of Springfield; Friends Church and Trinity Church of Xenia; Methodist Episcopal Church of Waynesville; and the Society of Friends of Green Plain monthly meeting, Selma, all in the State of Ohio, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce for an appropriation of $1,500,000 for construction of a harbor at Great Lakes Naval Station; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of citizens of Vian, Okla., requesting repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of Men's Bible Class of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Roswell, protesting against the repeal of the war-prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of the churches of Ozark, Ark., as follows: Nazarene, Christian, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian, favoring the retention of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of D. G. Bean and others, of Plumberville, Ark., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition signed by eight physicians and druggists of Williamston, Mich., protesting against further restrictions in the use of alcohol for medicinal purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Bible Class of Asbury Delavan Methodist Episcopal Church, of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of congregation of Humboldt Parkway Methodist Episcopal Church, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition law and enactment of bone-dry enforcement measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Maple Avenue Methodist Church, of Stamford, Conn., in opposition to repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of Fred J. Green, of 2807 South Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y., requesting the repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Young People's Bible Societies of Marcellus, N. Y., favoring national prohibition and the enactment of the necessary laws for its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of North Onondaga Sunday School Association, of Onondaga County, N. Y., requesting Congress not only to retain war-time prohibition but to enact laws for its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of many residents of McGraw, Cortland County, N. Y., favoring the retention at least until January 16, 1920, of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local No. 558, relating to nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Broad Street Methodist Episcopal Church South, 400 members; Presbyterian Church, Citronelle; also mass meeting community sing; Baptist Tabernacle; St. Francis Street Methodist Church, 900 members; St. Stephens Road Methodist Episcopal Church, all of Mobile and all of the State of Alabama, against the repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: Petitions of W. J. James and others, Mount Hope; citizens of Browntown; citizens of Bell Center; 22 citizens of Patch Grove; 29 citizens of Ironton; 77 citizens of South Wayne; 94 citizens of Lancaster; 46 citizens of Boscobel; 14 citizens of Patch Grove; and 61 citizens of Livingston, all in the State of Wisconsin, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 12 citizens of Leadmine, 12 citizens of Lancaster, and 54 citizens of Mount Horeb and neighboring cities, all in the State of Wisconsin, asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Madison, Wis., representing 189 persons, for the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Merrill, Wis., protesting against the peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of a number of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of a number of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of a number of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., asking for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of several hundred citizens of New York and Brooklyn, urging repeal of tax on ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELL: Petition of sundry residents of the city of New York, asking for the immediate repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of State officers of southern California Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Los Angeles Federation of Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Pasadena Sunday School of Church of the Brethren, all in California, against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES: Resolutions of Baptist Church, Des Arc, Mo., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Petition of members and congregation of Methodist Episcopal Church, of Hamilton, Mont., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Scobey, Mont., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Havre, Mont., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Culbertson, Mont., against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted by the executive committee of the federated Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches of Bozeman, Mont., urging the retention of the war-time prohibition law until national prohibition goes into effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of certain residents of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Miss M. Anna Crandall, of Kendall, N. Y., and 16 other residents of that village, urging the passage of a law defining intoxicating liquors as liquors containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol and urging the passage of adequate enforcement legislation of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the congregation of Spencer Ripley Methodist Episcopal Church, of Rochester, N. Y., unanimously protesting against any bill to weaken the provisions of the war-prohibition law effective July 1, 1919; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 110 residents of Batavia, N. Y., urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of 338 residents of Albany, N. Y., asking for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Troy and Watervliet, N. Y., protesting against enforcement of eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Conifer, N. Y., urging the enforcement of war-time and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Heuvelton, N. Y., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Plattsburg, N. Y., urging the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of Methodist Episcopal Church in Burke and Coveytown, N. Y., urging the enforcement of the war-time and constitutional prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of residents of Nazareth, Pa., requesting the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Jellico Grocery Co., of Jellico, Tenn., for legislation to limit the great meat-packing concerns transportation basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters, Boston Branch; and Boston Branch of the International Union of Steam and Operating Engineers, on the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WARD: Petition signed by citizens of Central Bridge, Schoharie, Ashokan, Glenford, West Hurley, and Wallkill, all in the State of New York, urging enactment of legislation to define intoxicating liquors as liquors containing more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by citizens of Highland, Livingston, Gardiner, Jewett, and Hunter, N. Y., urging repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream, signed by residents of Chatham, Ghent, Hudson, Philmont, Coxsackie, Liberty, Monticello, and Kingston, all in the State of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by H. Lutsker and other citizens of Hudson, N. Y., urging passage of resolution by Congress condemning atrocities committed against the Jews of Poland and other Slavic countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Lovell Grange, No. 5, Washington, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 16, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, thou hast given to us our part to play in the great spiritual democracy that has come to us from the hands of our fathers, blest with precious memories, setting forth the ideals of Thy Word, founded upon eternal truth. We pray that we may perform nobly and well our part as patrons in the arts and sciences of peace, as heralds of good will among men, as the champions of justice and right and freedom for all mankind. Give us Thy spirit and incline our hearts to keep Thy laws. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Harding	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Harris	New	Smoot
Calder	Harrison	Newberry	Sterling
Capper	Henderson	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Nugent	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Trammell
Curtis	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Dillingham	Keyes	Phipps	Wadsworth
Edge	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Lenroot	Pomerene	Warren
Fernald	McKellar	Robinson	Watson
France	McLean	Sheppard	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Sherman	
Gronna	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	
Hale	Myers	Smith, Md.	

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] are detained on official business.

Mr. MCKELLAR. My colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], is detained on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America extending the right of suffrage to women, which will be placed on file.

The Chair also lays before the Senate a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Illinois ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America extending the right of suffrage to women, which will be placed on file.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5227. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2480. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and

H. R. 5312. An act to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the acting president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in convention at Denver, Colo., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, requesting that the American peace conferees give the same consideration to Ulster as a part of Ireland that they give to Ireland in the matter of independence on the ground of racial self-determination, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA. I send to the Secretary's desk the following petition, numerously signed by citizens of my State. I ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the petition was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

COOPERSTOWN, N. DAK., *June 1, 1919.*

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States and residents of the State of North Dakota, being opposed to the treaty of peace and the league of nations in its present form, respectfully petition your honor to use your influence and your vote against the ratification of said treaty and league, as we honestly believe that its terms are not in harmony with the principles for which we freely gave our boys and our dollars.

As we understand it, we fought this war to crush autocracy and establish democracy throughout the world; not to crush autocracy in one country and help to build it up and strengthen it in another.

We are opposed to the league of nations in its present form, believing it to be founded on vicious principles; that the so-called league of nations, which excludes almost half of the peoples of Europe from membership, is not a league, but an alliance, and that therefore America's signature to the treaty would encourage war, not lead to peace.

We further believe that we have been misrepresented at the peace conference by our President, who has bartered away the principles as set forth in his 14 points, as we fail to see any of said principles embodied in the terms of the treaty as it now stands.

T. T. FUGLESTAD
(And others).

Mr. CUMMINS. I present a petition signed by 125,323 citizens of Iowa, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. I understand that a recommendation of that kind will be made to the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Inasmuch, however, as the bill to which reference is made in these petitions has been referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I ask that these petitions, signed by citizens of every county in my State, shall be referred to that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator present them at the Secretary's desk? [Laughter.]

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask that some able-bodied servitor of the Senate carry them to the committee?

Mr. THOMAS. May I venture to suggest to the Senator that he read the petitions to the Senate, because they have all the physical proportions of a senatorial speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. CUMMINS. I might well delay the Senate by the reading of these very instructive requests. I forbear, however, simply for one reason, and that is I think the people have become so thoroughly convinced that the daylight-saving law ought to be repealed that it would be an unnecessary burden for me to lay before the Senate all these petitions. Otherwise I would be very glad to comply with the request of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. POMERENE. Judging from the correspondence I have had from some of the constituents in my State, there seems to be an irreconcilable conflict between the views in the industrial centers and in the rural centers. I hope the Senator from Iowa can advise me as to how I can reconcile those differences.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am afraid I could not well advise the Senator from Ohio upon that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN. I present resolutions of the San Francisco Labor Council, which I ask may be read.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas President Woodrow Wilson, in his message cabled to the Sixty-sixth Congress from Paris, France, emphasized the necessity of closer attention to the world movement, in which the changing of working conditions is so pronounced, and in which there is to be discerned a determination of the workers for improvement in their hours of labor, recompense for their toil, and more equal opportunity for enjoyment of social and industrial conditions; and

Whereas such transition will involve, in all probability, drastic economic changes whereby the social system of the past several centuries will undergo a change as radical as that which succeeded the feudal period; and

Whereas no factor in the world's affairs has contributed so much toward the desired change as have the public utterances and official acts of Woodrow Wilson in his capacity as President of the United States and his larger sphere of action as member of the world peace conference: Therefore be it

Resolved by the San Francisco Labor Council in regular meeting assembled this 23d day of May, 1919, That we tender to President Woodrow Wilson our warm appreciation for his just and humane efforts for the uplift of the human race; his stand on all momentous questions discussed by the peace conference exalts him as a benefactor of humanity and labor's most ardent champion in the world's great crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Wilson, United States Senators PHELAN and JOHNSON, and Representatives KAHN and NOLAN, that the resolution be spread upon the minutes, and copies be furnished to the press.

Adopted by unanimous vote of San Francisco Labor Council.

Attest:

[SEAL.] JNO. A. O'CONNELL,
Secretary.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Jacob Ries Bottling Works (Inc.), of Shakopee, Minn., praying for the repeal of the tax imposed upon containers and packages containing nonalcoholic beverages, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a telegram from the acting governor of the State of Washington, signed by the acting governor and also by the commissioner of public lands and other State officials, urging the passage of a law for the effective enforcement of war-time prohibition and the prohibition amendment.

I also have a resolution from the Central Labor Council of the City of Tacoma urging the same thing.

Also a letter in the form of a petition from representatives of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, urging the same thing.

I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Natchez, Miss., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty unless the treaty includes a provision for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Chouteau County, Mont., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Blaine County, Mont., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Saginaw, Holton, and Bannister, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1410, Patrons of Husbandry, of Skandia, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ironwood, Mich., praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Common Council of St. Ignace, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Topeka, Iola, Salina, McPherson, Bridgeport, Arkansas City, Moundridge, and Tyro; of the Woodson County (Kans.) Chapter of the American Red Cross; and of sundry citizens of Sumner County, all in the State of Kansas, and of sundry citizens of Bunceton, Mo., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Atchison, Emporia, and Pittsburg, and of sundry citizens of Ford County, all in the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cowley County, Kans., praying for Government ownership and control of railroad, telephone, and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 26, S. N. P. J., of Cumberland, Wyo., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. OVERMAN presented petitions of Local Union No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth their grievances with the War Department in connection with working conditions, etc., at Muscle Shoals, Ala., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Brewer, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mason City, Iowa, praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, remonstrating against the massacre of Jews in Poland and Roumania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Iowa Branch of the League to Enforce Peace, of Des Moines, Iowa, and a petition of sundry

citizens of Janesville, Iowa, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COLT presented a memorial of Court Libia No. 49, Foresters of America, State of Rhode Island, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Hope, R. I., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry Jewish citizens of the State of Rhode Island, remonstrating against the massacre of Jews in Poland and Roumania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Providence, R. I., and a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Pawtucket, R. I., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PHIPPS presented the memorial of Prof. Wilbur F. Steele, of the University of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GRONNA. I am directed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, to report it favorably with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 16) thereon. I give notice that upon the conclusion of the routine morning business I shall move the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota whether it is his purpose to call up the bill to-day at the conclusion of the morning business. I did not quite understand the Senator's statement.

Mr. GRONNA. I stated that it is my purpose upon the conclusion of the morning business to call up the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. To-day?

Mr. GRONNA. To-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 17) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

LOAN OF AIRCRAFT MATERIAL.

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) authorizing the loan of aircraft material to educational institutions, reported it without amendment.

COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 65, submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on the 4th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

MAJ. ELLIS B. MILLER.

Mr. KENYON. On June 11 I introduced the bill (S. 1661) for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller, and it was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I move that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

BREWING AND LIQUOR INTERESTS AND GERMAN PROPAGANDA, AND BOLSHEVIK PROPAGANDA.

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary I submit the report of the subcommittee to the full committee on the question of the investigation of the activities of the United States Brewers' Association and allied interests, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having under consideration the resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate to call for certain evidence and documents relating to charges made against the United States Brewers' Association and allied interests and to report the result of their investigation to the Senate, have concluded their duties.

The chairman appointed as a subcommittee to investigate the matters and things named in said resolution the following Senators: Overman (chairman), King, Wolcott, Nelson, and Sterling.

The resolution directing the committee to make this investigation is here printed in full, as follows:

Whereas Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer, Custodian of Alien Property, on or about September 14 made the following statement:

"The facts will soon appear which will conclusively show that 12 or 15 German brewers of America, in association with the United States Brewers' Association, furnished the money, amounting to several hundred thousand dollars, to buy a great newspaper in one of the chief cities of the Nation; and its publisher, without disclosing whose money had bought that organ of public opinion, in the very Capital of the Nation, in the shadow of the Capitol itself, has been fighting the battle of the liquor traffic.

"When the traffic, doomed though it is, undertakes and seeks by these secret methods to control party nominations, party machinery, whole political parties, and thereby control the government of State and Nation, it is time the people know the truth.

"The organized liquor traffic of the country is a vicious interest, because it has been unpatriotic, because it has been pro-German in its sympathies and its conduct. Around these great brewery organizations owned by rich men, almost all of them are of German birth and sympathy, at least before we entered the war, has grown up the societies, all the organizations of this country intended to keep young German immigrants from becoming real American citizens.

"It is around the sangerfests and sangerbunds and organizations of that kind, generally financed by the rich brewers, that the young Germans who come to America are taught to remember, first, the fatherland, and, second, America"; and

Whereas it has been publicly and repeatedly charged against the United States Brewers' Association and allied brewing companies and interests that there is in the Department of Justice and in the office of a certain United States district attorney evidence showing—

That the said United States Brewers' Association, brewing companies, and allied interests have in recent years made contributions to political campaigns on a great scale without precedent in the political history of the country and in violation of the laws of the land;

That, in order to control legislation in State and Nation, they have exacted pledges from candidates to office, including Congressmen and United States Senators, before election, such pledges being on file;

That, in order to influence public opinion to their ends, they have heavily subsidized the public press and stipulated when contracting for advertising space with the newspapers that a certain amount be editorial space, the literary material for the space being provided from the brewers' central office in New York;

That, in order to suppress expressions of opinion hostile to their trade and political interests, they have set in operation an extensive system of boycotting of American manufacturers, merchants, railroads, and other interests;

That, for the furthering of their political enterprises, they have erected a political organization to carry out their purposes;

That they were allied to powerful suborganizations, among them the German-American Alliance, whose charter was revoked by the unanimous vote of Congress; the National Association of Commerce and Labor; and the Manufacturers and Dealers' Associations, and that they have their ramifications in other organizations neutral in character;

That they have on file political surveys of States, counties, and districts tabulating the men and forces for and against them, and that they have paid large sums of money to citizens of the United States to advocate their cause and interests, including some in the Government employ;

That they have defrauded the Federal Government by applying to their political corruption funds money which should have gone to the Federal Treasury in taxes;

That they are attempting to build up in the country, through the control of such organizations as the United States societies and by the manipulation of the foreign-language press, a political influence which can be turned to one or the other party, thus controlling electoral results;

That they, or some of their organizations, have pleaded nolo contendre to charges filed against them and have paid fines aggregating large sums of money: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to call upon the Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer, Alien Property Custodian, and the Department of Justice and its United States district attorneys to produce the evidence and documents relating to the charges herein mentioned, and to subpœna any witnesses or documents relating thereto that it may find necessary, and to make a report of the result of such investigation and what is shown thereby to the Senate of the United States as promptly as possible.

The subcommittee began its investigation on September 27, 1918. At the request of the subcommittee the Secretary of War very kindly detailed from the Judge Advocate General's Department, United States Army, to aid the committee, Maj. E. Lowry Humes, formerly United States district attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, and from the Military Intelligence Division, United States Army, Capt. George B. Lester, an attorney of New York, and also the Attorney General very kindly detailed from the Department of Justice Mr. William R. Ben-

ham, all of whom rendered most valuable assistance to the committee in the collection of evidence, the production of testimony, the examination of witnesses, and in the preparation of reports.

BREWING AND LIQUOR ACTIVITIES.

The allegations and charges made in said resolution No. 307, hereinbefore set out, in regard to the brewing and liquor activities, were substantially sustained, as will appear from the printed record, volumes 1 and 2, herewith transmitted.

Your committee in entering upon the investigation directed by said resolution No. 307 interpreted that resolution as requiring an inquiry into two subjects, to wit:

1. The conduct and activities of the brewing and liquor interests political and otherwise was specifically demanded; and

2. A general inquiry into pro-German propaganda and activities was required. The testimony taken having been printed, a review thereof is deemed unnecessary. Complying, however, with the mandate of the resolution requiring a report of the results established by the investigation the following findings are herewith submitted for the information and attention of the Senate.

I.

With regard to the conduct and activities of the brewing and liquor interests, the committee is of the opinion that the record clearly establishes the following facts:

(a) That they have furnished large sums of money for the purpose of secretly controlling newspapers and periodicals.

(b) That they have undertaken to and have frequently succeeded in controlling primaries, elections, and political organizations.

(c) That they have contributed enormous sums of money to political campaigns in violation of the Federal statutes and the statutes of several of the States.

(d) That they have exacted pledges from candidates for public office prior to the election.

(e) That for the purpose of influencing public opinion they have attempted and partly succeeded in subsidizing the public press.

(f) That to suppress and coerce persons hostile to and to compel support for them they have resorted to an extensive system of boycotting unfriendly American manufacturing and mercantile concerns.

(g) That they have created their own political organization in many States and in smaller political units for the purpose of carrying into effect their own political will and have financed the same with large contributions and assessments.

(h) That with a view of using it for their own political purposes they contributed large sums of money to the German-American Alliance, many of the membership of which were disloyal and unpatriotic.

(i) That they organized clubs, leagues, and corporations of various kinds for the purpose of secretly carrying on their political activities without having their interest known to the public.

(j) That they improperly treated the funds expended for political purposes as a proper expenditure of their business and consequently failed to return the same for taxation under the revenue laws of the United States.

(k) That they undertook through a cunningly conceived plan of advertising and subsidation to control and dominate the foreign-language press of the United States.

(l) That they have subsidized authors of recognized standing in literary circles to write articles of their selection for many standard periodicals.

(m) That for many years a working agreement existed between the brewing and distilling interests of the country by the terms of which the brewing interests contributed two-thirds and the distilling interests one-third of the political expenditures made by the joint interests.

GERMAN PROPAGANDA.

Your committee has conducted a large number of hearings and there has been produced before your committee a large amount of information through the testimony of witnesses and the production of documents in which is shown in considerable detail the system of propaganda carried on in the United States by the German Government and its sympathizers after the beginning of the European war.

The purpose of this inquiry has been to make a public and permanent record of the important facts and surrounding conditions which have made possible the creation and maintenance of a system of violence, espionage, and distribution of propaganda literature by the German Government during the period of our neutrality, in order that the public might be informed and that proper legislation by the Congress of the United States may render impossible the creation and maintenance in the future of a similar system, whether conducted by the German Government and its sympathizers or by any other foreign power.

Without going into the detailed activities of the agents and representatives of Germany and those who were aiding and assisting them in their purpose, it is clear from the evidence that the following may be accepted as the established facts:

For many years prior to the outbreak of the European war the Central Powers, especially Germany, had contributed largely to the populating of the United States, and according to the United States census of 1910 there were resident in the United States 1,337,000 males who had been born in Germany, and after the United States entered into the war with Germany there were registered as German alien enemies, pursuant to the President's proclamation of November 16, 1917, 254,000 males of the age of 18 years and upward.

There were in addition a vast number of residents within the United States who were the immediate descendants of German parents, and it has been variously estimated that the so-called German-American population within the United States total upward of 10,000,000 persons, or approximately one-tenth of our population. Of this vast number it is in evidence that a considerable part maintained and designedly perpetuated the language, customs, and racial ideals of Germany, and through and by means of the introduction and maintenance of the German language in the common schools of the various States and in the parochial and religious schools, seminaries and colleges, in conducting religious services in their churches in the German language, in the wide dissemination of German literature through the German language press, and in the publication, both in Germany and in this country, of books and writings in the German language, this portion of our population has been educated along lines of German thought.

In addition, these Germans and German-Americans have maintained a system of social segregation through numerous local societies and organizations which come under the general head of vereins and verbunds, the object and purpose of which have been to preserve the language and customs of Germany and to bind together those of German lineage. Many of these various societies and associations are subsidiary to or a part of so-called staatsverbunds, which in turn became subsidiary to and part of the German-American Alliance, a national organization incorporated by act of Congress of the United States, the charter of which has, however, been revoked by act of Congress since the United States entered the war. This organization, with its 1,200 local vereins and verbunds, claimed to have at the time of the outbreak of the European war a membership of approximately 2,000,000 persons. The members of the alliance never concealed their main aim, which was to keep their own nationality separate from that of their fellow citizens in the United States, and by means of the dissemination of literature by the national alliance, as well as by the State alliances and the local societies, their objects were accomplished.

At the outbreak of the European war the German-American Alliance, through its auxiliary societies, became particularly active in its efforts to bring all citizens and residents of the United States of German extraction together and to work publicly and privately for the aims of Germany.

In the Official Bulletin the propaganda committee of the German-American Alliance, by Joseph Keller, chairman, makes the following declaration, which gives a fair idea of the attitude of these Germans and German-Americans toward the rest of the country (bulletin of January, 1916):

> The leaders and lecturers of the German-American National Alliance have, since the establishment of this organization, never failed to emphasize the fact that the greatness, the strength, and the influence of Germanism in this country lies in appreciation of itself, in the recognition of an inviolable union of ideals which knows no limits, but only progress and upward aspiration, a union whose activity lies in the United States, protecting German style and manner and strengthening them.
>
> That the hyphenated American, as the German-American is now scornfully called, must run the gauntlet of the pro-British English press and the Anglicized Americans is largely to be ascribed to the fact that the concentration of the strength of the entire Germanism, or, rather, of the descendants of the great German race in this land, for which such efforts were made, especially during the years just preceding the outbreak of the Great War, had not yet been realized, inasmuch as in certain circles, especially in German church circles, there was to a certain extent a hesitation at forming a union of forces with the national alliance.
>
> Let us in this critical epoch for us German-Americans remember the words of Prof. T. Lindsey Playner, of the Central University, Kentucky, who said in his time: "Here in the New World, which possesses so much good and so much for the blessing of humanity, we believe that we are in no wise untrue to our fatherland if we, in contemplation of all that you have conferred on us, our spiritual mother, cry 'Hail Germania.'"
>
> As guiding principle and source of teaching courage and hope, we may quote the words of the German pastor, Otto Wappler, of Monona, Iowa, who speaks in the name of his synod: "As German pastors we should no longer look as silent spectators on the conflict of political

truth and social righteousness, but enter the arena in full sight of friend and foe, and with the talents which we possess serve in conflict the bold champions of the German cause as well as we are able. Too long already have we, German pastors, at any rate most of us, Lutheran pastors, lain inactively in well-protected trenches as little more than passive spectators of the conflict. But, praise God, we are finally shaken from our indolence and have determined to take our stand in the open and take an active part in the struggle for truth and righteousness before the forum of the public. Heretofore our efforts at reform were confined to the tranquillity of the church and the limited circle of the congregation. But from now on we propose to help in shedding the rays of German truthfulness, German honor, and German loyalty among the masses as far as we are able."

The propaganda committee of the German-American Alliance urges therefore at the beginning of the new year that all German-Americans, forgetting all separate interests, build, operate, and exercise their creative ability on the rock of true, inviolable union, on which all German life rests, on which all the higher ideals of the Germans can securely rest. This is the rock on which, unfortunately, the German-American National Alliance was established too late, although the latter can look back upon many fine achievements in the German-American struggle for the promotion of its peculiar culture and may be regarded in this storm-swept period as a veritable Gibraltar standing out against all vulgar, malicious insult and ridicule of the German name and against the unjust persecution of the German race and its offspring in this land provoked by British gold.

In addition to the German-American Alliance, with its extensive ramifications, there existed in the United States for many years various secret and semisecret organizations, more or less local in their character, that were devoted to the same general object, namely, that of preserving the language, customs, and ideals of Germany. Among these may be noted the Schlarrafia, a secret organization which had its inception in Germany many generations ago and which has been transplanted to this country. While it is largely a social secret organization, one of its principal objects is the maintenance of the respect for the Prussian military ideals and loyal adherence to Germany.

Another organization is the Sons of Herman, a secret organization similar to the Masonic fraternity. This organization has lodges in various parts of the United States. Its membership is almost exclusively made up of men of German birth or parentage.

Another organization is known as the Kriegesbund, a society of German Army veterans. The only men eligible to the society are men who have served in the German Army.

It is in evidence through documents produced by Prof. von Mach that in 1916 an offer was made by Dr. von Mach to the Secretary of War of the United States to list and send to the Secretary of War the names and addresses of upward of about 400,000 men of German birth resident within the United States who had served at one time or another in the German Army. The plan was conceived by Herman Ridder, the publisher of the Staats Zeitung, the leading New York German language daily paper, who undertook, as stated in his letter to Von Mach, to make this census, compile lists, and forward them to the Secretary of War. Mr. Garrison, then Secretary of War, declined the offer on the ground that the War Department could not accept the service.

It is in evidence before the committee that certain branches of the Lutheran Church were particularly active in defending the German cause during our period of neutrality, not only by means of religious teachings, but by work through the secular societies, especially the subsidiary organizations of the German-American Alliance.

Prior to the outbreak of the European war the Hamburg-American Steamship Co. and North German Lloyd, and the Atlas Line, a subsidiary of the Hamburg-American Line, handled a large part of the carrying trade between the United States and European countries. The Hamburg-American Line maintained a large commercial organization in the United States with offices in most of the principal cities of the country. Many of the agents and representatives were German citizens temporarily resident in the United States. This whole organization is semi-official in that all of these lines were under subsidy of the German Government and subject to its control and use if required.

At the outbreak of the European war the German Government had in the United States a very strong and well-trained diplomatic corps. The German Embassy in Washington was the headquarters of the German diplomatic system and the center of its directing influence. This system included the German consuls and consular agents who had headquarters and who were stationed at various of the larger cities in the United States. The commercial field in many industries was dominated by Germans or those of German extraction and sympathy. These included many of our largest banking institutions and many of the large export houses. The chemical and textile industries at many of the large centers were owned outright or dominated by Germans, many of whom were resident in Germany. The brewing interests of the country were largely owned and controlled by citizens of German extraction.

There had been built up in the United States a German language press with ramifications in practically every part of the country, which German language press was represented by large dailies in the principal cities of the United States. This German language press was supplemented by a vast number of periodicals and magazines printed in the German language and widely distributed, the official newspaper directories showing that upward of 1,100 German language publications were in existence in the United States at the outbreak of the European war.

With this situation before them the Imperial German Government had some reason to feel confident in August, 1914, that there was a powerful German influence in America, and if taken in hand and organized and properly directed by skilled agents of the German Government, the American Government's policies could be molded to suit the interest of Germany. To this end the German Government inaugurated within the United States a propaganda system, the main objects of which were—

First. To prevent the shipment of munitions of war and supplies of various kinds to the allied Governments who were at war with Germany, by peaceful or other means; and

Second. To keep the United States on a peace footing and at all hazards prevent the United States from entering into the European war as an ally of France and England.

Third. To maintain its solidarity of the German and Austrian elements of our population and to retard their assimilation.

Almost immediately after the outbreak of the European war the German Government sent to the United States Dr. Heinrich Albert, a privy councilor of the German ministry of the interior, as a special commercial agent to have charge of the financial affairs and general direction of the German propaganda in the United States.

Dr. Albert arrived in August, 1914, and at about the same time Dr. Dernberg, who was secretary of state for the colonies in Germany, Dr. Isaac Straus, Meyer Gehardt, and Capt. Hecker arrived, all of the above being members of a so-called German commission, the ostensible object of which was to purchase supplies of various kinds for transshipment to Germany, including munitions of war. This group brought with them $150,000,000 in German treasury notes, with the expectation that these would find a ready sale in the United States. As a matter of fact, only $5,000,000 of these notes were actually used, and these were used for the purpose of collateral in raising money.

Later on other financial arrangements were made by the German representatives in this country by means of the sale of German bonds and other Government securities and the transfer of credits, and the evidence shows that at least $35,000,000 was raised and expended by the German Government in the United States for various purposes during the period from August, 1914, to February, 1917.

Upon the arrival of Dr. Albert and Dr. Dernberg and their group there was an immediate organization of the German representatives, including the embassy forces, and the work of the various departments was laid out along the following lines:

Dr. Albert established headquarters in the offices of the Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York City, took over one Carl Heynen, agent of the Hamburg-American Line at Tampico, Mexico, as his main assistant, established financial connections with a number of important private banking houses and trust companies, and, with Count von Bernstorff, the German ambassador, proceeded to get in touch with important and influential people and concerns in the United States who were considered favorable to the German cause. American agents and representatives were employed to negotiate the purchase of ships, grain, cotton, rubber, and supplies of every nature and description ostensibly for shipment to Germany.

Under Albert's and Von Bernstorff's direction Capt. Hans Tauscher, representative of the Krupps in Germany, with the assistance of certain Americans, inaugurated the Bridgeport Projectile Co., which was financed by the German Government. This company built and partially equipped a large munition plant at Bridgeport, Conn., at an expense of upward of $3,500,000. The ostensible purpose was to manufacture shells and other ammunition, which later on could be shipped to Germany. The real purpose was to deplete the country, for a period, of machinery and mechanical devices and to concentrate labor, and by the manipulation of wages to cause disturbance in other munition factories, and to buy up and control—temporarily, at least—the available supply of powder. This enterprise started in the summer of 1915; the plant was built, a large quantity of powder was bought and held for a while, and certain labor disturbances were brought about in American munition factories located at Bridgeport, Conn., during the summer of 1915. Carl Heynen was treasurer of the Bridgeport Projectile Co. and, with Tauscher, directed its operations.

In connection with the work of Dr. Albert, Count von Bernstorff, the German ambassador, detailed Capt. Carl Boy-Ed, the naval attaché of the German Embassy in Washington, and Capt. Franz von Papen, the military attaché of the embassy, for special work, the purpose of which was to prevent the shipment of munitions and supplies to the Allies. Boy-Ed, as the naval attaché, used the organization of the Hamburg-American Line, especially Paul Koenig, head of the investigating bureau of this line, and his assistants to obtain information concerning the shipment of munitions and supplies, and to purchase or acquire by option to purchase various articles, such as rubber and copper, and it is in evidence that Boy-Ed employed certain American agents to endeavor to purchase large numbers of combustion engines and small boats.

In the early period of Boy-Ed's activities a certain group of German aliens and others were indicted by the Federal authorities for violating the neutrality of the United States by delivering supplies to German ships at sea.

Shortly thereafter an effort was made to prove that the British had violated the neutrality of the United States by similar practices. One witness before the committee, who admitted that he was an agent of the German Government and in the pay of Boy-Ed, claimed that he had undertaken to and had obtained the evidence showing that various affidavits and statements made by certain tugboat captains and others that supplies had been sent to British ships were untrue. Whether or not he did this at the instance of Boy-Ed does not appear.

In April, 1915, the German Government sent to the United States one Franz Rintelen, who undertook active work to prevent the shipment of munitions from the United States to the Allies.

Boy-Ed was suspected of complicity in various acts of violence perpetrated by Franz Rintelen, and his activities were so pronounced that it was requested by the United States Government that he be returned to Germany, and he was relieved as the naval attaché of the German Embassy on the 4th day of December, 1915, and subsequently returned to Germany.

Immediately upon Rintelen's arrival in the United States he was put in touch with David Lamar, "the notorious wolf of Wall Street," and a plot was conceived to stop the production of munitions by organizing labor employed in munition factories, and an organization was formed known as Labor's National Peace Council. Prominent Americans, including one United States Congressman, were enlisted in the movement. Meetings were held in various of the large cities of the United States, and resolutions were adopted recommending that the manufacture, sale, and shipment of munitions to the belligerent powers, as well as all materials used in the production of the same, be prohibited by Executive proclamation.

A convention was held in the latter part of July, 1915, in the city of Washington, at which were present some 200 delegates from various parts of the United States, and determined effort was made to induce the President and Congress to declare an embargo upon the manufacture and sale of munitions to the Allies. This scheme was financed by the German Government, approximately $500,000 being turned over to Lamar. The organization was broken up and never accomplished anything of consequence for the German Government. The failure was in a great measure due to the action of Mr. Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, who refused to give the movement any support. The leaders in the movement were all indicted by the Federal authorities for violation of the Sherman law in conspiring to instigate strikes in munition plants. Rintelen, Lamar, and one Martin were convicted and sentenced each to one year in jail.

Rintelen was engaged in attempting to further hinder the shipment of munitions by the placing of fire bombs on ships, in which work he was assisted by Dr. Walter Theodore Scheele, a German agent, who had resided in the United States since 1909. Scheele was an expert chemist and has a complete knowledge of explosives, and prior to 1915 had operated a drug store in the city of Brooklyn.

In 1915 Scheele started a business in Hoboken, N. J., under the name of the New Jersey Agricultural Chemical Co., which was a cover up for the manufacture of bombs, which were placed by employees of the North German Lloyd Line on various ships. Scheele and Rintelen were assisted in this work by Capt. Otto Wolpert, pier superintendent of the Atlas Line, who had the immediate charge of distributing and planting the fire bombs. Rintelen, Scheele, and Capt. Wolpert and a number of others were all indicted by the Federal authorities and convicted. Associated with Rintelen was a man by the name of Steinberg, who is said to have come from Germany with tetanus germs to be used for poisoning horses which were being shipped to the Allies.

Paul Koenig, who was the head of the Hamburg-American Line secret investigators, entered the employ of the German Government very shortly after the war began and served as head of the German secret service in New York City, working for Dr. Albert, Boy-Ed, Count von Papen, and the German consul and Austro-Hungarian consul. Koenig maintained a great force of men.

Von Papen and Hans Tauscher, the Krupp agent, undertook a plan to blow up the Welland Canal in order to prevent shipment of grain from the Northwest to the Allies by way of the Great Lakes. A German agent who went under the name of Von der Goltz had immediate charge of the plot. Von der Goltz and his immediate associates, as well as Tauscher, were indicted by the Federal grand jury. Von der Goltz made a confession to the effect that he was sent by Capt. von Papen, Von Igle, Von Papen's assistant, and others with dynamite to blow up the Welland Canal. They found the canal guarded and abandoned the enterprise. Von der Goltz was used as a Government witness. Von Papen was a diplomatic agent and was immune from prosecution, and Tauscher was acquitted. All others involved in the plot were convicted.

Von Papen was also responsible for an attempt to blow up the Vanceboro Bridge, using for this purpose a man by the name of Werner Horn, to whom he supplied money and arranged for a supply of dynamite, which was carried from New York City by Horn to Boston and from Boston to Vanceboro, Me., which attempt was only partially successful.

Von Papen was responsible and directing head of practically all of the violence work done by the German agents in the United States, and it was through his agents and under his direction that numerous fires and explosions in munition factories were brought about and attempts at labor disturbances.

In a communication sent from the Central Purchase Co. (Ltd.) to the Prussian ministry of war under date of October 3, 1917 (see the record, p. 1930), Dr. Albert's statement of account of his dealings with Von Papen is set forth, in which he takes credit for payments amounting to $280,000 as money being turned over to Von Papen while in America.

From a copy of a letter sent by Boy-Ed to Von Papen on the 3d of March, 1917, which letter is written by his excellency Von Igle Schwerin, the following is quoted:

> Herr von Papen's career closed with quite a disaster. He was charged with being concerned in many explosions in munition factories, in so far that he had given the money for the procuring of materials and instructed the people. It appears, too, that some really childish arrangements were made, which everyone capable of forming an opinion could have seen beforehand could not have the slightest use for us, whereas if the affair went askew a great injury must result. For example, the destruction of the Welland Canal, as well as the attempt to destroy a railway bridge in Canada. Even if both these had been successful, there were a lot of other ways for transporting the corn to the seaports, and the bridge, too, could only have upset the traffic for a few hours. Both attempts ended in absolute fiasco. The people who were involved in the affair will meet with a sentence, and one, of the name of Horn, had become a cripple and will have to spend a year locked up in prison. All that could have been forgiven, since failures in such things can not always be avoided; also much has been performed by Herr von Papen advantageous to us.

It is clear that plans were made by the German Government for extensive and far-reaching acts of violence, much of which was frustrated by the activities of State and Federal officials and lack of cooperation by trusted German agents.

Capt. Tunney's testimony gives a fair account of the violent work of the Germans in and about the city of New York, which can be taken as a fair example of attempts in different parts of the country.

The German Government, no doubt, counted largely upon the fact that in the various munition and other manufacturing plants in the United States there were employed a large number of German and Austrian subjects, whose sympathies would be for Germany, and who would act in accordance with the wishes of the German Government, even to the point of destructive methods.

In conjunction with the activities of the German Government, through its representatives, Von Bernstorff and Von Papen, to prevent the production and shipment of munitions during the year 1915, there was inaugurated by direction of Ambassador Dumba, the Austro-Hungarian minister to the United States, and Count von Bernstorff what was known as the Liebau Labor Relief Bureau, which was an employment agency or bureau run by one Hans Liebau and organized and maintained for the purpose of taking Austro-Hungarians and Germans out of munition and other factories. This bureau had its headquarters in the city of New York and branches in Philadelphia, Pa., Bridgeport, Conn., Chicago, Ill., Pittsburgh, Pa., and Cleveland, Ohio.

In a communication from the German Embassy to the foreign office in Berlin, under date of March 24, 1916, a review of the

activities of the bureau is given, and the necessity of a continuance of the bureau is made evident. This report says, in part:

I take the liberty to refer to the communication of the imperial and royal Austro-Hungarian chargé d'affaires, dated March 4, concerning the Liebau bureau, copy of which was sent here. I see from that communication that nothing is known to the imperial and royal chargé d'affaires relative to the arrangements of the imperial and royal Ambassador Dumba, which included a subsidy of the aforesaid bureau for a lengthy period.

My inquiries have disclosed that in the course of a conference with Capt. von Papen, Messrs. Rittmeister Hecker, Dr. von Kleinwaechter, and Consul Otto, the Attaché Prince Hohenlohe, as representative of the imperial and royal ambassador advised that the Imperial and Royal Government, as well as the German Government, would support the undertaking. On the strength of that announcement the activities of the bureau were also extended to subjects of the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

This communication then goes on to state that the bureau after being in operation for six and one-half months had received over 8,000 applications, and had filled 4,466 positions permanently, one-third of whom were Austro-Hungarian subjects.

The report then continues:

Patriotic sentiment and allegiance for the fatherland among the workmen has undoubtedly been awakened through the activity of this employment agency. Repeatedly people have visited the central and branch offices in order to express their thanks for the assistance furnished them. However, I will not go into the question now as to whether or not the continuation of the bureau after the war appears desirable.

At any rate, for the period of the war the continuation of this institution is desirable and will be maintained for military reasons by the German Government, even if the Imperial and Royal Government should withdraw its support from the bureau. Many disturbances and vacancies suffered by the war-material concerns, which could not always be removed quickly, but, on the contrary, often resulted in long-drawn strikes, can be traced back to the energetic propaganda of the workmen's relief.

This bureau was financed jointly by Germany and Austria and continued up to about the time when the United States entered the war. Germany paid two-thirds of the expenses and Austria one-third, and there is evidence that Germany's foreign office authorized a charge to be made by the embassy of $25,000 toward supporting the Liebau Bureau, or the workmen's relief, as it was sometimes called.

Mr. Bielaski has testified that there were, approximately, a million German and Austrian reservists in the United States, and that the agencies of the Department of Justice, supplemented by various other governmental investigating bureaus, and the local police officials of the various cities and towns of the United States aggregated, approximately, 700,000 men. With such a force, and the protection it afforded, a wholesale destruction of property would be almost impossible.

There is in addition one very potent factor which militated against the plans of the German agents—that is the high wages paid to the employees in munition factories, and the natural aversion which the average man has for destruction or damage to the plant in which he is working and from which he is deriving his living. The fact remains, however, and is clearly established that well-defined plans were made to prevent the manufacture and shipment of munitions and supplies by destructive and violent methods, which were only partially successful and covered only a short period of time.

Shortly after the arrival of Dr. Albert and Dr. Dernberg in the United States in August, 1914, there was established under their direction an organization for the dissemination of German propaganda through newspapers and the public press. This organization was known as the German information service and has been referred to as the German information bureau. It had its headquarters at 1123 Broadway, New York City, and was in the immediate charge of Dr. Carl A. Fuehr, together with a corps of translators, writers, and assistants, who conducted the operations of the bureau from the fall of 1914 down to about the 1st of February, 1917.

Dr. Bernard Dernberg was sent by the German Government to the United States ostensibly as a private citizen, but in reality to have general supervision of the publicity propaganda in the United States.

Dr. Carl A. Fuehr was the former commercial attaché of the German Embassy in Tokyo, Japan, and came from Japan to New York shortly after the outbreak of the European war.

The bureau employed Mathew B. Claussen, who had been publicity agent of the Hamburg-American Line, as the ostensible manager of the bureau under Dr. Fuehr, and in the early stages of the bureau's operation publicity was given to the fact that the bureau was "conducted by M. B. Claussen," at the request of a number of American citizens who believed that the public desired to be informed as to both sides of the war that it may form its own opinions from the facts. That, of course, was done to deceive the public, because the bureau was organized, financed, and directed by the official representatives of Germany.

The main functions of the bureau were to prepare daily what was known as an information sheet, which contained articles on the war strongly favoring Germany and giving information which tended to uphold the German cause. These sheets were sent gratis to newspapers all over the United States, from five to eight hundred newspapers being supplied with this service. In addition the bureau printed and distributed a large quantity of pamphlets, books, and leaflets, and in this connection worked in close conjunction with George Sylvester Vierick, editor of a weekly paper called the Fatherland, which was strongly pro-German and which had a wide circulation among Germans and German-Americans in the United States.

Dr. Dernberg's work was largely supervisory, so far as the bureau was concerned, he devoting a great deal of his time and energies to delivering lectures in different parts of the country and in getting in contact with men of prominence in literary and educational circles and enlisting the efforts of newspaper representatives to give a favorable comment on the German cause.

Dr. Dernberg and Dr. Albert undertook to negotiate the purchase of a great daily newspaper in the city of New York, and through agents and representatives made plans for the acquisition of some of the prominent newspapers, resulting finally in the purchase of the New York Evening Mail and the placing of Dr. Edward A. Rumley in charge as managing editor.

Dr. Dernberg's work as a propagandist in the United States came to a termination as a result of a speech which he made immediately following the sinking of the *Lusitania*, in which speech he justified the action of the German Government.

Dernberg was never credited as a diplomatic representative to the United States by the German Government, and he returned to Germany in June, 1915.

In December, 1914, the bureau engaged the services of Dr. William Bayard Hale to take charge of the publication of the daily information sheet. Dr. Hale was well known as an author and writer. Hale continued as head of the German information bureau from December, 1914, to December, 1915, receiving a salary of $15,000 a year.

In addition to Dr. Hale and Vierick, Dr. Fuehr had the cooperation and assistance of Dr. Isaac Straus, who had charge of the Jewish propaganda, and Dr. Hecker, who had been sent from Germany to take charge of the German Red Cross. He was also assisted by Meyer, one of the directors of the Hamburg-American Line, and Privy Councilor Dr. Meyer Gehardt, who accompanied Dr. Albert from Germany. In addition there was Dr. Carl Mechlenberg and a group of translators and readers, who assisted in compiling the material for publication.

The scheme of propaganda was to write up each day a series of articles strongly pro-German in their character, which articles were compiled from the daily press, from German newspapers, German magazines, German books, and American books.

For the purposes of the bureau there were transported to them from Germany quantities of German literature, consisting of books, magazines, illustrated periodicals of various kinds, scientific publications, books on the war, and war articles. From these were built up the articles which appeared in the news sheets and in the various books and pamphlets distributed directly by the bureau or through the numerous organizations which were created for propaganda purposes.

The evidence shows that in Dr. Fuehr's files there were records of 3,906 different topics, out of which Fuehr had made use of 1,430 items, by either giving them to the newspapers through the German information sheets or otherwise.

In addition to the German information news service, the bureau maintained what was known as the Irish press and news service. This was maintained in separate offices at 42 West Forty-second Street, New York City, but was under the control of Dr. Fuehr and his agents. The active manager of the Irish press and news service for the Germans was one James K. Maguire, who, with his corps of assistants, sent out news-service bulletins two or three times a week to 18 or 20 newspapers in many of which he personally was interested and also to various daily newspapers. Copies of all propaganda material supplied by the Irish press and news service was sent to Dr. Fuehr.

Throughout the German propaganda work in the United States use was made by the Germans of the disaffection of the Irish toward England and common cause was made by the adroit German agents with the Irish-Americans, and throughout the various associations and societies inaugurated by German propaganda will be found the Irish-American element strongly affiliated, as in the early stages the German agents convinced numerous people prominent in the Irish-American groups in the United States of the justness of the German cause and the advantage of a close alliance of Germany and the Irish sympathizers as against England.

Dr. Albert's part in the propaganda work of the German representatives was to attend conferences with Dr. Fuehr, Dr. Hale, and others, advise on the general plan of propaganda, and to himself deliver talks and lectures in clubs and in more or less exclusive circles of literary men and educators.

Part of the system was to enlist the aid and assistance of professors in American colleges as writers in favor of Germany, so that their personal influence and influence of their reports could be used to the advantage of the German cause.

There is in the record a list of men prominent as professors and teachers in various of the American universities whose services were enlisted in the cause of Germany and who wrote and lectured in favor of the German cause. Many of their writings were published in Vierick's Fatherland, in the first instance, and then widely distributed in pamphlet form.

A list of a number of the books distributed by the Fuehr bureau will be found on pages 1410 and 1415 of the record.

The Jewish propaganda, as stated, was conducted by Dr. Straus, who was sent here by Dr. Dernberg and Dr. Albert from Germany especially for the purpose.

It appears to have been the idea of the German Government that inasmuch as Russia was fighting against Germany, the Jews would naturally affiliate with Germany, Russia having oppressed them for many years.

Dr. Straus devoted himself to that work. Dr. Straus was assisted by a translator by the name of L. S. Malamede, who was sent from Germany for the purpose.

In a letter written by Dr. Straus to Dr. Albert, under date of October 20, 1914, the following is quoted:

The manipulation of the Jewish press in America, formerly casual, has now been changed by me into a regular systematic information service and organized on a firm basis. This was extremely necessary considering the peculiar nature of the Jewish press and the difficult conditions in other countries where Jews have not full citizenship. The confirmation of this opinion is furnished by the following article from Die Warheit, of which I spoke to you recently.

You see that the pro-German attitude of the Jew here has put the Times into a tremendous rage. The bureau began business yesterday, and I spend several hours there daily. Dr. Malamede works according to my instructions and under my supervision.

In another communication sent by Dr. Malamede about the same time is a report on his work in the Jewish press, showing the distribution of various pro-German articles in different Jewish publications in various parts of the United States.

The report shows that from the period of June 14, 1915, down to January 4, 1916, Dr. Straus received approximately $28,000 from the German Government, presumably for a small part of the Jewish propaganda, for other records show that Straus received from Dr. Albert's office between four and five million dollars.

In further connection with the expenses of the German propaganda the following should be noted: That the German Government had spent up to June 21, 1915, on press propaganda in the United States the sum of $786,000 and in addition to the sum of about $1,700,000 expended in the purchase of the Evening Mail and its manipulation. In addition to the money spent in New York, the German consuls throughout the country were furnished various sums by Von Bernstorff for different purposes, and the aggregate amount expended by the German Government for the purpose above stated is believed by your committee to be greatly in excess of the amounts disclosed by the evidence. A press bureau was maintained at San Francisco by the German consulate, and the evidence shows that large quantities of propaganda literature were sent by the Fuehr Bureau into Mexico.

As part of the information service there was operated and maintained what was known as the Trans-Ocean News Service, which was operated under the direction of Dr. Fuehr and his assistants, which was a wireless news service from New York to Berlin by way of Sayville, Long Island, and the Nauen wireless station in Germany. By means of this service the German agents operating under the direction of Dr. Albert and Dr. Fuehr were kept in direct communication with Berlin at all times and news information covering every conceivable phase of American activities was collected, classified, and forwarded to Berlin, and it was by means of the wireless service that a great deal of the current information concerning war happenings that went to make up the German information sheet was received.

At the commencement of the European war there were wireless plants located at Sayville, Long Island, and Tuckerton, N. J., owned and controlled by German interests, capable of receiving and transmitting messages to and from Berlin. Through this means of communication material received from Germany was forwarded to various centers for distribution in Central and South America and the West Indies by cable. The expenses of the New York bureau conducted by Mr. Fuehr for such cable service amounted to many thousands of dollars a month.

A letter from the German propagandist agent at Corumba, Brazil, dated May 27, 1916, which was intercepted by the British secret service, reads, in part, as follows:

It would be very fitting if immediately after the war a commission of wireless telegraphy was sent to all the States of South America to obtain concessions from the different Governments for the establishment of wireless stations and to start constructing the same immediately. The Sayville-Tuckerton station has been invaluable and without it South America would have been in the hands of the Anglo-French news service. The establishment of wireless is certainly cheaper than cable and impresses Creole governments about its simplicity and modernity.

All of the propaganda work in the United States, Mexico, and South America was conducted under the immediate direction of the German foreign office at Berlin by the central section for foreign news service, or Zentralstelle für Auslandsdienst. This section of the foreign office was under the immediate direction of Dr. Thiel, and was the bureau to which Dr. Fuehr reported. It was charged with the preparation of news matter, films, books, etc., for war propaganda in foreign countries and was the principal source from which foreign newspaper correspondents in Berlin obtain material for their dispatches.

One of the principal and most important means of disseminating German propaganda was through the medium of moving pictures, and early in the year of 1915 the German Government organized in the United States a film corporation known as the American Correspondence Film Co., with headquarters in the city of New York, for the purpose of receiving from Germany moving-picture films of various war scenes and civil life in Germany for dissemination through the moving-picture houses in the United States.

In a letter of Zimmermann, secretary of foreign affairs of the German Government, dated March 1, 1915, addressed to Count Von Bernstorff, directions are given for the carrying on of this type of propaganda. The letter states, in part, as follows:

I beg to advise your excellency that five copies of a film 1,200 meters long will shortly go to the German Bureau of Information in New York.

As propaganda through pictures has shown itself to be remarkably effective in neutral foreign countries, it seems expedient to place this work of publication on a greater basis than heretofore.

* * * * * *

In consideration of the fact that the sending of larger packages to the United States at this time encounters insuperable difficulty, the establishment and extension of a central place in New York, organized on a large scale, seems imperatively necessary. In this case particularly sharp proofs of all photographs and films received here should be sent in two exemplifications in letter form by different routes to the central point in New York. The latter could then, by calling on experts and persons well informed of conditions there—

1. Have produced from the original photographs there on the spot duplicates, enlargements, stereotype plates, illustrated writing and compositions, stereopticon pictures, etc.

2. Undertake the exhibition of this entire picture and films in the whole country through agencies to be established in all the larger cities.

In a report of Dr. Fuehr to Dr. Albert under date of April 20, 1915, the former states:

As I had the honor to explain briefly at the session of the press bureau on the 12th of this month, it seems settled that an especial registered company will be formed to obtain good war films in Germany adapted to propaganda in this country and to circulate the same in the United States.

* * * * * * *

According to the wireless received here yesterday, the plan mentioned has been officially approved in Berlin.

The company, whose incorporation under the firm name "American Correspondence Film Co." has been accomplished to-day under the proper authorities, is in need of a capital of nominally $10,000, divided into 1,000 shares of $10 per share.

The interest of the Imperial Government in this undertaking consists in the facts that the company should not work for the greatest possible financial profit from the disposal of the war films, but lay chief emphasis on the greatest possible circulation of them in the most respectable film theaters of the land.

The company was incorporated with a nominal capital of $10,000, which was shortly increased to $140,000. The enterprise was placed in the hands of Mathew B. Claussen, of the Hamburg-American Line, associated with whom were Felix Malitz, Adolph Ingel, and Dr. Fuehr, the latter retaining control of the company. The enterprise was largely financed by German money, and a scheme was adopted of smuggling films into the United States by way of neutral countries through arrangements made with the chief stewards of certain steamships. As a result of these activities, Malitz and Ingel were indicted by the Federal authorities, convicted, and sentenced to terms of imprisonment.

A great many films were brought over, the company having sent two men to Germany to take the pictures and write the scenarios, and there was considerable distribution throughout the moving-picture houses of the United States. An effort was made to interest the Hearst Film Service in handling all of the films obtained and produced by the American Correspondence Film Co., but the proposition was not consummated.

Under date of December 3, 1915, Dr. Fuehr makes a report to Von Bernstorff which indicates that the display of films was considered by him to be effective. The letter, in part, is as follows:

Our opponents now seem to have recognized the effectiveness of this propaganda and are exhibiting films from their fronts, which do not fail to make an impression, with extraordinary outlays for extensive advertising and under the patronage of the highest personalities. Some of the films exhibited are quite excellent; others are obviously maneuver pictures, which, however, have a thrilling effect upon the public.

* * * * * * *

Would it not be possible to secure similar pictures of our fronts for distribution to the American Correspondence Film Co.? We have far more celebrated men to introduce than any of our opponents; we have the most varied fronts; we have a much grander organization.

With the films which we have heretofore received, mostly from Austria and much from Germany, our business manager, with a skill highly worthy of recognition, has made up four good film dramas, but there is no doubt that he would do much better if our people were given more opportunity to take interesting views.

According to the books of the American Correspondence Film Co., it had received up to October 31, 1915, from the German Government the sum of $78,600.

In May of 1916 the assets and property of the company were turned over by the German Government to Malitz and wound up their direct connection with the film business.

As part of the German propaganda system in the United States, Dr. Albert, Count von Bernstorff, and other German representatives and agents were particularly active in the organization of and subsidizing of innumerable societies and leagues formed for the purpose of spreading German propaganda, and one at least for the definite purpose of influencing national legislation.

A review of all of these organizations and their various ramifications would be impracticable, but reference may be had to the most important ones as typical of this part of the system.

The most important and far-reaching of the efforts made by the German Government and its sympathizers was the organization of what was known as the American embargo conference, which was organized in the summer of 1915. Those in direct charge of the movement were William Bayard Hale, then in the employ of the German Government and connected with the Dr. Fuehr bureau; one G. H. Jacobson, from Chicago; Carl E. Schmidt, of Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Charles F. Aked; Will R. McDonald, a newspaper man, who was engaged as press agent; and George F. Hanscher, president. The organization was incorporated in September of 1915 under the laws of Illinois. The organization and its activities are described in a report made by Jacobson to William Bayard Hale, which reads in part as follows:

The organization of the American embargo conference was first formally discussed at a meeting held in Detroit on July 10 1915. This meeting was attended by representative men from Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota and several other States.

At this meeting numerous plans were canvassed in an effort to adopt one that would be most likely to bring about the success of the embargo movement, and when the plans had been outlined the committee adjourned to allow the representatives to consider them all thoroughly, with the understanding that they would be again canvassed at a meeting to be held in Chicago on July 24.

A meeting was held in Chicago, and the plan adopted was to endeavor to influence the voters of the United States, particularly the German-American voters, to use every effort with their Congressmen and Senators to pass a resolution which would be introduced prohibiting the shipping of munitions and supplies to the Allies. The plan adopted was exceedingly comprehensive, in that it contemplated a local organization in every town and city in the United States and the obtaining of signatures to individual declarations by voters who either were opposed to the shipment of munitions and supplies to the Allies or who could be persuaded to oppose the shipment.

The report of Jacobson to Dr. Hale states:

The first weeks of the campaign taught us that it would be necessary for the conference to depend in many ways upon the workers in the different localities, and this brought about the plan to establish local branches of the conference in all of the cities, towns, and villages of the United States.

This work has been pushed rapidly during the past two weeks, and already the conference has found that the local organization plan will make it possible to have the vote lined up and under orders in time to make it possible for the voters to show the Congressmen a strength that they will be afraid to ignore.

The method of doing this has been to secure the name or names of persons in different localities who are known to be strongly in favor of an embargo. We have secured these names in different manners. In one way we sent out letters to the editors of the different German papers of the country asking them to supply us with names. Again, we took the names of writers who had secured some of our postal cards and had not contented themselves with sending in their pledges, but had written for more cards or had sent in contributions to help the movement or had written to ask in what manner they could give their services.

And further on the report states:

In addition to all this, a staff of German-American speakers, under the direction of Dr. Herman Gerhard, has been at work among the German-American organizations of the States of Illinois, of Indiana, of Michigan, of Wisconsin, and of Nebraska, and these speakers have been teaching the doctrine of organization until we can say that it has been well drilled into the German-Americans of these sections, and already they are at work lining up the voters of other nationalities.

* * * * * * *

To aid in the initial work in Illinois, Dr. Gerhard, an excellent speaker and a most successful organizer, was brought to Chicago from Texas, and, as has been said before, was placed in charge of the speakers of our German-American bureau. Dr. Gerhard first devoted his time to the German-American societies of Chicago, and his success in securing their hearty support and offers of assistance was such as to lead the conference to add other speakers, and these men are now being sent out as rapidly as our funds will permit.

The report then goes into more detail about describing the distribution of literature of various kinds, including pamphlets and copies of editorials from certain prominent American newspapers which were in favor of the embargo, and then says:

To-day, J. J. Tobias, of the Friends of Peace, in an interview in the Chicago Herald, declared that the Teutonic voters of the country to the number of 5,000,000 were "going to raise hell with any party not in our favor." One month ago this statement would have called down the wrath of a score of editorial writers. To-day the editorial writers and the politicians are wondering just how close to the right number of voters Mr. Tobias was when he put the figure at 5,000,000.

And if the American embargo conference's success continues to grow as it has been growing during these early and trying weeks of its short career the politicians of the country will find that the Teutonic voters of the country are not standing alone but are lined up with other Americans in a body of Americans who are all real Americans and of so many nationalities that no one will attempt to drag out one nationality and attempt to hold it up to scorn as the friends of the munition forces have been attempting to do with the German-American vote.

The report shows that the embargo conference was particularly active in the States of Illinois, Indiana, New York, Arkansas, Alabama, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Texas, Iowa, and Michigan.

As a result of the activities of this group which composed the embargo conference the Members of Congress were flooded with numerous prepaid telegrams from all over the country, all of which telegrams were prepaid by the embargo conference in different forms and made to appear as though coming from separate groups of people who were solely prompted by their own views in sending the request.

The embargo conference continued its activities through 1916 and into the early part of 1917. It was financed in part by contributions made by citizens, many of whom were of German extraction, and a partial list of these contributions appears in the record on pages 1508 to 1512.

Confidential communications which passed between Von Bernstorff to the foreign office in Berlin and from other German agents, show that the movement was financed in a large measure by the German Government.

Reiswitz, the German consul at Chicago, under date of December 21, 1915, sent a cipher message to the German ambassador requesting financial assistance for the embargo conference to the extent of six or seven thousand dollars to continue its activities, stating that the embargo conference has rendered service worthy of acknowldgment.

In September, 1916, Von Bernstorff sent a message to the foreign office, Berlin, in part, as follows:

The embargo conference in regard to whose earlier fruitful cooperation Dr. Hale can give information, is just about to enter upon a vigorous campaign to secure a majority in both Houses of Congress favorable to Germany, and requests further support. There is no possibility of our being compromised.

And later, on January 22, 1917, just prior to the breach in diplomatic relations, Count Von Bernstorff sent the following message to the foreign office in Berlin:

I request authority to pay out up to $50,000 in order, as on former occasions, to influence Congress, through the organization you know of, which can perhaps prevent war. I am beginning in the meantime to act accordingly. In the above circumstances a public official German declaration in favor of Ireland is highly desirable in order to gain the support of Irish influence here.

It was about this time that the embargo conference, which had been continued by popular subscription as well as by German subsidy, was causing telegrams to be sent to Congressmen and Senators from all parts of the country, urging them to stand firm against any declaration of war. Specimens of these telegrams are as follows:

Your constituents urge and expect you to stand like a rock against the passing frenzy of insane and criminal folly on the part of the small portion of interested persons who are clamoring for war. We want peace. Nothing warrants any other action.

Another reads as follows:

If warlike rumors coming from Washington are true, will you let me reassure you that the great majority of your constituents stand for peace, believe war now unnecessary and uncalled for, and will resent being precipitated into the European conflict.

In the early stages of the activities of the embargo conference, in 1915, Dr. Hale organized a women's auxiliary known as the League of American Women for Strict Neutrality, which had its headquarters in the city of Baltimore. The object of this asso-

ciation was to enlist the women of the United States against war and the shipment of munitions and supplies to the Allies.

At one of the conferences held at Dr. Fuehr's office, written report of which is in the record at page 1394, the following appears:

Mr. Hale then reports concerning the progress of his negotiations with the Baltimore ladies concerning the propaganda against the export of arms.

All preparations were made for carrying through the project of poster advertising. A pamphlet entitled "Thou shalt not kill," written by Mr. Hale, has been printed and will be sent out. Signatures to a petition to Congress collected by the ladies now number 200,000 and will in time perhaps reach 600,000. The ladies have applied for assistance in their campaign to a number of persons named by Mr. Hale. It is suggested that it be put up to the ladies to address the petition to the President and Congress and not wait until the collection of signatures is complete before sending it to Washington, but send them at once in batches of about 10,000.

The League of American Women for Strict Neutrality received $20,000 from the German fund for poster advertising, which sum was paid through Dr. Hale.

In the same report the following is stated:

Mr. Claussen proposes to have a film prepared for propaganda against the exportation of arms, which shall exhibit the manufacture of American shrapnel munition and afterwards show in drastic style the results of the use of this munition.

Mr. Hale reports that Mrs. Hale is busy upon propaganda against the exportation of horses. Mr. Claussen undertakes to have a correspondingly touching scenario (story of former fire-brigade mare slaughtered in Flanders) written.

At this same conference, which took place on May 24, 1915, the report states:

Mr. Hale calls attention to the interview printed in the evening papers, with the surviving passenger of the *Lusitania*, Dr. Foss, who has arrived here. It is resolved that Mr. Claussen have the said Foss interviewed as to whether the *Lusitania* had any guns mounted on the deck at the time she was torpedoed. Mr. Meyer undertakes to prepare a collection of newspaper clippings in his office containing statements of passengers, etc., which show the blame attached to the Cunard Line. Mr. Fuehr will also prepare a similar collection.

The evidence shows that an attempt was made on the part of the German Government to prove by various false affidavits of passengers and those who claimed to be passengers that the *Lusitania* carried guns mounted on her forward deck, all of which was afterwards disproved and admitted to be false by German representatives in this country. However, as a result of Dr. Fuehr's work, enormous publicity was given to the claim of the Germans that the *Lusitania* was armed, and consequently the act of the German submarine in sinking her was justified.

As part of the German propaganda system there was incorporated by one Jeremiah A. O'Leary, an American citizen of Irish extraction, what was known as the American Truth Society, which had a very large membership, made up principally of Germans and German-Americans and American citizens of Irish extraction. This association had its headquarters in the city of New York, and had among its prominent members and organizers such men as George Sylvester Viereck; Bernard H. Ritter, of the New York Staats Zietung; Frederick F. Schroeder, associated with Viereck in the publication of the Fatherland; and Jeremiah A. O'Leary, who was the president of the society.

O'Leary's activities were mainly directed to lectures and addressing public meetings in New York and in various parts of the United States, writing articles for the German propaganda publications, and conducting a publication of his own known as The Bull. O'Leary's writings and speeches were violently anti-British and upheld the cause of Germany as against England.

The society published a large number of pro-German and anti-British pamphlets and books which had a wide distribution, a list of which is found on page 1541 of the record. An examination of these pamphlets and books show their violent anti-British and pro-German character.

Just how much the German Government assisted in financing the American Truth Society has never been developed, but the records show the transfer of approximately $10,000 to the society through a banking house in New York, which money came from the German Government, and a direction by Dr. Albert in a letter of April 19, 1915, to another banking house to pay over to the treasurer of the society the sum of $500 and charge the same to his account.

The society was maintained in a large measure by financial contributions of its members, 80 or 90 per cent of the contributors being German or German extraction.

O'Leary is under indictment by the Federal authorities for violation of the Federal statutes on account of his activities.

This society was particularly active during the year 1915 in the concentrated effort being made to induce Congress to place an embargo upon the shipment of munitions and supplies to allied Governments and to the formation of a large association of various pro-German societies which went under the name of the Friends of Peace, which was organized through the assistance of the German-American Alliance of the city of New York, of which Henry Weissman was president.

The Friends of Peace held two large meetings in 1915, one in Madison Square Garden, in New York, and one in Chicago, which meetings were addressed by prominent Americans who were in favor of peace for the United States at any price and who were particularly in favor of an embargo on shipment of munitions to the Allies. These addresses were widely distributed by the various pro-German organizations throughout the United States.

In their efforts to create a sentiment in the United States against the manufacture and shipment of munitions to the Allies, the German agents under the direction of Dr. Albert, acting through Dr. Rumley, undertook the preparation and publication, in April, of 1915, of what was known as an appeal to the American people, which was published in most of the foreign-language newspapers of the United States on or about the 5th of April, 1915, and in about 70 of the principal daily papers published in the English language. This propaganda was handled by Louis N. Hammerling, president of the American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers, which has its headquarters in the city of New York. A great deal of evidence has been given concerning the operations of this association in connection with the propaganda conducted for the United States Brewers' Association. Mr. Hammerling appeared before the committee and was examined at length, as well as other witnesses who testified on the same subject.

The American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers is a corporation of which Mr. Hammerling had the controlling interest. It is, in fact, an advertising agency of the foreign-language press of the United States, and through the parceling out of advertising contracts and business by Hammerling its so-called membership was held together and was used by Hammerling and others who retained him for political and propaganda purposes.

Hammerling's clients consisted of a considerable number of large national advertisers, whose annual appropriations for advertising purposes ran up into very large amounts of money. This advertising was distributed among the foreign-language papers by Hammerling, who received a commission for placing the advertising contracts with the newspapers that belonged to his association.

This association, in existence since about 1908, embraced between six and seven hundred newspapers published in various parts of the United States in about 30 foreign languages, exclusive of the German language, and including Bohemian, Italian, Jewish, Polish, Hungarian, Serbian, etc.

It is quite clear from the testimony of witnesses and from the practices shown by the arrangements made between Hammerling and the brewers' association that most, if not all, of the foreign-language papers accepted and printed practically anything that they were requested to do by Hammerling in the way of news and propaganda articles.

The plan of publication of articles was as follows: The Association of Foreign Language Newspapers published a bimonthly magazine known as the American Leader, in the English language, and to which various writers contributed articles. Many of these articles were translated into the various foreign languages, printed in proof form, and sent to the foreign-language newspapers who were members of the association for publication.

In the case of the brewers who used the Hammerling association extensively a long series of articles on personal liberty were published first in the American Leader, translated into 27 different foreign languages, and sent in proof form to the newspapers, and republished in the language of the individual paper. Mr. Percy Andreae, representing the brewers, prepared these articles which were signed by Hammerling.

In March, 1915, Hammerling was approached by Dr. Rumley with a proposition to publish in the foreign-language press an appeal to the American people against the manufacture and shipment of munitions to the Allies. Hammerling denied knowledge of the fact that Rumley was working for the German Government, claiming that he went into the proposition purely from the standpoint of financial profit. This, however, is denied by one of his former associates, who had assisted in the preparation of the article. The appeal was prepared and arrangements were made to publish the same in some five hundred of the papers which were members of the association, as well as in some seventy English-language papers. The consideration agreed upon was $205,000. The appeal was published, as arranged, on or about the 5th of April, 1915, in the daily papers and continued to be published in the weekly papers at intervals during

the month of April. This appeal appears on page 568 of the record and reads, in part, as follows:

We appeal to the American people, to the high-minded and courageous American press, and to the American manufacturer of powder, shrapnel, and cartridges, and we appeal to the workmen engaged in the plants devoted to the manufacture of ammunitions for use of the nations at war to immediately cease making powder, shrapnel, and cartridges destined to destroy our brothers, widow our sisters and mothers, and orphan their children, as well as destroy forever the priceless possession handed down by our ancestors.

We appeal particularly to the American manufacturers and their workmen engaged in manufacturing any of these articles to suspend at once the manufacture of powder and bullets, which are being made for the cruel and inhuman purpose of mutilating and destroying humanity.

We appeal individually to the workmen of such factories, even at the sacrifice of their positions, to go on record as being unalterably opposed to being employed for the purpose of manufacturing ammunition to shatter the bodies and blot out the lives of their own blood relatives.

It appears from the evidence that Hammerling had sent agents and representatives to the principal munition manufacturing centers prior to the publication of the appeal in order to ascertain the nationality of the various workers in the munition plants. Men were sent to Bridgeport, Conn.; Ilion, N. Y.; Bethlehem, Pa.; and to munition plants in Brooklyn. Hammerling denied that these men were sent to stir up any labor troubles, but were merely sent to ascertain the extent of the foreign element employed in the plants.

This appeal had an enormous circulation, and, of course, was designed by the German agents to reach the foreign-born element outside of the Germans and to add the weight of this element to the general propaganda being conducted at the same time by the various propaganda organizations throughout the country.

The extent of the circulation of the foreign-language press controlled by Hammerling at about this time is described by Percy Andreae in a report made to the brewers' association on October 15, 1915, as follows:

The personal-liberty articles appearing in the American Leader are being republished in 30 languages in whole or in part by about 800 newspapers, with a total circulation of 6,000,000 copies. There are thus being reached through this channel 18,000,000 readers biweekly. The organization of this press and the elements surrounding it by the American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers has now reached the stage at which practical results can be obtained throughout the country by the application of proper organization methods in any locality where this press is represented. This has been proven beyond question in Ohio, where in the last campaign, through the instrumentality of the foreign-language press, registration of voters of foreign origin or foreign extraction exceeded in one county alone by over 20,000 anything ever known in the political history of the county.

It developed in the examination of Hammerling that, although the latter at times claimed to be an American citizen by naturalization and to have been born in the island of Hawaii, in fact he was born in Galacia, under the sovereignty of the Austrian Imperial Government; that he had made a false affidavit upon his application for naturalization in the State of Pennsylvania in 1901, and upon his own admission had only resided in the United States for a period of three years prior to his application for naturalization papers. He admitted that his principal property interests were in Galacia, and, while denying all knowledge of the fact that the German Government had employed him and his association for propaganda purposes, admitted that he could see no harm in the appeal, as it was done purely for financial profit.

It appeared from Hammerling's statement and from other evidence that all of his personal books, papers, and documents, and the records of his association, covering the years 1915 and 1916 have been destroyed.

No other evidence on the use of the Foreign Language Press Association for German propaganda purposes was obtained, but it is clear from the evidence that Hammerling was employed for a definite purpose by the German agents, and the record indicates that he knew at the time the purpose for which he was being employed.

It appears from the evidence that there are several thousand foreign-language publications in the United States, of which a large number were unpatriotic and disloyal to the United States, its principles and institutions, and it has been established that some of these were subsidized by the German and Austrian Governments. Nor was the foreign-language press alone responsible for all pro-German propaganda. Many English newspapers, both before and for months after America entered the war, while not shown to have been actually subsidized nor charged with actual violation of the espionage act, persisted in the endeavor through editorials, news columns, and cartoons to create a popular prejudice against the war and against effectual action on the part of the United States. The effect of this attitude on the part of these English newspapers was to encourage Germany and German sympathizers.

One of the most effective organizations of the German propagandist system was the German University League, an organization formed in the city of New York by a group of Germans, German-Americans, and American citizens who were strongly pro-German in their sympathies, including Dr. Edmund von Mach; William R. Shepard, of Columbia University; M. R. Hine, George Viereck's father-in-law; Dr. Hugo Schweitzer, chief chemist of the Bayer Chemical Co., and others.

The constitution states the purpose of the league to be:

1. To establish in the United States a well-organized center for former students at German universities and other German institutions of similar standards in Germany, Austria-Hungary, and other countries.

2. To cooperate with every effort to strengthen the regard for the Germans and for their aims and ideals, and to secure for them fair play and proper appreciation.

3. To correct misinformation about German conditions and problems by placing before educated Americans and before the press of this country reliable material bearing on German affairs.

This organization had branches in New York City; Boston, Mass.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Richmond, Va.; Atlanta, Ga.; Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Kansas City, Kans.; Dallas, Tex.; and San Francisco, Calif. Its membership was made up of college professors, writers, publishers, clergymen, scientists, and, generally, men of higher education.

There is little evidence of the actual activities of this membership as a group, with the exception of the work of Dr. Edmund von Mach, who wrote several books in favor of the German cause, wrote continuously for the newspapers, and presented a petition to Congress on the 2d of April, 1917, urging Congress to refuse to declare war against Germany. This petition is found on pages 1532 to 1536 of the RECORD.

The only evidence contained in the record that the German University League was subsidized by the German Government agents in the United States is contained in a message of Count von Bernstorff to the foreign office, dated November 1, 1916, in which Von Bernstorff states as follows:

Since the *Lusitania* case we have strictly confined ourselves to such propaganda as can not hurt us if it becomes known. The sole exception is perhaps the peace propaganda, which has cost the largest amount, but which also has been the most successful.

Latterly I have been using the embargo association and some entirely reliable private intermediaries. I have also made use of the German University League, founded since the war. This has done its best to take the place of the German ——— Association, which has been of no use during the war on account of its management. The league has published under my collaboration an excellent collection of reports on the war, which will be of great service to our cause. The support which I have already given the league is entered in the first quarter's account for 1916, item No. 208. On the occasion of later installments to them I will refer to this report. I ask that this be sanctioned.

It would be difficult to write a full and complete history of the ramifications of the German propaganda in the United States from the time of the beginning of the European war down to the date of the departure of the official German group in February, 1917. Much of the material available discloses connections of various individuals and firms now under investigation by the Department of Justice and other information of persons now under indictment and awaiting trial.

It is needless to say that perhaps only a comparatively small part of the whole system will ever be known.

Sufficient evidence has been produced before this committee to establish the fact of the inauguration in the United States of a widespread system and most of its principal ramifications and activities.

There is a sharp line of demarcation to be drawn between legitimate commercial enterprises conducted by a foreign power within the United States and propaganda conducted for the purpose of influencing public opinion and official action.

In order to prevent the assimilation of the aliens coming to this country, the Austrian Government organized the large financial institution, having branch offices throughout the country, and the active endeavor of this institution was to secure the funds and earnings belonging to aliens for transfer to their native country. In this way as much as $400,000,000 was annually sent out of this country. In connection with these financial activities, this institution promoted the separatist movement, having for its purpose the holding together in nativistic groups the alien elements of our population.

On the 4th day of February, 1919, the Senate adopted the following resolution, No. 436, and in pursuance to the directions therein contained your committee proceeded to make the inquiry requested, and the testimony taken by your committee is contained in the printed record, entitled "Bolshevik propaganda," which is herewith transmitted.

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary conferred by S. Res. 307 be, and the same hereby is, extended so as to include the power and duty to inquire concerning any efforts being made to propagate in this country the principles of any party exercising or claiming to exercise authority in Russia, whether such efforts originate in this country or are incited or financed from abroad, and, further, to inquire into any effort to incite the overthrow of the Government of this country or all government by force, or by the destruction of life or property, or the general cessation of industry.

In order to determine the possible connection and relation between the principles of government advocated by those claiming to exercise authority in Russia and the several activities now being carried on in the United States it was deemed essential that a careful inquiry be made to determine the exact nature of the so-called principles of government now being applied in Russia. The record includes the constitution and a compilation of many of the so-called laws in force in Russia, from which the nature of the paper government can be determined and the testimony of many eyewitnesses of the attempted application of this paper government discloses the character and nature of the actual government in practical operation. The investigation which your committee has conducted convinces it that few of either the advocates or opponents in this country of the present Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic are familiar with the fundamental principles upon which this government is attempting to perpetuate itself. Consequently the agitation growing out of developments in Russia has largely degenerated into appeals to the prejudices and the animosities that are inherent in the selfish natures of most individuals, and little or no appeal has been made to the intelligence of the people.

It is therefore not surprising that the word "Bolshevism" has now become merely a generic term, and in America is nothing more than a slogan of the elements of unrest and discontent.

By reason of their ignorance as to what Bolshevism as a code of political and social morals in Russia means, almost every dissatisfied element, from the radical anarchist to the theoretical idealist, has seized upon it as approaching something of a Utopian nature. It is interesting to note that every witness called before your committee as a champion of the cause of the principles of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic admitted that he or she had never read the constitution of the government of which he was the champion.

The word "Bolshevism" has been so promiscuously applied to various political and social programs that we feel that it is of paramount importance that the delusions and misconceptions as to what it really is as it exists to-day in Russia should be, as far as possible, removed, and that the people of the United States should be thoroughly informed as to just what this much-discussed institution really is, both in theory and in practice.

Your committee is of the opinion that the best answer that can be given to the argument of the champions of this Russian institution is a true explanation of its real nature and the actual principles upon which it is founded as well as the unavoidable consequences that would follow its adoption. The word "Bolshevik" is the name of the party that controls the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic and that dictated its constitution. We are, therefore, justified in using this name to identify the constitution which it dictated and in accepting that constitution and the laws that have been prescribed under it as the platform and program of Bolshevism.

The following are a few of the fundamental facts descriptive of Bolshevism and the form and character of the government established and operated by the Bolsheviki in Russia under the name of the "Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic."

It is the dictatorship of a class and is not a democratic form of government. In its actual application it has become an autocracy of a few individuals, who exercise their authority and suppress all opposition by fear, terrorism, and force. It has developed into as much of an autocracy, though more cruel in its methods, as the monarchial government of the Czar's régime. Under the provisional government of Kerensky an effort was made to establish a democracy and to inaugurate a socialistic state under that form of government. With a view to establishing such a democratic government the provisional government, on July 22, 1917, ordered the election of the constituent assembly to be voted for by all of the people of Russia on September 30, 1917. Prior to this time general elections in Russia on an equal suffrage basis were unheard of, and it therefore became necessary for the provisional government to create the necessary election machinery and to secure a complete and impartial registration of the newly created electorate. The difficulties encountered in this undertaking made it necessary in August to postpone the election of the constituent assembly from the 30th of September to the 25th of November. This postponement was seized upon by the Bolsheviki as raising an issue through which they could attack the provisional government, and they charged that government with having an ulterior purpose in directing this postponement.

In raising this issue they appealed to the people to rise in defense of a democratic form of government by overthrowing the provisional government and securing for themselves thereby, through the Bolshevik party, the benefits and advantages of a democracy and the election of a constituent assembly as an instrument which would make possible the establishment of a constitution based upon the equality of man and secure to all Russian citizens equal participation in the affairs of government. With this issue, among others, the Bolshevik party overthrew the provisional government in the October revolution and immediately issued a decree (Exhibit 1, appendix of record of hearing) ordering "that the elections to the constituent assembly shall be held on November 25, the day set aside for this purpose" by the provisional government and ordering that the freedom of the ballot should be adequately safeguarded. At the appointed time the constituent assembly was elected, and a canvass of the personnel of that assembly established the overwhelming defeat of the Bolshevik party and the supremacy of other socialist parties, whereupon the attitude of the Bolsheviki toward the constituent assembly underwent a complete change, and from that time their antagonism toward a constituent assembly, universal equal suffrage, and a democratic form of government has been manifested in every official act of the government and in the actual application of that government to the several activities of the nation.

In the original call for the election of the constituent assembly December 12, 1917, had been fixed as the time of its meeting. It was not, however, until January, 1918, that the Bolshevik autocracy permitted the constituent assembly to convene. When it did meet the Bolshevik party submitted to this representative body for adoption a set of resolutions denouncing the election at which it was elected, repudiating itself as representative of the electorate, whose commission it held, and declaring that there was no proper function for it to perform in the proposed new government of the Russian nation. (Exhibit 16, appendix.) As might well have been expected, the constituent assembly declined to pass this resolution, whereupon the Bolshevik members withdrew and the constituent assembly was forcibly dispersed by the Red Guard and a democratic form of government was lost to the Russian people. In its place has arisen the dictatorship of the small minority—headed by Lenin and Trotski.

Lenin, president of the Soviet of People's Commissaries, frankly admits this in the following words:

> Just as 150,000 lordly landowners dominated the 180,000,000 of Russian peasants, so 200,000 members of the Bolshevik party are imposing their proletarian will on the mass. * * *

Nor is this dictatorship the result of a usurpation of power on the part of the officials of the Bolsheviki, but it is the recognized foundation upon which the whole governmental structure is erected, as is evidenced by paragraph 9 of the Bolshevik constitution, which provides as follows:

> The principal aim of the constitution of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic in the present transitory period is to establish the dictatorship of the city and rural proletariat and of the poorest elements of the peasantry in the form of a powerful all-Russian soviet government for the purpose of completely suppressing the capitalistic class. * * *
>
> [NOTE.—Under Bolshevism, the capitalistic class includes all persons who do not perform manual labor for a livelihood or who employ any person in their business or who own any property or receive any income, no matter how small the amount. The words "parasitic class" and "bourgeoise" are popularly used by the Bolsheviki as synonymous with "capitalistic class."]

It is perhaps difficult to realize that it has been possible to perpetuate a dictatorship of such a small minority through the many months which have passed since it came into power. Without some understanding of the nature and character of the actual activities of the Bolsheviki the casual observer would be persuaded that the tyranny of this autocracy would in a short time bring down upon its head the wrath of the majority, who with reasonable effort would have no difficulty in overthrowing the usurpers. A study of the actual methods and practices of the dictatorship, however, clearly establishes the helplessness of the great mass of the Russian populace. The Bolsheviki have inaugurated a reign of terror unparalleled in the history of modern civilization, in many of its aspects rivaling even the inhuman savagery of the Turk and the terrors of the French Revolution. Under the evidence your committee has been compelled to impose the responsibility for this terrorism upon the government itself rather than attribute it merely to the excesses of individuals and groups undisciplined and untrained in the personal liberty acquired by them with the overthrowing of the centralized autocratic government of the old monarchistic régime. Terrorism and excesses in a State are either attributable to the encouragement of the State or to the weakness and inability of the State to restrain the same. In Bolshevik Russia every instrument available for the exercise of force and power is in the possession of that government, and those opposed to the government or who fail to render it whole-hearted support are completely suppressed and absolutely powerless. The government is more highly cen-

tralized and less restricted in the exercise of that centralized power than was the government of the Czar. The agencies used by the dictators in imposing their will upon the masses are less restrained and restricted in the exercise of their power by law, custom, or humanity than were the agencies utilized by the old régime. Economic domination unheard of and unsought in the past has been seized upon and usurped by the dictatorship.

All these facts negative the suggestion of the existence of a degree of weakness which makes the Government impotent to exercise the necessary restraint. On the contrary, every act of terrorism is justified by the affirmative pronouncement of the Bolshevik government, either through its constitution and laws or the authoritative utterances of its officials. The government is founded upon class hatred; its avowed purpose is the extermination of all elements of society that are opposed to or are capable of opposing the Bolshevik party. "Merciless suppression" and "extermination" of all classes except the present governing class are familiar slogans of the Bolsheviki, and confiscation is adopted as an essential instrument in the governmental formula. As a guaranty of its perpetuation in power, its underlying policy is that "the end justifies the means," and in the application of this policy the government denies the existence of any inalienable right in the Russian citizen, and respects neither the right to life, liberty, or property. In its so-called declaration of rights, the government adopts a policy which it hopes will result in "the destruction of the parasitic classes of society," and as an aid to this end has decreed as an essential part of its fundamental law the principle of arming one class and disarming another, with a view of making the extermination and destruction more effective. In practice, this government has classified all of those people who fail to sympathize with and support the existing dictatorship as the bourgeoisie, and has proclaimed the doctrine that their refusal to bow to the edict of the dictatorship should be answered by "violence toward the bourgeoisie." A careful survey of the innumerable acts of violence and terrorism committed in Russia will fail to disclose scarcely a single offense that has not been participated in either by their Red Guard, by Commissars, or by others having an official and governmental status.

The dictatorship, utilizing Lettish troops and Chinese laborers, as well as to some extent German and Austrian prisoners and criminals discharged from the jails as its so-called Red Guard to enforce its decrees, promptly secured possession and control of:

(a) All arms and ammunition.

(b) Practically all foodstuffs and commodities essential to the maintenance of life.

(c) All clothing and household goods necessary for warmth and health.

(d) All gold, silver, and specie, including jewelry, ornaments, gold and silver plate.

This was accomplished by means of confiscation followed by the nationalization and monopolizing by the State of all commercial, industrial, and financial enterprises. Having secured possession of all of these instruments of physical and economic power and domination, this dictatorship was enabled to enforce the submission of most of the population to its will. The rank and file of the people of Russia had no other choice. They could not resist or oppose the Bolsheviki with force, as they were without firearms and without ammunition. They could not refuse to obey its dictates else they would be starved to death. They could not defy the dictators, as they would be left without raiment. They could not sustain life with money possessing an intrinsic value, for they had none, and thousands have been starved to death and murdered as a result of this régime.

Possessing, therefore, every instrument necessary for the exercise of the forcible persuasion of the populace, it became expedient to reinforce the dictatorship with an increased man power. Recognizing the state of the public mind, it was necessary to guard against betrayal by those who were drafted into the service of the State, and the most effective weapons selected to secure the faithful execution of the will of the dictators were fear, terrorism, and a system of hostages. By this system of hostages the relatives, family, and loved ones of the drafted subject were held as prisoners, their food supply, their clothing, even their lives, depending upon the fidelity with which the dictatorship was supported and its orders executed.

Having professed an adherence to the democratic form of government to assist in securing control of Russia, the Bolsheviki, in establishing its paper government, sought to maintain its dictatorship under color of a representative political system. A recognition of the democratic principle that all men are created equal, however, would have necessitated the equal participation of all citizens in the affairs of government. Such universal participation in political affairs would have made impossible a dictatorship of the minority, but would inherently have been a rule of the majority and have accomplished just what the dissolution of the constituent assembly was intended to prevent. The following of the Bolshevik government being more numerous in the cities, and these by reason of their concentration within more restricted territorial limits being more readily led and dominated, it was prescribed by constitutional direction that representation from cities in the government should be five times as great as the representation from the provincial districts. In other words, representation from cities is in the ratio of 1 to every 25,000 of the population, while from the rural districts and the territory of the peasants, who constitute a large percentage of the Russian population, representation is 1 to every 125,000 of the population. Even this discrimination did not adequately safeguard the domination of the Bolshevik minority. Disfranchisement of large groups of the population was necessary. By constitutional provision they denied the right to participate in the government and disfranchised the following classes:

(a) All persons employing others in connection with the conduct of their business.

(b) All persons receiving interest, rents, dividends, or an income from financial or industrial enterprises.

(c) All merchants, traders, and dealers.

(d) All clergymen, priests, and employees of churches and religious bodies.

(e) Certain persons connected with the Czar's government, persons mentally afflicted, and persons convicted of certain crimes against the Bolshevik government.

Even with these restrictions upon suffrage, the Bolshevik government has refused to undertake the election of a constituent assembly. The elections that are permitted are conducted under supervision of the Red Guard, and local bodies or soviets that are not satisfactory to the dictatorship are removed, and in some instances so-called commissars or officials of unquestioned loyalty to the government are imported from the cities to govern the affairs of the political unit (the local soviet) sought to be dominated according to the Bolshevik faith.

Confiscation on a wholesale scale has been used as a means of undertaking to create and maintain tangible assets that could be used as the economic foundation upon which could be built the industrial and financial superstructure of the Bolshevik state. By constitutional edict and by a series of decrees issued by the dictatorship all land, forests, and natural resources of Russia have been confiscated by the government in order that the Bolshevik government may become the landlord of the entire population and exercise the control incident thereto. Where a man shall live and toil and till the soil is determined by the State and the right to determine the nature and extent of each man's domicile, and the power to compel the migration of the peasant from the locality of his birth or adoption, even to the extent of separating families as the population of the various communities expands or contracts, is exercised by the Bolshevik government through the laws which it has decreed for the control of the people.

The alleged purpose of the seizure of land by the government was that the right to the land might be transferred to the rank and file of the people of Russia in order that the individual Russian peasant might become the unrestrained and unrestricted architect of his own future economic development, but the methods adopted by the Bolsheviki have merely transferred the landlordship from the large landowners, and in many instances from the peasant groups themselves, to the Bolshevik government, and the present control by that government is not confined to the land itself, as was the control of the landowners under the old régime, but extends as well to the persons and even the tools, implements, and products of the peasants. The aged and infirm are deprived of all right to utilize and enjoy during their declining years the soil their efforts may have enriched, because their physical strength makes them powerless to perform all of the labor incident to its full cultivation. They, thereupon, become mere pensioners of the State. This system guarantees to the peasant only the present enjoyment of a given piece of land, and consequently only warrants him in so utilizing the beneficence of the State in according him the right to use the same as to insure the maximum present production to the exclusion of a scientific development that will enure to future advantage. In other words, an uncertain tenure is naturally accompanied by an exploitation rather than by a systematic development of the leasehold interest. Under this system the peasant can never become the owner of the land he tills or of any other land. To aid in the system and to establish a larger control of peasant activities by the government the principle of confiscation has also been invoked in the case of all live stock and all agricultural implements, and as a conse-

quence these essential instruments of land cultivation, these chattels necessary to the production of both meat and vegetable foodstuffs have become, without regard to the rights of former owners or the advantage to the individual of future ownership therein, the property of the Bolshevik government, and the only right thereto that the peasant can in the future acquire is a use upon such terms and conditions as the government may prescribe.

As may well be expected, there seems to be much difficulty in determining the manner in which this policy is being carried into actual operation, and it is apparent that only by the application of arbitrary methods can the already existing articles in these categories be made useful to any portion of the peasant population or be adequately protected and maintained so as to preserve their value. It is also interesting to contemplate, but dubious to predict, how meat-food products can under this system be maintained at a sufficient quantity to sustain life.

The thrift, industry, perseverance, and intelligence which has enabled a portion of the Russian people in the past to acquire and save money has also been penalized by the confiscation of all banks and banking institutions and their transformation into a state monopoly.

Confiscation under the milder term of nationalization has eliminated from all industrial establishments such as factories, mills, and mines the business acumen and scientific methods necessary to successful operation and competitive methods. The absolute control of their operation and management is placed in the hands of the employees. This has been followed by the stagnation of the industrial life of the country, and even those nationalized industries which have been able to operate under government control have operated at an enormous percentage of loss, the deficiencies being met from the unlimited issue of fiat paper money printed by the government. The nationalization of the enterprises essential to the production and delivery of raw materials has so handicapped their production as to restrict the quantity of raw materials available for the maintenance of industrial enterprises, and the whole economic condition of Russia has made it impossible to secure relief from foreign sources. These industrial conditions can only continue so long as the government can succeed in monopolizing the means of subsistence, maintain an adequate military force to enforce the decrees of the dictatorship, and force the recognition of worthless fiat paper money as the basis of its financial system.

As the economic formula of the Bolsheviki prescribes the confiscation of the property rights of others, likewise it proclaims the doctrine of the repudiation of financial obligations, and the debts of Russia have been renounced. Repudiation is also invoked to secure the government against the incumbrances upon and liabilities of the property and assets of the enterprises, land and chattels seized by it under its confiscation program. This repudiation also aided materially in suppressing and exterminating the creditor class, which naturally constitutes a part of the element that the Bolsheviki are pleased to call the bourgeoisie, or capitalistic class, by depriving them of the right and ability to recover and utilize the earnings, savings, and accumulations of the past. As it affected them it was a form of confiscation. Repudiation is therefore a consistent accompaniment of confiscation and an essential element in the process of destruction. The financial condition of the dictatorship, however, required the adoption of some constructive policy that would finance it. It was necessary to maintain at least a color of legitimacy, an appearance of honest business methods, in supporting its so-called red army and in securing control of the articles necessary to sustain life. Further than that it was desirable to devise ways and means by which service in the red army and employment in nationalized enterprises might appear sufficiently attractive, and at the same time give an appearance of prosperity to the government itself, in order that hope as well as fear might assist in maintaining the Bolshevik government. The policy adopted was the printing of unlimited amounts of fiat paper money unsecured by any reserve. This naturally furnished to the government a cash capital limited only by the capacity of the printing presses of the government, which, in turn, had been confiscated and nationalized. Already it is estimated that a sum in excess of 30,000,000,000 rubles has been put into circulation. This has created a ridiculously inflated circulating medium of no material value to the public, but of enforced value to the government.

The populace are compelled to accept this paper money from the Bolshevik dictatorship, but can secure little for it in transactions between one another. Barter and exchange have, therefore, become the only satisfactory means of conducting commercial transactions, and the breakdown in the industrial life and transportation facilities of the country has made practically impossible the bringing together in the same community of the articles of trade and commerce necessary to the health, comfort, and life of the various elements of society. In consequence, many Russians are faced with starvation while possessing large sums of the money of the government that, in their extremity, avails them nothing. There can be no permanence to a government whose financial system is founded upon such a method.

The destruction of all effective military and naval power and the removal of the leadership of capable officers was essential to the establishment of a powerful dictatorship as well as to the complete abandonment of the eastern front during the war. By the safe conduct of Lenin from Switzerland through the German Empire into Russia, regardless of the question as to whether he and his confrères were financed, as seems probable, in their revolutionary undertaking by the German Government, an obligation was incurred to demoralize and destroy the existing Russian Army which had been more or less effectively maintaining the eastern front. How completely this was accomplished is now history. They promptly decreed in their so-called declaration of rights that "the soldiers and sailors are liberated from the power of autocratic generals, because the generals will now be elected and they may be removed." All titles and degrees of rank and the authority incident to superiority were annulled and discipline was discontinued. Instantaneously the army and navy degenerated into a mere mob with every soldier a law unto himself. Demobilization was directed and the demoralization was completed. The organization of the Red Army was undertaken around the nucleus which the Lettish troops and sailors in the Red Guard of the October revolution provided.

By similar means the organization of the Red Fleet was undertaken. Chinese laborers without other means of subsistence were easily enlisted. The opportunity that service in the Red Army and Red Fleet afforded for pilfering and looting under color of authorized confiscation presented a sufficient invitation to the lawless and criminal elements that had become conspicuous through the opening of the doors of prisons by the Bolsheviki to join those bodies and participate in the confiscation and seizure that were a part of the program of terror, fear, extermination, and destruction upon which the Bolshevik government had entered. The food and clothing situation was desperate, and the government had acquired, through the application of its formula, a generous supply and was using its Red Guard to gain a monopoly. In consequence, the one reasonably certain way of gaining a livelihood was by affiliating with the Red Army. This brought into the Bolshevik fold many people who otherwise would have been condemned to starve. Hostages were held by the government to compel the submission of those who might otherwise have been recalcitrant. Thus a Red Army and a Red Fleet has been created, and they are charged with the execution of the decrees of the dictatorship and the sentences of the so-called courts or revolutionary tribunals, and they are afforded a large degree of personal discretion in the exercise of duties which practically constitute a rule of martial law.

Repudiating the doctrine of all radical revolutionary groups throughout the world that have claimed for the individual of all lands the right of conscientious objection for religious or other reason against the bearing of arms and the participation in armed conflicts, the Bolsheviki have adopted as the essential safeguard of their political fabric compulsory military service. As Prussianism found it essential to world domination by the autocracy of the Hohenzollerns, so Bolshevism seized upon it as the mainstay that would weather its autocracy of the dictatorship through its campaign of confiscation and repudiation.

All of the established courts and judicial institutions have been abolished and in their place have been created revolutionary tribunals. Under the dictatorship these new judicial tribunals disregard all laws that "contradict the revolutionary conception of right." In actual operation these revolutionary tribunals have tried and condemned men in their absence. No right to bail is recognized and the penalty imposed depends largely upon the caprice of the court. The death penalty, the reestablishment of which under the provisional government was vociferously denounced by the Bolsheviki, has been invoked for all sorts of crimes and misdemeanors. In fact, the procedure in the courts is a mere travesty on justice and most summary in its nature.

Every activity of the Bolshevik government indicates clearly the antipathy of the Bolsheviki toward Christianity and the Christian religion. Its program is a direct challenge to that religion. The Christian church and Bolshevism can not both survive the program that is being developed by the Russian dictatorship and which it is undertaking to extend throughout the world. Not only have they confiscated all church property, real and personal, but they have established the right of anti-religious propaganda as a constitutionally recognized institu-

tion. Church and school have been divorced even to the extent of suppressing the Sunday school, and the teaching of all religious doctrines in public, either in schools or educational institutions of any kind, is expressly forbidden. Religion can only be taught or studied privately. All church and religious organizations are prohibited from owning property of any kind. All recognition of a Supreme Being in both governmental and judicial oaths is abolished. The clergy and all servants or employees of church bodies are expressly disfranchised and deprived of all right to hold public positions. The full significance of the attitude of the Bolsheviki toward Christianity is most fully manifested in the fact that, though by Russian custom and decree under the old régime, every newspaper or periodical published on Easter Sunday in the Russian Empire was required to carry the headline, "Christ is risen," on Easter Sunday in 1918, all Bolshevik papers substituted for this sacred sentiment the headline and slogan, "One hundred years ago to-day Karl Marx was born." Thus the issue has been framed between the gospel of Karl Marx and the teachings of Christ. We reiterate, therefore, that Bolshevism and the Christian religion can not both survive.

Bolshevism accords to the family no such sacred place in society as modern civilization accords to it. Conflicting reports have been passing current during the last few months relative to the nationalization of women by the new Russian Government. Two or three local soviets have apparently thus degraded the womanhood of their particular districts, but the central government has refrained from adopting any such policy in the whole nation. They have, however, promulgated decrees relating to marriage and divorce which practically establishes a state of free love. Their effect has been to furnish a vehicle for the legalization of prostitution by permitting the annullment of the marriage bonds at the whim of the parties, recognizing their collusive purposes as a ground for the severance of the matrimonial state.

The freedom of the press and of speech, though heralded by the advocates of Bolshevism as necessary to the intelligent participation of the people in popular government, has been abrogated in Russia, and by the usual confiscatory method of the accepted formula all of the mechanical devices and materials necessary for the publication of periodicals and all places of meeting and public assemblage have been seized by the Bolshevik government.

To make the control more complete and effective the publication of all advertisements, whether in regularly published periodicals or on handbills or programs, is made a monopoly of the government. As a consequence the people of Russia are deprived of all facts, literature, and public expression, through the medium of the press or public meetings, except such as is approved by the dictatorship and has been passed by its censorship.

In the attempted establishment of an educational system it is to be expected that much difficulty would arise because of the large percentage of illiteracy that afflicts Russia, and it is not surprising that this system is largely on paper and of little practical value. It is interesting to note, however, that under this system age rather than attainment determines the admissibility of the student to a given school or grade, and that to require the production of evidence of the qualification of a student for such admission is a criminal offense. This again reflects the Bolshevik theory that equalization can be accomplished by dictatorial decrees.

The apparent purpose of the Bolshevik government is to make the Russian citizens, and especially the women and children, the wards and dependents of that government. Not satisfied with the degree of dependency incurred by the economic and industrial control assumed by its functionaries, it has destroyed the natural ambition and made impossible of accomplishment the moral obligation of the father to provide, care for, and adequately protect the child of his blood and the mother of that child against the misfortunes of orphanhood and widowhood. To accomplish this it has by decree expressly abolished and prohibited all right of inheritance, either by law or will. Upon death all of the decedent's estate is confiscated by the State, and all heirs who are physically incapable of working become pensioners of the State to the extent that the assets confiscated by the government make such pensions possible

Insurance of all kinds has been nationalized, the assets of insurance companies confiscated, and the business of insuring life, property, accident, old age, and unemployment made a State monopoly. In the attempted liquidation of existing companies and associations the liquidating representatives of the government seem only concerned in securing possession and record of all of their assets and fail to recognize the propriety of accurately adjusting their liabilities. As a consequence, those insured and the beneficiaries under existing policies find themselves without the protection for which they have been paying premiums.

There has been much discussion with reference to the policy and motive of the associated Governments in landing troops on Russian soil. It is interesting to note that the combined military force at Archangel was landed at the solicitation and request of the established and de facto government of the northern Provinces of Russia to aid that government in protecting its citizenship from the murder, cruelty, and confiscation of the approaching Red Army of the Bolshevik government.

The salient features which constitute the program of Bolshevism as it exists to-day in Russia and is presented to the rest of the world as a panacea for all ills may be summarized as follows:

(1) The repudiation of democracy and the establishment of a dictatorship.

(2) The confiscation of all land and the improvements thereon.

(3) The confiscation of all forests and natural resources.

(4) The confiscation of all live stock and all agricultural implements.

(5) The confiscation of all banks and banking institutions and the establishment of a State monopoly of the banking business.

(6) The confiscation of all factories, mills, mines, and industrial institutions and the delivery of the control and operation thereof to the employees therein.

(7) The confiscation of all churches and all church property, real and personal.

(8) The confiscation of all newspapers and periodicals and all mechanical facilities and machinery used in the publication thereof.

(9) The seizure and confiscation of all public meeting places and assembly halls.

(10) The confiscation of all transportation and communication systems.

(11) The confiscation of the entire estate of all decedents.

(12) The monopolizing by the State of all advertisements of every nature, whether in newspapers, periodicals, handbills, or programs.

(13) The repudiation of all debts against the government and all obligations due the non-Bolshevik elements of the population.

(14) The establishment of universal compulsory military service regardless of religious scruples and conscientious objections.

(15) The establishment of universal compulsory labor.

(16) The abolition of the Sunday school and all other schools and institutions that teach religion.

(17) The absolute separation of churches and schools.

(18) The establishment, through marriage and divorce laws, of a method for the legalization of prostitution, when the same is engaged in by consent of the parties.

(19) The refusal to recognize the existence of God in its governmental and judicial proceedings.

(20) The conferring of the rights of citizenship on aliens without regard to length of residence or intelligence.

(21) The arming of all so-called "toilers," and the disarming of all persons that had succeeded in acquiring property.

(22) The discrimination in favor of residents of cities and against residents of the rural districts through giving residents of cities five times as much voting power as is accorded to residents of rural districts in such elections as are permitted.

(23) The disfranchisement of all persons employing any other person in connection with their business.

(24) The disfranchisement of all persons receiving rent, interest, or dividends.

(25) The disfranchisement of all merchants, traders, and commercial agents.

(26) The disfranchisement of all priests, clergymen, or employees of churches and religious bodies.

(27) The denial of the existence of any inalienable rights in the individual citizen.

(28) The establishment of a judicial system exercising autocratic power, convicting persons and imposing penalties in their absence, and without opportunity to be heard, and even adopting the death penalty for numerous crimes and misdemeanors.

(29) The inauguration of a reign of fear, terrorism, and violence.

This is the program that the revolutionary elements and the so-called "parlor Bolshevists" would have this country accept as a substitute for the Government of the United States, which recognizes that "all men are created equal," and that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are the inalienable rights of all its citizens. This is the formula they would have adopted to supersede the Government which was established by all the people of the United States "in order to form a more perfect

union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity," and "promote the general welfare." The mere recital of the program is a sufficient denunciation of it and of the individuals and groups which advocate and defend it.

During modern times the effort of civilization has been directed to lifting mankind to the highest possible level of intelligence and social and material well-being in order to attain the highest degree of social equality between man and man. For the first time since the Dark Ages has an organized government undertaken to invoke a process of equalization by establishing as the basis of social equality the minimum rather than the maximum degree of existing educational, industrial, social, and moral efficiency, yet such is the policy of the Bolshevik government. It recognizes that the psychology of even the most illiterate elements of the Russian people is such that it can not perpetuate this doctrine in practice unless the same reactionary methods of equalization are simultaneously destroying the social fabric, the efficiency, the individual initiative, the ambition, and the material prosperity of the people of all other nations, whose competition and accomplishments would necessarily result in odious and destructive comparisons. Not content, therefore, in fathering in Russia this retrograde method of establishing the equality of mankind on the basis of the lowest strata of society, it has undertaken to arouse in the United States and in all other countries resentment, rancor, and hatred against those elements of society which have, by reason of their aptitude, perseverance, industry, and thrift attained that superior degree of intelligence and prosperity that has made possible the accomplishments of twentieth century civilization. The effort of progressing civilization has always been the uplifting of man to a higher and higher plane of living and a loftier place in society.

The activities of the Bolsheviki constitute a complete repudiation of modern civilization and the promulgation of the doctrine that the best attainment of the most backward member of society shall be the level at which mankind shall find its final and victorious goal. The pulling down of the progressive rather than the lifting up of the retrogressive is presented as the doctrine of their new kind of civilization. To carry this message to the uttermost parts of the earth they have appropriated enormous sums of money, and, incidentally, their process of equalization in Russia was promoted by the starvation which the funds thus expended might have been utilized to alleviate. Their messengers and their friends have afflicted this country, and their new civilization has been represented as Utopian in its nature. Many well-disposed persons have been deceived into the belief that they were promoting a social welfare movement in advocating it. They have even given their substance that it might be perpetuated and extended. Yet, while these people who have been popularly called "parlor Bolshevists" are contributing to these Bolshevik agents, these same agents are appealing to the hatred and the lowest instincts of the more ignorant elements of the population, reinforced by the criminally inclined, to whom the doctrine of confiscation furnished a form of legalized robbery and a means of livelihood without physical or mental effort, to rise en masse and destroy our civilization and the so-called bourgeoise, with whom, of course, must be classed these same "parlor Bolshevists" who are assisting, by lending funds and respectability to the movement, in bringing the temple down upon their own heads.

It is significant, however, that in the United States only a portion of the so-called radical revolutionary groups and organizations accept in its entirety the doctrine of the Bolsheviki. They have, however, all seized upon Bolshevism as a rallying cry and are undertaking to unite all of these elements under that banner for the purpose of accomplishing the initial step in their common formula, to wit, the overthrow of existing governmental institutions and the complete demoralization of modern society. With this accomplished each group hopes that it can muster sufficient strength to maintain a supremacy in the new social order and invoke the policies of its particular creed. Most of these groups accept the common ground that forcible, as distinguished from political, action should be used as the instrument to secure the overthrow of the present government and in so doing defy and repudiate the democratic form of government which guarantees under our Constitution the rule of the majority. Like the Bolsheviki in Russia, these groups recognize in the destruction of life, property, and personal security the necessary preliminary to the establishment of a government founded upon the violence of the minority. They realize that riot, disorder, and hunger breed hatred, blood lust, and desperation, and that without these mankind can not be driven to the use of force to accomplish an end attainable by lawful and peaceable political methods under the existing government.

The radical revolutionary elements in this country and the Bolshevik government of Russia have, therefore, found a common cause in support of which they can unite their forces. They are both fanning the flame of discontent and endeavoring to incite revolution. Numerous newspapers are openly advocating revolution. Literature and circular matter demanding a resort to violence are being widely circulated. Bombs and high explosives have been used in many parts of the country in an attempt to inaugurate a reign of terror and to accomplish the assassination of public officials. The demonstration of the consequences of this movement in Russia, no matter how graphic the description, is a distant, far-away picture to the average citizen of the United States. While entertaining and perhaps amusing him, much as the novel in modern fiction does, it fails to impress him as an actual existing institution, in a world growing smaller and smaller through the accomplishments in transportation and communication, that must be considered and met as an actuality. To understand and realize its real consequences it must be brought home to the citizen and applied to the life and institutions which he knows.

With a view, therefore, of concretely illustrating just what this new social order would accomplish if transplanted into the political, educational, industrial, and religious life of the United States attention is invited to the following unavoidable consequences:

1. The application of force and violence, the shedding of blood and the destruction of life and property, the common incidents of all revolutions, and all this to destroy a democratic form of government, under which the majority can secure just the kind of government that it desires. The advocacy of revolutionary methods is an admission, therefore, that minority rather than majority rule is the goal sought to be attained.

2. To make possible the control of the minority as the dictators of the majority, the disfranchisement of millions of substantial, patriotic citizens who would fall in the so-called bourgeois or capitalistic class. This would deprive of the right to participate in affairs of government—

(a) Millions of farmers, merchants, and manufacturers, both large and small, employing persons in the conduct of their business, and all professional and business men utilizing the services of a clerk, bookkeeper, or stenographer.

(b) All persons receiving interest on borrowed money or bonds, rent from real estate or personal property, and dividends from stock of any kind.

(c) All traders, merchants, and dealers, even though they do not employ another person in the conduct of their business.

(d) All preachers, priests, janitors, and employees of all churches and religious bodies.

It is apparent with the millions of persons falling into these several classes, disfranchised and deprived of all right to participate in the affairs of government, accompanied with the immediate enfranchisement of all aliens who do not fall within these prohibited classes, and the opening of the doors of all prisons and penitentiaries, the domination of the criminal and most undesirable alien elements of the country would be a comparatively easy matter. To simplify the question of this control, however, the substantial rural portion of the population would be further suppressed and restricted, and under the revolutionary formula the voting power of the cities would be five times as great as that of the rural communities, the ratio of representation in cities being 1 to every 25,000 of the population, while that of the rural districts would be only 1 to every 125,000 of the population. In the United States the rural population under the 1910 census was considerably in excess of the urban. We must also remember that the application of the formula would include the disarming of all disfranchised classes and the arming to the teeth of these criminal and alien elements.

3. It would result in the confiscation by the government thus constituted of the land of the United States, including 6,361,502 farms, of which 62.1 per cent, or 3,948,722 farms, are owned in fee by the farmers who cultivate them and represent the labor and toil of a lifetime. On the farms of the United States there are improvements, machinery, and live stock to the value of $40,991,449,090 (census of 1910), all of which would be confiscated with the land. The confiscation program would include the more than 275,000 manufacturing establishments, including the $22,790,980,000 of invested capital, much of which is owned by the small investor, whose livelihood depends upon the success of the respective enterprises. The confiscation would also include 203,432 church edifices. Forests aggregating 555,000,000 acres would be seized by the government and an annual product of $1,375,000,000 would come under the control of the dictatorship. Dwellings to the number of 17,805,845, of which 9,093,675 are owned in fee, with 5,984,248 entirely free from debt, would be confiscated and the owners dispossessed at the pleasure of the government.

4. Although clamoring loudly for a free and unrestricted press the revolutionary program would require the seizure and confiscation of the 22,896 newspapers and periodicals in the United States, together with all mechanical equipment necessary for their publication, and a control and ownership of the public press by the government.

5. Complete control of all banking institutions and their assets is an essential part of the revolutionary program, and the 31,492 banks in the United States would be taken over by the government and the savings of millions, including 11,397,553 depositors drawing interest on accounts in savings banks, and consequently belonging to the so-called bourgeois or capitalistic class, jeopardized.

6. One of the most appalling and far-reaching consequences of an application of Bolshevism in the United States would be found in the confiscation and liquidation of its life insurance companies. There is 20 per cent more life insurance in force in this country than in all the rest of the world and nine-tenths of it is mutual insurance. Almost 50,000,000 life insurance policies representing nearly $30,000,000,000 of insurance, the substantial protection of the women and children of the Nation would be rendered valueless.

7. The atheism that permeates the whole Russian dictatorship is clearly reflected in the activities of their revolutionary confrères in the United States and in their publications they have denounced our religion and our God as "lies." This gives added significance to the revolutionary attitude toward the Christian Church and the Christian religion. The prohibition of religious schools and the teaching or studying of religion, except in private, would necessitate the abolition of 194,759 Sunday schools in the United States and a great number of seminaries, colleges, and universities; 19,935,890 Sunday school scholars would be deprived and prevented from enjoying the institution that has become an important part of their lives and is one of the great moral influences of the Nation. Catholic schools, colleges, and seminaries to the number of 6,681 would be suppressed. Church property of the value of $1,676,600,582 would be confiscated and 41,926,854 (census of 1916) members of 227,487 church organizations would be subjected to the domination of an atheist dictatorship.

Notwithstanding the fact that every champion and defender of Bolshevism that testified before your committee unequivocally admitted that the Bolshevik formula was not adaptable to the economic and social life of the United States, they and their coevangelists persist in their appeals to the passion of the people in an attempt to provoke discontent and hatred. In cooperation with the revolutionary elements, destruction of existing social and governmental institutions by violent methods is being promoted. They must, therefore, be condemned as the mere champions of discontent and disorder, offering no practical and acceptable ideal, as they profess to have, with which to soften and appease the wrath that they are undertaking to arouse.

GENERAL STATEMENT AND OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.

The testimony taken before this committee having been printed, a further review thereof is deemed unnecessary. A careful consideration of this record discloses certain well-defined abuses, prejudicial to the best interests of the Nation and calculated to undermine and destroy our form of government. The Nation having engaged in the greatest war in history with the purpose of saving the world for democracy, now emerges from that struggle confronted with the paramount duty of preserving democracy for the world.

The disclosures before this committee concerned (a) the political activities of the liquor interests in their effort to control and dominate elections and public officials, (b) the propaganda of the agents, representatives, and sympathizers of a foreign government, the form of which and whose purposes, industrial, commercial, and political, were incompatible with and antagonistic to the form, ideals, and purposes of the Government of the United States, and (c) Bolshevism as it exists in Russia and the activities of its champions in the country. No useful purpose is to be served by reviewing and recounting the reprehensible activities of either of the elements whose conduct has been the subject matter of this inquiry. A perusal of the testimony furnishes adequate evidence of it. This testimony embodies such an exposure of all of these elements as to justify fully the investigation.

The activities brought to the attention of the committee are so startling, however, that we believe that the real advantage of the inquiry will be lost unless Congress profits from the knowledge thus obtained by undertaking by appropriate legislation to make impossible a repetition of these activities, either on the part of the offenders who have been under investigation, and many of whose activities are still continuing, or by others who at some future time may seek to undermine the Government or pervert the popular will by the adoption of similar methods against which the Federal statutes seem to provide no adequate safeguard.

With this end in view, therefore, this committee invites attention to certain abuses which are clearly established by the record of its hearings and a summary of proposed legislation, the immediate adoption of which it earnestly recommends.

I.

That millions of dollars have been expended in elections, in connection with which Federal officers were voted for by special interests through organizations of their own creation and by methods of their own adoption. That secrecy has surrounded these expenditures and the activities thereby induced. That the publicity and accounting sought for all political expenditures by the corrupt-practices acts of the Federal and the several State Governments has been largely defeated. That the Federal corrupt-practices statutes are entirely inadequate to meet present-day political methods and are easily evaded without involving a violation of the statute. Any effective corrupt-practices act must provide—

(1) For full publicity of all receipts and expenditures intended to influence in any way the result of an election.

(2) To bring under legal control and supervision every committee and organization participating in a political activity.

(3) To perpetuate and preserve for a reasonable time a complete record of the financial transactions of all individuals, candidates, committees, and organizations.

(4) To define clearly the purposes and activities for which money can be legally expended.

(5) To require publicity that will unequivocally fix responsibility for all paid and inspired advertising or publicity matter used and intended either openly or secretly to affect the result of an election.

II.

Newspapers printed in both English and foreign languages have been subsidized directly and indirectly for the purpose of undertaking to influence the minds, thoughts, and actions of the people of the United States without disclosing in any way the commercial or political influence financially interested. It is of great importance that every facility should be afforded to all elements of society and to every commercial, industrial, social, religious, and educational interest to present openly and frankly its views on every subject not aimed at the impairment of the sovereignty of the Nation or in disparagement of our form of government as established by the Constitution. But as the right to present these various contentions should be preserved as inalienable, so the public to whom the appeal is made have an inalienable right to know and to be advised as to who is the spokesman of a given cause. Newspapers have become such an educational medium that the public should be afforded an ample opportunity to know just who their instructors are.

The act of Congress of August 24, 1912, undertook to accomplish this, but in the light of experience it is now clearly established that this act is inadequate. It permits of the adoption of many subterfuges by which its purpose is defeated though its spirit is violated without the commission of a legal breach of its prohibitions.

It is the opinion of this committee that this act should be amended and made more effective in several important particulars.

III.

The foreign-language press of the country as now conducted has the effect and in many instances is inspired with the purpose of discouraging the assimilation of the foreign elements with the American people and has been utilized by special interests for political and propaganda purposes. The financial condition of many of these newspapers has made them the easy and cheap victims of designing persons and interests whose financial advantage is best secured by retarding the Americanization of the alien and limiting him to the use of the foreign-language paper as his sole source of information. The foreign-language press exerts a greater influence upon its readers than an English newspaper does because of the limited educational facilities of the persons who can only read and talk in such foreign tongues, and consequently the subsidization and domination of this press is proportionately more vicious in its effects than similar practices would be in the case of English newspapers.

The experience of the last few years has clearly demonstrated the necessity of Americanizing the residents of this country, and especially those who from time to time are assuming the responsibility of citizenship. The aliens now residing within our borders or hereafter immigrating to our shores must either be assimilated by the Americans or they will be held together in their several nativistic groups, each group adhering to its

own language and customs, with the consequent adherence, either consciously or unconsciously, to the land of their nativity. While it must be recognized that during the time when they are merely the guests of this Nation a knowledge of their native language is all that can be expected, the Government is justified in requiring that before their status is changed to one of citizenship and before they can be permitted to participate in the government of the United States there should be some evidence at least of a purpose on their part toward that assimilation which is essential to the unity of purpose and substantial adherence to our institutions necessary to the healthy development of the Nation.

Foreign-language newspapers are a danger to the country unless they are utilized to assist in the assimilation of the alien element and to aid in the process of Americanization which is essential to the healthy development of the population into a homogeneous whole. This much-sought-for Americanization would be impeded by either depriving the alien of the educational value of a newspaper in the only language he can read or by withholding from him proper aid and facility for learning the English language and failing to encourage him to acquire the educational advantages incident to the mastering of the language of his adopted country. With this in mind, therefore, the committee recommends legislation to control and regulate the printing of foreign-language publications in this country.

IV.

For a number of years prior to our entry into the World War agents of the German Government persistently carried on a great propaganda in the United States, the purpose of which was to promote the interests of the German Government and to create a sentiment in this country in favor of that Government to the prejudice of this Nation. Every activity which tended to weaken our Government or to arouse antagonisms that would demoralize the unity and morale of our population and every movement that was aimed at involving us in foreign disputes or domestic difficulties was encouraged and frequently financed by the agents and representatives of the German Government.

To-day the forces of anarchy and violence are utilizing the financial resources plundered by them from the European people they have succeeded in exploiting to import into this country money, literature, and hired agents for the purpose of promulgating the doctrine of force, violence, assassination, confiscation, and revolution.

As an effect of these activities there has appeared in this country a large group of persons who advocate the overthrow of all organized government, and especially the Government of the United States, who favor revolutionary movements, repudiate the Constitution of the United States, and refuse to respect our national emblem and our governmental institutions. There are found among the leaders of this group many aliens who unhesitatingly abuse the hospitality which this country has extended to them and who because of that leadership are able to retard the real Americanization of the more ignorant residents possessing similar racial characteristics. These persons encourage and maintain a solidarity of the people of the several foreign tongues which is used to create and incite a class hatred that is quickly absorbed by and incorporated into the revolutionary movement led by them. The alien element in this country is the most susceptible and is the first to adopt violence as an effective weapon for supremacy.

More reprehensible than the alien element is that class of American citizens, whether native born or naturalized, who, having obligated themselves to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, lightly disregard their responsibilities and promulgate the doctrine that the form of government established by the Constitution should be overthrown and that a government responsive to a class rather than to all the people should be forcibly substituted therefor. It is a significant fact that almost without exception the persons in this country who are to-day advocating revolution and violence and all of the suffering, pain, and bloodshed incident to such a movement, have during the great struggle of the past two years undertaken to handicap, check, and obstruct in every way possible the military operations of this Government under the pretext that their consciences would not permit them to take the life of their fellow men even in war. The destruction of life, property, and government has no horrors to them when directed toward the overthrow of the Government of the United States, but the use of force in defense of our country they conscientiously object to.

Prior to the enactment of the statute of June 15, 1917, as amended by the statute of May 16, 1918, our Government was without laws adequate even to protect its own sovereignty. It is indeed unfortunate that this legislation should have been called an espionage act. Much of the complaint and criticism directed at this act was aimed more at the word used to designate it than at the text of the statute. Many of the provisions of this act are applicable only during time of war and consequently the restoration of peace will leave the Government of the United States more helpless and, because of the growth of the revolutionary movement as a result of the World War, more powerless than it found itself prior to our entrance into that struggle.

It is therefore imperative that there be enacted before the reestablishment of peace an act adequately protecting our national sovereignty and our established institutions.

V.

That the American people have been victimized and deceived by the activities of special interests and the subtle practices of designing individuals, some of them the agents and representatives of foreign governments through the use of organizations having dignified and respectable names, which completely disarm all suspicion of the ulterior purposes of those who inspired their organization. By the use of euphonious names given to supposedly patriotic, idealistic, and charitable organizations, patriotic and philanthropic citizens have been innocent victims of conniving representatives of foreign interests and governments and have been exploited by corrupt and dishonest elements. The Government of the United States long ago undertook by appropriate legislation to protect society from the fraudulent use of the mails commercially. The public have a right to some protection from deception being practiced by these mushroom organizations that have become so common.

No legitimate organization is ashamed of its paternity, its purposes, or its activities, and a proper registration of all voluntary associations or organizations appealing to the public through the mails for popular approval, financial support, and the propagation of its notions of government, sociology, benevolence, or what not is a reasonable requirement that can be utilized to provide some security to a much imposed-upon public; legislation is therefore recommended to this end.

VI.

Never have the Federal statutes provided adequate security against an unlawful and promiscuous use of high explosives. During the period of American neutrality, the representatives of the German Government, as well as many criminally inclined residents of our own country, resorted to the use of explosives for the destruction of life, property, and transportation facilities, and except for the provision in the interstate-commerce act, which prohibited the shipping or carrying of explosives in interstate commerce, the offenses could not be reached by the Federal Government, and when reached under this act the penalties were entirely incommensurate with the offense. The act of Congress of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," was enacted by Congress as a purely war statute, and becomes inoperative upon the restoration of peace. The efficacious effects of this legislation during the period of the war has not only justified its enactment as a war statute, but has impressed upon the people of the country the merit of its provision in times of peace as well as in times of war.

All law-abiding persons recognize the necessity of controlling and regulating the manufacture, distribution, and possession of the instruments of death and destruction relied upon by the criminal and lawless elements of society. The obligation of the Federal Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens would not be fully performed were Congress to permit the act of October 6, 1917, to die by limitation without enacting in its place a peace-time measure.

The committee wishes to again express its thanks to Maj. Humes, Capt. Lester, and Mr. Benham for their untiring zeal and great ability in aiding the committee in securing the great mass of testimony which, in our opinion, will be most useful to the public.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

LEE S. OVERMAN, *Chairman.*
WILLIAM H. KING.
JOSIAH O. WOLCOTT.
KNUTE NELSON.
THOMAS STERLING.

As a member of the subcommittee I have joined in the above report; but while agreeing with many of the statements and recommendations appearing on pages 43 to 48, inclusive, I desire to state that I am not in full accord with all the committee's recommendations.

WILLIAM H. KING.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1694) providing for the refund of taxes collected for stamp tax on certain policies under the emergency-tax act of October 22, 1914, under the proviso to which act such policies were exempt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1695) validating certain homestead entries; and

A bill (S. 1696) providing for enlarged homesteads in forest reserves and for additional homesteads; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1697) to amend section 3928 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 1698) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in certain cases to missionary or religious organizations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1699) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 1700) to authorize corporations organized in the District of Columbia to change their names; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1701) granting an increase of pension to William S. Young (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1702) granting an increase of pension to George Milholland (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1703) granting a pension to William R. Gillespie (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1704) granting an increase of pension to William Young (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1705) granting a pension to Charles J. McFadden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1706) granting an increase of pension to George W. McMahan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1707) granting an increase of pension to William D. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1708) granting a pension to Susan A. Hickman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Edgar L. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1710) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Hunt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1711) granting an increase of pension to James Anderson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1712) granting an increase of pension to James T. Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1713) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Ward (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1714) granting a pension to Schuyler C. Jackson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1715) granting an increase of pension to John M. Caulfield (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1716) granting an increase of pension to Richard Dobson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1717) granting an increase of pension to William McCory (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1718) granting a pension to James K. Waltermire (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWBERRY:

A bill (S. 1719) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 1720) to declare unlawful associations purposing by physical force, violence, or injury to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change in the United States, and prescribing punishment for persons engaged in the activities of such associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 1721) for the relief of Jennie Garrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1723) granting a pension to Helen A. Bull;

A bill (S. 1724) granting a pension to Rudolph Allmers; and

A bill (S. 1725) granting a pension to Fanny Wood Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1726) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1727) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Parmenter; and

A bill (S. 1728) granting a pension to Abbie Holbrook (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1729) permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States; and

A bill (S. 1730) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture," approved February 1, 1905; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1731) for the relief of Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1732) for the relief of Hannah Nelson Lundegren; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1733) for the relief of George R. Campbell, Milton B. Germond, and Walter D. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 1734) granting an increase of pension to Patrick G. Conley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1735) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1736) granting an increase of pension to Ira N. Levalley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1737) to grant rank to the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 1738) for the relief of Otis C. Mooney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1739) for the relief of Joel J. Booth; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1740) for the relief of James L. Wallace, his heirs or assigns; to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

A bill (S. 1741) to reinstate Frederick J. Birkett as third lieutenant in the United States Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Commitee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1742) to correct the naval record of Reuben E. Lawrence; and

A bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Matthew McDonald; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1744) for the relief of Lou Jahn;

A bill (S. 1745) for the relief of David H. Fay;

A bill (S. 1746) for the relief of William H. Manning;

A bill (S. 1747) for the relief of the estate of John McQuiddy, deceased;

A bill (S. 1748) for the relief of W. E. Thomas;

A bill (S. 1749) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel W. Boutwell;

A bill (S. 1750) for the relief of Mary E. Woodward;

A bill (S. 1751) for the relief of R. W. Branson;

A bill (S. 1752) for the relief of James Ferrell;

A bill (S. 1753) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas N. Stinson; and

A bill (S. 1754) for the relief of Jacob Samuel Weaver; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1755) for the relief of Charles Rayfield;

A bill (S. 1756) for the relief of William H. Dooley;

A bill (S. 1757) for the relief of Charles Dade;

A bill (S. 1758) for the relief of John A. Clark;

A bill (S. 1759) to correct the military record of James H. Painter;

A bill (S. 1760) to remove the charge of desertion against James B. Smock;

A bill (S. 1761) for the relief of John Ogden;

A bill (S. 1762) for the relief of Alfred Rebsamen;

A bill (S. 1763) to correct the military record of Daniel Elshire;

A bill (S. 1764) for the relief of Thomas J. Temple;

A bill (S. 1765) for the relief of William H. Dooley;

A bill (S. 1766) for the relief of Abner W. Loomis;
A bill (S. 1767) for the relief of David Porter Haseltine;
A bill (S. 1768) to correct the military record of Thomas Jackson Hanson;
A bill (S. 1769) for the relief of Ira Strickland;
A bill (S. 1770) for the relief of Henry Wagner;
A bill (S. 1771) for the relief of Franklin Bannon;
A bill (S. 1772) for the relief of John C. Hall;
A bill (S. 1773) for the permanent appointment as commissioned officers of certain noncommissioned officers who were called to active service under temporary commissions as officers between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918;
A bill (S. 1774) for the relief of Isaac D. Sells (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1775) for the relief of Henry W. Daly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1776) granting an increase of pension to Alexander C. Powell (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1777) granting a pension to Clifford Welch (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1778) granting an increase of pension to Archibald T. Lea (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1779) granting an increase of pension to William Rodgers (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1780) granting an increase of pension to John J. Smith (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1781) granting a pension to Mrs. Freddie Gibbons (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1782) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Gabrilla Anderson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1783) granting a pension to Henry Weese;
A bill (S. 1784) granting a pension to George A. Noblet;
A bill (S. 1785) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. Neely;
A bill (S. 1786) granting a pension to William A. Wilburn;
A bill (S. 1787) granting an increase of pension to Silas Clyde Whitcomb;
A bill (S. 1788) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Willard;
A bill (S. 1789) granting an increase of pension to Harrison White;
A bill (S. 1790) granting an increase of pension to James N. Yates;
A bill (S. 1791) granting a pension to John F. Smith;
A bill (S. 1792) granting a pension to Henry Scott;
A bill (S. 1793) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Shinn;
A bill (S. 1794) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. McQuiddy;
A bill (S. 1795) granting an increase of pension to Amos N. McReynolds;
A bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to John Rogers;
A bill (S. 1797) granting an increase of pension to James B. Rutherford;
A bill (S. 1798) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Rowland;
A bill (S. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Patterson;
A bill (S. 1800) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Nickelson;
A bill (S. 1801) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Wonsettler;
A bill (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to John P. Williams;
A bill (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to August Berndt;
A bill (S. 1804) granting a pension to Mary J. Davis;
A bill (S. 1805) granting an increase of pension to Nannie L. Davenport;
A bill (S. 1806) granting a pension to Robert Cook;
A bill (S. 1807) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Botsford;
A bill (S. 1808) granting an increase of pension to Leander T. Gage;
A bill (S. 1809) granting a pension to Levisa W. Brown;
A bill (S. 1810) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mott;
A bill (S. 1811) granting an increase of pension to Ludwell J. Mosher;
A bill (S. 1812) granting an increase of pension to William C. Moran;
A bill (S. 1813) granting a pension to Hattie W. Hurst;
A bill (S. 1814) granting an increase of pension to Abram A. Raub;
A bill (S. 1815) granting a pension to Julia A. Tucker;
A bill (S. 1816) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Pixley;
A bill (S. 1817) granting a pension to Marshall Ray;
A bill (S. 1818) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Bay;
A bill (S. 1819) granting an increase of pension to William B. Brooks;
A bill (S. 1820) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel H. Kendrick;
A bill (S. 1821) granting a pension to John C. Brewer;
A bill (S. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Harry D. Cessna;
A bill (S. 1823) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Danforth;
A bill (S. 1824) granting an increase of pension to Austin L. Myers;
A bill (S. 1825) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Moore;
A bill (S. 1826) granting an increase of pension to Nathan L. Fritts;
A bill (S. 1827) granting an increase of pension to John W. Magann;
A bill (S. 1828) granting an increase of pension to George Stamm, sr.;
A bill (S. 1829) granting a pension to Eliza A. Teters;
A bill (S. 1830) granting an increase of pension to Isobel M. Evans;
A bill (S. 1831) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Stumph;
A bill (S. 1832) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McCoy;
A bill (S. 1833) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilton;
A bill (S. 1834) granting a pension to Fred Thompson;
A bill (S. 1835) granting a pension to Lydia J. Willis;
A bill (S. 1836) granting a pension to Sarah Elmore;
A bill (S. 1837) granting a pension to Victoria Duby;
A bill (S. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Dora A. Dressler;
A bill (S. 1839) granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Caton;
A bill (S. 1840) granting an increase of pension to Carthenia H. Moore;
A bill (S. 1841) granting an increase of pension to Smith Culler;
A bill (S. 1842) granting a pension to Josephine Ryan Seyffer;
A bill (S. 1843) granting an increase of pension to Swain C. Kindblade;
A bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Williamson;
A bill (S. 1845) granting a pension to Mary E. Allen;
A bill (S. 1846) granting a pension to Martha E. Hart;
A bill (S. 1847) granting an increase of pension to John S. Wells;
A bill (S. 1848) granting an increase of pension to David H. Bruce;
A bill (S. 1849) granting an increase of pension to George Ketzler;
A bill (S. 1850) granting an increase of pension to John Wesley Jones;
A bill (S. 1851) granting an increase of pension to William H. Culter;
A bill (S. 1852) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Cunningham;
A bill (S. 1853) granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron;
A bill (S. 1854) granting an increase of pension to George W. Carroll;
A bill (S. 1855) granting a pension to Mrs. M. A. Campbell;
A bill (S. 1856) granting a pension to Lucy A. Cole;
A bill (S. 1857) granting a pension to Jennie L. Luppie;
A bill (S. 1858) granting an increase of pension to Harriet R. Hoagland;
A bill (S. 1859) granting an increase of pension to Smith Culler;
A bill (S. 1860) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cramer;
A bill (S. 1861) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Cook;
A bill (S. 1862) granting an increase of pension to William T. Cowan;
A bill (S. 1863) granting an increase of pension to John Gibson;
A bill (S. 1864) granting an increase of pension to William B. Gray;
A bill (S. 1865) granting a pension to Charles Grunert;

A bill (S. 1866) granting an increase of pension to William P. Gilbert;
A bill (S. 1867) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Griffith;
A bill (S. 1868) granting an increase of pension to James H. Gunion;
A bill (S. 1869) granting a pension to Henry Johns;
A bill (S. 1870) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Choat;
A bill (S. 1871) granting a pension to Alexander R. Banks;
A bill (S. 1872) granting a pension to John N. Baker;
A bill (S. 1873) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Bridgman;
A bill (S. 1874) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Burford;
A bill (S. 1875) granting an increase of pension to Richard Brookins;
A bill (S. 1876) granting a pension to Frederick Besancon;
A bill (S. 1877) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Anderson;
A bill (S. 1878) granting an increase of pension to Elias Andrew;
A bill (S. 1879) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Alexander;
A bill (S. 1880) granting a pension to Lucy Long;
A bill (S. 1881) granting an increase of pension to James S. Ames;
A bill (S. 1882) granting an increase of pension to Justin W. Allen;
A bill (S. 1883) granting an increase of pension to Wiley J. Baldwin, jr.;
A bill (S. 1884) granting an increase of pension to John A. Bell;
A bill (S. 1885) granting a pension to William Bruce;
A bill (S. 1886) granting a pension to Joshua Brown;
A bill (S. 1887) granting an increase of pension to John C. Ball;
A bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to David Brown;
A bill (S. 1889) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Brady;
A bill (S. 1890) granting an increase of pension to Allen Brown;
A bill (S. 1891) granting an increase of pension to John W. Baughman;
A bill (S. 1892) granting a pension to Jesse L. Knight;
A bill (S. 1893) granting an increase of pension to James I. Edwards;
A bill (S. 1894) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Puckett;
A bill (S. 1895) granting a pension to William W. Peyton;
A bill (S. 1896) granting an increase of pension to Charles Riggs;
A bill (S. 1897) granting an increase of pension to Frank Rogers;
A bill (S. 1898) granting an increase of pension to Willis Mills;
A bill (S. 1899) granting a pension to David Mitchell;
A bill (S. 1900) granting a pension to John Mahafa;
A bill (S. 1901) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Macomber;
A bill (S. 1902) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Mackey;
A bill (S. 1903) granting an increase of pension to Joh.. W. Lesh;
A bill (S. 1904) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Linn;
A bill (S. 1905) granting a pension to Fred M. Livingston;
A bill (S. 1906) granting a pension to John R. Martin;
A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to John D. Patterson;
A bill (S. 1908) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Parks;
A bill (S. 1909) granting a pension to Mary J. Maclary;
A bill (S. 1910) granting a pension to C. P. Ellis;
A bill (S. 1911) granting a pension to Elvira Jarrett;
A bill (S. 1912) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Haxton;
A bill (S. 1913) granting an increase of pension to H. E. Wentworth;
A bill (S. 1914) granting a pension to John A. Pryor;
A bill (S. 1915) granting an increase of pension to James M. Adkins;
A bill (S. 1916) granting an increase of pension to Elnathan Wert;
A bill (S. 1917) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Schiedel;
A bill (S. 1918) granting an increase of pension to Cal K. Shoemaker;
A bill (S. 1919) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Ash;
A bill (S. 1920) granting an increase of pension to John W. Alyea;
A bill (S. 1921) granting an increase of pension to David B. Owens;
A bill (S. 1922) granting an increase of pension to Lucetta A. Bryant;
A bill (S. 1923) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams;
A bill (S. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Loos;
A bill (S. 1925) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Sawrey;
A bill (S. 1926) granting an increase of pension to Hiram L. Hooton;
A bill (S. 1927) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Booker;
A bill (S. 1928) granting an increase of pension to Mary Melissa Anderson;
A bill (S. 1929) granting a pension to Susan A. Cline;
A bill (S. 1930) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Stover;
A bill (S. 1931) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Temperance Smith;
A bill (S. 1932) granting an increase of pension to William B. Lawrence;
A bill (S. 1933) granting a pension to Howard Copeland Little;
A bill (S. 1934) granting an increase of pension to Silas J. Warford;
A bill (S. 1935) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Bennett;
A bill (S. 1936) granting a pension to Flora E. White;
A bill (S. 1937) granting a pension to John M. Abney;
A bill (S. 1938) granting a pension to Lemuel Abbott;
A bill (S. 1939) granting a pension to George W. Williams;
A bill (S. 1940) granting a pension to Joseph J. Wood;
A bill (S. 1941) granting a pension to Robert E. Longbothom;
A bill (S. 1942) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Abeles;
A bill (S. 1943) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Snyder;
A bill (S. 1944) granting an increase of pension to John S. Lane;
A bill (S. 1945) granting an increase of pension to David Hood;
A bill (S. 1946) granting a pension to John Cropper;
A bill (S. 1947) granting an increase of pension to William Henthorn;
A bill (S. 1948) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Hatton;
A bill (S. 1949) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Henry;
A bill (S. 1950) granting a pension to James F. Hargett;
A bill (S. 1951) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Hurst;
A bill (S. 1952) granting an increase of pension to William H. Harris;
A bill (S. 1953) granting a pension to John W. Hill;
A bill (S. 1954) granting an increase of pension to Jesse L. Pelton;
A bill (S. 1955) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Briggs;
A bill (S. 1956) granting a pension to William M. Hiett;
A bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Jesse O. Dobyns;
A bill (S. 1958) granting an increase of pension to John W. Buffum;
A bill (S. 1959) granting an increase of pension to John Brown;
A bill (S. 1960) granting an increase of pension to Erastus Perrine;
A bill (S. 1961) granting an increase of pension to Abram W. Sidwell;
A bill (S. 1962) granting a pension to Walter C. Niccolls;
A bill (S. 1963) granting an increase of pension to James H. Mills;
A bill (S. 1964) granting an increase of pension to James William Alexander;
A bill (S. 1965) granting an increase of pension to Susan Owens;

A bill (S. 1966) granting a pension to Anna D. Blackford;
A bill (S. 1967) granting an increase of pension to William P. Briggs;
A bill (S. 1968) granting a pension to Samuel B. McMillan;
A bill (S. 1969) granting an increase of pension to John Squires;
A bill (S. 1970) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Shawhan;
A bill (S. 1971) granting a pension to Alice Noble;
A bill (S. 1972) granting a pension to Catherine Walker;
A bill (S. 1973) granting a pension to James Wright;
A bill (S. 1974) granting a pension ot Sarah Smith;
A bill (S. 1975) granting an increase of pension to Luther H. Smith;
A bill (S. 1976) granting an increase of pension to James M. Shuey;
A bill (S. 1977) granting an increase of pension to Milton Shields;
A bill (S. 1978) granting a pension to Janama Oldham;
A bill (S. 1979) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Clark;
A bill (S. 1980) granting a pension to Christian R. Barnett;
A bill (S. 1981) granting an increase of pension to William Peterson;
A bill (S. 1982) granting a pension to Sureno Doll;
A bill (S. 1983) granting a pension to Carrie L. Rouse;
A bill (S. 1984) granting an increase of pension to George M. Edwards;
A bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to James Jackson;
A bill (S. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Ella Laws;
A bill (S. 1987) granting an increase of pension to James Brooks;
A bill (S. 1988) granting an increase of pension to William R. Porter;
A bill (S. 1989) granting an increase of pension to Fernando C. Cash;
A bill (S. 1990) granting an increase of pension to David Tenpenny;
A bill (S. 1991) granting a pension to Sarah Cole;
A bill (S. 1992) granting an increase of pension to Abbott A. Mills;
A bill (S. 1993) granting an increase of pension to George W. Allen;
A bill (S. 1994) granting an increase of pension to Newton A. Mathis;
A bill (S. 1995) granting a pension to Susan A. Lautzenheiser;
A bill (S. 1996) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Wright;
A bill (S. 1997) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Davis;
A bill (S. 1998) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Phenicie;
A bill (S. 1999) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester L. Duff;
A bill (S. 2000) granting an increase of pension to Henry Yerkes;
A bill (S. 2001) granting an increase of pension to John H. Biddle;
A bill (S. 2002) granting an increase of pension to Miner N. King;
A bill (S. 2003) granting a pension to John J. Smith;
A bill (S. 2004) granting an increase of pension to Eli Avery;
A bill (S. 2005) granting a pension to Emma G. Randall;
A bill (S. 2006) granting a pension to William H Gage;
A bill (S. 2007) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Forrest;
A bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Julia McKim;
A bill (S. 2009) granting an increase of pension to Frank J. McLaughlin;
A bill (S. 2010) granting a pension to Harvey C. Myers;
A bill (S. 2011) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Reitzel;
A bill (S. 2012) granting a pension to John Preston Fairchild;
A bill (S. 2013) granting a pension to Tom Pogue;
A bill (S. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Arthur W. Brittingham;
A bill (S. 2015) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Helm;
A bill (S. 2016) granting an increase of pension to William L. Kessler;
A bill (S. 2017) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo H. Green;
A bill (S. 2018) granting an increase of pension to Elmer Y. Morris;
A bill (S. 2019) granting a pension to Charlotte Ann Ury;
A bill (S. 2020) granting a pension to Melvina Roberson;
A bill (S. 2021) granting a pension to Sarah E. Ross;
A bill (S. 2022) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wandel;
A bill (S. 2023) granting an increase of pension to John R. Merideth;
A bill (S. 2024) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Johnson Veale;
A bill (S. 2025) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Huey;
A bill (S. 2026) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Wood;
A bill (S. 2027) granting a pension to William C. Campbell;
A bill (S. 2028) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Briggs;
A bill (S. 2029) granting an increase of pension to Thomas White;
A bill (S. 2030) granting a pension to Thomas Jefferson Rothgeb;
A bill (S. 2031) granting a pension to Martha J. Thomas;
A bill (S. 2032) granting an increase of pension to John C. Mercer;
A bill (S. 2033) granting an increase of pension to Luther M. Summers;
A bill (S. 2034) granting a pension to Henry Taylor;
A bill (S. 2035) granting a pension to Francis Sullivan;
A bill (S. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Waller;
A bill (S. 2037) granting a pension to Daniel B. Waggoner;
A bill (S. 2038) granting an increase of pension to Davis B. Wilcoxson;
A bill (S. 2039) granting a pension to Lyman E. Tibbits;
A bill (S. 2040) granting an increase of pension to John F. M. Todd;
A bill (S. 2041) granting a pension to George E. Vale;
A bill (S. 2042) granting an increase of pension to Henry Thompson;
A bill (S. 2043) granting a pension to Louisa Leppla;
A bill (S. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Zephaniah Roberts;
A bill (S. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Kunkel;
A bill (S. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Henry Keeler;
A bill (S. 2047) granting an increase of pension to Francis Straub;
A bill (S. 2048) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Noland;
A bill (S. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Harrison A. Donals;
A bill (S. 2050) granting an increase of pension to James M. Friels;
A bill (S. 2051) granting an increase of pension to Mary McCray;
A bill (S. 2052) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Edens;
A bill (S. 2053) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Forkner;
A bill (S. 2054) granting an increase of pension to John Fitch;
A bill (S. 2055) granting a pension to Daniel Dye;
A bill (S. 2056) granting an increase of pension to James Devine;
A bill (S. 2057) granting an increase of pension to John F. Dixon;
A bill (S. 2058) granting an increase of pension to John Dodgion;
A bill (S. 2059) granting a pension to Mary Kelly;
A bill (S. 2060) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Ellis;
A bill (S. 2061) granting an increase of pension to Marion Pierce;
A bill (S. 2062) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Otto;
A bill (S. 2063) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. McClain;
A bill (S. 2064) granting a pension to Jesse McAllister;
A bill (S. 2065) granting an increase of pension to James W. Dougherty;
A bill (S. 2066) granting an increase of pension to James K. P. Wilson;

A bill (S. 2067) granting an increase of pension to William L. McClellan;

A bill (S. 2068) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Taylor;

A bill (S. 2069) granting a pension to Joseph Warner;

A bill (S. 2070) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Strohm;

A bill (S. 2071) granting a pension to Isaac F. Roberts;

A bill (S. 2072) granting an increase of pension to James F. DeWitt;

A bill (S. 2073) granting a pension to William W. Wilhite;

A bill (2074) granting a pension to George Coghill;

A bill (S. 2075) granting a pension to Niels Pedersen;

A bill (S. 2076) granting an increase of pension to William Kunkle;

A bill (S. 2077) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Potterton;

A bill (S. 2078) granting a pension to George J. Jones;

A bill (S. 2079) granting an increase of pension to George W. Jackson; and

A bill (S. 2080) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Potter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 2081) to prohibit intoxicating beverages and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the International Aircraft Standards Commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 for the study and improvement of methods of dehydrating materials used for food, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation relative to investigating the experiments in animal husbandry, etc., from $307,680 to $316,960, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. HARRISON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for cooperative agricultural extension work, etc., from $2,500,000 to $4,473,680, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NEW submitted an amendment providing that any person of foreign birth who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, etc., shall have the benefits of the seventh subdivision of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment relative to the naval militia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

TERRITORY OF TURKEY.

Mr. KING. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read and lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was ordered to lie over and be printed, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that the peace conference has invited the defunct Government of Turkey to send delegates to the conference; and

Whereas it is further reported that the peace conference contemplates that the Turkish Government shall be perpetuated and have its seat at Constantinople; and

Whereas the Turkish Government has neither right nor reason to exist, and the recognition of the same is inconsistent with any policy which has for its purpose the establishment of peace, justice, and liberty within the territories formerly comprised within the Turkish Empire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate the territories formerly comprised within the Turkish Empire should be governed by mandatories of the league of nations to the exclusion of the so-called Turkish Government from any and all authority therein, and that for this purpose mandatories should be appointed for Constantinople and the residue of Turkish territory in Europe, Anatolia, Armenia, Syria, Arabia and Mesopotamia; that Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotomia, including Allepo, should be grouped together and administered by Great Britain under the mandate of the league of nations; that Anatolia and Armenia should be grouped together and administered by France, under the mandate of the league of nations; and that Constantinople and European Turkey should be constituted a free metropolitan state under the protection of the league of nations

RAILROAD FINANCES.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Director General of Railroads be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate:

(1) A complete income account, in the form required by the Interstate Commerce Commission from railroads having income in excess of $1,000,000 per year, showing the financial operations of the United States Railroad Administration for the calendar year 1918 and from January 1, 1919, to the latest practicable date;

(2) A balance sheet prepared as of the latest date represented in said income account, showing the financial situation of the United States Railroad Administration on said date; and

(3) A similar balance sheet prepared as of December 31, 1918.

GERMAN PROPAGANDA.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 10,000 copies of the hearing and report of the committee entitled "Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda," and "Bolshevik Propaganda," held before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, in the second and third sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress, pursuant to Senate resolutions 307 and 469, of which 3,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 6,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. I submit the conference report on the third deficiency appropriation bill, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 15½, 16, 18, 42, 48, 53, 73, 74, 75, 77, and 82.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 17, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 78, 79, 80, and 81, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY.

"Not later than June 30, 1919, all books, records, and papers relating to the investigations of duplication of statistical and other work and to the work of the statistical clearing house of the Central Bureau of Planning and Statistics shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"For rent of the Navy Annex Building on New York Avenue near Eighteenth Street NW., fiscal year 1920, $40,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"OFFICE OF THE TREASURER.

"National currency (reimbursable): For the following employees from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows:

"Assistant tellers—One $2,200, 1 $2,000; clerks—4 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 4 of class 2; expert counters—20 at $1,100 each, 30 at $900 each; 3 messengers at $840 each; messenger boy, $480; in all, $75,400."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "determined by the Secretary of War and agreed to by the claimants"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

"Office expenses: For the purchase of new instruments, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $24,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$32,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference has been unable to agree on the amendment of the Senate numbered 21.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JAMES W. GOOD,
J. G. CANNON,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], what was done by the conferees in reference to the Alaskan relief amendment?

Mr. WARREN. It went out in conference. The Senate conferees were unable to reach an affirmative agreement with reference to that amendment, and it went out of the bill, with the expectation that the subject matter will be included in the sundry civil appropriation bill on which House Members are now working, and that it is going to be taken care of there. The money could not be expended this year; and, I repeat, it is expected that it will be taken care of in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then the understanding is that that situation will be taken care of in the sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. WARREN. So far as such understandings can be had that is the case. Of course the matter was not before the committee officially.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But that is the understanding with the House conferees?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; that they can take care of Alaskan matters in that way.

Mr. JONES of Washington. With that understanding upon the part of the chairman, I shall not oppose the adoption of this conference report. I do think, however, that the Congress of the United States can not afford to neglect the situation in Alaska. We have appropriated $100,000,000 to take care of the starving peoples of Europe. All this amendment provided for was $100,000 to take care of the starving and dying Indians in Alaska, who are peculiarly the wards of the Government. I can see absolutely no justification whatever for Congress not taking care of that situation. In fact, it seems to me it would be a reproach if we did not do so. I feel that it can be taken care of in the sundry civil appropriation bill if Members of Congress are disposed to do so. Therefore I am not disposed to delay the adoption of this conference report in view of the statement of the chairman of the committee. I feel satisfied that he has done what he could do to maintain this item in the bill. I think it really ought to be maintained in the bill, for it covers only what has been actually obligated by the governor of that Territory, acting upon his own responsibility, to meet a dire situation which exists there.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, according to the way in which the language was framed, the appropriation could have been used only for 1919, so it was out of our power as the matter was considered by the House. Therefore it was asked by the House conferees of the Senate conferees that we should pass the matter over to the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to ask the Senator a question. Is it a part of this understanding or of the understanding of the chairman, that whatever is done in the sundry civil appropriation bill will only apply to 1920? That is not the understanding of the chairman of the committee, is it?

Mr. WARREN. So far as that is concerned, if they had no money to expend they have not expended it. If any bills have come in which are to be paid under the regular appropriation, of course they will be considered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But, Mr. President, this is not a deficiency which has been created by an obligation of existing law. This is not to meet obligations of existing law. It is simply to meet a situation that arose there in connection with the influenza epidemic. The governor of the Territory, acting upon his own responsibiliy to meet the situation, sent out expeditions, engaged the services of various people to care for the situation, and also engaged the services of different institutions to take care of indigent and orphaned children who could not be cared for in any other way, relying upon the United States Government to appropriate the money to take care of the situation. He testified before the committee that the obligations that he had incurred in this way, while technically or legally the United States Government does not have to pay them if it does not want to do so, amount to over $100,000. The committee in reporting the resolution provided for an appropriation of $100,000 to take care of the situation, including obligations already incurred. If it is the understanding that merely the situation for the future will be taken care of in the sundry civil bill, that does not meet the case at all. When the bill comes over, I shall insist upon meeting the situation as in the past the Senate has provided for meeting it, by making this $100,000 available not only for the expenditures of the future but in order to take care of obligations already incurred by the Government.

I desired to make that statement in order that the chairman of the committee might plainly understand my position; and that is the language of the amendment which was put on the bill. It expressly includes obligations heretofore entered into and was intended to cover the promises made by the governor of the Territory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as has been noticed from the reading of the conference report, there is a disagreement on one item. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment numbered 21 and ask a further conference with the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. R. 5227. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the world cotton conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can not do that under the rule.

Mr. GRONNA. Then I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 4, line 17, before the word "of," to strike out "Office" and insert "Bureau"; in line 18, after the word "office," to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$5,000"; and, on page 5, line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "$83,430" and insert "$84,430," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, Bureau of Farm Management: One chief of office, $5,000; 1 assistant to the chief, $2,520; 1 executive assistant, $2,250; 2 clerks, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, class 2; 8 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at $1,100 each; 4 clerks, at $1,080 each; 1 clerk or draftsman, $1,020; 10 clerks, at $1,000 each; 18 clerks, at $900 each; 6 clerks or map tracers, at $840 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $720; 1 messenger boy, $660; 3 messenger boys, at $480 each; 1 charwoman, $480; 5 charwomen, at $240 each; 1 library assistant, $1,440; 1 library assistant, $900; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 cartographer, $1,500; 1 draftsman, $1,440; 1 draftsman, $1,200; 2 draftsmen, at $900 each; in all, $84,430.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to a number of items that show increases. I had supposed, under the promises made by the members of the Agriculture Committee when the bill was before the Senate for consideration at the last session of Congress, that the bill would show uniform reductions and economies, because it was contended that the very large appropriations carried by the regular bills during the past two years were required by reason of the war.

This bill has just been reported, so Senators not members of the committee have had no opportunity to examine its multitudinous items; but the hurried examination of the pages show no reductions, but increases in hundreds of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. There are a few items here that are increased over the appropriations contained in the bill that passed the House. I will say to the Senator, however, that this appropriation bill carries less than the Agricultural appropriation bill carried as it was reported from the Senate committee at the last session. It carries more than a million dollars less, although there is incorporated in this bill an appropriation of $2,000,000 for the purchase of land under the so-called Weeks law.

That, of course, is not an expenditure. It is simply an investment; and taking out the $2,000,000 and taking out the $1,000,000 which is appropriated only as an insurance fund for the foot-and-mouth disease, there is really no increase above what the bill carried as it passed the House.

This particular item changes the office of the Chief of the Bureau of Farm Management from an office to a bureau, and it does increase the salary of the chief $1,000. In explanation of that, I want to say that there has been a change in this office. A change was made, and Dr. H. C. Taylor, of Wisconsin University, was induced to accept this position at a sacrifice to himself, and the Secretary of Agriculture made the promise to Dr. Taylor that he would recommend that the salary of $4,000 be increased $1,000. In view of that fact, the committee did not think that we ought to refuse to grant the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, as long as he had promised to Dr. Taylor that he would recommend an increase in his salary.

Now, Mr. President, if I may take just a few minutes, I want to say to the Senator from Utah that I heartily concur in what he has said, that many of these appropriation bills ought to be reduced. This, however, is not my bill. It was only taken over by me as it was made by the Members of both Houses during the last Congress. This bill, as the Senator knows, passed the House of Representatives a year ago, came to the Senate, was submitted to the Senate committee, and was approved by the Senate committee, and there were some increases made; one a very large increase, one of $3,000,000 in what is known as the Bureau of Farm Management for extension work. The committee of the House appropriated this time only $1,500,000 instead of $4,500,000 for extension work. The Senate committee increased that item $1,000,000 this time, instead of $3,000,000 last time. There were conflicting opinions as to whether or not it should be increased, because, as the Senator knows, under permanent law, under the so-called Smith-Lever law, there is carried $3,080,000 for extension work; and together with the $1,500,000, which would make $4,580,000, and an additional appropriation of $551,000, which we increased to $751,000, it would give the Department of Agriculture more than $5,000,000 to expend for extension work.

We have been petitioned by every college professor and every university professor and by the people all over the country to increase this amount to $4,500,000. The Senate committee increased it only $1,000,000, instead of $3,000,000, as was done last year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. Why did not the committee leave the amount as the general statute provides?

Mr. GRONNA. That is a permanent fund. The $1,500,000 is a separate fund from that. The $3,080,000 is a permanent fund, which increases $500,000 each year up to the year 1922, so that next year that item will be $3,580,000.

Mr. KING. The committee, then, has added to the general and permanent fund in the present bill $1,000,000?

Mr. GRONNA. One million dollars; yes sir. That is correct.

Mr. KING. In view of the heavy appropriations made for the Agricultural Department, being nearly $50,000,000 for the last year—this sum including the so-called war appropriation—does the Senator think the committee should now exceed the general and permanent provisions by making a further contribution of $1,000,000?

Mr. GRONNA. If my individual view had prevailed, perhaps the amount would not have been increased; but the committee saw fit to increase it $1,000,000. The Senator must not forget that under the emergency legislation of 1917 and 1918 the Department of Agriculture had other funds. We appropriated $11,000,000 besides the appropriations made in the regular Agricultural bill; so, instead of saying that we appropriated $27,000,000 the year before, we had over $38,000,000—that is, including the appropriations to take care of the Food Control Board. As the Senator knows, there are no appropriations this year for food control. Some of those items have been taken over and are included in this bill.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, there was more than $38,000,000. First, there was the Agricultural appropriation bill, which carried more than $27,000,000.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. KING. Then there was the so-called war Agricultural bill, which carried over $20,000,000, as I recall, as it was originally introduced, but finally, when it was passed, it carried nearly $20,000,000. Then, in addition to that, there was a very large appropriation made to the commission over which Mr. Hoover presided.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

Mr. KING. That aggregated millions of dollars. So that for food distribution and for food control and for the Agricultural Department there was appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, a very much larger sum than was stated by the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, taking the whole term during the war, there was a great deal more appropriated. I am speaking of the fiscal years 1918 and 1919.

If the Senator will pardon me, I have made up a statement here which shows all of the increases made by the Senate committee.

In the Office of Farm Management there is an increase of $1,000. That is the item just read at the desk.

In the Bureau of Animal Industry there is an increase of $153,060.

In the Bureau of Plant Industry there is an increase of $285,440.

In the Forest Service there is an increase of $122,500.

In the Bureau of Entomology there is an increase of $65,500.

In the Bureau of Biological Survey there is an increase of $105,500.

In the Division of Publications there is an increase of $200.

In the States Relations Service—and that is the item to which I called attention, the extension service—there is an increase of $1,000,000, and a few other items, amounting in all to $1,230,000.

In the Bureau of Markets there is an increase of appropriations of $125,100.

This makes a total, in the various bureaus, of $2,183,300.

Those are all the increases which we have made in this bill, except $2,000,000 for the acquisition of lands for the protection of watersheds of navigable streams—that is to carry out the Weeks law—agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and inter-

national fairs in the United States, $100,000; and an international farm congress, to be held at Kansas City, Mo., $5,000; or a total increase of $4,288,300.

Mr. KING. When so many appeals were made for an increase in the appropriations for the Agricultural Department during the war, appeals based upon the obvious proposition that food was indispensable to the winning of the war, and those appeals were listened to and the appropriations made, does not the Senator think that now, when we have reached a normal condition again, there should be a reduction instead of an increase?

I know that appeals were made—if not by the Senator, certainly by other members of the committee—in favor of the very large appropriations made during 1917 and 1918, on the ground that it was necessary that we should furnish food for our allies as well as for ourselves; that these large appropriations were necessary to stimulate agriculture, and to aid in the conservation of the food supplies of our country; and the promise was made, directly and indirectly, that as soon as the war was over we would get back to normal conditions and that the appropriations would shrink to their normal prewar level. Now, however, when we have gotten back to peace times, the Senator presents us with a bill that is a very material increase over normal times, and, as I understand, an increase over war times.

Mr. GRONNA. No, not over war times, but an increase over the House bill as it passed the House. Let me say to the Senator, however, that under the food-production act we appropriated $11,031,863 and for the current year in the regular appropriation bill we appropriated $27,875,353, or a total of $38,907,216. That was the amount of the appropriations as the bill passed the House; but the bill as it passed the Senate carries $37,355,352. If you add the $11,000,000, which was appropriated under the food-control act, it makes more than $48,000,000; and there is a very large decrease in the appropriations that this bill carries as compared with the bills that we passed for the fiscal year which will end June 30, 1919.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, when I spoke of the appropriations made during 1917 and 1918 I referred to the usual Agricultural bill and not to the extraordinary ones, one of which, as the Senator has stated, carried approximately $11,000,000; but, as I understand, this bill, the regular annual appropriation bill for the Agricultural Department, does increase the appropriations considerably over the regular annual appropriation bill, say for 1916, 1915, or 1914.

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, yes.

Mr. KING. And, indeed, it is an increase over the regular annual appropriation bills for 1917 and 1918.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true; but this bill carries less than the same bill carried when it was presented to the Senate here at the last session.

Mr. KING. The Senator can not justify an extravagant appropriation in this bill, however, because at the last session of Congress there was presented to this body a bill equally as extravagant.

Mr. GRONNA. No, I do not justify it, but I simply want to state the facts as they are. That bill carried $37,355,332. The total of this bill, as it is presented to the Senate, is $36,625,853—a very large decrease, considering that there is one item alone of $2,000,000 for the purchase of land.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I interrogate the Senator for a moment? Is it not rather unusual for the Senate committee to allow more than the department itself asks for?

In other words, as I understand the Senator's summary, the amount of estimates from the department, in round figures, is $34,000,000 and the actual bill now under consideration totals $36,000,000. I did not get clearly the first part of the Senator's explanation. He may have covered the reason for that difference. Has the committee added directly to the bill items that were in no way contemplated by the Department of Agriculture? Apparently it has done so.

Mr. GRONNA. This bill does not carry nearly the amount that was estimated for by the department. Of course, the Senator may refer to the original estimate.

Mr. EDGE. I am referring to the estimate appearing here.

Mr. GRONNA. But we have supplemental estimates running into the millions; and, furthermore, the Senator does not take into account the $2,000,000 which the committee incorporated in this bill for the purchase of land for watersheds along navigable streams.

Mr. EDGE. Was that recommended by the department?

Mr. GRONNA. That is a permanent law that must be carried out. It was enacted in 1911, and the United States Government has expended about $10,000,000 for the purchase of land, at an average price of about $5.25 per acre. It is desired to purchase more land; and as I understand most of the land will be purchased in the neighborhood where the Senator lives, I assume that he has no objection to it.

Mr. EDGE. That would not influence the Senator in the slightest.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question. As I understand, this bill carries over $34,000,000.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. KING. Did not the Agricultural bills for 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916 carry considerably less than $30,000,000 each?

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will not try to compare the expenditures in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture or any other department with the expenditures in 1913, 1914, 1915, or even 1916, because they were so much less. I can give the Senator the amount, I think, if he would like to have it. I would like to say to the Senator that it is considerably less than the amount carried in 1917, 1918, and 1919, and necessarily so.

The Senator knows that wages have been increased. We have voted for appropriations in this body increasing the salary of every employee in all of the departments, some $120, others $240. That alone runs into the millions.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, would those increases be carried in this bill?

Mr. GRONNA. They are carried in this bill, I will say to the Senator, so far as they have to do with the Agricultural Department.

Mr. KING. How much would that increase the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. GRONNA. There are employed in the Department of Agriculture almost 30,000 people. So the Senator can estimate roughly what it will be.

Mr. KING. And the number is still being increased? Is that true?

Mr. GRONNA. The number has been increased. That is true.

Mr. KING. It was increased last year?

Mr. GRONNA. Two hundred and seven, I think, were taken over from the Food Department and transferred to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. KING. And there has been a very material increase in the personnel of this department during the past two or three years?

Mr. GRONNA. That is absolutely true.

Mr. KING. Instead of there being a reduction since the war, there has been an increase in the number of employees in this department.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

Mr. KING. This department is an illustration of the vice which we find in most other departments. I recall that strong representations were made that in order to stimulate the production of food supplies during the war a large increase in the number of employees in the Agricultural Department was required, but we were assured that as soon as the war was over there would be a prompt reduction in the number and only the normal number of employees retained. This promise is not only not kept, but there are constant additions to the swollen list of employees. As usual, the taxpayer suffers. The itch for position is too strong to drive out the thousands who have fastened themselves upon the Government. Where is the defender of the taxpayer? Why so much solicitude for the officeholder?

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the Senator that I am not disagreeing with him in what he states. I believe that something ought to be done to enable us to reduce these appropriations. I looked into that question very thoroughly, but when I commenced to study it I found that the question is so large that it is staggering. Certainly it would have been impossible for this committee, during the brief space of time it had, to go into the details of this entire department and to make any reform as to the personnel. The Senator knows that that was absolutely impossible.

I do not know what ought to be done. I have sometimes thought it would be well to appoint a commission and let that commission make an investigation, not only of this great department but of all departments, and to report to Congress, so that Congress might have all the facts. Such a report would show whether or not it would be possible to make a reduction in the personnel and, of course, make a reduction in the appropriations.

If the Senator only knew the pressure that was brought to bear on this committee to increase this one item $2,000,000. I suppose we had 100 people, educators and others, appearing before our committee asking that this fund of two and one-half million dollars be increased to four and a half million dollars. Nearly all these items we have been asked to increase. We have increased them, as I said, above what the bill carried when it passed the House, including the $2,000,000 for the pur-

chase of land, only $4,000,000; and members of the committee of the House, I will say to the Senator, have congratulated us that we were able to hold it down to that small increase.

I am just as anxious as the Senator from Utah to do something that would enable us to decrease these appropriations, because ultimately the public must pay for it, and, of course, it enters into the cost of living. I know that is true, and so far as I am personally concerned I shall be willing to cooperate with the Senator from Utah or any other Senator to bring about some reform or to bring about some method that will enable us to go into these expenditures in detail and then make an intelligent report to Congress. But that could not be done at this time.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, if he is anxious for reforms and to secure relief for the burdened taxpayer, why did he not commence the reform by refusing to accede to these demands and yielding to this "pressure" from the departments and from bureaus and employees as well as from without? Instead of maintaining the ante-bellum status quo—if I may be permitted the expression—of this department, instead of making appropriations along the lines followed in preceding years, this bill swells the amount until it exceeds the regular appropriation bill of the war period, when perhaps there was some excuse for the tremendous increase in the various departments. It seems to me that here was an ideal opportunity for the distinguished Senator to use the pruning knife and to insist upon the Senate legislating or aid in legislating. The Senator knows that departments and officials determine too much the character of legislation, particularly that which relates to compensation and the number of officeholders. The Senate and the House——

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator——

Mr. KING. Let me complete the sentence. The Senate and the House yield ready acquiescence too often to the demands of departments and executive agencies. There is no excuse for this vast army of Federal employees created and now being increased. The time has come to cry a halt in the increase of bureaus and agencies of the executive department and to enforce a reduction in the expenses of the Government. There are too many commissions and bureaus and employees, too many cellular divisions, too much of the breeding and spawning process, in the administration of governmental affairs. A bureau is created and soon it wants to be a department or to be divided into a number of bureaus, and so on ad infinitum. It is the pressure of the officeholder; it is the pressure of the bureaucrat. It is the demand to increase the personnel of the bureaus and the departments and increase the salaries, and we yield ready acquiescence to these demands. The Senator, now the chairman of a great committee, with the war over, trying to return to a peace basis, brings in the annual appropriation bill, which increases the amount of the appropriation above that of the war period.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator if he thinks it would be possible for any committee, having a week or 10 days to consider a bill, to get sufficient information to enable the committee to begin this pruning? Where would we begin, may I ask the Senator? Who shall be discharged? What employees in this great department are to be employed and what members are to be discharged, may I ask the Senator? We must go into this matter in an intelligent way. Simply reducing the appropriations would not meet the situation.

Mr. KING. I do not know whether the Senator propounded that as a question.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I do propound it as a question.

Mr. KING. I shall attempt, but perhaps ineffectually make the attempt, to answer the question.

In the first place, it seems to me that where you are dealing with public funds—funds that are wrung from the people by the strong hand of taxation—there ought to be the utmost care and caution upon the part of committees. They ought not to exact from the people one single dollar that is not legitimate, that is not within the purview of the Federal Government, and that is not absolutely essential for the maintenance of the Federal Government. If 10 days' consideration of a bill is not sufficient, the committee ought to take 20 days or 30 days. We have ample time here. It is true that on the 1st of July there will be no appropriations to meet the expenses of some of the departments, but by a resolution the appropriations can be continued, as we have done in the past, until there shall have been given to these measures that proper consideration which their importance demands. It seems to me that we have been yielding——

Mr. GRONNA. I just want to say to the Senator right there that that would increase the appropriation above the amount carried in this bill.

Mr. KING. It is possible that it might increase the amount pending the passage of the bill, but, be that as it may, I say, without any spirit of criticism at all and with due deference to the superior knowledge and ability and judgment of my distinguished friend, the committee ought not to report a bill carrying these large sums unless they know, first, that the amounts are necessary, and, secondly, that the appropriations are for matters which it is the duty of the Federal Government to provide for.

As I said a moment ago, we yield to the demands of executive officials who are interested, who will be benefited by an extension of their powers and authority; they become autocratic, and too often rule the Government. We are fast becoming a bureaucracy, and we are filling the States with myriads of Federal officials. It would seem that we can not pass a bill that the bureaus do not approve. We must get the consent of the bureaus and the departments and clerks and officials of the departments before we can get many of the bills reported from the committees.

It is a matter of common knowledge that when these bureaus once fasten themselves upon the Government they are very like the old man of the sea. We can not take them off and they increase in power and in authority and extend their prerogatives until they interfere with the legitimate functions of the legislative branch of the Government, so that to-day Congress has become in the eyes of many an unimportant part of the Government, a mere register—I ought to say a cash register, too, for the amount of cash which we expend—of the demands of the executive branches and agencies of the Government. I think the Senator could have done better service, and he has done admirable service to his country, if he had insisted that this department should show a material reduction instead of showing a material increase in the appropriations.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to vote upon each and every item, whether it is an increase or a decrease. This, as I understand it, is the first increase in the bill. It increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Farm Management $1,000. In the first place, it changes it from an office to a bureau. If the Senator is opposed to that, we can take a vote on that proposition. The next item is an increase in the salary of the chief of the office from $4,000 to $5,000. I am perfectly willing to submit it to the Senate. I have no pride of opinion about this measure at all. If the Senate sees fit, it may reduce it to the amount carried in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit one inquiry?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Out of this vast sum, thirty-four million and odd dollars, is it not a fact that perhaps 98 per cent of it or more goes as compensation and salaries to employees of the Government?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not think it is that much. Of course, a large amount must necessarily be used for the employment of the 25,000 or more people, that is true, but there are very large sums of money, as the Senator knows, used for other purposes in this bill. It could not be possibly 98 per cent or anywhere near it.

Mr. KING. Hastily running through the bill, it seemed to me that substantially all of many of the amounts were to pay salaries of employees in the department.

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the Senator that the increased salaries in the bill amount to practically nothing, and do not materially increase the appropriations in this bill, except the increase made by Congress a year ago increasing the salary of all the employees. The Senator was here at the time. He probably opposed it.

The amendment was agreed to.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the next clause of the bill, I wish to call attention to an editorial in the New York Times of June 15, 1919, entitled "The Consequences," which I desire to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where I have made lead-pencil marks on the left-hand side I would be glad if the printer would put the remarks in italics, but the italics are mine and not the italics of the author of the paper.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE CONSEQUENCES.

"For the sincerity of the motives which prompt their opposition to the peace treaty as it has been prepared by the conference at Paris the Republican Senators are responsible in the court of morals and to their consciences. For the consequences of their obstructive action they will be judged in the court of public

opinion. Except as they are so judged, they will escape responsibility, for the terrible burden of consequences will fall upon other shoulders, upon the American people, upon the people of every land who will be made to suffer through the prolongation of war conditions. *What these reckless men in the Senate seek is the destruction of the treaty, and that can mean only the continuance of war. They know—nobody knows better—that the rejection of the treaty by the Senate will plunge the whole peace negotiation into a veritable morass of confusion out of which no man can foresee any safe and certain way of deliverance. Either it would leave the United States at war with Germany while other nations made peace or it would force the peace conference again to take up its labors at the beginning and try to make another treaty.* In either alternative there is danger, the possibility of disaster.

"*Obstruction in the Senate works all the time powerfully in the interest of Germany.* The Republican Senators who oppose the treaty are not open to the slightest suspicion of any intent to aid the Germans. *That the position they have taken and the tactics they adopt do aid the Germans is equally beyond question. Why should the Germans bend their stiff necks to sign a treaty which one branch of the treaty-making power in the United States openly declares that it will never ratify? The Republican obstructionists are straining every nerve to secure a one-third vote in favor of Mr. Knox's resolutions, thus giving notice to the world, as they insist, that the treaty can never be ratified by the constitutional majority. Not in one case in a hundred wars is such an opportunity presented to the vanquished belligerent by the victors.*

"The Germans protest that the treaty is unbearably harsh, that it crushes them, makes them slaves, closes the door to any advancement which might restore them to a place among the nations. Men high in their Government declare that they can never sign the treaty. These divided counsels, these threats and acts of obstruction in the countries of their conquerors encourage them to refuse their signatures. They see in England one wing of the Labor Party insisting upon more tender treatment of the Germans; they are told by Mr. Lloyd-George's political opponents that he himself is wavering, that he is half inclined to more moderate terms. They see strikes in Paris and radical agitation against the Clemenceau government directed by Socialists who deplore the hard terms imposed upon their brethren beyond the Rhine.

"Two recent conventions in Switzerland, one of Socialists, one of pacifist women, they have been able to control in their interest, and the half-Germanized delegates from those assemblies went home to spread in England, France, and the United States the propaganda of kindness to Germany. *Now they see the Senate of the United States, from motives as wide as the world apart from those which have swayed the agitators in London and Paris or the Socialists and pacifists at Berne and Zurich, put directly into the hands of the Germans effective weapons of combat against the efforts of the Paris conference to procure their signature to the treaty of peace.*

"*Time works altogether with the Germans. The longer they can put off the signing of the treaty, the higher their hopes of better terms. And if the United States Senate forces the making of a new treaty, the Germans will be altogether confident that it will lighten the penalty of their crimes.* The sentimental and irresponsible in every land will plead for forgiveness and tolerance. If the Senate has its way, there may be a new treaty months hence which will be vastly more satisfactory to the German mind. That would mean that some of the fruits of victory will remain forever ungathered. Of the millions of the allied dead, of the 50,000 Americans who were slain in battle or died of wounds received in battle, a great part will have died in vain. Of the billions spent to destroy the German peril and make the world safe, much will have been wasted. We shall be making peace with the Germans more nearly upon their own terms.

"That is what obstruction to ratifying the treaty means. Those are the consequences of rejection. *In the blind passion of their partisanship the Republican Senators, we must believe, do not see or understand what their perverse obstinacy means to the United States and to the world.* Their insolent recklessness can be explained in no other way. *The solicitude they profess for our 'sovereignty,' for the Constitution, for our freedom from entanglements, does not impress the public, for Republicans of even greater eminence and no less distinguished for their powers of understanding and their devotion to the interests of this Republic approve the treaty and the league covenant, and are every day appealing to the people for acceptance and ratification. The impression that the motive of these Senators is their partisan hatred of President Wilson is one they have been unable to remove.* But whatever their motive, the perils to the country, to all countries, involved in their unreasonable and unprecedentedly violent opposition to the treaty that will end the war are plain in the sight of all men."

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the same connection I wish to insert as a part of my remarks an article in the New York Times, the author of which is Charles H. Grasty, who has been over in Europe all this time and has been closely watching what has been done and what was thought possible to be done in Europe. This article is printed in the New York Times of June 10. I request that it be inserted as a part of my remarks.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to object now, because the Senator could read it into the RECORD, and I know the Senator from North Dakota desires the appropriation bill to be passed, but I think the time is speedily arriving when clippings from all the newspapers of the United States are not going to get into the RECORD unless the Senate says so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My anxiety to have the appropriation bill passed was the reason why I expressly asked that unanimous consent be granted it be inserted in the RECORD instead of reading it upon the floor I am probably as well acquainted with what would follow if consent were not given, and probably as well acquainted with the usages of the Senate, as the Senator from Utah, who has constituted himself the mentor of this body.

Mr. SMOOT. My suggestion is this——

Mr. WILLIAMS. My object in asking that this article be inserted as a part of my remarks was to prevent a useless consumption of time, which the Senator from Utah frequently brings about by a sort of pretense of preventing it. I could have read the article, of course, in my own time, as the Senator knows.

Mr. President, a great deal of unnecessary vituperation has been heard of the President of the United States very lately by Senators upon this floor, and I find that the great editors of the great metropolitan papers and their great correspondents in Europe know so much more about the situation and know so much more about international law that there is no comparison between their utterances and those of the men who have been vituperating the President. As a consequence I prefer not to take up the time of the Senate, but to insert in the RECORD, in order that the American people may read it, the real thought of America, which is not coming from this body at all.

Mr. President, have I unanimous consent to insert this article or not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AMERICA'S PART IN PRESSING PEACE—EXTOLS WILSON'S SERVICES—FORECAST OF UNBENDING ATTITUDE BELIED BY HIS WILLINGNESS TO HEAR ALL.

[By Charles H. Grasty.]

"PARIS, *June 10.*

"Criticisms of the work of the peace conference, and particularly of the President's part therein, which have reached Paris from America are generally considered among Americans here as based on lack of full information. Whether or not Germany signs the treaty as it stands—and it can now be stated almost with certainty that there will be no material changes—those who have shared in the conference work feel that a reasonably satisfactory result has been obtained.

"It is understood that there is as much criticism in America as there is in England of the harshness of the terms, especially in view of President Wilson's previous advocacy of a settlement in accord with justice. But the President never believed in justice for the Germans and something less than justice for the Allies. It is said that he thinks the treaty terms give Germany fair play, and that he has no sympathy with the plea for 'trusting' Germany.

"Indeed, now that the terms have been made, general feeling among Americans here is that the Germans must do all the trusting. They are not in a position to ask for trust until their record of the war has been to some extent wiped out and until they have shown in actual performance the sincerity of repentance and reform.

AMERICAN SHARE IN CONFERENCE.

"On the general matter of the American share in the conference I have sought to obtain a statement from some one who could speak with authority, but the customs here are unfavorable to interviews. One of the best informed gave me the following for use without quoting him:

"'Americans who have taken part in the proceedings here have felt all along that they have been hampered by lack of full publicity. From our viewpoint there was every reason for and none against this policy. If, however, we had insisted on having our way about this matter, we would have offended so deeply against the habits and convictions, and perhaps the actual

necessities, of our European colleagues that harmony in the conference would have been sacrificed from the start.'

"'President Wilson arrived here with a reputation for dictatorial methods. Europeans believed he was arbitrary, that he was an incurable doctrinaire, who purposed to take advantage of the moral and material resources of the country which he represented, and which were essential for their rehabilitation, to force his peculiar theories upon them. So far from this idea proving correct, President Wilson showed from the first flexibility, breadth, and open-mindedness. He has disclosed himself here in such a way as to compel a revision of all preexisting opinions of him.

"'I have never known a man of like firmness who was so ready to listen to opposing views. Every suggestion, whether from European or American sources, has received consideration. Many of these suggestions have been adopted and incorporated in the peace terms. In no single instance has he permitted pride of authorship to interfere with reasonable agreement.

"'Now, what were the conditions he found when he arrived? Europe was literally in ruins. Every country was prostrate. Business and industry were utterly disorganized. Millions of the flower of the population had been killed and other millions disabled. Every Government had passed through trials that had reduced it to a state of weakness. Unity of counsel or action was impossible. The allied world was cut up into divisions, with different outlooks on the dreary prospect which stretched in every direction.

"'Leaving on one side the main division, that between Germany and the Allies, there was, first of all, various national standpoints which were more or less conflicting. Within the nations themselves there were at least three separate estates, each distinct and independent and more or less antagonistic. There was, first, the executive branch of the Government, which was represented by a premier clothed with nominal power and sitting in the peace conference. Then there was behind him the superior power of Parliament, of which the premier is the creature, and able at any moment to dismiss him. Still behind the Parliament was the people itself, emaciated, shell shocked, and feverish.

"'What these peoples desired was not entirely clear even to themselves. The sentiment nearest to the surface, and one that made itself most vocal, demanded the punishment of Germany to the point of destruction as the primary task of the peace conference. It is safe to say that every Government head personally took a broader and more philosophical view of what would constitute a sound and profitable peace than would have been tolerated in the state of passionate feeling aroused among the people by Hun barbarism.

CONCESSIONS FIERCELY OPPOSED.

"'Statesmen might think in terms of enlightened self-interest; they could look ahead to the necessity of setting the millions who had been destroying each other back to their everyday tasks. They could reason that we could never have a well world with a sick Germany. But at the slightest sign of plans inspired by such considerations there was a protest that was simply terrorizing. Until the Hun had been made to realize, acknowledge, and, as far as possible, expiate his crimes any discussion in the sense of abstract justice was rendered impossible by the popular temper. And our later dealings with the Huns make many of us think the popular feeling was nearer right than cold reason.

"'So much for the attitude toward Germany. There naturally arose in the conference questions among the Allies themselves, and lack of unity among nations and within nations created a delicate situation calling for patient and tactful methods at all times.

"'America's aloofness from territorial and similar interests here was recognized. Her desire to put herself at the service of the world and her great resources for extending help placed on the President as representing America the chief burden of championing the general cause of a sound peace which at times necessarily seemed in conflict with the desires and interests of individual nations.

"'To this difficult and somewhat thankless task he brought personal qualities that increased the influence possessed by his country. His patience and amiability knew no bounds. His indefatigable energy and his habits as a student enabled him to increase his knowledge of European intricacies until he came to understand any matter in controversy almost as well as the expert representatives of the various countries themselves. In these trying months he has done work that has been simply amazing on the score of energy alone. Nothing has been too much trouble for him. Those champion riveters who were breaking records in the shipyards have nothing on him.

"'There is another quality in the President which it is necessary to know in order to understand and measure his work in the conference. I refer to the sincere good fellowship which it is his nature to feel and practice in his relations with his colleagues. When he gets into the boat with his comrades he does not rock it.

"'Publicity was a thing which would have helped him. He believes in it. There was nothing he was contending for that would not have been helped by it from his personal and political point of view. His refusal to sacrifice his colaborers placed him in a false position and subjected him to a criticism that could not be met. He has simply stood pat and taken his punishment. Throughout all the weary days he has kept an even temper, and in moments of strain his light touch and unfailing sense of humor have prevented differences from becoming serious.

LEARNED SOMETHING AT EVERY TURN.

"'President Wilson may have come to Europe more of a philosopher and scholar than a man of action. Those of us close to him have witnessed a development that has been most interesting. This so-called doctrinaire has apparently learned something new at every turn and it has seemed to us as we have watched him that his principal growth has been along most practical lines. He has shown in a remarkable degree the American characteristic of zeal for "carrying the message to Garcia." Many times he has been appealed to to withdraw from the conference and leave the Europeans to fight it out among themselves, but nothing could shake his determination to stick.

"'It is not as a scholar or theorist or even as an orator that he has most impressed those who have seen him in his work as a man of affairs submitting himself patiently to each day's routine, showing keen discrimination in separating essentials from nonessentials and wonderful quickness to improve opportunity as it has offered itself.

"'You say your reports indicate that President Wilson has lost ground in America and that his work is considered by many as unsuccessful. Well, those who expected a miracle, those who thought that the ruin of these five years could be made good within a few months at the treaty table, are bound to be disappointed. But every sensible person knows, and particularly every sensible person who has had the advantage of precise knowledge, that dissatisfaction in every country is inevitable at this stage. This dissatisfaction is not a matter of a treaty. It arises from war destruction. Conditions can not be made perfect; they can not even be made fairly good by any treaty terms. The best that can be done is to set up some sort of order that will face in the direction of healing and reconstruction and provide instrumentalities which the good will and sense of justice in the world can lay hold of.

"'There are years ahead of us which will make deep demands on our devotion and self-sacrifice. We have got a start along the right line in the treaty and league of nations, and every influence that has been contributed by America has been in strictest accord with the American spirit of broad-minded helpfulness. We can feel we have rendered very real service in peace as we did in war.'"

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 5, line 17, after the word "Agriculture," to strike out "$802,110" and insert "$803,110," so as to make the clause read:

Total for office of the Secretary of Agriculture, $803,110.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 13, line 12, after the word "animals," to strike out "$495,282" and insert: "*Provided*, That of this sum $50,000 may be available to meet the emergency caused by an extensive outbreak of sheep scabies in the Western States," so as to make the clause read:

For inspection and quarantine work, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of live stock and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the 28-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the mallein testing of animals, $545,282: *Provided*, That of this sum $50,000 may be available to meet the emergency caused by an extensive outbreak of sheep scabies in the Western States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, etc., on page 13, line 24, after the word "which," to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$800,000," and in line 25, after the word "and," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$700,000," so as to read:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State, Territory, or county authorities, $1,500,000, of which $800,000 shall be set aside for administrative and operating expenses and $700,000 for the payment of indemnities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 2, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$307,680" and insert "$310,740," and in line 2, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "$36,940 may be used for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes" and insert "$40,000 shall be used for experiments, study, and investigation of the 'soft pork' problem," so as to make the clause read:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry; for experiments in animal feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings absolutely necessary to carry on the experiments, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and all other necessary expenses, $310,740: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated $40,000 shall be used for experiments, study, and investigation of the "soft pork" problem: *Provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated $58,640 may be used for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding: *Provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated $8,000 may be used for the equipment of the United States sheep experiment station in Fremont County, Idaho, including repairs and additions to and the erection of necessary buildings to furnish facilities for the investigation of problems pertaining to the sheep and wool industry on the farms and ranges of the Western States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 23, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$4,276,403" and insert "$4,329,463," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, $4,329,463.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 3, after the date "1920," to strike out "the sum of $803,960" and insert "$903,960, of which sum $100,000 may be used for the inspection of equine meat in the manner provided in said act, all of the provisions of which are hereby made applicable to such meat," and, in line 7, after the word "meat," to strike out "*Provided*," so as to make the clause read:

Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry: For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906 (34th Stat. L., p. 674), there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, $903,960, of which sum $100,000 may be used for the inspection of equine meat in the manner provided in said act, all of the provisions of which are hereby made applicable to such meat.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee what kind of meat this is?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this provision is incorporated in the bill for the purpose of changing the pure-food act so as to permit the inspection of horse meat.

Mr. SHERMAN. Are we eating horse meat now in this country?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not know; I can not answer that question. I will say to the Senator, however, that it is desired by a great many people, especially by western people, where they have very many light-weight horses, that they be allowed to slaughter horses for export. I may say to the Senator that there was a delegation here—and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] can explain the matter more fully than can I—which informed me that already packing houses are to be established in two of the western cities of the country for this particular industry.

The people of Europe will buy this meat, but they will not buy it unless it is inspected by the Federal Government. We had to increase the appropriation $100,000 to carry on this work.

Mr. SHERMAN. The inspection seems to imply that the industry is now in progress.

Mr. GRONNA. No; it is not in progress, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is any of the horse meat—I prefer to call it that instead of "equine meat"—to be sold in the United States markets?

Mr. GRONNA. No; it is for export.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is purely for export purposes?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Montana is present and can more fully explain the matter to the Senator from Illinois than can I.

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the character of horses that are to be devoted to this purpose? Are they mustangs or western horses?

Mr. GRONNA. I ask the Senator from Montana to make the explanation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have a number of letters and communications in relation to the subject concerning which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] inquires. These communications disclose that there are on the Western prairies, in the intermountain States particularly, a vast number of light-weight horses running from 650 to 950 pounds, that are practically valueless as draft or transportation animals. They actually consume an enormous amount of forage that might, and ought to be, devoted to the growth and nurture of meat stock in order to afford a more abundant supply to our people of the ordinary meats derived from meat animals. There is, however, abroad a very great demand for horse meat put up in different forms. It is made into sausages and is sold and finds a ready market in many European cities. It is not marketable, however, unless the meat comes with the authentication of Government inspection. That is all that stands in the way of developing that industry. The annual export would be very large. No one expects that there will be in this country a market of any very great consequence for the meat to be inspected under the provisions of this amendment, but I may say to the Senator from Illinois that in some of the cities in this country the demand is coming into evidence, so that in a number of municipalities provision has been made for inspection of horses designed for slaughter.

I have here a letter from the Board of Health of the city of Milwaukee, in which such local inspection takes place. I also have a letter from Dr. Mohler, the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, which will give the general information concerning the export aspect of the problem.

Mr. SHERMAN. Are not the cities in which such markets exist all in foreign countries? The Senator from Montana refers entirely to markets outside of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to say that in a few of the cities of this country the demand has manifested itself, and local inspection has been provided for by the local authorities.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will that provide for branding this variety of meat so that one will know what he is eating?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly. The pure food law requires that such meats be branded——

Mr. SHERMAN. I so understand.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In order that the purchaser may know the character of meat he is purchasing.

Mr. SHERMAN. But the greater part of this meat will be used for the export trade?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes, sir; that is the purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Practically all of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in this connection I ask leave to submit for the RECORD a letter upon the subject from Dr. Mohler, the chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Agricultural Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1919.

Mr. P. M. CHAPPEL,
Manhattan Hotel, East Forty-second Street,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of March 14 requesting information concerning the foreign shipment of equine meat and equine meat products, your questions are answered as follows:

(1) There are no department restrictions on the export of these products other than compliance with the requirements of the Federal food and drugs act, viz, that the meat be properly labeled, and that it be not adulterated within the meaning of the act.

(2) Equine meat and equine meat products, like fish and poultry, are not required to be inspected by any Federal law or department regulation except as stated in answer to question 1.

(3) I am informed by Dr. Alsberg, Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, who has supervision over the pure food and drugs act, that food products may be shipped to foreign countries in accordance with the requirements of the country of import. For instance, if such a country permits the use of boracic acid in equine meat products, it would not be in conflict with the food and drugs act to use boracic acid in such products going to such a country.

(4) The bureau will be glad to furnish the names of competent inspectors who have had experience in our bureau meat-inspection service should you desire to employ one of them at your plant in a private capacity.

(5) We will assist in so far as it is within our province in furnishing any information in our possession regarding the requirements of foreign countries. If a foreign Government wishes to delegate an inspector for your plant, the matter should be taken up through the diplomatic channels of the State Department.

The bureau has no data covering the cost of placing such meat on any of the foreign markets, nor information relative to the prices ob-

tainable there; therefore, it is unable to venture an opinion as to whether the business could be placed and conducted upon a profitable basis.

There is a great surplus of perfectly healthy and fat undersized horses on the western ranges which are unfit for commercial purposes, but which we believe should be utilized for food among those who are accustomed to the eating of horseflesh. These animals are at present a severe drain on the food resources of the country, as they use range and forage which could be utilized to better advantage for other kinds of live stock. They can be purchased very reasonably, and their slaughter would serve a fivefold purpose: By saving (1) large quantities of feed, (2) large quantities of beef, mutton, and pork; by producing (1) large quantities of meat, (2) large quantities of hides, (3) large quantities of by-products.

There is at present no demand or sale for this class of cheap horses. If the large numbers of these animals which are now occupying a large amount of the grazing land in New Mexico, Texas, Montana, the Dakotas, and other range States could be disposed of, it would relieve materially the shortage of feed in those sections. Horses are at present being slaughtered for human consumption in at least seven cities of this country under the supervision of municipal health authorities. Moreover, the use of horse meat as a food has been well established for years in many of the European countries, and it would appear probable that the poorer classes in those countries who have been accustomed to eating such meat might be supplied by your company by proper business connections in those sections.

Very truly, yours,

J. R. MOHLER,
Chief of Bureau.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I also submit a letter from the assistant chief of the division of food inspection of the health department of the city of Milwaukee, and also a letter from Dr. W. T. Butler, State veterinarian of the State of Montana, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken:

The matter referred to is as follows:

CITY OF MILWAUKEE, *March 12, 1919.*

From: Dr. R. H. Kreutzer, assistant chief division of food inspection.
To: Mr. P. M. Chappel, care of New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Horse meat for food.

DEAR SIR: Your request for a letter giving our opinion on the slaughtering of horses for food will be cheerfully given.

We believe the Milwaukee health department to be one of the first of its kind to establish horse-meat inspection and recommend horseflesh for food.

The first market was established in this city August 15, 1917, and up to the present time approximately 500 horses have been slaughtered, and less than 1 per cent have been condemned as unfit for food.

The method of inspection is as follows: Each horse is given an antemortem examination, and if found to be free from all infectious and contagious diseases it is then subjected to the opthalmic-mallein test for glanders and a numbered tag is placed in the ear. This animal is called a suspect. The animal is then slaughtered and a post-mortem is held. It is either condemned or passed, depending on the post-mortem findings. Meat then fit for food is stamped "Milwaukee health department, inspected and passed."

The use of horseflesh as a human food is as early a custom as that of using the flesh of other food-producing animals. To what extent and whether the custom of eating horse meat was popular or prevalent among the people of the European countries prior to the beginning of the nineteenth century can not be determined, but it appears that later its sale and use was gradualy permitted by the various governments as a necessary and progressive measure.

Considerable opposition has been brought forward, due to the sentimental feeling for an animal as domesticated as the horse. Any such sentimental feeling must be regarded as inconsistent in view of the fact that other completely domesticated animals are slaughtered for food purposes. Indeed, it would be an act of mercy well earned by many a faithful horse that has lost his early vigor to be sent to the abbattoir, rather than to allow him to fall into the hands of some huckster or cruel driver, to be underfed and overworked to a gradual death.

The use of horseflesh for human food should also be considered from the standpoint of public welfare and as an improving economic measure. It offers an acceptable flesh food, especially for the workers who are unable to afford a luxury of the present high-priced meats and still find it desirable or necessary to have meat a part of their daily diet.

It seems unreasonable that so much valuable food should be wasted in face of the privations that exist among the poorer population in the cities.

Here the foreign element have in the majority of cases been initiated to the eating of horseflesh in their native land, and would gladly accept this product in view of its wholesomeness and proportionately lower price.

Trusting you will be successful in your venture in supplying this valuable food to those who wish for it, I am,

Very truly, yours,

ROLAND H. KREUTZER, M. D.,
Assistant Chief Division of Food Inspection.

HELENA, MONT., *January 9, 1919.*

Hon. T. J. WALSH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose you copy of a letter presented to Mr. Herbert Hoover, through Prof. Alfred Atkinson, food administrator for the State of Montana. This letter has reference to the utilization of lightweight range horses as a food product. We do not advocate the raising of horses as a meat product, but we do recommend the use of lightweight range horses, of which there are no healthier in the world than in Montana, as a food product for the utilization of those desiring a cheaper meat and also that a nation's economic waste may be averted, unsalable horses eliminated from our ranges, and cattle, sheep, and hogs raised in their stead.

I have no desire to enter into a discussion with anyone with reference to the use of horse meat from a medicinal standpoint. I may simply state that from a medicinal and chemical standpoint the best authorities agree that it is the equal of lean cow meat. Under no circumstances do we advocate the utilization of injured, decrepit, or old worn-out beasts of burden such as they have in the past utilized in eastern cities and in foreign countries, but we do most emphatically advocate the use of the lightweight range horse as a food product.

The lightweight western horses feed on our western ranges, drink the finest water, and live in the open. Our experience and official data show that there is no healthier animal in the world than the lightweight range horse.

To properly safeguard the public interest we recommend that a certain amount of money be appropriated to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry for the purpose of post-mortem inspection of horse meat. At the present time moneys appropriated by Congress for the post-mortem inspection of meat apply only to post-mortem inspections of cattle, sheep, and hogs. With the establishment of meat inspection which would apply to horses it would permit the interstate shipment of horse meat. To the United States and to war-ridden Europe this is of more than ordinary economic importance.

When I was East this winter I inquired the selling price of the various cuts of meat. In New York round steak was retailing at 60 cents a pound and round steak is probably the cheapest steak cut on the market. Such a price makes cow meat prohibitive to the ordinary person.

Will not the Government help to reduce the present prohibitive high cost of living. It certainly can be materially affected by the utilization of the lightweight western horse as a food product.

Yours, very truly,

W. J. BUTLER.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 19, line 16, after the word "Industry," to strike out "$5,127,033" and insert "$5,786,573," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, $5,786,573.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 22, line 19, after the word "fruits," to strike out "$75,935" and insert "$80,935," and in line 11, after the word "pecan," to insert: "*Provided further*, That $5,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the raspberry," so as to make the clause read:

For the investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruit, $80,935: *Provided*, That $8,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the pecan: *Provided further*, That $5,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation of diseases of the raspberry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 1, after "$104,410," to strike out "*Provided*" and insert "*Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph"; in line 4, after the word "not," to strike out "more" and insert "less"; and in line 6, before the word "That," to strike out "*Provided further*" and insert "*And provided further*," so as to make the clause read:

For acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of cotton and other fiber plants by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, and for determining the feasibility of increasing the production of hard fibers outside of the continental United States, $104,410: *Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That not less than $7,500 of this sum may be used for experiments in cottonseed interbreeding: *And provided further*, That of this amount $3,000 may be used for experiments in the production of New Zealand flax in the United States and for its utilization in the manufacture of binder twine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 16, after the words "for the," to insert "location of and"; in the same line, after the words "destruction of," to insert "the barberry bushes and other"; and in line 21, after the word "necessary," to strike out "*Provided also*, That $20,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of take-all, flag smut, and related diseases of wheat, oats, barley, rye, and rice," so as to make the clause read:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production, and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, $452,505: *Provided*, That $40,000 shall be set aside for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production: *Provided also*, That $100,000 shall be set aside for the investigation and control of the diseases of wheat, oats, and barley known as black rust and stripe rust: *Provided also*, That $150,000 shall be set aside for the location of and destruction of the barberry bushes and other vegetation from which such rust spores originate: *Provided also*, That $25,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of corn root and stalk diseases and for the inauguration of such control measures as may be found necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 23, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence in the United States of flag smut of wheat, take-all, helminthosporium, and other destructive soil and seed infecting diseases of wheat and of other cereals and farm crops, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000, to be used in the development of the field work of the Plant Disease Survey of the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Plant Disease Survey, investigation, and control authorities of the several States to prevent the further spread of and to eradicate or control these diseases.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 12, to strike out:

For testing and breeding fibrous plants, including the testing of flax straw and hemp, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making, $16,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 12, after the word "*Provided*," to insert: "That the limitation of this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph: *Provided further*," so as to make the clause read:

For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, $159,000: *Provided*, That the limitation of this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the free distribution, or propagation for free distribution, of cuttings, seedlings, or trees of willow, box elder, ash, caragana, or other common varieties of fruit, ornamental, or shelter-belt trees in the Northern Great Plains area, except for experimental or demonstration purposes in the States of North and South Dakota west of the one hundredth meridian, and in Montana and Wyoming east of the 5,000-foot contour line.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 2, to insert:

For the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, almonds, Persian walnuts, black walnuts, hickory nuts, butternuts, chestnuts, filberts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing the same, $39,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 8, to insert:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of fruits during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, $103,200: *Provided*, That $9,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping the same: *Provided further*, That $20,000 of said amount may be used for investigating and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 20, after the word "country," to strike out "$82,700" and insert "$137,700, of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend $55,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of suitable land near the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of all necessary buildings and equipment, and for the establishment of a plant inspection and detention station: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 of this sum shall be expended for the purchase of the land: *Provided further*, That the limitation in this act as to cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph;" so as to make the clause read:

For investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country, $137,700, of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend $55,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of suitable land near the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of all necessary buildings and equipment, and for the establishment of a plant-inspection and detention station: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 of this sum shall be expended for the purchase of the land: *Provided further*, That the limitation in this act as to cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 21, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$2,337,938" and insert "$2,623,378," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, $2,623,378.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 12, after the word "Industry," to strike out "$3,251,398" and insert "$3,473,638," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Plant Industry, $3,473,638.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest service," on page 47, line 23, after "$145,640," to insert: "*Provided*, That of this sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use so much as may be necessary, but not to exceed $200, to acquire by purchase land now used as a forest nursery site for the Michigan National Forest," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase of tree seed, cones, and nursery stock, for seeding and tree planting within national forests, and for experiments and investigations necessary for such seeding and tree planting, $145,640: *Provided*, That of this sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use so much as may be necessary, but not to exceed $200, to acquire by purchase land now used as a forest nursery site for the Michigan National Forest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 5, after the word "with," to strike out "S at" and insert "States," and in line 8, after the word "lands," to strike out "$78,728" and insert "$103,728," so as to make the clause read:

For silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with States and with individuals, to determine the best methods for the conservative management of forests and forest lands, $103,728.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 8, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with State agricultural colleges or experiment stations, to conduct investigations of the nature and habits of the fungi and bacteria causing the decay of pulp and wood pulp and to devise and put into application methods of control, there shall be appropriated, out of the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to pay such expenses and employ such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the amendment on page 48, beginning with line 9, "to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with State agricultural colleges or experiment stations, to conduct investigations of the nature and habits of the fungi and bacteria," and so forth, the sum of $20,000 is appropriated, and at the same time the Secretary of Agriculture is granted authority "to pay such expenses and employ such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose."

Mr. President, in the case of many appropriations in the past similar to this, and employing wording authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to "employ such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as he may deem necessary," investigation has shown that most of the appropriations have been spent right here in the District of Columbia. I wish to know from the Senator in charge of the bill what real purpose there is for this appropriation, and also whether he thinks it advisable to have the words "in the city of Washington and elsewhere" included?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I would have no objection to striking out those words.

Mr. SMOOT. I think they ought to be stricken out.

Mr. GRONNA. I myself think that perhaps they ought to go out. This appropriation is proposed for the purpose of conducting investigations into the causes of decay of pulp and wood pulp, which the Senator knows is very important.

Mr. SMOOT. But not in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRONNA. The New York State Agricultural College has done a great deal of work in this direction, and this amendment simply authorizes the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with such institutions. I have no objection, however, to striking out the words "in the city of Washington and elsewhere."

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me that what this appropriation is for is the investigation of the nature and habits of fungi affecting pulp wood, and that ought to be conducted wherever such wood is found, and not in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, there is this to be considered: The amount is appropriated for scientific research work, and, whether the work is done in the city of Washington or whether it is done somewhere else, the money must be expended in the city of Washington through the Secretary of Agriculture or his office.

Mr. SMOOT. It must be paid out through the Secretary of Agriculture; yes; but that is not what this amendment provides. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture "to pay such expenses and employ such persons and means" as he may deem necessary. That really means that the Secretary of Agriculture can employ a number of men, more men than the department now have——

Mr. WARREN. Why would it not be well to say "not exceeding a certain number"?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we have men in this department who will do the departmental work, and I want this $20,000, if it is to be expended for this investigation, to be expended outside of the District of Columbia. Let it be expended where the examinations can be made and some results attained, and not pay it all in expenses and in salaries in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator. I have no objection, so far as I am concerned, to striking out the language to which he has referred.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, how much of the amendment is it proposed to strike out?

Mr. SMOOT. The words "in the city of Washington and elsewhere."

Mr. NORRIS. Why not strike out all after the word "necessary," in line 16?

Mr. SMOOT. I think that the suggestion of the Senator is a wise one, because all we want is the $20,000 for the investigation of the nature and habits of this particular fungi.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; and it would follow that the Secretary could do whatever might be necessary; but the amendment as it is now phrased is rather an invitation, it seems to me, to go outside of the civil service, for instance, to go wherever he pleases and employ various methods and persons in conducting the investigation.

Mr. SMOOT. I then move to strike out all after the word "necessary," in line 16, down to and including the word "purpose," in line 19, so as to make a straight appropriation of $20,000 for investigating this particular character of fungi and bacteria.

Mr. GRONNA. Just one moment. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska if he thinks this money can be used by the Secretary of Agriculture if we strike out the language he suggests?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think so. He could even use some of it in the city of Washington if that were necessary. It seems to me that the Secretary of Agriculture could do everything that would be desirable, if we should stop after the appropriation of the money and showing what the appropriation is to be used for. There would still be no limitation upon where the money could be expended.

Mr. WARREN. There is a general limitation under which the money could not be expended in Washington, unless it is so specifically stated.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is a general law to that effect; and it is a very wise law indeed.

Mr. NORRIS. Personally I can not conceive how it would carry out the real intent of this appropriation to spend it in the city of Washington, because the language itself says that it shall be done "in cooperation with State agricultural colleges or experiment stations." I rather think that, as it is now framed, the amendment is an invitation to use this money really for purposes not intended by the appropriation itself.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator think we ought to strike out all the language after the comma?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Or after the word "necessary"?

Mr. NORRIS. After the word "necessary."

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 48, after the word "necessary," it is proposed to strike out the comma, and all down to and including the word "purpose," on line 19.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 49, line 7, after the word "forests," to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$500,000"; and in line 8, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000," so as to read:

For the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, telephone lines, cabins, fences, and other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests, $500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for the construction and maintenance of boundary and range division fences, counting corrals, stock driveways and bridges, the development of stock watering places, and the eradication of poisonous plants on the national forests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 26, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$3,481,200" and insert "$3,576,209," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, $3,576,209.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 13, after the word "Service," to strike out "$5,966,869" and insert "$6,061,869," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Forest Service, $6,061,869.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, may I ask the indulgence of the chairman of the committee at this time? I have to leave the Chamber for an hour or so, and the consideration of the bill probably will be finished before I return.

I have received a telegram, which I will read to the Senate, from a great number of people, who seem to know what they are talking about, touching one of these appropriations. The Senator's explanation as he has made it to me, if it is put in the RECORD, is perfectly satisfactory, and, so far as I am concerned, I think the committee was right. The telegram I shall have printed in the RECORD at this point, with the permission of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegram is as follows:

BRAWLEY, CALIF., *June 15, 1919.*

Hon. MARK SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Senate Agricultural Committee has reported such reduced appropriation for Bureau of Markets that practically all its activities west of the Rocky Mountains will be seriously crippled. We protest such retrenchment and solicit your influence to combat curtailment of this service which is absolutely necessary to life of fruit and vegetable industry of the West, the large fruit-producing section of the United States. The work of the bureau, especially news work on fruits and vegetables, is worth millions annually in marketing our crops, and growers will be seriously handicapped by lack of this service. We ask your cooperation to maintain its western circuit, comprising offices in Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Portland.

F. H. Speich Co., Crutchfield Woolfolk, Arthur Miller, C. Agerrard Co., C. H. Weaver Co., Cohen Mann, Kahn A. Arena, Alamo Packing Co., W. S. Fawcett, T. H. Peppers, Hunt-Hutch Co., Randolph Marketing Co., California Growers & Shippers, G. M. H. Wagner Sons, American Fruit Distributors, Brown Ford, Robt. E. Leahy Co., Jos. Gentile Co., California Vegetable Union, John Amicon Bros. Co.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. This telegram speaks of the Senate Agricultural Committee reporting such reduced appropriations for the Bureau of Markets that practically all of its activities west of the Rocky Mountains will be seriously affected. I will ask whether or not that telegram is true, or whether ample provision is made in the bill for that purpose?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago in my discussion with the Senator from Utah, under the permanent law, under what is known as the Smith-Lever Act, passed in 1914, I think, this extension work began. There was an appropriation of $480,000 for the first year. The next year it increased $600,000, and each year thereafter it increased $500,000, so that this year there is a fund of $3,080,000 for this particular work. The House incorporated in this bill an item appropriating $1,500,000 for this same purpose. The Senate committee increased that $1,000,000, so that in fact there is available for this kind of work $5,580,000, besides another item in the bill of $751,000, making a total of more than $6,000,000. This same amount has to be duplicated by the different States, so that there will be available for this purpose more than $12,000,000. It is true, I will say to the Senator, that the Department of Agriculture asked for $2,000,000 more; but the committee did not see its way clear to give them more than this amount.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am much obliged to the chairman. Under that statement I congratulate the chairman and the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the subhead "Bureau of Chemistry," on page 50, line 17, after "$2,500," to insert "one administrative assistant, $2,500," and on page 51, line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "$409,170" and insert "$411,670," so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,500; 1 administrative assistant, $2,500; * * * in all, $411,670.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 8, to insert:

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of fish, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, $20,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if the past appropriations for this purpose have ever accomplished anything? I remember when this item was first put in the Agricultural appropriation bill. The House evidently has not thought it was absolutely necessary, and has left it out so often that I wondered if the Senate committee had made an investigation.

Mr. GRONNA. The committee of the House reported the bill with this item in it, but it was taken out. I do not recollect at this moment whether it went out on a point of order or not. The department shows that great work has been done in this direction, and I think it is very important that the great fish industry should have at least this small amount.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will understand that I am not objecting to the appropriation if it is really found necessary, but I have seen no report made upon the past appropriations.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Mississippi, I see, is here, and he can explain this item.

Mr. HARRISON. My recollection is that this item went out on a point of order in the House.

Mr. GRONNA. I think so.

Mr. HARRISON. And we did include the word "shrimp" in this provision, because it appeared that the word "fish" would not include "shrimp." I think that is about the only change.

Mr. GRONNA. That is the only change we made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 55, after line 6, to insert:

For the study and improvement of methods of dehydrating materials used for food, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, and to disseminate information as to the value and suitability of such products for food, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 14, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$894,901" and insert "$1,014,901," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, $1,014,901.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 15, after the word "Chemistry," to strike out "$1,304,071" and insert "$1,426,571," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Chemistry, $1,426,571.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology," on page 58, line 3, after "$4,500," to insert "and $500 additional as long as the office is held by the present incumbent," so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Entomology: One entomologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,500 and $500 additional as long as the office is held by the present incumbent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if there is no real necessity for that amendment, I think it ought to go out. In many of the appropriation bills for past years just such provisions as this were made for the purpose of taking care of the present incumbent. I believe the provision has been eliminated from every other appropriation bill, and I think this is the first time I have noticed those words in the Agricultural appropriation bill. I want to ask the Senator, therefore, if there is any real necessity for it. I would rather see the salary increased outright than to begin to make appropriations for any person as long as he may be in a given position.

Mr. GRONNA. The department holds that the present incumbent in this case is a very valuable man. He is receiving less than the chief of any other bureau, with the exception of one, and that is the Chief of the Office of Biology. We simply followed the recommendations of the department. If the Senator would prefer to increase this amount to $5,000 and strike out the language, I have no objection to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly would prefer it, Mr. President. I move that "$4,500" be struck out and "$5,000" inserted; and I also move to strike out the words "and $500 additional as long as the office is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 58, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$4,500" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the committee will be rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 58, line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "$123,510" and insert "$124,010."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 4, after the word "ant," to strike out "$85,400" and insert "$120,400," so as to make the clause read:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, $120,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 17, to insert:

For conducting investigations and study of the nature and habits of the pest known as the camphor thrip, for the purpose of discovering methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 1, after the word "insects," to strike out "$52,330" and insert "$77,330: *Provided*, That of this sum $25,000 shall be available for investigations relative to the screw worm fly with a view to prevent its ravages," so as to make the clause read:

For investigations, indentification, and systematic classification of miscellaneous insects, including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, household insects, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, $77,330: *Provided*, That of this sum $25,000 shall be available for investigations relative to the screw worm fly with a view to prevent its ravages.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 7, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$913,300" and insert "$978,300," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, $978,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 3, after word "Entomology," to strike out "$1,340,860" and insert "$1,406,360," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Entomology, $1,406,360.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Biological Survey," on page 62, line 6, after the word "bureau," to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$4,000," and in line 16, after the words "in all," to strike out "$55,470" and insert "$55,970," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: One biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000; one chief clerk and executive assistant, $1,800; one administrative assistant, $2,250; one executive assistant, $1,800; one financial clerk, $1,600; three clerks, class 3; six clerks, class 2; one clerk, $1,260; ten clerks, class 1; one clerk, $1,100; one clerk, $1,080; three clerks, at $1,000 each; four clerks, at $900 each; one clerk, $840; one clerk, $720; one preparator, $1,200; one preparator, $900; one messenger, $720; one photographer, $1,300; one game warden, $1,200; two messenger boys, at $480 each; one messenger boy, $360; one laborer, $600; two charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $55,970.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Biological Survey," on page 63, after line 9, to insert:

For the improvement of the game preserves in Sullys Hill National Park, in the State of North Dakota, including the construction of all fences, sheds, buildings, corrals, roads, shelters, and other structures which may be necessary for the protection of game or for the use of visitors, in addition to the amount heretofore appropriated, $5,000, the same to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 20, after the words "prairie dogs," to insert "gophers"; in line 23, after the word "marten," to strike out "$380,440" and insert "$489,440," so as to read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, gophers, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, $489,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 9, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$606,200" and insert "$711,200," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, $711,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 10, after the word "survey," to strike out "$661,670" and insert "$767,170," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Biological Survey, $767,170.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Publications," in the item of appropriation for "Salaries, Division of Publications," on page 66, line 17, after the word "each," to insert "one machine foreman, $1,400"; in the same line, before the word "machine," to strike out "five" and insert "four," and on page 67, line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "$196,520" and insert "$196,720," so as to read:

Twenty-one clerks, at $840 each; 1 machine foreman, $1,400; 4 machine operators, at $1,200 each; 5 skilled laborers, at $1,000 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $900 each; 7 skilled laborers, at $840 each; 4 skilled laborers, at $780 each; 1 chief folder, $1,200; 1 messenger or laborer, $900; 13 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 1 skilled laborer, $720; 1 folder, $1,000; 2 folders, at $900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $1,100 each; 1 skilled laborer, $1,000; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 7 messenger boys, at $720 each; 3 messenger boys, at $600 each; two messenger boys, at $480 each; two messenger boys, at $420 each; 2 messenger boys, at $360 each; 1 laborer, $840; 2 laborers, at $600 each; 3 charwomen, at $480 each; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $196,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 11, after the word "publications," to strike out "$240,590" and insert "$240,790," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Division of Publications, $240,790.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "States Relations Service," on page 73, line 17, after the word "expenses," to

strike out "$551,280" and insert "$751,280," so as to make the clause read:

For farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $751,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 14, after the word "Agriculture," to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,500,000," so as to make the clause read:

For cooperative agricultural extension work to be allotted, paid, and expended in the same manner, upon the same terms and conditions, and under the same supervision as the additional appropriations made by the act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. L., 372), entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," $2,500,000; and all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used, and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State which receives the benefits of said act of May 8, 1914.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I offered an amendment to this provision this morning—and it is now on the table—to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$4,473,680."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 74, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$4,473,680."

Mr. HARRISON. The amount is $1,500,000 in the House bill, and $2,500,000 in the Senate print.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this is the item which I have referred to once or twice this morning. I think it is only fair to say that the appropriation of two and a half million dollars in this bill plus the $551,000 which goes to certain cities of the country for the same class of work, and $3,080,000 which is appropriated under permanent law, under the so-called Smith-Lever Act, is sufficient. I do not believe that we should increase this amount. Personally, I was opposed to increasing it above $1,500,000, but the committee saw fit to increase it $1,000,000, and of course I had to abide by the wishes of the majority of the committee. I am exceedingly sorry to have to say that I must oppose the amendment proposed by my good friend from Mississippi, and I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment because, firstly, I think the sum is necessary to do the work; secondly, it is a most profitable work; and, thirdly, it appropriates the amount according to the estimate of the Department of Agriculture. In the report of the Secretary he states that if this amount is not appropriated, it will be necessary to curtail the work and about 700 of these farm agents will be thrown out. He further says, "It would be a serious mistake to dismantle this great organization and then build it up again through a series of years."

In my opinion, no service of the Government is more profitable and more beneficial than this particular branch of the Government service. The increased production of the American farmer is proof of that fact. I know the work that has been done in my section through these agents. Ten years ago in the State that I have the honor in part to represent we produced few hogs, little poultry, and a very few cattle. We raised cotton, and only cotton; but under the stimulus of the plan of these agents our people became educated in diversification, and they have now gone into the dairy business, the hog business, the cattle business, and are now raising forage crops not only for their own use but for the market. The effect is, they are to-day in a most prosperous condition. This condition is due very largely to the cooperation, aid, and assistance of this service.

The acreage in cotton in 1918 in the South, though large, was very much less than in prior years. There is a great reduction in the cotton acreage this year, and the acreage in corn and other crops shows a corresponding increase. For instance, the total corn acreage in the Southern States has increased more than 20 per cent since 1910; wheat nearly 100 per cent; oats more than 100 per cent; hay more than 115 per cent. In 1910 they were raising no velvet beans in the South. Last year there were 4,818,000 acres of velvet beans raised in that section alone. All this has been brought about through the stimulating influence of this particular branch of the Agricultural Department.

In 1910 the average was 10 acres of corn to the farm in the South. in 1918 it was 18 acres to the farm. In 1918 the average cotton acreage on the farms of the South had been reduced from 18 acres in 1910 to 10 acres, showing the diversification and showing the profits to that particular section. The livestock industry has had a similar experience. Dairy cows have increased approximately 20 per cent and other cattle a like increase, Alabama going as high as 57 per cent.

I received in my mail yesterday morning just a little pamphlet from a bank in my State showing that in one of the counties in Mississippi that 10 years ago was buying corn and other forage crops is now shipping annually out of that county 215 cars of ear corn and 801 cars of shelled corn, amounting to over $2,000,000 in value. In addition to that, it shipped $265,000 worth of poultry and other products that I will not enumerate, but which are immense, showing a total value of products shipped from that county alone in a year to be $6,011,000. Naturally, the bank deposits have increased accordingly. What is true there is true all over the State and all over the country to a more or less extent.

These agents have revolutionized hog raising in the South. They have taught the people how to vaccinate and prevent hog cholera. The consequence is that in practically every county of the South a very large increase is made in hog production.

The cooperative marketing system inaugurated in many sections under the instruction and leadership of these agents has been most profitable to the farmers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise, and their return to civil employment.

Mr. KENYON rose.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator from Iowa be kind enough to ask that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily?

Mr. KENYON. I would like to ask the Senator about how much longer he thinks the Agricultural appropriation bill will take?

Mr. GRONNA. I think it can be disposed of in half an hour.

Mr. KENYON. If that can be done, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. What is true of boys' pig clubs is true of boys' corn clubs—educating the young boys of this country to raise corn. I recall on 1 acre of piney woodland in my State a boy belonging to one of these clubs raised 226 bushels of corn on the 1 acre of ground. Through this work they have organized canning clubs, and the girls have canned vegetables and fruits, and during the late war they sold them in large quantities to the Army at the various cantonments.

When the Secretary of Agriculture tells us that this work must be greatly handicapped by lack of appropriation, if this increase is not provided, and that 700 of these agents will be thrown out, it does seem to me we ought to make the appropriation. The Senate last year did not stand back on this appropriation. The House appropriated $1,500,000. The Senate increased it to $4,500,000. We should not go back on what the Senate did last year and refuse to increase the amount requested. The work is too important, the benefits too great, for us to act niggardly about this appropriation.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Mississippi is a Democrat and believes in the cardinal principles of the Democratic Party. The doctrine that has been taught by Jefferson and the great leaders of the Democratic Party from that time until the present, until we have accepted a number of Republican and socialistic heresies, has been that the State looks after its local and domestic affairs and the Federal Government is a Government of delegated and enumerated powers; that its sphere is national and not domestic. Do I understand the Senator from Mississippi to contend that those views of the great Democratic leaders and those principles that have been the foundation of the Democratic Party have no application now, and that it is the duty of the Federal Government to go into the States, teach the people how to farm, how to raise corn, how to raise pigs, how to engage in and perform all the duties and activities of individuals and of community life? If that were true, why not abolish the States and superimpose upon the people an immense State socialism, such as Germany or Prussia imposed upon Germany?

It seems to me the argument of the Senator and the argument of others who contend for this interposition of the Federal Government in the domestic affairs of the States is a direct contradiction of what we have announced as our purposes in trying to make the world safe for democracy; that it is in harmony with the socialism and autocracy of Germany; and that in the end it must lead to the establishment of the same results here as have prevailed in those countries where they do have an autocratic form of government.

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to answer the Senator from Utah, but first I want him to answer me a question. Is the Senator opposed to this extension work?

Mr. KING. I am not defending this bill and shall vote against it, because there are so many things in it that are wholly indefensible, that can not be justified if anybody believes in a democratic form of government.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood from what the Senator said that he is opposed to this work on the ground that it is socialistic and that the Federal Government should not go in and do the work, but the States should do it or the individuals should do it for themselves. What we are doing is carrying out a law that was passed by Congress, I believe in 1914, the Smith-Lever Act, that appropriates money and cooperates with the States in carrying out this great work of extending agricultural education throughout the cuntry. Every dollar that is appropriated here is in cooperation with the States. A like amount of money is put up by the States to do the work. If we increase this appropriation to $4,500,000 according to my amendment, the States must put up a like sum.

The Secretary of Agriculture did recommend, I believe, and I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out, that we incorporate a provision giving him the discretion to make an exception in the law so that some States might not have to put up like amounts with the Federal Government, but we refused to grant that request, and all the money that is appropriated here is in cooperation with the States. It is not socialistic; it is spent for a great purpose; and it is doing more service to-day, I believe, than any other like amount of money appropriated by the Federal Congress. In my humble opinion the appropriation should be made and the Senate should stand by the farmers of the country—certainly as well as it did during the last Congress when it made this appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], I believe, will extend his sympathy to me at this time. He was rather severe in his criticism this morning, but I have no fault to find, of course, with his argument. I agree with the Senator that we ought to try to economize and that these appropriations should be reduced and should be trimmed down to the minimum. But the Senator knows how difficult it is to do these things in committee, and this is one example. The House appropriated $1,500,000. The department asked for $4,500,000. The committee was divided in opinion, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has indicated; but a majority were in favor of limiting it to $2,500,000. That was the action of the committee.

While this is important work, and I certainly do not fail to appreciate the work, I agree with every word the Senator from Mississippi has stated, and splendid work has been done in stimulating production not only in the South but in the West and in the North and in the East and throughout the United States. We must not overlook the fact that when the States put up a like amount that the Federal Government puts up there will be a fund of more than $12,000,000 for this purpose, giving to each and every county in the United States more than $4,200. That, I say, ought to be sufficient to hire county agents to do the work.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that splendid work has been done, that the Federal Government has cooperated with the States, and that the States have responded splendidly. But we can not go to extremes. We are criticized now; and, as I said a moment ago, I find no fault with the criticism; I believe criticism is wholesome; but we should not increase it above what the committee has recommended.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have not heard all the argument of my good friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I heard only the concluding observations which he submitted. Most appropriations made by the Federal Government find eloquent defenders, and apparently satisfactory reasons therefor; at least reasons based upon expediency and perhaps benefits to be derived by some one from the same. The donee of a large gift usually can derive benefits from the gift. And it is difficult to refuse gifts and gratuities flowing from the hands of Congress. But there is a deeper question than the question of whether money given by the National Government can be profitably used by the States. The Congress of the United States is not omnipotent. It has limitations, and if it appropriates one dollar beyond its constitutional authority a wrong is committed and an assault is made upon our Government. The Constitution determines its limitations and prescribes its functions. In these days we have a number of political prophets and political teachers who spend a great portion of their time in trying to destroy our form of government and seeking to erect a vast, stupendous, and omnipotent paternalism.

As I said a moment ago to the Senators, we were arrayed against Germany. Germany built up a great paternalism, a vast autocracy. She built up a State socialism. She reached out to every farm and into every home. She took charge of the children and usurped to a large extent the duties and obligations of the parents. She concentrated the power that belonged to the people and that belonged to the local political subdivisions in the great Prussian Government, and finally everything ministered to the State to its aggrandizement, to its autocratic power, and in the end, as we know, it became a tyranny.

A great many people now come to Congress to aid them in their private endeavors, to secure Federal aid in matters that are individual or purely local or exclusively for the State, and because benefits may be derived from Federal appropriations it is justified. There is no question but what if Congress should tax the people and distribute millions to the lawyers to educate them and to buy them books, or to the doctors to give them a post-graduate course and aid them in their business, it would be an immense advantage to the members of these professions.

There is no doubt but what appropriations by the Federal Government to the farmers and to all people in every walk of life would be of some temporary advantage to them. But that does not end the matter. That is only the beginning of a chapter which may record events of a serious and perhaps tragic character. A chapter which might tell of individualism lost, of initiative destroyed, of local self-government blotted out, of the spirit of liberty banished from a people once free and self-reliant, of a democracy overwhelmed by an omnipotent, domineering, centralized power, of a constitution perverted and betrayed, of a people weak and enemic, depending upon the Government to do for them that which a virile people do for themselves. It is not a long way from the heights of freedom and glorious individualism to a tyrannous and deadly socialism. We are now surrounded by influences demanding that the States cease to function, that the National Government assume the responsibilities of the States and many of the obligations of the individual. The question is, Has Congress the power to tax the people except for Federal purposes? There are limitations in the Constitution of the United States. The Federal Government is bound by those limitations and it is not a sufficient answer to say, "Oh, well, if the Government taxes the people and gives the money back to them, it may be of some advantage to the people in their local communities."

Mr. WILLIAMS. It taxes all and gives back to some.

Mr. KING. The senior Senator from Mississippi says it taxes all and gives back to some, but the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] says, or at least that is the trend of his argument, as I understand it, that it is not socialistic, it is not paternalistic, it is not wrong for the Federal Government to reach out its arm and tax the people of the United States to help a class of people if the States will make a like contribution to help the same class. The argument to my mind, with all due respect to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, is a fallacious one. The Federal Government either has the right or it does not have the right to go into the State and discharge the functions and responsibilities of the State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. If it does not have the right to do that, then the wrong is not sanctified into a right because the State accepts the donation or accepts the gratuity which is given by the Federal Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator opposed to the farm cooperation extension work?

Mr. KING. I am speaking generally about some classes of legislation which appear before Congress, without respect to any particular item in the bill. I am speaking about the general tendency of legislation, and this tendency finds some expression in some features of this bill. But, in reply to the Senator, speaking a little more specifically, I will say that, in my opinion, the Federal Government has no right to tax the people of the United States for the purpose of helping the lawyers or the farmers, or to go into the States and educate the people, or establish schools, or employ their school-teachers, or direct their educational methods, and perform the duties and functions which under our form of Government belong to the States. If the Senator from Tennessee were to follow the wise teachings and the splendid example of the great Tennesseean, former Senator Harris, he would not be defending, if he does defend, encroachments by the Federal Government upon the rights of the States, and justify legislation that superimposes the National Government upon the States and devolves upon the National Government the responsibilities and functions that belong to the States themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the general proposition of the taxation of all for the benefit of some being a wrong

thing and an unconstitutional thing I agree absolutely, of course, with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. But when the taxation is for the purpose of educating the men who are engaged in the avocations of raising more clothing for the world and more food for the world, then it can not be said that taxation is for the benefit of some. It is undoubtedly for the benefit of all. The lawyer, the dentist, the blacksmith, the carpenter, the preacher, the school-teacher, are just as much interested in getting more clothing and more food, and cheaper clothing and food, as the man who is raising textiles or the man who is raising wheat or corn. The only difference is that he gets it indirectly, of course, and the farmer gets it directly and indirectly, both. There is some advantage; but, after all, it is taxation for the public benefit.

I agree, Mr. President, absolutely with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] about the modern trend or the recent trend of legislation. This Congress and this Government are undertaking to do everything in the world. Upon this very bill, for example, there is a provision to go back to God's time instead of the time of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], the higher authority(?). Both Houses agreed at a recent date that instead of 12 o'clock being at meridian, as the sun indicated, it should be a part of the year a little before the meridian and a part of the year a little after the meridian.

That reminds me of a conversation my wife overheard on a street car. A couple of old darky women were riding along, and one of them turned to the other after a while and said, "Sally, do you know whar you are gwine to get off?" She said, "No; since they put up all these yaller moons around Washington I ain't got no idea whar I live, hardly." The other one said, "That ain't all. I understand that this here Democrat President up there done changed God's time," laying it upon Wilson, of course. That is a new and popular habit, not only among Republicans but among darkies. She said, "He's just changed God's time and passed a law that the sun shall rise up an hour earlier one part of the year and an hour later another part of the year and stand right above you at another part of the year different from what it do; and there ain't a mule on the plantation that don't know when 12 o'clock comes by the sun. That Democrat President done passed a law to make the sun stand different and rise different and come up different."

The thing that struck me about that legislation when it passed is this: It expresses absolute distrust and lack of confidence in the common sense of the employers and employees in the manufacturing establishments of the United States, as though they were such fools that they could not agree to go to work at one time a part of the year an hour later or go to work at another time another part of the year an hour earlier, and quit an hour later or earlier, without disturbing the farmer and the plantation darky and the plantation mule with a confusion of time.

That is not all. The Senate next goes out, and it undertakes—not quite as bad as "shelving God's time and substituting this Democrat man Wilson's time," as the old darky woman had it—but it undertakes to block the entire peace of the world by a lot of little self-asserted wisdom of a little group of Senators.

Just as we are about ready to get Germany to sign the treaty of peace, with a fountain pen in her hand, the Republican United States Senate presents itself before Germany and says, "Cheer up, Fritz, I will not sign it either," and so, of course, Fritz is not going to sign, and we will have to send 500,000 boys to Berlin just in order to satisfy the vanity and pride of opinion of a few men of the United States Senate. I gather that from a cartoon. [Exhibiting.] Senators can look at it. It can not be put in the RECORD, of course, because it would have to go, without unanimous consent, to the Committee on Printing, and I see the watchdog of the Treasury, my friend the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], on guard to make objection if I should make the request. But here it is, and it strikes me as an absolutely true picture of the situation.

I do not know how many Republican Senators are encouraging Fritz not to sign. I do not know that any of them want to encourage him not to sign. I think it is rather a case of stupidity than intent; but whatever it may be, that is the effect of what they have been doing. You will find out in a few days that it is the effect, and if you do not mind you will find out later that there is another effect, a union between what is left of Germany and the Hungarian Soviet and the Russian Bolsheviki to defy the peace and order of the world, whereas if this United States Government in all its parts had indicated a desire to work together, had shown teamwork, that spirit would never have displayed itself in Germany, at any rate, however much it might have displayed itself in Russia.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the New York World. I call the attention of the official reporters to the fact that I have stricken out in lead pencil certain parts of it, because, in my opinion, they are personal and ought not to go in the RECORD upon my request. The balance of it, however, I request to be inserted as a part of my remarks in connection with this general idea of dictating to the world from this body of the United States Federal Legislature. It is headed "A new exploit in demagogy." I have stricken out the words "in demagogy" and have made it read "A new exploit." I have stricken out that part of it which I believe is personal. It is from the New York World and is an absolute reply to a recent speech made by a Senator. I request unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

A NEW EXPLOIT.

* * * * * * *

Senator REED surpassed all his previous efforts Monday, in his speech against the league of nations, when he presented the league as a scheme to enable the "black, brown, yellow, and red races" to dominate the white races, and appealed to the southern Senators to oppose the covenant on racial grounds. Even more shocking than the REED performance was Senator KNOX's readiness to identify himself with it, for nothing better could have been expected of REED, while nothing so bad was ever expected of KNOX.

Yet this latest exploit in demagogy is a natural evolution of the whole campaign of false pretenses that has been made against the league of nations. It began in the assertion that the covenant sacrificed the sovereignty and rights of the American people, notwithstanding the obvious fact that the United States incurs no obligations and responsibilities that are not incurred by every other member.

Then Senator BORAH devised the * * * theory that the league was a subtle British invention to rule the United States, and he traveled around the country in company with Senator REED declaiming that President Wilson had surrendered to George V everything that Washington had won from George III. Those were the days when newspapers like the New York Sun and the Boston Transcript habitually referred to the league as the "British-Wilson league."

This argument was so silly that there was no public response, so Senator BORAH decided that the league of nations was probably a Bolshevist undertaking; anyway, that it was "internationalism," and straightway the POINDEXTERS and the SHERMANS and all that crew of curious * * * in the Senate began to froth about internationalism. That did not get very far, and now, in desperation, Senator REED is put forward with a lynching-bee appeal to the southern Senators to vote against the league because "dark-skinned people" have been admitted to membership.

There will be no response to REED'S argument either, except derision and disgust; but the speech is important as illustrating the methods to which the opponents of the league of nations are willing to resort and in fixing their estimate of the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand another editorial. I have forgotten what paper I clipped it from, but it is headed "Peace as a party issue." I have also stricken out of it certain sections which I do not think are parliamentary, that were permissible for an editor to write but not for a Senator to say. I have outlined on the left-hand side in lead pencil the part I desire to be italicized. I ask unanimous consent that it may go in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PEACE AS A PARTY ISSUE.

Some of the Republicans in the Senate are in a state of mind because the Democratic national committee at Chicago urged the ratification of the covenant of the league of nations. This, they say, is making a party issue of the peace treaty.

What the Democratic national committee did is what scores of organizations throughout the country have been doing—religious, agricultural, educational, and economic. Only a few days ago the Presbyterian Church formally indorsed the league. Probably some of the Senate Republicans regard that action as partisan, too.

The only people who have been trying to make a party issue of the league of nations are certain Republican Senators and certain Republican newspaper editors. Senator BORAH and the New York Sun have insisted from the outset that it was a partisan question, and that Republicans, as Republicans, must oppose the covenant. Senator LODGE, while professing to deplore any party division, has been playing politics with the league ever since he assembled his 36 Republican associates in the Senate and induced them to sign a round robin which demanded amendments but carefully refrained from mentioning a single amendment that was demanded.

Franklin Roosevelt in his speech at Chicago mentioned a prominent Republican who, when he was asked to define the policy or purpose of Senator LODGE as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said: "That changes from day to day. When Mr. LODGE reads the morning papers and sees what the President has said or done, his policy for the next 24 hours becomes the diametrical opposite."

* * * * * * *

The fact that this little group of Republican Senators is seeking to make a political issue of the peace treaty is well known in Paris. André Tardieu, former French high commissioner to the United States and now a member of the French peace delegation, referred to it bluntly in his speech to the American soldiers at Beaune Wednesday when he warned them that "at this very moment there are men, both in America and in France, who by their political campaigns threaten to strike a blow at our fraternity."

The covenant of the league of nations and the treaty of peace can not be made party issues unless the Republicans in the United States Senate make them party issues. Many of the most distinguished Republicans

in the United States, including former President Taft and former Attorney General Wickersham, are trying to save their party and their country from such a misfortune. Nor can there be much doubt that the rank and file of Republican voters are with them. The war against the league of nations and the treaty of peace is essentially a professional politicians' war. It does not come from the hearts of the American people, but from men who are gambling for power.

If the Senate Republicans under the LODGE leadership will stop playing politics with the covenant of the league of nations and the terms of the treaty, they may be sure that no partisan question will be raised by anybody who is important enough to count.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am only too glad to meet somebody from the State of Utah, even a Democrat from that State—I would be very rejoiced if I could meet a Republican from that State—who is opposed to the general plan of this Government taking over to itself all sorts of legislative power, and, furthermore, opposed to this Senate taking over to itself all sorts of congressional power, and who is, furthermore, opposed to taking over all sorts of international action all over the world by a little party majority in the Senate of the United States.

It is useless to conceal the fact that there is an effort to make of this great international question a party question. Round robins, instructions to Republican caucuses, open speeches upon the floor, articles in the New York Sun, as well as speeches by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], indicate that fact beyond all peradventure of a doubt. Then the Republican white-sepulchered Brahmins turn and wheel upon the chairman of the Democratic national committee and charge him with trying to make it partisan because he said, "If they dared to try to make it partisan, he welcomed the issue." That is all he ever said. I do not want it made a partisan question. I would regard it as the greatest day of catastrophe and tragedy in the history of the American Republic whenever any international question was made a partisan question.

But if I should say, "If you dare do it, I welcome it," I am not making it a party question; you are doing it, provided that you dare do it. Do not dare do it, let me advise you. If you do not, we will not; but if you do, we will. When you do, then we will—and we will not unless you do—but if you do, then you will find yourselves ground down just about as fine as the old Federalist Party was ground down when it dared make a sectional issue out of the War of 1812 with Great Britain and out of the peace that succeeded it. If you do not want it, I do not; the country certainly does not; and you and I both ought to be willing to trust the country.

I wonder how many Senators in this body would be willing to pass a resolution leaving to a vote of the people of the United States, as qualified for the suffrage in each State of the United States, to hold a voluntary election suggested, though not ordered, by Congress—for Congress has no power to order it—the question, "Do you approve of the league of nations? Below the question you will find the word 'Yes' and the word 'No'; put your cross mark in front of the word 'Yes' if you do; put a cross mark in front of the word 'No' if you do not." I wonder how many of them would be willing to do that?

There is an old stanza—I do not know whether or not I can remember it:

> Tied down by race and creed and station,
> Go learn thy strength in limitation.

It is as true for a nation as for a man; it is as true for Congress as it is for anybody else; it is as true for the Senate as a part of Congress as it is for Congress itself. The language is:

> Tied down by race and creed and station,
> Go learn thy strength in limitation.

What sort of limitation? The other fellow's limitation by force? No; your own self-limitation. Self-limitation? Why? In your own selfish individual or national interest? No. In the interest of the world, including yourselves in the long run—in the interest of civilization; in the interest of peace.

Oh, I have a right to go through the world, as Mark Twain once described it very humorously, claiming all my rights and forgetting all my duties; but if I do, I will find that I can not travel from San Francisco to New York with any degree of peace. There is not a right in the world that has not a cognate duty; and the greatest duty in the world is to limit yourself to doing the right. That is all the covenant of peace demands; and when these men make a fight against it as a party issue or as a mere selfish American-sovereignty-supremacy issue, they are forgetting that the highest and last word of civilization is self-limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the original act of 1914 did not provide that this money should be distributed among the States to agricultural or rural populations, and prescribe that no town of more than 2,500 people should be entitled to any of the money?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I believe that is the law; at any rate that is what the Department of Agricu ture has held, that no town having a population of more than 2,500 shall participate in these funds.

Mr. McLEAN. If that is true, this appropriation ought not to be increased from year to year, unless some change is made in the original law. I know that in my section of the country and in the State which I have the honor to represent in part, many of the towns would not get a dollar of this money. I think some 38 per cent of the towns in Connecticut would not be benefited by this act; and yet they are entirely agricultural towns. So, the more money you appropriate the less money we get, for we have to contribute our portion to the taxes, which is something to which we do not object within reason, but my recol'ection is that it was understood when I voted for this bill originally that the appropriations provided in the bill would be satisfactory and that these claims for constant increases as we go along would be rejected. Of course, no Congress could anticipate that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yie'd to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Connecticut will note that on page 73 there is an item which provides:

> For farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $751,280.

I have no doubt that when the Smith-Lever law was originally passed, it was thought that in the cotton belt there would be a very large amount of money expended, and so there was inserted a provision similar to this, that this money should be spent to take care of certain cases which the Senator has enumerated. I might say that some one presented to the Agricultural Committee the fact that his State was discriminated against because a sufficient amount would not go to the townships, and we increased the amount of this provision for $551,280 by $200,000, to take care of that situation.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I think I am the guilty person to whom the Senator from Mississippi refers.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the Senator from Connecticut, I believe, wrote a letter to the committee.

Mr. McLEAN. I am the Senator, I believe, who called the matter to the attention of the committee, and it was suggested that the amount should be more than $200,000; and it ought to be more. It is very evident that as this sum is increased which may be distributed in the discretion of the Department of Agriculture, you should subtract a like amount from the general appropriation. Otherwise it does not relieve the situation in the least, because the more you add to the general appropriation the less we get. We did not, however, think it was worth while to object to the appropriation of $1,500,000. As I have said, we are perfectly willing to contribute our share and more, for we realize that the work is a good work, and we want to see it carried on; but you get now, as I understand, $3,800,000 from the general law, and if you get this additional $2,500,000 you get a much larger sum than it was anticipated you would demand. If you keep on increasing this general appropriation, you must amend the original law, or I think you will be working an injustice upon some sections of the country that the Senate would not perpetuate if it understood the situation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] that the permanent act increases this appropriation $500,000 each year, so that next year, instead of getting $3,080,000, the rural districts will get $3,580,000; and that increase will go on until the year 1922.

It is true, as the Senator from Connecticut has stated, that his State gets but very little of this fund. During the year 1919 the State of Connecticut received from this fund $3,492.99. Mr. President, I have here a list of the distribution of funds by States, including the entire United States, and I believe, if there be no objection from the Senator from Connecticut, I will ask to have it printed in the RECORD to show what each State really receives.

Mr. McLEAN. I think that ought to go into the RECORD. I think it would be very instructive to put into the RECORD the amount which each State has to contribute to this fund under the law. While I presume it is too late to correct the law now, I want to give notice that, if this general appropriation is to be increased from year to year, I shall, if I am a Member of this body, insist when the next Agricultural appropriation bill comes up, that that matter be thoroughly understood, for I am sure that, if it is, the law will be properly amended. This appropriation ought to be reduced instead of increased.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, has the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] the data there that shows how much of the appropriation of $551,280 was obtained by States outside of the cotton belt? If he has such data, I would suggest to him that it ought to be incorporated in the RECORD in connection with the data that he has just presented.

Mr. GRONNA. I have that information here and I ask that it, together with the other data to which I have referred, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

Distribution of funds by States.

Name of State.	1918-19 emergency funds to be discontinued on June 30.	$1,500,000 as in House bill.	$4,500,000 as in Senate bill.
Alabama	$161,540.00	$53,729.55	$161,188.65
Arizona	36,318.50	4,288.68	12,866.04
Arkansas	117,765.00	41,696.01	125,088.03
California	141,925.17	27,593.64	82,780.92
Colorado	72,230.00	11,981.55	35,944.65
Connecticut	51,558.00	3,492.99	10,478.97
Delaware	20,642.00	3,198.75	9,596.25
Florida	76,000.00	16,217.37	48,652.11
Georgia	203,650.00	62,933.67	188,801.01
Idaho	65,050.00	7,772.10	23,316.30
Illinois	150,546.00	65,705.49	197,116.47
Indiana	184,800.00	47,327.55	141,982.65
Iowa	256,104.83	46,952.94	140,858.82
Kansas	145,570.00	36,388.65	109,165.95
Kentucky	174,775.00	52,720.44	158,161.32
Louisiana	119,000.00	35,255.28	105,765.84
Maine	42,857.00	10,970.70	32,912.10
Maryland	75,000.00	19,366.83	58,100.49
Massachusetts	101,414.00	7,326.87	21,980.61
Michigan	165,290.00	45,080.94	135,242.82
Minnesota	206,700.00	37,247.46	111,742.38
Mississippi	145,285.00	48,323.37	144,970.11
Missouri	201,480.00	57,585.45	172,756.35
Montana	90,327.50	7,375.02	22,125.06
Nebraska	151,500.00	26,789.73	80,369.19
Nevada	27,781.00	2,082.36	6,247.08
New Hampshire	38,407.00	5,333.64	16,000.92
New Jersey	67,018.00	19,148.07	57,444.21
New Mexico	56,250.00	8,533.02	25,599.06
New York	142,510.00	58,606.80	175,820.40
North Carolina	182,995.00	57,381.63	172,144.89
North Dakota	79,300.00	15,617.97	46,853.91
Ohio	203,340.00	63,891.36	191,674.08
Oklahoma	130,000.00	40,639.23	121,917.69
Oregon	75,200.00	11,115.90	33,347.70
Pennsylvania	93,732.00	92,234.37	276,703.11
Rhode Island	24,300.00	545.79	1,637.37
South Carolina	107,600.00	39,227.88	117,683.64
South Dakota	105,860.00	15,417.21	46,251.63
Tennessee	178,000.00	53,002.53	159,007.59
Texas	276,890.00	89,924.16	269,772.48
Utah	73,971.00	6,091.83	18,275.49
Vermont	31,300.00	5,684.40	17,053.20
Virginia	162,000.00	48,179.91	144,539.73
Washington	98,460.00	16,306.14	48,918.42
West Virginia	95,000.00	30,179.31	90,537.93
Wisconsin	126,700.00	40,412.46	121,237.38
Wyoming	45,125.00	3,123.00	9,369.00
Total	5,584,067.00	1,500,000.00	4,500,000.00

Proposed allotment of funds, 1919-20.

FARMERS' COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION WORK.

Arizona	$7,200
California	12,600
Colorado	11,400
Connecticut	9,600
Delaware	5,400
Idaho	11,100
Illinois	6,300
Indiana	10,200
Iowa	10,800
Kansas	9,000
Maine	9,000
Massachusetts	8,700
Michigan	9,000
Minnesota	10,800
Missouri	9,000
Montana	11,400
Nebraska	9,600
Nevada	6,300
New Hampshire	9,000
New Jersey	7,200
New Mexico	9,900
New York	7,800
North Dakota	11,400
Ohio	8,400
Oregon	11,400
Pennsylvania	4,200
Rhode Island	5,400
South Dakota	11,400
Utah	11,400
Vermont	9,000
Washington	11,400
Wisconsin	6,300
Wyoming	9,900
Total	301,500

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	McNary	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Harding	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Harris	New	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	Newberry	Sterling
Chamberlain	Henderson	Norris	Sutherland
Colt	Hitchcock	Nugent	Swanson
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Trammell
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Pittman	Warren
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Watson
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pomerene	Williams
France	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott.
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Sherman	
Gronna	McLean	Simmons	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word. The committee has been criticized for reporting a bill which carries a very large appropriation for the Agricultural Department for the next fiscal year. However, as I have previously stated, this is not the bill of a committee of the same personnel that had it in charge during the last session; it is the cleaning up, so to speak, of the last session. It is the heritage of the party in power at the last session of Congress. Undoubtedly it should be looked upon as a sort of emergency measure. As we have but a few days until the end of this fiscal year, I do not see how the committee could have acted differently than it did.

I have already stated that under permanent law there has been appropriated $3,080,000 this year for extension work. The bill as it came from the House carried $1,500,000 more. The Senate committee has increased that by another million, making $2,500,000 more. The Federal appropriation for the service is more than $6,000,000, and as the law provides that a like amount must be contributed by the States there will be available a fund of more than $12,000,000. There will be, as I have stated, more than $4,200 for each county in the United States from the Federal and State appropriations. That ought to be sufficient to pay the county agents to do this splendid work which has been carried on by the Agricultural Department.

I do not believe that we should further increase this appropriation. The motion of the Senator from Mississippi is to increase it $2,000,000 above the amount recommended by the committee. Personally I shall vote against that motion, and I hope it will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] and vote "yea."

I wish to announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate on account of a death in his family.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CALDER. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], which I transfer to my colleague [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "nay."

Mr. HARDING (after having voted in the negative). I note the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with whom I have a general pair. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a pair, did not answer to his name. So I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and let my vote stand.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

KELLOGG], who, I understand, has not voted. I therefore transfer my pair with him to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and let my vote stand.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]; and

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY].

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Stanley
Chamberlain	McKellar	Pittman	Swanson
Fletcher	Myers	Sheppard	Trammell
Harris	Nugent	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Henderson	Page	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott

NAYS—36.

Ball	France	Lenroot	Pomerene
Calder	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman
Capper	Gronna	McLean	Smoot
Colt	Hale	McNary	Sterling
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Sutherland
Curtis	Kenyon	New	Thomas
Dillingham	Keyes	Newberry	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	King	Phipps	Warren
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Watson

NOT VOTING—36.

Bankhead	Gore	Lodge	Robinson
Borah	Harding	McCumber	Shields
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Martin	Smith, Ga.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Spencer
Elkins	Kellogg	Owen	Townsend
Fernald	Kendrick	Penrose	Underwood
Gay	Kirby	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Gerry	Knox	Reed	Wolcott

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. McLEAN. I should like to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 74, in the item for cooperative agricultural extension work, on line 14, the committee proposes to strike out "$1,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the committee. The chairman of the committee has indicated that they did make some heroic efforts to prune this extravagant bill. In the case of this particular item their valor seems to have deserted them, and they yielded to the pressure to which the Senator referred this morning. It seems to me that the Senate would be doing an admirable thing if it would support the courageous effort of the committee in their attempt to prune this bill.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the Senator from Utah. The Senate never will have a better opportunity to save a million dollars than in this instance; and that is true for several reasons.

Under the act which appropriates this money, the distribution at present is indefensible. No town of more than 2,500 people gets a dollar of this appropriation; and in a great many States of the Union many towns of more than 2,500 population are engaged in agriculture and in nothing but agricultural pursuits. The remedy proposed is an addition of $200,000 to the fund on the preceding page, which may palliate the situation temporarily; but the law itself should be amended so that this money, if it is to be appropriated in constantly increasing sums, shall go to the benefit of the agricultural population of the country. This appropriation of $1,500,000 should be reduced in the sum that is added to the fund which is appropriated on the previous page, the distribution of which is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, if the appropriation is to be justly distributed; but that is not done. They do not reduce the $1,500,000, but instead add a million dollars.

It seems to me that the Senate, if it understood this law, would not consent to the present unequal distribution, and I sincerely hope that the amendment of the committee will be rejected. We will never have a better opportunity to save a million dollars than in this instance.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have observed that it is almost impossible to adjust these matters in the open sessions of the Senate. The committees which are charged with the duty of investigating these subjects are necessarily expected to consider the details of such bills as this.

I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi. I did that largely for the purpose of showing the feeling which I had regarding this general appropriation. I have had some occasion to observe the work which has been done along the lines of this provision of the bill. I know that in my State the results have been very satisfactory indeed. I have also been importuned to see that the appropriation is made as large as it can reasonably be made. I have been impressed by information from high sources in New Mexico that the amount of money appropriated by the House was wholly inadequate, and that this work would suffer in a large degree unless the appropriation were increased. For that reason I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi; but that amendement has been defeated. I certainly feel that if the amendment proposed by the Senate committee is also defeated, this branch of the service will suffer in a very marked degree.

I therefore hope, Mr. President, that the action of the committee in increasing this appropriation by a million dollars will be sustained.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as I understand, the Committee on Agriculture in the House has had extensive hearings in relation to the items that are found in this bill. I have no doubt that the House gave the subject careful consideration. I think perhaps if they had had time to go into the items a little more in detail, there would have been further reductions. It seems to me that without any showing different from that which was presented to the House, the Senate committee ought to have followed the action of the House. I have heard no sufficient reasons to warrant the increase which was suggested by the Senate committee.

But above and beyond all that, and conceding all that the Senator from New Mexico has just stated, I want to invite the attention of distinguished Senators upon the other side to the fact that they are pledged to economy. Some of the Republican leaders have given out a number of interviews and statements in which they have pledged their party to an economical administration. There is scarcely a Republican leader in Congress or out of Congress who has spoken since the last election who has not charged that the Democratic Party during the past few years has been guilty of gross extravagance; they have loudly declared that the Republican Party was the party of economy and would relieve the taxpayers from the heavy burdens resting upon them.

I was inclined to take the Republican leaders at their word when they promised economy, and I have been looking for some evidences in support of their assertions. I felt sure that the distinguished Republican Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the chairman of this committee, being himself an economist, and having so much to do with the framing of this bill, would produce a measure that was very much less in amount than the wicked, extravagant bills that were reported by Democratic Congresses; but, very much to my surprise and very much to my grief, I find that the distinguished Senator is sponsor for a measure that swells those bills millions of dollars. If we go back to normal periods—1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916—and compare this bill with the measures passed then, I think it will be found that this bill carries appropriations from five to ten million dollars in excess of the average appropriations for the years which I have just mentioned.

Is this one of the first evidences of the economical spirit that is to characterize the Republican Party? If so, I suggest to the Committee on Ways and Means that they had better speedily convene for the purpose of increasing the sources of revenue. We will have an empty Treasury from now on if this sort of virtue of economy is to characterize the Republican Party.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. May I ask the Senator if he is preparing to incorporate in the platform of 1920 this passage from the Democratic platform of 1912:

> We denounce the profligate waste of money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think that undoubtedly, almost word for word, the Democrats will put that in their platform of 1920, and they will find justification for it in the course of the Republican Party between now and then.

Mr. McCORMICK. They have been putting it in their platforms since 1860, have they not?

Mr. KING. They have had occasion to, if the Senator will remember the administrations of Grant and Garfield and Hayes and McKinley and note the extravagances which characterized the Republican Party when it has been in power.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I know the Senator from Utah wants to be fair. He is aware of the fact that the appropriation bills were brought before Congress and that there was a very clogged condition, and there was no opportunity to discuss them or to consider them; and now it is incumbent upon this Congress to pass those bills or permit them to lapse, with very little time given for detailed consideration. The proposition is this—that, considering all the appropriation bills that have come out from the appropriation committees of the House, they have cut the appropriations provided in the bills as they came to us from the Democratic Congress over $1,000,000,000 at this time.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that every vote in favor of increasing this appropriation, on the vote just taken, came from that side of the Chamber.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut why, if he wants to practice economy to such a limit, he did not ask for a separate vote on the item that affected his particular State, that increased the appropriation from $551,280 to $751,280, which was incorporated in the bill at his request? Why did he not ask for a separate vote on that, if he wanted to practice economy, and not wait for this item, which does not affect him at all?

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that in my explanation of my reasons for asking for that addition I also stated that any sum that was added to this appropriation should be subtracted from the main appropriation, in order that the fund might be equally distributed, and I think it should. I think the appropriation of $1,500,000 should be reduced to $1,300,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I think it might be very opportune to call to the Senator's attention at this time the fact that on the vote just taken two Democrats to one voted to retain the appropriation, while the Republicans practically unanimously voted to cut it down—that is, to vote down the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GRONNA. May I correct the Senator? To increase the appropriation $2,000,000.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; to increase the appropriation $2,000,000. Two Democrats to one voted in favor of it, while the Republicans practically unanimously voted not to increase it. Therefore I should think that, instead of upbraiding us, the Senator from Utah should turn and upbraid his own associates.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will note, too, that the Democrats were voting in the interest of the farmers of the country and the Republicans were lined up solidly against the appropriation for them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not entirely agree with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi; I have not always found myself in accord with my own associates upon the question of appropriations; at least, I have not agreed with many of them upon many votes which have been taken during the past two years with respect to appropriations. I hope I shall not be so partisan at any time as to approve of things in my own party which I condemn in the Republican Party. I have repeatedly voted during the past two years against appropriations which I thought were extravagant. I have no apologies for those votes. I have denounced a number of the appropriation bills which have passed the Senate during the past two years, because I felt that they carried amounts which were excessive. My experience in reading the records of both parties—of all political parties, for that matter—in municipal matters, in State matters, and in National matters, is that human nature is very much alike, and that both parties when out of power are very prone to claim virtues which they do not possess and to denounce their opponents and ascribe to them vices of which they are not guilty.

Too often there is in political platforms much that is camouflage, to use the common word which is used too often. But I do think that the Republican Party for many years was guilty of very gross extravagance. I have no doubt that the Democratic Party has supported appropriation measures that could be properly characterized as extravagant; but while what I said a few moments ago was more of a pleasantry than anything else, yet, after all, I meant it. When I adverted to the statements that the Republican leaders are constantly making about their determination to practice economy I sincerely hoped that that would be realized. I was sincere in the desire that the burdens upon the taxpayers of the United States might be ameliorated.

I sincerely hope that the time will speedily come when we will not be called upon to raise four to six billions of dollars per annum in order to defray the expenses of this Government, and I shall be very happy to join hands with Republicans or Democrats to reduce the expenses of the Government to the lowest possible figure.

I think there should be no partisanship in this respect. I think the effort should be to conserve the resources of the Treasury and to reduce the appropriations and the expenditures of the Government. I think the committee having this bill in charge ought to have reduced it many millions of dollars below its present figure. I do not quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Indiana that because this bill is a sort of a legacy from the preceding Congress we must take it substantially as it was drawn then. I think the committee charged with the preparation of this bill owed the duty to themselves, to the Senate, and to the country to fashion a measure that appealed to their conscience and to their judgment. If they found that the preceding Congress had prepared a bill which, in the closing hours of the session, failed to pass, and that that measure included provisions that did not commend themselves to their judgment, they ought to have eliminated them and to have produced here a bill that they indorsed and that they felt was a measure that could with propriety receive the support of all the Senators on both sides of the Chamber.

I feel that the committee ought not to take refuge behind the work of the preceding Congress and justify extravagant items here by contending that the prior Congress, in the preparation of the bill, provided items carrying similar amounts.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, no one will cooperate with Democrats or Republicans quicker than I to limit and greatly reduce the expenses of this Government. I think, however, my colleague [Mr. KING] was a little unfortunate in calling attention to this particular bill to prove extravagance of the Republican majority. The bill as it was reported at the last session of Congress carried an amount of $37,355,352. This bill as reported now carries $36,625,853, or a reduction of $729,499, and also includes an appropriation of $2,000,000 for the purchase of certain lands for protecting the watersheds of the New England States, or, in other words, there has been cut out of this bill by a Republican Senate an amount of $2,729,499.

There is an excuse for these bills not being scanned as closely as they ought to be. We have yet to pass, in the very few days remaining of this month, the great military bill——

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. Do I understand that the act of March 1, 1919, under which the $2,000,000 was added to the bill as it came from the House, was a mandatory act? Was it necessary that that appropriation should be made?

Mr. SMOOT. It is authorized, and I have no doubt that it will be used.

Mr. EDGE. It is just an authorized appropriation, then?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. President, in the remaining days of this month, 14 only, we have yet to pass through this body, there must go to conference, the conferences have to agree upon the bills, and the conference reports have to be agreed to in both House and Senate, the great military bill, the naval bill, the sundry civil bill, the District of Columbia bill, and one or two more deficiency bills. So I want to admit now, beforehand, that the sundry civil bill—that great bill that takes care of so many of the activities of the Government, and provides not only for the salaries of the employees who are not mentioned in the legislative appropriation bill but for almost all of the activities of the bureaus and departments of the Government—can not be examined as it ought to be, and I presume that bill will carry more money than should be appropriated at this time on account of a lack of time to thoroughly examine each appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why is it that we have such a short time in which to pass all these large appropriation bills?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, because they failed of passage at the last session of Congress.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Was that the sole reason?

Mr. SMOOT. Well, that is one good reason, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If we had been called in session along about the 5th of March we would have had considerably more time.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly correct; but I wanted to avoid even the appearance of politics in this discussion, because I believe the time is coming when the people of the United States are going to demand of Congress that the appropriations made shall be cut to the bone. It is true, perhaps, that the Republican Party has been extravagant in years past in appropriating in few cases hundreds of dollars, but in the last four or five years the extravagance on the part of a Democratic Congress has not been in hundreds of dollars of unnecessary appropriations, but has been in billions of dollars; and that is what we are going to correct. We want to begin to think now in thousands of dollars instead of billions of dollars, and until we do the American people never will be satisfied; and unless we do, I say, the American people are not going to support the men who continually vote these great sums for every conceivable purpose.

I want also to call attention to the fact that in the bills that will be passed at this session of Congress there will be saved, over and above the same bills that were reported at the last Congress and failed of passage, over $1,200,000,000. That is worth saving. I know that $1,200,000,000 is not very much money, taking into consideration the amounts that have been appropriated during the last few years, but it is worth saving, as I have stated; and I say that if we had time to examine all the particular items, and particularly the items in the sundry civil bill, we would save more than the $1,200,000,000, for I believe the bill could be cut half a billion dollars just as well as not. But in order to be perfectly safe, and in order that the Government shall function after June 30 of this year, we would rather err on the side of liberality than to take the chance of stopping the wheels of government in any department.

I simply want to give notice now that the failure at this session of Congress to carefully investigate the appropriation bills that failed of passage at the last session of Congress is not the fault of the Republican Party, and we only wish we had the time to do it more thoroughly, and I want to assure the American people that if we had the time it would be done.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has correctly stated the situation as it is—that the bill does carry between two and three million dollars less than the bill which was presented to the Senate during the last session. The report as made out by me, hastily, of course, would indicate that the total exceeds the total estimate made by the department. Such is not the fact, Mr. President. The detailed estimate of the department exceeds the amount carried in this bill by several million dollars. As the senior Senator from Utah has just stated, there is an appropriation in the bill of $2,000,000 to be used as an investment for the purpose of purchasing more land. I will say to the Senate that, of course, that is not necessarily included, and is not included in the estimate, which would reduce the total amount from $36,000,000 as reported in the bill to $34,000,000, so there is a much smaller amount carried in this bill than in the bill presented during the last session.

Mr. STERLING. Before the Senator from North Dakota takes his seat, I would like to know if the Department of Agriculture has submitted any statement in regard to the retention of the various county agents under this appropriation of $2,500,000, as the committee now has it?

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, yes.

Mr. STERLING. Will the appropriation of $2,500,000 be sufficient to provide for the several county agents throughout the country under the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GRONNA. In answer to the Senator from South Dakota I will state that the department claims that it will not be sufficient. The department states that it ought to have $4,500,000, and that the services of many of the people who have been employed in this work will have to be discontinued. I believe it is true that some of them will have to be discontinued.

Mr. STERLING. If the department is asking for an appropriation of $4,500,000, in order that the several county agents throughout the country may be retained and do their work, then $1,500,000 will not be sufficient.

Mr. GRONNA. It does not include only the county agents. It includes the county agents and all those appointed for work in what they call home economics.

Mr. HARRISON. Seven hundred will be the number.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; and boys' clubs, girls' clubs, and such things as that.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he does not think there should be an appropriation sufficient to at least maintain the county agents under the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I do.

Mr. STERLING. Does the Senator think that $2,500,000 is an excessive amount to maintain them?

Mr. GRONNA. No; I do not. I do not think it is excessive if we are to take care of the county agents and others who will have to do this work.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think a committee can at all times safely rely upon the demands and recommendations of the departments for appropriations?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not know that I can answer that question. Of course I take the statement of a department to be correct. The men employed in these departments are men of integrity as well as men of ability. I do not want to say that I disbelieve their figures and their statements.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator know that if Congress should respond to all recommendations of the departments of the United States Government, we would very soon be appropriating such huge sums that it would be impossible to realize them from taxation, and that in expending these vast sums the functions of the States would be materially abridged and the power of the National Government augmented, so that it would become in time a strongly centralized power, acting beyond the letter and spirit of the Federal Constitution?

Mr. GRONNA. This appropriation in the bill is only a part of the appropriation to be used, because the States must appropriate a like amount. All of the States, in order to get the benefits of these appropriations, must appropriate a like amount.

Mr. KING. The Senator does not mean all the appropriations contained in the bill, but just a few of the items?

Mr. GRONNA. No; I mean particular items. I am only discussing this particular item.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think the House committee, having made a careful examination of this subject, perhaps a more extended examination than the Senator's committee was permitted to give to it, that its judgment, if not controlling, ought to be persuasive with Senators, particularly those who have had no opportunity to investigate these various items?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator I have confidence in the judgment of the membership of the House, of course; but it was the judgment of the members of the Senate committee that it would not be sufficient and that it ought to be increased by $1,000,000.

Mr. KING. But the House committee, after a thorough examination, or at least an examination that was more thorough than the Senator's committee was permitted to make because of lack of time to give the subject, reached the conclusion that the amount appropriated by the House was all that ought to be appropriated at this time?

Mr. GRONNA. Possibly so.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator one more question, if he will permit me. The Senator has said this appropriation bill exceeds by but a small amount the appropriation bill for 1918, as I recall.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator it is much less than the amount appropriated for the same purpose in 1918.

Mr. KING. But in addition to the amount which was carried in the general appropriation bill there was another appropriation of more than $11,000,000 to be expended by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that this appropriation bill carries between five and ten million dollars greater appropriation than was carried in the appropriation bill, say, of 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, or 1916?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, of course, the amount is much larger than was carried in the years the Senator mentions.

Mr. KING. So that you are increasing the amounts carried by Agricultural appropriation bills, and these increases are very large?

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

Mr. KING. And this bill is probably double what it was 10 years ago?

Mr. GRONNA. No; it is not double; but there is a great increase, of course.

Mr. KING. I recall when I was in the House a few years ago the Agricultural appropriation bill carried between four and five million dollars.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, the Senator knows that the activities of the Department of Agriculture have vastly increased. It is not necessary for me to take the time of the Senate to make a speech and tell what has been done by the Department of Agriculture in the different fields and how active they have been in the stimulation of production, in marketing, and all such things.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I concede it has increased its activities, and I think that many of these increases in activity have been at the expense of the States; that is to say, they have suppressed activities upon the part of the States. The activities of the Federal Government have been the equivalent of bribes to the States, and the States have accepted the same in the form of Federal appropriations and the intrusion into the States of Federal agencies to perform the duties and functions of the States. This has resulted in the States omitting to perform duties which under our form of government clearly devolve upon them.

It is not one department or agency only that pursues this course which I am condemning, but there are many embraced within this criticism. The result is that the States, or many of them, are failing to assert themselves as I think they ought to assert themselves, are accepting these gratuities and largesses and bounties that are being offered by the Federal Government to an extent that will atrophy the State governments and impose upon them ultimately a deadly paternalism.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will pardon me, I will say to him that in my State large amounts have been appropriated for work along the same line in cooperation with the Federal Government. I do not know how it is in the Senator's State, but I believe if the Senator will carefully examine the records of his own State he will find that appropriations made by the legislative assembly of his State have increased in proportion just as much as they have been increased by the Federal Government.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] a question before he resumes his seat. Do I understand that practically it is the same bill now under consideration that was before the committee during the last session of Congress?

Mr. GRONNA. There are some changes, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HENDERSON. In amount?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, in amount. I can give the Senator the changes if he wants them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that in the last Congress this bill was reported out of committee carrying $4,500,000 for this particular work.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

Mr. HENDERSON. If it was considered at that time by the committee worthy of an appropriation of $4,500,000, why has it been changed to $2,500,000 at this session?

Mr. GRONNA. One reason, I will say to the Senator, is because some of us believe we are going to have peace restored before very long and that we are not going to be at war for all time to come. The Senator will understand that stimulation of agricultural activities was due largely on account of the war. That is one of the main reasons. Some of us believe, or we hope, at least, that in the near future there will be peace on earth, and it will not be necessary for the Federal Government to use so large a number of men to urge the producers to stimulate production to a maximum.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the opinion of the Senator that $2,500,000 is necessary to carry on this work for the next fiscal year?

Mr. GRONNA. The committee of which I have the honor of being chairman voted the amount of $2,500,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why did you vote that amount?

Mr. GRONNA. The committee voted that amount because they believed that the amount reported by the House committee was insufficient.

Mr. HENDERSON. After any consideration at all of the matter?

Mr. GRONNA. I think we gave it some consideration. We took into consideration how many counties there were involved in this work in the entire country, some 2,400.

Mr. HENDERSON. The only reason why I ask the question is because the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] would convey the idea that the committee did not consider this matter to any extent at all.

Mr. GRONNA. Permit me to make a statement to the Senator that I have repeated several times. The trouble is we have had only a few Senators here at the same time and I have had to make the same speech several times.

The Smith-Lever law, which is a permanent law, carried a permanent appropriation. This year it gives the department $3,080,000. It will increase $500,000 the coming year and continue to increase until the year 1922.

There are twenty-four hundred counties in the United States that participate in this particular fund. The Senator can figure it out for himself and see whether one-half million dollars added to $3,080,000 plus $551,000, which was appropriated for use of States outside of the cotton belt, will be sufficient to employ the county agents.

I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Nevada. I believe that we ought to have county agents. I do not believe it is necessary to employ several hundred women in the field of home economics. I think there are women in the United States who will resent the proposition that some one should come into their homes and tell them how to weigh up their groceries or whatever they have in the kitchen and say to them, "Save these potato peelings until Saturday night. I am going to be here on Saturday and see whether there has been an extravagance or not." Does the Senator believe all the people of the United States are in favor of that?

Mr. HENDERSON. I can not answer as to that; but I would like to state to the Senator that I am in favor of the amount now in the bill reported from the committee. I voted for the increase, because I believe that this sum is well expended throughout the country, and great good comes from it. I merely wanted to bring out the fact that the Senator's committee considered this matter so as to warrant it in submitting to the Senate the increased amount over the sum of $1,500,000 appropriated by the House.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am heartily in favor of the committee amendment. I voted for the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] increasing the amount awhile ago because I think this work is one of the best kinds of work that the United States Government engages in. The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has said that when he was in Congress about 20 years ago the appropriations for the Agricultural Department amounted to about $5,000,000 a year, and they have continued to increase until now the amount is $25,000,000 or $30,000,000. That is true. At the same time that that is true it is also true that by reason of the stimulation of agriculture, brought about in quite a large measure by the increased State and Federal appropriations and the better methods used in farming, due to instruction received from Government agents, the agricultural products of the country have increased very much more in proportion than the congressional agricultural appropriations have increased.

The junior Senator from Utah also said that the States ought to do this work, and that it ought to be left to the States, and the United States Government is taking away the proper authority from the States in making these appropriations. As a matter of fact, unless the United States Government makes these appropriations the States would not make half as large appropriations as they now do. The Federal appropriation stimulates the States to act. It stimulates the counties to act. It is, in my judgment, one of the very best appropriations for the good of all the people which we make, and I am surprised at our niggardliness in making these appropriations for the benefit of our farming interests, in view of the way we have made certain other appropriations in this body.

I certainly hope that the committee amendment will be agreed to. Generally speaking, I know of no better use that we can put the people's money to than to devote it to improved methods of farming and to teaching the farmers of the land how to raise more crops and better crops on their farms.

The amendment was agreed to.

VICE PRESIDENT MARSHALL'S FLAG DAY SPEECH.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, under ordinary circumstances I would not inject any extraneous matter into this debate, but I desire, while the present occupant of the chair is present and while the Vice President is absent, to ask unanimous consent that a speech delivered by the Vice President on Flag Day, June 14, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a very beautiful and inspiring apostrophe to the flag. It is something that should be preserved in the records of the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. May I ask the author of the speech?

Mr. PITTMAN. The Vice President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The speech referred to is as follows:

"The crucified Christ was declared by one of His apostles to be a stumbling block to the Jew and foolishness to the

Greek. Typical of that which most of us believe to be the finest and best in life, His career uptripped Jewish theocracy and caused mere wisdom to smile.

"May one who hopes and believes himself to be an apostle of the American flag declare it to be a stumbling block to autocracy and foolishness to anarchy. Seen aright, it uptrips the whole order of place, preferment, and power. It brings the derisive smile to the faces of those who believe that order may be brought out of chaos through mere thought. What is it really as to-day it kisses every breeze that blows and scintillates in every sunbeam sent earthward from the source of light?

"It is not so much how it looks as how it seems to you. Vain were the effort to band together the varying views of Americans concerning it. Let it suffice for me to describe it as I see it.

"It is not an emblem nor yet an ensign. It is not stars nor stripes. It is to me a photograph wherein I catch a glimpse of Washington, a shade of Jefferson, a touch of Lincoln.

"The brow is calm, serene, unmoved, unruffled, for that the spirit which hides beneath has consciousness of duty done and confidence in God's and man's approval; the eye, piercing and sleepless, for that the soul which looks out of it looks through all sham, all guile, and all self-seeking, looks above the dull level of ordinary self-service and preferment, looks up to the mountains of justice.

"And from the mouth there issues forth a voice, gentle as a mother's lullaby yet startling as Niagara's roar, proclaiming: 'I am the emblem of America. My might, my power, my hope are all fixed upon the eternal rights of humankind. I brood over the destinies of millions yet unborn; yet, brooding, I am not dismayed, for I shall bring to my country's aid in every hour of need the sympathetic soul of democracy, the intellectual aid of fraternity, and the unconquerable arm of liberty guided by law. I am not a bit of bunting. I live, I breathe and move. All other standards of the world salute me or go down in the dust of defeat, for it was, it is, it ever will be, mine to float above the heads of freemen who dare to die for humankind, and who in the economy of God, whether living or dying, always are triumphant. I call to the world to behold me and to all the sons of man to follow me. But particularly this day I call to the household of faith to take from beneath my protecting fold all those who are unwilling to obey constituted authority until by orderly processes that authority can be changed. By Valley Forge, Appomattox, by the Argonne, and by all the "loved and lost awhile" who there do rest I call upon the American to keep my stars undimmed, my stripes unsullied, my aims untarnished, and my glory high exalted. I am the apotheosis of liberty law encrowned. If thou I love no longer thus love me, haul me down and let unhallowed hands bury me in the grave of forgetfulness.'"

TREATY OF PEACE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 14, 1919.

In the absence of the President and the Secretary of State, and by the President's direction, the undersigned, Acting Secretary of State, presents his compliments to the honorable the Secretary of the Senate, and in response to Senate resolution of June 6 advises that the President states that he would, of course, be very glad to communicate to the Senate the full text of the treaty if that text were complete, which is not the case. The Acting Secretary of State advises further that the President states that the treaty is now in process of negotiation; that many points of great moment are under consideration; that the text will, of course, not be complete until it is finally ready for signature; and he (the President) feels that it would not be in the public interest to communicate officially to the Senate a text which is provisional and not definite, and he finds no precedent for such a procedure.

FRANK L. POLK.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I see the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] in the Senate, and while I dislike to interrupt the ordinary course of debate, I think there is a question of sufficient importance to the people of the country to justify that course at the present time.

We are informed by the morning press that some 3,600 United States soldiers have invaded Mexico. The Senator from New Mexico is probably more familiar with that situation than any other man in this body. His State borders on Mexico; his home is not far from that country. He is peculiarly familiar with the situation that exists there. I want to ask him as a Senator as to the cause of that invasion, whether it was ordered by the Commander in Chief, whether it was ordered by the War Department, or whether it is a voluntary act on the part of the commanding general. I am informed that Gen. Aguilar is in the city. I am told that he is the son-in-law of Carranza, the President of Mexico. I want to know whether or not, if the Senator can inform the Senate, his visit here has anything to do with this invasion of Mexico, whether it is an invasion of Mexico that has the assent of President Carranza or what the impelling motive may be that has produced it at this particular time.

I may say I am well aware of the fact that Senators generally have refrained from discussing the Mexican situation until peace had been declared with Germany, but inasmuch as this invasion has occurred it seems to me some sort of explanation of it should be had in the United States Senate. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. LODGE] is not in his seat. Therefore I take the liberty of addressing the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] as to his view of the situation.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, since we declared war against the German Imperial Government I have refrained from mentioning Mexico publicly, either in this Chamber or elsewhere, as I did not want to embarrass the administration in the handling of the serious problems with which we are confronted through our entrance into the European conflict. I may say that within the last few days I have declined various invitations and requests to give publicity to any information which I might have or to my views with reference to the situation in Mexico.

As to the particular movement referred to by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], it is, of course, of very grave moment and may have very serious consequences. As to the diplomatic situation leading up to the present warlike condition, I have no knowledge further than general information upon the subject; that is to say, I do not know exactly what has gone on between the Department of State of the United States, if anything, and the department of the Mexican Government with which Mr. Candido Aguilar is directly connected. He has been minister of foreign affairs in the Carranza cabinet. He is also governor of the State of Vera Cruz.

A few days since the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] had read in the Senate a telegram from the border protesting against the permission being granted to Mexican troops to proceed through our territory upon our railroads from one point to another. At that time I had in my possession telegrams of protest and certain information, I may say direct information, from the State Department and from the State of New Mexico with reference to what had gone on up to that date. The State Department, I may say without betraying confidence, as it has become a public matter through the press, on the 26th day of May requested of the governors of the border States, Texas, New Mexico, and I think Arizona—of the first two States I know—permission that the Carranza government might be allowed to move troops through the United States from point to point on the border. The governors of Texas and New Mexico, and, I am informed, the governor of Arizona, acceded to the request of the State Department on the 26th day of May. I have direct information from the governor of New Mexico to that effect. I received various telegrams of protest, some of which I have now as it happens in my desk. To answer intelligently the questions directed to me I am going to read a portion of one of the telegrams. It is a telegram addressed to myself and is signed by the Mining Circle of the El Paso University Club, at El Paso, Tex.

Current press reports here that the United States Government contemplates permitting Carranza government to transport Mexican troops through States of Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, said permit presumably contingent on approval of respective States.

The date of this telegram is May 27.

Mining Circle of El Paso University Club, an organization comprising leading mine operators and mine owners of Southwestern States and northern Mexico, earnestly protest against such permit as it imperils lives of all Americans throughout northern Mexico and means the destruction of American property of all kinds. The granting of just such permit three years ago is generally believed to have occasioned the frightful Santa Isabel massacre and the murderous Columbus raid. Villistas have avowed even worse revenge on American lives and property on its repetition. We thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

I immediately communicated with the State Department and called their attention to the fact that they would find upon the record protests made directly to them, as I was now making protest against the permission granted to Obregon to move Carranza troops through American territory prior to the Santa Isabel massacre and the Columbus raid, pointing out to the officials of our Government exactly what would occur—that

destruction of American property and murder of American citizens would inevitably follow our taking part with one faction or another in the internal affairs of Mexico. I had pointed out this same difficulty, I may say, during Mr. Taft's administration when Carranza, or at that time Madero troops, were allowed access to points along our border, and to take refuge within our border.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand it to be a fact that such permission was granted to the troops?

Mr. FALL. I was leading up to that. I may say that, very properly the Secretary of State withdrew permission, if he had granted permission to the Carranza troops to proceed through the territory of the United States on the 28th day of May. I do not care to read the correspondence, copies, or originals of the correspondence which I have here between the State Department and myself.

Mr. POMERENE. The 28th of May of this year?

Mr. FALL. The 28th of May of this year. On the 26th of May of this year the State Department requested the governors of the border States of New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas to permit the Carranza troops to be moved through our borders. On the 28th the public press carried a statement that the request of the Carranza troops had been refused by our State Department. The request was refused after the request had been made of the governors of the border States by our State Department.

Mr. President, I may say further that the governor of New Mexico did not withdraw his permission for the Carranza troops to proceed through New Mexico, and I am informed that the governor of Texas, after having given his permission to our State Department, withdrew such permission upon the ground that it would antagonize all those in Mexico opposed to Carranza, and it would inevitably result in the murder of American citizens and the destruction of American property, as Carranza was entirely unable to protect either the property or the lives of American citizens in Mexico. For that reason he withdrew his permit. The State Department, as I say, gave publicity to the statement that the permission to Carranza troops to proceed through our borders was not granted.

Mr. President, a few days later, just prior to this attack on Juarez, Gen. Felipe Angeles, who is cooperating with Francisco Villa and the other revolutionists, as they call themselves, or bandits, in northern Mexico, sent to the people of the United States, through an Associated Press dispatch, a statement that he desired the people of the United States to understand distinctly that he, Angeles, was not responsible for an attack, if such was made, upon Juarez; that it was ordered by Villa, the commander in chief of the army to which Angeles is attached.

Whether the Carranza government had any assurance from this Government when we finally refused the permit to the Carranza government to carry troops through the United States that this Government, through its armed forces, would protect the Carranza troops if attacked at Juarez, I can not say. I should presume from Angeles sending out the notice to the people of the United States that he had received at least some warning that, if Juarez were attacked, the United States troops would engage in battle with the Villistas or the Angelistas, and for that reason he desired the people of the United States to understand that it was not at his suggestion and not by his orders that Juarez would be attacked.

Mr. President, the condition, as shown in these telegrams and by this telegram received by me a few moments since—I may say less than half an hour ago—is this:

Hon. A. B. FALL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Our Government, in siding with Carranza at Juarez, has pleased no Mexican faction, but has placed every American life in Mexico in jeopardy. At this moment, more than ever, protection for their lives is needed, and our Government should immediately take necessary steps.

The telegram is signed by R. M. Dudley, who is at present a member of the State Senate of the State of Texas from the El Paso district, and is a very prominent business man, a man who is as thoroughly familiar with Mexico as is any other American of whom I have knowledge. I have myself known Mr. Dudley for 25 years in the Republic of Mexico; I have known what his business there was; I know his thorough familiarity with the Mexicans of the different factions, and I can vouch for his absolute reliability in every way.

This is the difficulty with which we are confronted, Mr. President, and I want to voice it as a solemn warning to the people of the United States now: If we have gone across the river, as it appears that we have gone, for the purpose of protecting the Carranza government against the attacks of the Villista forces, or if the result of such action has the effect of protecting the Carranza garrison of Juarez against the attacks of the Villista forces, just as surely as the sun rises in the east American property and American lives will suffer in Mexico, unless our troops proceed to police Mexico and protect our citizens and our property.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FALL. Yes; for a question.

Mr. PITTMAN. It was for information that I rose.

Mr. FALL. Any information of which I am in possession I shall gladly impart to the Senator.

Mr. PITTMAN. I really want the Senator's advice with regard to whether or not, if we should send troops into Juarez to prevent the firing across the river into El Paso, it would have that purpose?

Mr. FALL. I did not catch the latter part of the Senator's question.

Mr. PITTMAN. I noticed, through the account in the newspapers, that the probable cause of sending the troops there was to protect American citizens in El Paso, across the river from Juarez, from bullets and other missiles being fired by the Villa forces across the river. The Senator from New Mexico, of course, is familiar with the situation down there; I am not. Would it, in his opinion, be necessary to send troops across the river for that purpose?

Mr. FALL. I was coming to that point, but I will answer the Senator very frankly now. If troops are sent there for that purpose, then, sir, it vindicates my entire course, for which I have been so severely criticized by Senators upon the other side and by people outside of this Chamber for seven years—that is, that we have finally sent our troops into Mexico to protect the lives and property of American citizens. I welcome it, sir, if that is the reason for which our troops are sent there; and I intended to say that if that be the purpose of invading Mexico, then, as an American, I welcome it, and I congratulate the War Department if they have ordered troops to go into Mexico for such a purpose.

Mr. PITTMAN. I did not ask the question for the purpose of laying the foundation of an attack on the Senator. I do not think I ever have attacked the Senator, but I knew that he was familiar with the physical situation at El Paso and Juarez, and I knew that he would have an opinion as to whether or not it was essential to place troops on the Mexican side to protect the citizens on the American side from the fire of battle in Juarez.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I will undertake to answer that. Geographically the city of Juarez is situated on the south bank of the Rio Grande; the city of El Paso, Tex., a city of 80,000 people up to date, on the American side, is situated immediately on the north bank of the Rio Grande. Of course I am speaking of the general course of the Rio Grande. The rebels approaching Juarez for the purpose of attacking the city apparently approached from both the east and the west, but not from the south. The bullets, as nearly as I can gather, which injured Americans on the north side of the river in the city limits of El Paso, were fired from the south bank. From the geographical situation I should say that, in my judgment, it was absolutely impossible to decide whether those bullets were fired by the Carranzistas or by the Villistas, whether they were fired with the intention of wounding or injuring Americans on this side, or whether they were not fired for that purpose. I do not believe it would be possible for anyone to ascertain positively where the bullets came from.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask for information, has the War Department issued any statement as to the reasons for which these troops were sent into Mexico, or has the Senator from New Mexico inquired?

Mr. FALL. I have not inquired of the War Department, I may say, nor do I know that the War Department has issued any statement as to why the troops were ordered into Mexico. I hope I may be allowed, Mr. President, to voice the regret that I have no words in which to express my gratification, if finally the department has sent troops into Mexico to protect American citizens. We have sent troops into Mexico twice. We sent troops into Vera Cruz, but not to protect American citizens; and when some of us, being requested by the President of the United States to ratify his action in occupying Vera Cruz,

sought to assert that one of the objects of the attack upon the Huerta soldiers in Vera Cruz was the protection of American citizens, that object was defeated by a vote coming unanimously from the other side of the Chamber.

When we sent Pershing into Mexico, it was with the distinct declaration from the President of the United States that it was simply for the purpose of arresting Pancho Villa and those accompanying him in the raids upon Columbus, in New Mexico, 3 miles on this side of the border. The idea that we had gone into Mexico for any other purpose was indignantly denied before going.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FALL. Pardon me just one moment, and I shall yield.

Before proceeding across the line with the Pershing expedition, we first asked the consent of the Carranza government, and later asserted that we had secured such consent under the old Indian treaty.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, in the press reports to which I have had access this morning, it is uniformly stated that the purpose of the dispatch of the 3,600 troops across the border was to regulate the manner of fighting between the insurgents and the Carranza forces so as to protect El Paso, Tex., from any indiscriminate firing that might occur on the other side. It was not put on what I should call proper grounds, to protect the life and property of Americans, in which, like the Senator from New Mexico, I should very cordially join, but it was for the other purpose exclusively, as stated in the dispatches, and I think I read three sets of dispatches which substantially concur in that being the purpose.

Mr. FALL. I may say that the information that I have had during the day and upon yesterday, and the general impression here and in El Paso, Tex., is as set forth in the telegram from Senator Dudley, that apparently the purpose has been to protect the Carranza garrison. I have no further knowledge upon the subject. The headlines of the afternoon editions of a Washington newspaper say:

Yanks given orders to kill all rebels who resist capture.

I am quoting from the headlines before the dispatch from Gen. Erwin, which I find to be as follows:

EL PASO, TEX., *June 16.*

"Our work is finished; I will order our troops back from Juarez probably to-day," said Gen. J. B. Erwin, commanding this border district. American troops completed routed the Villistas in and around Juarez, driving them "in every direction," Erwin said.

Then follows the statement—I do not know how authentic it may be:

EL PASO, TEX., *June 16.*

With the Mexican city of Juarez in complete possession of American military forces, United States Cavalry and Infantry is deployed through the surrounding territory, running down Villistas. They have orders to kill instantly any rebel who refuses to surrender.

Mr. President, I have no knowledge as to what has become of the Carranza garrison further than the general statement over the wires that the Carranza garrison is not cooperating with the American troops; that the American troops are not attacking the Carranza garrison, nor have they attacked them in any way, nor have the Carranzistas, in so far as I have knowledge, attacked the American troops.

The race track which was occupied by the Villistas upon the east——

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask a question in that connection before the Senator proceeds further?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Is there any information to the effect that American troops have in fact attacked the Villistas?

Mr. FALL. I was coming to that.

The race track at Juarez—which is owned by Americans, I may say incidentally—lies immediately east of and in the suburbs of the city of Juarez, directly across the river, the international line, from East El Paso; that is, the eastern portion of the city of El Paso. There are large buildings of various kinds at the race track. The Villistas occupied the race track in their attack upon Juarez, and were shelled from their position by American soldiers, as I am informed. The Villistas attacked from the west, where they must go to get water for their horses. The region to the south of the city being a waterless desert it is necessary for them to reach the Rio Grande, as there is no water nearer than 30 miles from Juarez in a southerly direction, whence, I presume, they came. They must reach the Rio Grande either east or west of Juarez, directly across from El Paso, and there secure water and provender for their horses or, of course, they could not subsist at all. The American troops then shelled them from the race track, as I understand. According to my information, the attack has been made purely upon the Villistas. If so, irrespective of whether the reason for the attack was for the purpose of protecting American citizens in El Paso or for the purpose of protecting the Carranza garrison, the effect will be the same in Mexico.

Why, Mr. President, Carranza is the President of Mexico by the grace of the Government of the United States. He has no authority throughout Mexico generally; he is entirely unable to protect American citizens now, exactly as he was on the 21st day of June, after the Carrizal massacre, when the Secretary of State of the United States said to him in documents, which have been published by the Senate, that he was either unable or undesirous of protecting American citizens, and that he had thrown every obstacle in the way of the United States in its attempt to catch Villa. I may say that he has done nothing since that time to induce me to believe for a moment that the condition of his mind has changed or that he has any desire to protect American citizens. His inability to protect American citizens is certainly well known.

Sir, ask the State Department to publish the recent reports from American consuls throughout Mexico; ask that you may have here in the Senate the consular reports of Claude I. Dawson, of Tampico; ask who murdered American citizens at Tampico; ascertain whether they were murdered by Pelaez, the revolutionist, or by Carranza soldiers. The State Department reports are full of news from Mexico which should be given publicity.

I had not expected to refer to it; but, Mr. President, the entire course of our State Department for more than two years past has been avowedly to suppress news coming from Mexico. There are members of the press gallery of the Senate from each of whom the Senators can ascertain, if they so desire, whether I am stating the truth when I say here as a Senator that every newspaper in the United States has had a request, in the nature of a command, from the State Department that they suppress news from Mexico.

I sat here, sir, in my seat and heard the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], then occupying the desk at which I now stand, two years ago I think it was, or one year ago at any rate, read into the RECORD an Associated Press telegram taken from the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune—I believe that was the name of the paper—pretending to give a story to the public that was brought from Mazatlan and other coast points by naval officers of the United States. Senators can refer back to the RECORD. I may say, sir, that I had, and have now, in my possession a copy of the original story covering two typewritten pages, it being the report of naval officers of the United States who had just brought into a California port rescued citizens of the United States and of Great Britain. In this report were set forth the machinations of Germans in Mexico, outrages perpetrated upon American citizens by Carranza forces in Mexico, instigated, as it was claimed, by Germans in Mexico. I have attached to this Associated Press dispatch a telegram from the Associated Press to all their correspondents quoting Secretary of State Lansing, to the effect that some papers in the United States recently were not protecting the State Department or were not keeping their word to the State Department, but were publishing matters coming from Mexico which was causing great annoyance, and expressing his hope that no paper would publish any news coming from Mexico, as the discussion of such news by the American people might cause complications with the Government of that Republic. The Associated Press sent that message of Lansing to every paper taking its service with the command to "kill the story from our American naval officers." I have the documents here if the Senate or any Member of it desires to have them placed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this is the difficulty: The people of the United States to-day when they hear that we have invaded Mexico have no conception of the reasons actuating us, and are left to judge whether we are there for the protection of American citizens on this side of the line or whether we are there as allies of Carranza and for the purpose of protecting his garrisons.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not fully understand what it is the Senator said he had—an Associated Press dispatch that was suppressed?

Mr. FALL. I will accommodate the Senator. I thought that I had the papers in my desk, and fortunately I have.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator should put the document in the RECORD——

Mr. FALL. Very well; I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. So that we can see exactly what it is, because it is entirely too vague a matter as it exists now to make any comment on.

Mr. FALL. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico did not desire to be vague, nor did he desire to do anything except clear the atmosphere. The Senator from New Mexico stated that in the open Senate the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] more than a year ago had read from the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, I think, or some other paper, what purported to be an Associated Press telegram with reference to outrages in Mexico. I further stated that I had at that time the entire telegram in my possession; but I did not, however, take any part in that debate or seek to inject any observations of my own into the RECORD or to give publicity to them. I am very glad to yield to the request of the Senator and read the telegram referred to:

(Associated Press wire.)

A Pacific port, May 14——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. May 14 of what year?

Mr. FALL. I think 1916; but I am not positive. I will verify the date, I will say to the Senator. I am informed by one of the Senators near me that it was in 1917, and I think that is very likely; at any rate, the date is a matter of very little importance, unless the Senator desires to correct me, and I will give him the place where he can secure the data if I am not stating the matter correctly.

Terrible and ghastly accounts of atrocities on the west coast of Mexico, instigated by the German resident agents there, who work upon the overwrought feelings of the Mexican people, were authorized to-day by naval officers here. The authorization of their accounts is given coincident with the arrival of the British steamer *Violet*, under escort of an American warship, after a thrilling experience by the crew at Mazatlan. The *Violet* made the trip from Mazatlan with a crew of sailors from an American warship, and had on board the wife and daughter of Capt. E. J. Minster, who formerly commanded the *Catriana*. Although the vessel was plainly in need of urgent repairs, the Mazatlan authorities, it is said, did everything possible to hinder the *Violet's* departure, and a riot ensued on shore when the captain finally determined to leave in spite of the opposition. Some one cut his cables while the vessel was in a tideway and close to rocks, and but for the timely assistance of the American warship the *Violet* probably would have been wrecked. The warship then placed its own men aboard and brought the steamer to the American coast.

A fearful account of the plight that the American mining men are in comes also, all of the accounts being vouched for by reliable authorities. The men are held by the State troops of Tepic, south of Mazatlan, for tribute, and reminders that tribute is wanted are sent every little while to the American authorities.

The reminders consist of fingers purporting to be those of the captives. The first demand called for a ransom of $5,000, which was paid. Emboldened and encouraged, the troops withheld the captives and sent another finger, with a demand for $10,000 more. The second demand was met by the friends of the prisoners, and then another demand for $10,000 came with another ghastly memento. The State Department at Washington now has this case in hand, it is said. The Tepic troops are reported in revolt, and only this week have seized the important Tepic State ports of San Blas and Las Penas.

The United States authorities are reported following out a most consistent and determined policy of avoiding trouble with the Mexican people, every source of information proving that German agents are at the bottom of all the Mexican acts.

German radio reports are received at Mazatlan daily through the Mexican radio stations, the German Government subsidized press there giving daily accounts of the war, it is reported. The German papers inform the people of Mexico that the allies are struggling, fighting among each other, torn with anarchy, and that the victory of Germany can be expected at any time.

The Germans also are said to make every possible use of the blacklist, inciting the Mexican people against this country by misrepresenting the blacklist laws. Many of the most prominent Germans this country knew before the war are reported now in Mazatlan and other Mexican cities.

A formidable warship, equipped with full sea stores and armed with 4.7-inch guns, is reported at Mazatlan waiting for a dash to the open sea. The ship is the old Mexican gunboat *Morelos*, sunk by rebels in 1914, that recently was floated and overhauled at great cost. The German firm of Melcher & Co. is said to have taken a leading part in salvaging the ship. Nominally the *Morelos* is under Mexican control, but the American authorities are watching it constantly, in the fear that it may dart to sea at the first opportunity and begin its privateering work for the German cause.

The Americans say that the Germans at Mazatlan constantly brag of their knowledge of the warships on the Pacific, claiming that they know the location of every one, and that they will successfully dispatch the *Morelos* when they are ready. The American warships give their positions by ciphered radio, but the Germans can determine the position approximately through the agencies of coordinating observation from neighboring radio plants on the mainland and by actual observation when opportunity affords.

Heavy fighting at Acapulco, the most southerly important place on the Mexican west coast, is reported continuing. A recent disturbance there resulted in 100 casualties among the natives, the Americans and British there barely escaping to the protection of the warships.

American consul (Camon) at that port reported the situation safe for his charges.

The general commanding the Acapulco garrison was recalled to Mexico City, and the fighting took place in his absence, with a heavy sprinkling of Yaqui Indian conscripts from the north in the lead.

The American and British naval forces are reported patroling the entire Mexican west coast in the most thorough manner, fairly dotting the shore line with light-draft ships of every description. Some of the boats are old, but they are rated efficient, as they have no superiors to meet. Everything possible is done to circumvent the Germans, who are determined to lead the Mexicans into trouble in order to further the German cause, and the Americans and British in Mexico are freely saying that when the war is over the trouble in Mexico will end of itself.

WASHINGTON, *May 14.*

EDITORS: The State Department to-day issued the following confidential note to editors:

"Owing to the fact that the well-known desire of the Department of State that the Mexican situation be not featured has been ignored, the Secretary of State desires again to request newspapers to refrain from discussing events in Mexico which are calculated to make bad feeling between the two countries. It serves no useful purpose at this time to question Mexico's neutrality. The Secretary of State would like to take this opportunity of saying to editors who have loyally abided by the previous requests of the department that their forbearance concerning the Mexican situation has been a valuable national service."

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.

Correction.

A PACIFIC PORT, *May 14.*

EDITORS: In line with State Department's request, please kill story of atrocities, German propaganda in Mexico, steamer *Violet*, etc.

THE A. P.

Mr. President, I know that within less than 30 days it has been necessary for the American consul at Salina Cruz, Mexico, to request the sending of a British ship of war to Acapulco and to other ports along the western boundary of Mexico for the purpose of saving American citizens and bringing them out of that country. I know that reports of that occurrence and similar occurrences have been made by the American consuls in Mexico. I know that the newspapers of the United States have not published them. I know that Mr. Dawson, the consul at Tampico, has made report concerning occurrences and the deaths of American citizens and the conditions existing at Tampico and in Tuxpan, and that they have been at least kept, I may say, from the American people and American papers, or, if not, if leaking out, that the American papers have been requested to make no more than a paragraph, at any rate, of any news coming from Mexico.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing either the War Department or the State Department for this recent occurrence in Mexico. That was not my purpose, and I disavowed any such intention when I rose to answer the question of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I said then, and I repeat now, as solemnly as I am able to repeat it, that if the purpose of sending troops across to Juarez was the protection of American citizens, I thank God that finally an American administration has seen its duty, and proposes to protect American citizens on this side of the line, at any rate, if not upon the other, from attack by Mexican bandits, whether they wear the Carranza uniform or whether they claim to be followers of Pancho Villa.

If the purpose was to protect the Carranza garrison, then there can be no defense whatsoever of the act of the War Department. We are not in alliance with the Mexican so-called government, nor with Mr. Carranza, and we have no right to send our troops across the international line for the purpose simply of taking part upon one side or the other in a factional fight between citizens of another country, of whom the President of the United States has said that they have the God-given right to shed as much blood as they please without our interference.

Only upon the theory that we are protecting American citizens can our act be justified. If that is the purpose, then I simply desire to warn the Senate that you may expect reprisals, murders, outrages, attacks, and to warn you again that Carranza can not afford protection to Americans in Mexico, even if he desires to do so; that he is no more able to afford such protection now than he was when Secretary Lansing wrote him after the Columbus raid, in which message Secretary Lansing, as I have quoted, stated that it appeared that Carranza had no desire to protect American citizens, that his own soldiers had been attacking them, that his own soldiers had committed all kinds of murders from Laredo to El Paso, and that it now appeared that his sole purpose was to prevent the success of the American expedition in its attempt to capture Pancho Villa.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I did not intend to ask the Senator to yield for a question, but I should like to make a brief statement, if the Senator will permit me. I have just had a talk with the Secretary of War, and I think I can give the Senator a little information.

Mr. FALL. I shall be glad to have the information.

Mr. POMERENE. I am advised by the Secretary of War that this fighting was going on between the Carranzistas and the Villistas, and all the evidence they had here was that the Villistas were the ones who were shooting across the border. There were some few reports to the effect that the Carranzistas likewise were firing across the border into American territory, but they have no evidence to that effect; and the Carranza

party was advised that our troops were going across for the sole purpose of defending American citizens. They went for that purpose, and are now on their way back; and if this shooting had been by the Carranza forces we would have gone over in just the same way.

Mr. FALL. I am very glad to receive the information which the Senator has imparted; and I have no question that as to this immediate case of course the Secretary of War is stating the facts as he understands them. I know that the Senator, equally animated by a desire for the truth and an appreciation of it, will join the Senator from New Mexico in securing from the War Department the records of the captains, the privates, and the sergeants who have been killed on this side at El Paso and below El Paso even recently by Carranza soldiers firing from the other side when no Villistas were anywhere near them.

Mr. POMERENE. If that is a fact, I assure the Senator that I shall be very glad to join hands with him to get the information.

Mr. FALL. I was confident that the Senator would.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I simply desire to ask the Senator whether or not it is any more important to protect American citizens now than it has been at any time in the past?

Mr. FALL. I think not. That is what I have been demanding now for something like seven years, since my entrance into this body; and, as I said, it is exceedingly gratifying to me to know that while I have been criticized for making this demand—most severely criticized from various parts of the country, from Members upon the floor of this Chamber, from the departments of our Government—their action, if taken as the Senator says has been communicated to him by the Secretary of War, has been a vindication of my entire course in this body with reference to Mexico.

I have always claimed, as Thomas Jefferson said, that there was a mutual obligation between the citizen of a country and his country; that he was under obligations to support it whenever it needed his support, not merely in the payment of taxes, but with his life if necessary, and that equally it was the duty of the Government to protect him, wherever he might be under the sun, if he conducted himself as a reasonable American citizen, and that irrespective of the laws or the customs of any other country. As Lord Palmerston said in establishing, or at least in reaffirming, the doctrine which has made Great Britain great, it did not matter to Great Britain if it was the custom of the country to bastinado some man charged with a mere infraction of municipal regulations, that no such municipal regulations applied to a British subject, even there where the use of the bastinado was customary.

Mr. President, I had no intention of proceeding at even this length in the discussion of this matter. I again express my gratitude that the Government of the United States, under the present Secretary of War, has seen fit to use its forces for the protection of American citizens. That is Americanism. So long as that policy is followed it will have my support here and never my criticism.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

Mr. FALL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not know whether or not I understood my colleague a few minutes ago when he referred to some action by an American consul in Mexico. If I understood him correctly, he gave us the information that the American consul in Mexico at Tampico, or perhaps some other place, had applied to a British man-of-war for protection. If I was correct in my hearing, I should like to get more definitely, if I may, information upon that subject, as to when that was and the circumstances under which it was done.

Mr. FALL. The circumstances were these: That two American citizens from the State of California were in danger in a little town near Acapulco, on the west coast of Mexico; that they called for protection upon the Carranza authorities, who could not or would not protect the few foreigners there; that matters became very threatening, and a few of them undertook to arrange for their own defense, in the meantime sending word to the nearest American consul; that the American consul did his duty as he saw it—he could not obtain for them, for one reason or another, American protection—and that he secured the services of a British ship of war at Salina Cruz, on the west coast of Mexico, which ship of war proceeded to this little place and took off these two Californians, as well as other Americans; and that a report of this circumstance is in the files of the State Department, I presume.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Now, will my colleague give us the date when that occurred?

Mr. FALL. I said, in the first place, that it was within a month. I may be off a week, more or less.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. From this time?

Mr. FALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, I will ask whether or not there were any American forces in that district to which the consul might have appealed?

Mr. FALL. Oh, Mr. President, of course there were no American forces there. Acapulco is 800 or 1,000 miles from the American border, on the west coast of Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, I will ask if there were any American officials there?

Mr. FALL. As to that, I have no knowledge. I may say to the Senator that we have had gunboats and light cruisers up and down the coast of Mexico almost constantly; and it was the crew of one of those vessels of war which brought the crew of the ship *Violet* back to California, and the naval officers on which issued the statement upon which this story was based.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly my colleague does not intend to create the impression that the American consul appealed to a British man-of-war to help American citizens through preference, because he could get assistance from a British man-of-war when he could not get it from American forces or ships in the vicinity. There must have been some reason why that was done other than simply to show a preferance as between America and Great Britain.

Mr. FALL. Why, Mr. President, possibly his reasons for doing this were dictated by those which influenced the American consul at Tampico when the American ships refused to protect American citizens at Tampico, or practically so, by going into the harbor, and when the captain of a British ship and the captain of a German ship, prior to this war, sailed in there, landed troops, and rescued from the hotel where they were being attacked American citizens, with American men-of-war in the harbor. Possibly it may have been some reason of this kind which influenced the American consul.

I will say, if you want to go into that, that you will have presented to you more than one instance where American citizens in Mexico have appealed for protection to any other flag than that of the United States, because they were told that the United States could not interfere owing to the delicate relations between that country and this.

I have not undertaken to go into that subject. If my colleague wants to open it up, and he, living on the border, does not know enough not to open it up, he is at liberty to do it, and I will take a day off some time and give him some information.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I still can not say that I am entirely satisfied with the information which I have just elicited. This occurrence apparently was within a month of this time, and I was desirous of getting specific information regarding this incident if it could be had.

Mr. FALL. I suggest that the Senator go to the State Department and get the report of the American consul from Salina Cruz.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I had not heard of this incident before my colleague mentioned it here in the open session of the Senate, and I supposed that he had the detailed information, and I was trying to secure it from the very source which suggested it.

Mr. FALL. I mentioned it, and my colleague knows why I mentioned it. My reasons are perfectly apparent to him. I mentioned it for the announced purpose of showing that news from Mexico with reference to American citizens was not being given publicity—that, and that alone, not for the purpose of going into details to show that some American consul in Mexico was not doing his duty. I think he did his duty, and I think he succeeded, for the result of his efforts was the saving of American lives.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I do not rise for the purpose of propounding a a question, and I apologize to the Senator for interrupting him. There are two resolutions before the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the Senator is a member. One of the resolutions asks the State Department for certain information. It asks to be advised as to the number of Americans who have been killed in Mexico since the régime of Diaz. It asks for the number of Americans, so far as the State Department is advised, who have been driven by violence from Mexico since then. It asks for the amount of property belonging to Americans that has been confiscated.

Mr. FALL. May I ask the Senator—because, although a Member of that committee, I have not read the particular resolution—whether it asks for an investigating committee to be appointed by this body to ascertain those facts, if they can not be obtained from the files of the State Department?

Mr. KING. No; but I will say to the Senator that when that resolution is acted upon, and when another one to which I will

call the Senator's attention in a moment has likewise been acted upon, and a reasonable time has been afforded for that information to be obtained and for the Executive to take the steps which the resolution calls for, if the information is not forthcoming and no steps are taken I shall not hesitate to introduce a further resolution of the character indicated by the Senator.

Now, just one moment further. The other resolution to which I have referred, and which is now pending before the committee, asks the Executive immediately to negotiate a treaty with the de facto Government, which is perhaps the de jure government of Mexico, for the purpose of appointing a commission to inquire into and ascertain the amount of damages sustained by Americans, either through loss of life or through the destruction of property in Mexico, and to provide a method or methods of liquidation. I commend these two resolutions to my good friends and beg that the committee of which he is a member will report them favorably to this body at a very early moment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, it will afford me very great pleasure to accede to the request of the Senator; but before I undertake to devote any time to the subject allow me to give him a little information which possibly is not in his possession.

A resolution was adopted by this body three years since calling for some of the information requested, and particularly with reference to any steps which might have been taken by this administration to secure the adjustment of just such claims. An answer came to this body, sir; the most remarkable in some respects that was ever presented from any department of a government. The steps which were taken, as they assured us, were those which were embraced in a decree of Venustiano Carranza, a copy of which was printed with the answer itself. The history of that decree would be a very interesting one, if I had time and chose to occupy the attention of the Senate to the extent necessary to go into the history. Every statement which I might make in regard to it, I may say to the Senator, would be corroborated. However, the effect of that decree was this: That we recognized Carranza under simply an agreement with him that when his government was established he would see that foreign claims for damages, death, or the destruction of property were paid under the Mexican law by a commission appointed by Carranza to ascertain them. Does the Senator catch the significance of that?

Mr. KING. I do; and, if the Senator will pardon me, I can scarcely conceive of American representatives conceding to Mexico the right to appoint a commission to assess the damages due to American citizens.

Mr. FALL. And then to settle them under Mexican law.

Mr. KING. Obviously, if such an arrangement were made, Americans would not voluntarily submit to it.

Mr. FALL. We are upon very dangerous ground now, I may say to the Senator; and at some time it may become my duty to refer to the very proposition advanced here now, that we would not submit to it. I may be able to show to the Senator that at least one department of this Government has placed itself repeatedly on record as standing for the Calvo doctrine. The Calvo doctrine, as acknowledged and accepted by Latin-American countries, provides simply this, in effect. This is the way that it is carried out:

No Government shall be responsible for damages to any of its citizens occurring during a revolution or by virtue of a riot.

No citizen of a foreign country shall be entitled to collect damages against this Government except as a citizen of this country would be entitled to collect damages.

Under the Calvo doctrine, as it was presented at The Hague tribunal and refused, we could not have interfered diplomatically to recover damages for any of our citizens, either for death or otherwise. This doctrine has been accepted by those in great place in the United States repeatedly in public statements up to very recently.

But to proceed to enlighten the Senator just a little further. In 1913, prior to the recogniton of Carranza when he proclaimed himself first chief of the revolutionary forces, and when he was seeking recogniton, he issued a decree known as the Calvo decree, and in that decree he pledged himself to us, because he filed it in the State Department of the United States Government, that immediately upon the success of his revolution he would go back to the year 1910, to the inception of the Madero revolution, and that he would, by a joint commission, exactly under the Senator's suggestion, ascertain all damages done to any foreigner or to his property up to the time that he founded his government substantially in the City of Mexico, no matter from what source, whether by revolution or by riot; in other words, that he would not do as they had continuously done, put in a defense that the damage had occurred by revolution. But the decree of 1915, which the President sent to the Senate, as the foundation of his recognition of Carranza, repudiated the decree of 1913 and adopted the Calvo rule and we recognized him upon it; and what is the consequence to-day, to depart just one moment from this line? That we are bound by every rule not only of morality but of international law to every Government under the sun for every dollar of damage done to any foreigner in the Republic of Mexico from the time the revolution occurred in 1910 down to date, because the Secretary of State and the President of the United States called upon France and Germany and Great Britain to yield to us in handling Mexican affairs, as was announced by the State Department, and they yielded. When they yielded Carranza's decree agreeing to pay damages was in full force and effect. We handled Mexican affairs, and when we recognized Carranza we recognized him under an absolute repudiation of that decree. I leave it to the Senator as a lawyer, if we have not placed the Monroe doctrine at least in pawn to every foreign Government?

Mr. President, I have occupied more time than I had intended.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 3 on page 76.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that I shall move to suspend the rules on to-morrow and offer the amendment indicated in the notice in writing, which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

I give notice that under Rule XL I will move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI, in order that I may propose to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the following amendment. Add at the end of the bill the following paragraph:

"That, at and after 2 o'clock antemeridian on Sunday, October 26, 1919, next, the act entitled 'An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States,' approved March 19, 1918, be, and the same is, repealed."

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE.

Mr. KENYON. I give notice that under Rule XL I will move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI in order that I may propose to the pending bill the following amendment. Add, after line 15, page 104, the following paragraph:

That the word "package" where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include and shall be construed to include wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

Mr. PHELAN. I give notice that under Rule XL I will move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI in order that I may propose to the pending bill the following amendment:

That the act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products, and for other purposes,'" be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That after June 30, 1919, until the conclusion of the present war and thereafter until the termination of demobilization, the date of which shall be determined and proclaimed by the President of the United States, for the purpose of conserving the man power of the Nation, and to increase efficiency in the production of arms, munitions, ships, food, and clothing for the Army and Navy, it shall be unlawful to sell for beverage purposes any distilled spirits and during said time no distilled spirits held in bond shall be removed therefrom for beverage purposes except for export. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, in regard to the manufacture and sale of distilled spirits and removal of distilled spirits held in bond after June 30, 1919, until this act shall cease to operate, for other than beverage purposes. After the approval of this act no distilled liquors shall be imported into the United States during the continuance of the present war and period of demobilization: *Provided*, That this provision against importation shall not apply to shipments en route at the time of the passage of this act.

"Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions shall be punished by imprisonment not exceeding one year or by fine not exceeding $1,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine," be and the same are hereby repealed.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] was very kind this morning to agree to have the unfinished business laid aside. I had hoped that the appropriation bill could have been finished before this time. I now ask that this bill be laid aside and that the unfinished business——

Mr. SMOOT. I understand the amendment on page 76 has not yet been acted on.

Mr. GRONNA. No.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be the pending question when the bill comes up again?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is it the purpose of the Senator to continue the session longer to-night?

Mr. GRONNA. It is not, except that the Senator from Iowa would like to have the unfinished business laid before the Senate.

Mr. KING. There is no objection to that course.

Mr. KENYON. Let the unfinished business be laid before the Senate, so that it will not lose its place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the bill before the Senate, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June 16, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we praise Thy holy name, that these representatives of a great people stand before Thee in reasonable health and strength, to take up the new duties of another week with fortitude and courage.

Great are the problems which confront them, national and international. Inspire them with wisdom and strength that they may meet these questions wisely and fearlessly, in the spirit of truth, liberty, and righteousness; and Thine be the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 14, 1919, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. DALE, Mr. HUMPHREYS, and Mr. LARSEN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NONSTOP TRANS-ATLANTIC FLIGHT.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what subject is the gentleman going to illuminate?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I wish to give an expression of admiration for the accomplishment of two British aviators who have crossed the Atlantic Ocean in a nonstop flight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago this House praised and applauded the accomplishment of American aviators in crossing the Atlantic in a heavier-than-air flying machine. To-day we must frankly state that that great feat has been surpassed by the crossing of the ocean in a nonstop flight by Capt. John Alcock and Lieut. Arthur W. Brown, of the British flying force. [Applause.] They took the air from the coast of Newfoundland on Saturday, and crossed the ocean on a course of about 1,900 miles in 16 hours, at an average speed of 120 miles an hour, landing at Clifden, Ireland. They crossed in a Vickers-Vimy bomber, propelled by two Rolls-Royce 375-horsepower Eagle type motors. For zeal, courage, and skill this feat is unsurpassed in the history of aviation, and these two men have deservedly earned immortal fame. [Applause.]

There is, Mr. Speaker, no better sportsman, no more generous companion, no more modest individual than the British flyer, and when Capt. Read and his crew landed in England the other day they were generously received and greatly honored. They were also decorated and honored by the British Government. It is fitting therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we express our admiration to these men, and I have prepared a resolution which I shall introduce, and which I hope will be speedily passed, expressing the admiration of the American Congress and authorizing the President to confer upon Capt. Alcock and Lieut. Brown the medal of honor for their great feat. [Applause.]

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE WHITE HOUSE FOR APPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 5312. An act to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for carrying out the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; and

H. R. 2480. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH BRIGADE, AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Clerk to read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH BRIGADE,
Duan, Germany, May 21, 1919.

To His Excellency the Governor of Oklahoma.

MY DEAR GOV. ROBERTSON: This brigade is en route to the United States. The men will return to their homes and again take up their occupations in civil life.

This means my separation from men who have done their duty nobly and gallantly from the first night in the trenches, when they knew nothing of war, to the day the armistice was signed, when they were veteran soldiers of the highest type. A finer, braver, more intelligent body of troops does not exist.

I have tried in person to tell your men from Oklahoma how much I regret this separation; how proud I am of them. If anything has been added to my military reputation it is due to the red-blooded, big-hearted, valiant men of Oklahoma.

I can not help expressing to you, the governor of the State which gave such men to the service, the great satisfaction it has been to me to be associated with the men of this brigade.

Sincerely, yours,
J. P. O'NEIL,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commanding.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to make a privileged motion concerning the conference report filed Saturday on the deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in charge of that, and the Chair does not recognize him for that purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand that the motion I wish to make is a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is not now before the House.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, of course I recognize that this is the day for the consideration of bills upon the Calendar for Unanimous Consent; but, appreciating that it is necessary for us to make some expedition here, I would like to submit to the House a request that we may proceed immediately with the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and that the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar be postponed until we have finished that bill. I think we can finish it within an hour or two.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar be postponed in favor of the naval appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table to-morrow I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on matters referring to the Intelligence Division of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes on the Military Intelligence Division of the Army. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] to-morrow, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that, following the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], he be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. BUTLER, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 5608, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps is hereby temporarily increased to 27,400 plus such number of men as may be serving with the American Expeditionary Forces abroad: *Provided*, That the average number of enlisted men of the Marine Corps on active duty during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed 27,400, distribution in the various grades to be made in the same proportion as provided under existing law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee the reason for the increase in the Marine Corps?

Mr. BROWNING. The Marine Corps has been very greatly decreased, from 75,000 men to 27,400 men.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why is this language used? It says that the Marine Corps is hereby "temporarily increased to 27,400."

Mr. BROWNING. It is a temporary increase from the permanent force of 17,400, allowing for 10,000 men who are in France. There are now 19,000 marines in France.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is it expected to keep them there?

Mr. BROWNING. They expect to keep one brigade, or about 8,000 men, in the army of occupation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not expected to discharge those enlisted for the period of the war?

Mr. BROWNING. It is expected to discharge every man who is entitled to be discharged and send others to fill their places.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. "It is expected," but they do not always come back. I have had some instances where they have failed to discharge them. I will say, however, that on the whole the officers of the Marine Corps have been quite considerate.

Mr. BROWNING. I have had some myself, but I have always been given very good reasons for such refusals.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In this case it related to a man who had been returned from overseas; but let me get to another matter of more interest to myself and to the Members of the House. Unfortunately I was not here on Saturday. What provision has been made for the discharge of these young men who enlisted in the Navy for the period of the war and whose presence now is urgently needed at home?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday while the provisions of the bill relating to the personnel of the Navy were under consideration we spent some time in the House answering questions submitted to us by various Members touching the exact inquiry made by the gentleman from Iowa. I feel sure that if he will examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he will find all the information which we can give to him now. It may not be entirely satisfactory to my friend, but it is the best information we had, and we gave it in our very best way. The Secretary of the Navy has already directed to be discharged from the military service of the Government 23,000 men during the present month. He stated to us that he expected upon the peace treaty being ratified or approved—and over that we had some discussion last Saturday as to exactly what was meant——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is it exactly. I saw the RECORD, but I did not get any satisfaction out of it.

Mr. BUTLER. The best information I can give to my friend is that all the way through the bill we have prepared these paragraphs with the distinct understanding that when this period arrived, whatever it may be, all the young men belonging to the Navy would be permitted to return, and that there would be left in the Navy but 76,000 men out of 525,000, which we had during the war period.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How many merchant ships is the Navy operating now?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. One hundred and thirty-three.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They are operating some vessels besides transports.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. All the ships outside of a military character are 133.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not all transports.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; we have to carry supplies, and some are used in carrying those supplies and others are used in bringing the troops back.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is one of the features that I want to criticize. Let me first state for the information of the House and the information of the committee—and I do not intend to criticize the committee because they are up against a situation in the administration that they can not overcome—that I have had numerous letters setting forth cases of great hardship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have found several cases where women were compelled to go out on the farm, and even to go out to the stables and take care of the horses and the cattle, by reason of the detention of their sons in the Navy. A widow in one instance was compelled to do that because her boy is kept in the Navy at some menial occupation, some ordinary work, and they would not discharge him. She was compelled to go out to the barns, take care of the horses and the cattle in order to prevent their suffering for want of feed and care. I wrote the Secretary of the Navy—I do not suppose he ever saw the letter—that if some of these naval officers' wives were compelled to engage in such occupations, by reason of the retention of their sons, these young men in the Navy would be discharged very quickly.

I say, Mr. Chairman, it is an outrage on our young men who are being thus detained in the Navy. There is no excuse for it and there can be no excuse for it. They have them scrubbing decks and polishing brass or any kind of common labor. The most of them are not really sailors; they are "roustabouts." They put them in the fireroom. The administration says there shall be no conscription of labor. This is nothing but conscription of labor, involuntary servitude, to keep them in the Navy performing work that can be done by any common laborer.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the gentleman believe that these young men that are in the Navy ought to be used in the transport service to bring the boys back home? Does not the gentleman think that is a part of the duty for which they enlisted?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not. They enlisted for war. Moreover, the Navy is using in transportation 50 per cent more men than is used in the merchant marine for the same service. But if the Navy would stop running cargo ships I might reconcile myself to its operation of transports.

Mr. BLACK. Upon what authority does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Navy is running cargo ships that might better be operated by the merchant service, which would use less men and be at less expense, but instead of that the Navy is running these transports and cargo ships and keeping these young men in the service.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman must be in error; the only ships the Navy is operating is made necessary by military reasons—transporting supplies and——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The merchant ship can take the supplies now, as well as ships in charge of the Navy; they can get there just as quick and take the supplies a great deal cheaper.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not know about that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman knows it does not take near the number of men to operate a merchant ship that it does a ship in the Navy. The Navy uses from one-third to 50 per cent more than are used in the merchant service for the same work. A gentleman by my side, who is better informed, says that I have not got that per cent high enough. He says 100 per cent more.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The wages paid on merchant ships are three times that paid in the Navy.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is another thing. You put these young men at this labor and pay them $33 a month, and then

the administration says that it is not conscripting labor; but if they were in the merchant service they would be paid $100 a month or more for the same work. Does the committee think this is fair or just?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman was saying that he could do it much more cheaply by doing it with the merchant service.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, on the whole, that is true, because you would have so many less men. I repeat, this situation is simply an outrage and ought to be corrected.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If I have any more time, I will yield.

Mr. BEE. Do I understand the gentleman to believe that we ought to withdraw the Navy from the transportation of troops back from France and turn the transportation of the troops over to the merchant ships altogether?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would say that could just as well be done; but I am not complaining of that so much as I am of the use of ships that are not in the transport service. There are something over 100 ships, if I understand correctly——

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to say, if the gentleman will permit, that we are using battleships for the purpose of bringing these men back.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BUTLER. We have taken off these ships one-half their usual crews, and sometimes two-thirds, and we are now doing it against the protests of some of the military men, using these ships of war for the purpose of hastening the return of these soldiers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Let me have just a word further. Last week there appeared in the daily papers an item showing that a transport—the *Federal*, if I remember correctly, a 10,000-ton transport—came home bringing just 1 soldier and 10 Y. M. C. A. men.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do they protest against using battleships for bringing soldiers home?

Mr. BUTLER. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question in my own time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want somebody to answer it who knows something about it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If I could hear the question, I would answer it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why are they kicking about using these battleships to bring home the soldiers?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Nobody is kicking about it that I know of. I am complaining that the Navy takes our young men off the farm and uses them to operate cargo ships.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Pennsylvania just so stated.

Mr. BUTLER. I am prepared to answer the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What are battleships good for in time of peace except to bring soldiers home?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I make no complaint about using battleships. I did complain about their continuing to use the men in the way I speak of and give as an excuse that they want to bring our boys home, when they brought back a 10,000-ton transport the other day with only one soldier on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will now endeavor to answer the gentleman's question. It is the view of some of the military men connected with the Navy that the battleships are not intended for such use, but the Secretary of the Navy has insisted that everything that will carry soldiers shall be used for that purpose. The Committee on Naval Affairs stands by the Secretary in that view. We believe that it is the right thing to do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Secretary of the Navy is right. The people want the boys home and they are going to have them home.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would like to know why we are using a good many of our men in the Navy who enlisted for the duration of the war to man cargo ships to carry cargo to Europe.

Mr. BUTLER. We are only using them for transporting food for the soldiers, as I understand it. We are not using them commercially. The Secretary of the Navy is particularly careful that none should be used for commercial purposes. It is true that sailors are on our ships that are carrying foodstuffs and other materials to the soldiers abroad. We are using them on transports and battleships and other ships for the purpose of bringing the soldiers back. We took them over safely, and we are going to return them home.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman inform us how many enlisted men are being used for the purpose of manning cargo vessels?

Mr. BUTLER. Cargo vessels and transports, about 55,000.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman tell us why it is that the Navy does not man those cargo vessels with civilian employees that it can well do, without forcing these boys to do that?

Mr. BUTLER. There is no authority for it.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The matter actually before the committee at this time is the subject of the Marine Corps. Before we pass that subject I wish to take two or three minutes to say a word in regard to the part the Marine Corps played in the great struggle just closed in Europe.

It is well known that one brigade of marines was mixed up in practically all of the fighting of the war. That brigade was a part of the Second Division. The other part of the division was made up of Regulars. The first that we heard of the marines as taking a conspicuous place in the fighting was at Belleau Wood. The Germans had been advancing toward Paris since May 27. On June 5 they had reached the vicinity of a little place called Lucy. This might be called German high tide in 1918, for it was the nearest they came to Paris. The Second Division, containing the marine brigade, came up in trucks. Finding the French and Germans, too, going toward Paris, they halted, found a place in the line, and went in. We all recall the result.

The place which the marines had to occupy turned out to be opposite Belleau Wood. I recently returned from a trip with the Committee on Military Affairs, which included, among other places, Belleau Wood. Anyone who has gone on the ground and has seen this dense jungle of forest and undergrowth will appreciate the difficulties under which these troops fought, and will wish to take off his hat to anyone who fought there and came out of that place alive.

The marines made a fine showing on that occasion, as, of course, they did all the way through. After days and weeks of the most bitter fighting imaginable, the Germans were driven out of the wood. The American cemetery at the north end of the wood tells the story of American sacrifice.

For me there was an additional interest in this particular fight by the Second Division, for the line which this division gained and held, running north of Belleau Wood, through Bouresches to Vaux, became the jumping-off line of the Twenty-sixth, or Yankee, Division, in the advance of July, the second Battle of the Marne. The One hundred and second Infantry, originally drawn largely from my own State, jumped off near Bouresches on the day when the villages of Belleau and Torcy were taken by the division.

The second division was also engaged in the Soissons encounter which began on the 18th of July. As we all know, that was the last day of the German advance, because it was the first day of the allied offensive. From that time on the allies were moving toward Berlin instead of the Germans moving toward Paris. The marines took an active part in this critical battle of the war, as they did in the fighting which took place later on in the Meuse-Argonne campaign. It was one of those divisions which was always ready for its share of the fighting and never failed to bear itself well. It is now with the army of occupation keeping "our" watch on the Rhine.

Just a word as to one particular marine officer who was not in the Second Division during the fighting, though it was not his fault. I refer to the gallant son of the distinguished chairman of the Naval Committee, Brig. Gen. Smedley Butler. [Applause.] I do not know why he was sent to Brest. If it was intended to bury a man, that was a good place to send him, because the natural conditions were such that unless he took great care he might be buried by simply sinking out of sight in the mud. Smedley Butler was placed in charge of the Pontanazen Camp, near Brest. As I have said, the natural conditions of the place are the worst imaginable and very little had been done to improve them when Gen. Butler arrived. With energy characteristic of the son as well as of the father, whom we all know and love so well here in this House, he set in to make that camp a better place for soldiers to live in. What he did is a matter of record. With his own hands and assisted by the soldiers under his command he labored with such material as was at hand until Camp Pontanazen was made a livable place. One instance has been cited—I believe on this floor—where Gen. Butler with a line of enlisted men went for a load of what they

call duck boards, which are used to place on the mud to save the soldiers from sinking. On his own shoulders, along with the men, he carried these boards a considerable distance and put them down as walks in order to prevent the feet of the men who had to use this camp from being soaked in mud.

I relate what I saw and heard. A great transformation has taken place at Brest, a port we were compelled to use in order to bring our soldiers home quickly. Much of the credit for the change is due to Smedley Butler. This word is due the gallant son of a distinguished father and I am glad, as one not a member of this committee but very much interested in the Marine Corps, to thus speak of Smedley Butler and the work of the marines in the war. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

That the accounting officers of the Treasury Department are hereby authorized and directed to allow, in the settlement of the accounts of disbursing officers of the Navy and Marine Corps covering the period of the present emergency, such credits for payments to officers and enlisted men not ordinarily allowable under the statutes as are certified to them by the Secretary of the Navy as having been incurred under military necessity or as having been occasioned by accidental circumstances or conditions over which such disbursing officers had no control and for which they were not justly responsible: *Provided*, That the period of the present emergency as contemplated by this act shall be regarded as beginning on the 6th day of April, 1917, and as terminating six months after the expiration of the quarter in which peace is declared. And that nothing herein shall be construed to include payments under contracts for supplies or services.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 10, strike out the word "act" and substitute the word "paragraph."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the amendment which I offer may remove whatever objection the gentleman from Massachusetts has to the proviso. My amendment, if adopted, strikes out the word "act" and inserts the word "paragraph." The proviso relates entirely to the matter of accounting; that for the purpose of accounting the period of the emergency shall be considered as extended for six months after the expiration of the quarter in which peace is declared.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state what sort of accounts or credits to which this is supposed to apply?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It has sometimes happened that men have had to be paid in France without all the formalities required by the Treasury Department being complied with. Sometimes records have been destroyed in battle, and the pay officers in France have had to pay men without being able to meet all the requirements which the Treasury Department insists shall be met.

Mr. WALSH. Will this take in the case of where the papers have been lost in transfers from one hospital to another?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is the purpose of the section.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will permit a statement there for a moment, there was one case that we had presented to us which I think will be interesting to the gentleman from Massachusetts and other gentlemen, and that is where a shell had struck right in the center of one of this force's headquarters, and it blew the entire headquarters to pieces and destroyed all the records. This is in order to provide for the taking care of such cases and giving authority to make those payments.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The officers have gone ahead and made payments, and, of course, properly so, under circumstances such as stated by the gentleman from New York, and this is to take care of such cases in the accounting department of the Government.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me state, before the gentleman from Massachusetts concludes what he will do in reference to the proviso, that the committee was informed that the money consideration involved to make these accounts good would range from $5,000 to $50,000. As an example of what this provision is intended to accomplish, let me say that wounded men have been found who had lost everything in the way of personal effects and could not furnish the disbursing officer with any information, other than from memory, as to when they were last paid. They did not have the ordinary, customary papers they should have to show that they were legally entitled to the money. They did not have any money, and it was simply an act of mercy for the disbursing officers to help them out. So we desired to have this paragraph in the bill, so that the disbursing officers would get credit for disbursement where they were paid under such circumstances.

Mr. WALSH. So that the language, line 2, page 55, covering the period of the present emergency, is on account of the accounts incurred during the emergency?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is the idea. The accounting officers will have a little leeway after the accounts come in to straighten them out. It all relates, of course, to occurrences within the period of the emergency, and will necessarily be limited to such.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the reservation of the point of order, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the concluding sentence of this paragraph was read, and I think it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the concluding sentence.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Marine Corps: For enlisted men serving ashore; subsistence and lodging of enlisted men when traveling on duty, or cash in lieu thereof; commutation of rations to enlisted men regularly detailed as clerks and messengers; payments of board and lodging of applicants for enlistment while held under observation, recruits, recruiting parties, and enlisted men where it is impracticable to otherwise furnish subsistence, or in lieu of board, commutation of rations to recruiting parties, and enlisted men traveling on special duty at such rate as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe; ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for cold storage; ice for offices and preservation of rations, $4,526,964: *Provided*, That hereafter, except when detached by the President of the United States for duty with the Army, enlisted men of the Marine Corps shall be entitled to the same allowance for rations as are enlisted men of the Navy, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso. Will the gentleman state why that provision was put in there?

Mr. BUTLER. I am going to ask the gentleman from Tennessee, who knows the subject very thoroughly, to explain it to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, under the existing law the marines receive pay prescribed under the military law for the military. This provides when they are not detached to serve with the Army they shall receive the Navy ration. To be entirely frank with the gentleman, the Navy ration is a little better ration than the Army ration, and this is to give the Marine Corps when serving with the Navy the Navy ration instead of the Army ration. When they are serving with the Army they get the Army ration, of course, because they are serving with the Army.

Mr. BROWNING. In detached service they also get the Army ration. Under this law enlisted men of the Marine Corps on shore duty in the United States are entitled to receive only the Army ration, except that in certain cases in the island possessions and on foreign stations where it is impracticable to furnish the Army ration the Navy ration is allowed; so that approximately 1,136 men serving on shore are at present receiving the Navy ration, and to this number must be added 1,600 marines serving on board ship, who also receive this ration.

Mr. WALSH. Well, the Marine Corps properly is a part of the Naval Establishment.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; but it has an Army organization, and under the law they get the pay and the allowances of the Army.

Mr. WALSH. They are not in peace times attached to the Army, are they?

Mr. PADGETT. No; but they get the rations, though, of the Army in peace times, and this is to provide that when they are not detached and serving with the Army that they may get the Navy rations. They are a part of the Navy, but the incongruity existed that they were getting the Army ration instead of the Navy ration.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman from Tennessee will permit, another reason why they desire to substitute the Navy ration for the Army ration when the Marine Corps operates in detached service is that the Marine Corps operates in small units, only a few men together, and the Army ration contemplates large units and buying and serving in large quantities. It is almost impossible to properly subsist the Marine Corps in the small units on the Army ration based upon the larger units.

Mr. WALSH. Take the detachment down at San Domingo at the present time on detached duty, taken down there by naval

craft and left there to take charge of a situation requiring attention, they get the Army ration?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They get the Army ration.

Mr. WALSH. But if the Navy would take them down there and would stay with them and direct their movements they would get the Navy ration?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If they were on the ships, they would get the Navy ration.

Mr. WALSH. If the Navy controlled the situation, they would get the Navy ration?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Navy ration. This fixes it so they always get the Navy ration unless actually attached to the Army.

Mr. WALSH. The only time they would get the Army ration is when they are put into the Army by the order of the President?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation and recruiting, Marine Corps: For transportation of troops, and of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots or posts, including ferriage and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; toilet kits for issue to recruits upon their first enlistment and the expense of the recruiting service, $852,414.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EMERSON: Page 59, at the end of line 16, insert:

"There shall be paid to each honorably discharged sailor and marine who served for a longer period than 30 days the sum of $300 in addition to any bonus now paid."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes a point of order against the amendment. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Marine Corps: For freight, expressage, tolls, cartage, advertising, washing of bed sacks, mattress covers, pillowcases, towels, and sheets, funeral expenses of officers and enlisted men, and retired officers on active duty during the war, and retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps, including the transportation of bodies and their arms and wearing apparel from the place of demise to the homes of the deceased in the United States; stationery and other paper, printing and binding; telegraphing, rent of telephones; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters; apprehension of stragglers and deserters; per diem of enlisted men employed on constant labor for periods of not less than 10 days; employment of civilian labor; purchase, repair, and installation and maintenance of gas, electric, sewer, and water pipes and fixtures; office and barracks furniture, vacuum cleaners, camp and garrison equipage and implements; mess utensils for enlisted men; packing boxes, wrapping paper, oilcloth, crash, rope, twine, quarantine fees, camphor and carbonized paper, carpenters' tools, tools for police purposes, safes, purchase, hire, repair, and maintenance of such harness, wagons, motor wagons, armored automobiles, carts, drays, motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes, and other vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official military and garrison purposes; purchase of public horses and mules; services of veterinary surgeons, and medicines for public animals, and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase of mounts and horse equipment for all officers below the grade of major required to be mounted; shoeing for public animals and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase and repair of hose, fire extinguishers, hand grenades, carts, wheelbarrows, and lawn mowers, purchase, installation, and repair of cooking and heating stoves and furnaces; purchase of towels, soap, combs, and brushes for offices; postage stamps for foreign and registered postage; books, newspapers, and periodicals; improving parade grounds; repairs of pumps and wharves, water; straw for bedding, mattresses; mattress covers, pillows, sheets, furniture for Government quarters and repair of same; packing and crating officers' allowance of baggage on change of station; deodorizing, lubricants, disinfectants; for the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries; and for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising at home and abroad but impossible to anticipate or classify, $2,740,322: *Provided*, That hereafter the funds received in payment for laundry work performed by post laundries shall be used to defray the cost of operation of said laundries and the receipts and expenditures shall be accounted for in accordance with the methods prescribed by law, and any sums remaining at the end of the fiscal year after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of operation of such plants is paid.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to an instance of misspelling on page 62, line 13, in the word "accordance" in the copy of the bill that I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Submarine Tender numbered 3 from $2,280,000 to $3,400,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The committee has tabulated the total amount of increase on these ships, has it?

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman mean in the three-year program?

Mr. WALSH. I mean these ships computed below. Has the committee found out what is the total increase in cost?

Mr. BUTLER. We have not added the figures together. We simply increased it because they made it plain to us that with the money provided they could not finish these ships within the limit of cost fixed by Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Was it necessary to increase the limit of cost because they could not be finished in time, or because of the increased cost of labor or material, or both?

Mr. BUTLER. Because of the increased cost of both labor and material it is necessary to increase the original amounts as indicated here.

Mr. BROWNING. I will state to the gentleman that during the war they stopped work on all these large ships.

Mr. WALSH. Are they all being built in Government yards?

Mr. BROWNING. No, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. Six of the larger vessels of the three-year program are being built in Government yards. Does the gentleman's inquiry relate to the large ships?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; any of them.

Mr. BUTLER. Of the battle cruisers, six in number, two of them are being built in Government yards. Of the battleships, 10 in number, 4 are being built in navy yards.

Mr. WALSH. What can the gentleman state with reference to the submarines of the R class? The proportion of increase there would seem to be greater than in the case of some of the larger ships. Are they being constructed in the private yards—these small submarines?

Mr. BUTLER. My recollection is that they are. My recollection is that they are building in private yards, but I am not able to answer definitely.

Mr. WALSH. The increased limit of cost of each one of them is from $700,000 to $875,000?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. Anticipating that Congress might wish to complete this big program laid out three years ago, and having concluded that we would submit to Congress the wisdom of completing the program, we asked the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair to make us, as nearly as he could, an accurate estimate of the amount of money he would need to complete these different ships. I will say to my friend that we did not have time to go particularly into them, but had to rely upon him and his figures; and Admiral Taylor, the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, has perhaps the confidence of the Committee on Naval Affairs beyond that of any other man who ever occupied the place. He is absolutely dependable. He is as nearly accurate as a human being can be. He is extremely careful about appropriations, and therefore we said we would like to have him fix the amount of money necessary to complete these ships, and after consultation with his experts he returned and gave us these figures, and we did not go further into it.

Mr. WALSH. When will they probably be completed with this increase?

Mr. BUTLER. Admiral Taylor, the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, stated to us that he expected to have this program completed within three years, maybe two years and a half, but certainly within three years.

Mr. PADGETT. Four years in the case of the big cruisers.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; four years for the big cruisers. They have changed the style of the cruisers somewhat, reducing the speed a little bit and putting on a little heavier armor. It is expected that within four years these big cruisers will be completed.

Mr. WALSH. So that this increased cost is not to be devoted to employing three shifts in the 24-hour program?

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. WALSH. They are going to get back to more normal work?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to say this to the gentleman, that, of course, I would not dare to put my judgment up against that of the experienced chief constructor, but I do not believe that this program will be entirely completed within four years. I do not believe that some of the battleships will be completed. It is not the purpose of the Government to rush along and complete these ships as we did during the war period.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL EMERGENCY FUND.

To enable the Secretary of the Navy to restore to the owners, donors, or lessors such boats, vessels, land, or other property as has been donated, commandeered, chartered, or leased in connection with the prosecution of the war in the condition as required in the agreements, charters, contracts, or leases applying to said boats, vessels, land, or other property, $15,000,000, to be available for obligations heretofore and hereafter incurred on this account.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be done while the point of order is pending.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity for this manner of authorizing obligations hereafter on account of these vessels?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This is a fund which is to be put at the disposal of the Secretary of the Navy for the purpose of restoring ships, chartered during the war, to the condition in which they were found when we took them. Some of this work has already been done and will have to be paid for out of this fund; that is why we provide that the fund may be used to pay obligations heretofore incurred. The balance of the ships will have to be put in repair and we have provided for meeting this expense out of this fund. That is why we put in the language covering obligations hereafter incurred on this account.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but the obligation to do this work was incurred when they took the boats?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; that is true.

Mr. WALSH. Under this language they could take a boat and incur the obligation after this bill is passed, and I do not think they ought to be permitted to do that.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is not the intention.

Mr. WALSH. It says—

To be available for obligations heretofore and hereafter incurred on this account.

The obligations were incurred at the time they took over the craft by the contracts to charter the boats.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The obligation to restore the ships was incurred at that time, but contracts will be let to put these ships in repair, and obligations will be incurred on account of such work for which we want to pay out of this fund. That is the meaning or at least the intention of the language. We have a large number of these ships that have not yet been repaired and obligations will be incurred in making these repairs which we want to pay out of this fund.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the Navy Department instead of restoring these ships to the condition in which they were at the time they were chartered, as nearly as may be, are turning them back in poor condition and making an allowance or an award for damages to the owners of the vessels.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Allowing amounts in many instances very much less than what will put the vessels back in usable condition again. Now, would this fund be available for that purpose, to make an award of damages?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have no doubt that this fund could be used to settle with the owners of the vessels upon a cash basis as well as used to put ships in repair. I think the Government would have the option as to which course to pursue, assuming that an agreement as to the amount is reached with the shipowners.

Mr. WALSH. But I am advised that there have been instances where they have turned back ships in pretty badly used-up condition, and have said, "Now, here, we are not able to get this work done now. We are going to turn these ships back to you and make an award of $1,500 or $1,800." The owner says, "Why, I can not have that boat restored so I can use it for any such sum as that," and the officials have said, "Well, that is all we will allow you. Here is your boat, and if you will not take it we will not put it back in usable condition and will not increase the amount of the award."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not intended to settle any controverted questions arising between the owners of ships and the Navy Department by any language used here. Such questions would probably go to the courts. But this sum is intended merely to put the Navy Department in position either to have these repairs made or to pay a lump sum in lieu of the repairs, and it is intended to cover such obligations as may be incurred during the coming year on that account, as well as to cover any items that have been paid out during the last year on account of this same matter.

Mr. WALSH. I have grave doubts as to whether this language is so framed as to preclude the officials of the Navy Department from taking the charter of a boat after this act is passed and using some of this money to pay for the charter, because it says "to be available for obligations heretofore and hereafter incurred on this account."

Now, that is the account for boats loaned, donated, or chartered.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This says, "in connection with the prosecution of the war." Would not that limit the scope of this paragraph?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but of course the war is still going on.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not think there would be any objection to specifying a certain date.

Mr. WALSH. If you said, "Donated, commandeered, chartered, or leased prior to the passage of this act in connection with the prosecution of the war," that would be satisfactory to me, and I would withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think there will be no objection to that amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Then I withdraw the point of order and offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the point of order and offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WALSH. In line 14, page 65, insert, after the word "leased," the words "prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is no objection to that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 18, after the word "account" insert the following as a new paragraph:

"That no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that at the time of the proposed acquirement can be manufactured or produced in the United States at a sum less than they can be purchased or acquired elsewhere."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very plain.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I was under a wrong impression as to the wording of the amendment. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is clearly time that we should begin the work of reconstruction in the United States. Other countries are already reconstructing, and it is evident that many of them are reconstructing largely at the expense of the United States. We are rebuilding roads in France with American soldiers. We are rebuilding the bridges in France with American soldiers and American engineers. To a large extent we are bearing the burdens of reconstruction on the other side. We ought to begin the work of reconstruction here, and the sooner we begin in the United States the better off we will be.

Anybody reading the dispatches from Paris this morning will be astounded to learn that the taxes in France and Italy have increased 6 per cent during the war, and in the Kingdom of Great Britain 1,100 per cent; and that while the latter, if true, is an aggravated increase, in the United States the taxes have increased more than in any other country on earth. Here, we are told, they have increased 2,000 per cent.

Gentlemen, we have been bearing the burdens of this war more than the average American knows. The facts have not been spread over the land as they should have been because we wanted to get through with the war. Those of us on the committee to raise revenue are apprehensive of the future unless we begin to economize on the one hand and to encourage reconstruction and industry in the United States on the other.

As I stated, we are helping the foreign countries both with cash and with men to go ahead with the work of reconstruction. Let us not forget to keep our own industries going; let us keep them going to the limit. If we have manufactories,

keep the men employed on the United States side of the water. The soldiers are coming back seeking employment. We are finding places for them as rapidly as possible. We hope to take care of all of them, but we can not do it unless industries are going full tilt.

In the early stages of this war the very flags used by the soldiers of the United States were being purchased on the other side of the water; even that proud emblem with which the boys marched to victory was in some instances the product of foreign toil. That should not have been. They should have been manufactured here. It is said the Government was bringing in enginery and small parts of mechanism from abroad. We should encourage the manufacture of them here. We are making vast appropriations authorizing the Secretaries in the departments to buy, buy, buy. Now, let them buy in the United States so far as they can. Gentlemen, it is not a question of politics; it is a question of the employment of our brave soldier boys and the encouragement of industry and the reconstruction in the United States.

My amendment proposes to say to the Secretary of the Navy—and I understand such amendments have gone into other bills in another form—to say to the Secretary of the Navy, Whenever you can buy the article in the United States, buy it here.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I am just informed that the gentleman's amendment provides for the purchase where it can be bought as low or as cheap or less than it can be bought anywhere else. I do not suppose the gentleman intends for the Secretary of the Navy to buy regardless of the price.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wanted to give notice. The amendment was drafted to come in under the Holman rule, with which the gentleman is familiar.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. It provides that they must be bought here as cheaply or cheaper than elsewhere?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. That is all right.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, after the amendment just adopted, insert as a new paragraph:

"*Provided*, That no moneys made available by this act shall be used in transporting or maintaining any enlisted man of the Navy or Marine Corps who enlisted between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, who, without his consent, is retained in the service after September 1, 1919."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. It is a clear change of law.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is proper, for two reasons: In the first place, it comes within the Holman rule, as the result, as we all know, will be a reduction of expenditures. In the next place, it is a limitation upon the expenditures made by this particular bill. It is clearly a proper limitation, and there are hundreds of precedents which will sustain it. It is in the customary and usual form, recognized as proper practice in this House for many, many years. I am not advised upon what ground it can be argued that a point of order can be maintained against it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it provides that certain persons now in the Navy shall be discharged prior to a certain time.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No; it intends to force their discharge. That is the purpose of it. It forbids that they shall be maintained and transported. That is the purpose of the amendment in its technical statement and form.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. By a previous provision of the bill which we are now considering we have fixed the size of the Navy. If we let these men out, is not the gentleman increasing the expense, because others will have to come in and take their places and we will not only have to pay them but will have to pay their transportation and the expense of letting them out?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman takes a peculiar position. He assumes that one paragraph of the bill is superior to another. That paragraph is not the law any more than this is. To say it is subject to a point of order because it is inconsistent with some other provision of the bill is, of course, absurd, if the gentleman will pardon my saying so.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman was stating that it reduced expenses and I was pointing out that it increases them.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It reduces them, because it forbids the use of a part of this money for a certain purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, after looking at the amendment, and after being advised by those who know better than I, I believe my point of order is not well taken, and I withdraw it. Let us vote this down, because these boys will have to walk home. I shall not vote for the bill if such a thing is put into it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior years, and for other purposes, had further insisted upon the amendment of the Senate No. 21, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the war with Germany is over. The boys who enlisted to fight that war are entitled to be discharged. Their right to discharge is the highest kind of right; a moral right. It is true that they may, under the technical terms of their enlistment, be detained in the service until peace is actually proclaimed, but that is taking a legal advantage of the patriotic instincts which caused these boys to enlist. The war with Germany is over. The task for which these boys enlisted has been terminated exactly in the way we wanted it terminated. Germany may sign the peace treaty or not, still the war is over. We may agree with our associates in the war and with the other nations upon the terms of peace or not, as the case may be, and yet the war with Germany is over. The treaty as ultimately agreed on may be ratified by the Senate of the United States or not, according to their way of looking at it, but just the same the war with Germany is over. Germany is no more a naval power to-day than is Switzerland or Serbia or some other nation which has no fleet at all. She is absolutely helpless on the sea. It would not require a single submarine chaser to meet any occasion that might arise in connection with the German situation. Therefore the idea that these boys may still be retained in the service, I say, is violative of the moral consciousness of the Nation and of these boys themselves and I am free to say of my own.

The sailors and marines who enlisted for the duration of the war have been held seven months after the armistice was signed upon a theory that the war emergency still continued by the necessity of bringing our soldiers home. The work of bringing the soldiers home is about finished. We now have fewer than 700,000 soldiers in Europe, and proceeding at the rate we have for the past 30 days we will bring all the remainder home before August 1. When that is done, there is no longer the slightest excuse, no matter how flimsy, to keep the boys who enlisted in the Navy for the duration of the war still in the service. By my amendment the department is given 30 days after this work is finished in which to discharge them, this is ample time.

This amendment is not in conflict with the plans of the department. On page 20 of the recent committee hearings Mr. Secretary of the Navy Daniels himself said:

It is our purpose to give a discharge to everybody who enlisted for the duration of the war as soon as we have gotten the soldiers home.

So, as I say, this amendment is not at variance with the plans of the department. The department claims it is what they intend to do, anyway. They say they intend to let these boys out just as soon as they finish bringing the soldiers home, and that that work will be completed by August 1. I ask, What is the reason for not adopting this amendment and putting the provision in the bill?

I want to say that a good reason for putting it in the bill is that we owe the duty to these boys to redeem the pledge made them that the Government would deal in good faith with them and let them go as quick as the war emergency was over. This is the only time that Congress is going to have an opportunity to say anything on this subject. It is either for Congress to act now or let the Navy Department use its discretion and keep them there as long as they want to. Secretary Daniels may change his mind, as he has the right to do. He may decide for purely peace purposes of the Navy to keep these boys on longer. I venture to predict that they will not all be discharged by September 1; that they will not send all these boys home by the time mentioned in this amendment. I am not willing to leave this matter up in the air. I want to be sure that they are sent home. I ask Congress to come to the rescue of these boys, and to insure by the adoption of my amendment that they are sent home. This is a matter of right, and we ought to redeem our promises made to them.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that under the wording of the amendment it would bankrupt the Navy. There are hundreds—yes, thousands—of men who enlisted since April 6, 1917, for four years, and that would prohibit any one of them from being paid or transported or used.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I call for a vote. No; I can not yield. I call for a vote.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman will not yield for me to call attention to the fact that this bill itself puts these men in for the duration of the war only?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, line 8, after the word "plant," insert a semicolon and the words: "and that no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that at the time of the proposed acquirement can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards of the United States for a sum less than it can be produced or acquired otherwise."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DALLINGER. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order anyway, and let the Chair rule on it.

Mr. DALLINGER. I submit to the Chair that the amendment is a limitation, pure and simple, under the Holman rule.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It has been held that way. It has been ruled in order on three or four bills.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears to the Chair it is clearly a limitation, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment follows the same wording as the amendment put on the Army appropriation bill the other day in this House, and also the amendment put on the fortification bill in the last Congress, the only difference being that in those cases the amendments referred to Government arsenals and this being a Navy bill the words "navy yards" are used. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have in this country a number of large Government navy yards in the construction and equipment of which an immense amount of the money of the taxpayers of this country has been expended. The way things have been going for the past few years these navy yards are not kept running to their full capacity or on full time. Consequently, every month or two men are laid off and it causes great hardship among the employees. There is no reason why, when the work is to be done, that the navy yards should not be given all the work necessary to keep them running to their full capacity, providing that the work can be done more cheaply in those navy yards than it can be done in private yards. Mr. Chairman, that is the proposition, and my amendment simply provides that if the work can be done in Government navy yards and can be done for a less sum than it can be done in private yards, then the work shall be done in the navy yards, and I can not see how any Member of this House who has any regard——

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. No; I can not yield. I repeat that I can not see how any Member of this House who has any regard whatever for the welfare of the Government employees or for the saving of money to the taxpayers can refuse to vote for this amendment.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I will.

Mr. HICKS. How is the gentleman going to figure the cost of what the work comes to in a navy yard? Is he going to figure the overhead charges, the money invested, in order to arrive at the cost figures?

Mr. DALLINGER. That is entirely in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy and everybody knows that the commandants of these various navy yards can, through their heads of departments, figure exactly what the cost will be.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Is the gentleman in favor of the principle of the Government going into general business?

Mr. DALLINGER. I am in favor of the Government utilizing its arsenals and navy yards to their full capacity. Either the United States Government should go out of the business entirely and do away with all its navy yards and arsenals, or else work them to their full capacity. There is no other alternative.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true in the navy yards the Government has about the same overhead expense whether they run to full capacity or not?

Mr. DALLINGER. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he insists on the point of order or not?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on this amendment. It is in accordance with the plan adopted by the Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 73, noes 7.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 66, line 8, add the following:

"No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available if the mechanics and laborers employed in the naval stations and navy yards of the United States are required to work regularly more than 44 hours weekly."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not believe it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I will make it anyway, and take the chances.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Gentlemen in authority say it is not a limitation.

Mr. PADGETT. It changes existing law, and contains affirmative legislation, which can not be done, as I understand it, in the guise of a limitation on an appropriation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand the present eight-hour law came into being in the navy yards in just this manner. Now, how would the gentleman differentiate that from the present amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. That may be true. I do not know whether any objection was made to it or not. It may have gone in by common consent. My recollection is that our committee reported it out and it went through without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Tennessee any reason to submit why this is not a strict limitation?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing but what I stated a while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair to be a limitation; and, if so, it is not the province of the Chair to pass upon the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the amendment itself. Does the gentleman contend there is affirmative legislation of any kind in the amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Wherein?

Mr. PADGETT. It is affirmative in that it contains a direction not to work more than 44 hours in a week. The present law is 8 hours a day, and for 6 days in a week it would be 48 hours a week; and the amendment of the gentleman from New York contains affirmative legislation to the effect that they shall not work over 44 hours a week, and it thereby violates the existing law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PADGETT. And it increases the expense.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no claim that it comes under the Holman rule?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would not claim that.

The CHAIRMAN. The proponent of the amendment claims that it is a limitation; but if it also carries affirmative legislation, of course, it is not a strict limitation, and therefore should go out. The Chair is trying to determine.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. This takes four hours a week off of the work done by every employee in the navy yards. To that extent, to the extent of decreasing the work four hours a week of every employee, it clearly does not come within the Holman rule, in that it increases the expenses of this Government to the extent of 4 hours out of 48 to every employee in that department of the Government. Clearly the Chair could not hold it was merely a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not under the Holman rule. That is very clear. The only difficulty in the mind of the Chair is whether or not it also contains an affirmative direction. The Chair is inclined to believe, and shall hold, that the requirement that no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available if the mechanics and laborers employed in the naval stations and navy yards are required to work regularly more than 44 hours a week goes beyond a limitation and limits by affirmative direction the discretion of the executive who must expend the money. Therefore the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, we have to go back to the item of "Navy Homes." There is a point of order pending against the paragraph, which was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and who now asks to return to that paragraph. It is on page 15.

Mr. WALSH. It is at the top of page 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., pay of employees: One secretary, $2,000; one foreman mechanic, $2,000; one superintendent of grounds, at $1,080; one steward, at $1,200; one store laborer, at $660; one matron and office assistant, at $720; one beneficiaries' attendant, at $480; one chief cook, at $660; one assistant cook, at $540; one assistant cook, at $480; one chief laundress, at $420; two laundresses, at $360 each; three laundresses, at $300 each; one chief scrubber, at $420; three scrubbers, at $360 each; one head waitress, at $480; four waitresses, at $360 each; four waitresses, at $300 each; one kitchen attendant, at $540; seven laborers, at $600 each; five laborers, at $540 each; one stable keeper and driver, at $660; one master at arms, at $900; two house corporals, at $600 each; one barber, at $600; one carpenter, at $1,200; one painter, at $1,200; one painter, at $1,020; one engineer, $1,080; four laborers, at $720 each; three laborers, at $840 each; one laborer, at $600; one chauffeur, coal truck, at $960; one chauffeur, small truck, at $840; one chauffeur, governor's car, $840; total for employees, $40,420.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, there is a point of order reserved against the paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the officials who are in custody and control of this fund out of which these employees are paid have been consulted concerning this raise?

Mr. BUTLER. They not only have been consulted, but they have made a request that these items be raised. These salaries are paid out of the income on the "naval pension fund," as the gentleman will appreciate. The superintendent of the home writes to the Secretary of the Navy and makes his estimate of what it will cost to maintain the home, and makes his request for certain sums of money to be paid to the employees.

Mr. WALSH. Well, the gentleman appreciates that under the current law the secretary, who is now getting $1,800, will receive, after July 1, $120 bonus.

Mr. BUTLER. He may.

Mr. WALSH. He has received it in the past year.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Instead of making a point of order, why not reduce the item from $2,000 to $1,800?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the motion might not carry.

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say whether it will or not, but it would be less trouble.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the following point of order upon the paragraph:

One secretary, $2,000; one foreman mechanic, $2,000; one superintendent of grounds, $1,080, and one steward, at $1,200.

That is a change of existing law and an increase in salaries authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman if his point applies to the superintendent of grounds?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; to all the paragraph down to and including "one steward, at $1,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order against the increases. I understand it is admitted that they are increases. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is going to offer an amendment to restore them to the previous figures.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as follows:

One secretary, $1,800; one foreman mechanic, $1,800; one superintendent of grounds, at $900, and one steward, at $900.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the Clerk general authority to change these totals? If not, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to change the totals in accordance with the amendments that have been made to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to change the totals wherever necessary.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one word that has been printed incorrectly—the word "accordance."

Mr. BUTLER. That has been changed. In my print it is spelled correctly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BUTLER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentlemen of the House have been extremely generous in permitting a limitation of the privileges they had to speak on the bill in general debate, I request that three legislative days be granted to them to print any remarks they want to make on any feature of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman. Did he ask that all gentlemen be granted that privilege?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen be permitted to print their remarks on this bill for three legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER. To-day is unanimous-consent day. The Clerk will call the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

BRIDGE ACROSS SNAKE RIVER, WASH.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington, the county of Franklin, in the State of Washington, or the said counties of Walla Walla and Franklin, acting jointly, be, and they or either of them are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, such a point being along the route of and continuous with the Inland Empire Highway as officially designated by the State highway commissioner of the State of Washington, such point being about 3 miles above the confluence of the Snake River with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the gentlemen having charge of this measure to the somewhat clumsy language which has been used in designating the point where the bridge is to be erected. They use the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation," and then go on to say "such a point being," and, on line 1, page 2, "such point being" somewhere else. It seems to me that on line 9, page 1, we should strike out the words "such a point being," and on line 1 of page 2 we should strike out the words "such point being" and insert the word "and." If these were done the language would be very much clearer and plainer. I am going to offer an amendment that the bill be amended by striking out the words "such a point being," on line 9 of page 1, and to strike out the words "such point being" and insert the word "and."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Amend, page 1, line 9, by striking out the words "such a point being," and on page 2, line 1, strike out the words "such point being" and insert the word "and."

Mr. WALSH. I have been advised that the gentleman having this matter in charge is absent, but I wish to assure Members of the House that this is not to take advantage of his absence or in any way to encumber the bill. The bill will then read, "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation along the route of and continuous with the Inland Empire Highway as officially designated by the State highway commissioner of the State of Washington, and about 3 miles above the confluence of the Snake River with the Columbia River," and so forth. It merely makes the language much smoother and avoids the clumsy repetition of the words "such a point being" and "such point being."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House to-morrow for one hour at about 12.30 o'clock, if I can without interfering with other matters to be taken up in their order. Permit me to say that the Committee on Ways and Means is having hearings, and we recess from 12.30 to 2 o'clock, and I would like to occupy the time, if I can, at that hour.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would state to the gentleman that permission has been granted to two gentlemen to address the House for 10 minutes each to-morrow immediately after the reading of the Journal. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for one hour to-morrow, immediately after the conclusion of the remarks by the two gentlemen who have already been given permission.

Mr. SIMS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is to talk on the revenue.

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I propose to speak on the new freight rates put into effect by the Railroad Administration on imports coming into the Pacific coast ports and coming east. That is in connection with revenue matters.

Mr. SIMS. I did not know but that the gentleman was going to address the House on the luxury tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the gentleman's request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may adress the House for one hour to-morrow after the conclusion of the remarks by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And on what subject?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have stated that I wish to discuss the matter of the new freight rates that have been put into effect by the Railroad Administrator on imports coming into this country on the Pacific coast and coming east. The new rates went into effect on the 29th of May, and it is a matter of great importance, as it affects the revenue of the Government, and I wish to present my views to the House on that matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the gentleman going to make a tariff speech?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, sir; not necessarily. I want to talk upon this new rate.

The SPEAKER. This, of course, will be subject to conference reports. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, I assume that it would not be agreeable to the gentleman from Michigan to address the House this afternoon, after the Unanimous Consent Calendar is disposed of.

Mr. FORDNEY. The Committee on Ways and Means are having hearings and have recessed until 2.15 this afternoon, when we are to have a hearing upon a very important matter, and I would like to be present at the hearing. But during the hour I have requested for to-morrow the committee will be in recess and then we can go on with the hearings after I have concluded.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, we hope to take up to-morrow the wire bill, so called, and I presume that will take the time of the House for a couple of hours at least, and that can be taken up at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call attention to the fact that a conference report is on the Speaker's table.

Mr. MONDELL. We are still hopeful that that may be taken up this afternoon, although probably it will not be taken up until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will not object, but I want to make one further inquiry. Would it not be more for the public interest to go on and finish the appropriation bills?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, we have disposed of all the regular supply bills in the House in the first instance, except the sundry civil bill, which can not be reported until late Wednesday afternoon. In the meantime we hope to be able to dispose of the wire bill and the daylight-saving bill.

Mr. SIMS. I was about to ask the gentleman about the daylight-saving bill. Is it the purpose to bring up the daylight-saving bill on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it will come up Wednesday in the regular order.

Mr. SIMS. And therefore the sundry civil bill will be held back and not reported.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no; it is not being held back.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman said it would not be reported until late Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. MONDELL. Not because it is being held back, but because the committee has found that it is necessary to enter into some exhaustive hearings relative to some provisions of the bill that they could not possibly report until late Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. SIMS. What I intended to say was that you intend to take that much time regardless of appropriation bills.

Mr. MONDELL. No; the gentleman is mistaken about that. If the sundry civil bill was ready, if it was possible for the committee to get it ready, we would take it up immediately, but we hope to take it up at the earliest possible moment after it is reported by the committee. The committee will report it just as soon as it is humanly possible to do it. The committee was in session all day Sunday until nearly midnight, and has for some days been holding sessions all day late into the evening. It will be necessary for them to continue, and even at that they will not report until late Wednesday.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman knows that the daylight-saving bill as it has been reported does not take effect until the last Sunday in October so there is no urgency as to that bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Gentlemen are anxious, and probably under the rules of the House it will come up on Wednesday.

Mr. SIMS. I am not trying to prevent it; I am trying to find out how much dynamic force there is behind it to bring it up.

Mr. BARKLEY. How long did the gentleman from Wyoming estimate it would take on the wire bill to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that I estimated; I guessed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the gentleman to say a couple of hours. I thought if that was his estimate it might be a little bit of an underestimate. While there is no serious opposition, I think it will take longer than that.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman from Michigan is given an hour to-morrow, the House can take up the wire bill at about half past 1, and I assume that we can dispose of it in the afternoon.

Mr. ESCH. The two hours will be only for the general debate. There may be some debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MONDELL. We will have from 2 o'clock on.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. OLIVER, be given five days' leave of absence in order to attend the funeral of a relative.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for leave of absence for his colleague, Mr. OLIVER, for five days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS SNAKE RIVER, WASH.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of House bill 1706.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. MILLER of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. JOHN RIVER, ME.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 530) for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman who introduced the bill if any sort of an agreement has been entered into between the authorities of the Dominion of Canada and the State of Maine about this structure?

Mr. HERSEY. There is an understanding that if Congress consents to the erection of the bridge the Canadian Parliament will consent, and the bridge will be built between the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, each of which will equally share the expense. The gentleman will observe by the proviso on page 2 that the construction of the bridge can not be commenced until the consent of the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada has been obtained.

Mr. WALSH. I noticed that; but has not some understanding been entered into and put in writing between the Canadian Government and the State of Maine about this matter? This is apparently going to be an international highway.

Mr. HERSEY. The consent of the Legislature of Maine has been obtained, and I understand the Canadian Parliament will act upon it immediately, or have authorized the action of their commissioners, as soon as we get the consent of Congress. There is nothing in writing that I know of.

Mr. WALSH. Is this to replace an existing structure or is it an entirely new project?

Mr. HERSEY. A new project and a new bridge.

Mr. WALSH. How far is it from any other highway coming from the Province of New Brunswick into the State of Maine in that locality?

Mr. HERSEY. I should say about 20 miles from the nearest point.

Mr. WALSH. And it is not expected that the Federal Government will be asked to share any portion of the expense for the constructing of this bridge or its maintenance?

Mr. HERSEY. No; none whatever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the State of Maine and the Dominion of Canada, jointly, of a bridge to be erected across the St. John River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between Madawaska, Me., and Edmunston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided*, That the construction of said bridge shall not be commenced until the consent of the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada for the erection of the structure shall have been obtained.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 8, line 1, strike out "Edmunston" and insert in lieu thereof "Edmundston."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent the title was amended to read: "A bill for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada."

On motion of Mr. HERSEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEND OREILLE RIVER, WASH.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Pend Oreille County, State of Washington, and the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, Pend Oreille County, Wash., their successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized, jointly or separately, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pend Oreille River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between said towns, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. MILLER of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PITTSTON, PA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 241) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the east branch of the Susquehanna River, from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the east branch of the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, and State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, and State of Pennsylvania, at or in prolongation of Exeter Street, as the same is now established and used in the respective municipalities, to replace the present structure erected at the same location in accordance with the provision of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable water," March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "across," strike out the words "the east branch of."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "interest" and insert in lieu thereof the word "interests."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "provision" and insert in lieu thereof the word "provisions."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "water," insert the word "approved."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

By unanimous consent the title of the bill was amended so as read: "A bill to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsyl-

vania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania."

On motion of Mr. DEWALT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE, LA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1711) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to inquire what prospect there is for the completion of this structure at some time in the future? This was authorized in 1914 and the time has been extended once, I think, to two years and five years, respectively, and it is now intended to extend it three years and six years, respectively. The report from the committee consists simply of a letter from the Secretary of War, which sets forth the situation as the Secretary of War views it. It seems to me that it is an unwise policy to pursue, to extend time for building structures across navigable waters and have bills brought in after the time has been extended with just the plain statement that as the work was not commenced within the time limit the time should be extended.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think that there is difficulty in getting the money with which to erect this bridge?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, this is not an appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand, but the people who are going to build the bridge must have money.

Mr. WALSH. Probably they have had some difficulty in getting money, due to war conditions or material or something of that kind.

Mr. MADDEN. It may be that the community does not want the bridge, and this is being held for the purpose of a franchise——

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I think the community wants the bridge. I can satisfy the gentleman on that point.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it to be a public bridge?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there to be a railroad track upon it or is it just a highway bridge?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think possibly it may be used for both.

Mr MADDEN. Do the people who are going to build the bridge have to get a franchise from the local community to run street cars or trains over it? Does the gentleman from Kentucky know whether the people of the community insist on granting a franchise for the use of the bridge for railroad traffic?

Mr. BARKLEY. They are not insisting upon it, but I understand they are willing to do it, if it is necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. Are they going to charge tolls for the use of the bridge?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. That is an important question in connection with this bill, about which we ought to ascertain the facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the gentleman will be satisfied about that before we get through.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman looking up some reports upon it?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have the matter under consideration.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I still further reserve the right to object.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] is here. Perhaps he knows something about this bridge.

Mr. WALSH. I have yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ESCH. The extension was granted by Congress, owing to the fact that at the expiration of the first grant we were in the midst of war conditions and the company could not finance itself. On that account, of course, nothing was done within the limitations prescribed by the original act. Therefore they ask for further extension by this act, which expires June 30, 1918.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, if the regular order is to be demanded there will not be any more unanimous-consent bills passed to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering whether these people have made an application to the War Finance Board for authority to issue securities that they might place them on the market.

Mr. ESCH. I think that Gov. SANDERS of Louisiana could answer that question.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. No; they never made any such application, because they considered it was not propitious.

Mr. WALSH. May I ask the gentleman from Louisiana who is building this bridge?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. There is a combination of local people and the various railroads that center at Baton Rogue. There is no bridge across the Mississippi south of Memphis, and this is an effort to get a bridge across the river at that point.

Mr. WALSH. The time for beginning the bridge expired June 30, 1918. Is there any reason why the time for beginning it should be extended three years from this date?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I think there is, for this reason: At the time that the authority was granted and at the time the authority expired the world was at war. Prices were up. Steel and other material could be used to better advantage elsewhere, and no application was made to extend at that time. When the armistice came and Congress met I introduced this bill asking for an extension from the time this bill became a law, in hopes that conditions would be such as to permit the building of the bridge.

Mr. WALSH. Why do you add an additional year, and make it six years for the completion of the bridge, when all they asked originally was five?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. People who have looked into the matter will be very well satisfied if they can get it in the six years.

Mr. WALSH. Why? Because of the size of the structure and its character or because of the difficulty in financing it?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. There are two difficulties. First, there is the difficulty of financing a project of this kind at this time; and, second, the physical difficulty in putting the bridge there. The west bank of the river at Baton Rouge is purely alluvial deposit. On the right bank there will be no trouble in getting the proper kind of anchorage, but there will be engineering difficulties to overcome to get the proper anchorage on the west bank of the river.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman have any assurance that if we grant this extension there will be any attempt to begin the work of constructing this bridge within three years?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. There is no certainty, but a hope.

Mr. WALSH. I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought to have something more definite than simply a hope. People who come to Congress asking the consent of Congress for the construction of bridges across navigable waters ought to mean business when they come here, and they ought to be able to give some definite assurance that they are going to erect a bridge. We ought not to indiscriminately grant consent, and then come in two years later and extend the time, and then a few years later extend it further.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there can be no possible harm done by the granting of the extension, and we may thus get a bridge. This is not an exclusive grant. If they do not get the authority to build a bridge they never can get it. If Congress will give the authority to build, I can not state to the gentleman or to the House any certainty of the bridge being built, but I can state the certainty that it will not be built unless we get the authority.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, certainly, and that applies always, but here they have had the authority on two different occasions, and nothing has been done.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Not a thing——

Mr. WALSH. I think if we withhold authority until they are ready to come before Congress and say, "We have got our plans, we have got our money, and we are ready to arrange for material," that possibly then it would be wise to extend the time for it.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts think it was rather the part of wisdom on the part of these gentlemen not to take up in any way the resources of the Government in going into a bridge-building proposition of that scope at the time mentioned in the previous bill?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, these bridges are only built or permitted to be built across navigable waters when the Secretary of War is satisfied, and I am sure that that official, who

is gradually being relieved perhaps of some of the enormous responsibilities which rested upon his shoulders because of our participation in the struggle, would not have granted his consent to this unless he was satisfied that the material and labor necessary for the construction of this bridge would not hinder this Government in its further participation in the war and would not be a handicap to him in administering his department.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman will excuse me, the Secretary of War has not any such authority as that under the general law. While he passes upon it he simply passes on the question of interference of navigation, with the plans of the bridge, and so forth. He does not pass on the wisdom of constructing the bridge.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. He has nothing to do with the construction, except as it may hinder or impede navigation.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps he does not; in the strict letter of the report he sends to the committee I will agree he does not pass upon the wisdom, but I think we ought to be entitled to some assurance that this bridge is expected to be built and it is not a consent that is being received from the Congress simply to forestall or shut off other plans of improvements which perhaps other parties or other railroads or other corporations might be interested in.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I can assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is no danger at all in the question he has just raised. There will be no objection to anyone putting a bridge at that point, and I would be only too pleased as the Representative of that district to introduce any bill from anyone who will put a bridge at that point and urge its adoption. This is not an attempt to cut off the building of a bridge but an earnest and honest attempt to try to get a bridge located at Baton Rouge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing and completing the bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved July 17, 1914, to be built across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., is hereby extended three years and six years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "time" and insert the word "times."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "is" and insert the word "are."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. JAMES of Michigan presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 240) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the east branch of the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this upon the same portion of the river that this former bridge was authorized or how far is this from it?

Mr. DEWALT. This is to take the place of the bridge which, I think, was destroyed by fire, and therefore is an entirely new structure—must be, because the other was destroyed.

Mr. WALSH. So this is not a new bridge in that sense?

Mr. DEWALT. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge thereto across the east branch of the Susquehanna River at a point suitable to the interest of navigation from Main Street, in the village of Mocanaqua, township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, and State of Pennsylvania, to Main Street, in the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, and the State of Pennsylvania, as the same is now established and used in the respective municipalities, to replace the present structure erected at the same location, in accordance with the provision of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable water," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "branch," insert the words "and approaches."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "the east branch of."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "provision" and insert the word "provisions."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa."

On motion of Mr. DEWALT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER FROM CONYNGHAM, PA., TO SALEM, PA.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 242) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the east branch of the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the east branch of the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, at or in prolongation of Church Street, in the village of Wapwallopen, township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "the east branch of."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "interest" and insert the word "interests."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania."

On motion of Mr. DEWALT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CLERK AND SECRETARY TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas reserves the right to object.

Mr. BLACK. I would like to ask the gentleman who is in charge of this bill if it is not a fact that by placing these clerks on the roll under the bill he proposes to bring up it will increase the salary of these $240 under the bonus that has been heretofore provided by Congress, and add more than $200,000 to the amount paid for clerk hire?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, it is my own opinion that this resolution will not affect that in any way. Legislation as passed in the last Congress provided, while not in this exact language, that no part of the clerk-hire money should be paid to the Members. That of itself necessitated placing these men on the rolls, and for that reason I do not believe that this resolution would affect the bonus, but I suppose no one could answer your question definitely until the comptroller rules on it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I do not think it ought to be taken up.

Mr. MONDELL. Before the gentleman objects, will he yield for a moment? I am sure no one in the House wants to insist on having his individual way in this matter. I am sure every gentleman here is willing to have the House determine what is to be done. That is my frame of mind, and not only in regard to this but in regard to all other matters. Now, here is an opportunity to determine this matter by a vote of the House.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the gentleman know that it has been the universal custom in the House not to take up by unanimous consent propositions of this kind, involving large charges on the Treasury, when Members have no opportunity to study them and no notice that they will be brought up?

Mr. MONDELL. The appropriation is already made. It involves no charge on the Treasury.

Mr. BLACK. This would involve an additional charge of more than $200,000.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is mistaken about that. But the House certainly ought to be given an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I desire, if it is in order, to make a motion to recommit a conference report to a committee.

The SPEAKER. There is no conference report before the House.

Mr. BLANTON. It is on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. That does not bring it before the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not in order?

The SPEAKER. It is not in order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD] may have opportunity of addressing the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD] may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What about?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that he desires only 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What about?

Mr. GOULD. I wanted to discuss, Mr. Speaker, a few little incidents that have been occurring down in Juarez and El Paso in the last 48 hours or so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the gentleman any private information on the subject?

Mr. GOULD. Very little, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a further request, and on behalf of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], who desires to address the House at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD] for 80 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming requests that the gentleman from Oklahoma, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD], may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On what subject is the gentleman going to discourse?

Mr. MORGAN. On the subject of providing homes for our soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, is there not any other business to be transacted to-day?

Mr. MONDELL. The expectation is that at the conclusion of these addresses a motion will be made to adjourn.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] what is the reason we do not take up the conference report and get rid of it?

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that there is no present prospect, so far as I know, of being able to take up the conference report this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is there not one pending here now?

The SPEAKER. It has been acted upon by the Senate, and it is on the Speaker's table.

Mr. MONDELL. We can not take it up just at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MEXICO.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. Speaker, American troops, with or without the knowledge of the State Department or the American White House in Paris, and certainly without the advice or consent of the constitutional war-making authority, the Congress of the United States, yesterday occupied in force the Mexican city of Juarez.

The first announced purpose of this invasion was to protect American lives by preventing shots from being fired into American territory by either or both of two warring Mexican factions, one of which has been recognized by this Government as the de jure government of Mexico. With such a purpose I certainly have no quarrel, though to find our Government concerned with the protection of American lives in or near Mexico is a bit unusual.

Press dispatches from the border and such meager information as is obtainable from the State and War Departments indicate very clearly that this purpose is not to be adhered to. It is positively stated that American Cavalry since occupying Juarez have been engaged in offensive operations against the so-called Villista faction, and that American Artillery have pointedly shelled supposed concentration points of Villista troops.

Such activities constitute a tacit offensive military alliance between the United States and Mexico of which I, as one Member of the Congress of the United States, have not been apprised.

Waiving for the present the constitutional question involved, it is my purpose to summarize as briefly as possible such information touching on the protection of American lives in Mexico and along our Mexican border as has been permitted to leak out by the State Department.

President Wilson recognized the Carranza régime as the de facto government of Mexico on October 9, 1915. The record of Americans murdered in Mexico or by Mexicans along our borders from 1910 to September, 1916, reads approximately like this:

Killed on dates not given	6
Killed between 1910 and 1913 (3 years)	51
Killed in 1913	28
Killed in 1914	58
Killed in 1915	78
Killed in 1916	79
Total killed between 1910 and 1916	300

It will be noted from this that in the year in which Carranza was accorded de facto recognition by this Government the second largest number of murders were committed against our citizens, and that the year following this recognition the largest number of murders against our citizens were committed.

It should be said also, as concerns the figures for 1914, that they include 17 American sailors and marines killed when the Navy was ordered to take Vera Cruz, for God only knows what purpose.

Subsequent to 1916—or September, 1916—my information at present does not carry, for the simple reason that the Department of State, under the cloak of military censorship, denied all information to the public, to public men, or to the press on Mexico. My information, however, does carry to this extent, that in the Tampico oil fields alone, between August 15, 1917, and June 1, 1919, most of which time the United States was engaged in war with Germany et al., 11 Americans were murdered and 14 Americans were wounded, and in by far the majority of the cases the perpetrators of these outrages were Carranza troops.

And here is another fact: Of the 79 Americans murdered in Mexico or by Mexicans along our borders in 1916, the year following the de facto recognition, there were included 2 officers and 14 enlisted men of the United States Army, who were treacherously ambushed and massacred at Carrizal on June 18, 1916, by Carranza troops with whom they were supposed to be cooperating in the pursuit of Villa.

In spite of this terrible experience, for which no Mexican authority ever has been called to account, and in spite of the whole rotten record with respect to Mexico and Carranza, American troops, we learn from the newspapers this morning, are again cooperating with Carranza in the pursuit of Villa.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Do I understand the gentleman to be deploring the fact that American troops are protecting American soil from a bandit raid?

Mr. GOULD. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not Villa a bandit and a fugitive from justice at this time?

Mr. GOULD. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BLANTON. And is not the Carranza government at this time cooperating with our Government in trying to capture or resist this bandit, so far as an attack upon American soil is concerned?

Mr. GOULD. I can not say as to that. I am not sure of that at all.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not understand the gentleman on that.

Mr. GOULD. I am offering this plain statement of facts in order that Members of this House may have them before them to ponder on.

I hold no brief for any faction in Mexico. As a Member of this House, but first of all as a self-respecting American citizen, I do most emphatically hold a brief for every American citizen murdered or otherwise denied protection in any foreign country, and most emphatically and most specifically I hold a brief for every one of the three hundred and odd Americans who abandoned by their own Government, have been murdered in Mexico since 1910. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy the House has extended in granting me unanimous consent to address the House at this time.

I hold in my hand a bill (H. R. 487) introduced May 19, 1919, by the able and distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. According to the title, it is a "bill to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces" of the United States in the war with Germany.

I heartily approve the object and purpose of this bill. I am ready to do anything within reason to give proper recognition to our soldiers, seamen, and marines who rendered such inestimable service to our country and humanity. My objection to the Lane plan is that it is chiefly a reclamation project; only incidentally will it benefit soldiers. And yet, if nothing better can be devised, I will support this bill for the small amount of good it may do.

The Members of this House are generally familiar with the plan suggested by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, to provide farm homes for our soldiers. It has been given wide publicity. It proposes to reclaim swamp lands by drainage, arid lands by irrigation, and cut-over timberlands by clearing. These lands are then to be sold on easy terms to our soldiers. A number of bills have been introduced embodying the plan suggested by Secretary Lane. The Mondell bill is one of the number. In the hearings before the Committee on the Public Lands the Secretary of the Interior has indorsed the Mondell bill and recommended its passage. We may therefore regard the Mondell bill as representing the so-called "Lane plan" to provide homes for the soldiers.

SEEKING SOMETHING BETTER.

Anything which had for its object the proper recognition of the soldiers appealed to me strongly. I immediately began the study of Secretary Lane's plan. As I studied the proposition I was disappointed in it. I reluctantly reached the conclusion that the plan would not prove satisfactory to the soldiers and as a home-founding proposition would prove a failure. I then undertook to devise a plan which would be an improvement over the "Lane plan." As a result on the 26th day of September, 1918, in the Sixty-fifth Congress, I introduced H. R. 13007, entitled "A bill to provide homes for our soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes." On the 2d day of October, 1918, I addressed the House, explaining the provisions of the bill and advocated its passage. The Sixty-fifth Congress adjourned without any action being taken. When the Sixty-sixth Congress convened, I gave additional thought to the subject, revised my bill, and reintroduced it June 11, 1919. It is H. R. 5545.

In studying the question, I reached the conclusion that in the proposed legislation Congress should keep in mind three main propositions. First, that a plan should be adopted that would help the largest number of soldiers; second, that the plan should be financed in a way that would throw the least burden upon the taxpayers; and third, that a plan should be selected that would distribute its benefits equitably to every State and community. In brief, my plan was to benefit the largest number of soldiers at a minimum cost to the taxpayers, with the most general distribution of its benefits.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to go on with my statement. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman later.

OUTLINE OF PLAN.

With these outlines in my mind, I drew my bill. It creates a Government corporation with $100,000,000 capital, to be subscribed by the Government. The corporation is to be managed by five trustees, four of whom are to be appointed by the President. The Secretary of the Interior is to be one of the trustees and chairman of the board. The corporation is authorized to make loans to soldiers, seamen, and marines to aid them in purchasing homes. Soldiers of the Civil War and of the Spanish-American War, as well as soldiers of the war with Germany, are eligible to benefits of the act.

In developing my plan this question arose: Should the plan provide only for the purchase of farm homes? After considering the question, I came to the conclusion that it should provide for the purchase of either farm homes or homes in the towns or cities. I desired to benefit the largest number of soldiers possible. I knew that fully one-half of our soldiers were now residing, and would continue to reside, in our towns and cities. To limit the bill to aid in purchasing only farm homes would be deliberately excluding one-half of the soldiers from its benefits. To me there could be but one decision reached. With absolute confidence that I was right, I decided to authorize the corporation to make loans to purchase either rural or urban homes. The more I have studied the question, the stronger my convictions have grown that no plan should be adopted which does not provide for acquiring homes either in the towns and cities as well as in the country.

THE OUTLINE OF THE LOAN PLAN.

Having decided to provide for acquiring either rural or urban homes, the next proposition was to devise a loan plan to carry out the work. I came to the conclusion, first, that these loans should be made on long time; second, that they should be made at low rate of interest; and, third, that they should be made up to the full value of the homestead purchased, including improvements. The first and second propositions will be generally acquiesced in. I need not here spend time in discussing them. The third proposition—authorizing the corporation to make loans up to the appraised value of the homestead purchased—will be questioned. Generally speaking, loan companies, financial institutions, and money lenders do not make loans in excess of 60 per cent of the value of the real estate mortgaged to secure the loans. The Federal land banks are authorized to make loans only up to 50 per cent of the value of the land and 20 per cent of the value of improvements. The primary object of thus limiting the loan is to insure the payment of the money advanced. To propose to loan at the full value of the security at first glance may seem reckless and wholly at variance with sound business principles. But I think I can show the plan can be made safe and sound. Furthermore, it is the only way to bring the proposition within the reach of those soldiers who have not the money to make partial payments in cash on the homes purchased. If loans are not made up to the appraised value of the homestead, we will virtually fix a property qualification.

This would be unjustifiable. It would give the benefits of the act to those who needed it least, and deny them to those who needed assistance most. Whatever plan we adopt we must not discriminate against the poor in favor of the rich and well to do. The certificate of honorable discharge should be the only qualification required. I concluded that the whole home-founding proposition would have to be abandoned unless loans were made when necessary up to the appraised value of the homestead. Having reached this conclusion, I then sought some method of making the plan sound financially. I decided to provide an insurance or guaranty fund, to which all borrowers would contribute, and thus provide a fund sufficient to meet losses. The corporation is to obtain its chief capital through the sale of bonds. To provide a guaranty fund, my bill authorizes the corporation to charge on its long-time loans a rate of interest one-half of 1 per cent higher than the interest rate on the bonds. A still larger margin might be allowed if it was thought to be necessary. On short-time loans, secured by chattel mortgages on personal property, I allow 1 per cent margin between the interest rate on loans and the interest rate on short-time bonds.

To illustrate, we will suppose that the corporation has made long-time loans to the amount of $500,000,000 and short-time loans to the amount of $200,000,000. One-half of 1 per cent annually upon the long-time loans would place $2,500,000 in the guaranty fund. One per cent annually on the short-time loans would place $2,000,000 in the guaranty fund. This would place $4,500,000 annually in the guaranty fund. In addition to this the corporation would have the chief part of its $100,000,000 capital at interest ranging from 4½ to 5 per cent. From this source the corporation should have an annual net income of something like $3,500,000. These three items together would give the corporation when it had out $500,000,000 in long-time loans and $200,000,000 short-time loans a net annual surplus of

something like $10,000,000. This would appear to be ample to meet the annual losses. It is assumed, of course, that the corporation will conduct the business with care and exercise due diligence in protecting its financial interests. Appraisements will be made conservatively, titles must be good, precaution must be taken against fraud, and every safeguard should be thrown around the business.

I have thus provided a plan to meet any unusual losses that may arise from making loans up to the full appraised value of the homestead purchased. But there are some other points along this same line that should be mentioned. A large percentage of the soldiers would not want to secure a mortgage up to the full value of the homestead. Many of these would be able and would prefer to make a reasonable cash payment. They would not desire to go in debt any more than is necessary. The corporation would be expected to encourage applicants for loans to make cash payments.

Then there is a difference between long-time loans up to the full value and short-time loans of the same character. An ordinary loan for five years up to the full value of the property mortgage would present greater risk than a loan of this kind for 40 years, payable on the amortization plan. The latter is upon terms which are easily met. Only small annual payments on the principal are required. The interest rate is low. More than that, temporary depreciation in the selling price of farm lands or town property do not materially affect the security in long-time loans. Time restores natural conditions. As the years go on, lands and real estate in towns and cities grow in value. Our population will grow rapidly for many years. Business, trade, commerce, and industrial pursuits of all kinds will expand. This means greater demands for homes in our towns and cities. It means higher-priced farm lands. While the farm lands and town and city real estate are growing in value, the annual payments on the loans are constantly reducing the debt. The risk will grow less every year. The danger of loss decreases every year. With all these points considered, there is small possibility of any serious financial loss to the Federal Government in making loans up to the appraised value of the home purchased. By this method, the loan plan is all embracing. It is within reach of every honorably discharged soldier, seaman, or marine. Hundreds of thousands and possibly millions of them will take advantage of the provisions of the act and be made happier men and better citizens.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would it interrupt the gentleman if I were to ask him a question here? We are all very much interested in the gentleman's speech. The gentleman estimates that $100,000,000 would be sufficient, considering the selling of the bonds, to create a revolving fund to finance this proposition. Does not the gentleman recall in that connection the experience of the farm-loan bank proposition when $10,000,000 was appropriated and they came back to Congress and got authority for $200,000,000 more?

Mr. MORGAN. The Federal land banks did not come back to Congress because of a failure to sell bonds, but because of the war. The Secretary of the Treasury desired that they should not sell their bonds on the market. The Secretary of the Treasury was monopolizing the bond market. There never was a day when the Federal land banks could not sell all the bonds they needed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My question was not in a spirit of antagonism to the gentleman's proposition. I was merely seeking to know if the gentleman had in mind the experience of the farm-loan banks.

Mr. MORGAN. That was simply because the Secretary of the Treasury did not think it wise for land banks to sell bonds on the market when we were running a drive for liberty loans.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman studied the bill that I introduced?

Mr. MORGAN. I have only hastily read it, because I have not had the time over Sunday.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman's plan contemplates working through the Federal farm loan banks?

Mr. MORGAN. No; there is a good reason why we should not turn it over to the Federal farm loan banks, but I do not want to discuss that now. Under my plan it only needs an operating fund.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman will pardon me one more question, what is the maximum amount that the gentleman proposes to lend each man?

Mr. MORGAN. Four thousand dollars. The point which I think Congress should carefully consider is that by creating a corporation and let that corporation issue bonds, we need only to give the corporation an operating working fund. It is absolutely unnecessary to tax the taxpayers of the Nation to raise that fund needed for the operation. But even if the Lane plan should be adopted, instead of taxing the people $500,000,000 and then again $500,000,000, and so on for years to come, it ought to be done through the issue of bonds on the market, and especially in view of the condition of the Treasury and taxation for the future.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has considered the testimony given before the Public Lands Committee in regard to the experience of some railroad land agent, that individuals did not succeed well where surrounded by other people who had their farms paid for; that a man who had to struggle along with a great burden of debt did not do well when surrounded by people in prosperous and easy circumstances?

Mr. MORGAN. I have not considered the testimony, but it strikes me that there should be nothing in that. You have all over the United States men who own farms which are mortgaged surrounded by men well to do and in prosperous circumstances.

Mr. VAILE. I can not recall the name of the man who made the statement, but it was based on a large number of cases. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any practical way of obtaining data as to the success of individuals where they owe the entire purchase price of the property?

Mr. MORGAN. I will say to the gentleman that it has not been the custom to loan up to the full amount. Men took double security. It was a business conducted entirely through profits; but we know that in foreign countries, in European countries, for years they have had institutions that made loans up to 90 per cent, and sometimes the full value, in order to provide worthy men to acquire farm homes.

The results show there that there was little loss to the Government.

Mr. VAILE. The gentleman observes that the Mondell bill provides for a loan up to 95 per cent of the value of the land.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; but if it is wrong to loan to the full value of the land, it is wrong to loan up to 95 per cent of the value of the land.

Mr. VAILE. Is the gentleman so much opposed to the Mondell bill, because the gentleman desires to loan up to the full value of the land, that he would not vote for the bill which provides for a loan up to 95 per cent of it?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no; if I can not convince my colleagues that my plan is better, I shall vote for their plan.

PLAN OF FINANCING THE PROPOSITION.

A very important feature of the proposition is the plan of financing it. Sound public policy requires that a plan of financing the proposition should be adopted that will be the least burdensome to the taxpayers of the country. The Lane plan, as exemplified by the provisions of the Mondell bill, is to be financed through taxation. The money used in purchasing the lands and in reclaiming them and improving them is authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States. The money in the Treasury is the result of taxation. The Mondell bill authorizes as a beginning the appropriation of $500,000,000 out of the Treasury. This money is to be used in the purchase and improvement of swamp, arid, and cut-over timber lands. The lands are then to be sold to the soldiers on 40 years' time. It is true that this money is to be repaid to the Government. The repayments are to cover a period of 40 years. The benefits of the repayments will come very largely to the taxpayers of the future. It will be little help to the taxpayers of to-day. This plan, I think, is very unwise. I have, therefore, adopted a different plan. My proposition, in the main, is to be financed through the issue and sale of bonds by the Government corporation authorized to manage the business. The only money I propose to take out of the Treasury is the $100,000,000 capital given the corporation as an operating or working fund. It is probable that the entire proposition might be financed on a capital of only $50,000,000. The corporation will be restricted in the issue and sale of bonds to an amount not in excess of the amount of first mortgages owned by the corporation. The interest payments and the annual payments on the principal of the mortgages held by the corporation will pay the interest on the bonds issued by the corporation and in time pay the principal due on the bonds.

The plan is not a new one. It has been used in European countries by mortgage institutions for more than 150 years. It is the same plan adopted in financing the business of our Federal land banks. It is true that under my plan I require the Government to guarantee the payment of both the principal and interest of the bonds issued by the corporation, but with the safeguards I have thrown around the corporation there is little

liability assumed by the Government. The main object of having the Government guarantee the bonds is to insure their sale in large quantities and at a low rate of interest. But the Government had far better loan its credit than its cash, and the Government can well afford to loan its credit to a great proposition whose benefits will go exclusively to the soldiers, sailors, and marines, whose services have preserved and perpetuated it.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. I would ask the gentleman if his plan contemplates an amortization scheme of payment?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman please explain that. How are these loans to be repaid?

Mr. MORGAN. The loans would be made under my bill for not to exceed 60 years, and not over one-half of 1 per cent is the amortization payment annually. If you make it payable in 40 years you have to pay something like three-quarters of 1 per cent to 1 per cent annually to complete the payment. I do not think it makes much difference in the success of the proposition by allowing a few years more, the object being to keep the annual payment down within the limit, so that it would be made by the soldier.

Mr. HULINGS. You pay the principal and 1 per cent?

Mr. MORGAN. One-half of 1 per cent and the interest. My idea is that first, in general, whatever plan we adopt, it ought to be within the reach of every soldier; it ought to be such that any soldier is capable of utilizing it; and all that should be required of the soldier is that he have an honorable discharge. That should be his certificate of good character.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. The gentleman referred to the experience in France and in other countries of loaning very nearly up to the full value of the land. Does the gentleman know whether any plan of selection of the locators was followed in those cases or whether they threw the bars down to everybody?

Mr. MORGAN. That was limited to the poor. That was a civilian plan.

Mr. VAILE. Did the locator have to show any qualification of industry or thrift?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; in those cases, but that was to the public generally. It was not a gratuity to the soldier.

Mr. VAILE. The Mondell bill does not propose any such gratuity as I understand it?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know what you call it, but we are giving the soldiers the privilege not given to others.

Mr. VAILE. And you propose to give a still greater privilege by loaning up to the full value of the land.

Mr. MORGAN. Under the plan I think it is the right way.

How much time have I left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Four minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters indorsing my plan. I will ask that two of them be read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

NACOGDOCHES, TEX., *June 2, 1919.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MORGAN: As I was a soldier in the United States Army during the late war and was in France, I wish to express to you my very sincere thanks for your effort in behalf of the boys with respect to your efforts to aid them in the acquirement of homes and farms. Personally I am very much in need of such aid and would appreciate it very, very much, and I am sure that there are many, many more of the boys who would also equally appreciate such aid.

Your bill is the very best that I have heard of up to the present time, and I think that it would be very difficult to improve upon the same, as it is thoroughly sound, both from a financial and from a patriotic point of view. I have never liked the plan of the Secretary of the Interior Lane very much for the very simple reason that the larger portion of the boys would be unable to make use of such a scheme, and therefore it would be restricted to the use of only a very few. I heartily agree with you in your opinion of Mr. Lane's scheme, in that it is more of a reclamation scheme than an aid to the returning service men.

Assuring you that your efforts in the behalf of the boys will be thoroughly appreciated, and thanking you personally for all that you may be able to do for us, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

(Signed) RIDER M. JOHNSON.

EASTLAND, TEX., *May 28, 1919.*

Congressman DICK T. MORGAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the daily papers the outline of your bill to grant aid to soldiers.

I wish to say that yours is the first bill that meets my full indorsement. I think it much better than the Lane bill.

If we have a law to aid soldiers, it ought to be one that will grant real aid and as a partial remuneration for the services already rendered, and not force them to reclaim cut-over land or swamp lands, which reclamation would be a good price for the land. Again, I am sure the worthy soldiers would much prefer to purchase land and pay for land of their own choice than to have other land given to them where the location, climate, and, perhaps, other conditions would be unfavorable to them.

I wish you success in getting your measure through and would be pleased to have a copy of the bill as soon as drafted.

Yours, very truly,

M. A. HOPSON, *County Judge.*

SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE MONDELL BILL.

Mr. MORGAN. One of the chief objections to the Lane plan as expressed in the Mondell bill is the relatively insignificant number of service men who will be benefited thereby. It provides only for the acquiring of farm homes. This excludes all the soldiers who shall hereafter reside in the towns and cities, amounting to about 60 per cent of the entire number. It excludes from its benefits all those who own rural homes. Perhaps 20 per cent more are excluded by this provision. It discriminates in favor of the well-to-do soldiers and against the ones who are poor. It virtually requires a property qualification to be able to take advantage of the provisions. The soldier must pay in cash 5 per cent of the value of the land purchased. He must pay 25 per cent of the cost of improvements, and he must pay 40 per cent of the cost of live stock and equipment. Altogether the soldier would be required to advance cash in an amount ranging from $1,000 to $1,500. It seems unbelievable that Congress will ever pass any act of this kind which discriminates against a soldier on account of his poverty.

Only "approved applicants" can acquire land under the Mondell bill. The Secretary of the Interior will have power to select one applicant and reject another. This is a most offensive provision, and anything like it should never be allowed to go in any bill of this character. Those who are employed in the development of a project are given a preference right. This will exclude from the benefits of the act many of the most deserving soldiers, seamen, and marines, whose circumstances will not permit them to go and work on the projects.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000. According to the estimate of Secretary Lane, this will provide homes for about 100,000 soldiers. One hundred thousand soldiers constitute less than 2½ per cent of the entire number of men in our Army and Navy during the Great World War. The small number of men to be benefited by this large appropriation is, therefore, sufficient to condemn the project.

The plan presented in the Mondell bill is the most expensive and burdensome that could be provided, so far as the taxpayers are concerned. The entire cost of the project is to be paid in cash out of the Treasury. The taxpayers must first pay this money into the Treasury. I am not objecting to the amount the proposition costs. The objection which I am presenting is the manner of financing the proposition. The money should be raised by an issue of bonds. The bonds should be sold on the money market of the country. The people will willingly buy these bonds when issued for the benefit of our soldier boys. The payments made by the soldiers would pay the interest on the bonds, and in due time pay the principal. The whole proposition can be financed with the use of a comparatively small amount of money taken out of the Treasury.

Mr. EMERSON. Suppose there are thousands of soldiers who went from the cities; they might not want to go on the farms. What are we going to do for them?

Mr. MORGAN. There is the advantage of my plan. A man may buy his home in a town or a city or in the country. The soldiers who come from the factories and the shops and the commercial establishments of the cities, who, from the nature of things, must remain there throughout their lives, are as much entitled to these advantages as those who choose to go into the country; and, looking at it from a national viewpoint, on the ground of home owning, it is just as important that our citizenship in the towns and cities, where our great centers are, shall be home owners as it is that the people in the country shall be home owners.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not understand the purpose of the five-year short-term loan of $1,200 as a maximum. Is that to be loaned to the man who already owns the land?

Mr. MORGAN. No; that would be loaned to a man who has no tools, no farm implements, or machinery.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In addition to the loan on the real estate?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS.

There is another proposition which I think should be considered. In appropriating money out of the National Treasury for any purpose, we have a right to consider how the benefits of the appropriation will be distributed. Looking at it from the viewpoint of the State, the benefits of the Lane bill will go very largely to those States having large quantities of swamp,

arid, and cut-over timberlands. The money will chiefly be expended in those States. The cost of the project will be borne by the people of all the States. The plan which I have presented will distribute its benefits equitably to every State and to every community in every State. It is within the reach of every soldier, seaman, and marine. He can utilize its benefits without leaving his home, changing his business or employment, and without inconvenience or sacrifice on his part. It will not take population from one State into another. It is fair alike to the city and the country. Under it, every honorably discharged soldier, seaman, or marine may secure a loan not exceeding $4,000. The money must be used exclusively in the purchase of a home. Those who purchase farm homesteads may secure an additional loan not exceeding $1,200, to be used in the purchase of live stock and farm equipment.

It is not designed especially to aid in expanding agriculture. But its effect will be far-reaching in this line. Nearly 2,000,000 of our soldiers came from the farm. Probably 75 per cent of these farm boys are not owners of farm homes. Fully one-third of their number are the sons of parents who were not home owners. The bill, if enacted into law, will aid more than a million of farm boys to become owners of farms.

This will make them independent farmers. It will make them better citizens. It will make them better farmers. The bill if enacted into law would greatly reduce farm tenancy. This in itself would more than justify the money that will be expended in carrying out the proposition. Turning from the farms to the towns and cities, more than one-half of the soldier boys who went from our towns and cities are also not the owners of homes. A million or more of these boys who are now residing in rented homes will become home owners if this bill becomes a law. As home owners they will have greater attachment to our country and its institutions. It is, of course, a matter of conjecture how many men would acquire homes if my bill were enacted into law, but I believe it is a conservative estimate that it would give the Nation more than 2,000,000 additional home owners. The bill has for its object the recognition of military and naval service. A free country like ours can not spend money for a higher or nobler purpose. We spent money without stint or limit in the prosecution of the war. Shall we now in the hour of peace fail to do justice to the men who saved us in the extremity of war? Our country is rich. Our resources are almost inexhaustible. We rank first and foremost among all the nations of the world. If we were great in war why not be greater in peace? Let us not therefore doubt or hesitate in this great undertaking. It is just; it is right; it is wise. Let us therefore pass this bill, or some better one, that will stand as a monument, typifying the interest we have in the welfare of our soldiers and our appreciation of the great service they rendered their country and humanity.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of H. R. 5545, introduced by me June 11, 1919, and entitled "A bill to provide homes for soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes." It is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the short title of this act shall be the "Soldiers' and Seamen's Federal Home-Founding Act." Its administration shall be under the general supervision, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Interior.

DEFINITIONS.

SEC. 2. That whenever the term "first mortgage" is used in this act it shall be held to include such classes of first liens on farm lands or other real estate as shall be approved by the corporation and the credit instruments secured thereby.

BENEFICIARIES.

SEC. 3. That every private soldier and officer who served in the Army of the United States during the war with Germany, or during any previous war of the United States, and who was honorably discharged (herein called a beneficiary), and every seaman, marine, and officer who served in the Navy of the United States or in the Marine Corps in the war with Germany, or in any previous war of the United States, and who was honorably discharged (herein called a beneficiary), shall be entitled to all the benefits of this act, subject to the terms, conditions, limitations, and restrictions herein provided.

WIDOWS AND MINOR ORPHAN CHILDREN.

SEC. 4. That in case of the death of any person who would be entitled to the benefits of this act, his widow, if unmarried, or in case of her death or marriage, then his minor orphan children, by guardian duly appointed, and officially accredited with the corporation, shall be entitled to all the benefits of this act.

NOT TRANSFERABLE.

SEC. 5. That the privileges granted under this act shall not be transferable or assignable, and no beneficiary shall sell, assign, convey, or transfer the real estate purchased or mortgaged under this act except as follows:

1. A beneficiary having obtained a loan, may transfer the land purchased or mortgaged to another beneficiary who has not prior thereto obtained a loan, but such transferee shall not thereafter be entitled to obtain a loan from the corporation.

2. Any beneficiary who has paid 50 per cent of the loan obtained may thereafter transfer without restriction the real estate purchased or mortgaged, subject to all the rights and equities of the corporation.

3. Transfers without restriction may be made on or after 20 years from the date of loan.

4. The corporation may in special cases, for good and justifiable causes shown on the application of beneficiaries and under such terms, restrictions, limitations, and conditions as shall be prescribed by the corporation, authorize transfers other than those prescribed in the foregoing paragraphs.

THE SOLDIERS' AND SEAMEN'S FEDERAL HOME-FOUNDING CORPORATION.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior and four additional persons (who shall be the directors first appointed as hereinafter provided) are hereby created a body corporate and politic in deed and in law by the name, style, and title of "The Soldiers' and Seamen's Federal Home-Founding Corporation" (herein called the corporation), and shall have perpetual succession, unless Congress shall otherwise provide. The principal office of the corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be agencies or branch offices established in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors.

CAPITAL STOCK.

SEC. 7. That the capital stock of the corporation shall be $100,000,000, all of which shall be subscribed by the United States of America, and such subscription shall be subject to call upon the vote of three-fifths of the board of directors of the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, at such time or times as may be deemed advisable; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of making payment upon such subscription when and as called. Receipts for payments by the United States of America for or on account of such stock shall be issued by the corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of stock ownership.

MANAGEMENT OF THE CORPORATION.

SEC. 8. That the management of the corporation shall be vested in a board of directors, consisting of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be chairman of the board, and four other persons, to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each director, except the Secretary of the Interior, shall devote his time entirely to the business of the corporation. Not more than two of said directors shall be of one political party, and all of them shall be citizens of the United States. Before entering upon his duties, each of the four directors so appointed and each officer shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office.

The officers of the corporation shall consist of a president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer. The directors to serve as such officers shall be designated and appointed by the President at the time such directors are appointed. Of the four directors so appointed the President of the United States shall designate two to serve for two years, and two for four years, and thereafter each director so appointed shall serve for four years. Whenever a vacancy shall occur among the directors so appointed, the person appointed director to fill any such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired term of the member whose place he is selected to fill. Any director shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States. Three members of the board of directors shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The four directors of the corporation appointed as herein provided shall each receive an annual salary, payable monthly, of $7,500.

COUNTY BOARD.

SEC. 9. That there is hereby established in each county or parish in each State of the United States a county soldiers' and seamen's home-founding board (hereinafter called the county board). Every county board shall consist of the postmaster of the county seat of each county, the county agent of the Department of Agriculture in each county, and one other person, a resident of said county, to be appointed by the corporation: *Provided*, That in any county having no county agent the corporation shall appoint another person to be a member of the county board. The members of the county board shall receive and transmit applications for loans, act as appraisers of real estate to be mortgaged, aid generally in the administration of this act, and perform such other duties in relation thereto as shall be prescribed by the corporation, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Members of the county board shall receive such pay for actual services rendered as shall be prescribed by the corporation, but members of said county board are hereby prohibited from demanding or receiving any fee, pay, or compensation of any kind whatsoever from any beneficiary.

CITY BOARD.

SEC. 10. That in any incorporated city having a population in excess of 20,000 the corporation, in its discretion, may appoint a soldiers' and seamen's city home-founding board (hereinafter called the city board), consisting of three persons who are residents of the city for which they shall be appointed. Every city board shall act for the corporation within the limits of the city for which they are appointed in like manner as county boards, and the members thereof shall receive such compensation from the corporation as shall be prescribed by it, and are hereby prohibited from demanding or receiving any fee, pay, or compensation of any kind whatsoever from any beneficiary.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

SEC. 11. That the corporation, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be authorized and empowered to appoint and employ such inspectors, appraisers, attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as it may deem necessary to conduct the business of the corporation. The salaries of all such employees, together with the salaries of the directors, shall be paid by the United States, and all such appointees and employees shall be public officials or employees of the United States. During the first year after the organization of the corporation said appointees and employees shall be appointed without regard to the provision of the act of January 16, 1883 (vol. 22, United States Stat. L., p. 403), and amendments thereto, or any rule or regulation made in pursuance thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the President at any time from placing said employees and appointees in the classified service.

LOANS TO BENEFICIARIES.

SEC. 12. That the corporation under the terms and conditions of this act is hereby authorized to make to beneficiaries—

(a) Long-term loans which shall run for a period of not less than 5 nor more than 60 years; and

(b) Short-term loans which shall run for any period not exceeding 5 years.

Every beneficiary, under the restrictions and limitations of this act, shall be entitled to obtain from the corporation a long-term loan of not to exceed $4,000, to enable him to purchase a farm homestead or a homestead in a village, town, or city (herein called an urban homestead).

Any beneficiary who has obtained a long-term loan for the purchase of a farm homestead, under the restrictions and limitations of this act, may secure from the corporation a short-term loan, the proceeds of which shall be used for the purchase of such live stock, implements, tools, machinery, and other equipment which in the judgment of the corporation shall be reasonably necessary to operate profitably a farm homestead; but no short-term loan shall be made for an amount exceeding $1,200.

RESTRICTIONS OF LONG-TERM LOANS.

SEC. 13. That the corporation shall make long-term loans under the following terms, restrictions, and limitations:

First. Said loans shall be secured by duly recorded first mortgages.

Second. No loan shall be made for an amount exceeding the appraised value of the homestead, including permanent improvements, and all or any part of it may be paid at any interest payment.

Third. Every such mortgage shall contain an agreement providing on an amortization plan by means of a fixed number of annual or semiannual installments sufficient to cover, first, an interest rate of three and one-half of 1 per cent per annum; second, such an amount to be applied on the principal as will extinguish the debt within a period of not more than 60 years, not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent per annum; and, third, an additional annual payment of an amount equal to one-half of 1 per cent on the principal, which shall be paid into and become a part of the guaranty fund established by this act.

Fourth. No long-term loan on mortgages shall be made under this act at a rate of interest exceeding three and one-half of 1 per cent per annum, exclusive of amortization payment on the principal and the annual payment into the guaranty fund.

Fifth. Such long-term loans may be made for the following purposes and for no other:

(a) To provide for the purchase of a farm homestead or an urban homestead;

(b) To provide for the purchase of implements and machinery and live stock necessary for the proper and reasonable operation of the farm homestead; and

(c) To provide buildings and other permanent improvements on the land mortgaged, subject to rules and regulations, terms, and conditions as shall be prescribed by the corporation.

Sixth. In case of the death of the mortgagor, his heir or heirs or his legal representative or representatives may assume the mortgage and the interest of the deceased according to the law of the State in which such real estate is located.

Seventh. Every applicant for a long-term loan shall make application therefor on a form to be prescribed for this purpose by the corporation and furnish such reasonable information as shall be required.

Eighth. Every borrower shall pay simple interest on defaulted payments at the rate which the mortgage bears, and by express covenant in his mortgage shall undertake to pay when due all taxes, liens, judgments, or assessments which may be lawfully assessed against the real estate mortgaged. Taxes, liens, judgments, or assessments not paid when due and paid by the mortgagee shall become a part of the mortgage debt and shall bear simple interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum. Every mortgagor shall undertake to keep insured to the satisfaction of the corporation all buildings the value of which was a factor in determining the amount of the loan. Insurance shall be made payable to the corporation as its interest may appear at time of loss, and at the option of the corporation sums so received may be used to pay for reconstruction of the buildings destroyed.

Ninth. Any beneficiary obtaining a long-term loan shall furnish an abstract of title and shall pay legal fees and recording charges imposed by law in the State where the land to be mortgaged is located.

RESTRICTIONS OF SHORT-TERM LOANS.

SEC. 14. That short-term loans shall be made under the following restrictions and limitations:

First. The corporation may use not to exceed 15 per cent of its capital as a revolving fund in making such loans.

Second. The interest rate thereon shall not exceed an annual interest of 5½ per cent per annum.

Third. The corporation may prescribe the terms and conditions for the payment of such loans, but any borrower may pay all or any part of any loan at the time any interest payment is due.

Fourth. Loans shall be secured by duly recorded chattel mortgages or other instruments in writing which will give the corporation a first lien upon the live stock, implements, tools, or other equipment purchased from the proceeds of any loan.

Fifth. The corporation shall prescribe rules and regulations for the making of such loans and exercise such supervision and control over such loans as in its judgment are necessary to protect the financial interests of the corporation.

Sixth. It shall require borrowers to insure the mortgaged property for the benefit of the corporation as its interests may appear.

BONDS.

SEC. 15. That as a means of obtaining capital, other than that subscribed by the United States of America, with which to make the loans herein authorized, and to conduct the business for which it is created, the corporation is authorized to issue and sell—

(a) Long-term bonds payable in not less than 5 years and in not more than 60 years; and

(b) Short-term bonds payable in not more than five years.

The United States of America hereby guarantees the payment when due, both principal and interest, of any bond or bonds issued by the corporation under the provisions of this act.

Bonds provided for in this act shall be issued in such denominations as shall be prescribed by the corporation; they shall run for a specified minimum and maximum period, subject to payment and retirement, at the option of the corporation. They shall have interest coupons attached, payable semiannually, and shall be issued in series of not less than $1,000,000.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to prepare suitable bonds in such form, subject to the provisions of this act, as the Secretary of the Interior may approve, such bonds when prepared to be held in the Treasury subject to delivery upon the order of the corporation. The engraved plates, dies, bed pieces, etc., executed in connection therewith shall remain in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury. Any expenses incurred in the preparation, custody, and delivery of such bonds shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. They may be exchanged into registered bonds of any amount and reexchanged into coupon bonds at the option of the holder under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the corporation.

That the corporation shall be bound in all respects by the acts of its officers in signing and issuing bonds and by the acts of the corporation in authorizing their issue.

LONG-TERM BONDS.

SEC. 16. That long-term bonds shall be issued on such terms and conditions and shall be payable at such time or times as shall be prescribed by the corporation, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The total amount of bonds to be issued by the corporation shall at no time exceed the total amount of first mortgages held and owned by the corporation.

SHORT-TERM BONDS.

SEC. 17. That the amount of outstanding short-term bonds issued and sold by the corporation shall at no time exceed the amount of unpaid short-term loans due the corporation.

Short-term bonds shall bear an interest rate of not to exceed 4½ per cent per annum.

Interest collected on short-term loans, other than the amount set apart for and placed in the guaranty fund, shall be applied to the payment of interest on short-term bonds.

GUARANTY FUND.

SEC. 18. That for the purpose of enabling beneficiaries to be mutually helpful to each other in meeting their financial obligations, and especially to aid those who on account of sickness, physical injury, or other justifiable causes are unable to pay the amount due on their loans, a fund is hereby created to be designated and known as the "guaranty fund."

From the annual payment on a long-term loan by any beneficiary there shall be taken annually an amount equal to one-half of 1 per cent upon the principal, which shall be set aside and become a part of the guaranty fund, and from the interest paid on any short-term loan by any beneficiary there shall be taken annually an amount equal to 1 per cent of the principal of the loan, which shall also be set aside and become a part of the guaranty fund: *Provided*, That at any time after five years after the passage of this act the corporation may at its discretion reduce the amount to be paid into the guaranty fund.

The guaranty fund shall be a trust fund to be applied strictly to the purposes above set forth, and it shall be the duty of the corporation to see that the same shall be safely and properly invested and used as required by law.

INTEREST AND OTHER CHARGES.

SEC. 19. That every beneficiary securing a long-term loan shall pay an annual charge thereon sufficient to cover an interest rate of not to exceed three and one-half of 1 per cent per annum, a payment on the principal annually, of not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent, and an additional annual payment of an amount equal to one-half of 1 per cent on the principal, which shall be paid into and become a part of the guaranty fund established by this act.

Every beneficiary securing a short-term loan shall pay an annual charge thereon sufficient to cover an interest rate of not to exceed 4½ per cent and a payment of an amount equal to 1 per cent per annum upon the principal, which shall be paid into and become a part of the guaranty fund.

EXEMPT FROM TAXATION.

SEC. 20. That any and all bonds issued by the corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or by any local taxing authority. The corporation, including its franchise and the capital and reserve or surplus thereof and the income derived therefrom, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or by any local taxing authority, except that any real property of the corporation shall be subject to State, county, or municipal taxes to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

PAYMENTS ON INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL.

SEC. 21. That interest payments shall be available for the payments of coupons and the interest on bonds as they shall become due.

Amortization payments on the principal of loans shall constitute a trust fund in the hands of the corporation and shall be applied or employed as follows:

(a) To pay off bonds issued by the corporation as they mature.

(b) To purchase at or below par bonds issued by the corporation.

(c) To loan on first mortgages on a farm homestead or an urban homestead and on short-time loans, as provided in this act.

(d) To purchase United States Government bonds.

PURCHASE OF BONDS BY GOVERNMENT.

SEC. 22. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon the application of the corporation, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, purchase from the corporation its bonds issued under this act in an amount not to exceed $25,000,000 during any one year, and shall pay for the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall have purchased any such bonds he may hold the same until maturity or may sell the same at his discretion.

INVESTMENT IN BONDS.

SEC. 23. That bonds issued under the provisions of this act shall be a lawful investment for all fiduciary and trust funds, and may be accepted as security for all public deposits.

Any Federal reserve bank and any member bank of the Federal Reserve System may buy and sell bonds issued under this act to the same extent that it may buy and sell United States Government bonds.

EARNINGS AND RESERVE FUND.

SEC. 24. That all net earnings of the corporation shall become a part of its capital unless Congress shall otherwise provide, and the corporation may use any part of its capital to meet any of its financial obligations.

DEPOSITORIES.

SEC. 25. That prior to commencing business the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall select one or more Federal reserve banks or one or more member banks of the Federal Reserve System or one or more State banks, including trust companies and savings banks, as a depository or depositories in which the corporation shall daily deposit all its funds of every kind and character, and no part or portion of such funds shall be withdrawn from such depository or depositories except on check or order duly signed by the treasurer of such corporation and countersigned by the president. The corporation shall require from any depository or depositories such security as

may be agreed upon and as may, in the judgment of the corporation, be sufficient to insure the safety thereof. Interest on such deposits shall be paid at such rate as shall be approved by the corporation.

BANKS AUTHORIZED AGENCIES.

SEC. 26. That all member banks of the Federal Reserve System and all State banks, including trust companies and savings banks, and Federal reserve banks and Federal land banks are hereby authorized to act as the agents of the corporation in the payment of the proceeds of any loan to beneficiaries, in collecting payments on mortgages, in selling bonds issued under the provisions of this act, and to do such other acts as shall be specifically authorized by the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

PURCHASE AND SUBDIVISION OF LANDS.

SEC. 27. That the corporation, from time to time, may use not to exceed 25 per cent of its capital as a revolving fund in the purchase of land to be subdivided into farm homesteads of not less than 10 nor more than 80 acres each, or in the purchase of land within, adjacent to, or near a town or city suitable for residence purposes, to be subdivided and platted into urban homesteads. The corporation may sell and convey any homestead so acquired to any beneficiary and erect for him thereon a house and other improvements, suitable for residence purposes. Before erecting a building or other improvements under the foregoing provisions the beneficiary shall execute and deliver to the corporation a first mortgage on the purchased premises covering the purchase price of the homestead and the cost of the buildings and other improvements, less any amount which the purchaser may have paid in cash on said purchase.

PENALTIES.

SEC. 28. That any applicant for a loan under this act who shall knowingly make any false statement in his application for such loan, and any member of any county board or any city board or any appraiser provided for in this act who shall willfully overvalue any real or personal property offered as security for loans under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

Any person who shall falsely make, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited, or willingly aid or assist in falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting any bond, coupon, or paper in imitation of, or purporting to be in imitation of, the bonds or coupons issued by the corporation; or any person who shall pass, utter, or publish, or attempt to pass, utter, or publish any false, forged, or counterfeited bond, coupon, or paper purporting to be issued by the corporation, knowing the same to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited; or whoever shall falsely alter, or cause or procure to be falsely altered, or shall willingly aid or assist in falsely altering any such bond, coupon, or paper, or shall pass, utter, or publish as true any falsely altered or spurious bond, coupon, or paper issued, or purporting to have been issued, by such corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

Other than the usual salary or fee paid to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation no officer, director, attorney, or employee of the corporation shall receive, directly or indirectly, any fee, commission, gift, or other consideration for or in connection with any transaction or business of such corporation. The corporation shall not charge or receive any fee, commission, bonus, gift, or other consideration not herein specifically authorized. Any person violating any provision of this paragraph shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

Any person connected in any capacity with the corporation who embezzles, abstracts, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, or credits thereof, or who without authority from the directors draws any order, assigns any note, bond, draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or who makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of such corporation with intent in either case to defraud such corporation or any other company, body politic or corporate, or any individual person, and every person who, with like intent, aids or abets any officer, clerk, or agent in any violation of this section, shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

ORGANIZATION EXPENSES.

SEC. 29. That the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act, including the rent and equipment of necessary offices.

LIMITATION OF COURT DECISIONS.

SEC. 30. That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

PRIVILEGES UNDER PUBLIC LAND LAWS.

SEC. 31. That any beneficiary, on and after the passage of this act, shall be entitled to enter a tract of public land, under the provisions of the public land laws applicable to the land entered, and shall further be entitled to make said entry without payment of fees and commissions as now provided by law.

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to reserve from entry for a period of two years from the passage of this act any part or portion of the public domain, during which time the beneficiaries herein shall have a preference right to enter said land.

The corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may use any part of the public domain to provide homes for beneficiaries under the terms and provisions of section 27 of this act.

Any beneficiary who shall hereafter make an entry of public land shall be entitled to secure a short-term loan of $1,200 for the purposes and under the terms and conditions as provided in section 12 of this act.

REPEALING CLAUSE.

SEC. 32. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect upon its passage. The right to amend, alter, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

REPORTS.

SEC. 33. That the corporation shall annually make a full report of its operations to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall cause the same to be printed for the information of Congress.

CLERK AND SECRETARY TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House joint resolution 104 may be taken up and disposed of on Wednesday next after the business on the calendar is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that House joint resolution 104, objection to the consideration of which was made recently, be in order on Wednesday next at the conclusion of the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Education, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], or any other ranking member of that committee, I want to state for the benefit of the House that there is a very important bill which has been favorably reported from the Committee on Education and is on the calendar for consideration on Wednesday which affects the interests of about 4,000 disabled and handicapped soldiers, a bill which I regard as of very much greater importance at this time than the question of settling this clerk-hire trouble.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. My request does not interfere with that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the request to be in order after all the business is disposed of on the calendar which is in order on Wednesday?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not understand the gentleman's request. I beg his pardon, and I make no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the Members of the House be given ample opportunity to offer proper amendments to the bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Certainly; that is my desire. I want to do a little amending myself.

Mr. BLANTON. There will be opportunity given to offer amendments?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As fully as possible, as far as I can control it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be in order Wednesday at the conclusion of the calendar business.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. WALSH. On what subject?

Mr. MORGAN. On the speech I made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request, that I may have the privilege of extending my remarks on the farm-loan act and its operation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 17, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, calling attention to the necessity of an appropriation to enable the department to comply with House resolution 74 (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Civil Service Commission submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the commission for "Additional employees, fiscal year 1920" (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Labor, withdrawing the estimate of appropriation for "Information and Education Service, War Labor Administration, fiscal year 1920" (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting letter from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, requesting certain amendments in the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines" (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 45), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5902) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Tarkio, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 5903) to provide for a site and public building in New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 5904) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, to certain widows and certain helpless and dependent children of such soldiers and sailors, and to certain Army nurses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 5905) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Silver City, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5906) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tomahawk, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5907) defining certain rights and privileges under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 5908) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winchester, county of Randolph, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5909) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Muncie, county of Delaware, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5910) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bluffton, county of Wells, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5911) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Decatur, county of Adams, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5912) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elwood, county of Madison, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5913) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Union City, county of Randolph, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5914) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dunkirk, county of Jay, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5915) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anderson, county of Madison, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5916) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Portland, county of Jay, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5917) to aid in the construction of the Roosevelt Highway along the Pacific coast of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 5918) in reference to a national military park on the plains of Chalmette, below the city of New Orleans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5919) for the erection of a Federal building at Napoleon, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5920) for the purchase of a post-office site at Wauseon, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5921) for the purchase of a post-office site at Bryan, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5922) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5923) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the St. Albans Improvement Association one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5924) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Public School No. 87, Middle Village, Long Island, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5925) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Jamaica Welcome and Memorial Committee, of Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5926) for the improvement of Newton Creek, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5927) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Maspeth Civic Association one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 5928) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Salinas, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5929) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of San Jose, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5930) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of San Luis Obispo, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5931) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Gilroy, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5932) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Santa Barbara, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5933) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Carpinteria, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5934) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Santa Maria, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5935) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Lompoc, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5936) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Redwood City, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 5937) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State of Ohio, the cannon, war devices, trophies, etc., captured by the Thirty-seventh (Buckeye) Division; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 5938) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Logansport, Cass County, Ind., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 5939) providing for experimenting of nursery stock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5940) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Penn Yan, N. Y., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 5941) to provide for the national security and defense, by encouraging the production and refining of graphite (plumbago, silver lead) ores in the United States and its possessions, and to provide revenue for the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 111) directing the State Department to investigate the detention in Egypt of Dr. William T. Ellis, an American citizen and correspondent of the New York Herald; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution (H. Res. 112) for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 120; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELSTON: Resolution (H. Res. 113) authorizing a clerk for the Committee on Mileage; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Resolution (H. Res. 114) providing for the compensation of messengers in Republican cloak room and the minority cloak room of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DAVILA: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 116) for the relief of Richard Poillon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NOLAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) declaring the power of the President of the United States under section 1 of the act approved November 21, 1918, and section 15 of the act of August 10, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) tendering the congratulations of Congress to those associated in the achievement of accomplishing the first trans-Atlantic flight of an airship from America to Europe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 119) extending congratulations of Congress to Capt. John Alcock and Lieut. Arthur W. Brown of the Royal Flying Corps of Great Britain on accomplishing the first nonstop trans-Atlantic flight in an airplane from America to Europe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of Ohio requesting that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Memorial of the Legislature of Illinois requesting modification of Federal regulation of the shooting of wild ducks and geese; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5942) granting a pension to William Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5943) granting an increase of pension to Leroy Hines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 5944) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Kenneth McKenzie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5945) for the relief of Roscoe V. Wickes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 5946) granting an increase of pension to John L. McCalmont; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 5947) granting a pension to Phebe A. Shisler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5948) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Mueller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5949) granting a pension to Sarah Morrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5950) granting a pension to Arabella Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5951) granting a pension to Hans Fulson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5952) granting a pension to Lilla J. Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5953) granting a pension to Hattie Dennis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5954) granting an increase of pension to Silas D. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5955) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Mather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5956) granting an increase of pension to William McFarlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5957) granting an increase of pension to William D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5958) granting an increase of pension to Elijah A. Hearn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5959) granting an increase of pension to William B. Hazeltine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5960) granting an increase of pension to James H. Handy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Absalom Erickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5962) granting a pension to Henry C. Clausen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5964) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 5965) for the relief of Orion Mathews; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5966) for the relief of Delilah Siebenaler; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5967) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Rider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 5968) granting a pension to Anna M. Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 5969) granting a pension to Thomas L. Feyen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5970) granting a pension to Amel G. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5971) granting an increase of pension to Andrew W. Hepler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5972) granting an increase of pension to Tivis C. Simmons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 5973) granting an increase of pension to John W. Whitbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5974) granting a pension to Otto O. Yaap; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 5975) granting a pension to John H. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5976) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. O'Shea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5977) to amend the military record of Richard Parke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) for the relief of Catherine Burns; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5979) granting a pension to Martha Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 5980) granting a pension to Sarah J. Henkel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5981) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Scharbonaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 5982) granting a pension to Allen Landis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5983) granting a pension to Jane Philpot; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 5984) granting an increase of pension to John A. McKenna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 5985) granting a pension to Frances J. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5986) granting a pension to Lenora Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5987) for the relief of Morris S. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 5988) granting an increase of pension to Silas M. Abers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 5989) granting an increase of pension to Peter Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5990) granting an increase of pension to William Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 5991) for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of American Hampshire Sheep Association, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of mass meeting of residents of Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Berkley, at the armory, protesting against the atrocities inflicted upon Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of mass meeting of American citizens of Polish descent, at Newark, N. J., against the slander and mendacious information about pogroms in Poland affecting the Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Milwaukee Committee of Defense for Jews in Eastern Europe, against pogroms in Poland and Roumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Frank Morrison, secretary American Federation of Labor, Atlantic City, N. J., relative to United States Employment Service of Department of Labor and urging passage of Nolan bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of Women's Foreign Missionary Society of Free Methodist Church of North America, Greenville, Ill., protesting against any repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of members of Daviess County (Mo.) Farm Clubs, for repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Methodist Church of Exeter, Calif., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of Ridgewood Park Board of Trade, respecting six months' pay to soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Typographical Union No. 675, Marion, Ohio, urging the passage of the Americanization bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday school, Huntersville, Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Alger, and St. Pauls Church, all in the State of Ohio, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Petition for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream signed by the citizens of Murfreesboro, Tenn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of J. G. Clark, Earl Alkir, Sterling C. Hallus, Albert Scott, R. E. Lynn, W. H. Fuller, Ross H. Conrad, J. R. Askew, C. W. Ray, and C. A. Sleets, all of Butler, Mo., urging enforcement of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 21 citizens of Deepwater and of 39 citizens of Chilhowee, both in the State of Missouri, asking the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of topographic engineers, architects, and constructors' conference on national works, concerning topographic mapping; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of American Hampshire Sheep Association, Detroit, Mich., urging retention of the zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Bertha W. Hawes and 53 other women and men of New York City, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Commercial Club of Chicago, favoring an appropriation of $1,500,000 for a harbor at Great Lakes Naval Training Station; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Grange, for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of American Hampshire Sheep Association, opposing repeal of zone advances on second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition and memorial of sundry citizens of McDonough County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Hancock County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of citizens of Muskogee, Okla., requesting repeal of taxes on soda water and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of sundry citizens of New Mexico, relating to the Jugo-Slav question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of the Central Labor Council of San Jose, Santa Clara County, Calif., urging Congress to refer the entire subject matter of national prohibition to a referendum vote of the people of the whole Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Elkhart Lodge, No. 464, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, favoring Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petition of sundry citizens of Franklin and other towns in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of American Hampshire Sheep Association, Detroit, Mich., urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Resolution of Italian Chamber of Commerce, indorsing appeal of the citizens of Fiume sent to United States Senate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of sundry citizens of Orange and Newark, both in the State of New Jersey, for repeal of taxes on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the National Grange Association, for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Adolph Lewisohn, Simpson & Dallas Co., and several citizens, all of Baltimore, Md., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. J. Nelligan, Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., relative to disposal of whisky or spirits on storage after July 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. Gershenson and J. W. Suter, for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of several hundred citizens of Brooklyn and New York, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Newfield Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bridgeport, Conn., opposing the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Packard Motor Car Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the removal of manufacturers' sale tax on certain articles, including automobiles and automobile trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lawrenceville Board of Trade, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of citizens of Oneida, N. Y., protesting against tax on soda water, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jefferson County (N. Y.) Grange and Oswego County Grange, protesting against rural free-delivery route changes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Jefferson County (N. Y.) Grange, urging repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Jefferson County (N. Y.) Grange, protesting Lane plan for reclaiming swamp lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Merrill, Wis., protesting against the peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of G. H. Saylan, New York City, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of the session and congregation of Bethany Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, Calif., opposing the repeal and urging the enforcement of the war-time prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial by the Fifty-first Convention of Fruit Growers and Farmers, at Riverside, Calif., May 29, 1919, calling upon the Congress for prompt and definite action respecting the war-time prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of citizens of Boone County, Ky., asking for legislation to enforce national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of National Grange, representing more than a million producing farmers, for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of American Hampshire Sheep Association, of Detroit, Mich., urging retention of the zone advances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred R. Hill & Co., of New York, for repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Conference on Social Work, at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to the peace settlement and league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Nord-Oestliche Sangerbund of America, consisting of 175 individual societies, with a membership at least 3,000, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the enforcement of the war-time prohibiton act; also, W. W. Haaren, of New York City, for the repeal of the war-time prohibiton act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEARS: Petition of H. H. Bowen and sundry citizens of St. Cloud, Fla., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Gilead Grange, Michigan, to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Petition of board of directors of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, Oklahoma City, relating to the budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of Fulton County, Ohio, Sunday School Association expressing earnest and emphatic protest against any modification or change in the laws making prohibition mandatory in the United States July 1, 1919, and a demand that Congress pass such law or laws as will insure the enforcement of war prohibition and the national prohibition amendment effective January, 1920; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Virginia: Petition of J. W. Kidwell, of Virginia, relative to the strike of the commercial telegraphers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Stern Bros. and 27 other citizens of Valley City, N. Dak., urging repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Club of Bottineau, N. Dak., favoring the passage of House bill 15400; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Lower Intervale Grange, Plymouth, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Mount Gardner Grange, No. 325, Woodsville, N. H., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 17, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at the beginning of the high service of this hour and place we make mention of Thy name. We lift our hearts, we trust, in reverence and godly fear to Thee. From Thee we gain the inspiration of life. By Thy spirit we gain the vision of the coming day. By Thy grace we are fitted for the duties of the present day. Grant us all the ministry of Thy loving-kindness, and of Thy tender mercy, and of Thy infinite justice and truth this day, that we may accomplish all Thy will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ED. S. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, appeared in his seat to-day.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Michigan ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America extending the right of suffrage to women, which will be placed on file.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.;

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada;

H. R. 1706. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.;

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 2954. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington; and

H. R. 5608. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MOSES presented a petition of Squanamagoic Lodge, International Order of Good Templars, of Gonic, N. H., praying for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, and also for a definite defining of "intoxicating liquors," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pine Bluff, Everton, Siloam Springs, Gillett, Hot Springs, Fort Smith, Wild Cherry, Paragould, and Oxford, all in the State of Arkansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON. I present petitions of 17 labor unions in the city of St. Paul, Minn., aggregating 4,721 men, requesting that action be taken at this time to permit the manufacture and sale of malt liquors containing 2¾ per cent of alcohol by weight. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Trommald, Minn., praying that the Italo-Jugo-Slav controversy be solved through a plebescite, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. EDGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Camden, N. J., and a petition of sundry citizens of Passaic, N. J., praying that the Italo-Jugo-Slav controversy be solved through a plebiscite, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I present a joint memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, relating to Government ownership of packing plants, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The joint memorial is as follows:

Senate joint memorial 7, relating to Government ownership of packing plants.

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill known as H. R. 13324, by Mr. Sims, entitled, "A bill to provide transportation, storage, and marketing facilities for and to regulate commerce among the States in live stock, meats, and other products derived from live stock or the slaughtering of live stock"; and

Whereas we are confident in the opinion that said bill contravenes the principles of our Government and prompts us to a policy of state socialism; and

Whereas, regardless of our objections to said bill on the foregoing grounds, we believe that the remedy for the abuses of power and inefficient service to the public by larger concerns throughout the country lies in strict and broad-minded control and not in Government ownership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby protest against the Government of the United States being tied to a policy of Government ownership such as is proposed by said bill, H. R. 13324; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and they are urged to use their best efforts to prevent the passage of said bill.

W. W. McDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
O. W. BELDEN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 3, 1919.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed March 3, 1919, at 9.25 o'clock a. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Senate joint memorial No. 7, "Relating to Government ownership of packing plants," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 3d day of March, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 3d day of March, A. D. 1919.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I also present a joint memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, relative to Federal aid for post roads. I ask that the joint memorial be printed in the RECORD.

The joint memorial is as follows:

Senate joint memorial 10, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of amendments to certain bills now pending in Congress, in order to provide a more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in the sparsely settled States, and to provide a more reasonable time limit for the availability of such Federal aid.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, respectfully represent and petition as follows: That—

Whereas there are pending in the Congress of the United States bills known as S. 5088, S. 5098, and H. R. 13354, all of which provide for additional Federal aid for post roads under the terms of the act of Congress approved July 11, 1916, and commonly known as the Federal aid road act; and

Whereas section 6 of said Federal aid road act provides that the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and

Whereas, although additional Federal aid for road building at the present time is highly desirable, nevertheless those States having large areas and relatively small populations will be unable to avail themselves of the benefits of this act, as amended to provide additional Federal aid, without a disproportionate burden of taxation:

Now, therefore, your memorialists urgently request that the said bills, and any other similar bills which may be introduced in the Congress of the United States, be so amended that section 6 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that in those States where the average population per square mile of area is 100 persons or more, based upon the census of 1910, the United States shall not cooperate in any road project in an amount greater than 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof; and that in those States where the average population per square mile of area, based on the census of 1910, is less than 100 persons, the share of the United States shall be increased one-fourth of 1 per cent for each person, or major fraction thereof, less than 100 per square mile; and, furthermore,

Whereas section 3 of said Federal aid road act provides that so much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof, shall be available to such State only until the close of the succeeding fiscal year; and

Whereas on account of the said provision of section 3 of said act, local conditions existing in some States render it practically impossible to comply with the terms of the act:

Now, therefore, your memorialists all request that said bills now pending in Congress and any other similar bills which may be introduced, be amended so that section 3 of the said Federal aid road act will provide that so much of the appropriation to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof, shall be available to such State until the close of the second succeeding fiscal year; and be it

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, with a request that they use every effort within their power to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
President of the Senate.
RONALD HIGGINS,
Speaker pro tempore of the House.

Approved March 4, 1919.

S. V. STEWART, *Governor.*

Filed March 5, 1919, at 9.35 a. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss.

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of joint memorial No. 10, "Memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of amendments to certain bills now pending in Congress, in order to provide a more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in the sparsely settled States, and to provide a more reasonable time limit for the availability of such Federal aid," enacted by the sixteenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by S. V. Stewart, governor of said State, on the 4th day of March, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana at Helena, the capital, this 5th day of March, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.] C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sherwood and Wittman, in the State of Maryland, praying for the proposed modification of prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of beer and wines, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Jefferson Lodge, No. 9, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the massacre of Jews in Poland and Roumania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution is as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of senate joint resolution No. 23 of the Fifty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, filed June 10, 1919, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 11th day of June, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.] LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 23.

Whereas the general assembly, by section 11 of an act for the conservation of game, wild fowl, birds, and fish, has provided as follows:

"The ownership of and title to all wild game and birds in the State of Illinois is hereby declared to be in the State, and no wild game or birds shall be taken or killed in any manner or at any time except the person so taking or killing shall consent that the title to said game shall remain in the State of Illinois for the purpose of regulating the use and disposition of the same after such taking or killing. The taking or killing of wild game or birds at any time in any manner or by any person shall be deemed a consent of said person that the title to such game shall be and remain in the State, for said purpose of regulating the use and disposition of the same," and has provided regulations authorizing the hunting of game and birds at certain seasons upon the payment of a license fee to the State; and

Whereas the shooting of ducks and geese is the chief recreation and sport of many thousands of outdoor enthusiasts, who either secure hunting licenses or are exempt from its provisions; and

Whereas the progressive measures for the protection, conservation, and propagation of game, birds, and fish enacted by the General Assembly of Illinois, with the earnest and energetic assistance of the sportsmen of Illinois, rebuts the charge "enemies of wild life" employed by certain eastern organizations because of the natural resentment felt by citizens of Illinois at the unjust and discriminatory feature of the Federal regulations for the shooting of wild ducks and geese as applied to this State; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, under authority of an act of Congress enacted in 1913, prescribing regulations fixing an open season for wild ducks and geese which operated to restrict very largely the hunting of such fowl to territory contiguous to large rivers and lakes, most of which property is in private hands and not open to the public, and to fix an open season which, in the Southern States, came at a time when ducks and geese were plentiful, thereby discriminating greatly against farmer boys and hunters in the valley of the small inland rivers and creeks and the sportsmen of Illinois and of the Middle West States; and

Whereas protests against the unfair features of these regulations were made to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the State law providing an open season was amended in 1915 to provide for two short seasons from September 1 to December 15 and February 15 to March 31, in the hope of securing modification of the Federal provisions, but to no avail, although the Bureau of Biological Survey, the department charged with the enforcement of the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, recognized the force of these protests and admitted that fall shooting (which Federal regulation necessitates) in this locality is very poor; and

Whereas Congress enacted in 1918 the migratory bird treaty act, vesting authority in the Secretary of Agriculture to determine when, to what extent, if at all, and by what means to allow hunting of migratory birds, and under this power an open season has been provided from September 16 to December 31 for the shooting of ducks and geese in Illinois, and is subject to the same exception and the same criticism as the prior regulations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That a joint committee composed of six members, three from the senate and three from the house of representatives, be appointed by the senate and speaker of the house of representatives, respectively, to secure a modification of the Federal regulation, so as to provide a late winter open season from February 15 to March 31, or as near as may be, for the shooting of wild ducks and geese; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey at Washington, the director of agriculture and chief game and fish warden in Springfield, Ill., and to the Members of Congress from Illinois, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That our Members of Congress be requested to lend their aid and cooperation to this committee by their personal efforts directed toward securing a modification as suggested of the regulation issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Adopted by the senate April 22, 1919.

JOHN G. OGLESBY,
President of the Senate.
J. H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives June 5, 1919.

DAVID E. SHANAHAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Filed June 10, 1919.

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHERMAN. I also present a joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution is as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Louis L. Emmerson, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of senate joint resolution No. 31 of the Fifty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, filed June 10, 1919, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Illinois. Done at the city of Springfield this 11th day of June, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.] LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 31.

Whereas the United States during the last half century has witnessed the reduction of the forest in one region after another. The white-pine forests of Pennsylvania, New York, and New England disappeared nearly a half century ago. Likewise the pine forests of the Lake States for the most part were obliterated before 1900. The southern pineries, which for 20 years have been the main supply of lumber for Illinois and other Central States, will, according to statements recently made by authoritative sources, be to a large extent exhausted within the next 10 years; and

Whereas the effect of the exhaustion of the commercial forests has been the closing of near-by industries which depended upon these forests for supplies and the shifting of local population to new centers, involving heavy penalties upon both the industries and the people. As another result the country has observed the area of cut-over timberland increase to an area estimated by the Secretary of the Interior at 228,000,000 acres. Far the greater part of this land is in the North, South, and East, and a very large percentage of it is non-agricultural. With recurring destructive forest fires millions of acres of it have become waste and can only be restored to productiveness through an extensive program of reforestation; and

Whereas the wood-using industries not depending upon uncertain local forest supplies have become centered to a very large extent in the thickly populated districts east of the Mississippi River and are drawing their supplies from the remaining forests in the Eastern States, the Gulf States, and the States adjacent to the Great Lakes. A large number of such industries are located in the State of Illinois, with the city of Chicago the center of a very large and important group. Chicago has for many years been the chief lumber distribution point of the United States and the greatest point of lumber distribution in the world. These important industries, including the manufacture of railway cars, boxes, sashes and doors, farm machinery, furniture, pianos, vehicles, and many other articles, are now threatened by the exhaustion of the forests from which their supplies have been drawn. They now face the necessity of bringing timber from the Pacific coast with heavy freight charges added to the cost. To the same Pacific coast supply the country must look for lumber for general construction purposes. The transportation system of the country must add to its present burdens the transcontinental shipment of very large quantities of lumber, a bulky product upon which a high freight rate greatly increases the cost to the consumer; and

Whereas such forests as are owned and managed by the Government, the national forests, are 97 per cent in the far West, and for that reason can not contribute substantially to the solution of the problem of wood supplies, which has become so threatening to the industries of the Eastern States; and

Whereas the situation is of such gravity as to require the most careful consideration by the Federal Government and the States to the end that policies may be adopted that will lead to the solution of the problem: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Fifty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois urges the attention of the President and the Congress of the United States to the present timber situation and recommends that, without delay, there be formulated such a national program of forestry as will insure the future timber supplies required by the industries of the country. As an example of what should be done, this general assembly points to the wise course of the Republic of France in so managing its forests for more than a century that they contributed substantially to the winning of the great war.

It is further urged that the Federal Government, acting independently or in cooperation with the States, inaugurate action looking toward such measure of public control of the remaining bodies of original timber as will make sure that their supplies will be available as needed by the industries

It is furthermore urged that comprehensive plans be put into effect for restoring the forest on cut-over lands which are nonagricultural in character in the Eastern States, in the States bordering the Great Lakes, and in the South, in order that timber supplies from these regions may be available to the established industries of the Central and Eastern States.

Be it resolved, That the secretary of state of Illinois he, and hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this preamble and resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Senate, and to the House of Representatives, and to the Forester of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Adopted by the senate June 4, 1919.

JOHN G. OGLESBY,
President of the Senate.
J. H. PADDOCK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives June 5, 1919.

DAVID E. SHANAHAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. H. MCCANN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Filed June 10, 1919.

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Greenville, Chicago, and Palatine, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against any modification or repeal of war-time prohibiton, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial from the City Council of Chicago, Ill., relative to a hearing being granted to the people of that city before any change is made in the cost of telephone service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the Aroostook Federation of Farmers, of Caribou, Me., remonstrating against the proposed appropriation of $500,000,000 for the reclamation of lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Federated Trades Council, of Sacramento, Calif., praying for the submission of a referendum on the question of prohibition, which was referred to the Commmittee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Westbrook, Pleasant Valley, Portland, East Haddam, Noank, Willimantic, Bridgeport, Packerville, Warehouse Point, Forestville, Norwich, East Hampton, Clinton, Hartford, Mystic, Jewett City, Stamford, and Moodus, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Middletown, Conn., praying for the proposed modification of prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Simsbury, Conn., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry Jewish citizens of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the massacre of Jews in Poland and Roumania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEXICAN OIL SITUATION.

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 81), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the article submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on June 3, 1919, entitled "Mexican oil situation," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article referred to in the foregoing resolution is as follows:

[From the Marine News.]

MEXICAN OIL SITUATION HAS VITAL BEARING ON MERCHANT MARINE FUTURE—CARRANZA ADMINISTRATION DECREES WOULD SERIOUSLY HAMPER OPERATION OF MANY NEWLY BUILT VESSELS EQUIPPED TO USE OIL AS FUEL.

"The Emergency Fleet Corporation will, when its program is completed, have built a total of 1,300 cargo-carrying vessels equipped to burn oil as fuel under their boilers. This broad adoption of fuel oil burners by the United States Shipping Board is the outcome of prolonged observations as to the trend in other maritime nations.

"In connection with the approaching completion of this great number of vessels equipped to burn oil as fuel the prevailing imbroglio in Mexico is of paramount interest.

"It is conceded, without even coming close to undue panicky thought, that unless the Mexican situation is properly adjusted the newly built oil-burning steamers may be involuntarily tied up.

"England some time ago saw into the future of the fuel-oil situation and, under the cover of the Shell Oil Co., has been acquiring oil-land holdings in Mexico for the very purpose of protecting the ever-growing oil-fuel consuming British merchant marine.

"To operate an American merchant marine we must have American officers. American officers must be developed from American seamen. American seamen must be paid American wages—higher than any other country's sailor pay, but American wages can not and must not be reduced. Our new ships, then, must compete under a handicap. The handicap must be overcome. The use of oil fuel will overcome it and make our steamships livable for their American crews. The oil-burning ship cuts down stokehold force 80 per cent. It bunkers while working cargo. It makes quick turnabout—another great saving—possible. Most of all, it makes possible for American steamships to employ American crews.

"The relative economy of oil fuel has been demonstrated beyond peradventure of doubt. Edward Hungerford, the well-known writer, in an article in Collier's stated that a saving of 32 per cent resulted from the use of oil as fuel under steam boilers, but subsequent purchases by the Emergency Fleet Corporation of over 30,000,000 barrels of oil fuel for consumption in 1919 have been at prices 45 per cent below those that served as Mr. Hungerford's basis.

"The question arises, Where will we get the extra oil needed to fuel our merchant ships? The United States consumes as much as it produces of all kinds of oil. Its exports of refined

and altered oils are almost exactly equal to its imports of crude and fuel oil from Mexico. Mexico must produce and export the oil required for our fleet.

IS AMERICA IN POSITION TO GET MEXICAN OIL?

"If international law is observed and international obligations of Mexico are lived up to, there is no question whatsoever about America's supply from oil fields in Mexico, purchased under Mexican law and developed by American independent producers. The laws of Mexico since 1884 have distinctly provided that petroleum is the property of the owner of the soil, who may dispose of it like any other real estate. The only means of acquiring oil rights in Mexico has always been purchase and lease from Mexican landowners. American independent producers since 1900, when the movement began, have acquired their oil rights only in this legal manner. Not one American company or individual holds a concession covering oil lands in Mexico.

"The task of development has been long and wearisome. In 1916 only two of the producing companies had finally got on a dividend-paying basis—their income from sales exceeded their operating expenses—but they still had a $200,000,000 investment to recover. The Carranza Government, which was existing on income from railways, tramways, express companies, telephone lines, etc., which it had confiscated from British, French, Belgian, and American owners, looked for new sources of illicit income. The laws of Mexico guaranteed the oil titles of the American investors. Carranza's problem was how to seize and take over this entire industry without compensation.

"Mexico called a constitutional assembly, limited in membership to those who had served with Carranza—in other words, about 2 per cent of the whole population.

"This assembly went through the form of adopting a 'new constitution' for Mexico, which provides that the Mexican nation—not the landowners—owns petroleum deposits, that it may concede rights to work these petroleum deposits, and that no American individual may receive oil rights from the Government without resigning his citizenship, and no American corporation may acquire such rights under any circumstances.

FAIL TO CARRY OUT ASSURANCES.

"The American Government protested. When Ambassador Fletcher went to Mexico to present his credentials before the de facto Government in advance of presentation of his credentials he was assured by the Mexican secretary of state that confiscation was not intended by the constitution as the constitution itself provides that no law shall have retroactive effect. The Mexican official press has since repeatedly assured the American public that confiscation would not be enforced.

"Nevertheless, acting, without doubt, under inspiration of the German legation in Mexico, in the year 1918 Mexico issued a series of decrees putting into effect the confiscation of petroleum in spite of the nonretroactive clause of the constitution. The American Government made proper protest. The Mexican Government has since been employed in successive attempts to coerce the companies, which sued to justify their rights before the Mexican federal courts, to admit the legality of confiscation. Two examples will suffice. The companies were required to pay rentals and royalties on their own properties on pain of having them open to the filing of mineral claims by Mexican citizens. Had the companies paid rentals and royalties they would have admitted that the Government owns their properties. Second example: The Government has decreed that no company may drill a well on its own property until it admits that the Government owns it. The penalty for drilling without such permit after such admission is the escheat of the well drilled to the Government.

"The companies still hold their lands and still drill. The whole matter is now before the Mexican Congress in the form of a petroleum law, codifying all the decrees. England, France, Holland, and the United States have all united in protest against the confiscation. Great Britain has refused to accept the Mexican minister unless this matter and other matters of confiscation of its nationals' properties are satisfactorily settled.

MEXICO NOT IN LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

"The proposed constitution of the league of nations provides that nations not yet invited to join may be invited when they give satisfactory guaranties of compliance with international obligations. Mexico, Turkey, and a few other countries are not yet invited to join. The Mexican public and members of the house of deputies are waking to the ignominy that Mexico's course in regard to petroleum rights has brought upon the Mexican nation.

"If the American Government stands firm—as it will—the fuel oil needed to keep our ships and our flag on the sea, commanded by American officers, manned by healthy, husky, team-working American crews, will not be lacking. If Mexico succeeds in confiscating these oil properties, our ships will be on the auction block for sale to nationals of countries which do protect the legally acquired rights of their citizens who went forth to develop their foreign trade and commerce.

"The British Empire now controls the Shell Oil Co. The Shell Oil Co. has purchased all British holdings in oil lands in Mexico. It is perfectly clear that Great Britain sees the importance to the Empire of Mexican fuel oil for its maritime well-being.

"It is equally clear that the United States sees the same interest to itself. The difference is that the British Government now controls the British oil holdings. American individuals have developed and control American oil holdings in Mexico.

"They will continue to own their own properties, and our ships will steam under the American flags, but if the Carranza radicals had their way our ships would not."

MOTOR-BOAT REGULATIONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1028) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to amend the laws for preventing collision of vessels, and to regulate the equipment of certain motor boats on navigable waters of the United States," approved June 9, 1910, to report it favorably with an amendment.

This is a brief but very important bill. The only amendment of the law is to leave out the words "except for failure to observe the provisions of section 6 of the act, relating to motor boats." Under that clause in section 8 the Secretary of Commerce, who otherwise would have the power to remit penalties or mitigate or compromise them, can not do it, and so many cases must go to the courts that could be settled otherwise. According to the letter of the Secretary there are thousands of these cases and the district attorneys are not able to take care of them. By the amendment the committee adopted the Secretary is enabled to adjust them without burdening the courts with them. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to amend the laws for preventing collision of vessels, and to regulate the equipment of certain motor boats on the navigable waters of the United States," approved June 9, 1910, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of Commerce shall make such regulations as may be necessary to secure the proper execution of this act by collectors of customs and other officers of the Government. And the Secretary of Commerce may, upon application therefor, remit or mitigate any fine, penalty, or forfeiture relating to motor boats."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 63, submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS on the 4th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the cost of reporting hearings held on Costa Rican matters by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, upon voucher to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, said payment to be at the rate of $1 per printed page, and not to exceed the sum of $33.

HUDSON RIVER TUNNEL.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York. I invite the attention of the Senators from New York and New Jersey to the bill.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I would like to secure the privilege of unanimous consent to have the immediate consideration of this bill. If I can have just a moment of the time of the Senate I will explain the necessity for it. There can not be any objection, I am sure, to the passage of the act. As the title recites, it provides for the necessary Federal authority to permit the States of New York and New Jersey to enter into a contract to build a traffic or vehicular tunnel under the Hudson River.

It will probably be recalled that at the last session of Congress the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] introduced a bill providing for Federal participation. Congress decided that it was not a matter which warranted an appropriation by the Federal Government. So the two States of New York and New Jersey have concluded to bear the burden, and this bill provides the necessary authority for the two States to spend their own money.

It is an improvement of national—almost international—importance, providing a method to deliver to the city of New York, or to New York Harbor, for export purposes the products of all sections of the country. We all know the terrible congestion that has existed during the winter in years gone by, and the primitive method of lighterage across the river is still being employed. The two commissions appointed by New York and New Jersey are unable to actually enter into a contract until this legislative authority is given as provided under the Federal Constitution. They are now meeting, they are all ready to spend $12,000,000 on this great improvement, and I thought under the circumstances the Senate would be willing to allow immediate consideration in order that the work could be expedited.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress of the United States of America hereby consents to the contracts, agreements, or compacts between the States of New Jersey and New York authorized by chapters 49 and 50 of the Session Laws of 1918 of New Jersey and chapter 70 of the Session Laws of 1919 of New Jersey and by chapter 178 of the General Laws of New York for 1919, for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the city of Jersey City, in the State of New Jersey, and the Borough of Manhattan, in the city and State of New York, and for the joint operation, maintenance, and repair of such tunnel or tunnels, for regulating their traffic and policing and protecting the same, for the fixing and collection of tolls and charges for the use of such tunnel or tunnels, and for the regulation of such other matters as are incidental thereto.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect the right of the United States to regulate interstate commerce or the jurisdiction of the Unitetd States over navigable waters.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2082) for the relief of Maj. Alexander Boynton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington (for Mr. LODGE):

A bill (S. 2083) to authorize the acquisition and operation by the United States of the Cape Cod Canal; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 2084) to provide for the construction of safe and sanitary dwellings, to be leased at a moderate rental to persons residing in buildings erected in alleys in the District of Columbia, and to aid in carrying out the provisions of an act of Congress, approved September 25, 1914, entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys in the District of Columbia," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 2085) relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2086) to provide for the erection of a public building on ground already acquired at Caruthersville, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2087) to fix the salary of the United States marshal for the eastern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2088) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2089) for the relief of the estate of Henry A. V. Post; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWBERRY (for Mr. TOWNSEND):

A bill (S. 2090) to correct the military record of Edgar Durfee (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 2091) granting a pension to Floyd B. Daugherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 2092) granting a pension to Mary Diven; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 2093) to make the land and personal property of John Bonomache, Indian, liable to execution upon judgment of superior court of the State of Washington, county of Spokane, in the case of Louise Fletterman against John Bonomache; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) for a conference of capital and labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENTS TO ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for rifle ranges for civilian instruction from $100,000 to $300,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation to establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, etc., from $10,000 to $200,000, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM T. ELLIS.

Mr. BORAH. I offer a resolution, which I ask to have read, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 82) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the Senate the following information:

1. The facts with reference to the charge made that a noted American correspondent of the New York Herald, William T. Ellis, is now detained if not actually restrained of his liberty by the British authorities at Cairo, Egypt.

2. The facts with reference to the charge that the American consul general and other American consular officers at Cairo have connived with the British authorities in depriving or denying said Ellis of his rights and privileges as an American citizen.

3. The facts with reference to the refusal of the British Government to permit said William T. Ellis to visit Syria and Palestine, and the reasons for such refusal.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. SMOOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 84), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Printing, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

LOSSES TO CONTRACTORS.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, requested to have an examination made and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable moment as to the amount and cause of loss, if any, to the contractors on the following contracts:

In lower St. Francis levee district and first and second Government districts:

Miles 41/ 0– 48/4. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 83/30– 87/14. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 93/15– 96/8. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 130/ 0–140/29. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 168/20–169/30. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 171/32–173/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 173/ 0–175/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 175/ 0–177/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 177/ 0–179/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 179/ 0–180/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.

In lower Yazoo levee district and third Government district:

Stations 1513–1575. Bid received November 10, 1917.
Stations 1200–1513. Bid received September 4, 1917.

The Secretary of War is also requested to report as to stage of completion of said contracts, the delay on each, if any, the cause of delay, and what estimate of what the work contemplated in said contracts would cost as of the day of the report.

TERRITORY OF TURKEY.

Mr. KING. I think under the rule a resolution I offered yesterday with respect to Turkey would be laid before the Senate. I ask that it may go over without prejudice and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND PEACE.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I desire to have published in the RECORD an article appearing in the Central Law Journal, of St. Louis, and the Chicago Legal News on International psychology and peace.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the article be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. KIRBY. Before it is printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; before it is printed.

Mr. KIRBY. Since there is objection, let it go to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 5608. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.;

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River, from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River, between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada;

H. R. 1706. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.;

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; and

H. R. 2954. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 3, after the word "Hawaii," to insert:

Provided further, That hereafter employees of the Department of Agriculture assigned to permanent duty in the Virgin Islands shall be entitled to the same privileges as to leave of absence as are conferred upon employees assigned to Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam by the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 441), and if any employee of the agricultural experiment stations of the United States in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands shall elect to postpone the taking of any or all of the annual leave to which he may be entitled under the said act of June 30, 1914, he may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the interests of the public service, be allowed to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years, and be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted.

So as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, $215,000, as follows: Alaska, $75,000, of which $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be immediately available for the erection of barns, purchase of breeding live stock, and other expenses connected with the stock-breeding experiments on the island of Kodiak and at the Matanuska station; Hawaii, $50,000; Porto Rico, $50,000; Guam, $25,000, of which $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be immediately available to repair damage due to typhoon; and the Virgin Islands of the United States, $15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated for the experiment station in Hawaii $10,000 may be used in agricultural extension work in Hawaii: *Provided further*, That hereafter employees of the Department of Agriculture assigned to permanent duty in the Virgin Islands shall be entitled to the same privileges as to leave of absence as are conferred upon employees assigned to Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam by the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 441), and if any employee of the agricultural experiment stations of the United States in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands shall elect to postpone the taking of any or all of the annual leave to which he may be entitled under the said act of June 30, 1914, he may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the interests of the public service, be allowed to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years, and be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think that the amendment down to and including the figures "441," on page 76, is fair and just to the employees of the Department of Agriculture who may be assigned to permanent duty in the Virgin Islands, but the remainder of the amendment is adverse to the practices in the departments of the Government. Cumulative leave of absence is specifically provided against by law, and the provision here simply means that employees of the Department of Agriculture when assigned to Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands shall have the privilege of cumulative leave of absence. Not only that, but it is provided that they shall "be allowed to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years," and shall be paid at the rate of compensation they are receiving at the time the leave is granted; or, in other words, if there is any promotion or increase in salary during the four years' time, this provision authorizes any leave of absence that has not been taken during the four years to be taken at the higher rate of compensation, no matter when it may be granted, even though it be one month before the amendment becomes a law.

I think that the amendment, as I have said, down to line 9, including the figures "441," is a very proper amendment and should be extended to those who are assigned to the Virgin Islands for the work of this department, but all of the remainder of the amendment ought to be stricken out, and I move that all after the figures "441," line 9, page 76, be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 76, line 9 of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out all after the words in parentheses "(Thirty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 441)," down to and including line 18 of the amendment, as follows:

And if any employee of the agricultural experiment stations of the United States in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands shall elect to postpone the taking of any or all of the annual leave to which he may be entitled under the said act of June 30, 1914, he may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the interests of the public service, be allowed to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years, and be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is mistaken in his interpretation of this amendment, and for the information of the Senate I send to the Secretary's desk a letter from the Agricultural Department in justification of the amendment. I desire the Secretary to kindly read from the letter, beginning at the point where I have marked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

This provision was included in the department's estimates and was incorporated in the bill as it passed the House and as reported from the Senate committee at the last session. It was also approved by the present House committee, but when the bill was recently under discussion on the floor of the House the proviso was eliminated through a point of order.

This provision, if enacted, will grant to permanent employees of the department on the Virgin Islands the same privilege as to annual leave as that conferred upon employees assigned to Alaska, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Guam. It will also permit the permanent employees at all these stations to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years. Under existing law employees of the department in the Virgin Islands are entitled to only 15 days' leave, whereas permanent employees at other insular stations are allowed 30 days.

For some time those in charge of these stations have urged a change in the law regarding leave of absence for the members of their staffs. Under the present limitation of 30 days' annual leave, few of them take vacations, as there are few places they desire to visit that can be reached within the period allowed. In normal times two weeks is required for the trip from Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Virgin Islands stations to the nearest mainland port and return, and for the Alaska and Guam stations a much longer period is required. On account of the shortness of the time granted and the expense of the trip, many of the men have not been away from their stations for several years. The stations are all isolated and the work is carried on under very monotonous conditions. The isolation and the enervating climate of the Tropics cause a rapid deterioration in capacity for research. Other departments and Governments have recognized this condition and have made more liberal provision for annual leave. It is reported that the Customs Service and the Labor and Immigration Service in Hawaii and Porto Rico grant additional leave to cover the time required on the voyage. Civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments located

at stations outside the continental United States are granted more leave than those on the mainland. The Philippine and Canal Zone administrations are liberal in the matter of annual leave, and in addition they make allowance for the time required for transportation. The naval act approved August 29, 1916 (Stat. L., 39, pt. 1, pp. 557, 558), provides for cumulative leave for civilian employees at stations outside the continental limits of the United States. It is believed that the enactment of the legislation proposed would serve to keep the men more contented and make possible the restoration of their mental and corporal vigor, besides increasing the efficiency of the personnel and removing a cause of frequent resignations, as it would give time for recuperation.

It is earnestly hoped that the Senate will restore this provision to the bill.

Mr. KENYON. This provision, as I understand, is to give longer vacations to the Government employees in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. SMOOT. Not only in the Virgin Islands, but——

Mr. KENYON. And also in Porto Rico.

Mr. SMOOT. Also in Porto Rico, Guam, Alaska, and Hawaii.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think anyone who has ever visited the Virgin Islands and been compelled to live in that climate will realize that more efficient work can be done by the Government employees there if they have some reasonable kind of vacation. It is hard to get anywhere from the Virgin Islands within any reasonable period of time. A 15 days' vacation does not amount to anything.

Mr. SMOOT. But this would give the employees there 30 days.

Mr. KENYON. The climate there is such that one's thinking apparatus does not work well. I have talked with some soldier boys at St. Thomas, who had been there for over two years. They had had no vacation, no change, and they were in a very desperate condition of mind.

We seem to have forgotten the Virgin Islands and the duty which we owe to them. A gentleman from the Virgin Islands told me on yesterday that there were 3,500 people in St. Thomas who got up every morning without knowing where they were going to get their breakfast; and that is incidental to this question. I believe we ought to send a commission of Congress—not a "joy-riding expedition," but two Members of the Senate and two Members of the House—to the Virgin Islands to investigate conditions there and report to Congress. Those people are our wards, and yet we are paying absolutely no attention to them. People are going to be starved in St. Thomas before this year is over.

As for St. Johns, I think they slipped that in in the conveyance when nobody was looking, for I do not know what in the world anybody should want with the island of St. Johns.

If these Government employees have got to stay on the Virgin Islands, with that unlivable climate and with those bad conditions, especially water conditions, they ought to have the privilege of cumulating their vacations in the interest of efficient service and for their own health. I had supposed that was what this provision did, and that is why I favored it.

Mr. SMOOT. It goes further than that, I will say to the Senator. As I stated in the beginning, I am not at all objecting to including the Virgin Islands along with Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rica, and Guam.

Mr. KENYON. Does this bill give to employees in those islands a cumulative vacation?

Mr. SMOOT. It gives the Government employees in the Virgin Islands 30 days' leave of absence, instead of 15 days as is now provided by law. I have no objection whatever to that, but I object to allowing not only the employees in the Virgin Islands, but the employees in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rica, and Guam, to take four years' back leave of absence, and not only take the four years' back leave of absence, but to take it at the rate they shall be paid at the time they take it. If they are then receiving a higher rate of compensation they are permitted to take their leave of absence at that rate, and not at the rate at which they had been paid two years or three years back.

Mr. KENYON. Let us take the instance of a man who has been in Guam as a Government employee for four years. Now, he has a higher salary at the end of four years during which he has cumulated his vacation, so that he would have 120 days, and he could take it at the end of four years, could he not?

Mr. SMOOT. He could do so under this cumulative provision.

Mr. KENYON. That is, he would take that vacation under the salary he was drawing the last year, as the Senator contends.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true. That is exactly what this provides for; in other words, if in the first year he was drawing $125 a month, the second year $150 a month, the third year $175 a month, and the fourth year $200 a month, under this provision as contained in the bill he would take all of these cumulative leaves of absence at the $200 a month rate.

Mr. KENYON. I get the Senator's idea.

Mr. GRONNA. I know the Senator from Utah desires to be perfectly fair.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly I do.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not think the Senator ought to put that broad interpretation upon this language, because it is specifically stated that the leave shall be granted "in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture," so that even if the employee is entitled to the leave, still his application has to be acted upon by the Secretary of Agriculture. I think it is perfectly safe to leave it to the Secretary of Agriculture, and whenever, in his judgment, he thinks that some employee who has been in one of these islands for four years is entitled to a leave of absence, cumulative or whatever else it may be, it ought to be given him.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does the Senator really believe that we ought to begin now in this bill to provide for cumulative leaves of absence dated four years back, and, not only dated four years back, but providing that the employee shall "be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted"?

Mr. GRONNA. But the Senator is overlooking the fact that there is a safety valve supplied in the amendment, in that it is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture whether or not the application shall be approved.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any question, however, as to the rate of compensation during the leave of absence; but there is a discretion left in the Secretary of Agriculture by the words "in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the interests of the public service"; in other words, the Secretary is to decide when the leave of absence is to be taken. There is nothing to prevent an employee claiming a leave of absence—because he can do so under the law—and the Secretary of Agriculture, the same as the head of every other department, has the right to decide when that leave of absence may be taken.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I could not understand, on account of the confusion, all that was said in the colloquy. Does the Senator from Utah claim that the language of the amendment would put it absolutely in the power of the employee to say when he would take his leave of absence?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I say that the language of the amendment puts it in the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to say when the leave of absence shall be taken, and that under the provision the amount of leave is specific; but if the amendment becomes a law the employee while on leave of absence will "be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted." There is no question about that.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not disagree with the Senator on that construction, but it does not follow, as I read it—and I do not presume the Senator claims that it follows—that the employee would have the right under this language absolutely to secure four years' cumulative leave of absence all at once?

Mr. SMOOT. Not unless the Secretary of Agriculture approved such application. It is optional with him, as I have stated, but it is not optional with him as to the rate of compensation to be granted while the employee is enjoying his leave of absence.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SMOOT. That is fixed by the proposed law.

Mr. NORRIS. That is fixed now, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. No; this is a change of the law.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand this is a change of the law; but under the law now, if any employee takes leave of absence, he takes it at the rate of pay at the time the leave of absence is granted.

Mr. SMOOT. He takes it at whatever rate of compensation he has drawn during the year. There is no cumulative leave of absence allowed to employees of the Government in continental United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose an employee were entitled to 15 days' leave of absence in one year, and that for the first half of the year he was getting $100 a month and for the remainder of the year he was getting $150, and he took his leave of absence at the close of the year, he would get paid while on leave of absence at the rate of $150 a month, would he not?

Mr. SMOOT. No; he would be paid for a portion of the time at the rate of $100 a month. If for six months, for instance, he received $100 a month and for the other six months he received $150 a month, if the leave of absence was taken at one time toward the close of the year——

Mr. NORRIS. He is paid proportionally?

Mr. SMOOT. He is paid in proportion to the rate the employee received during the year in which the leave of absence was granted.

Mr. NORRIS. In that case the employee would get seven and one-half days' leave at the rate of compensation of $100 a month, and seven and one-half days at the rate of $150 a month?

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator may be right; I did not understand that was the law. However, I do not believe that ought to be the law. It seems to me the employee ought to be paid while on leave of absence at the rate he was drawing from the Government at the time he gets his leave of absence, because that is what he would draw from the Government if he did not take leave.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether there has been any change in the salaries of the employees in the Virgin Islands, Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam in the last four years, but more than likely there has been. I can not say as to that.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume so, for I assume that employees in those places are promoted.

Mr. SMOOT. I judge that the salaries have been increased, or this wording would not have been put in this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator object particularly to that part of the amendment which provides that the employees shall "be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted"?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to modify my amendment so as to strike out the words, on lines 17 and 18, "and be paid at the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted."

Mr. NORRIS. What is the Senator's amendment? I did not hear it.

Mr. SMOOT. The first amendment I offered was to strike out all of the committee amendment after the words in parentheses in line 8 "(Thirty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 441)" to the end of the amendment. That would provide leave of absence for the employees of the Agricultural Department in the Virgin Islands of 30 days, the same as is provided for employees in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam. Under the law there are only allowed 15 days' leave of absence to employees on the Virgin Islands, and that is not fair.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think that is right; we will all have to admit that is not right; but, if the Senator's amendment prevails, then the effect would be that none of the employees at the various places named would be able to get cumulative leave of absence.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the original amendment I offered. It was simply designed to treat employees in those islands the same as employees in the United States are treated under every department of the Government. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] suggested that it is a long way to and from these islands, and he thought that employees ought to have cumulative leave of absence. I am not particularly opposed to that under the conditions existing in those islands; but I do believe, if they are to have the right of going back four years and claiming leave of absence cumulative in character, that they ought to be paid compensation at the rate they were receiving in the years for which they were allowed cumulative leave of absence.

Mr. NORRIS. I am inclined to agree with the Senator on that proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all there is to it.

Mr. NORRIS. But it seems to me that the general rule that prohibits long cumulations of leave of absence ought not to apply to these distant places, particularly to the Virgin Islands, for there is no place for an employee in the Virgin Islands to go to obtain his vacation, unless he spends a great deal of time to get there and puts in all of his time going and coming.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. So that he ought to have a little longer vacation for that reason in addition to the terrible conditions under which he has to work and live while he is there.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator, and not only does it apply——

Mr. NORRIS. That ought to be a good reason for allowing him to remain on duty longer at one time and then taking all of his vacation at once, but I do agree with the Senator that the pay an employee receives while on leave of absence ought to be divided up in proportion to the salary that he was actually receiving for the various years that are added to make up the cumulative leave of absence.

Mr. SMOOT. Particularly so as it reverts back four years.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will agree to that amendment and say "the rate obtaining at the time the leave is granted," I have no objection then to the balance of the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before my colleague makes that concession, I should like to ask a question for information.

As I read this amendment, it provides that any employees who are serving within the Territories referred to may cumulate their leave of absence, extending back for a period of four years, so that now a person who had not taken a vacation four years ago, three years ago, two years ago, or one year ago could cumulate all those vacations, put them into one, and obtain compensation now for service and leave of absence for the entire cumulative period. Does the Senator think that the plan proposed makes for efficiency, for economy, and does it accomplish the end that Congress had in view when it permitted these vacations?

As I understood, one of the objects of the vacation was to give the employee a chance for rest and recuperation, to the end that his health might not be impaired and more efficient service might be rendered the Government. It seems to me that that very purpose is thwarted if you deny, so to speak, the vacation period and permit cumulations. Besides, it seems to me that the effect upon the public service would be very deleterious.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator's argument, as applied to ordinary positions, is good. I think he has stated one of the objects, at least, of the law that grants Government employees a vacation. But here we have an employee over at the Virgin Islands. He gets 15 days' leave of absence and wants to take a vacation. He spends half of that time getting to the place where he takes his vacation, and before he recovers from the seasickness that he acquires on the voyage he has to start back again to the imprisonment at the Virgin Islands.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, it is 30 days instead of 15, as I understand the law.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it will be 30 days if the first part of this amendment is adopted. As it is now, it is only 15 days at the Virgin Islands.

Mr. SMOOT. In the Virgin Islands, the Senator is correct. In the other cases it is 30 days.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that takes it out of the general rule; that the Senator would have to concede, if he wants to be fair—and I know he does—that here is a condition in the Virgin Islands—and the same is true of Guam and of Alaska, and to a great extent, although not so much so, of the Hawaiian Islands, because they can get vacations easier there—where it takes most of the employee's time getting to and from his place of vacation, and if he uses up his time in going and returning he has not any recreation, he has not any chance for recuperation; so that it is almost a necessity, it seems to me, that you either give him a longer vacation every year or permit him to let it accumulate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it would not take as long to return to the mainland from the Virgin Islands as it would to go from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or vice versa; so the argument which the Senator has made would not apply to the Virgin Islands. But let me ask the Senator if this is not a bad precedent? If you begin to break down the law and make exceptions because somebody works in Hawaii, or the Virgin Islands, or the Panama Canal Zone, where are you going to draw the line?

Mr. NORRIS. There is a good deal in what the Senator says.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit me just a moment further, after a while employees will say: "I have been designated to work in Florida. My home is in Washington. It takes me four or five days to reach Washington, or Oregon, or Montana—a much longer period than it would take to come from Panama to the United States, or from the Virgin Islands to the United States"; and they will ask for modifications of the existing law, until finally you are going to break down the law entirely.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator states the general proposition correctly, I think; but we have a condition here which I believe to be exceptional, particularly in the case of the Virgin Islands. If the Senator were an employee of the Government in the Virgin Islands and began his vacation to-day, he probably could not get a boat for a week. The means of getting there and returning are crude. His argument as it applies to Hawaii, I think, is absolutely good. I would not care if that were obliterated from it, because you can get vacations there in various ways. To some extent that is true of Panama, but not so much.

Mr. KING. The same is true of Alaska.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably it is true in Alaska; I am not so familiar with that; but in the Virgin Islands there is not any possibility of a vacation unless you take a whole lot of time to get it. Here is an instance where I think we will do an injustice unless we make an exception to the general rule. I think it is conceded that these people in the Virgin Islands are working under the most adverse circumstances, that place where we paid several millions of dollars to Denmark for the privilege of feeding the starving population. We have to do the work, and we ought

to do it right, and it will take a great many employees there. I understand, from those living there, that the living conditions are probably as hard as they are anywhere in the world.

Mr. KING. Let me suggest to the Senator that in addition to the leave of absence, of course, there is the sick leave; and my information is that that is usually crowded into the period and taken advantage of.

Mr. NORRIS. I think an employee working in the Virgin Islands would be inclined to need a whole lot of sick leave; but the sick leave only comes when he is sick.

Mr. KING. But the complaint I am making is that this extends not to the Virgin Islands alone, but the committee amendment includes within it Hawaii, Guam, Alaska, and other Territories.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to my colleague that I think the employees in Hawaii and Porto Rico and Alaska take their leave regularly, and I do not think there will be very much cumulative leave of absence in those places; but in the Virgin Islands it will make quite a difference, and I do not know but that it ought to be done, as far as that is concerned, as affecting the employees of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I disagree with both the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Nebraska; but in order to avoid any further debate I will suggest an amendment to the Senator from Utah, to insert, after the word "rate," this language——

Mr. KING. In what line?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator proposes to strike out all of line 18?

Mr. GRONNA. After line 17 strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert:

Prevailing during the years such time has accumulated.

Mr. SMOOT. "During the years such leave has accumulated," or "such leave of absence."

Mr. GRONNA. I do not object to that—"leave of absence."

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if he will accept a further amendment to strike out the words "Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam, or"? The senior Senator from Utah states that the employees of the Government working in these islands have availed themselves of their leaves of absence, so that perhaps there will be no cumulation. If that is true, then it seems to me this amendment ought to be accepted, because it would not be of any advantage to them anyway; but in the future they might take advantage of it and permit cumulation, unless the amendment which I have suggested is made.

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the junior Senator from Utah that you might just as well strike out the whole amendment as to strike out the language the Senator suggests. It would be eminently unfair to do that.

Mr. KING. But it extends to the Virgin Islands, and that, as I understood my colleague——

Mr. GRONNA. It should extend to them all. It is left to the Secretary of Agriculture to decide whether or not this leave of absence shall be granted. It is perfectly safe.

Mr. SMOOT. As to the time?

Mr. GRONNA. I mean as to the accumulated time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will agree to the amendment which is offered by the Senator as a substitute for the amendment which I offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out line 18 and to insert the words "prevailing during the time such leave of absence accumulated."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the committee if he will not accept as an amendment the striking out of the words "Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Guam, or" in lines 10 and 11. I repeat, if he will permit it, that those employees live in such close proximity to the mainland, and with means of transportation so excellent, that if they care for a vacation they ought to avail themselves of that vacation each year, instead of cumulating it. If it is an evil to permit cumulation—and, as I understand, that is conceded—it seems to me the privilege ought not to be extended except in cases of difficulty or extreme cases of hardship, such as it has been suggested the Virgin Islands present.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if the Senator is anxious to have any of the insular possessions and Territories stricken out, he certainly should not include Alaska and Guam.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think the cumulation ought to extend to the employees in Alaska?

Mr. GRONNA. I most certainly do. I believe it would be very unjust to the people who are employed by this department in Alaska to be denied this privilege.

Mr. KING. Of cumulation?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator agree with my colleague that in the main they have availed themselves of their annual leave?

Mr. GRONNA. No; I am sorry to say that I do not agree with the Senator's colleague.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the committee ought to accept this amendment. I think he is standing for a bad precedent, and he is chiseling away a law of some merit; and in the end he will find the law broken down and the service very seriously impaired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 77, line 2, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$46,280" and insert "$76,280," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, with the cooperation of other bureaus of the department, and to disseminate useful information on this subject, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, $76,280.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to have some explanation of that amendment from the chairman of the committee. The House, having better opportunities than the Senate for the investigation of the various items of this bill, fixed this appropriation at $46,280. The Senate has increased the appropriation to $76,280. I find very large appropriations made in preceding portions of the bill with respect to matters that are embraced within the provision just read, and under which appropriations the investigation herein called for might with propriety be made. I also invite the Senator's attention to the fact—and I shall be glad if he will direct attention to that matter—that there seems to be no limitation whatever upon the number of employees whose services could be obtained under this provision, nor upon the amount of compensation paid to each of the employees, because as I understand the preceding parts of the bill fix the compensation and salaries allowed to the thousands of employees provided for by this bill, it is obvious that the greater part of this $76,280 will be paid for the compensation of additional employees. There is nothing here to require that the employees shall be taken from the civil service. There is nothing to indicate who the employees shall be. They may be technical men, or men taken from various other departments, or taken generally from public activities. It seems to me that if there is to be an appropriation of this amount, there ought to be a limitation upon the amount paid to each individual employee, and there ought to be some indication as to the number of employees who will be authorized to serve in the discharge of the duties required by this provision.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, answering the question of the Senator from Utah, with respect to this particular item, I will simply say that this is the amount estimated for by the department.

The House did not see fit to allow them the full amount of the estimate. There were members of the Senate committee who believed that the amount appropriated by the House might be sufficient. A majority of the members, however, believed otherwise—that it would be insufficient. The Senator is correct in his statement that this money will be used for the payment of employees. He is absolutely correct about that. That is the purpose of the appropriation—to be used for the payment of employees to do this particular work.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. Part of the appropriation is to be used for the printing and distribution of bulletins, too; is it not?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the thing I object to more particularly, outside of the principle of economy, is that we provide that these employees shall be in the city of Washington. That is the worst part of this provision.

Mr. GRONNA. I think I can explain that to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say that this practice of putting into a law the authority to employ people located in the Dis-

trict of Columbia to do examination work throughout the United States is a vicious practice. It almost ceased a few years ago. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] knows very well that the Committee on Appropriations took the position that wherever the investigation was to be made, that was where the men were to go; that was where they were to labor. Gradually, however, on account of the war situation, the old practice is being indulged in again by the departments of our Government; and nearly all of the appropriations that are made now for an investigation outside of the District of Columbia have words that include the employment of people in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator has said—that many times investigations, no matter what they might be in the field, are of such a nature that the actual examination in the scientific branches of the business on account of equipment, and so forth, would necessarily be held at some place where the equipment existed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly right in that, and I want to say to the Senator that there is not an appropriation bill that passes in which we do not specifically provide for that kind of employees. They are named in the bill, their duty is defined, and they are paid a larger salary because of the knowledge which they have of a particular work.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am acquainted with the fact as stated by the chairman of the committee, and very wisely, I take it; but I was afraid, making the limitation excluding entirely the city of Washington, it might have the effect of intruding somewhat upon a proper investigation of some of these matters. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the Senator as to the investigations being made on the ground, but I would not entirely exclude by any means that scientific investigation which may be required by employees living in the city of Washington and stationed here.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say, Mr. President, that my remarks would apply to other parts of the bill more than to this particular item. I recognize the fact that there could be, and would have to be, employees provided for in the District of Columbia to carry on this particular work, as the Department of Agriculture is to cooperate with other departments of the Government. I do not want the Senator having the bill in charge to think that my remarks apply only to this item, for they do not apply to it nearly so much as they do to other parts of the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Permit me to say to both of the Senators from Utah that a portion of this appropriation will, of course, be used for the payment of salaries to men performing research work, and a large portion of it will also be used for sending out bulletins for the diffusion of the knowledge which has been obtained. Where will we do that work outside of the city of Washington? Necessarily it must be expended here in the city of Washington. If it can be done for $46,000 we shall save $30,000, of course. The department says it can not be done for less than $76,000. I am perfectly willing to take a vote on it, and whatever the Senate does with respect to it I will abide by.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The language of the provision is:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home.

Preliminary to the question which I wish to ask the Senator, allow me to state that in preceding parts of the bill millions of dollars are provided for the investigation of plants and farms and agricultural products, to increase the fertility of the soil, and to aid in agricultural development, and generally to take charge of the farms of the farmers of the United States, the theory evidently being that the farmers do not know as much about their farms and do not know how to manage them or plant their seeds as well as employees here in Washington. Of course, the Senator from North Dakota having the bill in charge, being a farmer himself, does not know how to operate his farm, and is delighted to have a $1,500 or $2,000 clerk come out there from Washington to show him how to run his farm. That is in harmony, of course, with the beautiful paternalistic theory that seems to be obtaining, which we should all welcome with so much joy.

But, having in view the fact that millions of dollars have been provided for the perpetuation of that paternalism, and to enter the homes of farmers and to teach them how to operate their farms, and their wives how to make cottage cheese and how to make butter and how to operate the churns and how to wash the dishes, and so on——

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I have an article here from the New York Evening Mail on this subject, which I would like to have read just at this point, with the permission of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator whether it agrees with my remarks?

Mr. KENYON. Entirely.

Mr. KING. Then I should be glad to have it read, although I was right in the midst of a sentence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MAKING FARMERS' WIVES EFFICIENT.

(Roy K. Moulton, in the Evening Mail, N. Y.)

One bureau of the Department of Agriculture is devoting its time just now with renewed vigor to the task of making the farmer's wife more efficient in her household duties. Much literature is being sent about the country.

Taking efficiency to a farmer's wife is like carrying cheese to Switzerland.

The farmer's wife rises at half-past 4 and gets breakfast for her husband and the hired man, so they can get out with their scythes or harvesters and sneak up on the oats and barley while it is dark.

By the time the average city woman has taken her first look at the clock and begun to think about getting up, the farmer's wife has milked 9 cows, fed 300 chickens and a dozen pigs; washed, dressed, and fed 7 children, put the milk away in the cellar, washed the dishes, done the churning, made the beds, done the family washing, and has gone out with a tin bucket looking for potato bugs.

During the forenoon all she has to do is to weed the kitchen garden, harvest the eggs, peel the rutabagas, make a couple of apple pies for dinner, darn the old man's socks, make a couple of pairs of pants for the twins out of father's old ones, dicker with the butter and egg merchant and chase the tin peddlers out of the front yard.

After she has washed the dinner dishes, she teaches two or three calves how to drink out of a tin pail, oils the windmill, does her dusting and sweeping, puts up a few preserves, cans nine bushels of plums, and gets supper.

All her real relaxation and pleasure come after supper, when she has nothing much to do except wash the dishes, cut the old man's hair, mend the hired man's overalls, spank the seven children and put them to bed, read the "Weekly Bazoo" to her husband, make a batch of yarb tea, set the pancake batter for breakfast, do some quilting, string four bushels of apples to dry, put the cats out, wind the clock, lock the chicken coop, cover up the bird cages, grease the old man's chest with arnicky, and go to bed.

When she gets to bed she meets herself getting up. Teach the farmer's wife efficiency? Huh! She invented it.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from Utah if that answers his interrogatory of me?

Mr. KING. I was about to ask the Senator a question, but I think this article submitted by the Senator from Iowa is a very clear exposition of the follies and the idiocies of some of the employees of the Agricultural Department. I was going to ask the Senator what is meant by investigating "the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home"? Does not the farmer know the benefit of potatoes and grain and vegetables? Does he have to be taught how to cook them, how to raise them, or the relative food values? If these things are essential I think the States and the State schools will furnish all the information that his experience has failed to disclose to him. But my understanding and knowledge of farmers is that they are not the anemic mollycoddles that Government employees would have us believe them to be.

The farmers of the United States are strong, virile men, and the wives of the farmers possess the virtues of America's exalted womanhood. They work together for the development of the farm and the development of the Nation. I do not think the farmers of the United States are here with cap in hand asking the Government to send out clerks and officials and individuals, some of whom claim scientific and expert knowledge, to teach them the common practices, and the common duties, and the common labors which devolve upon them every day.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator's interrogatory involves a great many questions. I can not answer them all. I can only answer them in so far as they relate to this particular item.

This appropriation is to be used in the Department of Agriculture for home economics. The money is to be expended, as I said to the Senator before, for paying employees to do research work and for the distribution of bulletins and pamphlets touching upon all of the different kinds of industries named in the paragraph. I can not, of course, go into the science of agriculture at this time. Some time, when the Senator from Utah and I have more time than we have to-day, I shall be very glad to take a day off and discuss with the Senator from Utah the sciences and how they work out from a practical standpoint in the field of farming and agriculture.

Mr. KING. I ask that the Senate disagree to the amendment reported by the committee and adhere to the House provision. I ask for a vote.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Now that the Senator from North Dakota has obtained $76,280 to be paid I do not know to whom, and he does not know to whom the payment is to be made, will he consent to a limitation upon the compensation to be paid to individuals? Will he insist that it shall be left to the discretion of somebody in the department to pay $10,000 a year to some employee or $5,000, or any amount which his judgment may determine to be proper?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that all these men are on the statutory roll. Their salary has been fixed by law. As the Senator knows, we have a general law. He knows more than I do, perhaps, how that law operates, how the estimates are made first by the department and then the provisions are adopted by Congress. The idea, of course, is to place all on the statutory roll and not pay them out of a lump sum.

Of course, it is possible that some men will be paid out of a lump sum. It is possible that they will be paid out of this item of $76,000; but if the Senator will refer to the Book of Estimates he will find the amount of salaries paid to all these employees.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me? I find on pages 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the bill appropriations amounting to $500,520 to be paid to officials in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and it indicates the personnel to whom these payments are to be made. For instance, an executive clerk gets $2,250; three law clerks obtain $1,800 each; eight law clerks obtain $2,500 each; two law clerks obtain $2,750 each; two attorneys obtain $3,250 each, and so on.

Mr. NORRIS. May I make an inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator claim that this language will enable the Secretary to hire anyone he chooses at any salary he sees fit?

Mr. KING. I am asking for information. As I understand the bill and as I interpret it, in view of the fact that various other provisions of the bill antecedent to this one specify certain employees and the compensation of each, this provision is taken out of those classes and there is no limitation placed in the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is right, if it is true that there is not any limitation, for one I would be very glad to support any amendment that would put a limitation on it. While I may be wrong and the Senator right, I understand, and I never supposed there was a question about it, that this particular language would not enable the Secretary to go out and hire some one and pay him $10,000 a year to do this or that. Under the general law he would have to get some one who was under the civil-service law. He would go to the regular organization and obtain men who would get salaries provided by law when appointed to positions under the civil-service law. If that is not true, then I will vote with the Senator at any time to put a limitation on it.

Mr. KING. Concede what the Senator has said to be true, it is obvious that this provision can not be tied to the preceding provisions of the bill, and there is no limitation in this act as to the number of employees who may be procured by the Secretary of Agriculture under the appropriation of $76,280.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me make a suggestion to the Senator, if he will allow me.

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, under the parliamentary situation it would not be in order for individual amendments to be offered, and let me suggest to the Senator that he look that up. If I can get time I would like to cooperate with him in looking it up to see if that is right. If I am wrong and the Senator is right about it, I would be glad to cooperate with him and support an amendment that would put some kind of a limitation on it that I think we all agree ought to be made. As I understand the parliamentary situation he could not offer that amendment now, because we must first consider the committee amendments.

Mr. KING. I think that is probably true. I want to say that I intend to go back to the beginning of this bill and challenge attention to numerous items which according to my view put no limitation upon the Secretary of Agriculture. He may employ as many men as he pleases under these appropriations and at such compensation as he pleases.

I want to make this qualification to the broad statement I have just made. It is possible that some general statute may limit the payment which he may make to various individuals, but, as the Senator knows, the general statute places the maximum, as I recall it, to be paid to employees within certain departments. He might select one or two or three coming under the maximum list of the highest grade of employment and therefore absorb the entire appropriation by paying half a dozen individuals.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, nobody wants to do that. I do not believe he could do it, but if he could we ought to prohibit it by law.

Mr. KING. For two years we have been passing these lump-sum appropriations which impose no proper limitations upon executive officers, and there have been gross discriminations. Men who have been employed in the Government service for years, doing splendid service, see under these lump-sum appropriations men placed far above them, receiving double and sometimes treble the compensation that they are receiving, and perhaps men who are not as well qualified to discharge the public duties as they are themselves.

Mr. NORRIS. I think there are instances where that is true, but I am somewhat familiar with some of the work done by scientific men in the Agricultural Department. For instance, I happen to know something about the Bureau of Chemistry and what the chemists have been doing. There will probably be some chemical work done under this very provision. I know the Government has seen gradually its chemists taken away and absorbed by private individuals and corporations because the Government has been unable to pay the salaries that these men get in private employment. Last year when there was a great cry for chemists not only in the Government service, in the War Department, but in private business, the Bureau of Chemistry sent one of its best men through the country to visit the various colleges where chemistry was taught with a view of getting some to go into the Government service and help out the Bureau of Chemistry. He spent 10 or 15 days going to the leading colleges in different parts of the country and was not able to secure a single man. In every instance he found every one of them whom it was desirable to get taken up at salaries sometimes twice what he was able to offer them for the Government service.

If the Secretary of Agriculture had been able to pay whatever he pleased for the salaries of these men, that condition could not possibly have existed. These salaries are fixed by law. These employees must get into the service through a civil-service examination. The difficulty has been that in this high-class work private individuals have been taking men from the Government service at salaries away beyond what the Secretary of Agriculture is under the law allowed to pay. I know of several instances where men have turned down offers of largely increased salaries because they realized that the demands upon the Bureau of Chemistry would be practically nullified if all the employees left the service. I know personally of one or two instances where chemists in the service of the Government have been offered permanent positions at twice the salaries which they are getting, and have refused such offers solely from feelings of patriotism. Some of these employees did that during the war who are now leaving, feeling that their obligation is not resting so heavily upon them as formerly. I may be wrong, but I am satisfied that there is a general law which prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from going out and employing anyone he sees fit at any salary he may have in mind to fix for his services.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say to the Senator from Nebraska that the cases to which he refers are cases where the compensation is fixed in the law. For instance, take the legislative appropriation bill. The salaries of the Bureau of Chemistry are fixed by law. The chemist is paid so much per annum. The department can not change a salary so fixed; and the salary is a statutory one. However, wherever there is a lump-sum appropriation, unless there is a provision that the employees shall be appointed under the civil-service law and unless there is a limit fixed, no limitation is observed as to the amount of salary that shall be paid to any employee, whether he be a chemist or otherwise who is to be paid out of the fund. That is why, Mr. President, we have tried so hard to get rid of lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not quarreling with anybody about lump-sum appropriations; I know they are an evil, and I should like to avoid them just as much as possible. I agree with the Senator from Utah on that proposition. I am willing to go as far as anyone else in providing a limitation. Anything that will come as nearly as possible in itemizing every particular part of every appropriation bill, I am willing to favor. I agree with the Senator from Utah and his colleague on that proposition.

However, I am going to offer an amendment, when we get this bill along in a parliamentary position so that it will be in order, which is in the nature of a lump-sum appropriation, although only $15,000 is involved in it. It is an item that has been previously carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill. I happen to know what is done and how the money is to be handled. I happen to be acquainted with the man who

handles it. I have talked with him about his work, which is conducted simply under a lump-sum appropriation.

I know that during the war, when it was very important to conduct the investigation that is provided for, the Secretary of Agriculture could not go out and fix his own limit as to the salary he would pay. I happen to know about the effort that was made to get some chemists to help out on the work, but the department was unable to get them because it could not compete in the open market in the way of salaries, the appropriation not being large, but if the Senator's colleague is right, the Secretary could have given the $15,000 all to one man.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is true.

Mr. NORRIS. And that man might have been a man who could neither read nor write. The intention of the law, of course, was that the matter should be handled by expert chemists; and I think it was so handled. It is left out of the bill now, I think, by inadvertence; it was not called to the attention of the committee, and I have no doubt that when the Members of the Senate realize its importance, they will put the item back in the bill. It is, however, a purely scientific proposition. Men of that class demand higher salaries, and ought to have higher salaries than are received by ordinary individuals, for they have spent years and years of their lives in preparation for this scientific work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that in almost all of the estimates that are made, even in the case of lump-sum appropriations, it is specifically stated for what they are to be expended when the estimate is sent to the committee. I have no doubt that as to the lump-sum appropriation which is now under discussion, when the department sent down an estimate for the amount they desired they also at the same time stated just how the money would be spent. The wording of this provision, however, does not require that the department shall follow the estimate. That is the trouble with lump-sum appropriations. Later, however, we frequently ascertain that the appropriation has not been spent in the way the committee was told that it would be.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that in the case of the Housing Corporation estimates were made for certain employees at $5,000 per annum, but they had not been in Government employ six months before their salaries were raised to $10,000. If there should be an investigation made, it will show how many such salaries have been increased. That was not because the law did not specifically provide that they should have $5,000 salaries as estimated for; but because there was no restriction whatever, and the salaries were raised from $5,000 to $10,000. This often happens and then the department comes in with a claim for a deficiency just at the end of the session, and we are required to make an appropriation to pay the expenses that have been incurred by the officials of the bureau or department. That is the evil of lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will give me his attention, I can now furnish him an itemized account of the purposes for which this money is to be used. The amendment has been adopted, but the Senator is entitled to whatever information on the subject I may have. Omitting the language as used in the bill, I will read a note from the department:

> There is an apparent increase in this item of $46,160, but taking into consideration the transfers to the statutory roll of two clerks at $1,320 each and one clerk of class 1, aggregating $3,840, the actual increase is $50,000.
>
> During the past few years the public demand for reliable information on the scientific and economic aspects of home problems has increased greatly. This has been due (a) to the increased cost of living and the shortage of many materials consumed in the home, and the consequent need for more careful choice and utilization; (b) to the increased instruction given in schools and colleges, due in part to the vocational education act and in part to the general interest in more practical education in our school system, and the consequent need on the part of teachers and students for more information than is available in standard reference books; and (c) to the rapid extension of the work of the home-demonstration agents now employed in all the States, 2,000 women being engaged in this work.

I think I have read enough so that the Senator will know for what purpose the appropriation is used. I shall be very glad to give him an itemized statement of the salaries paid. The salary of the chief home economics expert is $3,300 per annum; the next item is assistant chief, $2,700; specialist, $2,700; another specialist——

Mr. KING. How many specialists are there?

Mr. GRONNA. One specialist at $2,700, one specialist at $2,520, one at $2,400, one at $2,220, one at $2,040, one at $1,800, and one at $1,500. Then there is a specialist at $6 per diem and one at $5 per diem. Then, scientist assistant, $1,800; scientist assistant, $1,620, and so forth. Then, one clerk, at $1,620; one at $1,500, one at $1,320, one at $1,260, one at $1,200, and one at $1,000; messenger boy, $480; aids, messenger boys, student assistants, collaborators, and charwomen, $900 to $240, making a total of $56,390.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, that is all for salaries?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly; it is all for salaries.

Mr. KING. I understood the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to indicate that the appropriation was partly for bulletins, but I find that——

Mr. GRONNA. It is in part for the distribution of bulletins. The Senator from Mississippi is correct in that.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what appeared before the Committee on Agriculture, that they wanted to distribute bulletins throughout the country.

Mr. KING. But I understand that this entire appropriation is consumed by the employees, the aggregate amount paid each being stated by the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. So that the entire compensation is $76,280.

Mr. GRONNA. The entire compensation is $56,390. The difference between $76,280 and $56,390 is made up as follows:

Other objects of expenditure:	
Stationery	$800
Traveling expenses	3,600
Equipment and material	10,150
Miscellaneous items	5,340

Mr. KING. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is it permissible, without moving to reconsider, to offer an amendment to the amendment, it having been adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can move to reconsider. The Chair hardly knows what amendment the Senator desires to offer, and it is difficult to rule until that is known.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator submit his amendment?

Mr. KING. I offer the following amendment to the amendment. Add a proviso as follows:

> *Provided*, That no person employed under this provision shall be paid in excess of $2,500 a year, and not more than $35,000 shall be used in the payment of employees.

Let the farmers get some benefit, if possible, out of this appropriation, and not let a few officeholders eat it all up. The amendment I have suggested is a limitation on the appropriation, it seems to me, and therefore not subject to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to reconsidering the vote by which the amendment was adopted? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Secretary will state.

Mr. KING. I do not have the amendment in form that the Secretary can read it, so that I will state it again myself. I offer to amend the amendment by adding the following proviso:

> *Provided*, That no person employed under this provision shall be paid to exceed $2,500 per annum, and not more than $35,000 shall be used in the payment of employees.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator that instead of saying "to exceed $2,500" he say "at a rate to exceed $2,500." I think the Senator will see the importance of that.

Mr. KING. I accept the suggestion. I think it is a great improvement over my language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah as modified to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will not insist upon that amendment. I am told that the Chief of the Bureau of Home Economics is a very hard-working man, and there have been many appeals to the committee to increase his salary. He is receiving now $3,300 a year, and I think it would be a discrimination against this particular man, here on the floor of the Senate, without knowing whether we are working an injustice or not, to decrease his salary from $3,300 to $2,500.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator consent to the remainder of the amendment if I will change "$2,500" to "$3,300"?

Mr. GRONNA. The amount is so small, Mr. President, that I hardly think it is material. How much will be saved by the proposed change?

Mr. KING. I do not know what will be saved, but certainly there will not be as many officeholders.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah were adopted, would its effect be to change any statutory salary of any of the employees?

Mr. GRONNA. There are two assistants now receiving $2,700 a year each.

Mr. NORRIS. Then let me suggest to the Senator from Utah that he modify his amendment so that it will not apply to any person receiving a statutory salary already fixed by law. If he will do that I do not see any objection to the amendment.

Mr. KING. Will the chairman of the committee consider the amendment as pending and not finally acted upon, and I will redraft my amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Utah would simply say in his proviso that no person not on the statutory roll shall receive a salary more than at the rate of $2,500 per annum out of this fund, it seems to me that would cover it.

Mr. KING. Will the chairman consent that this item may be passed over and that we may recur to it later, so that in the meanwhile I may perfect my amendment?

Mr. GRONNA. I will be very glad to yield to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be temporarily passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with the lines of work of the States Relations Service, including the offices of the director, the chief clerk, the officers in charge of publications, library, accounts, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto, $14,180.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman the purpose of this appropriation. As I recall, this bill carries several million dollars for what is denominated States Relations Service, and provides compensation for a large number of employees. I see no reason, after carrying several million dollars and providing large sums for compensation, to add this additional sum. To whom is it to be paid?

Mr. GRONNA. I may say to the Senator that the estimate of the department was for $19,180. The House committee reduced it to $14,180. That action was approved by the House, and the Senate committee adopted the House provision.

Mr. KING. But the Senator, if he will pardon me, does not answer my question. There are millions of dollars carried by this bill for States Relations Service. Do not the preceding appropriations embrace the services that seem to be called for by this provision?

Mr. GRONNA. I can give the Senator the information which is to be found in the Book of Estimates on page 214. Of course, I am willing, Mr. President, to yield to the request of the Senator from Utah, and answer his questions, but it will take a number of weeks to complete this bill if it is the Senator's intention to attack every item in it, whether it involves an increase or a decrease by the Senate committee, and especially in the items for administrative purposes, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] suggests to me.

Mr. KING. There has nothing so far transpired that indicates a purpose on my part to attack every item in this bill. I have called attention to two or three. Probably if I did my full duty, I should attack all of the items, or some part of each item of this bill.

Mr. GRONNA. I find no fault whatever with the Senator's procedure, and I will say to him that this money is used for—

general administrative expenses connected with the lines of work of the States Relations Service, including the offices of director, the chief clerk, the officer in charge of publications, library, accounts, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto.

The Senator will find the authority for this in the act of July 2, 1862, volume 12, page 503. The estimates for this appropriation are as follows:

Salaries of employees: Agricultural physicist, $3,240; scientific assistant, $1,920; another assistant, $1,800; another assistant, $1,200; one clerk at $1,400, one at $1,200, another one at $1,200, one at $1,100, and two at $1,000; stationery, $1,100; traveling expenses, $350; equipment and material, $2,000; telephone and telegraph service, $500; miscellaneous items, $1,600. Total, $19,180. The House, after hearings were held, allowed $14,180.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will indulge me a moment, I find on page 71, under the heading of "States Relations Service," provisions for salaries, States Relations Service. It proceeds to appropriate for a director, $4,500; a chief clerk, $2,000; one clerk or chief accountant, $2,400; and so on down; 36 clerks of class 1, 3 clerks of a different class, 39 clerks of a different class, and 31 clerks of a different class; a number of employees, perhaps two or three or four hundred, being provided for there.

Then, on page 73, I find an appropriation of $751,280, which provides compensation for a multitude of employees under the States Relations Service.

Then following, on the same page, there is an item of $645,040 to pay employees of this bureau or department of the Government.

On the next page we find there is an item of $2,500,000.

On the bottom of the page there is a further appropriation, extending over on to page 75, of $20,600 to pay the expenses of this service.

Then following, on the same page, for expenses and salaries under this branch of the public service, there is appropriated $215,000, $75,000, $50,000, $50,000, $25,000, and $15,000 additional. On the next page there is $10,000 additional, and then the $76,280 item which the Senate passed upon a moment ago.

So that there is appropriated under this general heading, the greater portion of which is for compensation, $5,935,820, less $14,180. After appropriating that large sum this small item of $14,180 is asked for additional compensation. It seems to me that the compensation for which this is sought is to cover items that properly might be classified and are classified in some of the other appropriations to which I have invited the attention of the Senator. It seems to be a duplication and a piling up of items upon other items, and in a sort of indirect manner getting additional appropriations for other employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the head of "Bureau of Markets," on page 83, after line 21, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect until their termination, the provisions of the proclamations of the President of June 18 and September 6, 1918, and the regulations thereunder, relating to the stockyards industry, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $75,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if that item was called to the attention of the House committee?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not know whether it was or not, Mr. President. I think I may say to the Senator that not exactly this amount, but the same provision, went out on a point of order. If the Senator will give me his attention, I shall give him the information regarding this appropriation.

Under the President's proclamations of June 18 and September 6, 1918, there was turned over to this specific bureau $285,000 for investigations to be made in the stockyards. The committee was told that splendid work has been done. This investigation has been productive of much good; and when I say to the Senator that I have personally seen one check—and I think the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will bear me out; I think he saw it—for $992 returned to one shipper because of overcharges made by these commission men, I think the Senator will agree that this provision has some merit. The Secretary of Agriculture asked $150,000 for this purpose. We heard a Mr. Hall, who has this work in charge, and he satisfied the committee—I think every member of the committee—that this was a most useful investigation, and that the work ought to be continued; that discriminations and overcharges had been made against shippers, people from the Senator's own country as well as from other parts of the United States, and they expect to compel these men to return thousands and thousands of dollars of money and profits which they have taken from the pockets of the people. The $75,000 is to be used for that purpose.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me? Do I understand that it is the Railroad Administration that has been discriminating against the shippers and robbing them?

Mr. GRONNA. It is the commission men in the stockyards who have made overcharges for feed and for yardage and other services.

Mr. KING. Then do I understand that the idea of the Senator is that the Federal Government should take charge of the contractual relations between vendors and vendees of stock——

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. KING (continuing). And should ascertain whether good bargains or bad bargains were made, or whether too much was charged or too little was charged for shipment?

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will not try to put me in that kind of a position. The Senator knows that during the war it was important to supervise all of these industries. Congress very properly gave the President all those powers. The President very properly issued his proclamations on the dates which I have named, and gave instructions that supervision and strict regulation should be made in these industrial centers; and that work was carried out. The work is not completed. It is possible that it may be completed within the next five or six months. It seems to me that it is a splendid investment for the people of the United States to see that this work is carried to completion.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have learned sufficiently, in my experience here, that to challenge successfully the action of committees which report appropriations is a very difficult thing. Indeed, the appropriation bills which are reported are usually increased upon the floor, instead of decreased.

I do not think any assault that could be made upon this appropriation would succeed. At the same time, I want to

express my disapproval of this apparent determination of the Federal Government, and of this department particularly—I say "particularly" because we have evidence of it in this bill—to interfere with the private activities of individuals, and to exercise a sort of supervisory care over the business relations existing between individuals and between individuals and corporations. The employees of this department seem to proceed upon the theory that the people are incompetent to deal with themselves and for themselves, that they need guardians, and that some man in Washington, getting a few thousand dollars or $10,000 a year can become an effective guardian for the poor, benighted people of the United States. We are so weak, so incompetent to deal with the affairs which are entrusted to our hands, or with our own business affairs, that we must come to the Federal Government, to the multitude of employees who are found throughout the land, and ask for their advice and their assistance.

The whole policy is wrong. It is belittling the American people. It is an arraignment and an indictment of the intelligence of the people of the United States. It presupposes that we must be kept in apron strings, and that the United States Government must be the guardian of the people in all sections of the land.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me just a moment, perhaps I did not make myself clear. The Senator knows as well as I do, of course, that during the war it was important to have a strict supervision not only over the cattle industry, the packing plants, and the wool industry, but over all other industries. It was a very important matter. I think the Senator will agree with me in that. This was a war measure. It was undertaken by the President during the war, and, as I said a moment ago, he set aside $285,000 for this purpose. That fund has been exhausted. The department wants to compete the work. The Senator knows how certain men in certain centers profiteered on wool. The Senator, of course, is aware of that. They are making an investigation with reference to the prices and the excess profits which these men have made on wool, and thousands of dollars have been refunded by some of these commission firms from the excess profits which they have made on wool. Does the Senator believe it is a mistake for us to do that?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not know to what particular item the Senator addresses his question. I do not assent to the proposition, if I understood the Senator correctly, that the Government of the United States during the period of the war was intrusted with the superintendence of all of those matters to which the Senator called attention. We did pass the food-control bill. We passed the bill with respect to fuel control. Aside from those two measures, I recall no other bill that authorized the Government of the United States to enter into the business affairs and to control the activities of the people. There may be some other measures which, as I am speaking hurriedly, have escaped my recollection; but I repeat that the idea exists to-day in the departments—fostered by some people, too—that the Government can govern people better than they can govern themselves, and that all power is centered here in Washington, and that when we are touched with the oil of anointing that comes from some clerk or some executive official, then our salvation, material and otherwise, is assured. It is a pernicious doctrine; and the sooner we repudiate it and reestablish the old American doctrine of individualism, self-initiative, self-reliance, and the development of local self-government the better it will be for the American people, the better it will be for this Republic, and the better will the example be for the entire world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 85, line 16, after the word "vegetables," to strike out "poultry, butter, and hay" and insert "and other perishable farm products," and in line 17, after the word "received," to strike out "in interstate commerce," so as to make the clause read:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, and other perishable farm products when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 12, after the word "elsewhere," to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$50,100," so as to make the clause read:

Administration of the United States warehouse act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States warehouse act, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $50,100.

Mr. KING. I notice that the Senate committee, carrying out the principles of economy for which the Republican Party now stands, has stricken out the provision of $35,000 included in the bill by the House and increased it to $50,100. Since the House made an examination and was satisfied with the lesser amount, does the Senator from North Dakota think it should be increased?

Mr. GRONNA. I do think it should be increased. It has reference to the warehousing act, as I understand it. If the Senator wants a full explanation, I can either give it from the Book of Estimates or, if he will defer a moment, we can pass over the amendment temporarily, and I will have the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] explain it very fully.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will say he personally has examined it and finds the House committee was mistaken and that the demands of the department ought to be acceded to, I will abate any further opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from North Dakota will not say that the House was mistaken. The Senator from North Dakota will say that the department has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Senate committee that we ought to allow them $50,100, the amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. KING. I want to say to the Senator that if the department asked for it and stated that it was necessary it would not be very persuasive with me.

I want to ask the Senator about the item found in lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, on page 88, $598,600.

Mr. GRONNA. That is to carry out the United States grain-standards act?

Mr. KING. Yes. What proportion of that appropriation is for salaries? And if the Senator will answer that I will ask another question. What is the limitation placed upon the salaries paid and upon the number of employees?

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, that is expended under the supervision of the Chief of the Bureau of Markets. There is a full statement of it in the Book of Estimates. I will put that into the RECORD, I will say to the Senator, if that will satisfy him, it being a fully itemized statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. KENYON. I would like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he has any end in sight for the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator I believe we can finish it in an hour.

Mr. KENYON. Then I will ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I directed attention——

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York for a moment?

Mr. KING. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from New York can not be here all the afternoon and there is an item in the bill which we passed and which he wishes to have reconsidered. I have no objection to taking that action. I think it should be reconsidered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The item to which I desire to refer is near the top of page 17, being the proviso, which read as the House passed it:

That of the sum thus appropriated $36,940 may be used for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes.

The Senate committee has stricken out that language, thereby destroying that bureau completely. I think it would be a very grave error to give up that work. The Government has embarked upon it in three districts in the United States—one in Kentucky, with headquarters at Lexington; another in the Virginias, with headquarters at Front Royal; and another in northern New England, with headquarters in the State of Vermont. This breeding program has been commenced and

is well on its way and is being popularized among the farmers in the neighborhood of these stations. If the item is not included, the stallions will be withdrawn and the whole project abandoned.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask the Senator from New York if this question does not properly come before the Committee on Military Affairs? This item has reference to experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes. The Government, as the Senator probably knows, has such a station in Montana and one in Kentucky. Was the question of breeding of horses taken up at those stations?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is for the Army itself, on a very small scale by comparison. It has always been under the Department of Agriculture and is operated upon a different basis entirely. The farmers all through the neighborhood are encouraged to breed and raise good horses, and the Government offers to purchase from the farmers the result of the foal at a fixed price at the age of 3 years. Hundreds and hundreds of farmers have gone into that work with the Government, and if this item is stricken out the whole thing is wrecked.

Mr. CURTIS. How many years has it been carried on?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think since 1913.

I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that if the proviso is restored and still the $40,000 to be used for an investigation of the so-called "soft pork" problem is kept in as a committee amendment, a change will be necessary in the total of the appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. I understand the total would have to be increased $36,940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). Does the Senator from New York ask to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted, in lines 3 and 4, on page 17.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope it will not be agreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the total be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from North Dakota that the clerks at the desk be instructed to make the necessary corrections in all totals.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill if it would seriously inconvenience him if I should take this opportunity to make a few remarks upon Senate resolution 76?

Mr. GRONNA. It will not.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	McNary	Smith, Md.
Ball	Harding	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harris	Myers	Smoot
Calder	Henderson	New	Spencer
Capper	Hitchcock	Newberry	Stanley
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Swanson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Thomas
Curtis	Kenyon	Phelan	Trammell
Dial	Keyes	Pittman	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Edge	Knox	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	La Follette	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Lenroot	Sheppard	Warren
Fernald	McCormick	Sherman	Watson
Fletcher	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ga.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

On the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Chair lays before the Senate Senate resolution 76, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations on the 12th instant, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States in declaring, pursuant to its exclusive authority under the Constitution, the existence of a state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government, solemnly affirmed that the Imperial Government has so "committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States" that a state of war had been thrust upon them by that Government, and thereupon formally pledged the whole military and national resources of the country "to bring the conflict to a successful termination"; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States, being a coequal part of the treaty-making power of this Government, and therefore coequally responsible for any treaty which is concluded and ratified, is deeply concerned over the draft treaty of peace negotiated at Versailles by which it is proposed to end our victorious war and is gravely impressed by the fact that its provisions appear calculated to force upon us undesirable and far-reaching covenants inimical to our free institutions under the penalty that failing to accept these we shall continue in a state of war while our cobelligerents shall be at peace and enjoying its blessings; that it is proposed to make us parties to a league of nations, under a plan as to which the people of the United States have had neither time to examine and consider nor opportunity to express regarding it a matured and deliberate judgment, whereas the treaty may be easily so drawn as to permit the making of immediate peace, leaving the question of the establishment of a league of nations for later determination; and that the treaty as drawn contains principles, guaranties, and undertakings obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations, oppressive of weak nations and peoples, and destructive of human progress and liberty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States will regard as fully adequate for our national needs and as completely responsive to the duties and obligations we owe to our cobelligerents and to humanity, a peace treaty which shall assure to the United States and its people the attainment of those ends for which we entered the war, and that it will look with disfavor upon all treaty provisions going beyond these ends.

2. That since the people of the United States have themselves determined and provided in their Constitution the only ways in which the Constitution may be amended, and since amendment by treaty stipulation is not one of the methods which the people have so prescribed, the treaty-making power of the United States has no authority to make a treaty which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States, and the Senate of the United States can not advise and consent to any treaty provision which would have such effect, if enforced.

3. That the Senate advises, in accordance with its constitutional right and duty, that the great paramount, if not sole, duty of the peace conference is quickly to bring all the belligerents a full and complete peace; that to this end the treaty shall be so drawn as to permit any nation to reserve without prejudice to itself for future separate and full consideration by its people the question of any league of nations, that neither such an article nor the exercise of the rights reserved thereunder, whether at the time of signature, the time of ratification, or at any other time, shall affect the substance of the obligations of Germany and its cobelligerents under the treaty, nor the validity of signature and ratification on their behalf; and that any indispensable participation by the United States in matters covered by the league covenant shall, pending the entry of the United States into the league, be accomplished through diplomatic commissions which shall be created with full power in the premises.

4. That this resolution indicates and gives notice of the limits of the present obligations against the United States in which the Senate of the United States is now prepared to acquiesce by consenting to the ratification of a treaty embodying peace conditions that may be found otherwise acceptable to its judgment, and that the adoption by the peace conference of the foregoing reasonable limitations and positions will facilitate the early acceptance of the treaty of peace by the Senate of the United States, will in no wise interfere with the league of nations as between these countries prepared to ratify the treaty without further consideration and will afford such a manifestation of real respect for the wishes of a great people as can not fail more firmly to cement the friendship already existing between ourselves and our cobelligerents.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I feel justified in asking of my associates the courtesy that is usually extended to a Senator who has made careful preparation of the remarks he is about to submit. I have analyzed and shall undertake to explain in detail the resolution itself, the purposes for which it is drawn, and some of the arguments which tend to its support.

Mr. President, one point I must make at the outset, for it is vital and fundamental not only to all that I shall say, but likewise to all that any other Senator has said or shall say during this debate: The resolution before us does not call for a vote for or against the league of nations; it does not call for even an expression of an opinion either for or against the league. On these points this resolution is wholly colorless. This resolution asks merely and solely that the treaty embodying the league shall be in words so framed that the Senate may advise and consent to that part of it which shall bring us peace, and that it may reserve for further consideration that part of it by which it is proposed to make us a part of a projected league of nations; and this is done in order that the Senate, the coequal partner in the treaty-making power of the United States, may have time to consider the league in all its aspects, and that the sovereign people of the United States, whose agents and representatives the Executive and ourselves are, shall have opportunity maturely to deliberate upon it before by our votes we fasten it upon them. For, whether good or bad, this league, once entered upon and perpetuated, will, under the compelling force of the combined armies and navies of the whole world, control our destiny from now down through the full remaining period of recorded time.

It can not be that this mere request by the Senate for an opportunity fully to study and consider this tremendous question is unreasonable, nor can it be that a request that the sovereign people of the United States shall have full and equal opportunity calmly to deliberate and decide upon this measure is unreasonable. This being the situation to which this resolution brings us, a vote against it is a vote to deny the right of the Senate to have time to consider this momentous question, is a vote to deny the right of the people calmly and fully to

consider this great problem, the greatest which has been put before them since, through the terrible arbitrament of the sword, with all its attendant miseries and woes, it was determined that this Union was one and inseparable.

That such is the effect, and the only effect, of the resolution no one will, I take it, attempt successfully to deny, and it is my purpose to do what I am able to the end that the people of our great Nation shall be equally advised that this is the full and the only issue now before us. This is the whole question. You may take it, Senators, and make the most of it.

One word more before I begin my discussion proper; charges are made here in the Senate and elsewhere that it is planned to make of the support or opposition to the proposed league a party issue; it is said that such a situation would be both unfortunate and iniquitous, because the adoption or the rejection of the league, being a matter touching our foreign relations and intercourse, should be approached and disposed of free from party bias on grounds of the broadest and most unselfish patriotism. With this in mind there are those who, failing to perceive the precise issues involved in the adoption of the resolution now before us, have made like charges as to the support or opposition to it.

Somewhat experienced in the ills and embarrassments suffered by the executive branch from opposition (for partisan purposes) to legitimate national activities, I fully sympathize with the position that in foreign affairs we should present a firm and united front. If, therefore, opposition or support of the league becomes a party issue in this country, it will not be upon my initiative nor with my partisan support. But if Senators on the other side continue as a party to oppose all efforts to secure full consideration of this great matter, if they do not cease to listen to and to obey the mere fiat of a partisan Executive, if they remain firm in their stand against the constitutional right of the Senate fully and fairly to consider this question upon its merits, and if they persist in their denial of the sovereign right of the people to deliberate upon and reach a determination concerning it, if this, sir, is to be the party attitude of Senators who oppose, then I say here and now, in all soberness, I shall be the last to shrink from the issue which they so force. And I will say further, if to stand for the rights of the Senate as a coequal part of the treaty-making power is a manifestation of partisanship, then I am a partisan; if to demand that the people of the United States shall have a right to make up their own minds as to whether or not we shall put ourselves under the domination of the balance of the world; if to regard our free institutions as the greatest instrumentalities of government which the world now possesses and therefore worthy of preservation over all others which exist in the world; if to love my own country and our own people with my whole heart and soul above and beyond all other countries and peoples of the world—if these things are manifestation of partisanship, then, thank God, I am a partisan. Senators of the opposition, you may make this a partisan issue if you choose, but if you do you must pay to the American people and to their posterity throughout all time the penalty which they will exact.

But, Mr. President, I come to the subject at the present time wholly and simply as a plain American citizen filled with a zeal to do what is best and wisest for his country. I am at this time concerned only with the simple issue before us—shall we have time to consider this covenant before we advise and consent to its ratification? This is our present problem, and this is all of it. With the wisdom or the unwisdom of the treaty covenants, I am not now concerned. I shall not attempt to peer into the future either to fathom the abysmal depths to which it may sink us nor to explore the transcendent heights to which we may by it be raised. These are for future consideration. It is for time and opportunity to go to the depths or to climb to the heights that I am now urging this resolution upon the attention of the Senate.

What I want now to secure is what the whole people of the United States ardently wish—peace, immediate and permanent peace. Six long, weary months have been consumed by the peace conference at Paris in merely drawing the peace terms that are to be forced upon our enemies, six long, weary months of secret quibbling, bartering, and quarreling. There have been times when it seemed that we nations who entered the conference sworn friends might leave it bitter enemies and this unhappy contingency is not yet put from us. To these six months must be added another during which our crushed and fallen enemies have been considering whether or not, at the penalty of an invasion and occupation of their territory, they would sign the treaty so drawn. And still we wait. Meanwhile Europe is in turmoil, to the point of anarchy and chaos. Our own country remains in a technical status of war, under irksome laws inimical to our freedom. Influences hostile to our Government and its institutions thrive and propagate; socialists, Bolshevists, and anarchists feed, fatten, and grow to threatening proportions on the fears of the people. The people themselves are torn by uncertainties and dread, and industry and commerce lag and wait. We must, sir, have peace—a wise and permanent peace, and to get this we must have the wisdom of the Senate as well as the wisdom of the Executive. As the resolution before us has been proposed to facilitate and insure, so far as this is humanly possible, the making of such a right peace, I shall pass now to its consideration.

The first paragraph of the preamble of this resolution recites merely the fact of the declaration of war, the reason why we went to war, and the ends sought by the war as stated in that declaration. The first paragraph of the resolution proper states that the Senate—

> Will regard as fully adequate for our national needs and as completely responsive to the duties and obligations we owe to our cobelligerents and to humanity, a peace treaty which shall assure to the United States and its people the attainment of those ends for which we entered the war, and that it will look with disfavor upon all treaty provisions going beyond these ends.

I can not conceive that these paragraphs can be the basis of serious objection from any person. The sovereign people of the United States have placed the exclusive authority to declare war in the hands of the Congress. An exercise of this power necessarily and inevitably involves the power to pass upon the reasons and the motives for going to war, as to the sufficiency of which Congress alone is the judge. It is a necessary corrolary to this that Congress alone can determine and declare what the ends sought by the war shall be. Moreover, no other branch of government is concerned in the exercise of this function of government. War being declared, the Chief Executive must, on the one hand, conduct it as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and he must also, as the Chief Executive, enforce under his peace-time powers the laws of the United States. On the other hand, the judiciary exercises its regular functions in judging the laws which may be passed either in due course or by virtue of the status of war. But neither of these branches of government has any necessary constitutional function to perform in determining whether or not we have a cause of war, what that cause is, or with declaring war or declaring to what ends it shall be prosecuted. These, I repeat, are matters for Congress, and for Congress alone.

This being true, it is not possible for the judiciary or the Executive to determine what shall be the ends sought by the war. Members of those branches of government may in the exercise of their rights as American citizens express their views on these subjects, but such views or expressions are binding neither upon the Congress nor the Nation.

In the present instance Congress declared that by repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States, the Imperial German Government had thrust upon us a status of war and we pledged the whole military and national resources of the country to bring the conflict to a victorious termination. These acts of war committed against the United States and its citizens were, all of them that were of substance, incident to a violation of the rights of navigation as established under international law, rights flouted by the Imperial German Government, which announced its deliberate intention to continue the course it had begun. The rights violated and this declaration of intention to continue the violation made it indispensable that a "successful termination" of the war involved removing forever the German menace to our peace. Therefore these were the things and none others for which Congress declared war, for which we sent our sons to the battle fields; and the people, through their duly elected representatives and agents, have declared this to be our war aim. This is the full limit which they have authorized their Government, or any branch of it, to go. Efforts of some months since to secure plenipotentiary powers from the people of the United States to go further and beyond this ended in conspicuous failure amounting to repudiation.

In view of these circumstances I take it that this part of the resolution can not be the subject of fair and honest criticism.

I pass now to a consideration of the second branch of the resolution, which provides:

> That since the people of the United States have themselves determined and provided in their Constitution the only ways in which the Constitution may be amended, and since amendment by treaty stipulation is not one of the methods which the people have so prescribed, the treaty-making power of the United States has no authority to make a treaty which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States, and the Senate of the United States can not advise and consent to any treaty provision which would have such effect if enforced.

I can not believe it necessary on this point to take the time of the Senate to read the provisions of the Constitution governing this matter, nor to labor an argument upon the fundamental

soundness of the principle stated, which indeed is a constitutional axiom. Some question, however, has been raised as to the nature and extent of the application of this principle to the present situation.

In my remarks of March 1 last, concerning the league of nations, I asserted that certain of the league provisions were unconstitutional because containing unauthorized derogations from our sovereignty. I am advised that the soundness of this position has been challenged, and that my challengers have reasoned the matter in this wise: Since absolute sovereignty involves an uncontrolled exercise of the arbitrary, unreasoning sovereign will, therefore any and all of the limitations imposed upon sovereignty by reason of the necessities of international intercourse and relations is a derogation of that sovereignty; that since the treaty-making power of the United States is endowed with authority to make treaties governing our relations with other countries in matters which derogate from our absolute sovereignty, therefore the treaty-making power may legitimately and constitutionally make treaties which may derogate from our sovereignty, and that finally, the foregoing premises being viewed as sound, the conclusion is drawn that since the treaty-making power may so make treaties which derogate from sovereignty in certain matters, it may make treaties which derogate from sovereignty in any matter that it elects.

The difficulty, sir, with this argument is that it proves too much. The syllogism is a false one.

It is perfectly true that Congress can make treaties which derogate from our national sovereignty, can bind us to do things and not to do things, as to which as sovereign we lay, prior to the treaty, under no obligation. It is also true that the line between what the treaty-making power may do and what it may not do is in many places indistinctly traced. It passes through regions of twilight, which it has not thus far been necessary to explore. But there are certain definite things which we all concede that the treaty-making power may do and there are certain other things which I take it we will all agree the treaty-making power may not do. For example, I assume that no one will be bold enough to say that the Executive and the Senate could by treaty provide that King George of England should be President of the United States; or that the House of Lords should stand in lieu of and perform the functions of the Senate of the United States; or that the House of Commons should take the place of the House of Representatives of the United States with authority "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises," "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," "to coin money," or "to declare war," "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," or "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;" and if the treaty-making power may not by treaty confer such authority upon the House of Commons, it may not by the same token confer it upon any other body which may exist in the world. I am not now concerned with the situation which would confront us if under the heel of a victorious foe, imposing upon us his will and his sovereignty, the treaty-making power of the United States should in the dire necessity of defeat act as a constituent assembly, and, as the functioning government instrumentality, make a treaty which should surrender our sovereignty, because, sir, this is not our position now, and, pray God, it may never be. When that unhappy time comes we shall face it as we must. We stand now victorious, and as victors our constitutional bodies move in their regular and appointed orbits. We have now only those powers with which the sovereign people of the United States have endowed us. Standing in this position and having these limitations, it is right that we should proclaim to the people, whose servants we are, that we know our powers and the extent of our authority, and it is but fair to those who negotiate with us at the peace table that they should likewise be made aware of the extent of our power and of the limitations of our authority, as they are set forth in this resolution.

In this view I take it there can be no question as to the propriety of the inclusion of this clause.

Before passing to the discussion of the third clause of the resolution, I wish to say a few words regarding the final clause of the second paragraph of the preamble which declares "that the treaty as drawn contains principles, guaranties, and undertakings obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations, oppressive of weak nations and peoples, and destructive of human progress and liberty."

Right here let me interpolate that several of my associates upon the floor have inquired whether I mean that the treaty, having regard to its other provisions, is meant, or the league. I mean the league. Technically it is correctly stated, because the league is a part of the treaty; but I wish, in order to clear the minds of those Senators who have made the inquiry, distinctly to state that I have reference to the league.

Senators have asked me to designate those features of the treaty which justify this arraignment. I hasten to give some of them, sufficient to demonstrate that the charge as drawn is true.

As the covenant is now framed it contains the pernicious provisions embodied in article 10, which are designed to fix through all time—and merit is made of this purpose of the provision—the boundaries set up by the treaty of peace. It is no secret that these boundaries are already, though not yet fixed other than in contemplation, the subject of serious complaint and even of dispute. Peoples are objecting to their disposition by this treaty, which once more hands them about as mere pawns in a game of chess, and those who are so objecting are not our sworn enemies over whom we stand victors, but our friends, our allies, our equals in this undertaking and in their rights to enjoy the benefits of its happy fruition. No matter what may be the desires of these discontented peoples in the future, no matter what race affinities may be hereafter worked out, no matter what their real interest may demand or a wise statesmanlike handling of their affairs would counsel, their boundaries stand fixed, subject to readjustment under such covenant procedure as would make futile any hope of change.

Could any scheme more "obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations" be concocted?

Moreover, word has within the last week come from Paris that upon complaint of certain of the smaller Balkan powers, as to provisions of the treaty affecting them, our own Chief Executive has warned them that it was proposed under the covenant so to control their domestic affairs that minorities within their jurisdiction should be handled as the league saw fit and not as the States themselves might deem expedient. In other words, the proposal is to set up this league as a mentor over the small nations of the earth with power to compel them to do as the league wishes, to travel along the roads that the league points out, and to reach that destiny alone to which the league consents. Is not such a plan sufficiently "oppressive of weak nations and peoples"? And in this connection it may be well worth while to have in mind the announcement from Paris that our President has declared the Irish question—the political dynamite of the whole Anglo-Saxon race—might properly be the subject of consideration by the league when established, and of the suggestion heard in the United States that, by a parity of reasoning, it may be contended that the Negro question of the United States—for we have such a question, vital, far-reaching, and ominous—might receive a like consideration.

I come now to the third clause of the resolution, which asks for and shows how we may be given time fully to consider the far-reaching plan which is to be placed before us for our action. In the first clause of this paragraph "the Senate *advises*, in accordance with its constitutional right and duty, that the great paramount, if not sole, duty of the peace conference is quickly to bring to all the belligerents a full and complete peace."

Question has been made in some quarters of the nature and extent of the advisory powers of the Senate in treaty making. As it is a subject not without difficulty and not without previous discussion and explanation, I would commend to the attention of the Senators on the other side the views expressed by the late Senator Bacon, of Georgia, in 1906. It will give enlightenment, even though not comfort, to those who contend for a ministerial paucity of senatorial right in the making of treaties.

This is not the time, nor is this the occasion, to enter into an extended discussion of this subject, but I assure you that an examination of the records will show that from the earliest days of our Republic the Chief Executives, beginning with Washington, have not only regarded the Senate as possessing real functions of deliberation over the terms of the treaty, but have also regarded it as proper, desirable, and consistent with the mutual rights involved, to consult the Senate even before negotiations have been undertaken. Such was the course followed by Washington in 1790 before negotiating treaties with the Creek Indians and with the Cherokee Indians, and as to a boundary treaty with Great Britain and a treaty with Algiers in 1792 for ransoming American captives. In 1818 President Monroe asked whether the Senate thought he could make an agreement regarding armament on the Great Lakes, and in case they thought he could not he asked them to advise and consent to an agreement, and they so consented.

In 1830 Jackson inquired whether he should sign a proposed treaty with the Indians, and the Senate advised him not to make or to ratify the treaty. Jackson again approached the Senate in 1831 as to protesting against an arbitral award regarding a boundary dispute with Great Britain, and the Senate advised the President to communicate to Great Britain that the United States

declined to adopt the boundary awarded. In 1846 President Polk submitted a British proposal regarding the Oregon treaty for the Senate's "consideration" and "advice," stating that he would "conform" his "action to their advice." He likewise, in the same year, approached the Senate regarding peace negotiations with Mexico, suggesting a certain course which the Senate stated "receives the approbation of the Senate."

In 1861 President Buchanan submitted to the Senate a British proposal to arbitrate our northwest boundaries, with a statement that "before accepting this proposition I have thought it wise to take the advice of the Senate," and asking, "Will the Senate approve a treaty" incorporating certain terms specified? Later, in the same year, President Lincoln repeated Buchanan's inquiry regarding this arbitration. In 1862 Lincoln submitted "to the Senate for its advice" a copy of a proposed treaty for a loan to Mexico, upon which the Senate resolved that the "Senate express the opinion that it is not advisable to negotiate a treaty" of the kind suggested.

In 1873 President Grant submitted a British proposition regarding an adjustment of differences in connection with the Geneva Convention of 1873 and requested an "expression by the Senate of their disposition in regard to advising and consenting to the formal adoption of an article such as is proposed by the British Government," the President declaring that he desired "counsel in advance in agreeing to the proposal of Great Britain." In 1874 Grant again communicated with the Senate, this time regarding a draft of a reciprocity agreement with Canada. He expressed an "earnest wish that the Senate may be able to consider and determine before the adjournment of Congress whether it will give its constitutional concurrence to the conclusion of a treaty with Great Britain for the purposes already named, either in such form as is proposed by the British plenipotentiaries or in such other more acceptable form as the Senate may prefer." And in 1884 President Arthur transmitted "for the consideration of the Senate and appropriate action thereon" a report of the Secretary of State containing a proposal from Hawaii to extend the period of the reciprocity treaty of 1884. The President deemed "it fitting to consult the Senate in the matter before directing the negotiations to proceed."

Moreover, whenever and so often as the Senate itself proposes amendments to a treaty already negotiated and signed, it *advises* by such act the Federal Executive before a treaty is concluded; and, moreover, thus gives in advance its advice and consent to a treaty negotiated in accordance with the terms which the Senate itself lays down.

In the face of these precedents running over practically the whole course of our history, I deem it unnecessary further to contend for the constitutional right of the Senate to *advise* the President in the present negotiations as to the sort of treaty which it regards as desirable. I must therefore assume that no constitutional objection can be raised to these clauses.

The next clause of the third resolution which requires our attention reads, "that to this end," the bringing of an early peace to all belligerents, "the treaty shall be so drawn as to permit any nation to reserve without prejudice to itself for future separate and full consideration by its people the question of any league of nations, that neither such an article nor the exercise of the rights reserved thereunder, whether at the time of signature, the time of ratification, or at any other time, shall affect the substance of the obligations of Germany and its cobelligerents under the treaty, nor the validity of signature and ratification upon their behalf."

This clause is designed to set out the diplomatic procedure, the treaty mechanism, by and through which we may be able to secure without embarrassment to ourselves or to our allies, and without advantage to our enemy, the time and the opportunity to discuss the covenant of the league of nations. Thus this is the real crux of the entire resolution.

To proceed with the discussion of the resolution: I have been asked the meaning of the final clause of paragraph 3, reading "that any indispensable participation by the United States in matters covered by the league covenant shall, pending the entry of the United States into the league, be accomplished through diplomatic commissions which shall be created with full power in the premises." The answer to that question is this: If it should be the duty of the United States as one of the cobelligerents and a party to the treaty of peace to cooperate with the other cobelligerents to enforce any of the terms of peace that would require our cooperation as a cosignatory, and if by the terms of the treaty there is delegated to the league of nations any function, in respect to such terms, that should require the cooperation of the United States, then under this resolution our country's cooperation with the league would be accomplished through a commission or other diplomatic agency which is wholly in accord with existing international usage.

As to the whole of the third paragraph, I admit that the course proposed would result in a separate consideration and treatment of the peace terms as distinguished from the covenant of the league, but in explanation and as sufficient justification I adopt as quite adequate the statement of an unnamed American delegate to the peace conference, who (so reports the Associated Press) "in replying to an inquiry why the covenant of the league of nations had been published, said that while the covenant was part of the treaty, it does not actually deal with the terms of peace and consequently is essentially of a different character."

I submit that to this point I have demonstrated, first, that the only issue reached by this resolution is whether or not the treaty should be so drawn that without interfering with the terms and the making of peace we shall have full opportunity to deliberate upon the covenant of the league of nations; that the resolution offered with the view to bringing such a situation about is sound and accurate in its recitals; that it sets forth as to the ends and purposes of the war only what the Congress has declared in its exclusive authority; that it lays down a fundamental constitutional principle by which the people of the United States have declared that we must act in our treaty-making capacity; that it offers to the Executive as to the conclusion of an early peace advice in strict accord with the Senate's constitutional prerogatives; and that it points out a definite way by which the end sought, deliberation upon the covenant provisions, may be facilitated.

In this view the only question remaining for our consideration is whether or not the covenant of the league of nations contains any provisions requiring that maturity of thought and deliberation for which an opportunity is by this resolution requested.

In a certain aspect the answer to this question is not without difficulty. When the covenant in its original form was first proclaimed to the American people it was heralded by its proponents as a plan for the organization of a great world state which was to compel the obedience not only of its constituent members, but of all others who might be outside and beyond its pale. We were told "armed force is in the background of this program, but it is in the background, and if the moral force of the world will not suffice, the physical force of the world shall. But that is the last resort, because this is intended as a constitution of peace, not as a league of war."

But when the people of the United States and when we here in the Senate began calmly to consider the plan proposed and to look beneath the unctious phrases in which it was couched, some apprehension began to be felt that possibly after all there was a legitimate question as to whether this was "a constitution of peace, not * * * a league of war," and I myself had the honor of pointing out that in this alleged instrument of peace war was legalized in seven cases and made compulsory in three. The result of these investigations and discussions by those who had no personal or selfish ends or ambitions to serve by an advocacy of the league caused its proponents to veer in their course, and they then began to speak of the league as a purely deliberative organization without any considerable administrative or executive powers. Indeed, so far did these expressions go that one could believe the covenant created nothing but a debating club in which eloquent members might exhibit to an admiring world their forensic or other abilities. At the same time an impression was insinuated into the minds of the people that if and in so far as the covenant failed to provide for such an organization, it would be so amended as to insure it. In other words, while the plan had been heralded as a guaranty to the war-sick peoples of the world as a guaranty that war should come no more, it was not proclaimed as a society in which men might deprecate the horrors of war.

Of course, if the proposed plan is not what its terms on their face would seem to indicate, if after all the peoples of the world are being misled in this matter by a hope which it is not even intended they should realize, if this is a cheat, a trick, and a swindle, with its promoters conscious that it is such, it must be contemptuously tossed aside without further consideration. It is because of this possibility which has been gradually insinuated into the minds of the people that I have said the matter was not free from doubt.

But if, on the other hand, the plan is intended to be a living plan, instinct with mighty powers—whether for good or for evil—then it behooves us to face it as men and carefully and calmly to deliberate upon its provisions and determine our course with respect thereto. I am proceeding on the theory that the covenant is not to be a cadaver, but a living, operating body.

I have already on a previous occasion taken the time of the Senate in pointing out that the plan as first proposed not

only did not abolish or prevent wars but sanctioned and commanded them, thus giving the lie to the hope of the people that the covenant was to make future war impossible. I have shown how it strikes down our great constitutional principles, bulwarks of our protection; how it robs us of most vital attributes of sovereignty and threatens our independence and life.

Since then the covenant has undergone a reconsideration and a redrafting, and thus refurbished it is again presented semi-officially to the people of the United States for their consideration. Once more I have carefully examined the covenant in its new form, but only to find that instead of having my previously expressed doubts removed, those already entertained are much augmented and others not heretofore held are raised.

But it seems not necessary now to take the time of the Senate to discuss these matters in their detail, for it is my sole present purpose to do no more than support my contention that the treaty is overflowing with matters which demand a consideration that shall be full, calm, and free from passion and that shall be characterized by a spirit of deep and unselfish devotion to one's country.

I now ask for time, sir, merely to consider whether or not, under the covenant as drawn, the power to put us at war will still rest with us or be placed in a body outside our own Government, and, if placed outside, whether or not such lodging of this sovereign power is desirable.

I now ask only for time to deliberate whether or not we shall put it beyond our power to increase the size of our Army or our Navy in times of dire emergency without first consulting the wish or desires of other countries, some of whom may not be wholly disinterested in the conclusion they reach.

I ask simply that we be given a breathing pause after we finish our battles before we obligate ourselves to maintain for all time the territorial status quo which is to be set up by this treaty, time to know whether we are prepared to say there never can be such a change in circumstance or condition, such a change of sympathy and of ideal as would make improper this partitioning of the world to which it is proposed we shall now become a party and a sponsor, and as to which we shall be guarantor.

And in this connection let me observe that my friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], for whose opinion as a lawyer, for whose wisdom as a statesman, and for whose integrity as a man I have the most profound regard, like Jove, occasionally nods, and is not fortunate in his defense of the tenth article of the covenant in citing the United States as a guarantor of the independence of Panama. That guaranty was intended to protect the Panama Canal, and was intended, as the Senator so well said, to give notice that "we would go to war with any country that attempts to reduce the republic through whose concession we built the Panama Canal."

It is a far cry from this covenant to protect our own interests and from the like treaty of 1846 with New Granada to the proposition embodied in the tenth article of the covenant, wherein we are *asked* to guarantee the integrity of the newly swollen British Empire, the enlarged territories of France and Italy, the acquisitions of Japan, and the newly created States of Europe in which we have no interest.

From the time when the sweep of Balboa's vision from a peak in Darien comprehended the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific, the construction of a canal to join those mighty oceans has been the ambition of various nations. It was decreed that we should accomplish the feat, and in all our treaties contemplating this gigantic task we have made sure that its immediate environment should not be vexed by war.

I ask further for time to deliberate whether it is wisdom for us and for the world that we shall enter into a superstate where, notwithstanding we are the most powerful Nation in the world, with the most advanced and enlightened government, we nevertheless shall become subject to the control of a body a good part of which will be made up of the representatives of imperial governments and kings with dynastic and other interests to serve alien to us, and with a further number who are representatives of nations that are inevitably under the domination and control of these autocracies.

I ask for time to bring to bear any power of prescience which we possess upon the question of whether or not we wish to submit to the control and domination of the league bodies questions involving our own purely internal affairs; for while under the covenant as originally drawn it was open to argument that such matters were excluded from the purview of the league bodies, yet I submit there can be now little doubt that under the treaty as redrafted such matters are not only not withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the league but are actually and positively placed within the scope of its activities.

Moreover, inasmuch as this is a point which I have not heretofore discussed, because not a direct issue under the covenant as first drawn, I may be pardoned if I take sufficient time to indicate the grounds on which my request is based.

It is provided in article 15 of the revised covenant that "if the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and *is found by the council*, to arise out of matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

The council may, in any case under this article, refer the dispute to the assembly.

Now, it seems from this that the council has the power and the jurisdiction to determine that any dispute brought before it does not arise "out of a matter which, *by international law*, is solely within the jurisdiction of that party," and having so determined the council may proceed to pass upon the dispute, no matter what the dispute may be, nor how vital its issue may be to the party raising it. Moreover, if the council wishes to refrain from passing upon this question as to the domestic or other character of the dispute, it may refer the whole subject, including this question, to the full assembly, which may make a like determination and disposition. It seems, therefore, clear that by joining the league not we but the council shall determine whether any matter is solely within our domestic jurisdiction; and as affecting the decision of the council and as indicating the principle by which it will be guided, we must bear in mind the provision of article 11, that "it is also declared to be the friendly right of each member of the league to bring to the attention of the assembly or of the council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threaten to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends"; of the provisions of article 3, which provides that "the assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world"; and of article 4, which provides that "the council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world." I must, therefore, ask for time to consider whether or not such vital matters as our right to regulate immigration, our right to make alliances with other nations, our right to make reciprocity treaties upon such terms as we see fit, our right to make with our adjacent neighbors treaties such as we have with Cuba incorporating the Platt amendment, our right to intervene diplomatically to protect the lives and property of our nationals in other countries, and our right to intervene and adopt means and methods necessary to protect the people of our own borders from the encroachment of robber bands from adjacent unsettled countries, shall remain within the sole determination of our will and purpose or shall be subjected to the determination of a league body.

I must also request the attention of the Senate to another provision of the newly vamped covenant. Much deserved criticism was urged against the first draft of the covenant on the ground that if we adopted the plan therein proposed we took from the Monroe doctrine its life, thus leaving us no longer able to control the destinies of America, with the consequent loss, perhaps forever, of that great national security which had for a century been ours.

Seemingly to meet this objection—as we must assume if we are to give the negotiators credit for honesty—there has been incorporated in the new covenant a provision reading as follows:

Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitrations or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

Now for our purposes this provision must, as a matter of grammatical construction, be read as follows:

Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as * * * regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

I am bound in all soberness to say that the author of this language either had a profound ignorance of what the Monroe doctrine is, or is determined to make out of it something it is not and ought not to be. In either event the result of the league provision is the same—it completely wipes out the doctrine as it has been accepted and enforced for a hundred years, as my further observations will show.

In the first place, the doctrine is not an "international engagement," nor is it an understanding, *regional* or *otherwise*, all of which are of necessity reached by international agreement, formal or informal, by and between two or more nations. There is nothing in the circumstances attending the framing and proclamation of the doctrine, nothing in the various discussions and pronouncements concerning it, which even remotely resembles the making of an international agreement. It is no more such an agreement than is the pronouncement of Washington against entangling foreign alliances, of our nation-old practice of neu-

trality, or our labor-protecting Chinese exclusion, or our protective tariff, or our regulation of immigration.

The Monroe doctrine is and, if it is to perform the service it has heretofore rendered, must continue to be *merely* a *policy*, as are all those others I have named. Its precise character, the extent, method, and time of its application, the means of compelling its observance, all are matters of our high and uncontrolled will and sovereign prerogative. We, the United States, can not answer to anyone else in respect of it. We use it when, as, and to the extent we need it. There can be no limitation upon it except our requirements, our will, and our force of arms. Whatever security we may need within its purview it must give if we ask it.

But if we embody this provision in the league, the Monroe doctrine will cease to be a policy, and it will become in truth a formal agreement. Thereafter others besides ourselves will have a voice as to it; not we alone, but the league, must determine the meaning and scope of this "regional understanding," must pass upon the occasion and extent of its use and the means of its enforcement, just as the league will pass upon any other "circumstances whatever affecting international relations which threaten to disrupt either the peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends."

The covenant adopted, we stand shorn of this powerful means of defense not only for ourselves, but for our sister republics of the whole hemisphere. That I may not be thought to be taking a prejudiced view of this matter I shall take the time of the Senate again to call its attention to the official commentary of the British mission at Paris upon this provision.

This commentary states:

> Article 21 makes it clear that the covenant is not intended to abrogate or weaken any other agreements so long as they are consistent with its own terms, into which the members of the league may have entered, or may enter hereafter, for the further assurance of peace. Such agreements would include special treaties for compulsory arbitration and military conventions that are genuinely defensive. The Monroe doctrine and similar understandings are put in the same category. They have shown themselves in history to be not instruments of national ambitions, but guarantees of peace.
>
> The origin of the Monroe doctrine is well known. It was proclaimed in 1823 to prevent America becoming a theater for the intrigues of European absolutism. At first a principle of American foreign policy, it has become an international understanding, and it is not illegitimate for the people of the United States to ask that the covenant should recognize this fact. In its essence it is consistent with the spirit of the covenant and indeed the principles of the league as expressed in article 10, represent the extension to the whole world of the principles of the doctrine; while, *should any dispute as to the meaning of the latter ever arise between American and European powers the league is there to settle it.*

But the British mission is not alone in understanding that this will be the effect of the league upon the Monroe doctrine. Other British writers and authorities declare the article destroys the Monroe doctrine by redefining it, thus making the covenant recognize the doctrine merely for what it is not. International engagements and international understandings are terms of European diplomacy synonymous with alliances. We do not make alliances to affect the balance of power; Europe does. By this article of the covenant we, in spite of the maledictions of our representative in Paris against the Old World system of balance of power, agree specifically to its recognition and practice. This article, instead of protecting our national policy of defense, will legalize Europe's alliances which our representative has so emphatically condemned. A writer in a British magazine that for more than a century has expressed the thought of the dominant British mind has this to say of this provision of the covenant and its effect upon the old system of balancing powers:

> We feel that once more we are our own masters, free to enter into alliances behind the league's back and to insure our supremacy by strengthening our navy. If there be one doctrine in America there shall be another doctrine in Europe, and as the league will manifestly be of little use in checking the ambitions of Germany, France and England, knit in a close alliance, will know very well how to protect their own borders. In brief, the hands of the clock have gone around the circle. The Old World has been recalled into being to redress the balance of the New.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is that from?

Mr. KNOX. It is a quotation from an editorial in Blackwood's Magazine for the present month, June.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KNOX. I do.

Mr. McCORMICK. The recognition of regional agreements, of course, comprehends the Japanese-British treaty affecting the Far East?

Mr. KNOX. Why, certainly. I think that is what it was originally designed for.

But even if all the foregoing were not true, and even if we still held the full control of the occasion and the extent of the exercise of the doctrine as a true policy, yet it has been so curtailed by covenant definition as to rob it of most of its value. It has now become a "regional understanding * * * for securing the maintenance of peace."

It is difficult to speak calmly of a perversion such as this. It is hard to conceive of any man traditioned in Americanism lending his sanction to such a monstrosity. Never before has the Monroe doctrine been a mere measure of spineless pacifism. It has until now been a strong means of self-protection and self-preservation. It was designed first to preserve our own life, liberty, happiness, and institutions and next to preserve the liberties and institutions of our sister Republics of the Western World, that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people should not perish from the earth." It was aimed to keep monarchy from this hemisphere; kings, princes, and emperors were to have no place on this side of the world. But under the new doctrine, if Mexico should peaceably agree to allow to Japan a strip of her western territory; if Guatemala should make an alliance with Great Britain, or Brazil with Germany, or Argentina with Italy, or if they should grant to them regions or strips of territory or concessions or zones of influence, how could we say that "a regional understanding * * * for securing the maintenance of peace" had been violated? Would not the answer be, "No hostile activity has occurred, none is contemplated, and none will occur unless you yourselves, America, undertake or threaten them"? And if we did threaten them, no matter how great the menace to our own existence they might ultimately prove, we should merely bring ourselves within the restraining hand of the whole league itself.

The Monroe doctrine in its covenant form is a sanction and an invitation to colonization by monarchies (one of the precise things to avoid which the Monroe doctrine was declared), for in the great emancipated brotherhood which the league professes to set up, what brother can accuse his fellow of so ignoble a thing as a design upon the power and integrity of his own dominion—a thing made holy by the league itself.

Thus, sir, one question which the covenant presents for the solemn consideration of this body and for the matured deliberation of the American people is the question whether or not we are to surrender the Monroe doctrine as it now is and adopt a doctrine, misnamed Monroe, such as is proposed. Are we not entitled and are the people not entitled to whatever time may be necessary for our reaching a wise determination upon this matter?

One further point and I shall have enumerated all which the necessities of the present occasion seem to require that I shall mention. The criticism leveled at the first draft—that it provided not methods by which a member once a party to the league could withdraw therefrom—has been met in the new draft by a provision that "any member of the league may, after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the league, *provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal.*"

It is difficult to believe, Mr. President, that there is not here some error in wording, that those who drafted the provision have failed to understand the meaning of the negotiators, for it would be hard to draw a provision which purporting to give a right to withdraw should at the same time make withdrawal so completely and absolutely impossible. No nation may withdraw unless *at the time* of its withdrawal, notified two years in advance, *all of its international obligations* and *of its obligations under this covenant* shall have been fulfilled, and the party who determines the question of fulfillment or nonfulfillment is the league itself from which the nation is to withdraw.

Are we or are we not entitled to time to deliberate whether it is wise that we tie ourselves in a covenant which so completely binds us to the will or whim of other partners? For it must be always remembered in respect of these things that affirmative action by the council—and release from the league would, I take it, be affirmative action—must be unanimous, and any one power in the council, whatever its motive and whatever its ends, might under this provision as it stands make us permanent members of the league, our wills to the contrary notwithstanding.

For almost a century and a half our foreign relations have been trained to meet the principles of that political religion which Washington laid down in his Farewell Address, his benediction upon the Nation to which he himself had given life.

> The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.
>
> Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent contro-

versies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

* * * * * * * *

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world, so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. * * *

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

I am quite aware of the fashion now to regard everything that comes to us from the past as outgrown or inapplicable or wholly bad. Even honor, integrity, and virtue must now belong only to conservative, stand-pat reactionaries. And in line with this new thought, attempt is made to bring this all but infinite wisdom of Washington into disrepute, for it has been assumed by some and accepted by others that these words were merely the speculative fiat of a mellow old man about to leave this world to enjoy the reward to which his sterling character and inestimable service entitled him; that behind his words there stood no lessons of experience. But before we so dismiss them in this critical hour of our history, let us recall that Washington had himself lived through two colonial wars and that there had come to him in recent tradition the trials, losses, and horrors of the other two that had gone before. The Colonies as a whole had been engaged in four wars. Four times they had sacrificed their sons, three times for causes in which they had no concern whatsoever, war coming to them with its curses merely because the mother countries in Europe were in conflict. Each of these three times the Colonists were required by the terms of a treaty negotiated in Europe to give up to the enemy without compensation whatsoever of advantage their suffering and sacrifices had wrung from him. In the fourth and last war only did the Colonists reap any advantage from the war, and even here those advantages went not to themselves but to the mother country. Washington well knew the effect of embroilment in the politics of Europe, and he spoke to us not the dreams of a speculative mind but the sober realities of a hard and costly experience.

The covenant now proposed calls upon us to abandon these principles which he thus laid down and under which we have prospered. Is it an unreasonable request to ask that before they be discarded, we shall have time to weigh the consequences and discover so far as possible the end of the new path we are about to begin to tread?

And here let me again state my abhorrence of war, with all its attendant woe, misery, and crime. I loath it more than I loath anything else, except that which is worse than war, because dearer than life, namely, the loss of our honor and our freedom, for unless we are sunk to such ignobility that we had rather live slaves than die free men, we must face the grim reality of fighting to live. But we do want to blot out the miseries of the world as far as we can. We do want to live free and happy, enjoying the association of our friends and kindred. Therefore, whatever there is of good in the league we want to save, and the whole people want it saved. But we must have the opportunity fairly to decide what is worth saving.

To deny a hearing in a cause is contrary to fundamental principles of Anglo-Saxon law. To deny a hearing in this cause is to give substance to the suspicion already abroad in the land that those to whom we gave our sons and our substance in the hour of their need and distress are now, in adjusting their terms of peace with the Central Powers, attempting to force upon us the harsh alternative of choosing, on the one hand, between a treaty of peace with which are intertwined denationalizing covenants relating to the distinctly separate subject of a league of nations, or, upon the other hand, the necessity of concluding a separate peace or continuing a status of war. We must not increase the already growing distrust by any deliberate act of ours.

To deny a hearing in this cause will be to convince many beyond change that the covenant of any league of nations must include so much that is strange toward our traditional policy, contrary to our fundamental principles of international intercourse, destructive of our treaty rights, and subversive of our constitutional principles, that no league is to be accepted under any view.

If this covenant be a good thing, surely its merit will be the better appreciated after careful study. If the debate that preceded our Declaration of Independence raged for almost a decade before the Revolution; if the debate over the meaning of the Constitution as to the powers of the Nation and the rights of the States lasted for generations and is not yet ended; if every great question in every free country has required a long period of discussion and thought before the people could reach a conclusion upon it, should not this, one of the most fundamental and far-reaching proposals ever made to the American people, also receive careful and extended examination before the people are called upon to give their assent?

If the covenant be not a good thing, certainly the agitated days following a great war should not be seized upon to burden the country with a policy which it has not examined and which is no necessary part of the making of peace.

Why, then, this undue haste? Do those of you who wish to prevent the people from deliberately considering this proposition mean to suggest that pending such consideration we would neglect any duty we owe to the world because we had not by formal writing bound ourselves to its performance? If so, I ask, Where was the treaty obligation that bound us to rush to the rescue of a conflagrant world? Shall we be less sensitive of our duties during the months of sober contemplation of the momentous questions involved in this new step?

And, sir, have they thought out, they who are unwilling we shall have time to debate this matter, have they considered, if America had not been what she is as the result of Washington's policy we could have done the mighty work of this war? It has been our aloofness that has made us great, mighty, and strong. But for the policy of Washington we should hardly have escaped disaster in the Napoleonic wars; but for it our youth also would have perished by thousands in the Crimea; they might also have been among the dead at Solferino, at Sedan, and at Plevna.

But in addition to all this we would have failed to possess that impartial and disinterested attitude which enabled us to see the right in the conflict now closing and to throw the weight of our great resources in the right side of the balance. We must have time, and the people must have time, to consider whether we are to give up that position; whether we are to remain free hereafter to choose the right as we see it, the best as it appears to us; or whether we shall bind our discretion, our judgment, and our freedom of action and become merely the tool of other powers who have different interests, aims, ambitions, and ideals. Shall we or shall we not have time to consider whether we shall go on through history the masters of our own fate, confident in the superiority of our own institutions and civilizations, and able and willing to give to humanity the blessings which we ourselves possess, unhampered by the jealousies and bickerings of a world to which we do not belong and with the aspirations of a good part of which we are not in accord?

We saved the liberties of Europe, and in order to insure them for the future we have acquiesced in our associates absorbing the gigantic spoils of the common victory.

Perhaps we may be willing to guarantee their perpetual possession of those spoils, as is proposed in article 10 of the covenant. Perhaps we may be willing to surrender our liberties to foreign domination. But let us think it over and know the full import of our act.

This resolution asks no more than to request the peace conference, while the negotiations are still open and subject to change by a single line, to concede our right to consider what we are asked to do without delaying peace. What Senator can justify a negative vote? Beware of the possible consequences of haste. God forbid that "the war that was to end all war" shall conclude with a peace that may end all peace. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The occupants of the galleries will refrain from applause. It is contrary to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that to-morrow immediately after the close of the morning business or as soon thereafter as I can get the floor I shall address the Senate upon some legal and constitutional features of the pending resolution.

Mr. McCUMBER. I had intended to give the same notice.

Mr. THOMAS. I have been informed by the Senator from North Dakota that it was his intention to address the Senate to-morrow upon the same subject, and in order to enable him to do so I shall postpone the notice which I just gave until Thursday, and under similar conditions.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it was understood that in the discussion I would probably follow the Senator from Pennsylvania to-day, but I do not think it proper to begin at this hour in the day. So I desire to give notice that to-morrow after the close of the morning business, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], I will present an analysis of the provisions of the league portion of the treaty for the purpose of ascertaining whether any of those provisions are incon-

sistent with our duty, inimical to our interests, or destructive of our constitutional rights, and necessarily as to whether there is anything in that portion of the treaty which we denominate the league provision which would justify our separating it from the general terms of the treaty for further consideration.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I can not permit this occasion to pass without a brief reference to the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] in the eloquent address to which we have just listened concerning the provisions of our treaty with the Republic of Panama. From what was said by the Senator upon that subject it was to be gathered that the guaranteed provisions of the treaty with Panama apply only to territory acquired by the United States by virtue of that treaty. Under that treaty we acquired dominion over a strip of land 10 miles wide, 5 miles on either side of the center of the canal, together with islands adjacent to either extremity of the canal, and other territory formerly belonging to the Republic of Panama. The guarantee provisions of article 1 of the treaty of Panama do not refer to those properties at all, nor have they any reference to that territory. That belongs to us. We defend that as our own. The guarantee provision of article 1 refers to the territory of Panama and not to the territory of the United States.

The Republic of Panama has an area of something over 30,000 square miles. It is approximately 118 miles wide by 430 miles in length. We have guaranteed to defend and protect every inch of that territory, not alone that adjacent to the Panama Canal or to the Canal Zone. We entered into that undertaking in consideration of Panama granting to us the Canal Zone and the adjacent islands and territory. The guaranty of the treaty does not relate to the territory or the property of the United States at all. It relates to the territory and property of the Republic of Panama, as foreign to our territory as is the territory of Honduras or of Switzerland or of Argentina or of Russia. The guaranty is exactly the same, to all intents and purposes, as though we guaranteed the political independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Brazil.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is partly correct and he is incorrect in some of his statements. The treaty with Panama not only secured for us the Canal Zone, but it secured for us certain rights within the territory of Panama. It secured for us certain rights in the matter of guarding both the Pacific and the Atlantic entrances to the Panama Canal.

The treaty with Panama was entered into, as the world knows, and protection was guaranteed against an immediate threatened danger. The debates in Congress will show from what source that danger was immediate. The treaty itself will show that we have vastly more right under the treaty with Panama than merely the right to sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

But an absolute answer to the argument of the Senator from Montana, with due deference to his great legal ability, is that we did not delegate to Panama the right to decide what action we should take in protecting her nor the right to declare war for the United States, which we are delegating to a great league of nations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is an entirely different question.

Mr. FALL. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It relates to an entirely different thing.

Mr. FALL. It does.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Under article 10 we guarantee the political independence and territorial integrity of every member of the league. Under our treaty with Panama we guarantee the political independence and territorial integrity of Panama. How can you distinguish between the two?

Mr. FALL. I will undertake to show the Senator a little later that there is a very great difference and that he, in my judgment, did not at all touch the point at issue between the two sides of this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning a great deal was said about the United States Government pledging itself to maintain the independence and the territorial integrity of other people from external aggression, intimating that we had gone further and had pledged ourselves to maintain them against internal revolution. The answer to the last part of that is simply that it is not true.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] cited the Panama treaty. I wish now to read certain parts of the treaty which we made with Cuba, after we had made a treaty with Spain. Amongst other things in that treaty, Cuba undertakes to take over and maintain the obligations which the United States had entered into with regard to Spain. In this treaty we not only undertake to defend the independence of Cuba and maintain a stable government there, but we make Cuba agree to it. The language is this:

I. That the Government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise—

Notice the breadth of the language—

lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

That is protection of territorial integrity with a vengeance.

II. That said Government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

III. That the Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence—

That is not all—

the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the Government of Cuba.

Again, section 7:

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the Government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

Mr. President, in this case we have not only undertaken to defend the independence and the territorial integrity of Cuba by having her under our wing but we have made her enter into a treaty with us granting us that limitation of her sovereignty; yet we heard this morning an oratorical appeal to the effect that if we undertook to defend the territorial integrity or the independence of anybody upon the surface of the globe we were entangling ourselves in Heaven knows how much trouble for all the future. This treaty was effected on July 1, 1904, under a Republican régime, a Republican Secretary of State, and a Republican President. The fact remains that if there be any danger to the Constitution—a queer thing for a Republican to invoke, by the way, after having violated it as political legatees of the old Federalist Party for something like 50 years of uninterrupted government—if there be anything dangerous to the Constitution in all that, we have done it not only with regard to Panama but we have done it in a much stronger way with regard to Cuba.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 88, line 13, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$50,100," so as to make the paragraph read:

Administration of the United States warehouse act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States warehouse act, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $50,100.

Mr. KING. I asked the Senator having the bill in charge to give an explanation of this increase. I listened attentively to the explanation. As I understood it, it is not satisfying. I hope that the amendment of the committee will be rejected and the House provision adhered to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll. The question is upon agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KING. I call for a division. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harrison	New	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Henderson	Newberry	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	Norris	Sterling
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Nugent	Sutherland
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Swanson
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Thomas
Dial	Kenyon	Phipps	Trammell
Dillingham	Keyes	Pittman	Underwood
Edge	King	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Kirby	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	La Follette	Robinson	Warren
Fletcher	Lenroot	Sheppard	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman	Williams
Gronna	McKellar	Shields	Wolcott
Hale	McNary	Simmons	
Harding	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	
Harris	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has asked for a division.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 88, in the item for the administration of the United States warehouse act, the committee propose to strike out " $35,000 " and in lieu to insert " $50,100."

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I move to reconsider for the purpose of offering an amendment to the amendment.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. KING. At the end of line 13, on page 88, I move to insert the following:

Provided, That no person employed under this provision shall be paid at a rate in excess of $2,500 per annum.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that, so far as I am personally concerned, I will let that amendment to the amendment go to conference. I am not going to promise the Senator that I will support it, but I will carefully examine it, and if I find there is any merit in it, of course, it will be retained.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator that the House committee examined this matter, they knew the duties which were required to be performed in the execution of the law referred to, namely, the warehouse act, and with that knowledge before them they fixed the compensation at $35,000. It seems to me that the Senate committee ought not to have increased that amount, but the Senate has supported the committee and, of course, I am powerless.

I hope the chairman of the committee will not treat the amendment to the amendment, which he has now accepted, in a perfunctory way, but will insist upon the House accepting it, and I think the House will accept it if the Senate conferees do their duty.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 13, to insert:

That, effective on and after the passage of this act, section 6 of said United States warehouse act is hereby amended by striking out of the first sentence of said section the words " other than personal security," and by striking out at the end of the second sentence of said section the words " including the requirements of fire insurance "; and section 18 of said act is hereby amended by striking out at the end of said section the words " if it have plainly and conspicuously embodied in its written or printed terms a provision that such receipt is not negotiable " (acts of Aug. 11, 1916, vol. 39, pp. 486–491, secs. 1–33; Oct. 1, 1918, vol. 40, p. 1003, sec. 1).

Mr. KING. Unless the Senator from North Dakota can give some explanation that is satisfactory respecting the necessity of this item, I shall raise a point of order against it that it is general legislation.

Mr. GRONNA. May I call this item to the attention of Senators from the cotton section of the country, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] or the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]? It was submitted to the Senator from South Carolina and to the department; I am informed that it was submitted to Members of the House from the South. It is my understanding that it was submitted to Mr. LEVER, who has had as much to do with legislation of this kind as any Member of Congress, and it has been approved by all of them. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] can probably explain this better than I can.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to pass it over temporarily, as the Senator from South Carolina is absent from the Chamber, and I was not present at the time it was brought up.

Mr. KING. I shall be very glad if this item can be passed over temporarily.

Mr. GRONNA. I have just learned that the Senator from South Carolina will not be here to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL].

Mr. GRONNA. The senior Senator from Louisiana is absent and will not be here to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is present. May I ask, Does the Senator expect to get through with the bill to-day?

Mr. GRONNA. I expect to finish it to-day, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator will pass it over for a little while?

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to passing it over temporarily.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. GRONNA. There can be no possible objection to the amendment. It is permitting the people in that section of the country to do business in their own way, and it is an improvement on the old law.

Mr. KING. If I thought there was any provision in the bill that would permit people to do business in their own way, unhampered by Federal restriction, it would receive my most hearty and cordial support.

Mr. GRONNA. I trust the Senator from Utah will not make a point of order against it.

Mr. KING. I will wait until the explanation is offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over for the present.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 89, to insert:

That hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (United States cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., p. 476; United States grain-standards act, 39 Stat. L., p. 482; United States warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., p. 486; standard-container act, 39 Stat. L., p. 673; and the acts making annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative authorized by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator from North Dakota what is the purpose of this amendment? I reserve the point of order with respect to this amendment and the proposed amendment found on the same page, beginning with line 15 and ending with line 7 on page 90. I want to say with respect to the latter amendment, in regard to the domestic-wool section of the War Industries Board, it is my understanding that the wool secured by the Government during the war and for war purposes is now being handled by the War Department and not by the Agricultural Department. If it has been transferred to the Agricultural Department it has been done within the past few days or weeks.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that that amendment has a bearing upon the same matter as the first amendment. We might just as well let both amendments go over temporarily.

Mr. KING. All right.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator can be furnished with information that will satisfy him the amendments should be agreed to.

Mr. KING. I reserve the point of order on this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to what appears to be an inconsistency in the amendment that has just been read. It starts off by saying that " hereafter "—and in legislation that means forever hereafter—and it winds up by saying " during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920." The Senator should strike out either one or the other. If he wants to make it applicable for all the years to come, he should strike out the latter part of the amendment. If he wants it to apply only to the fiscal year 1920, he should strike out the word " hereafter."

Mr. GRONNA. I have an amendment to correct that, I will say to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not know that. I only heard the amendment as it was read. I ask that the amendment may go over, and I will await the amendment to the amendment which the Senator has in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 14, to insert:

To enable the Bureau of Markets to complete work of the Domestic Wool Section of the War Industries Board and to enforce the Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, $35,000. The activities to be undertaken under this appropriation shall include the securing and auditing of accounts and records of all dealers, the further collection of excess profits as provided in the regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, and, so far as practicable, the distribution of such excess profits to the individual growers of the wool upon which such profits were made; necessary printing and the publication of the results of this work, including the names and addresses of dealers who have complied or who have failed or refused to comply with the rules and regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the provision just read, beginning on line 15, page 89, and ending with line 7 on page 90. It is general legislation upon an appropriation bill. Moreover, the War Department already is handling and has handled since the war the wool which was purchased by the United States. I am not willing to give to this bureau the right to become an inquisitorial board and perform the functions of the Federal Trade Commission and the functions perhaps of the Internal Revenue Office and the functions

of the Department of Justice. I make a point of order against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Can anyone inform the Chair whether the Bureau of Markets is authorized by law to secure and audit the accounts and records of dealers and to collect excess profits and distribute the same back to the individual growers of wool upon which such profits were made?

Mr. GRONNA. The Bureau of Markets was authorized under a proclamation issued by the President to do that work. It has performed a part of the work, but it has not completed it. All that is asked in this paragraph, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Utah, is simply an appropriation to complete the work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not an answer to the question of the Chair. Is there any law?

Mr. GRONNA. There is a general law giving the President of the United States power to order this work to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To do what? To do anything he wants to do?

Mr. GRONNA. Under the Overman Act the President has the power to order this work done. Such an order was promulgated under the date mentioned in the paragraph, and the Bureau of Markets has partially done this work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Do I understand the Senator from North Dakota to say that the President of the United States by some general act of the Congress of the United States has power to organize a bureau——

Mr. GRONNA. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And to audit accounts and records of dealers, to collect excess-profits tax, and pay it back to the wool growers?

Mr. GRONNA. I was very unfortunate if I conveyed that idea. The idea I want to convey is that under the power which the President has, under his war powers, authorization was made to do this work. The work has not been completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What the Chair wants to know is whether this is an appropriation to carry out some lawful order of the Government or is it new legislation?

Mr. GRONNA. It is not new legislation. It is simply an appropriation to complete work that has been performed in part under a proclamation by the Chief Executive during the war.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there any existing law that has authorized the Bureau of Markets to examine the books of a concern and determine whether there were any excess profits or not?

Mr. GRONNA. That is a very unfair question to ask, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. That is among the things provided for in the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. There were specific orders given as to the amount of profits that could be made or should be made in these industries. The Senator from Utah knows that. It had reference to wool especially.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the question.

Mr. GRONNA. It is the question.

Mr. SMOOT. I asked it in good faith. Is there any existing law that authorizes the Bureau of Markets to send for papers, to swear witnesses, and examine the books of concerns in the United States?

Mr. GRONNA. The only law in existence is the order of the Chief Executive of the Nation.

Mr. KING. Where did the Chief Executive of the Nation get authority for such an order? I deny that there is such a law; I deny that the President had any authority to do that. If he did it, he did it without any authority of law.

Mr. GRONNA. I said the Chief Executive, but, of course, all his work is done by bureaus, and this was done by the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. An agent of the department came before the committee, as I recall the fact, and stated that part of this information had been secured and diffused to the manufacturers of wool in the East through the provision found on page 83, which reads:

> For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products.

And so on.

Mr. SMOOT. "Nonmanufactured food products."

Mr. HARRISON. "Nonmanufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies," and so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. Wool.

Mr. HARRISON. They considered that it was a farm product, and they expended some money under this appropriation that had gone to the trade board or to some other board here in the city.

Mr. SMOOT. That would make no difference; but what I was interested in was whether the Bureau of Markets had the power now to examine books, to call and swear witnesses, and to go in and demand information from any concern in the United States. I do not think they have that power, and if they have it this language would not be in the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Let me ask the Senator from Utah a question. Will the Senator from Utah deny that a part of this work has been done, and done by this very bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know that many of the accounts have been settled by the War Industries Board, but I am not aware of the fact that they secured the information or settled the accounts by having subpœnas issued or ordering the books of a concern to be examined. I myself think the reason for this legislation is that there are disputes between the firms that sold the wool and the War Industries Bureau as to just what the wool was worth, as claimed by the men who raised it, and what it was sold for by the firm that sold the wool.

Mr. GRONNA. It is simply to complete the auditing of the books.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I do know that there are disputes, for I have taken letters from constituents of mine stating that their accounts are not settled. I think this new legislation is desired for the purpose of compelling the bringing of the books into the Bureau of Markets for examination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The thing the Chair is interested in is to ascertain whether or not this is general legislation on an appropriation bill. The phraseology used here is:

> The activities to be undertaken under this appropriation shall include the securing and auditing of accounts and records of all dealers, the further collection of excess profits as provided in the regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, and, so far as practicable, the distribution of such excess profits to the individual growers of the wool upon which such profits were made.

Whether that clause is general legislation is the question, and on the determination of the fact the Chair will rule.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator let the Chair state the question?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Bureau of Markets has lawful authority to secure and to audit accounts and records of dealers, to collect excess profits, to distribute the excess to the individual growers of the wool upon which the profits were made, and this is simply an appropriation to enable them to carry out the power which they have, the point of order is not well taken. On the other hand, if they have no such power, the point of order is well taken.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, in regard to the power on the part of the Executive to make such an order as is evidently contemplated by this paragraph, I call the attention of the Chair to one act conferring great powers upon the President of the United States—the act which is known as the Overman Act. I am sure that it contemplated and included just such powers as have been exercised by the President in this case, transferring from the wool section of the War Industries Board the powers and duties performed by that section to the Bureau of Markets. It surely comes within the provisions of that act. The President would have the power, without any other specific act, it seems to me, to make such an order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is seeking light only for the purpose of ruling. Does the Senator from South Dakota say that the act that is commonly known as the Overman Act authorizes the President of the United States to combine bureaus, or to take duties from some one bureau and to transfer them to another bureau; that that act is so comprehensive in its character that it also gave the President of the United States the power to have anything whatsoever done in America?

Mr. STERLING. I did not quite say that, although the Overman Act went very far in that direction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then, the question goes back as to whether under any law the bureau created had power to do this thing?

Mr. STERLING. But, Mr. President, the Overman Act permits the President of the United States to transfer one bureau in one department to another department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not disputing that; but was there any bureau at any time anywhere by any law that had the power to do this thing?

Mr. STERLING. I think, perhaps, not under this act but under some other act the War Industries Board had that power conferred upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is just what the Chair would like to know. It would be impossible for the Chair to keep in mind all the legislation that has been passed here in the past six years. No historian will be able even to ascertain what it was, and the Chair does not know everything Congress has done.

Mr. STERLING. We know that there was in existence the War Industries Board, that that War Industries Board was performing certain duties, and that one matter over which the War Industries Board had jurisdiction was the question of wool. There was a wool section, as it was termed, in the War Industries Board, and the President by order—I think under the Overman Act, and under no other authority—transferred the powers exercised by that wool section to the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. KING. I challenge the distinguished Senator to place his finger upon a single line of legislation that authorizes the War Industries Board to do anything which this proposed amendment authorizes the Bureau of Markets to do. The War Industries Board, by the way, has gone out of business; to use the vulgarism of the street, it is defunct; but it never had the authority to do what the Senator has intimated that it did have the power to do.

Mr. STERLING. I am not able to put my finger on the section of the law or on any act giving the War Industries Board this power; but I state as a fact that that board was performing duties in regard to this very subject matter, and the President then, in the exercise of his power, transferred those powers and duties to the Bureau of Markets.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would say that those are ordinary judicial duties.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, allow me to say that the War Department is handling the wool, and the sales are conducted by the Quartermaster General of the Army.

Mr. KING. The War Department is handling the wool?

Mr. WARREN. That department is handling it through the markets from time to time—two or three times a month—by having auctions.

Mr. KING. I insist on my point of order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not have the War Industries Board law before him or know where it can be found.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that this matter go over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over temporarily.

The reading of the bill was resumed, the last clause read being as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the establishment of the potato wart in eastern Pennsylvania, and to provide means for the extermination of this disease in Pennsylvania or elsewhere in the United States in cooperation with the State or States concerned, including rent outside the District of Columbia, employment of labor in the city of Washington or elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $50,000.

Mr. KING. I ask the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the last item. Is the emergency therein referred to still before us or it is in the past? I refer to the emergency for the appropriation in Pennsylvania for some potato disease.

Mr. GRONNA. My attention was diverted for a moment, and I did not understand to what item the Senator from Utah referred.

Mr. KING. I am inviting the Senator's attention to page 92, where an appropriation of $50,000 is made—

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the establishment of the potato wart in eastern Pennsylvania.

My recollection is that there was such an appropriation, or some appropriation, for this same emergency last year. I was wondering if the emergency is in future as well as in præsenti?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator has great faith in the membership of the House. This was put into the bill by the membership of the House and approved by the Senate.

Mr. KING. I do not think the House is infallible. I wish to ask the Senator whether he knows anything about whether there is any emergency, or whether this is merely the perpetuation of an appropriation that was made at some remote period of time?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows that there is always danger of agricultural crops being destroyed by pests or by these spores. I am really surprised that the Senator from Utah, with his experience in agriculture, should ask such a question as that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. GRONNA. Pardon me. The Senator from Utah knows there is not a single year when all the different kinds of crops—cereals of all kinds and potatoes, corn, and so forth—are not all subject to these pests. Of course, appropriations must be made in order to eradicate them.

Mr. KING. The Senator now having delivered a lecture, but not having answered my question, may I beg his indulgence while I again propound the question?

Mr. GRONNA. I have listened to the Senator's lectures now for two days.

Mr. KING. Well, I hope the Senator will profit by them. The Senator will observe that this is an appropriation, not to meet the general conditions which the Senator has described, but that it is to meet a specific condition. Certainly the Senator would not justify the appropriation of $50,000 or any amount for a specific purpose to meet anticipated general conditions.

I now repeat the question. Is there a specific condition, such as is described in this provision, which calls for this appropriation?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture, through its proper bureau, submitted an estimate. This estimate was submitted to the other House and later on to the Senate. I will say to the Senator from Utah, with all due respect to him, that all these estimates can be found in the Book of Estimates; they are subject to the inspection of every Senator, of course. The House committee believed that it was necessary to carry this appropriation for this specific purpose. The Senate committee did not, I will say to the Senator, particularly examine into this particular appropriation, for there was no change suggested, either by the department or by any member of the committee; but, so far as I know, the appropriation is necessary and will be needed, as stated in the Book of Estimates, which, of course, the Senator can read just as well as can I. I believe the appropriation is necessary; I believe it ought to be approved.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will suggest that if this potato disease has been discovered in Pennsylvania, it will be a very wise thing to stop it there.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It should be stopped there before it spreads. If the same provision had been made against the boll weevil, to eradicate it where it started, it would probably have preserved many a cotton crop.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is a very useful Member of this body; nobody questions that, and I agree with the Senator that we ought not to make appropriations for any purpose that is not necessary; but the Senator can see by reading the bill that all through it there are appropriations for specific things in specific localities. Take the appropriations for this year. There is a disease which has broken out in the State of Illinois, in the wheat sections of the country—a new disease; that is, one that is new to this country—and is known as flag smut of wheat, take-all, or helminthosporium. There is an appropriation of $100,000 in order to make every effort possible to stop it before it spreads over the country. That appropriation is one of the items in the bill; the same is true as to the appropriation for the extermination of the corn borer. There is an appropriation of $250,000 in the bill to eradicate the corn borer, a pest which has manifested itself in the New England States, especially in Massachusetts and to some extent in New York, and I believe also in Connecticut. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is a large amount, but what is $250,000 compared with the damage that a pest of this sort can do to the corn crop?

I agree with the Senator that this bill carries a large amount. There are items in this bill which I think do not really belong in an agricultural appropriation bill; but they have been placed in the bill; there are no duplications, so far as I know; the people in the various sections of the country demand that these appropriations be made, and for that reason the committee saw fit to leave them in the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the subhead "Federal Horticultural Board," on page 92, after line 15, to insert:

That the plant quarantine act, approved August 20, 1912 (37 Stats., p. 315), be, and is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"SEC. 15. That in order further to control and eradicate and to prevent the dissemination of dangerous plant diseases and insect infections and infestations no plant or plant products for or capable of propagation, including nursery stock, hereinafter referred to as plants and plant products, shall be moved or allowed to be moved, shipped, transported, or carried by any means whatever into or out of the District of Columbia, except in compliance with such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture as hereinafter provided. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture, after investigation, shall determine that any plants and plant products in the District of Columbia are infested or infected with insect pests and diseases and that any place, articles, and substances used or connected therewith are so infested or infected, written notice thereof shall be given by him to the owner or person in possession or control thereof, and such owner

or person shall forthwith control or eradicate and prevent the dissemination of such insect pest or disease and shall remove, cut, or destroy such infested and infected plants, plant products, and articles and substances used or connected therewith, which are hereby declared to be nuisances, within the time and in the manner required in said notice or by the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Whenever such owner or person can not be found, or shall fail, neglect, or refuse to comply with the foregoing provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and required to control and eradicate and prevent dissemination of such insect pest or disease and to remove, cut, or destroy infested or infected plants and plant products and articles and substances used or connected therewith, and the United States shall have an action of debt against such owner or persons for expenses incurred by the Secretary of Agriculture in that behalf. Employees of the Federal Horticultural Board are hereby authorized and required to inspect places, plants, and plant products and articles and substances used or connected therewith whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that such inspections are necessary for the purposes of this section. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions and requirements of this section and of the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture made hereunder, and the notices given pursuant thereto, employees of the Federal Horticultural Board shall have power with a warrant to enter into or upon any place and open any bundle, package, or other container of plants or plant products whenever they shall have cause to believe that infections or infestations of plant pests and diseases exist therein or thereon, and when such infections or infestations are found to exist, after notice by the Secretary of Agriculture to the owner or person in possession or control thereof and an opportunity by said owner or person to be heard, to destroy the infected or infested plants or plant products contained therein. The police court or the municipal court of the District of Columbia shall have power, upon information supported by oath or affirmation showing probable cause for believing that there exists in any place, bundle, package, or other container in the District of Columbia any plant or plant product which is infected or infested with plant pests or disease, to issue warrants for the search for and seizure of all such plants and plant products. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is hereby required, from time to time, to make and promulgate such rules and regulations as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, and any person who shall move or allow to be moved, or shall ship, transport, or carry, by any means whatever, any plant or plant products from or into the District of Columbia, except in compliance with the rules and regulations prescribed under this section, shall be punished, as is provided in section 10 of this act."

Mr. KING. I raise the point of order against this provision, which is apparently an amendment to a general statute. My point of order is that it is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will allow me, I am ready to explain to the Senator from Utah the nature of the amendment on page 88 proposing to amend "United States warehouse act" by striking out the words "other than personal security." At the present time warehouses operating under the law referred to are required to execute bonds with some bonding company or corporation as security. The purpose of the amendment is to allow such a warehouse to be bonded by personal security as well as by corporate security.

I am not sure that this amendment is wise. The Agricultural Department seems to think that it will broaden the usefulness of the warehouses and relieve them of a certain burden on account of the fact that it is believed by the Market Division that an unreasonable charge has been put upon them by the bonding corporations. I should be glad if the Senator from Utah would allow the amendment to go through. It will then go to conference, and I will confer with Members of the House upon the conference committee who have given special study to this subject. The effect of the amendment, as I have stated, is to broaden the character of security required.

Mr. KING. To what warehouses does the provision refer?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It applies to cotton warehouses.

Mr. KING. It is limited to those?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only know of it in connection with them.

Mr. KING. And to what extent does the Government of the United States—and I ask the question for information—provide warehouses and superintend them?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It provides none.

Mr. KING. And guarantee them or become responsible for their operation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It does not become responsible, but certain inspectors classify the cotton, and the certificate of classification in the cotton warehouses is accepted on the market as a true test of the grade. The Government is in no way responsible and does not furnish any of the warehouses. Private individuals put up the warehouses and bond their warehouses to make their warehouse certificates more available in the market and to make the deposit of cotton by individuals in the warehouses more attractive to the depositors.

Mr. KING. That was my understanding, if the Senator will allow me; but it seems to me that any legislation that possibly might weaken the value of the security might impair the ability of those who negotiated the warehouse certificates to——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Use the certificates?

Mr. KING. To use the certificates.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course, it cuts two ways. The more rigorous the requirement of the bond, in one sense, the better the certificate——

Mr. KING. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Unless it is carried to a point where the cost of the bond hinders the industry. That is the opinion at the present time of the Market Division of the Agriculture Department. They brought it to our attention in connection with the bill that was pending just prior to the 4th of March. The Agricultural appropriation bill was before us at that time, and that subject was then under consideration by the committee. I am not sure that the House conferees will agree to this amendment; but if the Senator will allow it to go in—I am not sure that I am for it myself—I presume, if the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] does not get here, that I will probably be one of the conferees. My view is that we should let it go in now and we will take it up with the House conferees and look into the matter a little further.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the explanation of the Senator from Georgia, I shall not press the point of order, although I should like to say in conclusion that I think it would perhaps be a mistake to amend the law. I think that if Congress shall legislate in this way it may weaken the security which the warehousemen or the cotton men may have to offer, and thus impair their ability to secure adequate loans.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I may agree with the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 88, beginning in line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 95, line 26, after the word "work," to strike out "$29,847,162" and insert "$32,676,453," so as to make the clause read:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, $32,676,453.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary continued the reading, and read to the end of line 8, on page 96, as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS.

Demonstrations of reclamation projects: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of the Government reclamation projects; to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in others ways, settlers on the projects; and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $48,600.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having this bill in charge what reason there is for the Agricultural bill carrying a provision with respect to reclamation projects? If any aid is to be given to entrymen upon reclamation projects, it ought to be given through the officials who have charge of the reclamation projects. There is a very efficient branch of the Government service that has to do with the reclamation projects under the so-called Newlands Act, and it seems to me that this is an unwise division of responsibility and of authority.

I do not desire to attack this provision by moving to strike it from the bill if the Senator thinks that this proposed legislation is wise and proper; but knowing as I do much about reclamation projects and the close contact of the employees of the Reclamation Service with the people upon the projects, such employees knowing the needs of the settlers far better than anyone else can know them, I feel that if any aid is to be given along the lines indicated by this provision it should be administered through the Reclamation Service rather than through the Agricultural Department.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in order not to delay the bill and take up the time of the Senate, I shall have no objection to the Senator's motion to strike this out, and let it go to conference.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out this provision, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is not a committee amendment.

Mr. KING. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let us get through with the committee amendments first.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to line 4, on page 97, the last paragraph read being as follows:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the

States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $60,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota about that appropriation. I notice that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is not here; but I remember distinctly when that appropriation first went into the Agricultural appropriation bill. The object of putting it in the bill, as stated upon the floor of the Senate at that time, was that on account of cotton being at 6 cents a pound the South had to go to work and raise something else and turn to other vocations, particularly while cotton was at that low price. Every bill that has been here since the initial appropriation has carried the same appropriation, and it is increasing every year. I should like to have some report as to what they have been doing. Have they not built enough barns already with the different appropriations that have been made for experimenting in raising horses and cattle down there?

I do not want to be captious in this matter; but evidently when an appropriation once gets in a bill it never goes out, but it forever increases. I will ask the Senator whether there was any testimony on this subject before the committee?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this is a House provision.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I know it is.

Mr. GRONNA. It was not discussed before the committee of the Senate. I can give the Senator the information, though, from the Book of Estimates, and show what the amount is to be used for.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I know that. Most of it will be used for salaries. I am perfectly aware of that. If there is any really good reason for the appropriation, I will support it with all my heart. When it was first made, however, I could not for the life of me see why the appropriation should be made; and now that it is beginning to increase in amount I think we are entitled to an explanation of the necessity for it, and a report on what has been done under it in the past.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am not a member of the committee. The Senator from Louisiana is out of the city on some engagement, and he no doubt would be able to furnish the facts with reference to it. I know, however, that in the sugar-cane and cotton sections of the country a great deal of attention is being given to the live-stock industry. I know that they are getting in blooded stock and cattle of the very highest grade, and the industry is of enormous importance. Just what this particular provision is to cover, I am not informed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that that work is provided for in another part of the bill; and every time an appropriation of this character has been made, since the first time it appeared here, it has been in exactly the same language, "including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere."

However, I do not want to take advantage of the absence of the Senator from Louisiana. I know that he is deeply interested in this question. If he were here, I would move to strike this provision out of the bill; but he is not here, and, as I say, I do not want to take advantage of his absence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," at the top of page 102, to insert:

That, in order to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), as amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, the sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending on the 30th day of June, 1920.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not know anything about this matter. I reserve the point of order against this item on the ground that it is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to overrule that point. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 102, line 16, before the word "cents," to strike out "2" and insert "4," and in line 17, before the word "cents," to strike out "6" and insert "10," so as to make the clause read:

Whenever during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the expenses of travel can be reduced thereby, he may, in lieu of actual traveling expenses, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of not to exceed 4 cents per mile for a motorcycle or 10 cents per mile for an automobile, used for necessary travel on official business.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, after line 7, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make suitable agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and international fairs held within the United States, including the National Dairy Show to be held at Chicago, Ill., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, $100,000: *Provided*, That not more than $25,000 shall be used in connection with the National Dairy Show to be held at Chicago, Ill., and that not more than $5,000 shall be used in connection with any other one fair.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment. In line 12, I move to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, in line 12, page 103, it is proposed to strike out "$100,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will not insist upon that amendment.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will not compel me to raise the point of order.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. KING. I think it is.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows the benefit that is derived by the people of this country and the knowledge that they secure from attending these fairs. It is provided that not to exceed $25,000 shall be used for the National Dairy Show at Chicago. The Senator knows that is a large affair; and if we spent ten times that amount I believe we could not expend our money for any better purpose than that. The Senator certainly can have no objection to the various States getting together and having their exhibits. This simply permits the Government of the United States in a small way, to the extent of $5,000 in any one State, to participate in that fair.

I hope the Senator will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I think there are fifty-odd largs fairs in the United States. This is simply to enable the Government to make its own exhibits, which will be interesting and beneficial to the farmers at these various large fairs. To reduce it would simply make it a question of favoritism.

It would be limited to a few States. All the States would not get it; and it seems to me nothing is more beneficial than to show at these large agricultural fairs the progress that is made in agriculture. The Government certainly ought to be willing to pay for its own exhibits.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question? I notice that $25,000 of this $100,000 goes to one fair. How can the rest of the States receive any considerable portion if such a large proportion of the amount goes to one State?

Mr. SWANSON. I think that is a limitation, that they can not expend an amount exceeding that.

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

Mr. SWANSON. It was put there so that this entire fund could not be appropriated for the great Dairy Fair that they have in Chicago; and this is a limitation on the appropriation. I think that fair is one of the largest in the country.

Mr. KENYON. The largest in the world.

Mr. SWANSON. The largest in the world, I understand. This limitation was put there so that the rest of the country might have exhibits. It does not require that that amount shall be spent there, but limits it to not more than that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The theory is that the Chicago fair represents several States also.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to my colleague that more good comes from this than from the appropriation that is made here for barns and buildings for taking care of a few horses and cows down in Louisiana.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there are so many improper items in this bill—and I have discovered that that is the case with the agricultural bills that have been presented here since I have been in the Senate—that we view with considerable suspicion even meritorious items. I do not think it is the function of the Federal Government to go around throughout the United States and participate in every county or State fair. I think that the States and the counties throughout the United States are yearly giving most excellent fairs, exhibiting the progress in agriculture, in art, in science, in commerce. The

help of the Federal Government, of course, is of some advantage; but I think that in the end it is weakening and impoverishing to the States themselves.

I find, however, that there is such a happy conspiracy here upon the part of Senators to support the provisions of this bill that any effort to secure a modification or a reduction is absolutely futile. Having struggled here for two days to save a few dollars to the Government of the United States—which has a Treasury that is like old Mother Hubbard's cupboard, bare, with not even a bone—I shall be forced to desist from pressing this amendment, and therefore withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 103, after line 16, to insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919, and for the purpose of defraying such expenses as may be incidental to the meeting of such congress the sum of $5,000 is appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be granted or used for the expenses of delegates.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator having the bill in charge that there is an inconsistency in the wording of the amendment. First, it states:

That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919, and for the purpose of defraying such expenses as may be incidental to the meeting of such congress the sum of $5,000 is appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and to be immediately available—

Then the words "and to remain available until expended" ought to be stricken out.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I would be very glad, personally, to have those words go out. I called the matter to the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure the Senator will not object to those words being stricken from this amendment. I am in full sympathy with the appropriation, but the appropriation is made for this congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919, so it is rather inconsistent to say that this money shall be made immediately available and remain available until it is expended. It will do no good if it is not expended in the year 1919.

Mr. CAPPER. That is all right.

Mr. SMOOT. All I care about is to make it consistent. I move, therefore, to strike out the words "and to remain available until expended."

Mr. CAPPER. That is agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 104, after line 15, to insert:

That the word "package" where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include and shall be construed to include wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee what useful regulation this is intended to accomplish?

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] can give the Senator more detailed information about that.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no doubt of that. I should like to be enlightened as to its purpose.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the purpose of it is to reduce the cost of living. The pure-food law was passed in 1906, and what is known as the Gould amendment to that law was enacted on March 3, 1913. That law as it now stands, as amended, covers the misbranding of food products, and provides that if in package form the quantity of the contents shall be plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count. That law made it necessary to stamp upon packages the net weight. I perhaps ought not to say that the packers secured counsel to come here, but I think the record fully shows it. They secured the services of Mr. McCabe, who formerly had been solicitor of the Agricultural Department. He came here and presented the matter to the Agricultural Department. They held that the term "package" as used in this act did not cover meat packages. The result of that ruling simply resulted in this, that when you buy bacon or ham or pork products you are paying bacon and ham and pork prices for the paper in which they are wrapped and the string. According to the testimony that was given before the House committee at the last session, the evidence secured by Mr. Heney at Chicago showed instances that appear on pages 2192 and 2193 of the hearings where, in the case of a ham weighing a certain amount, wrapped up with paper weighing a certain amount, the dealer said he could have sold the ham or the bacon a little cheaper than he could have otherwise, and it stands to reason that he could. It makes a difference in bacon, according to one dealer, of about 2 cents a pound, because the customer is paying for the string and the paper, which he can not eat, the exact price that he pays for the bacon which he eats.

There is another side to it that I think ought to be stated, in fairness. Under this ruling, you will see, it is not necessary to stamp the net weight upon the package; so the ham or the bacon is sold to the customer by the pound, as it weighs up at the time. Under this change that I am advocating it will be necessary to stamp the net weight on those packages just as on other packages under the law. Now, there will be a shrinkage, though not large. The customer will suffer to some extent, possibly, by the shrinkage. That is the other side of this controversy. A ham that may be stamped 10 pounds or 15 pounds will have shrunk to some extent when you come to sell it to the customer, and he will suffer a little by that shrinkage.

That side of it is problematical; we do not know about it; but the other side that we are trying to get at is not problematical. The paper used in wrapping pork loins is bought under contract, as the investigations of the Federal Trade Commission show, at about 3.7 cents per pound. The paper used in wrapping hams is bought in the open market at about 12 cents a pound for grease-proof parchment, and 2 cents a pound for plain paper, averaging about 7 cents a pound. The paper used in wrapping bacon is bought in the open market at 12 cents a pound for grease-proof parchment and 2 cents a pound for plain paper, averaging about 7 cents. That paper, under this ruling, is sold for the same prices as pork and ham and bacon, and the man who buys these things is paying those prices for the paper.

It seems to me it is a little species of profiteering that does not amount to much in specific instances—perhaps half or three-quarters of a cent a pound on ham, and from one and one-half to two cents a pound on bacon—but which is a practice that ought to stop. If the price of bacon was cut 2 cents a pound by this amendment, it would be worth while. It runs up to what is estimated at seven or eight million dollars a year that the people are paying for paper and string; that is, paying bacon and ham prices for it.

That is the object of this amendment to the law. It is subject to a point of order. I gave notice yesterday that I would move a suspension of the rules to make the amendment in order. I hope a point of order will not be made against it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I shall not make a point of order, because I am in sympathy with the purposes of the amendment as the Senator from Iowa has explained it. What I am solicitous about is to ascertain whether I get 16 ounces in a pound of sliced bacon or whether I will get 16 ounces in a package of clean rice or whether I will get 16 ounces avoirdupois in every pound of packaged sugar I buy. In my migrations around through various markets of this metropolis I bought some rice the other morning, calling for a certain number of pounds, and when I wound up with the rice, after having first paid for it, of course, I got 14½ ounces in a pound. Will it tend, if this amendment is adopted, to eradicate such practices?

Mr. KENYON. It will not have anything to do with rice or sugar, but if it is adopted when the Senator buys bacon he will not be paying for paper and strings.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am paying for pasteboard under the application of the pure-food act by the department, and the criticism I wish to make is that they enforce the law as, evidently, the authors of the law intended. When I buy rice I pay for pasteboard with certain brands that are put up in package form on the market. I get 49 pounds of flour, and have for a great many years, for 50 pounds. There are only 196 pounds in a barrel of flour. The other 4 pounds are sack. We are paying for string and pasteboard and packing material and gunny bags when we buy coffee, and have been for a great many years.

I am not referring to this in a censorious mood, but only to remind the department that is enforcing the law that after this amendment has been applied to meat products—and I have no objection; I am in sympathy with the amendment as explained

by the Senator from Iowa—after the amendment has perfected the pure-food law on misbranded and short-weight goods I wish to call the attention particularly of the departments, not only the Department of Commerce but the other departments that have to do with the ministerial portion of it, and of the Attorney General of the United States, who gives advice upon this question, and urge that they extend the law in such a way that other forms of food may have the same protection evidently designed by the law of 1906, but never enforced in that way.

I have been paying for pasteboard and strings and a great many inedible substances for some years, from 1906 or 1907, the time when the law became operative through the Department of Justice, down to the present time. It is a question of construction of the law.

I am making these comments, I will say to the chairman of the committee and to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], in the hope that the Department of Justice will apply this law in such a way as to make it applicable to every form of merchandise sold on the market. I have no objection to requiring the Attorney General and the Trade Commission and other departments of the Government that have under the act we passed here coordinated their activities—not so that anybody can perceptibly observe it, but we take it for theory that it is done—to apply this amendment to meat products so that we will get 16 ounces for a pound. I am in favor of that, but because I am not wholly a carnivorous animal—I am somewhat vegetarian and herbivorous in my habits—I would like to get some of the rest of my food at 16 ounces to the pound. I call attention particularly of the department here enforcing these acts to seeing that the public gets 16 ounces to the pound in other forms of food necessities. I hope that this act will not be applied in such a way as to discriminate against certain food products on the market and let others escape, as they have done for five or six years, so that dealers can sell me and my neighbors large quantities of inedible subsitutes for food products.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, before the next amendment is taken up, which is one that will take some little time, I would like to offer an amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. The committee amendments are not yet finished.

Mr. SWANSON. There is only one amendment left, and——

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think we ought to vary the rule, unless there is some good reason for it—that the Senator can not be here to-morrow, for instance.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the chairman a question? Is it his intention to go on with the bill to-night?

Mr. GRONNA. I hope to be able to finish it. I think it will take only a few minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I give notice that I am going to ask for night sessions, beginning to-morrow night. There are a number of appropriation bills that must be passed by July 1. They can not be passed in that time unless we get down to their consideration and have night sessions, and to-morrow I shall ask for a night session.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 105, to insert:

That, at and after 2 o'clock antemeridian on Sunday, October 26, 1919, next, the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, be, and the same is, repealed.

Mr. CALDER. I make a point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on yesterday I gave notice that under Rule XL, I would move to suspend the rules in order that I might offer this amendment, and I now make that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments are not disposed of yet. As soon as they are disposed of the Chair will recognize the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment will provoke considerable discussion. I wish therefore that it may go over. I am in doubt whether we could get a quorum now. I think perhaps we will have to adjourn unless the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] wishes to offer his amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. I would like to offer the amendment now, as I may not be here to-morrow. I do not think there will be any opposition to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are we going through with the committee amendments or not?

Mr. SWANSON. I thought the committee amendments were completed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will not press that motion now.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to state that it is absolutely necessary to hold an executive session in order to confirm an officer in the Army, and unless it is done to-day the age limit will apply.

Mr. NORRIS. If we are going to debate the motion let us have both sides heard.

On a division, the motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 18, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17, 1919.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Richard Crane, of Illinois, lately private secretary to the Secretary of State, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia.

Hugh S. Gibson, of California, lately secretary of embassy or legation of class 1, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

Norman Hapgood, of New York City, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 1.

Charles D. Tenney, of Massachusetts, now secretary-interpreter of legation to China, to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 1 of the United States of America.

CLASS 3.

T. Hart Anderson, jr., of New York, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

John W. Belt, of Kentucky, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Frederick C. Chabot, of Texas, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Matthew E. Hanna, of Connecticut, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Casper Y. Offutt, of Nebraska, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

J. Donald C. Rodgers, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Walter C. Thurston, of Arizona, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Charles H. Russell, jr., of New York, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California, to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America, promoted from class 4.

CLASS 4.

Harold L. Williamson, of Chicago, Ill., to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4 of the United States of America.

SHIPPING BOARD.

Henry M. Robinson, of California, to be a member of the United States Shipping Board for the unexpired term of six years from January 19, 1919, vice Charles R. Page, resigned.

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

C. F. McIntosh, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the unexpired term of two years from July 17, 1917, vice Charles A. Greathouse, resigned.

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

John J. Keegan, of Indiana, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of six years. (Reappointment.)

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS.

Martin A. Morrison, of Indiana, to be civil-service commissioner, vice John Avery McIlhenny, resigned.

George R. Wales, of Vermont, to be civil-service commissioner, vice Hermon W. Craven, resigned.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Robert G. Hand, of Storkville, Miss., to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States, in place of George Fort, deceased.

Mr. Hand is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY.

John Skelton Williams, of Richmond, Va., to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John Pallace, of Rochester, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y., in place of Charles F. Rattigan, resigned.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF MINT.

William A. Burns, of Reno, Nev., to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev., in place of Ed Ryan, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles F. Lynch, of Newark, N. J., to be United States district judge, district of New Jersey, vice Thomas G. Haight, appointed circuit judge.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Joseph L. Bodine, of Trenton, N. J., to be United States attorney, district of New Jersey, vice Charles F. Lynch, nominated to be United States district judge.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Ole Thompson, of Detroit, Minn., to be register of the land office at Crookston, Minn., vice Peter M. Ringdal, term expired.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

James P. O'Connell, of Minnesota, to be receiver of public moneys at Crookston, Minn., his term having expired February 17, 1918. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Roscoe Roy Spencer to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from January 5, 1919.

This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination for promotion.

Asst. Surg. Charles Joseph McDevitt to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service to rank as such from January 9, 1919.

This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination for promotion.

Asst. Surg. Sanders Louis Christian to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service to rank as such from January 8, 1919.

This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination for promotion.

Asst. Surg. Walter Casper Teufel to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from January 7, 1919.

This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination for promotion.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenant with rank from June 11, 1919, Capt. Wilmer Clayton Dreibelbies, Medical Corps, United States Army (temporary).

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 17, 1919.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Wilmer C. Dreibelbies, to be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *June 17, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, on earth, and in the hearts of Thy children, to uphold, sustain, and guide them in thought and deed, in harmony with Thy holy purposes, cleanse our hearts and renew a right spirit within, that with clear vision and high resolves we may go forward to the duties of the hour and hallow Thy name, thus becoming instruments in Thy hands for the promotion of Thy kingdom. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WOMAN-SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the secretary of state of the State of Michigan, inclosing a notice of ratification of the woman-suffrage amendment, which was read and laid on the table.

DEFICIENCIES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3478.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3478, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Whenever it is in order I desire to make a motion to recommit this report back to the managers on the part of the House, and I wish to inquire whether at this time it is in order to make such a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. No; it is not in order now. It will be in order after it is read.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought it was read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 15½, 16, 18, 42, 48, 53, 73, 74, 75, 77, and 82.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 17, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 78, 79, 80, and 81, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY.

"Not later than June 30, 1919, all books, records, and papers relating to the investigations of duplication of statistical and other work and to the work of the statistical clearing house of the central bureau of planning and statistics shall be transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "For rent of the Navy Annex Building, on New York

Avenue near Eighteenth Street NW., fiscal year 1920, $40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"OFFICE OF THE TREASURER.

"National currency (reimbursable): For the following employees from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows:

"Assistant tellers—one $2,200, one $2,000; clerks—four of class 4, four of class 3, four of class 2; expert counters—twenty at $1,100 each, thirty at $900 each; three messengers at $840 each; messenger boy, $480; in all, $75,400."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "determined by the Secretary of War and agreed to by the claimants"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert a comma and the following: "to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

"Office expenses: For the purchase of new instruments, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $24,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$32,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Renumber the section to read "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: The committee of conference has been unable to agree on the amendment of the Senate numbered 21.

JAMES W. GOOD,
J. G. CANNON,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, amending section 9 of the trading-with-the-enemy act, approved October 6, 1917.

On No. 2: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, transferring to the Bureau of Efficiency on or before June 30, 1919, the records of duplication of work now in the possession of the central bureau of planning and statistics, modified so as to eliminate from the amendment the proposed appropriation of $5,000.

On Nos. 3 and 4: Inserts the amendments, proposed by the Senate, in the paragraph providing for the preferential appointment to Government positions of soldiers, sailors, and marines, the widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines.

On No. 5: Inserts the appropriation, proposed by the Senate, increasing the compensation of an expert stenographer in the office of the President.

On No. 6: Restores the appropriation of $3,500, stricken out by the Senate, for an ice or cold-storage plant at the morgue in the District of Columbia.

On No. 7: Inserts the appropriation of $72,000, proposed by the Senate, for longevity pay of school teachers in the District of Columbia.

On No. 8: Inserts the appropriation of $1,000, proposed by the Senate, for allowance to principals in the schools of the District of Columbia.

On No. 9: Provides for the payment of employees in the night schools of the District of Columbia to May 30, 1919, as proposed by the Senate, instead of March 22, as proposed by the House.

On No. 10: Restores the appropriation of $710.70 for the police court of the District of Columbia.

On Nos. 11 and 12: Appropriates $42,000 for the Washington Asylum and Jail, as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 13: Appropriates $500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250, as proposed by the House, for the deportation of nonresident insane from the District of Columbia.

On No. 14: Appropriates $500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,417,186.95, as proposed by the Senate, for recruiting and training by the Shipping Board of personnel for American vessels.

On Nos. 15, 15½, 16, and 17, relating to the State Department: Restores the appropriation of $20,000 for additional employees, strikes out the increases proposed by the Senate in the amounts for contingent expenses for United States consulates and foreign missions, and appropriates $60,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House for relief and protection of American seamen in foreign countries.

On No. 18: Restores the appropriations, stricken out by the Senate, for the care and maintenance of Treasury Department buildings.

On No. 19: Appropriates $40,000, as proposed by the House, for rent of the Navy Annex and eliminates the authority for the assignment of the lease of that building from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Treasury.

On No. 20: Appropriates $75,400, as proposed by the House, for additional personal services in the Treasurer's Office and strikes out the appropriation of $4,080 to increase the compensation of 26 expert counters.

On No. 21: The committee of conference has been unable to agree on amendment 21, relating to the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill.

On No. 22: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the issuance of duplicates of bonds of officers or members of the crew, lost in the sinking of the U. S. S. *San Diego.*

On Nos. 23 and 24, relating to the War Department: Appropriates $150,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $252,258.14, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses, and strikes out the appropriation of $1,978.72 for rent in the District of Columbia.

On Nos. 25, 26, and 27: Inserts the amendments proposed by the Senate for the payment of claims for damages to and loss of private property in connection with the explosion and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co. at Morgan, N. J.

On Nos. 28 to 36, inclusive: Appropriates for the various branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in the amounts as proposed by the Senate instead of the amounts proposed by the House.

On No. 37: Increases from $900,000 to $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation on personal services for the Bureau of Construction and Repair of the Navy Department.

On No. 38: Appropriates $5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general repairs of the Capitol Building.

On No. 39: Appropriates $4,400, as proposed by the Senate, for improvement of the Maltby Building.

On No. 40: Appropriates $57,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the completion of the construction and furnishing of the courthouse in the District of Columbia.

On No. 41: Appropriates $100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for St. Elizabeths Hospital.

On No. 42: Strikes out the appropriation of $100,000, inserted by the Senate, for relief of sufferers from influenza in Alaska.

On No. 43: Appropriates $2,229.17 for the salary of the additional district judge for the northern district of Texas from March 4 to June 30, 1919, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 44: Appropriates $6,934.67, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,500, as proposed by the House, for the increased cost of envelopes in the Post Office Department.

On No. 45: Appropriates $691,493.45, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $474,500, as proposed by the House, for payment of limited indemnity for the injury or loss of mail matter.

On No. 46: Corrects the fiscal year of the appropriation for increased cost of envelopes in the Department of Commerce.

On No. 47: Restores the appropriation of $24,000 for purchase of new instruments for the Coast Survey and strikes out the appropriation of $15,000 for surveys on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

On No. 48: Restores the appropriation of $7,500 stricken out by the Senate for a wooden power lighter for use at the Pribilof Islands.

On No. 49: Inserts the appropriation of $272,000 proposed by the Senate for the employment service under the Department of Labor.

On No. 50: Appropriates $26,393.11, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, to enable the Secretary of Labor to carry on the work of mediation and conciliation in labor disputes.

On Nos. 51 and 52, relating to housing for war needs: Returns to the Treasury $32,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $40,000,000, as proposed by the House, and inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate covering into the Treasury all revenues and receipts under the act providing housing for war needs.

On No. 53: Restores the appropriation of $20,000 for the legislative drafting service.

On Nos. 54 to 72, inclusive: Appropriates for salaries and expenses of the Senate in the manner proposed by the Senate amendments.

On Nos. 73, 74, and 75: Appropriates $700 to pay Charles C. Allen, a messenger on night duty during the Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, as proposed by the House.

On No. 76: Appropriates $219,476.26 for payment of judgments of the Court of Claims certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

On No. 77: Strikes out the appropriation inserted by the Senate for payment of the claims of Brown, Howard & Co. and the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.

On No. 78: Appropriates $377,838.71 for the payment of audited claims certified to Congress after the bill had passed the House.

On Nos. 79 and 80: Corrects section numbers in the bill.

On No. 81: Inserts the language proposed by the Senate in the section prohibiting the expenditure of money to influence a Member of Congress in a matter of legislation or appropriations.

On No. 82: Strikes out the paragraph inserted by the Senate authorizing the reopening of the claims of the State of New York.

On No. 83: Corrects a section number in the bill.

JAMES W. GOOD,
J. G. CANNON,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair finds after examining the papers that the Senate has already acted upon this conference report, because the Senate first had the papers, and therefore the Senate having acted upon the conference report and discharged its conferees, there is no conference committee to which the report can be recommitted. Therefore a motion to recommit is not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair will remember that yesterday morning, before the Senate had acted, I asked for recognition by the Chair to make this motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman could not make the motion before the papers were before the House, and the papers could not come before the House until the Senate had acted.

Mr. BLANTON. The papers were not before the House on Saturday when the conference report was filed.

The SPEAKER. The Senate had the papers. The conference report was simply printed, and that does not give the House charge of the papers. The report is not before the House until the Senate has acted.

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry. May I ask if there is no way whereby the House may express an opinion through a vote concerning any one of these various amendments upon which the conferees have receded?

The SPEAKER. Why, certainly; the House can vote down the conference report and take up any of them.

Mr. BLANTON. And voting down the report is the only way this House can pass upon any amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is the only way now.

Mr. BLANTON. And if the House desired to not appropriate $272,000 for the United States Employment Service until that matter had been investigated by a proper audit and accounting, the only way to do it would be by voting down this conference report?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the conference report will be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The matter is not debatable.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add anything by explanation that will make more clear the facts set forth in the statement. There are, perhaps, a couple of items that the House might want to know about rather more in detail in regard to the action of the conferees.

The first amendment is an amendment to the trading-with-the-enemy act, and while the amendment seems to be a long and rather complicated one, it only involves two things; first, it confers additional jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to try certain classes of cases that arise in the administration of this law. These cases have practically all be tried in the southern district of the State of New York, and the work is so congested in that district that it was found necessary to confer upon some other courts jurisdiction to try them. So in line 19, page 3, there is a provision conferring jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and in order to write that provision in the law those in charge with administering the law thought it best to rewrite the entire paragraph, and that was done.

Then there was another provision in the law. When the Alien Property Custodian took over the property of alien enemies no discretion was made with regard to the property of an alien who might be residing in Germany. If an American citizen was residing in Germany, under the law the Alien Property Custodian took over his property. Now, that has worked a great hardship on a great many citizens of neutral countries having property in the United States who happened to be residing in Germany when the hostilities broke out, and this amendment simply gives to the Alien Property Custodian the right to restore the property of such neutral citizens and, in some cases, of American citizens without the necessity of their presenting their cases in the courts.

Another amendment I desire to call to the attention of the House is amendment No. 14. The Senate carried in the bill a deficiency——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know whether anything has been done on the other side of the water to restore property seized by Germany or Austria, property of American citizens, and restore it to American owners?

Mr. GOOD. If it is enemy-alien property it can not be restored without going to the court and conferring on the Alien Property Custodian some additional authority.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wish to say that there are some hearings now being carried on by the Ways and Means Committee.

Some American capital is very much dependent upon the restoration of property which has been in German hands for two years, which has not been restored to the original owners.

Mr. GOOD. We had no hearings on that amendment at all. It was not submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House. It is a Senate amendment. The Senate had rather meager hearings upon it, but the two questions presented were of a character that made it seem to us that the law should be amended.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do they first proceed to restore our property before we restore theirs?

Mr. GOOD. I have no information on that.

Another amendment that I wish to refer to is the amendment of the Senate, appropriating $2,417,186.95 for recruiting and training men for service on the seas for the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. This concern has a large fleet, and they are in need of men, and there was an actual deficiency to that amount. But they have borrowed practically all of that from the Division of Operations of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and if we appropriated the full amount, all in excess of $500,000 would be immediately turned over to the

Emergency Fleet Corporation. This corporation being a Government-owned concern, we saw no use in this. So the Senate yielded with an amendment to strike out "$2,417,186.95" and insert "$500,000," which will take care of that service up to the end of this fiscal year.

Nos. 23 and 24 relate to the War Department. The Senate amendment carried $202,258.14 for file cases and furniture, and I want to call the attention of the House to what I think is a very bad practice in the War Department in purchasing furniture, and items of that kind, before there is any authority of law for the purchase. The War Department already had acres of furniture here in Washington, much of which it has no use for, and it seems that in some of its bureaus they went to work and purchased furniture and machines to the amount of $252,000 without any authority of law, without any appropriation, or anything of the kind; and while the House conferees yielded with an amendment, the House conferees did maintain that not a single dollar ought to be appropriated for this sort of a transaction. The War Department in buying furniture should be placed upon an exact equality with every other department, and that no other department should be permitted to buy a single dollar's worth of furniture or other property until the money is appropriated and they are authorized to buy it. But, working along in a sort of slipshod fashion, they pay no attention to the appropriations made by Congress or the lack of authority to purchase, but go out and obligate the Government and get furniture and then hope that Congress will come forward and appropriate the money.

I want to serve notice now on the executive departments that, so far as I am concerned, unless they come to Congress and get the authority to buy, I shall not favor any appropriation to pay for things that they have purchased without authority. [Applause.] But the conferees were in this fix: Here an officer had been permitted to buy, and innocent manufacturers and dealers had sold to the Government, believing that the Government was purchasing under authority granted by Congress, and they have a good deal, if not all of this material. I do not doubt but that we shall have to appropriate more money for the purpose, but our position was that we wanted an opportunity to look into the matter further, and that $150,000 would give some relief to those persons who, acting upon the assumption that the War Department had the right to buy, sold their goods, and should receive a part of the money at least. And so we have carried $150,000 instead of $252,000 for that purpose.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman give the House the name of the official responsible for this expenditure?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that it was a matter that the House Committee knew nothing about. It appeared first in the Senate bill, and the hearings on that before the Senate committee are not extensive and do not give the facts the gentleman refers to, and do not give very much of the details in regard to the transaction, except that we have the furniture and somebody has furnished it, and the Government will either have to pay for it or return the furniture. And so we carried here $150,000, which will permit them to pay for the things they actually need, which they do not now possess, and allow them to return the things to the owners that they have purchased which they do not need.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Government is liable to pay for purchases that have been made where they have not been authorized?

Mr. GOOD. I do not say that there is a legal liability, but there is a moral liability, it seems to me, for the Government of the United States to pay for the things it has actually received. Whether there was a legal contract for their acquisition or not, if the Government uses those things, it seems to me there is a legal as well as a moral responsibility on our part to pay for them.

Mr. ROMJUE. Can the gentleman give any instances of the amount of purchases which have been made which have been unauthorized, according to the judgment of the committee?

Mr. GOOD. All we know in regard to this item is what is contained in the very meager hearings that the Senate had on the subject. They did not take very much time; they were crowded for time. I am not complaining that the Senate did not go into the matter more fully. The Senate put on the item of $252,258.14, which, as I understand, is the amount of the purchases which were unauthorized.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I want to ask if the gentleman thinks this is one of the subjects that the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department has the right to investigate? Does the gentleman think the committee ought to investigate that subject?

Mr. GOOD. I think so, of course. Any violation of the plain language of the statute ought to be investigated, and thoroughly investigated, and men that are buying things that they have no right to buy for the Government ought to be discharged from the service.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman remembers that only a little while ago we authorized the payment of contracts that were not formally executed, as the law requires, with the munition manufacturers, did we not?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is there any difference between that and this?

Mr. GOOD. These purchases were made after the armistice was signed. I should say there was a great difference. The war is over, and we must return now to a condition where the executive departments will not only enforce the law themselves, but will see to it that it is enforced by all of their subordinates. They ought not to violate the law.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WHEELER. I infer from what the chairman of the committee said that it will be necessary to appropriate $100,000 later on to pay for furniture that has been furnished.

Mr. GOOD. It may be, if it has been delivered and received and is not returned, but we will look into it.

Mr. BUTLER. What are we going to do with all this furniture? It seems to me the streets are filled with it.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know. The gentleman will have to ask somebody who has been buying it. We had no opportunity to go into this matter.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman think there is any moral or legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay for furniture and materials purchased when the act of Congress would show quite plainly, or the intention of the House was apparent, that the contract for it should not be made? Why does not the contractor look at the authority?

Mr. GOOD. I think they will commence to look if we serve notice on them in this way that we do not propose to pay for things that are not authorized. They will not fare so well next time.

Mr. BUTLER. The question in my mind is that the contractors ought to know that there is no obligation on the part of the Government and that the contract ought not to be made.

Mr. GOOD. I think the gentleman will agree to this, that where a person acting in good faith has furnished the Government with supplies and the Government has accepted them and used them, there is a moral responsibility on the part of the Government to pay for the thing furnished.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's remarks. Is he referring to the item inserted by the Senate for the purchase of files?

Mr. GOOD. Furniture and files.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did the gentleman inform the House that the statement of the Senate conferees was, and the statement made by Gen. Lord in the hearings was, that the money was desired for the purpose of buying files to care for the records that are being sent in from the camps, and buying files that the supply committee did not have, and that it does not apply to general supplies of furniture, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] seems to think?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that there is absolutely nothing in the hearings before the Senate committee to show that the supply committee did not have the files. My information is that the supply committee has acres of files. Whether they are the exact files desired or not, I do not know; but what I was complaining about was that they went on to purchase these files before Congress authorized their purchase by an appropriation.

Mr. HAMILTON. And after the armistice.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not know the source of the gentleman's information. My information is to the contrary, that they had not the files, and that the files used by the War Department during the war are now filled with the records of this Government, and, unlike chairs that are vacated by clerks, files are not vacated. If they should take the papers out of the files that they have and throw them away, this Congress would be the first to complain, because the records of the Government would be lost to the Government.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, even that does not justify any official in going out and buying things that Congress did not authorize.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. We would not say to a man who has no bread and whose family is starving that he had a right to go into somebody's else home and take food; both propositions are in violation of law.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman that they ought to go ahead and get the necessary authority.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the gentleman moves the previous question will he yield me three minutes on one of these 83 amendments?

Mr. GOOD. I am going to refer to the matter that the gentleman has in mind, and then I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I will appreciate the three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, by amendment 49 the appropriation was restored that went out on a point of order on the floor of the House, appropriating $272,000 for the employment service for the rest of this fiscal year. That is for a very greatly reduced force, but there are something over 400 clerks who would not receive any compensation for the month of June, who have been employed in this service, if Congress did not by a deficiency appropriation appropriate the money to supply the deficiency. I do not undertake to say that the employment service has been a model service. I would not say for a minute that the money was economically and well spent. On the contrary, I think it was miserably managed in some respects and that there was waste all along the line in the expenditure of the money. Notwithstanding that, I do think great good was also accomplished by the service while we were at war. Then, too, when Congress adjourned last March this House had without a dissenting vote placed in the bill that failed an item of $1,800,000 for the service for the balance of the year. The amount carried in the bill now is only sufficient to permit this organization to wind up its affairs, to permit the clerks who have been employed there to receive their salaries and the ordinary expenses under this reduced program.

I do not know whether it has produced all the good results claimed for it or not, but I do know that when the Congress that adjourned in March there was carried in the bill without a dissenting vote $1,800,000 for the service to June 30, and it at least gave some notice to this organization that it was the intention to continue it during the balance of the year. And it has been continued. Instead of at a rate requiring $1,800,000 we have accepted the Senate amendment of $272,000. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings on the last deficiency bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress Director J. B. Densmore (pp. 965–1755) testified that up to January 1, 1919, he had expended $3,282,790, and that on February 1, 1919, he still had on hand unexpended $1,543,400 of appropriations made to him by Congress. We would like for him to explain in detail what he has done with this unexpended $1,543,400. Immediately after Congress adjourned you will find, if you will investigate in your district, provided the same procedure was carried out in your district as was carried out in mine, that Director Densmore withdrew every single office from your district except possibly some main office in some large city. You will find that they disposed of the furniture and office fixtures in a manner that was wasteful and extravagant; that they withdrew every employee from the service, and it will further show upon investigation that there has been no service to the country except the loyal, patriotic service which gratuitously has been rendered by the many worthy chambers of commerce in each district in the United States. [Applause.]

These efficient chambers of commerce took over the service after March 4 without receiving one dollar from Director Densmore and without any expense whatever to this Government, and paid a man $75 a month to do service that four men had been doing in many places on behalf of the Government, drawing salaries as high as $150 a month apiece. And at such time Director Densmore had cash on hand unexpended to the amount of $1,543,400 wholly unaccounted for. You will find, notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding the fact that Congress called upon him and his department to retrench, that after March 4 salary after salary down here in this department in Washington has been raised instead of lowered. Many of his 513 high-salaried employees here in Washington have had their already enormous unearned salaries increased. One man's salary since March 4 has been raised $1,000. I can bring witnesses before your committee, which has promised a hearing on this matter, to show that salary after salary in Washington has been raised. I want an opportunity to let expert auditors show you exactly what Director Densmore has done with this $5,500,000 of the people's money, two-thirds of which Auditor Burroughs says has been wasted and misapplied, before we give him any more money.

I have witnesses who will testify before this committee in a day or two showing that employee after employee is being held on what is called a dollar-a-year basis, and have been told that as soon as they get this appropriation from Congress every salary will date back to the time that they were laid off and put on the dollar-a-year basis. I have shown to this Congress, not by evidence that is biased and prejudiced but by the impartial statement in the RECORD from Charles H. Burroughs, one of the former head employees of this department, and now an honored employee of the Shipping Board, that out of the five and a half million dollars that was turned over to this department much has been wasted and misapplied, and that if it had gotten hold of the proposed $10,000,000 knocked out of the former bill on my point of order fully two-thirds of same would have been wasted and the funds misapplied. And yet Congress will stay here and let this conference report pass carrying another $272,000 of the people's money to be wasted by the department that every day is sending editorials specially prepared by Federal directors out to your newspapers—propaganda specially prepared by Federal directors in different States to hoodwink us and to put us to sleep. I hope the conference report will be voted down and that we will instruct the conferees to insist on Senate amendment No. 49 going out of the bill.

The only itemized statement of expenditures Director Densmore has given us is:

From July 1, 1918, to December 31, 1918, six months, said Employment Service paid out in—

Salaries	$1,967,962.81
Rent of offices	229,239.11
Per diem expenses	164,380.00
Travel expenses	74,803.19
Furniture, etc	361,495.21
Printing and stationery	172,862.47
Telephone	168,036.79
Miscellaneous	146,498.46

Auditor Burroughs has told us where most of that $164,380 per diem expenses and that $74,803.19 travel expenses went to, but no one has ever told us how much of the $361,495.21 went for furniture and how much of it went for the "etc."

I know that Mr. Samuel Gompers has indorsed this appropriation and that Mr. Samuel Gompers, jr., is Secretary Wilson's chief clerk of the Department of Labor, and that Director Densmore is Secretary Wilson's brother-in-law, and all of these very significant facts rather appeal to me; but I do hope that this House will wait for a rigid audit of the money already spent before appropriating more.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with some of the work performed by this department, and if the gentleman from Texas knew anything about labor conditions in the large centers of the country he would not be here day after day attacking this department. I know that thousands upon thousands of men have been placed in the city of Chicago by this department. This department has aided manufacturing concerns and commercial concerns to secure labor when they were hard up. On the other hand, thousands and thousands of men and women have been properly placed by this department. I think this department has done a wonderful work and should be retained and should be encouraged. Formerly a great deal of this work, now well performed by this labor bureau, was done by cheap labor agents, who preyed on the unfortunate men seeking employment. They would charge a man $2 to $5 to secure a job, and within three to five days the man would, through connivance and conspiracy between these labor agents, lose his job, whereupon they would send a new man, and in that way they would rob these poor, unfortunate people that were looking for work and who to secure it would borrow the fee to pay these thieving agents.

We endeavored to abolish that damnable system, and have in a measure succeeded, and I say to you gentlemen that this bureau in doing this wonderful work should be encouraged, and I am only sorry that the appropriation is not larger than $272,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. GOOD. I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas also objects to the little increases paid to the laboring men in the District of Columbia and elsewhere. He forgets that the people in his district are getting from 300 to 400 per cent more for cotton; that the people in the West are getting from 200 to 300 per cent more for wheat; and that the laboring man is obliged to pay from 100 to 150 per cent more for the necessaries of

life, and objects because the poorly paid clerks and employees and the laboring man has his salary increased by a few dollars a week or month, though that little increase, although of great benefit to them, nowhere meets the needs of the people, who are obliged to pay the great increase due to the high cost of living now prevailing. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] One member standing, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 208, noes 1.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and sixty-nine members present—a quorum.

So the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now call up Senate amendment No. 21, and I offer the following motion, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Treasury, until further authorized by law, shall take no further action under the authority granted in sections 6 and 7 and such portions of sections 8, 9, and 10 that relate to the acquisition of land and hospitals and the expenditures of funds authorized in sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, approved March 3, 1919': *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress within the next 30 days the contracts or obligations entered into and the sums expended under the authority granted in said act, together with his recommendations as to what action, if any, should be taken in the matter of acquiring any of the hospitals authorized to be acquired by said act."

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's right will be preserved.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 21 and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 21 and concur in the same.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, may we have the Senate amendment No. 21 reported?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I understand the motion of the gentleman from Illinois will be voted upon first?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And if that should be voted down, I desire to make a point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remember that the gentleman's point of order is pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the meantime I reserve the point of order against the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report Senate amendment No. 21.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919 (Public act No. 326, 65th Cong.).

The last paragraph of section 6 of the "Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The sum of $1,500,000 is hereby authorized to be held as an emergency fund for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of buildings or for the purchase of land and buildings, and the remodeling thereof, suitable for hospital and sanatoria purposes, which the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to select and locate for the uses of the United States Public Health Service, if in his judgment the emergency requires it."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be debate upon this motion which I offer of one hour and a half on a side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that there be debate upon the motion of one hour and a half on a side. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we will not need that amount of time. I believe that we can get through upon our side of the question with an hour's debate. Is the gentleman sure that he will need an hour and a half?

Mr. CANNON. I feel so from the applications that I have for time. I have every desire, however, to shorten the debate. We will get through in an hour if it is possible.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, then, that the debate upon Senate amendment No. 21 be limited to three hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and one-half by myself. I will say that those on the other side of the aisle who are opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois will be given one-half of the time that I control.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois be limited to three hours, one-half of that time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. And also, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of the three hours the previous question may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. And that the previous question be considered as ordered at the end of the three hours. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by a curious coincidence the great States of Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin, although they supplied more than 800,000 troops to the war, have no permanent hospital facilities for the care of those who are coming back from the field. It is true that the Secretary of the Treasury, in a communication to the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. GOOD], says that he has hospital facilities for over 30,000 people; but I want to ask the House and the Secretary of the Treasury what use 30,000 or any other number of beds are to the soldiers of the Middle West if those beds are located in Florida and Texas? It seems to me that the Middle West has a right to equal consideration with every other section of the Nation. It so happens that in the instance that is now before us, while the war was still in progress a semiofficial contract was entered into by those who constructed the so-called Speedway Hospital, and they have already expended in the construction of this building more than $1,000,000.

They own 320 acres of land, which is a part of the proposal pending, and the proposition is to take over the hospital, which was erected as a result of an understanding with the War Department at a price of something like $3,000,000. I am not interested as to whether this building shall be the building through which the facilities are to be supplied; I am interested in having the facilities supplied to the more than 800,000 men from whom the wounded are coming back from the front. It is true the Secretary of the Treasury says that he already has facilities that he can obtain at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, but the Secretary of the Treasury can not be unmindful of the fact that in the law recently passed by the House he has no authority whatever to use any naval training station building anywhere in the United States. He may say that he has facilities at Fort Sheridan. There are temporary hospital facilities at Fort Sheridan, but every bed is filled by a wounded soldier. Those buildings are only temporary. They are fire traps and can not last long at the best. They have no place there; they never should have been constructed; so that we are in the position of saying that there is no hospital for the care of the men proposed to be provided for by this provision of the bill in the Middle West anywhere, except the hotel hospital in Chicago, the lease of which expires next August. If we have more facilities than we need, as the Secretary of the Treasury says, why did he buy, at a cost of $1,500,000, a new building at Corpus Christi, Tex., on the 7th day of June? If we have more facilities than we need to provide for the care of the wounded soldiers, why is the Secretary of the Treasury trying to buy or lease a hospital up on Wisconsin Avenue for that purpose? If we have more facilities than we need, why is the Secretary of the Treasury so anxious to spend $550,000 for the erection of a hospital for this very pur-

pose up here on the Soldiers' Home grounds? If we have more of these facilities than we need, why buy new sites? The very fact we are buying them every day indicates that some one must be wrong about it. I do not pretend to say whether we have more or less facilities than we need, but I do pretend to say we ought to have all the facilities we need, for if there is any duty laid upon the American people through its Congress it is the duty of supplying facilities for the care of those who gave their blood that the country might be safe. It is said that $3,000,000 is involved. True, but we have been talking in sums much larger than this for a long time past, and will $3,000,000 be allowed to stand between the care of those who need the care and justice? I ask for no favor for the Middle West, and I ask for no favors for Chicago. I am interested in no man and in no piece of property. I care not what the site may be, provided it meets the need of the hour, and I say to you, upon my word as a man who has given a lifetime to the study of building and to the erection of buildings, that I have never seen a building better constructed than the one now in question.

This building is on a beautiful site, easily accessible by railroad. It stands on the outer edge of a 320-acre tract. This tract is fenced in. There are 22 miles of sewers and an abundance of fine water. The building is 2,040 feet long, 50 feet wide, four stories high, and is of fireproof construction. I repeat, is there any construction too good for the care of those who gave their blood to the country, or can we submit to their being cared for in fire traps all over the land? Has the hour come when we shall say by our votes upon this floor that we want nothing but the most fragile kind of construction for the care of those we love? Shall it be said that this great territory, from which came 20 per cent of all the men who engaged in the Army, is to have no facilities? My own State gave 351,153 men to the war, and are no facilities of any kind to be supplied for the care of those who come back wounded? Is that to be the policy——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to get a little information. Who are the present owners of this property?

Mr. MADDEN. My understanding is that the Shank Co., or a man named Shenck, and Edward Hines, of Chicago, are the owners, and they have already invested of their own money, by direction of the War Department, in the construction of this building more than a million dollars.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Now, that is the very question I was leading up to. Have they entered into any negotiations with the Government or any authorized agents of the Government for this improvement that they have made or for the sale of this property to the Government for any purpose?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I understand there was an informal contract and that contract never was completed for the erection of the building, but I may say for the information of the gentleman that the investment was made as the result of this informal contract, and that recommendations for its purchase——

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MADDEN. Just a moment. I can not yield; I have only a limited time—that recommendation for its purchase and erection was made by John L. Chamberlain, major general, inspector general; Merritte W. Ireland, major general, surgeon general; R. C. Marshall, jr., brigadier general, Chief of Construction Division; C. C. Wright, lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps, Construction Division; Louis W. Stotesbury, major, Inspector General's Department; and A. E. Strode major, Judge Advocate General's Department, and in addition I want to say that Assistant Secretary Moyle, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, has gone all over this and has suggested modifications to the contract and is favorable toward the purchase of the building and property, and that those suggestions have been made twice by him to the Secretary of the Treasury with favorable report——

Mr. KINCHELOE. And Col. Banks, too.

Mr. MADDEN. And that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury has also gone over it and made two separate favorable reports, and that other agencies of the Government have been sent to investigate.

Surg. Gen. Blue has also made two favorable reports, and the matter is now pending in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, and has been for four months.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman takes the position, as I understand it, that from these transactions the Government is morally bound in obligation to the owners of the property?

Mr. MADDEN. I take the position that if the Government induced some one to invest a million dollars there must be some kind of obligation somewhere on the Government.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. MASON. The question, I want to say to the gentleman, is, Is it not true that Congress investigated all this matter and finally passed a bill ratifying these things and making appropriation for the hospital?

Mr. MADDEN. I understand the Senate——

Mr. MASON. Did not Congress pass the appropriation for it?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MASON. Yes. They did pass the appropriation. It directs the Secretary now to enforce the law that was passed.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman referred to the building under the direction of the War Department. Is not the gentleman aware of the fact that both the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War, as soon as they heard that there was this impression on the part of this contractor, advised him that he was not working under any direction of the War Department?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know anything about the details of the telegrams that passed between them, but I do know that there is a contract prepared by the War Department through its own legal officers and signed by the contractor, but never signed by the Secretary of War.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the gentleman contend that because a man signs a contract that that binds the War Department?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all. But I do contend that the Secretary of War authorized a contract to be written and signed by the contractor, which was submitted to him later and then he refused to sign it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. He authorized the submission of a proposal which he refused to sign.

Mr. MADDEN. That is a different proposition than a contract.

Mr. SABATH. Up to that time they had proceeded with the construction and had completed nearly 40 or 50 per cent of it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Was the building originally started for the Government?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And how much was completed?

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that about 60 per cent is complete.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Can the gentleman produce a statement from anybody to show that this building was constructed for the Government?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not tell the details. I only know there were negotiations, and as a result of the negotiations a report, by responsible Government officers, that a million dollars has been spent by these private individuals.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as we all know when the Bureau of War Risk Insurance act was passed by Congress it not only provided for allotments and for allowances and insurance, but it said to these boys, "Congress, with a solemn pledge, says when you go and bare your breast to the bayonet and win this fight, if you come back maimed and wounded the Government, in addition to that, is going to provide every hospital facility." We passed that act. Now then, on March 3 last, just before we adjourned, we passed this sanatorium bill. So far as the Speedway Hospital is concerned, regardless of whether when the first excavation was made there was an understanding with the Government as to whether it should take it or not, I do know that a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, composed of Senator Hardwick, Senator BECKHAM of Kentucky, and several other Senators, investigated that proposition for days and nights, and Senator BECKHAM told me only this morning that when he began that investigation he had a prejudice against the Speedway Hospital. But they unanimously reported that it was a good propositon and to buy it. Embodied in this law of March 3 is this hospital, together with others. But if the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] prevails, it not only affects the Speedway Hospital, but it puts out of business the Dawsonsprings Hospital in Kentucky, where we appropriated $1,500,000 for the buildings, contingent upon the fact that the public-spirited people there would give the ground. You would put out of business $900,000 in Norfolk, Va.; you would put out of business the $500,000 in the District of Columbia; and you would put out of business $500,000 in Staten Island, and many other items too numerous to mention, and absolutely retard the work. In other words, in my judgment it simply repeals all of this hospital legislation that we promised the American boys.

Now, as to Dawsonsprings, I said here when we passed it that the business people of that community would give any-

where from 1,000 to 5,000 acres of land absolutely free to the Government if it would erect this hospital there. You passed that bill. Over $90,000 is now in the bank at Dawsonsprings to pay for these 5,000 acres that the Public Health Service says we need. The abstracts have already been made and are in the hands of the United States district attorney at Louisville. Condemnation proceedings against a few tracts of land have already been instigated. There were 400 acres of coal land there that the Bureau of Public Health said that it had to have. Vein No. 6, as fine a bituminous coal as any in the world, is under this tract. That is owned by the Simmons Hardware Co., of St. Louis. They had been getting a royalty at the rate of 6 per cent on a valuation of $840 an acre on that land. The business people of Dawsonsprings went over and saw Mr. Simmons and said that they had to have the land in connection with this hospital. He said that it was not for sale, but when they explained the proposition he said, "If my Government wants it and the deed is to be made to the United States Government, then let your commercial club go over there and fix a price and I will take it." They fixed it at $15 an acre, and the Simmons Hardware Co. not only turned it over, but sent their engineer there, who made a blue print, and turned over $360,000 worth of that property for the pitiful sum of $6,000 because the Government wanted it. [Applause.] And yet, if the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is to prevail, that is all to go and be held for naught. I talked with Mr. Perry, the architect, at Dawsonsprings the other day.

He said, "We can not only use this coal for this hospital, but we can send it to every hospital in the United States that the Government owns, and save thereby $4 on every ton of coal that is burned by mining it there." Col. Banks, the Chief Surgeon of the Bureau of Public Health, went to Dawsonsprings—and I reiterate this for the benefit of the new Members, because the old Members will remember it—he went there and recommended Dawsonsprings as the site for the central hospital in the United States. When they analyzed the water they found that the only water in the world that has the medicinal qualities of the springs at Dawsonsprings is that at Carlsbad, in Bohemia. The Weather Bureau shows that there has been 79 per cent of sunshine there for the last 20 years. The main line of the Illinois Central Railroad, running from Louisville to New Orleans, runs through there. The Louisville & Nashville Railroad runs from Chicago and St. Louis to Jacksonville, Fla., across the tracks of the Illinois Central, 10 miles distant from Dawsonsprings. The specifications are now ready, and the contract is ready to be let. The Government surveyors are there now, ready to build the roads. The Illinois Central Railroad engineers are surveying for a switch, and there is $400,000 worth of real estate, including the coal land, which the patriotic citizenship of three counties there, and the magnanimity of Mr. Simmons, of the Simmons Hardware Co., turned over to the Government absolutely free of charge; $400,000 worth of property, with coal enough to enable them to supply every hospital that we have in the United States with fuel.

That is for Dawsonsprings alone. That does not include Norfolk, Va., or Staten Island, N. Y. If the motion of the gentleman from Iowa prevails, it puts them all out of business.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. I am interested to know what effect this conference report amendment has on the other projects that the gentleman has mentioned. I am interested to know in what way it affects these other provisions that the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will read that. I can read it quicker than I can tell the gentleman. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury, until further authorized by law, shall take no further action under the authority granted in sections 6 and 7, and such portions of sections 8, 9, and 10 that relate to the acquisition of land and hospitals, and the expenditure of funds authorized in sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled, "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress within the next 30 days the contracts or obligations entered into, and the sums expended, under the authority granted in said act, together with his recommendations as to what action, if any, should be taken in the matter of acquiring any of the hospitals authorized to be acquired by said act.

You will notice that reference is made to the authority granted in sections 6 and 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919. That includes the Speedway Hospital and the Dawsonsprings and the Norfolk, Va., hospital, and the Staten Island hospital, and the District of Columbia hospital. It is practically a repeal of the act of March 3, 1919, that we passed only a few months ago. It throws a monkey wrench into all these activities. The contract for Dawsonsprings is to be let in two weeks, and the money is now in the bank waiting for the United States district attorney at Louisville, Mr. Miller, to O. K. the title, and then they will turn the money over to the landowners and make out the deeds direct to the Government. In other words, so far as the hospital propaganda for discharged soldiers and sailors and marines is concerned, which this Congress promised to give, it is practically paralyzed, and this amendment would put the whole scheme of propaganda entirely out of business.

Now, they talk about these 30,000 beds. I know, gentlemen, you have all been around these hospitals at cantonments, temporarily constructed and with paper roofs. I submit to you, if you had a boy who had gone over and rendered service to his country and was wounded to such an extent as to put him out of business for life—remembering this solemn pledge that this American Congress made to these boys, that it would take care of them—would you want your boy to go into one of these hospitals with a paper roof over it? [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. I was curious to know in what way the hospitals you speak of could be erected in time to take in any of these boys; for instance, the one at Dawsonsprings. How long would it take to construct that hospital?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Hardly a year. They will let out the buildings in one contract, the sewerage in another contract, the lighting proposition in one contract, and the dairy buildings in another, and so on. I do not believe that the Congress is going to turn down this $400,000 tract of land that will supply coal to all the hospitals, including the Speedway. When they made an exhaustive investigation of the Speedway Hospital proposition they said it was all right. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa use some of his time?

Mr. GOOD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] proposes to recede from the disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur with an amendment that strikes out the Senate amendment and inserts new language the effect of which would be to suspend for 30 days or less—to suspend for such time as the Secretary might utilize less than 30 days in preparing the report called for by the amendment—all action under the bill of March 3 providing for certain hospitals.

The action proposed by the gentleman's amendment is radical and should not be agreed to unless there is some good reason for agreeing to it. I think there is a very good reason, a compelling reason or a number of compelling reasons, why the House should agree to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

What are they? Among the items specifically provided for in the hospital bill of March 3, 1919, was what is commonly known as the Speedway Hospital, near Chicago. That was one of the institutions to be taken over. It has not so far been taken over, and there seems to be an impression on the part of some gentlemen that it may not be taken over, as provided for under the bill referred to, and the Senate, in view of that belief, placed in the bill a mandatory provision compelling the Secretary to take over the Speedway Hospital.

Now, we should not take action of that character unless we are very clear that such action is justified. My own personal opinion, based possibly on lack of information rather than upon information, is that the Speedway Hospital is a most excellent and excellently located hospital. My impression has been that the provision for taking that hospital over was a wise one, but I can not act to-day on my limited information, possibly my misinformation or my lack of information, in the face of the written record. Now, what is the written record? The Secretary of the Treasury, who is responsible under the act of March 3, who was directed to take over the Speedway Hospital and to provide other hospitals if, in his judgment, it was wise to do so, has said that the contract under which it is proposed to take over the Speedway Hospital is a contract utterly indefensible. He says it is a contract that no ordinarily prudent business man would undertake in his own affairs. In addition to that he has expressed the opinion, based on the judgment of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, that it would cost nearly $2,000,000 in addition to the sum proposed to be paid for the Speedway Hospital to provide the additional buildings and facilities necessary to make that hospital available for public purposes. And the Surgeon General expresses some doubt as to whether or not that establishment would be an ideal one, even with that very large additional expenditure.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The Surgeon General, however, made two reports that are quite contrary to the one that he was sent to make and which the gentleman is now quoting.

Mr. MONDELL. I am quoting, of course, the most recent report, because I must accept the most recent judgment of these officials as being their present judgment based on their fullest and widest knowledge of the facts.

In addition to that, the Secretary of the Treasury says that for the present and for the immediate future, for six months, possibly for a year, we have all the hospital beds that we need and that we can use, and that we have them generally distributed over the country, without the Speedway Hospital. He does not say, but it follows logically, that we have all the hospital beds we need and will need in the near future without Dawsonsprings Hospital, without Corpus Christi, without another hospital suggested and provided for in the Senate amendment. And if these opinions of the Secretary be founded on fact, then this House is not justified in ordering the Secretary to take over a hospital which he says can only be taken over, as matters now stand, under an indefensible contract, can only be utilized by the expenditure of $2,000,000, and is possibly not needed. If this House takes action like that, our mouths are closed for the future in criticism of any sort of reckless expenditure—past, present, or prospective—under this administration.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Has the gentleman ever visited what he calls the hospitals at Camp Grant and at Fort Sheridan?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I have not.

Mr. MASON. Well, I have.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not visited those hospitals. I have some mental reservations with regard to the accuracy of a number of the statements in the Secretary's letter, but I do not know. The Secretary speaks as a member of the Cabinet and the head of a great department on his responsibility. I must accept his statement. If I now command the Secretary of the Treasury to do a thing which he says is indefensible, to do a thing which he says in effect is not in the public interest, I shall never rise in my place on this floor in the future to denounce indefensible acts of extravagance, because I could not do that and justify myself. I want to remain in a position to act without embarrassment with regard to all of these enterprises, and in a position where I feel justified in condemning when the act performed deserves condemnation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman give me two minutes more?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, what will happen if the motion of the gentleman from Iowa is adopted? Within 30 days, probably within less time than that, possibly within 10 days, we shall have from the Secretary a complete statement with regard to this general situation. Unfortunately we never have had such a statement up to this time. We did not have at the time we passed the bill on March 3 a satisfactory statement from responsible sources as to the hospital needs and facilities of the country, and here is an opportunity to secure from the highest official sources a statement based on the knowledge of this hour as to what we need and as to what we ought to have to care for our discharged soldiers and others entitled to hospital treatment from the Federal Government.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. I will say to the gentleman that the Senate investigated, and I ask the gentleman whether he has read their report? They gave weeks and months to the investigation, and hundreds of pages of evidence were taken. Their report was furnished to us before we passed the law directing the Secretary of the Treasury to buy this, and finding for the gentleman the very facts that he asks for.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman undoubtedly will have time to make his own statement about that. I know that the Senate made an investigation and made a report, and that report is entitled to proper consideration and should be given due weight. But the latest statement we have—and it is a very recent one—is a letter over the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury as to conditions to-day, and I for one shall not vote to command the Secretary of the Treasury or any other high and responsible official under the Government to do an act which he says is indefensible, an act which he asserts is not justified in the public interest, an act which he claims would entail a large additional expenditure with doubtful public benefit.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I have only a moment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I just wanted to ask the gentleman whether he had any information as to whether the Senate had any particular project in mind with reference to this $1,500,000?

Mr. MONDELL. I am not fully informed with regard to that matter. Other gentlemen, no doubt, are. I want to say, in conclusion, that on the record the House cannot justify itself in approving the Senate amendment. Under the circumstances, the only way to act intelligently on this entire matter of hospitals is to call on the Secretary of the Treasury to make a report. He may be in a position to make it within a week—within 30 days at the latest—whereupon we can act intelligently and in the public interest.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have the utmost confidence in the Secretary of the Treasury. I believe that he is sincere and that he means to protect the interests of our Government, and in that he has my sincere approval and shall have our cooperation. It is claimed that the Secretary did not have the time to properly investigate the plans and specifications. The bill authorizing him to take over this hospital passed March 3, nearly three and one-half months ago, surely long enough for anyone—even for the Secretary—to have the plans and specifications examined, investigated, redrafted, and rewritten. Of course, I realize that he is an extremely busy man; that he has many important matters to look after; but, Mr. Speaker, he has many assistants in whom he has confidence, whom he can trust. Why can he not turn over to them this investigation? No one man can do it all. Or is it possible that he has no one he can rely on?

The Senate has investigated this for over 20 days, had long hearings, heard many witnesses, and they unanimously reported in favor of this project. It came to the House and the House by nearly a unanimous vote approved and requested the department to proceed with the completion.

The construction of this hospital, as shown by the evidence of several gentlemen, has been commenced, under the supervision of the War Department, but due to the armistice it was stopped. I believe that the Government is morally responsible to repay the owners every dollar which they have expended. This building is nearly 60 per cent completed, as has been stated by the Senate committee and other experts, and if for any reason the Government should fail to take it over it will mean a loss of nearly a million dollars and a delay of many months. It is a splendid building; it is over 2,000 feet long, four stories high, fireproof, and I have not only the expert opinion of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], but of others, that it is the best constructed building in the United States. I will read from the report of the Senate committee hearings, or, rather, from their report, which they made after 20 long days of investigation. They say:

> As for the future of the hospital, we are very clearly of the opinion that it ought to be completed and utilized. There seems to be no question that it is a better building for hospital purposes than any now owned by the United States Government.

In our judgment, if work is stopped upon this hospital now the Government might at some time in the future pay to the owners a large sum of money, for which it will obtain nothing, and the people of the United States will lose the benefit of the magnificent structure which has been erected.

With slight changes it will serve admirably for the purpose of the Public Health Service. The various services of the Government will need hospital facilities especially for the sick and maimed soldiers under the war-risk act, and will need them for many years. It will be stated that there is no need now for this large hospital; that the department has 13,000 beds. It may; I do not know in what sections of our country; but I am sure in Chicago we have none and need them badly.

A few days ago I received a telegram from the health commissioner of the city of Chicago which states that every hospital in the city of Chicago is filled and that they can not find a place to put these boys who are returning from Europe and who need attention and care. I will insert the telegram I received:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 20, 1919.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The situation in regard to hospital beds in the city of Chicago is precarious. The total bed capacity of the city of Chicago is approximately 10,000. At the present time there are over 12,000 patients, making it impossible for me to enforce the city ordinances in regard to bed space. The municipal tuberculosis sanitarium is crowded to capacity. There is a waiting list of several hundred. The sanitarium has been caring for soldiers and relatives of soldiers, taking all the cases referred to us by the Red Cross. We have reached the limit of our endurance. Should an epidemic occur which would make hospital beds

necessary, the situation would be appalling. I wish you would hurry arrangements for marine hospital beds so as to take this burden from the city of Chicago, and provide the proper space for patients, so that I may be able to maintain proper sanitary control of the hospitals.

JOHN DILL ROBERTSON,
Commissioner of Health.

This hospital can be completed within 60 days, and I say we owe it to ourselves to do so. The mere fact that the gentleman from Wyoming does not know, the mere fact that some other gentlemen do not know, is no excuse for delay. If we know and have the information showing the need and the desirability, we ought to act. We have enough information at hand now to justify us in insisting and demanding that the department should proceed and complete this hospital.

This hospital is situated about 7 miles from my own district. I know thousands of poor boys from the section of the city where I live who are returning and who will need to be taken care of. There is no place anywhere around there to which they can be sent, and I say it is manifestly unfair that we should send them from 100 to 1,000 miles away for the purpose of being treated, where their relatives, wives, and children can not visit them. This place can be reached in 30 to 50 minutes on the street car and 35 minutes by automobile from the heart of the city. It is splendidly located, and the experts tell us that the price is reasonable. So I do not know why we should hesitate. This amendment, properly placed on it by the Senate, should be favorably considered and the work should go on, so that the hospital can be completed in the shortest possible time.

Under the war-risk insurance we have legislated and promised the boys that they will be taken care of and provided for. What have we done up to the present time? We have secured a few temporary wooden hospitals that can not be utilized for this purpose to advantage. Here we have a fireproof structure at a very reasonable cost. We have the land as well as the building, which can be completed and utilized within 60 or 75 days. I say it is our duty and we owe it to ourselves and our boys to act. We ought not to delay the completion of the building.

Personally I care nothing about the owners, I care nothing about the contractor, but what I am interested in is the boys who offered their lives to their country, who are coming back in a condition where they need and must have attention, and we must provide suitable buildings as near to their homes as we possibly can, so as to give their mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, and friends a chance to visit them, to see them, and to encourage them.

This hospital is situated in a splendid location, and I do not know of any other place that would be more advantageous than this one. Within 40 miles of this place there is a population of nearly three and a half to four million people. We have sent out from that district alone over 750,000 boys. If only 1 per cent of those boys will need attention and care we will require a building with a capacity of 7,500. If only one-half per cent of these boys will need to be taken care of, still we would need the capacity of 3,750, and we have not got it now. The hospitals around Chicago are filled. We can not provide for these wounded, and I say that we should not delay; we should act, so that this place is completed before the boys will reach home.

By unanimous consent Mr. SABATH was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address a few remarks to the hospital situation for our wounded soldiers in New England. There has been in Brookline, a suburb of Boston, a hospital able to accommodate some 750 or 800 wounded soldiers. Within a short time announcement has been made by the War Department that on June 15 this hospital would be abandoned. Several of the Members from Massachusetts and from New England have endeavored to secure from the War Department some explanation of why this General Hospital No. 10 should be given up, and the patients there transferred out of New England, away from their home sections, just in the manner the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY] referred to with respect to those in the vicinity of Chicago. Before it was closed the men could be visited by their friends and by their parents. I submit that New England has done its fair share, together with its sister States, in the number of boys it has willingly sent to the front in the war. It seems to me that there is an obligation upon the part of this Government to give them just the very best care and attention possible now that they have returned to our shores in such numbers maimed and wounded. I had an illustration only a few days ago of what it will mean when a mother wrote a most pitiful appeal to me from my district asking that her wounded boy in a hospital in Maryland be transferred nearer home, so that she could visit him. I applied to the department for the son's transfer, and was told that the nearest hospital, now that this one of which I speak was about to be closed, to which that wounded boy could be transferred would be Plattsburg, N. Y., or New York City itself. There is not a place in the New England States where that boy could be sent so that his relative could have the opportunity of visiting him without the great expense of travel which it is not proper should be put upon these poor parents.

Now, what excuse is there for such a condition as that? Why, forsooth, we are told that it is a matter of economy. Great heavens, Mr. Speaker, were we economizing to win the war, and is it for us to-day to economize for those who willingly sacrificed their all that victory might crown our colors? A poor excuse, Mr. Speaker; but it is the only one we can get from the War Department. I received a telegram a few days ago, signed by a committee of the boys there, on behalf of 400 New England boys in that hospital, asking that it be not closed and that they should not be transferred elsewhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I have one minute additional?

Mr. GOOD. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is the situation with all New England boys to-day, and whether that hospital should be under the control of the War Department or under the Treasury Department matters not, but the sons of New England should have a place where care can be given them and their friends and relatives can visit them. I therefore protest against this attitude of the War Department that for the saving of a few paltry dollars the only general hospital in New England for soldier boys should be closed on June 15. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I think it is well we should understand the situation that now presents itself. We are confronted with a motion on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to concur in the two amendments added to the deficiency bill in the Senate. Those amendments refer first to the Speedway Hospital, and secondly to the appropriation of $1,300,000, which in the act of March 3, 1919, is called an emergency fund. It is well first to look at that law, in order that we may understand what we are doing. Section 7 of the act of March 3 provided that—

> At Cook County, Ill., by taking over the land and executing the contract for the construction thereon of hospital buildings specified therein of a certain proposed contract executed by the Shank Co., August 31, 1918, and in accordance with such contract and the plans and specifications, identified in connection therewith August 31, 1918, by the signature and initials of Brig. Gen. R. C. Marshall, jr., construction division, Quartermaster's Department, United States Army, by Lieut. Col. C. C. Wright, and the Shank Co., by George H. Shank, president, that the cost stated therein, namely, $2,500,000, with such changes in said plans and specifications as may be required by the Secretary of the Treasury to adapt said specified buildings to the needs and purposes of the Public Health Service, at a total limit of cost not to exceed $3,000,000.

By that act the Secretary of the Treasury was directed to sign a certain contract for the construction of a building if in his discretion it was to the best interest of the Government from the standpoint of location, cost, and the needs of the Public Health Service. Pursuant to that direction the Secretary of the Treasury proceeded to direct the Supervising Architect to confer with the Public Health Service as to such plans as would be necessary to transform the building into a building suitable for their purposes. The Supervising Architect proceeded to hold such conferences with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and the Supervising Architect after such conferences entered upon the preparation of plans for the hospital. Now, while those plans are in preparation, and before the Supervising Architect can submit to the Secretary of the Treasury his final report, an amendment placed upon this bill by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] directs and makes mandatory the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in accepting this proposition and signing the contract specified in that act. In other words, the Congress by that act said to the Secretary of the Treasury, "You are directed to investigate this proposition. If in your discretion it is not suitable for the purpose of the Public Health Service, either because of location or cost or the needs of the service, you are to reject it. If you find it is suitable and you can build it within the $3,000,000 you are to accept it. If you do not accept it you can construct another building in the city of Chicago." The Secretary of the Treasury, understand me, can either accept this building, or, if he deems it not suitable for the purposes of the Public Health Service, he can take the $3,000,000 and construct one that will be suited to their purposes in the city of Chicago to-day. Now, while he is exercising that discretion, consulting the Public Health Service, having plans drawn, and they are very near completion, for some reason——

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Senate decided—I can not yield right now, I will in a minute—for some reason those behind this proposition decided that action must be had now, that the contract must be signed whether the Secretary deems it wise or not. You told him, "The discretion is yours"; but now we say, "My friend, the discretion was yours; but I am afraid you may not exercise it as we want you to; therefore I am going to take that discretion away and I am going to exercise it without knowing anything about the merits of the proposition."

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not yield now, I will in a minute.

Mr. SABATH. The Secretary had three months and a half?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I said I would not yield, but I will answer that. Yes; someone else said it had been before the Secretary for three months and a half. I happen to know from the hearings that the Secretary of the Treasury said that the papers were placed upon his desk in April—I think about April 15. Now, what is the cause of the hurry? Why, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who is on the floor doubtless trying to account for this haste, says the boys are suffering. Well, you know more crimes are going to be committed in the name of the boys than anything this country has ever witnessed. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, what is the fact? Where are the boys maimed and wounded out in Chicago who have no place to go? The gentleman says the hospitals are full. That might be accepted here if we did not have the official statement of the Public Health Service. Now, you understand that the War Risk Bureau takes charge of a soldier when he is discharged and puts on citizen clothes, and if he is entitled to hospital benefits he is assigned to a hospital of the Public Health Service. How many are in Chicago hospitals to-day? Here is the last statement, secured by the Secretary of the Treasury for the specific purpose of having the Congress know. It was secured on June 5. It says:

[Telegram.]

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 5, 1919.*

BLUE, *Washington:*

Red Cross have record of but 85 soldiers in various hospitals in Chicago, 35 of whom are in the tuberculosis hospitals. Other charitable associations like the Catholic Charities, the Jewish Relief, and others may have approximately the same number. Representative Chicago hospitals, St. Lukes Presbyterian, Michael Reese, Augustana, Lakeview, Mercy, and Hahnemann state that they are not at this time and have not been congested because of admission of discharged soldiers. All of these hospitals are full of patients, but that condition is normal at this time of the year. To-day's census at the following hospitals shows number of soldiers as patients:

St. Lukes	8
Hahnemann	4
Marys	1
Cook County	12
Tuberculosis	35
Mercy	
Augustana	
Presbyterian	2
Michael Reese	2
Lakeview	

Marine Hospital is full.

(Signed) CALDWELL.

He enumerates every hospital in which these soldiers are located—hospital after hospital. You ask how many beds they have there to take care of them. Here is a statement from the same authority, the Surgeon General. This is addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury and signed by Rupert Blue, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, June 12, 1919.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

SIR: In connection with the consideration of the so-called Speedway project in Chicago I have the honor to state that I have recently visited that city and gone over the entire hospital situation.

Owing to recent developments, it seems advisable for me now to give you a statement of the present hospital facilities that are available to this service in the city of Chicago for use in the care of war-risk and other beneficiaries of the service. They are now as follows:

Marine Hospital, approximately 200 beds.
Cooper-Monatah Hospital, approximately 525 beds.

And I will say for the benefit of the House—and the gentleman [Mr. SABATH] well knows—that it was a hotel, a fireproof building, with 525 beds for the 86 soldiers in Chicago to-day.

Mr. SABATH. When was that taken over?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The letter states it was to be turned over on June 15. It is the Cooper-Monatah Hotel. Let me finish this letter:

Park View Hospital (leased), 65 beds.
Great Lakes Naval Training Station, approximately 1,200 beds.

The Cooper-Monatah Hospital is being turned over to the service on June 15. The hospital beds at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station have not yet been turned over to the service but probably will be at an early date. Leaving out the beds at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, we can actually count upon 790 beds immediately available. The beds at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station could at the present time be considered as a probable reserve, in case such reserve were needed. The use of these latter beds would be dependent upon sufficient appropriation to remodel the buildings.

From all present indications, it would seem certain that the above-mentioned hospital facilities would amply serve to meet the needs of this service in the city of Chicago for the next six months, thus permitting the service time for more mature consideration concerning additional hospital facilities.

Respectfully, (Signed) RUPERT BLUE,
Surgeon General.

That makes 790 beds for the 86 soldiers in the city of Chicago that my friend has been crying about.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. In response to the gentleman, I wish to say——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have yielded only for a question. The gentleman has already made a speech.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I want to say this, that in the Chicago Marine Hospital there are 216 sick and wounded fighting men crowded into accommodations for about 170 patients, 180 men in a dining room built for 50, and lavatory doing duty as a sick ward.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Who said that?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. That is from the Chicago Tribune, a daily paper.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not yield to the gentleman any more. I yielded for a question. The gentleman quotes what the Chicago Tribune says as against what the Surgeon General said. Of course the Tribune says so. Secretary Glass, in his testimony before the Senate committee, referred to the receipt of a newspaper clipping from Chicago in which the paper says: "Write your Congressman and write your Senator. This thing means an expenditure of $10,000,000 in Chicago." Of course my friend knows who is responsible for these statements. It says: "Write your Congressman immediately; write your Senator immediately." But I think it comes near telling the truth. It may mean an expenditure of $10,000,000.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield to enable me to give a substantial statement, instead of saying what the Chicago Tribune said?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman can get the time and put it in. The newspaper says $10,000,000. I am inclined to agree with it. Why? This proposition was to involve an expenditure of $3,000,000, but it now appears it is not sufficient, and no one knows how much it will cost. My good friend here, who has just finished speaking, says that this proposition originated on the part of a gentleman who wanted to commemorate the death of his boy. His boy, I understand from all accounts, was a fine fellow, and I admire the spirit of every boy who went into the service. This boy died of pneumonia in France, and it is a laudable purpose for this gentleman to commemorate the services of his son. But if that be true, and $500,000 will complete it, why does he not complete it and turn it over to the city of Chicago in commemoration of the services of his son?

This act proposes to ask the Government for $2,500,000 for this incomplete building, the statement being that the building as it stands is worth $4,000,000, and therefore is a donation of $1,500,000.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY] says, however, it is a donation to commemorate the services of the gentleman's son. There has never been a greater fight to get the Government to erect anything in all my experience. I ask, if it is to commemorate the memory of a son, why is it necessary to employ lawyers from New York to come down here and force the Government to take $1,500,000 from a man? I never yet saw a man employ lawyers to force one to take $1,500,000. They do not do it. They employ lawyers to take a million and a half from you, but they never employ lawyers to force you to accept a million and a half. They say, "Do not look a gift horse in the mouth." But there are exceptions to all rules. When a man offers you a horse, tells you the horse is worth $400, but he will give it to you for $250, and then while you are considering the offer employs lawyers to force you to take the horse, you had better look that horse all over. It is going to cost you too much to take that horse. What does the Supervising Architect say it would cost? The Secretary of the Treasury, of course, handles the people's money. You say that you would exercise this discretion and have the Secretary of the Treasury sign this contract without knowing anything about it. The Secretary thought otherwise. He submitted it to the solicitor of the department, and the solicitor of the department told him he

should make the specifications a part of the contract. Would you not do it? If you made a contract with a man to construct a building, would you not make the specifications a part of the contract? And yet this legislation is designed to force the Secretary of the Treasury to sign a contract before the specifications are prepared. Do you not know that by the time the contractor got through making you pay for the extras this thing would do just what the Chicago newspapers say, make the expenditures $10,000,000? The Secretary of the Treasury wants to make the specifications a part of the contract, and he can then see whether it will come within the cost. A preliminary statement from the Supervising Architect says that to transform this building into a building suitable for the purposes of the Public Health Service will cost $1,915,000 more than provided for in this bill. We must rely on the Public Health Service to know what is needed. Friends of the proposition say the reason for that is that they are providing quarters for the doctors in the building. We have got to do it, because if we do not they will come here and ask appropriations for quarters for the officials and doctors outside, and you will have to spend more money.

The Public Health Service informed the architect of their needs, and the Supervising Architect says that to transform the old building would mean an expenditure of $1,915,000 more than the $3,000,000 provided for here. Now, failure to accept this Hines proposition does not necessarily mean that a hospital would not be built at Chicago.

Mr. BUTLER. Have they not got one there? What bothers me is this: Is there not a law now on the statute books requiring and commanding that a hospital shall be built somewhere about Chicago?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This bill provides it, but it does not require the Secretary of the Treasury to sign a contract that no business man on earth would sign to take over this thing, which the Supervising Architect says will cost $1,915,000 more than the money you appropriate.

Mr. MASON. That is for another building.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; that is for this building. When it was urged here originally and the "soft stuff" was resorted to to take over this proposition, it was stated it would take care of at least 2,000 beds. The Supervising Architect says it will take care of 850 beds. It will take care of 850 patients, and at this rate it will cost $5,924 per bed. Does the Surgeon General recommend it to be taken over? No. The Surgeon General went there on June 5, and after personally inspecting the building for the first time he recommends that it be not taken over.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. How about the Supervising Architect?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, he has nothing to do with making recommendations. All he has to do is to draw the plans. He says it will take $1,915,000 more than the $3,000,000 provided for, or $5,924 per bed for 850 beds.

Now, as to the necessity. The chairman of this committee held a hearing the other day on the sundry civil bill and directed the attention of the Director of the War Risk Insurance Bureau to the number of patients he had. He said he had 2,334 patients entitled to the benefits provided under the war-risk insurance act, and to take care of those 2,334 patients he has beds sufficient to accommodate 15,133 men. That is what the Director of the War Risk Insurance Bureau says; and he has not only got them, but here is a list of the hospitals that the War Department has—hospitals which are no longer used, and which have been offered to the Public Health Service, comprising 13,830 beds, in addition to the 15,133 just mentioned, making 28,000 in all to take care of 2,334 men.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman is speaking of all these beds. I visited a soldier the other day at one of the local hospitals here. He was from the southern part of the State of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think that the mother and father and sisters and brothers of that boy would like to have him a little nearer home than the Walter Reed Hospital?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. I have just shown you the figures, to assure you that while there are 86 men in the hospitals in Chicago they have facilities to take care of 2,000 men. That is a matter of administration. The gentleman can not cure that by spending the money of the people to build more hospitals.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I regret I can not yield. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has seven minutes more.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I refuse to yield. The gentleman can get time in his own right. I have talked about these 2,000 beds in the vicinity of Chicago, to take care of those men. I share the views of the gentleman that men should be sent to hospitals near their homes when it is possible, and it seems to me that to utilize the surplus beds the people of other States must be sent to Chicago. Therefore I am glad to say the hospital service has taken over to-day, in Iowa City, a hospital where they have more than 300 beds, and at St. Louis a hospital with 600 beds, and at Waukesha, Wis., they have taken over a very large hospital. Remember that in all he has only 2,334 patients.

Now, I want to speak for a moment about another phase of the situation.

Mr. SABATH. Is that the information from the health commissioner?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That information is from the Surgeon of the Public Health Service. One gentleman says the hospitals in the city of Chicago are pretty well filled; but, my friend, we do not intend to take care, under the Public Health Service, of all persons requiring hospital treatment in the city of Chicago. The only people in Chicago hospitals entitled to this service are the 86 soldiers and sailors in those hospitals. It may be that they want this building to look after city patients. Then, in memory of his son, the gentleman who makes this offer ought to pay the other $500,000 and give this hospital outright to the city of Chicago.

In this bill, passed in the closing hours of the last Congress, we put in a million three hundred thousand dollars as an emergency fund. Everybody wanted that money, and they worked on it out in Colorado. The department considered taking over a property there at an expenditure of about $200,000. At Colorado Springs they saw an opportunity to get at the million and a half for a new building. As the law did not give the Secretary of the Treasury the power to construct a new building, they propose now to amend the law so this amount will be available for new construction, and the object is to put up a new building in Colorado Springs, Colo.

Now, if you want to put it up and appropriate that million and a half, all right; but, for my part, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who makes the motion now to concur, was right back in January—January 27, 1919—when he made the best speech against the whole bill that anybody made on the subject. I love him as much as any man in this House. He has more wisdom and more experience than anybody in this House, and he is always fair and fearless. He knows human beings. He knows the human heart. Therefore he said this:

> Now, I want to say another thing, and with high respect, for I suppose I am as selfish as most Members of Congress, if not all Members of Congress, in caring for my constituency. But you may take Document No. 14 and Document No. 16 of these hearings, and you may read them all through, and you will find there that the anxiety about the location of the hospitals, the hearings about their location, was pretty near, you know, in interest to many members of that committee, interested in building hospitals in the back yards of their districts, or in their sections. I do not care where they are built, provided they are properly located and built, and provided that they ought to be built at all.
>
> I believe this bill ought to be amended—

I can see him now as he said it—

> instructing the War Department and the Navy Department to turn over all these camps and cantonments for use as hospitals for the people who are entitled to relief therein. We have over 100,000 beds, with 50,000 occupied, it is said. A fair reading of these hearings shows that the great mass of men who come back and are not well, but sick are kept by the War Department until they get well, and then they are discharged. * * * But I am here to say that I believe from these hearings and from this bill and from the legislation that has been had, even before the war commenced, extending the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, coupled with what has happened since that time, the time has come to call a halt—not in caring for the soldier, but in caring for the soldier taking care also for the civilian, playing favorites.

He wanted a halt called, notwithstanding the interest of Members who wanted hospitals in their back yards. My friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] pleaded in the interest of economy that you refrain from passing the bill that authorized the purchase of the Speedway Hospital. Now, although he has moved to concur in the Senate amendment, I know he will not insist upon his motion after he reads his speech from which I have quoted. He will be convinced by his own speech. I will say now, as he said then, that it is time to call a halt when we have more than 15,000 beds to care for 2,334 patients, and that we should not authorize this expenditure of $4,915,000 to take over this proposition in Chicago that is so bad that a man has to employ a lawyer to induce you to take it, and to authorize the expenditure of a million and a half dollars for new construction, so that a new building may be constructed at Colorado Springs when it is not needed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I understand there will be just a couple of more talks. We will have to have a quorum, I

take it, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Obviously, there is not.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed, and the Sergeant at Arms was directed to notify absentees.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Fess	Kitchin	Reber
Anderson	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Reed, W. Va.
Anthony	Fitzgerald	Lesher	Rhodes
Babka	Fordney	Lonergan	Rogers
Baer	Foster	Longworth	Rowan
Begg	French	Luce	Rubey
Benson	Fuller, Mass.	McDuffie	Rucker
Blackmon	Gallivan	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Ind.	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Sanford
Britten	Goldfogle	MacGregor	Scully
Brumbaugh	Goodall	Mann	Sears
Burke	Gould	Mansfield	Sells
Cantrill	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Sherwood
Carew	Griest	Montague	Sinclair
Coady	Griffin	Mooney	Smith, Ill.
Collier	Hadley	Moore, Pa.	Smith, N. Y.
Copley	Hamill	Morin	Snell
Costello	Harrison	Mudd	Snyder
Crago	Hawley	Murphy	Steenerson
Crisp	Hayden	Neely	Stephens, Miss.
Cullen	Hill	Nicholls, S. C.	Stevenson
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell	Strong, Pa.
Dickinson, Mo.	Husted	Oliver	Sullivan
Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Olney	Tilson
Dooling	Johnson, S. Dak.	Paige	Venable
Dunbar	Johnston, N. Y.	Parker	Ward
Dyer	Jones, Pa.	Platt	Watkins
Eagan	Kahn	Purnell	Watson, Pa.
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Ragsdale	Whaley
Echols	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, H. T.	Wilson, Pa.
Elston	Kiess	Rayburn	Wise

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifteen Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was present during the roll call but engaged in reading, and I ask unanimous consent to be recorded "present."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can be recorded.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that during the next 10 years we will spend hundreds of millions of dollars in the name of the soldier, and that many, many millions of it will be wasted. Congress should not hesitate to appropriate all the money that is necessary to take the very best of care of all our wounded and disabled soldiers of this Great War. [Applause.] Without stint and with a liberal hand we should appropriate all the money necessary to provide the best facilities for these men. At the outset I want to call attention to the fact that not one penny of the amount appropriated in the act of March 3, creating the Public Health Service, can be expended for the care of a single soldier, sailor, or marine while he is in the military or naval service of the United States. That appropriation and that law was only enacted to give relief to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. They are the patients of the War Risk Insurance, and I want to say to you to-day that in the Public Health hospitals in the United States there are only 2,335 of these patients, and yet the Treasury has, according to the hearings on the sundry civil appropriation bill, 15,500 beds to care for them.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. After I make a general statement I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. But this is the proper place for my question.

Mr. GOOD. Not now; I will come——

Mr. MADDEN. I would like very much to get my question in here.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Not now. To-day the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] came to me and said that one of the finest hospitals in the United States, a fireproof hospital, if you please, in Boston, was tendered to the Public Health Service for a nominal rent, and yet they refused to take it because they do not need it. Let us keep in mind that during the next two years, without repealing a single tax law in the United States, you will expend all the money provided for by taxation and you will have to borrow more than $7,000,000,000 to pay the actual expenses of the Government, and because of the war, and I want to present this matter to you as a business proposition. I am embarrassed in presenting it. Chicago is at my front door, 200 miles from my home, and I have as much interest in the soldiers of Iowa and in seeing that they get proper hospital facilities as any man from Kentucky or Tennessee can possibly have in the discharged soldiers from his State, but I am not willing while I occupy the position of chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to shirk my duty of trying to prevent an expenditure of an appropriation of $9,000,000 when the Secretary says to you and me that he does not need it.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Not now. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KENDALL] hands me a statement that in his district the Markleton Sanitarium was taken over by the War Department, a fireproof hospital with about 300 beds, and the Government paid out of the Treasury of the United States $118,000 to make that hospital modern, and they turned it back; they did not want it any more; and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, I take it, does not want it. Fifteen thousand beds to-day to accommodate less than 2,500 honorably discharged soldiers and sailors! Just think of that, and that we are seriously thinking of ordering more hospitals. We have just concluded hearing the Bureau of Public Health, and they say that next year they estimate they will have about 10,000 of these soldiers and sailors in the hospitals at one time, and the Secretary of the Treasury says that more than 30,000 beds will be available without building a single additional hospital, without taking over the hospital in Boston, without occupying the hospital in Pennsylvania, and I have no doubt that there are a great many of these hospitals that will be available. While I am willing to appropriate any sum to care for these honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, I am not willing to vote to take out of an empty Treasury $9,000,000 to build hospitals for which we have no need——

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question, just a brief question?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield for a question.

Mr. JUUL. How many of these beds which the gentleman mentioned a moment ago are in woodsheds such as has just been described——

Mr. GOOD. I know this: That the Surgeon General of the Army has said, in defending the expenditures for temporary hospitals, that wooden hospitals in some respects are just as desirable as fireproof hospitals; and the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that if the Chicago hospital is taken over that the additional buildings be constructed to complete it. What are you going to build them of? Of wood; that is all they have asked for. That is the estimate that I am talking about——

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Who asked him to build them of wood, or who asked them to build them at all?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows that is a long story, that the owners have been engaged for a long time in a controversy with the War Department——

Mr. MADDEN. Did anybody ask them to build anything? Nobody asked them to build anything.

Mr. GOOD. If nobody asked Mr. Hines to build anything, do not come in here and say we must reach our hands down into the Treasury for $3,000,000. That is the basis of the owner's whole claim.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman wants to be fair. I am sure the gentleman does not want to misstate the thing.

Mr. GOOD. Of course I do not.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman did.

Mr. GOOD. I assure the gentleman I had no such intention; but the gentleman is making a speech in my time. He said nobody asked them to do anything. Then I call attention to the fact that the owner did ask the Secretary of the Treasury and the gentleman denies it——

Mr. MADDEN. I said they did not ask the Secretary of the Treasury to build anything. That is what I said, and then the gentleman puts the question on somebody else.

Mr. GOOD. Well, I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of the Treasury, as the gentleman knows, has been consulting with the Supervising Architect and the Shank Co. and their attorneys with regard to how much money it would take to complete this hospital, and they have been working on the plans; and the gentleman knows that those plans provide for a power house, laundry, a bakery, and three other buildings, and every one of them is to be a wooden structure in connection with this hospital.

Mr. MADDEN. If there are other buildings proposed they are proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury and not by anybody else.

Mr. GOOD. Now, I want the House to keep this in mind, that since the armistice was signed Congress has enacted a law making available all of the national soldiers' homes for war-risk patients, and the patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and honorably discharged soldiers and marines are admitted to those hospitals and homes on an equal footing with the veterans of the Civil War. There is a capacity in them, not including the hospitals, for 21,000 beds; not hospital facilities, but facilities all told. And I have a report here of the committee appointed to investigate these soldiers' homes, and it states that they have only 14,000 inmates in those homes and that there are vacancies to the extent of 6,000 in those splendid institutions and the vacancies will rapidly grow. And what do they recommend? They say that so far as those homes are concerned it has been proposed to turn some of them over to this service, and they say that the old and honored veterans of the Nation could readily and, it is believed, would very willingly be concentrated more in the branches now partially vacant, only that rules and regulations designed for their convenience and comfort should be established for them in their declining years. It is further recommended that the Danville Branch, at Danville, Ill., be the first one selected.

And if you will take the report of Gen. Wood with regard to the vacancies of the homes, you will find there are about 6,000. And the boys that fought in this war, under a wise piece of legislation, were admitted to these homes.

In addition, this very act provides in section 4 that the Battle Mountain Sanitarium shall be turned over to the Public Health Service. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY], who represents the district where this institution is located, tells me to-day that, notwithstanding the provisions contained in section 4 of the act of March 3, which threw open the doors of the Battle Mountain Sanitarium up in South Dakota, one of the finest sanitariums and hospitals in the world, to these boys, to receive them there and care for them—with 600 beds—not one of these boys has been admitted. The home has not been made available for the patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. Why is it not used for this purpose? Because we already have facilities for 15,500 boys, and we only have 2,345 applications.

Now, it may be good judgment, it may be a sound business policy for this Congress, notwithstanding we have had to appropriate billions upon billions of dollars to win the war, to keep on making appropriations on an extravagant scale and permit the expenditure of money for things that are no longer necessary. But it seemed to me that when the Secretary of the Treasury comes and says that the Health Service had more beds than it could use for the soldiers and sailors, that they did not need this hospital, we must come to the conclusion, after reading his letter, that if they did not need this Speedway Hospital they did not need any of the other hospitals that were provided for in the bill. And I am not willing to play favorites with regard to locality. If the others are needed, then by the same argument Speedway is needed. My own city, my own district and State, are more directly interested in this, and perhaps many people there would like to see it constructed and acquired. But I say to you if you do not need the beds let us not build the hospitals out of an empty Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman says the Secretary of the Treasury says they do not need hospitals. Why is he trying to get a hospital up here on Wisconsin Avenue? Why is he trying to get an opportunity to build an expensive hospital, costing $500,000, in the Soldiers' Home grounds? And why is he for building one in the city of Corpus Christi, Tex.? And why is he doing a lot of things like that if he does not need them?

Mr. GOOD. I will agree with the gentleman that the Secretary of the Treasury ought to take a survey of this matter, and he ought not to spend a single dollar for hospitals, whether in Iowa, Kentucky, Illinois, or any place else, as long as we have, as is estimated for the year, three times or, as at present, seven times the hospital facilities that we need. Give the Secretary this authority, and then if he spends money for hospitals I will assist you in requiring him to explain his actions.

Mr. SABATH. If there is no need, and we have so many beds, can the gentleman explain why it was necessary on the part of the department a few days ago to secure the Cooper-Carlton Hotel in Chicago for hospital purposes?

Mr. GOOD. They have had that during the war.

Mr. SABATH. That was the War Department?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and the War Department had an unexpired lease, and it was simply turned over to the War Risk Insurance Bureau in order to provide for the boys there in Chicago.

Mr. SABATH. Well, I thought they had so many beds in the hospitals that it would not be required.

Mr. GOOD. They have a proposition before Congress now, as an amendment to this law, turning over the naval hospitals to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. It ought to be done.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. FREAR. Has the gentleman read Senate Document 22? If not, I wish to inquire about a little item at the bottom of page 4, which states as follows:

> Of the 109,059 beds available January 18, 1919, in the hospitals other than post hospitals, 45,973 were vacant. The evidence before the committee is that this number of vacancies will increase rather than decrease, and that the full number of beds which were provided by the War Department will never be used by it.

Is that statement true?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. And I was surprised after reading that when I came to this sentence in the same document:

> The various services of the Government will need hospital facilities, especially for sick and maimed soldiers under the war-risk act, and will need them for many years.

The report states this, notwithstanding the fact that the committee previously made a finding that the number of vacancies will increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and I am frank to say while I am not willing to follow the Secretary of the Treasury in all of his recommendations, when he points out to me that $3,000,000 can be saved and yet no harm done to the public service, I think, under the oath I have taken as a Member of this House, it is my duty by my vote to help save it. And that is just the conclusion his letter reaches. If, however, we give full credence to his letter, the entire $9,000,000 can be saved, for if we do not need beds at Chicago we do not need more in the South, where too many hospitals are now located. I think we all agree as to that. I saw the Secretary of the Treasury on the 10th. I asked him about this service. He told me in a general way that they had more beds than they could use, and I told him I thought that was a remarkable statement, in view of the fact that we were, and had been up to this date, buying or renting every available hospital.

I asked him to write me a letter. He did so. It is illuminating, and I want to read it to you, because it gives you the situation from that point of view with regard to the needs of the service. And I want you to keep in mind the fact that the Public Health Service is a bureau of the Treasury Department, under the Secretary of the Treasury. He says:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, June 12, 1919.

DEAR MR. GOOD: Answering your inquiry concerning the urgency of the so-called Speedway Hospital project at Chicago, and in regard to the general needs of the Public Health Service in the matter of hospital facilities, I beg to state that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service has repeatedly assured me recently that there is no urgency, from the viewpoint of his department, about the Speedway Hospital scheme. He tells me specifically that, with hospital facilities recently acquired from the War and Navy Departments, the Public Health Service is amply prepared to take care of present requirements and of prospective needs of the immediate future. The Surgeon General definitely stated that there is no reason why the Secretary of the Treasury may not proceed, with the utmost caution and a due regard for the public interest, in his investigation of the facts relating to the purchase of the Speedway property and its conversion, upon approved plans and specifications, into a hospital adapted to the permanent needs and purposes of the Public Health Service.

You will find attached a statement sent me from the War Department of the hospitals already turned over to the Public Health Service, aggregating 11,160 beds, together with a list of other hospitals totaling 13,830 beds, which will be available soon for the Public Health Service. In addition to these facilities the Navy Department has given assurance of 1,000 beds at the Great Lakes Training School, within 20 miles of Chicago, and the War Department will, on June 15, turn over to the Public Health Service a hospital of 530 beds in Chicago. These accommodations, I am told by the Surgeon General, are not only ample for immediate purposes but for prospective needs for the ensuing six months at least.

There is no actual basis, the Surgeon General assures me, for the assertions now being made that soldiers and sailors entitled to the care of the Public Health Service are suffering any degree of neglect in any section of the country. I am attaching to this letter an official report from Chicago, made in response to my special inquiry on this very point. From this telegraphic report it will be noted that hospital conditions in Chicago are normal. On next Monday, as previously stated, the facilities of the Public Health Service in Chicago will be further improved by the acquisition of an additional hospital with 530 beds.

As required by the act of March 3, 1919, I am having plans and specifications prepared for adapting the proposed Speedway Hospital to the needs and purposes of the Public Health Service, with a view to determining at the earliest possible moment whether or not this may be done in a satisfactory way within the limits of the appropriation made

by Congress. The Supervising Architect's Office is working under pressure on these plans and specifications, and until they are completed it is utterly impossible for anybody to say what the cost will be, or even whether the uncompleted Speedway building can be adapted to the permanent needs and purposes of the Public Health Service to the advantage of the Government.

It has been stated that the Secretary of the Treasury has made no objection to a proposition to have Congress direct him to acquire this Speedway property immediately and have it adapted to the needs and purposes of the Public Health Service. There is absent from this statement the very material qualification that the Secretary said he had no objection to Congress assuming full responsibility for directing the Secretary to approve a proposed contract, which otherwise he would not approve until all the facts are ascertained and the plans and specifications required by law are prepared and bids received. The usual and orderly way is to make the plans and specifications a part of the contract, and the law officer of the Treasury advises me that, under the act of March 3, I must do this. It will be noted from my testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 5, page 79, that I distinctly expressed the judgment that the proposed contract in its present form is "simply wide open, and one which I do not think any member of this committee who is a business man would dream of approving in his own affairs." Further, on page 78, it will be seen that I gave the opinion that "the proposed contract is in such a state of incompleteness and, in my considerate judgment, leaves the Government so utterly defenseless that I am unwilling to approve it until the Supervising Architect shall have completed the plans and specifications required by the act."

I can see no tenable reason why this matter should not be permitted to proceed in the accustomed way under the terms of the act of March 3, 1919, in order that all the facts may be developed fully and an intelligent decision reached which will not be to the prejudice of the Government. The Public Health Service thoroughly participates in this view.

Sincerely, yours,

CARTER GLASS.

Hon. JAMES W. GOOD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be kind enough to say where those beds are in Chicago?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. I will come to that.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Not now.

Mr. MADDEN. I just want to correct a statement that the Secretary makes.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman after I have finished.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it only fair that the statement should be corrected now.

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa refuses to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not wish to let the statement of the Secretary go by without correction. It is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman when I get through reading.

Mr. MADDEN. I just wanted to say that if all the statements made by the Secretary of the Treasury are as accurate as his statement of how far the Great Lakes Training Station is from Chicago, I would not give much for his statement. He says it is only 20 miles, when as a matter of fact it is 36 miles.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman wanted to know in regard to hospitals. There is appended to the letter of the Secretary this note from the Assistant Secretary of War, sending a list to the Secretary of the Treasury of all the hospitals. He says:

MAY 26, 1919.

Memorandum.

Subject: War Department hospital space and public health.

1. The Public Health Service has already accepted from the War Department the following hospitals of the stated capacities:

Hospital:	Capacity.
United States Army General Hospital No. 34, East Norfolk, Mass.	250
Camp Beauregard, La.	2,144
Camp Cody, N. Mex.	1,289
Camp Fremont, Calif.	1,156
Camp Hancock, Ga.	1,604
Camp Johnston, Fla.	816
Camp Logan, Tex.	1,156
Camp Sevier, S. C.	1,396
United States Army General Hospital No. 13, Dansville, N. Y.	288
United States Army General Hospital No. 15, Corpus Christi, Tex.	262
Norwegian Home and Hospital	250
Norfolk Terminal	250
Total	11,160

2. The following hospitals are no longer used by the Medical Department and have been offered to the Public Health Service:

Hospital:	Capacity.
United States Army General Hospital No. 9, Lakewood, N. J.	900
United States Army General Hospital No. 17, Markleton, Pa.	200
United States Army General Hospital No. 18, Waynesville, N. C.	400
United States Army General Hospital No. 23, Hot Springs, N. C.	300
United States Army General Hospital No. 32, Chicago, Ill.	530
United States Army General Hospital No. 35, West Baden, Ind.	800
United States Army General Hospital No. 39, Long Beach, Long Island, N. Y.	600
United States Army General Hospital No. 22, Richmond, Va.	700
Base Hospital, Camp Greene, N. C.	1,500
Base Hospital, Camp Wheeler, Ga.	1,300
Base Hospital, Camp McClellan, Ala.	1,690
Base Hospital, Camp MacArthur, Tex.	1,370
Base Hospital, Camp Sheridan, Ala.	1,300
Base Hospital, Camp Bowie, Tex.	1,240
Base Hospital, Camp Shelby, Miss.	1,000
Total	13,830

3. The following-named hospitals will be abandoned by the Medical Department on or before the dates given and will then be available for the Public Health Service:

United States Army General Hospital No. 10, Boston, Mass.; capacity, 750 beds; will be abandoned June 15, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 11, Cape May, N. J.; capacity, 750 beds; will be abandoned July 1, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 12, Biltmore, N. C.; capacity, 450 beds; will be abandoned not later than September 1, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 16, New Haven, Conn.; capacity, 500 beds; will be abandoned not later than August 1, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 22, Philadelphia, Pa.; capacity, 450 beds; will be abandoned July 1, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 24, Parkview, Pa.; capacity, 700 beds; will be abandoned August 1, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 32, Chicago, Ill.; capacity, 530 beds; will be abandoned June 15, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 34, East Norfolk, Mass.; capacity, 340 beds; will be abandoned June 15, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 36, Detroit, Mich.; capacity, 919 beds; will be abandoned August 1, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 38, East View, N. Y.; capacity, 851 beds; will be abandoned August 1, 1919.

United States Army General Hospital No. 40, St. Louis, Mo.; capacity, 531 beds; will be abandoned June 15, 1919.

I read further:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, June 12, 1919.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

SIR: In connection with the consideration of the so-called Speedway project in Chicago, I have the honor to state that I have recently visited that city and gone over the entire hospital situation.

Owing to recent developments, it seems advisable for me now to give you a statement of the present hospital facilities that are available to this service in the city of Chicago for use in the care of war-risk and other beneficiaries of the service. They are now as follows:

	Beds.
Marine Hospital, approximately	200
Cooper-Monatah Hospital, approximately	525
Park View Hospital (leased)	65
Great Lakes Naval Training Station, approximately	1,200

The Cooper-Monatah Hospital is being turned over to the service on June 15. The hospital beds at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station have not yet been turned over to the service, but probably will be at an early date. Leaving out the beds at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, we can actually count upon 790 beds immediately available. The beds at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station could at the present time be considered as a probable reserve in case such reserve were needed. The use of these latter beds would be dependent upon sufficient appropriation to remodel the buildings.

From all present indications it would seem certain that the above-mentioned hospital facilities would amply serve to meet the needs of this service in the city of Chicago for the next six months, thus permitting the service time for more mature consideration concerning additional hospital facilities.

Respectfully,

RUPERT BLUE,
Surgeon General.

[Telegram.]

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 5, 1919.*

BLUE, *Washington:*

Red Cross have record of but 85 soldiers in various hospitals in Chicago, 35 of whom are in the tuberculosis hospitals. Other charitable associations like the Catholic Charities, the Jewish Relief, and others may have approximately the same number. Representative Chicago hospitals—St. Luke's, Presbyterian, Michael Reese, Augustana, Lakeview, Mercy, and Hahnemann—state that they are not at this time, and have not been, congested because of admission of discharged soldiers. All of these hospitals are full of patients, but that condition is normal at this time of the year. To-day's census at the following hospitals show number of soldiers as patients:

St. Luke's	8
St. Mary's	4
Hahnemann	1
Cook County	12
Tuberculosis	35
Mercy	0
Augustana	0
Presbyterian	2
Michael Reese	2
Lakeview	0
Total	64

Marine Hospital is full.

CALDWELL.

There are, or soon will be, more than 30,000 beds available for the Public Health Service to take care of these boys that are discharged from the Army and naval service of the United States; and if these hospitals are filled, as estimated by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, you will have only 10,000 men for 30,000 beds. [Applause.] And seriously you ask here that an appropriation of $9,000,000, wrung from the taxpayers, who are getting very weary of paying taxes, shall now be expended in the doing of what? The building of more hospitals in the United States.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question just for information?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The gentleman from Massachusetts said there were no hospitals in New England or nearer than New York. Did I not understand the gentleman to read the names of three hospitals in Massachusetts?

Mr. GOOD. I read the names. I also referred to the statement of Mr. GALLIVAN, of Boston, to the effect that a fireproof hospital had been tendered to the Public Health Service with 700 beds.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. In New England?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; in Boston, Mass. I think Boston is still in Massachusetts. [Laughter.] And that it had not been accepted by the Public Health Service because they had too many hospitals. And yet because somebody in Kentucky wants a hospital, because somebody in Chicago wants a hospital, because somebody in Texas wants a hospital, it is seriously urged that we make a raid on the Treasury to buy or build one. I am in favor of providing all the hospitals that are necessary to take care of the boys who shall return from the war requiring hospital care, but not hospitals to take care of Members of Congress. [Laughter and applause.]

I want to say to you, after reading that letter and making the investigation I have made, that the Secretary of the Treasury is not, in my judgment, authorized to spend a single dollar for acquiring more hospitals when he now has more than he knows what to do with. [Applause.]

Let us regain our sanity in this matter, gentlemen. In a few months you will be called upon to report to your constituencies with regard to the vast appropriations made by Congress. What are you going to say to the man who comes to you and asks you about this thing? Will you knowingly put yourself in a place where you must say, "Yes; I voted for that $9,000,000 hospital bill; I voted against tying up that fund and keeping it in the Treasury; I voted against it when I knew that the Secretary of the Treasury already had more hospitals, 3 to 1, than he anticipated he would have patients for in the next year. I really do not know why I did it." Do not put yourselves in that position.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will ask you if you ever knew of a constituency in the United States, when it had the proposition of a bond issue before it for the building of a public school or the erection of a hospital, refusing to grant it?

Mr. GOOD. Well, I imagine if the proposition was put to the voters in my town, where we had a hospital, and if we had three beds for every patient that came to that hospital—I imagine if the proposition was put before the people to build another hospital by the sale of bonds, they would vote it down. [Applause.] That is the way they are used to doing things out there. They may do things differently over in New York. [Applause.] But that is the way the people of the United States are expecting this Congress to function, and I hope it will function that way, and I hope that the Secretary of the Treasury will not spend a single dollar in the future in building hospitals until the conditions which he has detailed, over his own signature, have very materially changed and until there is need for hospitals.

Oh, gentlemen say that these hospitals are mere sheds with paper roofs. Why, my friends, do you know that it is in the RECORD that this Speedway Hospital did not cost as much per bed to build as the paper-roof hospitals that they have been talking about? I want to say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. MASON], when he talks about these hospitals being mere sheds, I fear he does not know the character of all these hospitals, for the Surgeon General of the United States says that these hospitals are not of flimsy construction, and that in order to be sanitary and desirable a hospital does not need to be a fireproof building, and that many of our wooden structures are just as desirable, so far as sanitation and health are concerned, as the fireproof hospitals.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MASON. If your son was wounded and being treated and helpless, would you just as soon he would be in one of these wooden sheds as in a fireproof hospital?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that if my son had been wounded in the Army and was under the care of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, I, of course, would hope that the Government would take the best care of him that a great Government like ours can take of her honorably discharged soldiers, and I believe that with the facilities now in existence, with fireproof hospitals vacant in Boston and in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, there is no need to keep my boy or yours in the shed you talk about.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is it not also a fact that the maimed and wounded and sick boys during the war were placed in these hospitals to which the gentleman refers? And in the opinion of the Surgeon General of the Army and of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service are not these safe places provided you supply fire protection?

Mr. GOOD. I understand that is true, and that ample fire protection is afforded. [Applause.]

Mr. MASON. May I ask one more question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. How many minutes have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Thirty-four minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are two propositions to consider when we come to vote upon this motion. First, in God's chancery, from all the citizens to one citizen, is this firm that owned the ground, 320 acres, and turned it over to the Government, after expending $500,000 to clear it off and has not asked for a cent in return, and then spent a million dollars more in the construction of the best hospital in the United States—as American citizens, are they entitled to relief, even if we do not consider the rights of the soldiers? That is up to you to determine first.

"Well, but they did not have any contract." Great God, gentlemen, did we not validate contracts by the wholesale and the retail where people went ahead without contracts because there was no opportunity to make them, no time to make them? You say, "Is this one of those cases?" In substance it is. Let me show you:

However, it is shown by overwhelming evidence and proof that at the time Mr. Shank signed the contract, August 31, 1918, there was great urgency in the procuring of hospital beds; that a large number of additional beds would be required in the Chicago district and that there were no beds in sight. The Shank contract was the only contract which had been signed, and when Mr. Shank commenced work on September 3, 1918, it was the only work being done on any hospital project in the Chicago district toward filling the Government requirements of 12,000 beds.

Mind you, this company signed the contract, Mr. Shank owning one-thirteenth and Mr. Hines the other twelve-thirteenths:

There is no doubt that this urgency was brought to the attention of Mr. Shank and his architects. A clause was even inserted in the contract referring to this urgency.

There is also no doubt that the Construction Division and the Surgeon General's Office, both of which approved the project, expected the contract to be authorized by the Secretary of War and that this expectation was communicated to Mr. Shank.

Now, I trust you will take my word instead of stopping to read this proposition. It was put up to the Secretary of War who was just about departing for Europe. He did depart for Europe, and he gave orders that it be looked into and examined and hastened. It was looked into.

Acting under the knowledge of this urgency and with the laudable desire to complete this large and important hospital project in the minimum time, the contractor, during the month of September, 1918, pushed the work prodigiously, and not until substantial progress had been made in the work did the contractors receive any intimation that it was not the desire of the War Department for them to proceed with the work in advance of the formal approval of the contract.

The work did proceed. The armistice came, and over a million dollars was spent upon this property, 320 acres of land, which was practically donated to the Government, and the buildings that were on it cleared off. So much for that.

Now, I read from the report of the Senate committee which investigated all of these contracts. The report was signed by the subcommittee that investigated the question and approved by the full committee. Who were the members of that subcommittee? Thomas W. Hardwick, chairman, J. C. W. BECKHAM, PARK TRAMMELL, JOSEPH I. FRANCE, IRVINE L. LENROOT.

That was the subcommittee that made this investigation and reported the result to the full committee, and the full committee reported to the Senate, and the Senate said that morally, if not legally, in God's chancery, these men acted in good faith, as hundreds of thousands of contractors and loyal citizens did act, without having every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed.

There stands a hospital, shown by this report to be the best hospital in the United States, awaiting completion, which can be made in 40 days, and still the contract is not to be signed, the way the wind blows. I want to say again, talking about the Secretary of the Treasury, that I have great respect for Carter Glass. He used to be our colleague. I have no stone to throw at him. So far as I know, he is acting according to his best lights; but do you know I had rather have an investigation, lasting for weeks, by the United States Senate, with all this evidence taken here, over a thousand pages, by a high-class committee, and the report made, from which I have read

extracts, with a unanimous Senate, after having made the investigation, saying that from every standpoint of justice this contract should be validated legally as it was validated in God's chancery. Now, I might drop it right there.

"Oh, but maybe the Senate did not know." Now, I have respect for Woodrow Wilson. You may think that is pretty strong, but I have. [Laughter and applause.] He has great ability. He can turn double somersaults with greater skill than anybody I know of and can get away with it. I respect him for his industry and for his intellect. I have great respect for members of his Cabinet. I have especially great respect for Mr. Glass; but I had rather have the unanimous opinion of a Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds after an investigation lasting weeks, and a report, and the approval of the full committee, and a unanimous Senate, than to have the opinion, uninformed, at least in part, because he has been awfully busy since he became Secretary of the Treasury—I had rather have that information and opinion of the Senate than of the Secretary of the Treasury or of the whole Cabinet. Would not you? Now, I might rest right there and say that this amendment should be agreed to. I think it is necessary. Mr. Secretary Glass thinks it is not necessary in view of the 50,000—or was it 500,000?—extra beds. Why, say, Secretary Glass approved of the West Point Hospital and the Dawsonsprings Hospital in the last few days. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What made him do it if we did not need it? He approved of that place down in Texas, did he not? Yes; within a week. My Lord, has he just found out about this particular project?

I am not abusing him; I am merely calling attention to the fact that people should be consistent. Now, I believe that this hospital on the dead merits, contract or no contract, should be completed. It is stated here by the evidence of the experts in the Surgeon General's office that this hospital is the best hospital in the United States.

Again, it serves a great constituency. I would to God that there was nobody with legs off, with arms off, with tuberculosis, or that was insane, but there are; there are multiplied thousands of boys, and they are entitled to have a good hospital.

I know something about the beds at Sheridan. I think we have heard it stated here that there were 200 insane in a second-floor fire trap. We all know something about fire traps, and we know the construction of the cantonments that were put up in great haste. They were very expensive. I am not here to discuss whether there was any fraud. They were constructed in great haste, and it would be strange if there was not here and there a thief who profited by the cost plus. But I am not going to discuss that. I think the future will show probably that they did the best they could, in the shortest possible time, to get the men assembled, train them, and, after they had been drafted, ship them across the ocean and win that great contest. [Applause.]

It is now nearly time to adjourn, and I do not know that I need to say anything more. Mr. Edward Hines speaking for Shank & Co., he being the owner of twelve-thirteenths of that company, has placed a million and a half dollars of Liberty bonds as security for his offer, that can not be withdrawn, that if at any time within 10 years the Government wants to turn this property back, he will take it back, and, instead of scrapping it, he will pay in cash 40 per cent of its value, and then give that property to the city of Chicago. [Applause.]

You may say, What do we care for Chicago? I care a good deal about it. I went there first in 1858. The first time I visited Chicago it was up and down. There was less than 100,000 people there in 1860 by the census. The swamps were all about it. I would not have given $50 for all the lots there were there. I would not give $50 an acre for the swamps that surrounded it. It was swamps, swamps, swamps everywhere, and swamps across in Indiana, and sand lots. I have lived from that time to this, and I have seen the great city of Chicago grow, and I believe the census will show 3,000,000 of people within the county of Cook, saying nothing about the adjacent villages of other counties which are practically a part of Chicago, and saying nothing about Gary, across the boundary, and all these other places where great manufacturing plants have sprung up as if by magic almost over night. They are the greatest on earth. I have seen my own State grow until I think we have at least between six and seven million people. I have seen the lands that could be located with 70 per cent land warrants drained, and now worth from $150 to $200 an acre. I have seen Iowa progress, I have seen Minnesota created, I have seen Wisconsin created, I have seen Michigan make great improvements, I have seen Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and all that country in every direction from this great center grow up. Somebody said this morning—I have not verified it, but I guess it is true—that five of these States have sent 800,000 people into the military service of the United States since the war was declared.

I know, and I am not boasting of it, that that country contains a great and brave population, as brave as you are in the South, but no braver; as brave as you are in the mountains, but no braver; as brave as you are on the Atlantic coast, and no braver, for we are all good Americans. [Applause.]

I measure my words when I say that this proposition as found by the Senate committee and upon which the Senate committee has acted has just as good a contract as hundreds of millions of contracts that have been validated. Not signed, no; but depended upon by which over one million was spent, saying nothing about the change of ground upon which this hospital stands. From every standpoint it ought to be done.

One word in conclusion. I believe I would not have drawn the proposition that is pending before the House, to disagree with the Senate amendment. What is it? I want to call your attention to it. It suspends and repeals the act of the 3d of March last. That is its effect. There is not a hospital under construction, there is not anything that is happening under that act of the 3d of March last, whether it is in Texas, Kentucky, the Carolinas, Virginia, Illinois, or anywhere else, but what if that legislation be enacted as proposed, by way of amendment, if you vote my motion down, but would require a report to be made upon it by the Secretary of the Treasury within 30 days for the consideration of Congress. I do not know how long it would take us to consider and create anew what we already have. I am content to say that I think we would better meet the present condition and agree to this Senate amendment, which will pass the bill, and let it go to the President for approval or disapproval. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois be now in order?

Mr. CANNON. The previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. It has been agreed that the previous question be considered as ordered. Such an amendment would not be in order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 21.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 58, noes 127.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, there is no quorum present. The Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, the Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 21.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 92, nays 220, answered "present" 1, not voting 117, as follows:

YEAS—92.

Barkley	Fordney	Langley	Parrish
Bee	French	Lazaro	Rainey, H. T.
Bland, Ind.	Fuller, Ill.	Little	Rainey, J. W.
Bowers	Gallagher	McAndrews	Randall, Calif.
Briggs	Gallivan	McDuffie	Rayburn
Brooks, Ill.	Ganly	McGlennon	Riordan
Browning	Garner	McKeown	Rodenberg
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodykoontz	McKinley	Rose
Caldwell	Graham, Ill.	McLane	Rouse
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sabath
Cannon	Hardy, Colo.	MacCrate	Sanders, La.
Cantrill	Haskell	Madden	Schall
Chindblom	Hays	Maher	Siegel
Cleary	Hernandez	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Cullen	Hickey	Mason	Thomas
Curry, Calif.	Holland	Mead	Timberlake
Denison	Hudspeth	Minahan, N. J.	Tincher
Doremus	Hull, Iowa	Mooney	Vaile
Dowell	Igoe	Moore, Ohio	Wheeler
Dupré	Juul	Moores, Ind.	Williams
Elliott	Kincheloe	Newton, Minn.	Wilson, Ill.
Evans, Mont.	King	Newton, Mo.	Wood, Ind.
Fields	Knutson	Osborne	Yates

NAYS—220.

Alexander	Boies	Clark, Mo.	Dickinson, Mo.
Almon	Box	Classon	Dominick
Anderson	Brand	Cole	Doughton
Andrews, Md.	Brinson	Collier	Drane
Andrews, Nebr.	Brooks, Pa.	Connally	Dunbar
Ashbrook	Browne	Cooper	Dunn
Aswell	Buchanan	Cramton	Echols
Ayres	Burdick	Crisp	Edmonds
Bacharach	Burroughs	Crowther	Ellsworth
Bankhead	Butler	Currie, Mich.	Elston
Barbour	Byrnes, S. C.	Dallinger	Emerson
Bell	Campbell, Kans.	Darrow	Esch
Benham	Candler	Davey	Evans, Nebr.
Black	Caraway	Davis, Minn.	Evans, Nev.
Bland, Mo.	Carss	Davis, Tenn.	Fairfield
Bland, Va.	Casey	Dewalt	Fisher
Blanton	Christopherson	Dickinson, Iowa	Flood

Focht	Kraus	Padgett	Strong, Kans.
Frear	Kreider	Park	Summers, Wash.
Freeman	LaGuardia	Pell	Sumners, Tex.
Gandy	Lampert	Peters	Sweet
Gard	Lanham	Porter	Taylor, Ark.
Glynn	Lankford	Quin	Taylor, Colo.
Good	Larsen	Radcliffe	Taylor, Tenn.
Goodall	Layton	Raker	Temple
Gould	Lea, Calif.	Ramsey	Thompson, Ohio
Green, Iowa	Lehlbach	Ramseyer	Thompson, Okla.
Greene, Mass.	Lever	Randall, Wis.	Tillman
Greene, Vt.	Lufkin	Reavis	Tinkham
Hamilton	Luhring	Reber	Towner
Hardy, Tex.	McCulloch	Reed, N. Y.	Treadway
Hastings	McFadden	Rhodes	Upshaw
Haugen	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Ricketts	Vare
Hayden	McPherson	Riddick	Venable
Hersey	Magee	Robinson, N. C.	Vestal
Hersman	Major	Robsion, Ky.	Vinson
Hicks	Mapes	Romjue	Volstead
Hoch	Mays	Rowe	Walsh
Houghton	Merritt	Sanders, Ind.	Walters
Howard	Michener	Sanders, N. Y.	Wason
Huddleston	Miller	Saunders, Va.	Watkins
Hulings	Monahan, Wis.	Scott	Watson, Va.
Hutchinson	Mondell	Shreve	Welling
Ireland	Moon	Sims	Welty
Jacoway	Moore, Va.	Sinnott	White, Kans.
James	Morgan	Sisson	White, Me.
Jefferis	Mott	Slemp	Wilson, La.
Johnson, Miss.	Nelson, Mo.	Smith, Mich.	Wingo
Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, Wis.	Smithwick	Winslow
Jones, Tex.	Nicholls, S. C.	Steagall	Woods, Va.
Kearns	Nichols, Mich.	Stedman	Woodyard
Kelly, Pa.	O'Conner	Steele	Wright
Kennedy, Iowa	Ogden	Stephens, Ohio	Young, N. Dak.
Kinkaid	Oldfield	Stevenson	Young, Tex.
Kleczka	Overstreet	Stiness	Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Harrison

NOT VOTING—117.

Ackerman	Fuller, Mass.	Lonergan	Rubey
Anthony	Garland	Longworth	Rucker
Babka	Garrett	Luce	Sanford
Baer	Godwin, N. C.	McArthur	Scully
Begg	Goldfogle	McClintic	Sears
Benson	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Sells
Blackmon	Graham, Pa.	McKinley	Sherwood
Booher	Griest	MacGregor	Sinclair
Britten	Griffin	Mann	Small
Brumbaugh	Hamill	Mansfield	Smith, Ill.
Burke	Hawley	Montague	Smith, N. Y.
Carew	Heflin	Moore, Pa.	Snell
Carter	Hill	Morin	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Hull, Tenn.	Mudd	Steenerson
Coady	Humphreys	Murphy	Stephens, Miss.
Copley	Husted	Neely	Strong, Pa.
Costello	Johnson, Ky.	Nolan	Sullivan
Crago	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connell	Tilson
Dale	Johnston, N. Y.	Oliver	Voigt
Dempsey	Jones, Pa.	Olney	Ward
Dent	Kahn	Paige	Watson, Pa.
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Parker	Weaver
Dooling	Kendall	Phelan	Webb
Dyer	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Webster
Eagan	Kettner	Pou	Whaley
Eagle	Kiess	Purnell	Wilson, Pa.
Ferris	Kitchin	Ragsdale	Wise
Fess	Lee, Ga.	Reed, W. Va.	
Fitzgerald	Lesher	Rogers	
Foster	Linthicum	Rowan	

So the motion to recede and concur was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. VOIGT with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. TILSON with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. SNELL with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. PLATT with Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. NOLAN with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. MACGREGOR with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. LESHER.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. LONERGAN.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. RAGSDALE.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. HILL with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. GARLAND with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. FOSTER with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. DALE with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. CRAGO with Mr. WISE.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. WARD with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. ROGERS with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. DYER with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. OLNEY (from June 14, 1919, to June 20, 1919).

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. HUMPHREYS (for balance of day).

On this vote:

Mr. HEFLIN (for) with Mr. WEBB (against).

Mr. COADY (for) with Mr. CARTER (against).

Mr. COPLEY (for) with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], to which a point of order was made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point of order which I make is that the motion of the gentleman from Iowa is not germane to Senate amendment No. 21.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the previous question was ordered. It is too late for the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky made his point of order, and the Chair stated that he would consider it as pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. I made the point of order immediately.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the question in my mind is, with all due respect to the gentleman and the Chair, Can a man reserve a point of order, even with the assent of the Speaker, after the previous question is ordered?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the right. The gentleman made the point of order, and the Chair suggested that it be suspended until the decision was first made upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, which was a preferential motion. After that, by unanimous consent, the previous question was agreed to be considered as ordered, and that was with the point of order pending. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the right to make the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Why does not the gentleman ask—it seems to me this is a new question—why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent and let the Journal appear that way? I do not believe anybody would object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Journal will appear, if it appears correctly, that I made the point of order against the motion of the gentleman from Iowa immediately on the making of his motion. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] rose upon his feet with a preferential motion, and his motion having preference in the vote and consideration, my point of order against the motion of the gentleman from Iowa was deferred until the action of the House was taken upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Mr. Speaker, the act of March 3, 1919, which is no doubt familiar to the Chair, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to locate and construct certain hospitals throughout the United States. Those hospitals are designated in section 7 of the act of March 3, 1919, under several subsections. Subsection a of section 7 designates the hospital in Cook County, Ill., as one of those hospitals. Subsection b provides for the expenditure of money upon that hospital. Subsection c locates one at Dawsonsprings, Ky. Subsection d appropriates $900,000 for the location of one at Norfolk, Va. Subsection e provides for one in the District of Columbia, and subsection f provides for one at Staten Island, N. Y. When this appropriation bill passed the House a few days ago it had no provision whatever in it in reference to these various hospitals. It did not even make an appropriation to carry out the authorization of the act of March 3. When the bill passed the Senate a few days ago it contained amendment No. 21, which, following the authorization contained in the act of March 3, directed the Secretary of the Treasury to complete the hospital at Chicago. It does not amend the original law; it makes no effort to amend

even subsection e of section 7 of the act, but it merely directs the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of that act.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. It says the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete. Was the Secretary authorized to acquire and complete by the previous act?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, sir; he was authorized to acquire and complete it, and he was authorized to do it, but not directed by the original act to do it. This amendment directs him to do what in that act he is authorized to do. Now, I do not believe that any amendment that could be offered upon the floor of the House to amendment No. 21 which in effect or in terms changes the original law of March 3, 1919, is now germane to this amendment. The only points of difference between the House and the Senate are subsection a of section 7, which applies to the Chicago hospital, and the last paragraph of section 6, which provides for some slight change in the million and a half appropriation provided for in that paragraph of the original act.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman contend, then, it would not be in order to offer an amendment here providing for the repeal of that act?

Mr. BARKLEY. Why, I certainly do. I contend it would not be in order.

Mr. GOOD. Take the gentleman on that question. The former Speaker ruled exactly on that point when the question of making an appropriation of $5,000,000 to take the agricultural census of the United States was under consideration. I offered an amendment to strike that out and repeal the section. The Speaker held that that was germane.

Mr. BARKLEY. This amendment of the Senate, as I said at the outset, does not seek to repeal any part of the law. It simply directs the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed to comply with the original act. And under the numerous precedents of the House it has been held that an amendment to an amendment placed upon the bill by the Senate is not in order unless it is germane to the amendment of the Senate, although it may apply to the subject matter of the Senate amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that that was just the situation to which I alluded. Congress had attempted to make an appropriation of $5,000,000 to take the agricultural census of the United States. I offered an amendment to repeal the section and the Speaker held that it was germane.

Mr. BARKLEY. Taking it for granted, for the sake of argument, that the gentleman's position was right, that applied to only one subject, and that was the taking of the census. This applies to only one building, and that the hospital in Cook County, Ill. It makes no mention in the amendment to the hospital in Kentucky, or at Norfolk, or Staten Island, or in the District of Columbia. Therefore the only points of difference between the House and the Senate are whether the Secretary of the Treasury shall be directed to complete the hospital in Chicago, Ill., and whether the last paragraph of section 6 of the original act shall be amended as provided in the Senate amendment. It might have been competent if the Senate had instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed with the construction of the hospital in Chicago, at Dawsonsprings, at Norfolk, at Staten Island, and the District of Columbia, to have amended all those propositions in any way the House might see fit, but having omitted all of them except the Chicago proposition it is not in order for the House to amend by mentioning or providing in any other way for the other hospitals provided for in the original act.

The reason for that ruling is perfectly plain. The policy of the House rules is, when there is a difference between the Senate and the House, that the rule shall be so construed as to bring the two Houses together as nearly as possible and not separate them more widely than they were when the conference report came in. The only difference between the Houses as to these hospitals is as to the Chicago hospital, and if we admit the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] it does not bring the House and Senate nearer together, but divides them more than when the conferees came back, and therefore that brings up before the Senate a proposition that has neither been considered by the Senate nor the House. I do not believe that by concurring with an amendment it is in order to bring in new matter that neither the House nor the Senate has considered in the original bill.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is it the gentleman's contention that the difference between the two Houses upon a subsection of section 6 of the original act does not permit adjusting the differences or the amendment of other sections of the original act or the entire act?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is an entirely different subject.

Now, the rules of the House applying to Senate amendments, so far as germaneness is concerned, are exactly the same as if offered as an original proposition in the House, and if an amendment would not be germane under the rules of the House, if it was under consideration here originally, it would not be germane when it comes back as a Senate amendment. And that rule is perfectly clear under the rules of the House. If the Speaker will bear with me a few moments while I cite previous rulings of previous Speakers and Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole, unless he is familiar with it——

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think the trouble is we fail to discriminate between a proposition as an original amendment and the proposition as it comes before the House at this time in a conference report. This proposition comes on an amendment that was adopted in the Senate, and coming back as it does, with an amendment, in regard to the hospital authorized under this act, it throws the whole act open for consideration, and the whole act is before the House. But, answering the inquiry of the Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Speaker to the incident that I referred to a minute ago, when the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Johnson, reported the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which carried an appropriation of $5,000,000 for taking an agricultural census in a certain way. When that was pending before the House I offered an amendment to strike out all of the language and to insert a provision that the act authorizing the taking of the said census be repealed.

The same objection was made that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] now makes, that we were repealing an act of Congress that was not placed in issue at all; that all that was before the House was whether or not we would appropriate the money to provide for taking the agricultural census; that we could either appropriate the money or could refuse to appropriate the money. But my amendment, it was claimed, went further than that. It repeals the entire statute.

I submit that if an amendment is in order, even when the matter comes before the House in that way, that simply repeals a whole statute, certainly it is in order to suspend the operation of a statute for a given time, and that is all we are attempting here. The only point of order here, as there, relates to germaneness. There may be no difference, so far as the legal propositions are involved, between suspending a statute for 30 days and repealing it. I submit to the Speaker that the incident I call attention to went a great deal further and absolutely repealed the law, while this only suspends its operation for 30 days. The amendment was adopted. That was in the fiscal year 1916, in the act approved March 4, 1915.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was that during the consideration of a bill in the House originally, or when the conferees reported?

Mr. GOOD. That was in the consideration of the bill as an original proposition, which makes, in my opinion, the position that we are now in a great deal stronger than the position then.

The amendment adopted at that time was this: "That section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, is hereby repealed." That was a motion to strike out the entire appropriation and repeal the act. All that we are attempting here is to suspend the operation of the act for 30 days.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman contend that he is only suspending the operation of the act for 30 days, or requiring the Secretary to report in 30 days, after which new legislation will be enacted?

Mr. GOOD. This goes further than that. This provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall not expend any of this money until he has ascertained the facts. It is a duty imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain the facts of the matter. But in this regard it imposes no new obligation on the Secretary not imposed by the act itself. We have not increased any of his obligations in that respect. He is directed in the act to make an investigation, and the amendment simply provides that the money shall not be expended until the investigation is made.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa delegates the power to the Secretary of the Treasury to act and legislate for the Congress of the United States, because

immediately after he investigates, whatever report he makes, I assume that the gentleman from Iowa will want to have it enacted into law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would also ask the Speaker's attention to this: The amendment put on by the Senate amends the law—changes the law. It expressly changes section 6, and by implication changes another part of the law. Now, the amendment offered by my colleague simply adds another restriction to the amendment put on by the Senate. In other words, it carries the amendment a little further.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. The Speaker will note that the amendment adopted by the Senate takes from the Secretary of the Treasury the right to exercise his judgment and commands him to do a certain thing.

The SPEAKER. That is just the point that the Chair would like the gentleman to address himself to.

Mr. GOOD. The Senate amendment changes the law. Under the law the Secretary was not compelled to buy this hospital unless he found after a full inquiry that it was desirable. Full discretion was lodged in the Secretary of the Treasury. This amendment compels him to buy it, whether he thinks it needed, no matter if he finds it suitable for the service, or whether it is desirable or not. It provides how he shall buy it, and directs him to sign a certain contract. I do not know what the contract is, and yet the contract he is to sign is understood.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman cite the original law?

Mr. MADDEN. The act of March 3, 1919.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. The act of March 3, 1919, after making provision as to who the beneficiaries of the War Risk Insurance are, and providing that there shall be permanently transferred to the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Bureau equipment, sites, leases, and things of that kind, provides in section 6:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, if in his judgment the same will be for the best interests of the Government from the standpoint of cost, location, and of the emergency needs of the Public Health Service, to purchase the site, buildings, and hospital facilities and appurtenances, at Corpus Christi, Tex., known as General Hospital No. 15, and for such purpose the sum of $150,000 is hereby authorized.

And so forth. Then, section 7 provides:

> SEC. 7. By the construction of new hospitals and sanatoria, to include the necessary buildings with their appropriate mechanical and other equipment and approach work, including roads leading thereto, for the accommodation of patients, officers, nurses, attendants, storage, laundries, vehicles, and live stock on sites now owned by the Government, or on new sites to be acquired by purchase or otherwise, at the places hereinafter named: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall make a finding that any hospital project hereinafter specifically authorized is not to the best interest of the Government from the standpoint of cost, location, and of the emergency needs of the Public Health Service, he is hereby authorized to reject such project or projects and to locate, construct, or acquire hospitals at such other locations as would best subserve the interest of the Government and the emergency needs of the Public Health Service within the limits of cost of such authorization.

Now, we have before us a Senate amendment absolutely changing these provisions of law, and commanding the Secretary of the Treasury, whether the Public Health Service requires additional service or not, whether it is to the best interest of the Government from the standpoint of cost, location, and the emergency needs of the Public Health Service, to purchase this particular hospital.

The SPEAKER. The difficulty in the mind of the Chair—and the Chair would be glad to have the gentleman clarify that difficulty if he can—is this: The Chair understands that the original statute gave the Secretary of the Treasury authority to buy land, subject to various restrictions. Now the Chair understands this amendment takes away that authority.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; it does not. The Speaker is referring to the amendment I have offered?

The SPEAKER. Exactly.

Mr. GOOD. The amendment I have offered simply suspends the expenditure of any money until the Secretary has made this investigation, but I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the Senate amendment does take all authority from the Secretary of the Treasury. My amendment provides that he shall take no further action in the matter until he has made this investigation. But the Senate amendment went much further than that. In the Senate amendment the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to buy the hospital at Chicago without an investigation, without considering the needs of the service, or anything of the kind. My amendment simply provides that no expenditures shall take place until the Secretary of the Treasury has made the investigation which the act imposes upon him in the matter of selecting all hospitals.

The SPEAKER. If this applied simply to the hospital at Chicago, it would be in order. The Chair has no question as to that.

Mr. GOOD. Unquestionably; and I can not see any objection as relates to the others, for they are all mixed in together in the general instructions for investigation. Where is there any special instruction for the Chicago hospital? The command of Congress is general. I have read the precedent where a whole statute that dealt with the taking of the agricultural census every five years, and providing for the manner of taking it, was repealed by an amendment which struck out the $5,000,000 that was carried in the bill. And certainly if you could repeal an entire statute, then I submit that it is in order to repeal any section or sections in a statute. But the amendment does not even go that far.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman cite the Chair to that precedent?

Mr. MASON. May the gentleman's amendment be read again, please? As I understood it, it directs the Secretary of the Treasury to report and then wait for further congressional action, which would be in effect a repeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> Mr. GOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment insert the following:
>
> "The Secretary of the Treasury, until further authorized by law, shall take no further action under the authority granted in sections 6 and 7 and such portions of sections 8, 9, and 10 that relate to the acquisition of land and hospitals and the expenditures of funds authorized in sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, approved March 3, 1919': *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress within the next 30 days the contracts or obligations entered into and the sums expended under the authority granted in said act, together with his recommendations as to what action, if any, should be taken in the matter of acquiring any of the hospitals authorized to be acquired by said act."

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state for the benefit of the gentleman that the problem which the Chair faces is this: In the opinion of the Chair, subject to correction, that amendment repeals the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to continue in acquiring or completing the hospital buildings and, in effect, practically repeals the law. Now, if the gentleman from Iowa can show that that is not so, or can show that if it is so it is in order, the Chair will be glad to hear him.

Mr. GOOD. In the first place, if it is true that it would repeal the law, I still maintain that it is in order under the ruling of the Chairman on December 17, 1914. When the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill was before the House and an item was reached appropriating $5,000,000 for taking the census, it was stricken out on a motion that also included the repeal of the statute itself that authorized the taking of the census.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman cite the Chair to that ruling?

Mr. GOOD. The Chair will find that ruling on page 320 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 17, 1914, which I send to the desk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the other matter that the Speaker has referred to, I want to call the attention of the Speaker to this fact, that the Secretary of the Treasury is not authorized to buy the Speedway Hospital or to buy a single hospital enumerated there, unless he finds that it is for the best of the service.

He absolutely states that he can reject all these matters. He can reject the hospital at Dawnsonsprings, at Corpus Christi, or the Speedway if he finds that it is not desirable. The Senate amendment comes in and says that he shall buy one of them. Now, it is seriously urged that it is not in order to suspend all operations until the Secretary of the Treasury can investigate. But the whole thing is grouped together in the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury. So we must group the reductions on that act. The Speedway was not pointed out in the language of the act that if the Secretary should find it was desirable he should purchase it, but the language of the statute is that if any of these hospitals are undesirable, or if the Secretary finds that they should not be purchased, he can reject one or all of them. The Senate amendment has thrown that whole proposition back to the House, and it seems to me there can be no escape from the conclusion that that proposition is properly before this House. We could repeal the whole act under that provision and under the authority of the ruling in December to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would be glad to look at that authority. The Chair would state that it is now half past 5

and that this matter might be debated and go over until to-morrow morning before the Chair rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the suggestion?

The SPEAKER. That the point of order be debated to-night and that it go over for a ruling by the Chair to-morrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is satisfactory as far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair will suggest that no other business be transacted to-night except the discussion of the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be no further business taken up this afternoon except the discussion of the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that there be no other business taken up to-night except the discussion of the point of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, does that include requests for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it does.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the act of March 3, 1919, sections 6 and 7, the Secretary of the Treasury was given unquestioned power to settle as to whether he would purchase a building or not. Nobody will contend that he had to come back to Congress for authority to decide. The power was with him completely. When he made the investigation and reached the conclusion he could act upon it.

Now the gentleman from Iowa comes in with an amendment proposing to repeal the power granted in the act of March 3, 1919, by requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate, and takes away from the Secretary the power to conclude and to act without further authority from the Congress.

There is nothing before the House except the question as to whether or not the Secretary shall be directed to buy the Speedway Hospital. I maintain that under the rules of the House it is not competent for the House in an amendment to a report of a conference committee to repeal that portion of the act not before the House for consideration. That is what this amendment does. I do not think anybody will deny that. I do not believe the gentleman from Iowa himself will undertake to deny it.

But the amendment he offers is so clear that anybody can understand it. He first sets out in his amendment that for a period of 30 days no investment shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in any hospital, site or building, and that in the meantime the Secretary shall investigate, and that even after he concludes his investigation he shall have no power to act until further authorized by Congress. Does anybody deny that is a repeal of the act, or does anyone deny it is a repeal of a part of the act, that is not before the House for consideration. I do not believe the Chair can hold the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa to be in order. I think it is beyond the power of the House at this stage of proceedings to enter upon the consideration of an amendment such as the gentleman from Iowa proposes. If we can do that we can do anything. It is not fair to assume that the ruling he cites to the Chair is a case in point at all. The House had under consideration an appropriation bill for $5,000,000 to take the agricultural census. The House had previously authorized such a census to be taken. In pursuance of that authority the Committee on Appropriations reported an appropriation of $5,000,000, and while that was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—not after it had been separated from something else, for there was nothing to separate it from—the gentleman from Iowa rose in his place and moved to amend the law by repealing it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], which he cited a little while ago, which repealed section 31 of the act of July 2, his motion specifically repealed section 31 of that act.

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not have been in order to offer an amendment to his motion repealing the entire section of that act.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course not, because there was no other section before the House for consideration. Here is a totally different case. The House has had under consideration the question of appropriating money. The House passed on the 3d of March a law in which it appropriated for certain specific things to be done by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Senate, when the deficiency bill went over a few days ago, amended a portion of the act by requiring that the Secretary should be directed to perform a certain function instead of being authorized to do it. That direction dealt with only one step in the law that we passed. It did not deal with them all. The other parts of the subject are not before us for consideration and have not been. The only question before us is the particular subject on which the Senate amended the law and that subject was a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase a certain site and building in the city of Chicago known as the Speedway Park Hospital. The gentleman from Iowa comes back from a conference had with the Senate. He brings in his report. The report is approved in every particular except the one particular, and that particular is the instance in which the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to do a thing that he was previously authorized to do. If the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa should be considered in order and become the law, he repeals every other element of the law enacted on March 3, 1919, which has no relation whatever to the subject reported by the conferees.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look on page 27 of the bill he will find that the Senate amendment there refers to section 7, and that the amendment on page 28, which is a part of amendment 21, refers to section 6. There are only two sections of the bill that provided for an appropriation. The other sections, 8, 9, and 10, simply provide the manner of expenditure under that, but the hospital projects themselves are all described in the two sections that are referred to in Senate amendments.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman from Iowa will not contend, I hope, that the matters he seeks to repeal were under consideration in the conference of which he was a member. There was nothing whatever relating to the subject matter under consideration by the conferees, except the particular things relating to the Speedway Hospital.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; the second part does not refer to the Speedway Park at all. That refers to where we had given authority to buy lands and erect buildings, and they propose to change that so that they could buy a completed hospital. They are changing the law in that respect.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, the change was the other way.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; but it was a change.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, everyone must admit that the discretion already granted to the Secretary of the Treasury is taken away by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa. He previously had the power, and now, by a system of camouflage in the proposed amendment, the gentleman from Iowa comes here and says that he is simply directing the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate, to ascertain facts, and report back. But what does the language of this amendment mean? What does it say? It says not only that the Secretary of the Treasury must under the direction they adopted investigate and report, but it also says that during the period of the investigation and prior to the report, and prior to further legislation by the Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury shall be estopped from the investment of another dollar or the exercise of any further discretion in the purchase or erection of buildings anywhere in the United States for hospital purposes. I maintain that the amendment is not only not germane to the subject before the House but is a change of law, and violative of the rules of the House and all the practices of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the only point of order pending is that the motion of the gentleman from Iowa is not germane, but it is well to note that the Senate amendment has never been before the House except as it came from the Senate. The House bill as it was sent to the Senate contained no provision which the Senate changed. This is a new amendment. Now, the gentleman from Illinois says we can enlarge and broaden the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, but we can not limit it or cut it out. I submit that amendment No. 21, in the first paragraph, which provides that the Secretary is directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, authorized and appropriated for, not by certain sections of an act but by the entire act, in the act approved March 3, 1919.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH (continuing). That that portion of the amendment puts that act in the law, seeks to direct him to do something that was permissive under that act, not under any one section of the act but under the entire act, and that to say that you can not by an amendment here come in and instead of directing the Secretary of the Treasury suspend the discretion under that act to say that is not germane seems to me not to be well taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman contend that a reference to an act by name in an amendment gives jurisdiction over that whole act?

Mr. WALSH. Why, Mr. Speaker, I contend this: That they are directing the Secretary to acquire and complete immediately something that was authorized and appropriated for by the act.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. If you can direct him to acquire and complete immediately something that was authorized by that act we can, in adjusting differences between the two Houses, forbid the Secretary from acquiring and direct what the Secretary——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is assuming it would be in order in the House to direct him under that act. This is not a House amendment; it is a Senate amendment.

Mr. WALSH. But, if the Chair will permit, it is true this is a Senate amendment, something that was never considered in the House, but this is now in conference and in disagreement, and in adjusting that disagreement, I submit, it is likely there may be other points of order which have not been made, certainly it is germane for the House to offer an amendment and say that under the provisions of that act the Secretary shall suspend operations until certain other things are done. That certainly is germane and——

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, everybody will agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that if it is competent for the House to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed that it might likewise be competent for the House to direct him to suspend, but only as to the particular thing before the House, not on a lot of other things.

Mr. WALSH. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this amendment in the first paragraph directs him to acquire and complete one hospital, and in the second paragraph refers to section 6 of that act, certainly you can not from that deduce that because you refer to other sections in the bill the instructions you seek to give are not germane, because to hold that would be to hold that one section of this law was not germane to the other. And the rule is not the same, I submit to the Chair in passing, in a general law with a comprehensive project as it is in an appropriation bill when items are made for specific purposes. In those sorts of measures, of course, it is not germane to provide for appropriations for one object which have nothing whatever to do with another object, but this is a general law and a general authorization giving the Secretary of the Treasury wide power and authority, and now it is thrown by means of an amendment put on this bill in the Senate into the conference, and there is a difference between the two Houses, and because the Senate insists that the Secretary is directed to acquire and complete something immediately you can not say that the hands of the House are tied so that they can not say, "You shall not acquire and complete immediately, neither shall you operate under sections 8, 9, and 10 of that act until you do other things."

Why, it seems to me that the point made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that it is not germane is not well grounded. On the other hand, that act has been put into controversy by the very first paragraph of this amendment, and the House is clearly within its rights in seeking to adopt this motion. It is clearly within its rights as far as germaneness goes, Mr. Speaker, in limiting the Secretary under any or all provisions of that act. And I submit the contention of the gentleman from Kentucky and of the gentleman from Illinois is not well taken.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Arkansas in favor of the point of order or against it?

Mr. WINGO. I am in favor of the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear some one against the point of order first.

Mr. MONDELL. I am against the point of order, Mr. Speaker. If this matter were not very important, I would not take the time of the House and the time of the Speaker at this late hour to discuss it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be very glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Kentucky insists that the House amendment is not germane to the Senate amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is one of the reasons I made the point of order, but my point of order was not limited to that.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, well, if the gentleman has found that he is wrong and now wants to make a new point of order, we would like to know what it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] undertook to put in my mouth a statement I did not make.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the point of order of the gentleman? I would like to know what it is before I discuss it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point of order was that the amendment was not only not germane, but it repealed existing law, and therefore, on either count, was not in order. And, further, that it extended jurisdiction to the conferees that they did not possess at the time it was originally in conference.

Mr. MONDELL. The matter is getting now to the point of a joke.

Mr. GOOD. May I inquire whether or not a point of order could be amended in this way indefinitely? I supposed it was a point of order that was made definitely, that it was not germane, and that was the only point of order that was made. And I undertake to say the gentleman can not amend his point of order; that he has made his point of order on germaneness alone and must stand or fall on that point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, whether that is true or not, I do not think it is material.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman's point of order to be that it was not germane.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought perhaps I ought to have laid more argument on that than on the other. If the Chair will recall, I held it repealed the existing act of March 3, applying to all the hospitals.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is very material whether the gentleman's point of order is as he originally stated, or as he has at various times amended it, or illuminated it, or decorated it with frills. I do not think any of the alleged points of order are well taken. If the amendment is germane, it is a valid amendment, even though it repealed provisions of law. If the amendment is germane, it is a valid amendment, even though it relates to something over which the conferees had no jurisdiction before the Senate acted. The Senate has acted on the matter, and, of course, the conferees have jurisdiction of anything that is in conflict between the two Houses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I do not yield.

That is elementary. The gentleman's original proposition is, however, that the amendment of the House is not germane to the Senate amendment. Now, let us see about that. What is the bill which the Senate amended? It is "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines." That is the object and purpose of the act. And through every section of the act that object and purpose are carried out. My contention is that a material amendment of any section of the act opens up the entire subject matter of the act, and that if the Senate amendment were to the first paragraph, that defines and determines the beneficiaries under the bill, it would open up the whole subject, because if you reduce the number of the beneficiaries you would reduce the need of hospitals; if you increase the number of beneficiaries, you increase the need of hospitals. The second section of the bill provides for transfers of certain facilities. Now, those transfers are necessary and essential as a part of the general plan and purpose of the act, and if you were to amend that section relating to transfers, it would open up the whole question of facilities for the soldiers and sailors and marines of the United States.

Now, without taking the time of the Chair to go through all the sections, let me say this——

The SPEAKER. Any amendment that applies to the several paragraphs would open up the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, it may be argued, and I want to give the gentleman the benefit of every doubt, that the first four sections are general; that sections 4 and 5 are somewhat specific, and that it is possible that an amendment to sections 4 and 5 might not vitally affect the general purpose of the bill. But at any rate, any amendment to the general sections of the act, and any amendment to later sections of the act which are all of the same character, opens up all of the questions involved in the act.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. Let me call the attention of the Chair to what the Senate amendment does. It amends section 6 of the bill by widening the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, so that he may build as well as purchase. The section as it stands provides for the purchase and improvement, and so forth—the last paragraph of it—at a cost of $1,500,000, and the Senate amended that so as to authorize the construction of a hospital.

Now section 6 is amended. There is no doubt about that. Therefore any amendment that affects section 6 is a germane amendment.

The first part of the Senate amendment is an amendment of section 7. What is section 7? Section 7 is a section which,

after certain general provisions, refers by specific reference to a number of proposed projects for hospitals. Now, the moment you affect that section, any part of it, you affect the entire section, because when we start out to provide hospital facilities for our soldiers and sailors it is assumed that we do it with knowledge and information and judgment as to the facilities that are needed, and when we provide that the Secretary may take over this hospital, or take over that hospital, or take over another hospital, and later propose an amendment to any of these provisions, we open the entire question, because if we were to abandon any one of these hospitals we would affect the entire plan, assuming that the act was based on knowledge of the facilities needed. You can not amend a provision relative to any one of the hospitals proposed without affecting the general provisions of the act.

Now, the amendment of the Senate affects specifically and directly sections 6 and 7. Therefore, beyond question, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to modify those amendments relative to sections 6 and 7 is germane. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa also refers to sections 8 and 9. Sections 8 and 9 are sections which make provision for the funds and the manner of construction of all these buildings; and manifestly, when you affect and modify and change sections 6 and 7, you open up the entire subject as to the manner of construction; you open up the entire question as to the appropriations.

The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is germane, therefore, first, because the Senate amendment affects, and affects in a fundamental way, the general provisions of the act, and therefore the amendment is germane, because it relates to the same subject matter.

But it is germane further because the gentleman from Iowa endeavors only to modify sections 6, 7, 8, and 9, all of which have direct reference to a set of projects that are related one to the other. The Congress provided for these various projects because, in its wisdom, that number of projects was required to care for the soldiers, sailors, and marines. It added a section relative to the construction of all the projects. It added a section relative to the appropriations for all the projects. And the moment you change the law with regard to the projects you open up the whole question as to how many there shall be, where they shall be, how they shall be secured, the manner of their construction, and the appropriations for them. The gentleman's amendment is in order if it does effect a repeal, just as much in order as it would be if it were only what it is in effect—a suspension of the law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would call the attention of the gentleman to a matter that he has temporarily overlooked, that section 7, by express reference to the projects hereinafter specially authorized, refers to these following sections and applies to them.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. All of the sections referred to in the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa are completely interwoven and relate to one general scheme and plan and purpose, and the moment you open any of the questions settled by these paragraphs by amendment you open up the entire question.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MASON. May I ask a question for information? I want to understand it. Does not the gentleman understand from the reading of the amendment that if this is passed there is nothing to be done further under this act until further congressional action is had?

Mr. MONDELL. Nothing would be done further until the Secretary had made his report.

Mr. MASON. Wait a moment, please——

Mr. MONDELL. I am willing to admit, if it will please the gentleman, that the amendment might involve a repeal.

Mr. MASON. I am not asking to be pleased, I am asking whether it does in effect repeal that whole act?

Mr. MONDELL. It does not.

Mr. MASON. What can the Secretary do under this resolution? I am asking this now for information. What can the Secretary do until further legislative action is had? Does it not provide in the amendment that I have asked to have read——

Mr. MONDELL. I think the amendment is very clear and plain. It provides for a report, whereupon—and that is the purpose of this amendment—the report being made, provision will then be made for these hospitals.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose provision is not made. What can he do?

Mr. MASON. It takes further legislative action, does it not?

Mr. MONDELL. Not necessarily.

Mr. MASON. Read the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think it would make any difference if it did. I still think the provision would be in order. The Senate has raised the question of this general plan and purpose of hospitals, and has offered an amendment relative to them which repeals certain provisions and substitutes others for them. It opens up the entire subject matter. The field of the conferees and the field of action by the House is as broad as the statute itself. If it is not, I will say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, then we are utterly defenseless in the presence of such amendments offered by the Senate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the Speaker allow me just a word further in the line of the argument of the gentleman from Wyoming?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that section 7 read by itself would be utterly meaningless. In order to get the connection and the power conferred by this section you are obliged to go clear back to the first paragraph of the bill, the general paragraph, which says that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to provide additional hospital facilities. Then section 7 goes on to specify one of the ways in which hospital facilities may be provided, and starts out "by the construction of new hospitals," and so forth, and if you put section 7 by itself, as I stated before, it would be absolutely meaningless.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is not that true of every section of every act? You have got to refer to the original enacting clause or it would all be senseless.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Of course; but I am not speaking of the enacting clause. I am speaking of the sections as to which that is not true. That is not true of sections 5 and 6 of the act which we are discussing, and the gentleman ought to know it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman's question answers itself.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it does.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As to the objection that the amendment now proposed repeals the act in question, we will be aided in the consideration of this matter if we dwell for a moment on a very plain and well-settled legal principle. The amendment offered by the Senate does not specify that this hospital, which is referred to therein, shall be an exception to the provisions of the act which is amended or changed. It does not add it in the way of a proviso, but in utter contradiction of the provisions of section 7 absolutely directs the Secretary of the Treasury to buy this hospital whether he considers it to the best interests of the Government or not, and it absolutely takes away from him that power which is conferred as the act now stands.

We speak of the act as amended, but it is not simply amended, it is absolutely repealed so far as that part is concerned that is in conflict with the addition made thereto. The gentleman complains that the provision offered by my colleague repeals the act. The provision inserted by the Senate repeals a portion of it, and while I think it is not important if we concede that the amendment offered by my colleague repeals a part of the act, it would be doing nothing but what the Senate has done.

The SPEAKER. But no point of order has been raised to that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know. The gentleman in attempting to meet the point of order raised the objection that this provision repealed the act, and nine-tenths of the argument has been devoted to that. So far as the germaneness is concerned they have practically abandoned that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken if he thinks that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They have devoted but very little of their argument to that point. I say that the Senate amendment repeals this act so far as it is in conflict with its provisions. The Senate amendment takes away a power which the original act gave. Consequently, if it be urged, and urged correctly, that the amendment offered by my colleague repeals it this raises no further objection for it modifies the act no more than the Senate amendment does.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa that section 7 of the original act would be without meaning except by reference back to the beginning of the act, that is obviously true about all acts. You

must refer back to the enacting clause that gives vitality to every section that follows. You might select any section out of any act, and unless connected with the entire act it would have no binding effect. The last statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] was that section 7 might be considered as a general legislative act.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not refer to the enacting clause. I referred to the part where it said that the Secretary was authorized to buy certain hospitals in a certain way, and then went on to say in other sections by doing so and so.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is frequent in the passage of bills that some general provision is made in the first part of the act, and each section that follows is an amplification or description of the manner in which the officials shall perform the act mentioned in the first part.

If the gentleman's contention that section 7 might be considered a general legislative proposition be correct, we are bound to consider the subsections as being distinct legislative propositions. In order that we may understand clearly what the situation is, if this bill had been passed by the Senate originally giving direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to go ahead and build a hospital in Chicago, I doubt seriously whether it would be in order to amend by specifying the establishment of a hospital in some other part of the United States. Certainly if there was a bill originating in the House providing for the creation of a hospital at any point in the United States it would not be in order to offer an amendment to construct another hospital somewhere else in the United States. That is so well settled that I need not call the attention of the Chair to it. Likewise, if we had a bill originally in the House where a special public building was authorized, or if we had here a bill to repeal the law in so far as it affected a public building in the town of Alexandria, it would not be in order to offer an amendment repealing the authorization of a building in Davenport, Iowa. The Senate has added an amendment naming specifically a hospital location that created a difference between the two Houses, something that creates a disagreement in conference on that amendment.

That disagreement does not arise over the location of a hospital at Dawsonsprings, nor in the District of Columbia, nor in Norfolk, Va., nor Staten Island, or anywhere else, except at Chicago. That is all that was before the conferees. The conferees did not have before them the question of the Secretary's authority as to Dawsonsprings or any of these other places. The only thing the conferees had before them was the question of disagreeing to the Senate amendment as to Chicago, Ill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, I am sure, does not mean that.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the $1,500,000 under the last paragraph of section 6.

Mr. GOOD. Where was that to go?

Mr. BARKLEY. Down at Corpus Christi, Tex.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; it was not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, suppose it was a general provision?

Mr. GOOD. It is a general provision, and nobody knows where it is to go.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was a part of section 6. Then, if the mention of that $1,500,000 in the last paragraph of section 6 opened up the entire section 6 to amendment, because it was a general provision and not a specific designation of location, it would not have any effect upon the propriety of the point of order as to section 7. As I was saying, the only question of difference as to the location of these specific points designated in the original act was at Chicago, leaving aside the million and a half which was indefinite, and which for the purpose of this point of order is unimportant. Section 7 provided for the location of specific hospitals, and, in so far as the Senate amended section 7, it was limited to the hospital at Chicago. Therefore the conferees came into the House with a disagreement not about Dawsonsprings or Staten Island or the District of Columbia, but about Chicago, and a further disagreement as to whether the million and a half of indefinite appropriations authorized to the Secretary of the Treasury should be somewhat broadened; but that does not affect the question of germaneness as applied to these various locations that were specifically designated by Congress. If this amendment is germane and is admissible, it goes back to conference. The original matter which was submitted to the conferees is entirely changed. Instead of determining whether the Secretary of the Treasury shall be directed forthwith to proceed with the construction of the Chicago hospital, the whole question of hospitals in the United States is opened up before the conferees, something they could not take jurisdiction of in their original conference.

I maintain that when the conferees come in with a conference report and that report discloses a disagreement over a specific thing that has been under disagreement and discussion in conference, any amendment that broadens the scope of the conferees and submits to them matters not originally in their jurisdiction is not germane, and, therefore, ought not to be admitted under the guise of an amendment. If this amendment were admitted and it were voted on by the House favorably, and put in the bill, and it should go back to the Senate, then the Senate would have a right, considering this repealed the entire law on the subject of hospitals in the United States, to offer a further amendment to the provision of the House by designating entirely different locations for the erection of these hospitals. That would then come back to the House again and in that way we could in a sort of fan shape expand the differences between the two Houses indefinitely instead of tending to bring them together.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that the House could not repeal section 6 of that law which the Senate has amended?

Mr. BARKLEY. I say that originally things proposed under certain rules of the House——

Mr. WALSH. I am not stating originally, but now the matter being in dispute between the Houses that the House could not repeal section 6?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe the House could repeal it outright. It could only take action as to the last paragraph of section 6.

Mr. WALSH. I mean the last paragraph. Could the House repeal that?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it could.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman consider the first paragraph of Senate amendment No. 21 as an amendment to the original law?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course it is an amendment to the original law. Any change in the original law is an amendment, but the fact that the Senate refers specifically to the last paragraph of section 6 of the original act, though it changes the act as a whole, does not authorize the House to open up the entire act for change. It must be confined to the specific provisions of the act which the Senate amendment changes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has said, as I understand it, that the first paragraph of Senate amendment No. 21 is an amendment to the original law?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is an amendment to the original law, but it specifies where that amendment applies not only by section but by paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. The first paragraph does not refer to any paragraph or section.

Mr. BARKLEY. The matter with reference to the million and a half dollars appropriated in the last paragraph of section——

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman misunderstands my question. I am referring to the first paragraph of Senate amendment 21.

Mr. BARKLEY. The first paragraph of Senate amendment 21 refers specifically to section a of the original act——

Mr. WALSH. It does not refer specifically to anything except the act.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman will refer to the original act——

Mr. WALSH. I am not referring to the original act; I am referring to Senate amendment 21. We are bound by the language of that amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are bound by the reading of the two together:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, etc., of March 3."

Now, where is that Broadview Hospital mentioned in that act? It is mentioned——

Mr. WALSH. It is included in all the provisions of the original act, because more than one section of the original act refers to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In subsection a of section 7 of the original act is the particular place in the original act where the Secretary is authorized to acquire and take over this hospital in Cook County.

Mr. WALSH. But if section 7 of the original act were eliminated he could not do anything about it, so that the authorization——

Mr. BARKLEY. If section 7 of the original act only referred to Cook County hospital, of course, if that section were repealed it would by implication repeal the rest of the section referring to it, but the gentleman is seeking——

The SPEAKER. Suppose the amendment had read, "The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill.," and did not cite at all the act under which it was appropriated for, would the gentleman from Massachusetts still maintain the objection which he makes?

Mr. WALSH. It would make no difference, I submit, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wished to get the gentleman's view.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Chair seriously entertains the view of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would like to make this suggestion: If the amendment read that the Secretary is directed to acquire and complete the hospital at Broadview, Ill., the natural implication would be that the Senate intended to repeal in effect only that part of the original act that applied to the hospital at Broadview, Ill. The effect of the language mentioning the act in which it is included merely identifies it as being the hospital originally appropriated for and——

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield, but I do not care to take up too much time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Now, the gentleman says the first paragraph of Senate amendment 21 only referred to certain paragraphs in the original act. Now, does not the gentleman think it is significant that in Senate amendment 21, in referring to Broadview, Ill., they referred to the entire act, whereas in the second paragraph of Senate amendment 21 they referred specifically to the last paragraph of section 6?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think it is significant, because it shows the intention of the Senate, in so far as that million and a half appropriation is concerned, was only to touch the last paragraph of section 6, and of course the gentleman would not think that either House would be short-sighted enough not to mention the act they proposed, even in a remote degree, to affect. That is always done in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. If we introduce a bill in the House originally that has an amendment to some pending bill repealing some section of a previous act of Congress, the act is mentioned as being an act approved on a certain date, in order that the particular section may be identified. If we did not do that, and somebody brought in a bill and we offered an amendment simply repealing section 37, nobody would know what act was referred to. An act must be mentioned, and under the rules of construction the way to identify that is to mention the day on which it was approved. Sometimes broader descriptions are given, such as "the Clayton Antitrust Act." But ordinarily we identify an act by the mention of the date on which it was approved, and by mentioning the act it does not open the entire act for consideration.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look at sections 8, 9, and 10 of the bill, he will find the things referred to there refer not only, and make provision not only, for the hospital in Cook County, but make provisions for all of them. They are all tied up together. The appropriation is contained in paragraph 9 of the bill, and in paragraph 8 the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to employ persons, to employ architects, and things of that kind. That was for all the provisions of the bill and not for any one particular provision. So all the sections of this bill, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] said, are tied up together, and you can not separate them if you would.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose it is true that the provisions that follow are directions to the Secretary of the Treasury as to how he shall carry out the work as to all of these hospitals. Suppose Congress did bring in an act repealing the provision as to Chicago, it would not mean that all the restrictions applying to the other hospitals were repealed. And, of course, automatically, if the Chicago hospital provision were repealed, all the subsequent provisions that apply to Chicago would fall with it; but it would not by implication follow that those restrictions and regulations would not go on and be a part of the construction of the hospitals provided for in portions of the bill that were not repealed. I have here a number of citations I would like briefly to call to the attention of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear them.

Mr. BARKLEY. We must bear in mind that this is a Senate amendment, and under the rules of the House all amendments to Senate amendments must be germane. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] seemed to have formed the opinion that I had abandoned the contention of germaneness. I had no such intention.

In Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6188, page 614, we find this:

In the consideration of Senate amendments in the House, an amendment must be germane to the particular Senate amendment to which it is offered, it not being sufficient that it should be germane to the provisions of the bill.

Of course, there can not be any contention that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is germane to the provisions of the bill, because the bill does not mention this hospital anywhere except in the Senate amendment. Therefore we are confined on the question of germaneness here to the hospital at Chicago.

Mr. Goldsmith W. Hewitt, of Alabama, moved that the House concur in the amendment with an amendment.

Mr. Thomas M. Browne, of Indiana, made the point of order that Mr. Hewitt's amendment was not in order, not being germane to the subject matter of the Senate amendment.

The Speaker (Mr. Speaker Carlisle) sustained the point of order on the ground that an amendment proposed to an amendment of the Senate must be germane to that amendment, and could not be in order on the ground of being germane to the subject matter of the pending bill, for the reason that the text of the bill, except as amended by the Senate, was not again open to amendment by the House.

The SPEAKER. There is no question about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. It says further:

On March 8, 1898, the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering Senate amendments to the Indian appropriation bill, one of these amendments being as follows:

"That the time fixed by the Indian appropriation act, approved June 7, 1897, for opening for location and entry, under all land laws of the United States, the lands of the Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in Utah, under the limitations and exceptions as therein provided, is hereby extended six months from the 1st day of April, 1898."

On behalf of the Committee on Indian Affairs, Mr. James S. Sherman, of New York, proposed to concur in the Senate amendment with this amendment:

"And the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease the said lands containing said minerals, said leases to be upon such royalty as the said Secretary may determine to be reasonable, and said leases to be for such periods, not exceeding 10 years, as he may determine; and regulations and limitations shall be provided by the Secretary as to the amount of lands embraced in each lease, or as to assignments of said leases, so as to prevent any monopoly of said minerals; and the Secretary will make all such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the objects of this act."

Mr. WILLIAM H. KING, of Utah, made the point of order that the proposed amendment was not germane and was a change of existing law.

After debate, the Chairman sustained the point of order.

In that case the Indian appropriation bill came back from the Senate containing an amendment extending the time for entering on certain reservations of Indian lands for six months. The amendment offered on the floor of the House to that amendment was an amendment which directed the Secretary to lease these lands and opened up a general provision for the distribution and leasing of these identical Indian reservations.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole held that that was not in order, as not only not being germane, but a change of existing law. Now, I do not suppose that even the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] will contend that the distinguished Member from Iowa, Mr. Hepburn, was not one of the greatest parliamentarians ever in the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Was that case last cited on a conference report?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it was not on a conference report.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I thought not.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the case of the amendment offered to this Indian appropriation bill, it opened up the whole question of the disposition of Indian lands, and it was held to be not in order, because not germane, and it would fall either on the question of germaneness or change of existing law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me finish these quotations.

Mr. WALSH. Did the gentleman state that was an item in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. On the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky permit me a moment? I assume he is closing, and I want to call his attention to a decision here, in order that he may refer to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I agree with the general proposition that the rule is not well settled as to amendments to Senate amendments on conference reports. The decisions have squinted both ways. But I have here a decision which, I think, is quite in point to the question raised here, and I will cite it for the benefit of the Chair and for the information of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is that?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is cited in volume 4, Hinds' Precedents, section 3912. The facts are as follows:

On June 4, 1900, the House had agreed to a partial conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill and was considering the amendment making appropriation for the work of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, moved to recede and concur, with an amendment directing the commission to prepare and report a comprehensive plan of improvement of the Mississippi River.

Mr. Thaddeus M. Mahon, of Pennsylvania, made the point of order that the amendment proposed new legislation and was not germane.

The Speaker (Mr. Henderson) said:

The point of order is overruled. If the point were to be sustained it would entirely disarm the House from the treatment of amendments of the Senate. The Senate amendment has reference to the Mississippi River and its improvements and the Mississippi River Commission, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Burton] treats of the same matter. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Burton] to recede and concur, with an amendment.

It seems to me that this being a proposition to purchase a particular hospital, the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury before purchasing it to make an investigation would be germane and would be on all fours with the case just cited.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that if this amendment directed the Secretary to suspend all operations as to the Chicago project until he had made a report, or until he had found from further investigation that it was the proper thing to do, that amendment would probably be in order, but it would not have been in order on the amendment cited by the gentleman from Kansas to have brought into the question of controversy the improvements on any other river than the Mississippi, because the Mississippi River Commission has jurisdiction of all improvements on the Mississippi River.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am referring to the broad principle involved here as to the authority of the House to amend a Senate amendment on a conference report partially agreed to, as here.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman will pardon me. In that case the House agreed to the Senate amendment, did it not?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No. The Senate amendment was on a partial conference report, and the House agreed to it with an amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Burton.

Mr. SABATH. It would go much further than to appropriate, because in addition to that it created a commission.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the question whether the House agreed or disagreed to that amendment has anything to do with the point of order in this case.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was a germane amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not in conflict with my position in this case. The improvement of the Mississippi River was one project, put under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission by Congress.

They had authority to expend all the money which was appropriated by Congress for the improvement of the Mississippi River, and it was germane, as the Speaker held at that time, that on an appropriation affecting the Mississippi River Congress could instruct the commission that had jurisdiction to expend that money, to make a report to Congress with reference to the general improvement of that river over which it had jurisdiction.

Now, that is exactly in line with the contention I make, that the Secretary of the Treasury could be instructed, and it would be in order for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] or anybody else to offer an amendment directing the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend operations on this Chicago hospital until any contingency had occurred that the Congress might fix. But it would not have been germane in that amendment cited by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] to have provided that all improvements on the Ohio River should be suspended, or on the Missouri River, or on the Arkansas River, or on the Great Lakes, or in the harbor of New York. Therefore the citation which he has just read not only is not in conflict with the position I take, but supports it, that it would be in order for a germane amendment to be offered affecting the amendment of the Senate which brings certain things into controversy. But it is not in order here to open up the whole subject of hospital construction, any more than it would have been in order in that amendment to open up the entire policy of the United States with reference to river and harbor improvement.

Now, in another case here which I wish to read, on March 10, 1898, the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering Senate amendments to the Indian appropriation bill, the same bill to which I previously referred. This precedent is found in section 6190, on page 615, of volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents. One of the Senate amendments, No. 72, was for the ratification of a treaty with the Seminole Tribe of Indians. It was moved that the House concur in this amendment with an amendment ratifying a similar treaty with the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians.

Mr. James S. Sherman, of New York, raised the point of order that the amendment to the amendment was not germane and that it was new legislation.

The same chairman, Mr. Hepburn, of Iowa, sustained the point of order.

On March 10, 1898, the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering the Senate amendments to the Indian appropriation bill. Amendment No. 58, the free-homestead amendment, was under consideration. This amendment proposed to give to settlers certain lands, the proceeds of which, if the lands were sold, would go to agricultural colleges in the country.

Mr. Levin I. Handy, of Delaware, moved that the House concur with the Senate amendment, with an amendment striking out of the act of August 3, 1890, that portion which restricts the national appropriations for agricultural colleges to proceeds of the sale of public lands.

Mr. James S. Sherman, of New York, made the point of order that this amendment was a change of existing law, and also not germane to the Senate amendment.

After debate the Chairman said:

It appears to the present occupant of the chair that this question is not a new one; that there are very many precedents for the decision he proposes to make, and he has no difficulty at all in arriving at the conclusion that the point of order, or both points of order, should be sustained, and so sustains the points of order. Mr. Handy having appealed, the decision of the Chair was sustained—140 ayes to 34 noes.

This is section 6191, Hinds' Precedents, volume 5.

These cases, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion clearly establish the rule of restriction as to a House amendment to a Senate amendment; and on an amendment to a conference report is even narrower than it would be if it came back from the Senate without going to conference. These cases which I have cited are all of the cases I have been able to find on the subject of the germaneness of Senate amendments, except the one cited by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], which, I think, sustains my position. If the amendment goes beyond the matter in disagreement between the House and the Senate, and if it changes existing law, or brings into the controversy something not considered by the Senate in its original amendment, then it is not germane and is not in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a citation to the Chair, in view of the contention of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that this amendment would not be in order now if it were not in order in the House originally? Section 5824, volume 5, Hinds' Precedents——

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the gentleman understand me to make that contention?

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman did the first time he rose to the point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I claimed it would not be in order upon an amendment repealing a specific section of any act to repeal another section of the same act.

Mr. WALSH. I want to cite section 5824 to the effect that to a bill amending a general law in several particulars an amendment providing for the repeal of the whole law was held to be germane. An attempt was made to amend the bankruptcy law in several particulars, in specific sections. An amendment was offered to repeal the entire law, and the Chair, of course, very properly held the amendment germane. The gentleman from Kentucky has stated that both paragraphs of the Senate amendment 21 are amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is where an original bill was brought into the House.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman stated at the beginning of his argument on this point of order, the first time he took the floor, that this would not be in order now upon this conference report unless it would have been in order in the House when this bill was under consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, that rule is very clear. If a bill is brought in originally in the House repealing several sections, various provisions of an act, it is in order to repeal the whole act; but an amendment would not be in order to repeal the whole act originally if the bill only repealed one section, upon the same theory that if you bring in an appropriation authorizing the construction of a building at one place it is not in order to offer an amendment to put one at another place; but if you have a general bill for the construction of buildings at various places, it is in order to amend by bringing one other place into the scope of the bill. That is exactly what happened in this particular. The bill was brought in amending several

sections, repealing several sections, and it was held as an original proposition that it was in order to repeal the entire act.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state what section of the original act the first paragraph of Senate amendment No. 21 amends? The second paragraph amends section 6.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, that thing has been thrashed out here. It is very plain that the first section of the Senate amendment amends subsection (a) of section 7 of the original act.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WAR EXPENDITURES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to be a member of the special select committee to investigate war expenditures, to take the place of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] who resigned, Mr. FREAR's name to come immediately following Mr. MCKENZIE's name on the committee.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 18, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Charlotte Harbor, Fla., with a view to securing a channel of increased depth from the Gulf of Mexico to the town of Boca Grande (H. Doc. 113); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for maintenance, Military Academy, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GREENE of Vermont, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 46), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWEET, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5707) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 47), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5992) providing for a United States Civil Service Board of Adjustments to constitute a court of appeals for employees in the classified civil service of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5993) to provide for the emergency arising out of the demobilization of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the discharge of workers from war industries and other occupations by securing therefor permanent opportunities for profitable employment by means of a national construction service organized for the systematic extension of useful public works and the development of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 5994) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Worcester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5995) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Douglas, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5996) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Grafton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5997) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hopedale, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5998) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hopkinton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5999) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mendon, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6000) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6001) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Millbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6002) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Millville, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6003) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Northbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6004) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Shrewsbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6005) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Upton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6006) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Uxbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6007) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sutton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6008) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6009) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Auburn, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6010) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blackstone, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 6011) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a cannon or some other fieldpiece to the city of Del Rio, Val Verde County, State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6012) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Standish, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 6013) donating a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the borough of Califon, State of New Jersey, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 6014) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6015) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Dubuque, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6016) for the construction of a road in the Bad River Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 6017) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kingfisher, Kingfisher County, in the State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6018) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Harvey, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 6019) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Fayetteville, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 6020) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Trenton, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6021) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Milan, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6022) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Salisbury, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6023) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of cannon and ordnance to designated towns and cities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6024) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Paris, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6025) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901," and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Benson, Swift County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ortonville, Bigstone County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Montevideo, Chippewa County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6029) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alexandria, Douglas County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6030) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madison, Lac qui Parle County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6031) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Granite Falls, Yellow Medicine County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6032) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wheaton, Traverse County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6033) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Olivia, Renville County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6034) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Litchfield, Meeker County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6035) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marshall, Lyon County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6036) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Willmar, Kandiyohi County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6037) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Glenwood, Pope County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6038) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elbow Lake, Grant County, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 6039) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Nanticoke, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6040) to enlarge, extend, remodel, and improve the public building at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6041) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Plymouth, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 6042) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Arlington, Reno County, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 6043) to provide homes for soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 6044) to assist in increasing the productive agricultural area of the Imperial and Coachella Valleys, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 6045) to equalize the effects of an act approved March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to provide for recognizing the services of certain officers of the Army and Navy in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 6046) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Wallington, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 6047) to aid the construction of a highway suitable for military coast-defense purposes along the north Pacific coast of California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 6048) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jackson, county of Jackson, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6049) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ypsilanti, county of Washtenaw, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6050) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ann Arbor, county of Washtenaw, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6051) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monroe, county of Monroe, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6052) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Adrian, county of Lenawee, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6053) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Belleville, county of Wayne, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6054) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Trenton, County of Wayne, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6055) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Franklin, County of Lenawee, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6056) to appropriate money to build an addition to the post office and custom-house at Petersburg, Va., and acquire additional land therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 6057) to amend sections 1 and 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908, as amended by the act of September 8, 1916, and the act of October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6058) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county seats designated herein one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6059) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county seats designated herein one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6060) for the erection of a public building in the city of Childress, county seat of Childress County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6061) for the erection of a public building in the city of Memphis, county seat of Hall County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6062) for the erection of a public building in the city of Clarendon, county seat of Donley County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6063) for the erection of a public building in the city of Plainview, county seat of Hale County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6064) for the erection of a public building in the city of Lubbock, county seat of Lubbock County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 115) to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Resolution (H. Res. 116) to promote the growing of food products in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 117) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KREIDER: Resolution (H. Res. 118) for the relief of Grace W. Hunt, widow of John T. Hunt, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 120) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Tao Hung Chang and Zeng Tze Wong, citizens of China; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) authorizing the President of the United States to call a national conference for the consideration of industrial problems and the amelioration of differences between capital and labor; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 6065) for the relief of the estate of John H. Christy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 6066) granting a pension to Catherine P. Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6067) granting a pension to Carrie C. Fry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6068) granting a pension to Emma A. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6069) granting a pension to Kate Lockerby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6070) granting a pension to James Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 6071) granting an increase of pension to David L. Stage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 6072) granting a pension to Martin Tepper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6073) granting a pension to William Unfug; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6074) granting an increase of pension to Frederick B. Clapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6075) granting an increase of pension to De Witt W. Toll; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6076) granting an increase of pension to Margrethe Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6077) to pay the claim of the King Coal Co., of San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6078) granting a pension to Charles B. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) granting a pension to Niels H. Dreio; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 6080) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Perdue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6081) granting an increase of pension to Peter G. Wynegar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6082) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Ingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 6083) granting an increase of pension to James Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6084) granting a pension to Robert Noble; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6085) granting a pension to Miguel Archuleta; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 6086) for the relief of Pedro Chaboya; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6087) granting an increase of pension to John H. Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6088) to provide for the payment to Miss Jennie Mutter of insurance money of Pvt. Joseph A. Riley; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6089) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Banister; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6090) granting a pension to Sophia Doering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 6091) granting authority, on certain conditions, to the Secretary of the Navy to reinstate Armour Simpson Heffley in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6092) for the relief of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 6093) granting a pension to Mary E. Flint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 6094) to correct the military record of Richard W. Bates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6095) granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Travis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6096) granting a pension to Ann E. Haymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6097) for the relief of C. W. Struckmeyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PELL: A bill (H. R. 6098) for the relief of A. S. Rosenthal & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6099) to carry out the decree of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of United States of America, owner of the steam dredge Delaware, *v.* Steamship A. A. Raven, American Transportation Co., claimant, and to pay the amount decreed to be due to said company; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 6100) granting an increase of pension to Harry A. P. Mayville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6101) granting an increase of pension to David N. Landers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6102) granting a pension to Charles M. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6103) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6104) granting an increase of pension to John J. Byrne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6105) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also. a bill (H. R. 6106) granting an increase of pension to Gustave Pinksohn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6107) granting a pension to Thomas Dunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6108) granting a pension to Daniel D. Brothers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6109) granting a pension to Benjamin Laurence; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6110) granting a pension to Albert Fritz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 6111) for the relief of the legal representative of Mrs. S. M. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6112) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Butler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6113) granting a pension to W. G. Patton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6114) granting a pension to John W. Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6115) granting a pension to Doctor Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6116) granting a pension to Maude Woods; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6117) granting a pension to William S. Steruss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 6118) granting an increase of pension to John C. Kauffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 6119) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6120) granting an increase of pension to William S. Stockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6121) granting an increase of pension to Charles Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6122) granting an increase of pension to John C. Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6123) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brookover, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6124) granting a pension to Myra E. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6125) granting a pension to William Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6126) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6127) for the relief of Nathan McDaneld; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6128) granting a pension to Mary E. Cutts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6129) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 6130) granting an increase of pension to James Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6131) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Crooms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6132) granting a pension to Edgar Shadbolt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6133) granting a pension to Angeline Latty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 6134) granting a pension to Elizabeth Crossley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 6135) granting a pension to John H. Shellenbarger; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Republicans of Wood Ridge, Bergen County, N. J., opposing league of nations in conjunction with treaty of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Union Chapel Congregation, of Springfield, Mass., favoring league of nations and urging United States Senate to ratify treaty of peace without delay; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of St. Brendan Society, Roxbury, Mass., composed of citizens of Boston, relative to league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of mass meeting of friends of Irish freedom and the Aloysius Club, opposing the proposed league of nations as against the traditional principles and policies of this Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: Telegram from members of First Presbyterian Church of Newton, petition from members of Methodist Episcopal Church of Canton, petition from citizens of Sumner County, and resolutions passed by members of the Church of Christ of Clearwater, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition and praying for effective legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of York, Pa., requesting the immediate repeal of the luxury tax of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Fawn Grove (Pa.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 1733, for the repeal of the present daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Fawn Grove (Pa.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 1733, to uphold the war-time prohibition law as originally passed upon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fawn Grove Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 1733, representing 226 members, against the $500,000,000 appropriation for reclaiming swamps and arid lands for farming purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Wichita Board of Commerce, Wichita Building Trades Council, Wichita Trades and Labor Assembly, all of Wichita, Kans., against the repeal of the United States Employment Service and asking that this service be permanently established; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Resolution adopted by the City Federation of Women's Organizations, city of Schenectady, N. Y., requesting that the full appropriation recommended by the Secretary of Labor be granted to the women in industry service in the Labor Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of certain residents of the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of numerous voters of Esperance, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers against repeal of day-light saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of American Wholesale Coal Association membership, representing the industry in 30 States, assembled at Cleveland, Ohio, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of legislative committee of National Association of Retail Druggists, favoring repeal of sections 630 and 907 of the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 150 citizens of Rockford, Ill., favoring repeal of tax on soda water, ice cream, and other similar articles of food and drink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition that the Illinois delegation in Congress be requested to use their influence to include in Agricultural appropriation bill item 124, for maintaining Bureau of Markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of sundry citizens of Chittenden County, Vt., for the repeal of the stamp taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Bertrand; New McKendree Methodist Church, of Jackson; First Baptist Sunday School of Jackson; Methodist Episcopal Church of Cape Girardeau, all in the State of Missouri, against repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Billings Farm Club, of Billings, Mo., for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. IRELAND: Petition of Inez M. Rice and others, of Princeville, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of R. B. Lawson and others, of Bigelow, Ark., favoring the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of California Pharmaceutical Association, of Los Angeles, and Cohn Coldwater Co., of Los Angeles, both in the State of California, against repeal of daylight saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Orange County Automobile Trades Association, Fullerton, Calif., protesting against manufacturer's sale tax on automobile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Iron Chief Mining Co., of Los Angeles, for a two years' extension of time for assessment work on mining claims; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of 196 Milwaukee citizens, requesting the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Petition of citizens of Salem, Mass., and vicinity, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of citizens of Altus and Clinton, Okla., asking for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Petition of Antonia Chacon *v.* the United States, asking reimbursement for 1,300,000 acres of land in Louisiana given to her grandfather by Charles IV, King of Spain; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of the town of Dewitt, Onondaga County, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition and necessary laws for the enforcement of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mr. F. H. Ebeling, and other residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring a strong enforcement act defining intoxicating liquors as including all alcoholic liquors, and extending prohibition wherever else our treaties permit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAJOR: Petition of numerous citizens of the seventh district of Missouri, urging repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the seventh district of Missouri for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of the seventh district of Missouri, opposing repeal of war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of a number of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., asking the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of Federal Employees' Union of Wichita, Kans., favoring continuance of United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of San Francisco Olympic Club, favoring the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of National Association of Retail Druggists of the United States, asking for repeal of sections 630 and 907 of the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELL: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of the Gardner Woman's Christian Temperance Union of 76 members, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fitchburg, all of the State of Massachusetts, against any modification or repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William M. L. McAdams, Shreve Crump & Law Co., E. F. Mahady Co., Frank E. Fetts Manufacturing & Supply Co., all of Boston, Mass., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from the Methodist Episcopal Church, Roseville, Calif., protesting against any repeal of the war-time prohibition act; letter from State commissioner of horticulture of California and resolution adopted by State convention of fruit growers of California, asking for immediate decision in regard to war-time prohibition; letter from the Loomis Congregational Church, of Loomis, Calif., asking that the war-time prohibition act be retained; letter from the Womans Christian Temperance Union of Corning, Calif., urging retention of the war-time prohibition measure; letter from the California Sunday School Association, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; and letter from William J. Cronin, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from Barker Bros. (Inc.), and Edwards & Son, all of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the repeal of the zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John W. Bardsley, of Philadelphia, Pa., indorsing legislation restricting wholesale immigration to this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, letter from Engineering Council, Washington, D. C., urging appropriation for topographic mapping; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Merchants' & Manufacturers' Traffic Association, California Fruit Distributors' Association, Union and Alameda sugar companies, Western Refinery Co., and Holt Manufacturing Co., all of California, protesting against Senator POINDEXTER's bill amending section 4 of the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Grange, Washington, D. C., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; also petition of Holbrook, Merrill & Stetson; John Coldwater Co.; Brownstein-Louis Co.; and Kullman, Salz & Co., all of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against any repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions with reference to the repeal of the tax exemption of Federal land-bank bonds adopted at group 7 and group 5 of the Iowa Bankers' Association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Archdiocesan Union of Sodalities, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the Sabath educational bill (S. 4987); to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Federal Employees' Union No. 1, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing soldiers' settlement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of Muscle Shoals, Ala., asking that their demands on the War Department for higher wages and better living conditions be granted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter from Butler-Veitch (Inc.), of Oakland, Calif., favoring the removal of manufacturing sales tax on industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of Kenton County (Ky.) Equal Suffrage Association, asking that the food now held by the War Department be released at reasonable prices to the American people; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Arthur Woods, assistant to the secretary, and of John Joy Edson, both of Washington, D. C., against the repeal of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lenna L. Yost, against the repeal of the so-called war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Association of Retail Druggists, by Frank T. Stone, for the repeal of the luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Workers' Defense Union, of New York, representing labor unions and other working class bodies, with a membership of 800,000, demanding the immediate and complete repeal of the espionage act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Building & Trade Exchange, Newark, N. J.; The Crockery Board of Trade of New York; and the National Pickle Packers' Association, favoring the zone law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of mass meeting of Lithuanians of Newark, N. J., protesting against Polish aggression and asking for recognition of their race; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Methodist Sunday School of Fort Clark, Stanton, and Hensler; the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Chilton; and the Women's Christian Temperence Union of North Dakota, all in the State of North Dakota, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Douglas, Ryder, Benedict, Max, and Bowbells, all in the State of North Dakota, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mott (N. Dak.) Congregational Sunday School, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of various residents of Utica, N. Y., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of motor dealers in Utica, N. Y., for the removal of the tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Motor Boat Club of Utica, N. Y., against the present tax on motor craft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of 150 members of the Natchez-Congregational Church of Yakima, Wash., protesting against President Wilson's recommendation for the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of the First Methodist Church of Mabton, Wash., asking enforcement of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ottie M. Gray, Bertha H. King, Henrietta Kelly, and others, citizens of Walla Walla, Wash., asking for the immediate passage of an adequate, permanent enforcement code to carry into effect the eighteenth amendment and war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition from State Senator R. A. Hutchinson, Spokane, Wash., asking protection for magnesite industry in this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from O. C. Glaur, O. M. Johnston, and Henry Karfstedt, of Colfax, Wash., and other jewelers of eastern Washington, asking repeal of the 3 per cent tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Stephen J. Harmlay, Pamelia Pearl Jones, and other members of the Presbyterian Church of Vashon, Wash., asking for immediate enactment of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegrams and letters from Sunset Auto Co. of Cle Elum, Wash., Washington Auto Chamber of Commerce, and others, asking for repeal of manufacturers' sale tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from Zillah (Wash.) Community Club indorsing and unanimously urging passage of the Mondell bill (H. R. 487) being a soldiers' settlement act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition from Seattle Chamber of Commerce favoring agricultural appropriation recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, telegrams protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition measures from Tekoa Methodist Church and Sunday School, St. John Federated Sunday School, and Garfield Methodist Church, all in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, telegrams from J. D. Ogden, of Walla Walla, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and others, all of the State of Washington, protesting against repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of certain citizens of Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin relative to the repeal of section 630 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Bryan, Ohio, urging a strong prohibition enforcement act, defining "intoxicating liquors" as including all alcoholic liquors, and extending prohibition to Americans in China and wherever treaties permit; also for Federal censorship of motion pictures to furnish wholesome saloon substitutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *June 18, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy gracious favor in the performance of the duties of this day. Thou hast led our fathers onward. Thou hast taken note of every issue that has been raised. Thou hast prevented us with Thy grace. Thou hast led us with Thy Spirit. To-day we come, we trust, with openmindedness toward Thee, praying that Thou wilt endue us with that wisdom which will equip us for the tasks of the day and for the rebuilding of the world that has been stricken, that has been ruined, by war. Grant us to-day Thy gracious favor. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the third congressional district of the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Santa Ana, and Long Beach, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Holton, Cawker City, Oskaloosa, Atchison, Hutchinson, Belleville, Brantford, Topeka, Gypsum City, Waverly, Agricola, Elmer, Dodge City, Atwood, Valley Falls, Rock, Milton, Hope, Summerfield, Glasco, Greenleaf, Mankato, Chetopa, Boyle, Canton, Belpre, Nortonville, Newton, Herington, Abilene, and Beloit, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sublet, Wyo., praying that the Italo-Jugo-Slav controversy be solved through a plebescite, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wiggins, Colo., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Merino, Colo., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Maine State Federation of Labor, in convention at Calais, Me., praying for the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Washington County, Md., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Garrett County, Md., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FALL. I ask to have printed in the RECORD telegrams from the mayor of El Paso, Tex., and the chamber of commerce and from Senator R. M. Dudley and Col. W. J. Fewel indorsing the action of the military in going across the border into Mexico.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL PASO, TEX., *June 17, 1919.*

Hon. ALBERT B. FALL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

No intention to criticize local military commanders for their entry into Juarez, as we believe firing into our city has been effectively stopped. We commend Gen. Erwin, as he acted on information sufficient to himself, although we believe Carranzistas equally guilty as Villastas for casualties in our city. Can not something be done to protect lives and property of citizens in interior of Mexico? Can not all factions in Mexico be put on notice that no one will be allowed to fight within 5 miles of our border anywhere or our troops will stop same?

CHARLES DAVIS, *Mayor.*

—

EL PASO, TEX., *June 17, 1919.*

Senator ALBERT B. FALL,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the military affairs committee of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, unqualifiedly commend Maj. Gen. Cabell, commander of the Southern Department, and Brig. Gen. Erwin, commanding the El Paso district, for their prompt action in taking the necessary measures to stop the fight across the American border, and thereby preventing further loss of life in El Paso during the fighting in Juarez on June 14 and 15, 1919.

MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
EL PASO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

EL PASO, TEX., *June 17, 1919.*

Hon. ALBERT B. FALL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Adding to telegram of yesterday, I want to say too much praise can not be given Gen. Erwin, commanding El Paso troops, for his prompt action in trying to protect life and property in El Paso. I do protest, though, against our Government allowing protection to our citizens only to extend to the border. Gen. Erwin's act permanently protects this city.

R. M. DUDLEY.

—

EL PASO, TEX., *June 18, 1919.*

Senator ALBERT B. FALL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Our forces have come out of Mexico for the third time, and it is the opinion of all thinking men I have talked to that this means the death of every American in the State of Chihuahua unless we go in to protect the country and to stay there until it is pacified, which, you know, can never be done by the Carranza government. Show this to HUDSPETH.

W. J. FEWEL.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that a similar telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL PASO, TEX. *June 17, 1919.*

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the military affairs committee of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce unqualifiedly commend Maj. Gen. Cabell commander of the Southern Department and Brig. Gen. Erwin commander of the El Paso district for their prompt action in taking the necessary measures to stop the firing across the American border and preventing further loss of life in El Paso during the fighting in Juarez on June 14 and 15, 1919.

MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
EL PASO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. From the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I report back favorably with amendments Senate resolution No. 11, submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] on May 20, 1919, authorizing an investigation of alleged unlawful practices in the election of a Senator from the State of Michigan. I ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Psesident, on May 20 I submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the sundry civil bill appropriating $50,000,000 for work on reclamation projects. The amendment was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands. By direction of that committee I report back the amendment favorably and I submit a report (No. 19) thereon. I ask that the report be printed and that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 84, submitted yesterday by Mr. SMOOT, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Printing, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2094) to encourage the building of homes by providing for exemption from taxation of the income on mortgages on real estate; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2095) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint William Shelby Barriger captain of Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2096) to regulate immigration to the United States and to prohibit immigration to the United States from Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, and their possessions for 50 years and from all other foreign countries for 20 years; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 2097) to prohibit admission to the mails of the United States of any printed matter or literature which is printed in the German language.

A bill (S. 2098) relating to the naturalization of aliens and providing for notice by publication of hearings of applications for issuance of final naturalization certificates; and

A bill (S. 2099) to prohibit admission to the mails of the United States of newspapers, periodicals, magazines, or publications printed in a foreign language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2100) authorizing the Union Pacific Railroad Co., or its successors, to convey for public-road purposes certain parts of its right of way; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for Mr. BANKHEAD):

A bill (S. 2101) to correct the military record of George Openshaw; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2102) granting an increase of pension to Jerry S. Fish; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

A bill (S. 2103) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 2104) providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2105) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Smiley; and

A bill (S. 2106) granting a pension to Leona J. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 2107) extending the time of notice required in ejectment or dispossession proceedings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2108) granting a pension to Clementine A. Walker (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 2109) to repeal an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 2110) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Adams;

A bill (S. 2111) granting an increase of pension to William Redman; and

A bill (S. 2112) granting an increase of pension to Joshua H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Birch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 2114) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Silver City, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2115) for the relief of entrymen and their assigns where final entry has been canceled in violation of law; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2116) for the relief of Martina Sena and Luis E. Armijo; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (for Mr. BANKHEAD) submitted an amendment providing that any retired commissioned officer of the Navy or Marine Corps who has performed active duty during the period of the war with Germany, and who while on active duty was promoted, and whose record is creditable, shall retain permanently the rank and pay of the grade or rank to which such officers were temporarily promoted, etc., intended to be proposed to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

OFFICE SPACE FOR SENATORS.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the following resolution and ask that the Secretary may read it.

The resolution (S. Res. 85) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, directed to make an examination and report to the Senate—

First. The number of rooms in the Senate Office Building, designating which are office rooms and which are committee rooms and which have heretofore been designated and used as committee rooms, and by what committees used.

Second. The number of rooms in the Senate wing of the Capitol used either as private offices or as committee rooms.

Third. The said committee is directed to report the rooms, by numbers, occupied by each Senator as of date March 3, 1919. If any rooms were occupied by Senators that were not numbered, such fact will be reported, and if any rooms were used as "borrowed" rooms, such fact will be reported and the name of the Senator thus occupying the room.

Fourth. The number of rooms now occupied by each Senator, both in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building.

Fifth. The said committee will further report as to the office space occupied by each Senator in square feet.

Sixth. The offices occupied by persons who are not Senators in either building and the names of such persons, and the number of rooms and the amount of space occupied by them.

Seventh. If any rooms are occupied by Senators as storage rooms or otherwise, such fact will be reported, and the names of the Senators and the location of the rooms given.

Eighth. By what authority does the Committee on Rules undertake to dispossess Senators of offices which have heretofore been assigned to them and which are now occupied by them. The committee will set out and quote the statutes vesting such authority.

Resolved further, That the Committee on Rules be directed to take no action to oust or dispossess any Senator from the rooms occupied by him until the coming in of said report and the action of the Senate thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee ask for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CURTIS. Let it go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOSES. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not see the chairman of the committee present, and I do not ask for a reference of the resolution. I take it as a matter of course that the investigation will be made and a report made to the Senate. I do not see how anyone could object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the resolution going to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; let it go to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, if I can do so without inconvenience to the business of the Senate, I shall address the Senate on Friday next on the subject of the league of nations.

TERRITORY OF TURKEY.

Mr. KING. The resolution which I offered a day or two ago is lying on the table. I ask that it may go over without prejudice, to be called up at a later date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

LOSSES TO CONTRACTORS.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate resolution 83. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to the resolution. The resolution simply asks for certain information and data to be furnished by the War Department. I think there will be no objection to it, and I hope the Senator from Washington will agree to its adoption.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator called my attention to the resolution yesterday, and I can see no objection to it. It calls for a report from the Secretary of War of facts. I suggest that it be read.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask the Senator if there is likely to be any discussion on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. I ask that the resolution be read as requested by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolution is not on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in the hands of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was submitted yesterday. I understand it is not on the calendar. I simply ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not know the resolution had been referred to the Committee on Commerce. I know the Senator submitted it yesterday and I thought it was lying on the table.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know to what committee it had been referred, but naturally supposed it would go to the committee of which the Senator from Washington is the chairman. I spoke to him about it, and I hope it will be taken up.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. The Committee on Commerce has a right without a resolution of the Senate to call for the information. The Committee on Commerce can secure the information without passing a resolution of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Committee on Commerce will have a meeting to-morrow morning and we will take up the matter. I did not know the resolution had gone to the committee. I thought it was on the table.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not on the calendar, and I would be glad to have the committee consider it to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. McCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	McNary	Simmons
Ball	Henderson	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Md.
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Stanley
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Sterling
Culberson	Kellogg	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	Overman	Swanson
Dial	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Dillingham	Keyes	Phelan	Trammell
Edge	King	Phipps	Underwood
Elkins	Kirby	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Knox	Poindexter	Warren
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Pomerene	Watson
Gronna	McCormick	Robinson	Williams
Hale	McCumber	Sheppard	Wolcott
Harding	McKellar	Sherman	
Harris	McLean	Shields	

Mr. DIAL. My colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is entitled to the floor.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice which I gave yesterday I desire this morning to consider at some length the general league of nations proposition and also the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. President, the only thing in the peace treaty so far presented to us which has reached such a stage of completion as to justify the assumption of finality is the league of nations provision. Therefore it seems to me we may defer such violent condemnation of the peace terms proper as has been made in respect to some of the tentative propositions of that treaty until the completed peace terms have been signed and presented.

In view of the fact that a resolution is now on the calendar calling for the elimination of the league of nations provision as a part of the treaty, we may well ask ourselves at this time whether there is anything in that provision which surrenders our sovereignty, threatens our independence, or is in any way inimical to our interest—whether there is anything in it which we as a peace-loving and peace-proclaiming nation can not or ought not subscribe to.

This resolution as it comes from the Committee on Foreign Relations is not in effect and in purpose a resolution merely to postpone the present consideration of a compact between the nations to prevent war, but rather the pronouncement of a death sentence upon the whole proposition for such a compact. It does not even embody the real heartfelt conviction of the Senator who drew it, but is an abject surrender not only of his personal conviction, as expressed in section 5 of his original resolution, but also of the personal conviction of most Republicans, as well as Democrats, that we ought to have some agreement between the great nations to maintain the peace of the world and prevent unjust wars.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has too often, in words of power, wisdom, and eloquence, supported this thought to doubt his sentiment. So strong was this conviction that he was unable to refrain from inserting it in the resolution as he presented it to the Senate.

This is what the Senator said in section 5 of his resolution as introduced by him:

> 5. That finally it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

That is the conviction and the sentiment of the Senator from Pennsylvania solemnly introduced into the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I would be satisfied if that section 5, without elimination or addition, should be the only compact between the great nations of the world. All I would ask would be that it be signed by the other members of the league of nations as their concurrent policy. That would, in my opinion, prevent unjust wars as effectively as the 26 articles of the proposed national league.

Why was that provision withdrawn in the Committee on Foreign Relations? Mr. President, that great principle was surrendered to the exigency of vote getting.

There are those in the Senate, as there are of course many in the country, who are desperately opposed to any kind of an agreement which would tend to secure the settlement of international disputes in a peaceful manner. Knowing our great power and that our vast population of mediate or immediate foreign extraction from every country of Europe still maintain Old World prejudices and sympathies, loves and hates, they hope to be able to play upon those prejudices and sympathies in such manner as to involve us in war.

Mr. President, those holding to such hopes and views never would vote for any resolution that would even look toward any kind of international good will. Those holding such views are a very small minority on either side of the Chamber. And yet with a nearly tie vote between the two sides of the Chamber, and especially on this general treaty, the great majority surrendered to the small minority. It is because I know that this resolution, whether so intended to operate by its author or not, will be the death knell of any scheme for the maintenance of world peace that I refuse to surrender my convictions to this minority.

If a league to prevent unjust wars is wrong, then, of course, not only should this resolution be adopted but the league provision should be thrown bodily out of the peace treaty. The first question must necessarily be the question of the merits of the proposed league, which I shall therefore first discuss.

ARE EUROPEAN QUARRELS OF NO CONCERN TO THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. President, the very first question that challenges our attention in the matter of a league of nations is the question of whether a war in Europe is a matter of concern to the United States. The ultraopponents of any league of nations assert that European quarrels and European battles are no concern of ours. If that be true, we may well pause before obligating ourselves to make them our concern. Is it true?

Mr. President, on the 28th day of June, 1914, in one of the most insignificant countries of Europe, a country so small that its exact location at that time was scarcely known by the American people, a man and his wife were murdered by a little band of political assassins. Had this murder been committed upon an ordinary family it would not have been considered of sufficient importance to have justified the expense of a cablegram to this country. But as the victims of these misled malefactors were of the Hapsburg family, the world was notified of the occurrence. Had anyone then suggested that this act might bring on a great world war, his mental balance would have been questioned. The world was to civilized in the year 1914 to permit the destruction of millions of innocent men because one man stabbed or shot another to death. Austria would demand that the criminals be brought to justice and that demand would be acceded to by Serbia. If it were not agreed to, Austria would send an armed force into Serbia and compel not only the execution of the criminals but an apology to the Austrian Nation. And even if it did bring on a war between Austria and Serbia, we need not concern ourselves about it. Let those discordant Balkan States settle their own scores with each other; America had nothing to do with their quarrels.

Well, Mr. President, that murder has already cost the lives of more than 50,000 young American boys, and so it did become our concern. We can not look upon their fresh-made graves, scarce yet softened by nature's verdant shroud, without yielding our belief that it was no concern of ours.

That murder has cost us about $40,000,000,000 up to the present time, and before we are through $100,000,000,000 will have been paid out by the American people. Is a conflict in Europe which compels us to load that enormous debt upon the American people for a century a conflict which does not concern us? Our Civil War cost us only about five or six billions of dollars, or only about one-eighth of the cost of one year of this war. Is it no concern of ours that there shall be left at the close of this conflict the possibility, yes, the probability, that another worse war shall blacken the earth?

About 8,000,000 boys, the best boys of the great white race, were killed in battle or died of wounds. Close to 20,000,000 boys of the same blood have died because of this war. Of course only a very small proportion of them were our boys; but they were boys with the same ambitions, the same lofty hopes and aspirations, and in whom the love of life was equally strong—boys with mothers like the mothers of our boys—their hopes, their ambitions, their lofty aspirations all buried with their mangled bodies. And yet I hear Senators still say this is no

concern of ours. Twenty million young girls of this generation, the best young girls in the world, deprived of their God-given right to reign queen of heart and home, must now go down to their graves husbandless, homeless, childless.

But, say the advocates of American isolation, this is no concern of ours. We are big enough to take care of ourselves. Let other nations do the same. We do not want to be brought into European squabbles.

Says the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], speaking of these European countries:

> We do not need them as partners. They require us. They yield to us nothing. They can yield to us nothing. We give to them everything. We can protect our borders for centuries to come just as we have in the centuries past. The Lord has given us geographical isolation and the Lord has denied just that thing to the different races of Europe.

And he might have added, "And so the Lord be praised"—

> And while our internationalists in behalf of the league of nations prate of the fact that we can not remain longer isolated, they forget that the geography of the situation remains immutable.

What do we get out of it? asks the Senator from California. Do we ask ourselves that question in the thousands of acts of generosity by which we gladden the lives of others? If the Senator does not ask himself that question, and I know he does not, then why does he insist that his Nation, which he loves better than himself, should ask it? If the question means, What are we to get out of it from a financial or a territorial standpoint, I freely admit that we do not need the assistance of any power on earth to protect our rights. I admit that we are so much more powerful than any other single nation to-day, so secure in our vast territorial expanse, in our geographical position, and in our material resources that we are practically immune from assault. But are we thereby relieved from any duty toward the rest of the world, or does that immunity impose upon us a greater duty toward those who are not so protected as we are? What is the true American answer? There can be but one answer: The God of international justice, by His special favors, has given to us in territorial extent, in that splendid isolation, in our vast resources, in our mighty population, has by His very law of compensation imposed upon us a greater duty than upon the less fortunate people of the world to shield the weak and to compel international right.

Mr. President, there is no moral duty incumbent upon any man in his relation to his fellow man that is not equally incumbent upon a nation in its relation to every other nation. Does any man deny that proposition? What would you say of the strong, vigorous man who would stand by while another strong man was beating a weak child to death, and idly remark, "It is no concern of mine; it is not my child." What would you say of a strong, vigorous swimmer who would stand on the shore and see a woman struggling in the waves that would soon be her death, reaching her white arms and crying for help, while he folding his muscular arms announces: "Oh, that is no concern of mine, she is not my wife or daughter." Mr. President, this doctrine of "no concern of ours" is a shameful and monstrous doctrine from every standpoint of national morality.

"Oh," but say the opponents of the league of nations, "we can make up our minds what to do when the occasion arises." Well, Mr. President, what I want us to do is to be right there on the spot, with the contractual right in our hand when the occasion arises. Had the United States been right on the spot with an agreement signed by us and signed by Germany, that Germany would not make war on France or any other country without submitting to a league of nations the question of the righteousness of her cause, the world would have been spared this awful conflagration with its consequent miseries which can never be forgotten or forgiven. You know and I know that so long as the present conception of international right continues, the conception that sovereignty has no bounds or limitations, we will not interfere unless some right of ours is attacked. What we want to-day is an international law on this subject, a law that will declare that war by one nation is a matter of concern to every other nation, and that no unjust war shall be waged by any nation. Now, that is just exactly what this league of nations does.

So, Mr. President, all this prating about what we will do in the future is worse than idle talk. We will do in the future just what we have done in the past under a like conception of sovereign rights. If there is no league of nations, the present world understanding that a war waged by one great power to annihilate another is not an assault upon other nations of the world, and that no other nation is bound to take up the cause of the weaker, will continue to prevail. You talk about our entering this war for the cause of a great world principle. The man who makes that assertion knows that he falsifies the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, right there in connection with what the Senator is saying—every word of which I approve, especially what went before—shortly before his last statement he said that he admitted that we were practically immune from attack. As a matter of fact, we have never been practically immune from attack even in our selfish interests.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not mean that no country would ever be bold enough to attack us; I meant that we are strong enough to make such action very improbable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, I am not talking about that. I would admit that we were practically immune from a public confessed attack; but we were drawn into this war by the attacks of Germany not only upon our morale and our industries through the ambassador from Austria and the ambassador from Prussia, but we were drawn into it by actual attacks upon our men, our women, and our children upon the high seas.

Mr. McCUMBER. I admit that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wanted to reenforce the idea that the United States could not remain isolated from the world now, however she might have done so in George Washington's day, and she did not succeed even then——

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope to cover a little later the point suggested by the Senator more in detail, if he will allow me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes—and that we are subject every day to attack in our body politic at home by foreign influence of every description.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, proceeding, I desire to say that the man who makes that assertion knows that this country never officially uttered one word of condemnation of Germany's entering upon this conquest. He knows that we never once said to Germany: "You have no right to make war on France."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Belgium.

Mr. McCUMBER. Or Belgium, either. He knows that we never uttered one word about our entrance into the war being for the cause of humanity. We based our right of action solely upon the ground that by the acts of Germany she had made war upon us. Of course, when we got into the war we were naturally fighting the cause of humanity. But it was not the cause of humanity which brought us into it. Now, I want to put ourselves in such a position that we shall never feel it necessary to reiterate that falsehood in order to place ourselves right before our own people or the world. I want this country to be in a position where she can assert without any equivocation, "This is our mutual agreement, signed by all of us, that no one of us will wage a war of conquest, and that we will act together to prevent the murder of millions of innocent human beings for the selfish ends of any one nation." I want this country to be in a position that it can say "Under the letter of this bond and for the defense of this principle we command you to halt your armies, and to maintain that principle we will consecrate the blood of our men, the tears of our women, and every resource of our Nation."

We knew all along just what Germany had in mind; we knew the course of instruction which had been given to her people from every possible source, that her destiny lay in the conquest and destruction of her neighbors. We knew her scheme of Mitteleuropa. We knew her purpose of world domination. We knew that she intended to destroy Belgium and annex the most valuable portions of France as the first step toward the accomplishment of her world-domination idea, and that was the time that we should have called the halt. But we did not have the right under international law or under any agreement to demand that she refrain from that hellish purpose. Had we had the agreement proposed in this league of nations, then, standing upon our contractual rights, we would have called her to account, and Germany would have desisted and the world would have been saved from these awful wrongs and sufferings. We do not want this country or any other country or the world to again be placed in such a position of shameful impotency.

And why, I ask you, do you boast of our fighting this war for the sake of humanity and for the higher principles of international justice, while in the same breath you declare against any obligation that shall bind us, in connection with other great nations of the world, to prevent such war of injustice and wrong? Is a war to prevent the accomplishment of an international felony right, but an agreement to prevent the initiation of the felonious purpose wrong? Let us at least attempt consistency.

Mr. President, the one regrettable thing to-day is that this war was carried on so far from us that we saw but little of its horrors, that we got into it so late that we suffered but little, comparatively, of its sacrifices, and that our people knew so little of the destitution in its wake. The closest estimate

places the number of soldiers who were killed or died of wounds from the beginning of the war to November 11, 1918, at nearly 8,000,000, and there have been more people killed in Russia since Russia's surrender to Bolshevism and German machinations than there were of Russian troops killed in the war. I think it safe to say as a fair estimate, if we include with the soldiers the civilian populations that were killed or starved to death or whose death was directly attributable to this war, that up to the present time the war has caused the death of more than 20,000,000 persons.

I wish it were possible for each of us to realize the sufferings of one dying soldier, to see the stroke and hear the thud as a rifle butt beats to a mass the head of a poor wounded boy, to view the agonizing gasps of a drowning man, to watch as the last breath passes the tender lips of a famished child. Then I wish it were possible to comprehend the multiplication of those things twenty million times over. We would then realize this war. It is well that there is a limit to our power to realize horrors, else the whole world would die of anguish. I wish we could look upon the army of millions upon millions of armless, legless, eyeless men who will suffer the agony of wounds all the balance of their lives. I wish we could fully realize for one moment the awful grief of a mother whose brave boy went down to a watery grave in defense of his country. He suffered but once, but his death agony is repeated again and again every day of the life of this devoted mother. Multiply that by the number of all the mothers whose sons died in this conflict and we get even then only a slight conception of all the suffering this war has caused.

Mr. President, if we could do this, nothing on earth would prevent us from demanding immediately a combination of all the peoples of the world to prevent a repetition of this war.

I can not understand how any man whose heart throbs for the woes and cares of humanity, whose mind is capable of grasping the awful misery inflicted by this most ungodly conflict, can fail to labor with all his power, with all his heart and influence, to shield poor humanity from another such awful crime.

And again when I come to the present cost of this war to the principal nations engaged in it, I find that it aggregates little less than $200,000,000,000. It is an awful debt to load upon these impoverished countries. And yet with interest and pensions and other obligations, that two hundred billions will probably be increased to two thousand billions before the debt is wiped out and the last pension paid.

Senators, is such an impoverishment of the world as that no concern of ours?

In making this estimate of the cost of the war, we might yet add at least twenty-five billions for property destroyed. The British Empire lost in value of ships and shipping alone more than $4,500,000,000. The Allies alone lost 404 warships with a displacement of 1,364,000 tons. The enemy lost 216 warships with a displacement of 518,000 tons.

The Allies and neutrals lost in merchant tonnage 15,027,718 gross tons, of which Great Britain alone lost 8,889,659 tons. The tonnage lost to the world was 15,336,922 gross tons. Norway, a neutral country, a seafaring nation, the livelihood of whose people is gained in great part by braving the waves of the ocean, lost of her merchant marine 1,177,000 gross tons. She lost more tonnage than any country engaged in the war except Great Britain. Norway had committed no offense against Germany, and yet she was made to suffer in this war a greater loss in merchant marine than any belligerent except Great Britain. Is a war which results in such loss to a neutral friendly nation of no concern to us?

But you say we can continue a peaceful policy with the world, without binding ourselves to act in any particular way. Yes; that is exactly what we were saying for years prior to 1914, and especially prior to 1917. But we found that the world was not so large that we could escape being drawn into the vortex of a European conflagration. And while we scarcely got into the real conflict before its close, while not more than a quarter of a million American soldiers were on the actual battle line at any one time, it is safe to say that this war has cost the United States not less than $40,000,000,000. And before the principal and interest and pensions have been fully met, it is a conservative estimate that we shall have expended not less than $100,000,000,000. Have you contemplated what that means to us?

Mr. President, one of the most beautiful structures in the United States is our Public Library Building, facing Capitol Square. That building cost about $6,000,000, less than one-third the cost of a modern battleship. That beautiful structure, gladdening the hearts of millions of people, may last as long as the earth lasts. The battleship will become obsolete in 10 years. With just what money this single year of war will have cost us we could build in the United States 17,000 of these buildings, 350 of them in each State in the Union, one in each city, town, and village. With this sum we could purchase all the flour at prewar prices and population, the American people, would consume in 154 years. The cost of one year of this war would pay all the expenses necessary to relieve all the distress, hunger, or sickness of all the people for a hundred years. It would save the lives annually of more than 100,000 invalids afflicted with the great white plague who are too poor to change their location or secure the rest necessary for their convalescence. The expenses of the four years of this great war could change this old world from a dingy workshop into a paradise for a whole century. Are European wars of no concern to us?

No, Mr. President, these premises are wrong. They are our concern; and if there is any one great duty resting upon this country at the close of this sanguinary struggle, if that struggle has made one thing in the world clear and definite, it is the commanding duty of this country, the country most able to prevent war and without whose assistance such prevention is impossible, to take the lead in this great world movement for the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means.

Mr. President, there was speaking in this country some little time ago a gentleman by the name of Philip Gibbs, who had spent four years at the front. On the 7th of March, 1919, he published in the New York Times an article which ought to be read by every American statesman. He admits in that article that the United States could get along without calling upon Europe for assistance. But Europe—the innocent people of Europe, the peaceful people of Europe, the people who do not wish to injure their fellow men, and whose aims are noble and ideal—need the United States to protect them against a repetition of this awful tragedy. I want to read a few excerpts from that article. He says:

> But what the American people I have met do not understand, what it is difficult for them to understand, is the patient yearning of great masses of people for American aid in liberating them from the repetition of horrors through which they have passed in agony.

That, Mr. President, is Europe's call to America. Shall the call go unanswered? Are we to reply that this is no concern of ours? Are we to ask, as have some Senators asked, what are we to get out of this?

Again, he says:

> Among the soldiers of the French Army, as well as among those of the British Army, there was from the beginning a sense of despair that civilization itself should have been dragged down to such depths of degradation in the filth of the battle fields, with their wholesale slaughter of youth and of life's beauty and decency. Their hatred of the Germans, who were the direct cause of this, did not blind them to the large truth that the whole structure and philosophy of Europe had been damnably guilty, and that if it had been different, not even the Germans would or could have let those devils loose upon the boyhood of the nations and upon women and children.

Mr. President, do we join them in this indictment? No man dare question the truth of the statement. Are we willing, then, to remedy the wrong by shouldering the responsibility, not necessarily for our preservation, but in the name of God and humanity; shoulder it for the preservation of the innocent, suffering peoples of Europe? I say the true American heart, uninfluenced by false or misleading criticisms, will ever answer, "Yes."

Again, he says:

> Over and over again in the early days, French officers and men said to me with a thrill of passion in their voices, "If I thought this thing would ever happen again I would strangle my child in its cradle to save it from such tortures." This was said to me not once nor dozens of times nor scores of times, by bloody and bandaged men, but hundreds of times. It was the common, general, passionate thought. And hundreds of times on the British front, in trenches and in dugouts, and in officers' messes our own men spoke to me in a similar line of thought. Deeper than their hatred of the enemy who had brought this thing upon them was their hatred of statesmen and politicians and men of wealth and learning who had failed to foresee the horrors ahead and who had gone on in the foolish old way supporting balances of power, framing secret alliances, influencing national hatreds and rivalries, and maintaining the old philosophy of material force to hold and to grab. Young English officers of good family argued passionately in the face of death that all our social structure was wrong, and that there was no hope for humanity for which they were going to die—they knew that—unless some new relationship between nations could be established giving at least some postponement and respite to the spasms of slaughter between periods of so-called peace, which were but a preparation for a new massacre of youth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that connection, merely to reinforce what the Senator says, does the Senator not recall the time when a British battalion went into the Battle of Ypres with the cry, "Never again!" taken up by the entire battalion, all of them crying, "Never again! never again!"?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and all going down to death.

And I say candidly, Senators, that you may defeat this treaty, this league of nations; you may scatter abroad criticisms that are unjust or baseless; you may appeal to a national pride and

to the selfish side of our natures and thereby destroy at this time the hope that has been in the heart of every thinking, feeling, loving human being for centuries that the time would come when the same law which governs the rights of individuals would be applied to shield the lives of nations. But as surely as this is defeated and the world suffers another such calamity, deeper than the hatred of the enemy will be the hatred toward the statesmen of the world who have failed in this great opportunty to league together to shield poor, innocent human beings from such sufferings and calamities as have been visited upon them because there was no law to check a great, powerful nation from criminal aggression.

Again, Mr. Gibbs says:

That conviction has not been killed by victory. It is in the hearts of the living as it was in the souls of the dead, and I write of what I know. It is in the hearts of the multitudes of women who gave their first born—sometimes their second and third and fourth—to the devouring monster of war. It is hot in the brains of millions of workers who watch the politicians of the world with increasing hatred and distrust because of their failure to avert the frightful catastrophe, and they are tinkering now with problems which must be handled largely with an unshrinking courage in order to make the world clean of the foul outrage against civilized ideals on these corpse-strewn fields in France.

You may eliminate it from the hearts of these people by unjust and false interpretation, but if you do so, in my candid judgment, you are committing a grievous wrong against the best impulses of the best people in the world, including our own:

Again, he speaks in prophetic words when he says:

America has the supreme chance of any power in the world to-day, because she is looked upon by the peoples of Europe as a fair, unselfish, and democratic arbitrator, aloof from their rivalries and untainted by the disease which infected their civilization.

Quoting again:

It was the thoughts of men who fought and suffered that which will form the motive power behind the league of nations. There were certain elementary thoughts in the minds of those men. They saw before them the long stretches of chalked German trenches and behind those trenches was the enemy. They knew it was that enemy that had brought this thing to pass and that unless they killed the Germans the Germans would kill them. These men knew that unless they smashed the German front Germany would smash England and France. These men asked why had this thing come to pass. They wanted to know the meaning of it all. Why, they asked, are men with centuries of civilization behind them thrown into these filthy, vermin-infested holes? Why is everything that life holds most sacred destroyed? Why did this thing happen in the twentieth century, so long after Christ?

It happened, Mr. President, because the great nations of the world had never adopted as a code of international law that no nation had a right to destroy another nation, to seize its domains or murder its people. Infinitely worse than that, the right to commit such crimes has been recognized from time immemorial as a right incident to sovereignty which no other country could dispute, so long as its interest was not directly jeopardized. That is why every nation for a hundred years has stood idly by while Turkish soldiers have massacred hundreds of thousands of defenseless Armenians. The nations have simply followed the policy so ardently proclaimed by Senators, that while they regret such atrocities, really it is not their national concern. That is why, Mr. President, with full cognizance of Germany's purpose, with full knowledge of the atrocities committed by command of her officers, we never raised a hand to stay her until she had murdered our own people. Nay, further, not until she had shaken the mailed fist in our face and sworn that she would continue to kill our people wherever found upon the high seas.

And it may be further answered that this thing will continue to happen until this principle is written into international law by all the nations and the honor of each and all pledged to uphold it with whatever force may be necessary.

Again says this writer:

Now, these men, those who survive, are going back to England and to Canada. And they are thinking more positively and more silently than they did on the battle field. I know that in England and in France these thoughts are setting among the people of these nations and these thoughts are being talked from man to man, and what I say applies not only to our side but it is also what is happening on the German side.

I admit that the sentiment for a world league is not as strong in this country, because few, comparatively, of our vast population ever saw even one battle field. Slight, in comparison with our population, were our losses. Other countries bathed in blood, starved and emaciated, their cities full of cripples—armless, legless, sightless men—are calling to us whose wounds were slight to help them to rescue themselves from national hatreds and jealousies which too many regard as elements of patriotism. Shall we in the arrogance of our power and self-sufficiency turn a deaf ear to their entreaties?

HOW PURPOSES OF LEAGUE EFFECTUATED.

Mr. President, after contemplating these horrors of war, after placing in the balance on the one side whatever of cupidity and purely selfish considerations we may be possessed of, and on the other side our humanitarian impulses; after eliminating the hatreds we may have against one foreign nation and partiality for some other foreign nation; after eliminating all political advantages to be gained by playing upon race or hyphenated American prejudices; after concluding to forego tail twisting either for our own edification or the edification of others, after concluding that this country has a higher and nobler destiny than mere material gains, higher and nobler aspirations than mere national prowess, and having finally concluded that this, the greatest Nation of the earth in population, wealth, and resources, has by virtue of her transcendent position incurred a moral responsibility toward the weaker and less favorably situated countries of the world and ought, therefore, to exercise her mighty influence and power for the preservation of peace, the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, guided by right and justice—ought to help save the people of the world from another such awful calamity as they have just passed through—we are brought face to face with this question: By what character of agreement between nations can we best secure this result? Of course, not one of us would have written this covenant just as it has come to us, either in its original or revised form. Some of us would have inserted additional and explanatory clauses and definitions and some of us would have opposed any kind of agreement whatsoever for the preservation of peace. And, I might add, another class would not have accepted any agreement unless it gave to this country special advantages over every other nation of the world.

But, Mr. President, this covenant represents the deliberations of nations, some very important, some very small and weak. It deals with complex situations in Europe, both as to races and boundaries. It comes to us as a compromise compact, which all of these great nations believe will accomplish the purpose of preventing any stupendous world war in the future. To secure the support of this country special concessions have been given to us. Our Monroe doctrine, which has never been acquiesced in by any European power except Great Britain, is by this instrument given a world sanction.

It seems to me that we are now put to the test as to whether our boast of special humanitarian impulses is but the braggadocio mouthings of an insincere people or the deep heart conviction of a Christian nation.

I think none of us will claim that the instrument clearly and definitely conveys its purposes. But that it is susceptible of the construction many opponents have given it, and to the criticism based upon such construction, I most emphatically deny. During my 20 years as a Member of this body I recall but one or two instances in which an instrument has been so viciously and unjustifiably assailed.

Allegations have been made and published to the people of this country concerning the powers granted to the council or assembly provided for in this instrument and the dangers to this country that are as false to the context and the true meaning of the instrument as could possibly be imagined. It is my purpose to analyze several sections of this compact, so far as it relates to the league for permanent peace, and to present its meaning in a spirit of absolute fairness, and with the hope that I may be able to both simplify and clarify its meaning.

In the condemnatory discussions certain terms in the instrument have been so employed by speakers as to confuse and mislead. The term "league of nations" is frequently used synonymously with "council" or with "assembly," or with both. The words "league of nations" are but descriptive of the organization. It is the mere name. The powers and duties of the organization are exercised by and through two separate bodies, composed in the council of the representatives of nine leading nations and in the assembly of representatives of all nations entering into the compact.

The members of the league are the several nations of the world who join in its organization and such others as may thereafter be admitted to it. The following nations are included in the present league: United States of America, British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Greece, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India, Roumania, Serbia—all of said nations being directly involved in the war on the part of the Allies; also Czechoslovakia and Poland, newly created countries, and Siam, China, Cuba, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Uruguay, Bolivia, and Brazil, all of which, as I remember, declared war against the Central Powers, but took no further action. This inclusion seemed necessary, because, foregoing special advantages they might have reaped as neutrals, these countries chose to declare themselves in a state of war against our enemies as evidence of their belief in the justice of our cause; and all would, therefore, necessarily join in the treaty of peace.

In addition to these several States, the following neutrals have by the instrument itself been invited to become members of the league, namely: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. These constitute all the important States of the world, except the enemy States and Russia. As soon as stable governments are established in Germany, Austria, and other enemy countries, as well as in Russia, and whenever any of these countries shall give effective guaranties of their intention to observe their international obligations, they will be admitted to full fellowship under the provisions of article 1.

I am free to say that I would hesitate a long time before voting for any league of nations which should leave Germany outside its domains. If Germany shall sincerely relinquish her doctrine of world conquest and her pretended right to rob or destroy her neighbor, she should be made a party to this world compact. This covenant should not be so drawn or arranged as to compel other nations to unite and thus divide the world into hostile camps. So if Russia shall have the ability to emerge from her present chaos and take on the responsibilities of government, she, too, should be invited into this bond of national fellowship.

Proceeding on the assumption that we really and sincerely wish to avoid any great war in the future, and that we really believe what we say, assuming that we are willing to do our part to accomplish such an understanding—and in my opinion the mere pledge of this Government in conjunction with the other European States would produce this result, and we should never be required to enlist a single soldier or fire a single gun to assure such peaceful settlement—let us proceed to analyze the instrument for the purpose of determining, first, whether the adoption of its provisions would accomplish the purposes sought; second, whether any of its provisions would operate to the injury of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION OF PROVISIONS.

Mr. President, the spirit of sympathy or hostility, which more or less influences every mind, very often leads us into strained constructions to meet such sentiments. If we set out to search for faults, we are apt to look only for words or sentences or assumptions to support our purposes.

Admitting, as I do, that I sincerely wish for the adoption of such a covenant, I shall nevertheless try to give to the proposed instrument its true and natural construction.

The first and most important rule in the construction of any law, contract, or document is that it shall be so construed as to effectuate its purposes; and when those purposes are declared in the instrument itself, we must accept the declaration made in the instrument and not substitute our own views as to what might have been the purpose of the makers of the instruments.

While to my mind the preamble is somewhat vague and clumsy, I do not think anyone will question that the following are the purposes which it intends to convey:

1. International cooperation to achieve international peace and security.

2. The acceptance of obligations not to resort to war to settle international disputes.

3. To prescribe what are just and honorable relations between nations. We have not done so heretofore.

4. To establish the understanding of international law as a rule of conduct among governments. We have never had such an understanding heretofore.

5. To maintain a just and scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations.

The second, third, fourth, and fifth declared purposes are all to subserve the first great purpose—the achievement and maintenance of international peace and security.

Is not every one of these purposes most laudable, most honorable, most devoutly to be prayed for?

One of the necessary things to be agreed upon is to establish the understanding of international laws as a rule of conduct among governments. About the only international law we now have is a set of rules generally acquiesced in by warring nations, governing the action of belligerents and neutrals when war is on. What the world has been needing for thousands of years has been not a code governing war but an international code which should define the duties and relations of nations in their intercourse with and relations to each other in times of peace, and thereby make war practically impossible. There is an international understanding or law which recognizes and limits the right of blockade, the seizure of ships and cargoes of neutral vessels when war is on, a rule that no belligerent shall sink the merchant ship of a neutral without warning, and that the question of whether the ship or cargo is subject to confiscation shall be determined by a prize court. But there is not now, and there never has been, a rule of international law that prohibits any nation from making a war of conquest against a weaker nation or committing any character of atrocity or brutality against such weaker nation. When Germany declared war against France and Belgium, when she initiated this war for the purpose of robbing her weaker neighbors she was guilty of no breach of international law. To-day, so far as international law is concerned, any nation can commit any act of atrocity or brutality against any other nation without laying itself open to the charge of general international misconduct. There is nothing to-day in any international law which makes it the duty of the honorable nations of the world to prevent the most heinous offenses committed by any dishonorable nation. The time has now arrived for the world to declare that a war by one or more nations for conquest and plunder and wrong of any kind is a breach of international law against every other nation of the world and a cause for war against the offending nation, and the only way to make that an international law is for the nations to agree that it is a world concern, and the only way to make it a living precept is for the nations of the world to agree that they will enforce it. That is just what this league agreement does. It is a simple proposition. Those who wish war, those who are less concerned about international right and justice than they are about personal interest or political advantage would naturally be against a proposition of this kind. Those who have the capacity to realize the horrors of this war and the conscience to wish to defend the world from another ought to be earnest advocates of some constructive plan to bring about the result. If this is not the best plan, formulate and present a better one, which will stand a chance of adoption by all the leading nations of the world.

Had the world powers had such an agreement in July, 1914, with this Nation as a signatory power, does anyone for an instant believe that Germany would have made this war? Mr. President, the haughty sword of Wilhelm would never have been drawn, not a soldier would have had to be raised for world defense, not a life would have been sacrificed, and not a dollar of debt piled up for future generations to pay. The fact that we had no such world agreement made this damnable war possible. If we now refuse to join other nations in such a compact, the responsibility for another such damnable war will rest upon us.

UNFAIR CRITICISM (ART. 10).

Mr. President, in connection with the processes by which these purposes are to be accomplished, let us examine into the code of international ethics on which these nations agree in their relations with each other. Considering them in relative importance rather than in the order in which they may appear in the text, they are:

1. The members of the league agree to respect * * * the territorial integrity of every other member of the league. (Art. 10.)

We hear talk of eliminating this provision. Mr. President, the right to live as a nation is inseparable from the right to occupy exclusively a definite area of God's green earth. Agreement to respect this right is the very foundation of any agreement to maintain international peace. The structure of international peace must necessarily be bottomed on the maintenance of this inviolable right of territory.

2. The members of the league undertake to preserve the territorial integrity only against external aggression.

This, again, is as it should be. A community of landowners, where there is no other law to appeal to for the protection of individual right, may most properly unite to protect the land of each and every one against the avariciously inclined of any one or more of them. As to what the owner of any tract of land may do concerning his own, how he may divide his acreage among his children, the community has nothing to do. But it has the right to say that no one shall take the land of his neighbor by force. So, if the people of Russia wish to divide their territory into three or more separate countries, that is their concern. The league has nothing to do with her internal broils or divisions. All the league can do and all it ought to do is to say to every other country, "Hands off."

I can understand, and do understand, how the Pan-Germanists, having sought to despoil France of her territory and having failed, are now looking forward to the conquest of Poland and Russia, and how such Pan-Germanists view with earnest disapproval this world doctrine of "hands off"; but I can not see how any intelligent man, capable of realizing what Pan-Germanism has inflicted upon the innocent people of the world, can oppose this doctrine of territorial sanctity.

It has been asserted and reasserted in all the false attacks on this instrument that the United States would be compelled to help Great Britain preserve her domains against her own internal revolutions or rebellions. Oh, Mr. President, nothing could

be more false. India, Canada, Australia, Ireland, and Scotland, or any other British possession or integral part of the Empire, may assert and maintain its independence, and we are in no way, under this instrument, compelled to come to the assistance of the mother country. It is only against "external aggression" that the league assures its protection. If the league were once to admit that an outside country might interfere to assist any integral part of the Government to secure its independence, the league would be absolutely helpless, because, admitting such a right, any propaganda could stir up an insurrection, and, on the theory of assistance, inaugurate a war of aggression. German propaganda would find ample opportunity to stir up insurrection on her own eastern border, or even in Alsace and Lorraine, and begin again the struggle for world dominion.

The claim reiterated again and again by those who oppose a league of nations that this country could be called upon to bolster up distintegrating countries is so clearly false that I can scarcely understand how anyone having any regard for fairness could possibly make it. That there might be no possible misunderstanding as to the scope of the obligation imposed; that there might be no possible claim that the league must guarantee the boundaries of a nation changed by revolution or secession or internal dissension, the conferees carefully limited the protection which should be accorded each State to a defense against external aggression, thereby clearly negativing any claim that any country could be called upon to defend another if it failed to so conduct itself toward every other section of its domain as to retain the loyalty of the people of such section. Such a claim is an appeal to national animosities and not an appeal to either reason or right.

"But," say our antagonists, "you purpose to maintain the life of decaying nations, and thereby stay all progress in the world." I deny it. We recognize that the immutable law of disintegration, which brings the feebleness of age and final dissolution of the body, must operate upon nations as upon individuals. We permit men to die of old age in this country, but we make a law against murdering them. Section 10 permits any country to disintegrate from any internal cause; it simply makes international murder an international crime. There is, and can be, no argument either against the righteousness of this principle or the duty of right-minded nations to maintain it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the Senator passes from article 10, I wish to inquire of him what obstacle it would have interposed to the separation of all South and Central America from Spain if it had been in existence 100 years ago?

Mr. McCUMBER. They could have separated from one another, just as they have done. Each one of those nations maintained its independence without our assistance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will allow me, under the proposed league a nation's political independence is to be maintained only against external aggression.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Would the great domain of Spain have remained as it was in the beginning of the last century?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator must remember, as suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, that a nation's political independence is to be maintained only against external aggression.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So that these new countries would have been able to establish themselves and their independence just the same if the league had been in existence?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and that will be possible in the future just as it has been in the past.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me ask the Senator also if article 10 would have presented any obstacle to the acquisition by this country of Louisiana from France?

Mr. McCUMBER. No obstacle in the world, that I can see.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Or of Alaska from Russia?

Mr. McCUMBER. That would not afford an example of external aggression.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So that the world would not be in a strait-jacket, by any means?

Mr. McCUMBER. There would be no external aggression if some sections should unite with other sections any more than there would be if two or three of the little countries created by the compact should unite together by agreement. They would have a right to do that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me ask the Senator if it is conceivable that all the Balkan States might confederate into a larger republic?

Mr. McCUMBER. As I have said, any State now in existence or created by the peace treaty may divide itself into as many independent States as it sees fit, provided that it is not done by a war of aggression by another great power, and there is nothing in the league provision which prohibits small States from uniting into a large State. The peace treaty proper, I think, does contain provisions which would make certain for some definite period the boundaries of the newly created countries on the German border, but the league of nations provision goes no further than I have suggested.

3. The members of the league undertake to preserve the political independence of all members of the league.

Of course, Mr. President, the protection of the territorial integrity would be of no avail to a nation if its political independence were destroyed. Its people could be exploited and enslaved and the incitement to so exploit and enslave would be all the greater if the State should be vassal while the territory remained foreign to the superior power.

4. The members of the league agree to the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

Mr. President, one of the greatest burdens imposed upon the peoples of the world has been that of maintaining means of defense against each other. Prior to this war three-fourths of all the revenues of the great nations were raised for the purpose of war or defense against war. After the close of this war nine-tenths of all the taxes and immensely increased taxes will be required for the payment of interest on war debts, a sinking fund to take care of the principal, and to maintain armies and navies to watch each other.

If we would only stop to contemplate how everlastingly ridiculous would be the position of each citizen if to-day one-half of all his work and energy were required in the manufacture of implements and weapons, in building barriers to defend himself against his neighbor—how ridiculous would be our condition if every man were filled with apprehension and with certain knowledge that every other person was more or less jealous of him and was at perfect liberty to take his life and property, we should then better realize the like ridiculous position of continuing these same relations among nations.

Mr. President, thousands of years ago, in the gradual, progressive enlightenment of humanity, there came a day when the right, theretofore conceded to the strong, to murder his fellow being, to seize his property, to enslave his children, began to be questioned by the little communities, began to be considered a matter of concern to all of them, and so the people got together and said to the stronger man, the man who could swing the bigger club: "While you may be more powerful than any one of us, you are not more powerful than all of us, and we have concluded to inaugurate a new community code which shall protect the weak from the strong. We therefore command you to lay down that club and submit your difference with your neighbors to the judgment of good men who shall be selected by the community, and if you refuse to do so we will compel you to do so." Naturally this stronger man said: "That is an interference with my sovereign rights. If I agree to do that, I shall be surrendering my sovereignty and shall lose my independence. While I may desist from doing those things which you consider unjust, I could not bind myself by an agreement not to do them, because I would thereby allow my neighbors to pass judgment on what I ought to do, and that would be a clear violation of my constitutional prerogatives." But he did consent and agree, just as you and I have consented and agreed to substitute a government of law for a government of brute force.

And, Mr. President, from that final decision forced upon communities by the atrocities committed by the stronger man, from that period began a system which developed into the courts of to-day, with their well-defined powers and jurisdiction, governing every individual right. All that the world has since accomplished in progress, in enlightenment, and human happiness has followed in consequence of that decision arrived at in that far-off age, that the community would henceforth protect the life and property of the weak against the strong. All that we now know of the beauty and grandeur of life on this earth has resulted from that decision which freed each individual from the necessity of expending the greater part of his life's energy in devising means to protect himself from his neighbor, when the community, acting together, responded to the slogan, "Down with the club, and long live law." Except for the establishment of that doctrine men would still be living in caves, gnawing bones, and expending the greater part of their time in making flint spears.

And by the same rule, Mr. President, and for the same reason, this old world of ours will progress in grandeur and in enlightenment and consequent happiness when the nations of the world shall adopt the slogan, "Down with might and long live right."

And yet to-day, Mr. President, the human family has been only partially emancipated from this thralldom of personal violence and crime. While the individual, with a sense of absolute immunity from personal danger, may walk among his fellowmen with all his undivided and unimpeded thought directed toward

the betterment of his condition and the happiness of those dependent upon him, this is not true in any sense of people in their collective capacity. Individual murder, theft, and robbery have been abolished, but collective murder, theft, and robbery are still sanctioned by international law. You can and do punish with death the man who willfully causes the death of another, but you not only condone the crime but you even refuse to enjoin the nation which would be guilty of the willful murder of twenty millions of people and which would render defenseless and helpless another twenty-five or thirty million men, women, and children.

What a travesty on human intelligence! What a condemnation of international impotency!

And why has such a strange inconsistency between the ideals of individual justice and right and international justice and right so long existed? It is because our national selfishness so greatly exceeds our individual selfishness; because in every country there is such a fervent ambition that that country shall be able to overawe all others. We curse that propensity which in late years has been driven by systematic national education into the German mind, while we regard it as an element of patriotism in our own national character.

And so we wave aloft the banners of sovereignty and independence as a scarecrow to frighten those who do not stop to consider that every compact or treaty between nations that has ever been adopted or ever will be adopted is just as much a surrender of our sovereignty or national independence as though the same treaty was made en bloc with all the nations in a single instrument. Whenever one nation agrees with another to do or not to do a thing which it has the right to decline to do or not to do, it does not thereby surrender its sovereignty or its independence, but it agrees in honor that it will not exercise its sovereign authority on the subject covered by the agreement during the life of the compact without the consent of the other party to that compact; and, Mr. President, the other party to the contract withholds the exercise of its sovereign power exactly in the same manner.

If a nation stood upon its dignity and its right to exercise its judgment whenever it saw fit, it not only would never enter into any treaty agreement but at all times would, if a powerful country, be a menace to the peace of the world. In all the arguments against a league of nations we hear of the powers which we surrender but not a word of the powers surrendered by every other nation of the world—and all surrendered or held in abeyance for the grandest purpose that ever challenged the attention of nations.

Mr. President, why do we spend many hundreds of millions yearly for our Army and Navy? We do so because other nations do the same thing. And they do so because of their fear of us and of each other. And so, prior to this war, nations were following a policy of outdoing each other in armaments that meant ultimate bankruptcy for the weaker; and the statesmen of each nation were proclaiming the doctrine that being prepared for war was an assurance of peace. And so we were all preparing for war, and we have had this awful illustration of the fallacy of such a doctrine. There were many of us who were not statesmen, of course, who insisted that a general preparation for war by all the great nations was an assurance that war would result sooner or later. Naturally, we all know that if one nation is prepared and the other great nation is not prepared, the weaker is always in danger of a threatened attack by the stronger. But it is far more certain that if no nation were prepared for an extensive aggressive war there would be universal peace. Long before the time any nation could prepare for hostility against another the world would learn which was right and which was wrong, the sense of justice would prevail, and war would be avoided.

So, Mr. President, the conference was unquestionably right when it declared in article 8:

> The members of the league recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

Mr. President, when this matter was before us at the last session this provision was viciously attacked by those who oppose a league of nations on the ground that it allows Europe, whose interests might be antagonistic to our own, to determine the size of our Army and Navy, and weaken us in our ability to maintain our national policies, and especially our Monroe doctrine. As a matter of fact, in that instrument each nation must agree to the limitation, and therefore we could not be bound unless we should agree that the comparative reduction was just, and every other nation would have to agree to the same thing.

And, again, instead of this danger of a combination against us, he would be a very poor reader of European rivalries who would not understand that these nations of Europe are far more fearful and far more jealous of each other than any one of them is or ever will be of the United States. It is the near danger and not the remote danger that always awakens rivalry and enmity. Therefore, if there were any danger of national jealousies or antipathies playing any part in the scheme of disarmament, the United States would in all probability have the best of it. And in any event the United States is not deprived of the power to say that in the proposed reduction of arms the relative diminution is not just to us and refuse to accept it until it is made to conform to our idea of reductions.

It is most vital to the cause of peace that the loaded guns pointing across national boundary lines, speaking only the language of destruction and hate, should be lowered. Along the more than 3,000 miles of boundary between the United States and Canada not a fort is erected, a cannon mounted, or a warship afloat. Does anyone of sane mind contend that the same sentiment of trust and friendliness between these two nations would exist if bristling bayonets, glistening like the white teeth of a snarling dog, fenced that entire way? Grim cannon are not the vehicles of international fraternity.

In view of the almost hysterical attitude of the opponents of disarmament, is it not strange that no one in all our history has ever complained that when we entered into the agreement with Canada, through Great Britain, exactly the kind of agreement we now purpose to enter into with other nations, that we were giving Canada a voice in determining the size and character of our Navy or Army, that we were surrendering our sovereignty? Who to-day would reverse that policy? Who would erect along that boundary line the engines of national hate? No one but him who hates international amity and glories in international enmity.

But stress is laid upon the proposition that the constitutional right of Congress to raise and support armies and navies is limited and controlled by this partially foreign body. I have shown that Congress must adopt this plan before we become even morally bound. Every other country must do the same. It is no more binding upon us than upon every other party to this compact. But, Mr. President, it is exactly the same from every standpoint of constitutional legality and authority as any other treaty. When we entered into an agreement with Great Britain and Canada that neither would maintain war vessels on the Great Lakes or forts along the boundary we, of course, agreed to hold in abeyance during the life of that agreement a limited portion of our constitutional right to maintain armies and navies. We did not surrender the constitutional right to do so. And that is exactly true of every other treaty made. Whenever we have submitted any matter to arbitration we have authorized some foreign citizen or ruler to say what we should do or refrain from doing; and not only that, we have agreed in advance, so far as we could bind a future Congress, which, of course, is morally only, that we would abide by his decision. We have done this from the very beginning of our national life, and it has never occurred to anyone to declare that we were thereby surrendering our independence or our sovereignty or delegating our constitutional authority. But a few years ago we submitted a controversy to a sole arbitrator, the King of Sweden and Norway. In that instance the decision of a foreign autocrat was to bind our national honor. Did that mean that our Constitution was shattered? That we had delegated the authority of Congress to the King of Sweden? No, Mr. President, it meant simply that as Congress had the sole right to say whether we would pay a claim urged against us, or would not pay it, so it had the equal right to say that we would pay the claim if, after an investigation, a chosen arbitrator should say that we should pay it, or any part of it.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, in his resolution for the separation of the league of nations provision from the peace provisions of the treaty, asserts in the preamble that some provisions of this league in effect violate the Constitution, from which I infer he means that such provision was never contemplated in the Constitution or that it is contrary to the spirit and purpose of that instrument. I feel quite certain that the Senator will never go on record as declaring that an agreement made by this country with another country, or with other countries, whereby upon the happening of a contingency agreed upon by all, the nations shall act together to effectuate the purposes of the agreement, would be violative of any provision of the Constitution.

When we entered into a treaty with Great Britain and Japan and Russia to protect the seals in the Bering Sea and off the Pribilof Islands that treaty meant to all intent and purposes that our warships would act jointly with theirs against any people or any nation that would attempt to destroy those seals. Did we thereby surrender our power to declare war or to main-

tain an Army and Navy? And is it possible that we can enter into such an alliance to protect the lives of a few thousand seals without violating our Constitution, but that if we make a like agreement with the nations of the world to prevent the wholesale slaughter and starvation of millions of human beings we are violating the fundamental law of the land and surrendering the independence of the country?

But, Mr. President, this provision for disarmament is far more carefully guarded than an ordinary agreement for either arbitration or for unity of action. The fourth paragraph of article 8 declares:

> The council, taking account of the geographical situation of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several governments.

Under this provision the council does not make or order the reduction. It simply formulates a plan for reduction. This plan is then to be submitted "for the consideration and action of the several governments." That means in this country that Congress must act before the plan becomes binding even in honor upon us. Of course, after it is adopted by one Congress the next Congress is in honor bound to comply with it.

If it is necessary or proper to reduce armaments somebody or some commission must be selected to study the situation of the several countries and to ascertain and present what would be an equitable and proportionate reduction. The situation of each of the nations of the world differs widely from that of others. Some are great in territorial extent and small in population; some great in population and small in area; some blessed with every natural resource necessary to sustain their populations; some dependent almost wholly on imports from every other corner of the earth; some almost immune from threatened attack by reason of their isolation or geographical situation; some so vulnerable that the very lives of their people depend upon their ability to meet immediately any threatened invasion; some contiguous to hostile and greedy nations ever ready to devour them; some within zones of peace and tranquillity, and some adjacent to restless and discordant peoples whose turmoils are as threatening as an active volcano. Unwise and unjust would be any international agreement which should not take into consideration the peculiar necessities of these several nations in determining what should be a just and fair military or naval strength. And so provision is made that the council shall formulate a general plan which can only become binding when each and every nation has agreed thereto.

To-day, after one of the most sanguinary and far-reaching wars, where national life has been saved only through past preparation and the Herculean efforts of present preparation, it is most natural that no nation would dare render itself totally helpless as against even a possible failure of a peace agreement. National life is too precious to be allowed to hang by that thread alone. Time and the beneficial results of such a compact can alone banish the spirit of fear and install the spirit of trust. But each nation can and should now reduce its armament, can and should lower its threatening arm.

Mr. President, we have preached the reduction of armaments for years. Now, present to me, if you can, a better or a safer plan than that provided in this treaty, or else acknowledge frankly that we never intended to conform our acts to our declarations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In addition to protecting our interests in this respect by requiring the plan as formulated by the council to be submitted to us and to be approved by us, is it not also true that no plan can ever be formulated or agreed upon without our consent?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly. That is one of the things that must be agreed upon by unanimous consent. It is not one of those questions like a dispute between nations where the two disputants are eliminated. It must have the unanimous consent of each and every nation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask the Senator from North Dakota on that very point a question, and I would like to preface it by just a single remark.

It has seemed to me that this particular provision of the league is subject to criticism because it is doubtful whether it would bring about a reduction of armament. At least that is the way I look at it. I would like it much better if it definitely agreed upon a plan that would be carried out without any further action than the signing of the treaty.

The question I want to ask is, Does not the Senator think, assuming that this is agreed to, there is great danger that there never will be any reduction of armament because of the fact that, in the first place, it requires a unanimous agreement of the council to the plan, and then it must be approved by every nation on earth before any nation would commence to reduce its armament?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think, Mr. President, that with the present condition of the world, after what the world has suffered, the impoverishment of the peoples of the world, the mighty debt that is laid upon their shoulders, they will be rather glad to agree to any disarmament that will be equitable. I admit that it will be a delicate question, because of the fact that in some countries the very lives of their people depend upon their ability at all times to reach every section of the earth and to defend their little island empires.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will pardon me, in extension of what he has just stated, his opinion is furthermore reenforced by the fact that under the provisions of the treaty, not a part of the league of nations, Germany is compelled to disarm, and that compulsion of disarmament upon the part of Germany will lead to a willingness for partial disarmament upon the part of those who have kept armed out of the fear of her.

Mr. McCUMBER. I must assume, Mr. President, that when the league provision itself declares that a "reduction of armament is necessary for world peace," there will be an attempt to diminish the present armament.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I feel like saying in this connection, prompted by the inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], when this subject was being considered by the English House of Lords in the month of August last, one of the gentlemen contributing to the debate advanced the idea that if the league went into operation it would carry so much of a guaranty to the various members thereof of future peace and safety that they themselves would, without any compulsion, reduce their armament, that they would not feel the necessity for it when a tribunal was provided before which international controversies would come; and he even argued that an agreement for disarmament was not necessary; that that would be the natural consequence which would result; and that the nations would reduce their armament in order to relieve themselves from the enormous burden of maintaining military establishments when there was no occasion for it. So I apprehend that, as the Senator from North Dakota suggests, it will not be found difficult even under this arrangement to secure the necessary disarmament.

Mr. NORRIS. May I interrupt the Senator further?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have heard that argument made a great many times. It has been made all over the world for a great many years. I have advocated it myself. Yet I learned to doubt its efficacy several years ago. I think if every man would apply it to himself here, if this were agreed to, he could select some nation that, if it did not reduce its armament and would continue to increase it, we would not for a moment think of cutting ours down unless there was an agreement all around. I think it is like the Senator from North Dakota has said. We build ships and raise armies because another nation builds ships and raises armies, and that nation builds ships and raises armies because we do. I do not believe we will get disarmament until there is an agreement that becomes effective among at least five or six of the leading nations of the world, of which we are one.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am compelled to believe that when all these nations solemnly declare in the league itself, "The members of the league agree to a reduction of national armament," they will attempt to do so and that the attempt will succeed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And especially when they disarm the enemy.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

VOTING POWER OF GREAT BRITAIN.

But it is complained that in this league of nations Great Britain has a voting power far superior to our own, because some of her self-governing colonies are allowed a vote, not in the council, which will undoubtedly settle all of the great international questions, but in the assembly to which some international question might by some possibility be referred.

Let us first consider the fairness or unfairness of such a declaration. I have never heard, either on the floor of the Senate

or in any of the addresses which have been made in opposition to this league outside of the Senate, a full, fair statement of its provisions relating to this subject. None of these opponents have told their audiences that in the council the British Empire has, in fact, but one vote.

Article 4 declares:

The council shall consist of representatives of the United States of America, of the British Empire, of France, of Italy, of Japan, together with the representatives of four other members of the league. * * * At the meetings of the council each member of the league shall have one vote.

As at first organized, the other four shall consist of Belgium, Brazil, Greece, and Spain. Whether these other four shall be continued or whether they shall be replaced with other nations, or whether the number shall be increased—all of which must be accomplished by unanimous vote, and on all matters considered—the British Empire has but one vote.

With the approval of the majority of the assembly the council may name additional members of the league whose representatives shall always be members of the council.

Thereby they may add to the membership of the council.

But, Mr. President, let us not forget that the council can only do that by a unanimous vote. Therefore it is in the power of the United States delegates to veto any attempt to add a single other member to the council. In this council Canada has no vote, Australia has no vote, New Zealand has no vote, and none of those can become a member of the council without the consent of the United States.

But, answer the opponents of a league of nations—and especially those opponents who wish to incite a hyphenated American opposition—the disputes may be removed to the assembly, where each member of the league, including colonies, would have a vote. But that would never be done unless we ourselves should desire it. First, because it would require a unanimous vote for removal, and, second, even if it did not require such a vote, it is almost inconceivable that the wishes of the most powerful nation, the one upon which the league must principally depend for its success, would be vetoed, not by a mere majority but by each and every other member of that council. To my mind it is unthinkable. But, first, as to the requirement of a unanimous vote for removal. That paragraph admittedly lacks clearness. But, applying the first rule of construction, that effect shall be given if possible to each and every provision, the following acts are necessary to secure the removal of any matter from the council to the assembly:

1. The application must come from one of the disputants;

2. It must come within 14 days after the submission of the dispute to the council; and

3. The council may, not must or shall, then refer the dispute to the assembly. And, Mr. President, if the council has any discretion in the matter of removal, which discretion is certainly reserved by the use of the word "may," it would require unanimous vote for removal, because the removal of a dispute is not among the exceptions to the requirement for unanimous vote provided in article 5. It is only on the merits of the question under dispute that the votes of the disputants are eliminated by article 15, and the unanimous verdict of all other members is required to indicate even the judgment of the council.

To give force and effect to both clauses the word "shall," in the second clause, must be construed as directory, meaning that the matter of removal shall be initiated only at the request of one of the parties, rather than mandatory, meaning that one party to the dispute could overrule the judgment of all the other parties, a construction that would not only eliminate bodily the first clause, "The council may in any case under this article refer the dispute to the assembly," but would be grossly antagonistic to and violative of the whole spirit of the instrument requiring unanimity of action on all matters except those of procedure.

I maintain, therefore, that giving a meaning to both clauses of that paragraph, it would require a unanimous vote in order to relieve the council of its jurisdiction to consider the international dispute. Neither we nor any other nation would change the jurisdiction unless we felt perfectly justified in doing so. But even if we should take the other view and do such violence to the law of construction as to entirely destroy the clause, "The council may in any case under this article refer the dispute to the assembly," what would be the danger to us of having Canada and Australia and New Zealand and, I believe, South Africa, blood of our blood and bone of our bone—peoples of the same inheritance, the same ideals, the same aspirations; peoples between whom there is as great and close a friendship and sympathy as between them and the mother country, members of this assembly? What would we have to fear from them? Take Canada, for example. The relation between Canada and Great Britain is similar to that between a grown daughter, who has married and is maintaining her own household far from the home of the mother, toward that mother. Canada says to Great Britain, "The old affection and kindly feeling still exist, but I am mistress of my own home, and whatever I do of kindness or of loyalty must come of my own volition." No treaties made by Great Britain are binding upon Canada unless Canada acquiesces. Were Canada to set up an independent nation to-day, I do not believe for an instant that Great Britain would challenge her right to do so, though she might think it wrong or unjust. Canadians, Americans, Britishers fought side by side in this Great War, suffered and died together, and I have no fear of any combination against the interests of the Western Hemisphere in which Canada would be found siding against any just claim of the United States. Every dispute that we have ever had has been amicably settled, and I can imagine nothing worse in this world than a war between the English-speaking peoples. And what I say of Canada can be said with almost equal emphasis with reference to Australia and New Zealand.

But let us look at the matter from another standpoint—that of fairness to Canada. There are included in the present league of nations 32 separate, independent countries. Canada is the eighth in population and the first in territory. Canada has 8,361,000 population and an area of 3,729,665 square miles, a little larger than the United States. We give Hedjaz, with a population of 300,000; and Panama, with a population of 427,000; Honduras, with a population of 592,000; Uruguay, with a population of 689,000, each a vote on the great international questions that must arise in the assembly. But you say that Canada, with 8,361,000 population and with a territory thirty times as great as all these countries together, should have no separate voice. Would that be just to Canada, that self-governing country whose blood and wealth have been so freely expended in defense of human civilization?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I dislike very much to interfere with the Senator, because he is speaking so clearly, but I wish to say right there, and I think he will agree with me, that upon all purely American questions, if a difference rose between Great Britain and the United States in the assembly Canada's vote would be with the United States and not with the mother country. On questions like Japanese and Hindu immigration and various other questions of that kind, that has been demonstrated in the past.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have placed the same thought in other words already, that Canada would not be found voting against the interests of this hemisphere.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I heard that, and I was merely emphasizing it.

Mr. McCUMBER. You give China a vote and she has 320,000,000 population, and yet China is far more under the control of the great powers of the eastern world than is Canada under the control of Great Britain. You give black Haiti a vote, you give black Liberia a vote, you give each of these little nations of whatever color a vote. But you would deny the great, independent Commonwealth of Canada a right, not in the upper house, not in the council, but in this assembly, where the only power that will in any probability be exercised will be the power of discussion, the right either to raise her voice or to give it an effectiveness equal to Hedjaz or Honduras or Panama. To my mind Canada has a far greater right to be heard in that assembly than any of these dozens of small nations which I have mentioned.

In addition to those 32 countries, we have invited—and they will undoubtedly accept—13 other nations, and 10 out of those 13 have a far less population than Canada.

And so I say most frankly, Mr. President, that to deny Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, whose sons suffered through four long years of this war, a voice not in the council but in the assembly, which can only be called together when some great question arises, while we give to Salvador and Paraguay and Hedjaz and Panama and 20 other such countries a full voting power in this assembly, would be so repellant to a world sense of justice that no league of nations bottomed upon such an inequitable foundation could ever fulfill its mission.

Therefore, from every principle of fairness, there should be one forum in which Canada can have a voice, Australia a voice, and New Zealand can be heard. That right has been granted, so far as the assembly is concerned, but in the higher tribunal, the permanent tribunal, which under this system will decide practically every question of international dispute, Canada and Australia, as separate entities, have no vote. Great Britain, which includes them in her empire, will have one vote, the same as the United States, the same as Belgium and Brazil and Greece—no greater power, no greater strength than the smallest nations whose representatives constitute this council.

I think it not improper to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of this address a table, which I have prepared, showing the population and area of each of the original members of the league of nations and the population and area of those States which have been invited to become members up to the present time. I shall ask that permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DOMESTIC MATTERS NOT SUBJECT TO JURISDICTION OF LEAGUE.

Mr. President, it has been declared on this floor that under the provisions of this covenant the United States would be compelled to submit for determination the question of immigration and other domestic policies. This claim is based upon the second clause of article 11, which reads:

It is also declared to be the fundamental right of each member of the league to bring to the attention of the assembly or the council any circumstances whatever affecting international relations which threaten to disturb either the peace or good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

And it is urged that as Japan or China might declare that an exclusion law by the United States would threaten to disturb the good understanding and amity between either of these countries and the United States, the question of whether such laws should remain or whether they constitute a breach of the international compact could be passed upon by the council or the assembly. There is no foundation whatever for such a claim. It is true that under the provisions of this covenant any matter which any nation claims will disturb or tend to disturb international comity and good will may be presented by any nation to either the council or the assembly, but it is not true that either the council or the assembly has the right to pass upon or decide every question which any nation might think engendered international hostility. It is true that the door is wide open for the presentation of any circumstance affecting international relations, no matter how trivial or how foolish. And, Mr. President, it would be impossible to close this door even partially if we expect to inculcate a spirit of friendship and trust. We can not in the instrument itself differentiate between all classes of cases which might affect international amity more clearly than has been done by placing the domestic questions entirely outside the pale of international interference. This covenant guards and confines the questions which may be acted upon by either of these bodies to those questions that are not domestic in character.

The seventh paragraph of article 15 declares:

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

What could be more clear and definite? Certainly no Senator would ask that a list of all the domestic questions should be enumerated. Their number is legion. There are, however, a large number of purely domestic questions which naturally awaken international opposition or resentment. Great Britain, being a great manufacturing country, might feel aggrieved that we erect a tariff wall against everything which she produces, while she allows the importation of everything we produce into her territory free from any tariff levy. But neither Great Britain nor any other country has ever denied our national right to do so. So China might complain of the Chinese exclusion law, a law which excludes Chinese from our country, while we enjoy perfect freedom of settlement in China. But no Chinaman, no matter how wise or ignorant, has ever questioned the fact that the subject is purely a domestic one.

Mr. President, we have 4,000 years of recorded history from which to draw our precedents to determine what subjects are clearly within the domain of sovereign or domestic powers of an independent State. It would be foolish to attempt to set them out in detail. They are evidenced by the yearly legislation turned out in thousands of tons from the legislative halls of every free and independent country. There is probably no subject in the world on which great nations would be so fully in accord as on the question of what is a domestic question and within the exclusive power of an independent State. Of course, it would be within the right of Japan to present the claim that our exclusion law was distasteful to her people, and, therefore, affected our good relations with her. But no intelligent statesman of Japan or any other country in the world would ever suggest that the exercise of such a power was not the exercise of a purely domestic right.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Has the Senator from North Dakota ever heard it even suggested by anyone, except those who are conjuring up objections to the league, that the subject of immigration was not a domestic question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Never in the world. It never has been, and it never will be. The right of petition is guaranteed by our Constitution. Would any Senator claim that this sacred edifice of our national safety would be jeopardized by allowing a petition to be filed which might by a possibility ask us to do what we could not constitutionally do? Why, Mr. President, a large proportion of the thousands of petitions coming here yearly request us to pass Federal statutes that would contravene the rights reserved to the States. But we do not shut the door against them. We simply lay them aside as being without our Federal jurisdiction.

But you say that the question of whether the matter complained of is a domestic one must be decided by the council, and, therefore, an awful danger confronts us. Well, Mr. President, naturally some one must decide that question, and what better source could there be? But just remember that the verdict must receive the affirmative vote of every State represented in the council, outside the parties to the dispute, and that all the others must wickedly, contrary to and in defiance of the provisions of the compact, conspire against the United States. And to carry out such conspiracy each nation would commit an act of suicide by establishing a precedent that would compel it to surrender its own purely domestic powers to this council. To my mind it is simply unthinkable and not worthy of serious consideration. There is no danger on earth that Great Britain, or France, or the United States, or any other of the nine nations would vote a precedent which would destroy the independence of each of them.

But, on the other hand, Mr. President, there might be instances in which some irresponsible nation might claim that a matter clearly international in character was one of domestic concern only, and, therefore, not subject to consideration by either the council or the assembly, and it would not do to leave the matter in such shape that the mere claim of its being a domestic concern only could eliminate from the consideration of the council that which was unquestionably international, and hence the provision that not only the claim must be made that it is domestic but that it must be found by the council to arise out of a matter solely within the jurisdiction of one party. And, as I have suggested, if there is any one question certain and easy of solution it is the question of what is purely a domestic matter.

MONROE DOCTRINE.

A word about the Monroe doctrine. When opponents to the league of nations can not find support for a construction within the instrument itself, they sometimes go outside and accept some declaration from some outside source as to the meaning of a phrase. When this matter came before us in its original form it did not mention specifically the Monroe doctrine. There was no question but that the Monroe doctrine as it is generally understood by the world, namely, that no South or Central American Republic should be subject to conquest or domination by any European power, was merged into the broader world doctrine that no independent nation, whether in South America or elsewhere, should be subject to a war of conquest or domination by any other nation. What a German may say to his constituency as to his understanding of the Monroe doctrine, or what some British subject may say to his constituency as to his idea of what the Monroe doctrine means, can have little weight with us, especially as we evidently do not always agree ourselves as to what it means. But whatever it does mean we are protected in it, and as we alone promulgated the doctrine we shall undoubtedly give it a construction in accordance with the consensus of the American view. While I deny that the Monroe doctrine ever meant anything more than is clearly included within the declaration of President Monroe, I would not have this international compact itself attempt to define it. The framers of the league of nations in the amendment have sought to meet the objections made in this country that the Monroe doctrine was not recognized by specially recognizing it. Other nations have regional policies which such nations feel are necessary also for their own protection as we feel that the Monroe doctrine is necessary for our protection. We could not consistently ask on this side of the ocean a policy for our protection while we deny similar policies which other nations regard in Europe or Asia or Africa as necessary for their protection.

And so there was written into this new agreement these words:

Nothing in this document shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaty obligations or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.

No one questions that the Monroe doctrine is an engagement on our part for securing the maintenance of peace. The document itself so declares. We, therefore, do not need to go outside the records to ascertain the opinion of anyone else as to whether the Monroe doctrine is recognized. The instrument says it is. That ought to be satisfactory to a reasonable man. Certainly Senators would not ask that it go further and define just what the Monroe doctrine may mean under every possible contingency. Let us get down to the very heart of the objection made. It is clearly indicated, though not quite specifically declared, in the address of the Senator from Pennsylvania of yesterday. He says:

> Never before has the Monroe doctrine been a mere measure of spineless pacifism.

And again:

> If we embody this provision in the league, the Monroe doctrine will cease to be a policy; it will become in truth a formal agreement.

And that he does not want. And again:

> Its precise character, the extent, method, and time of its application, the means of compelling its observance, are all matters of our high and uncontrolled will and sovereign prerogative. We, the United States, can not answer to anyone else in any respect of it. We use it when, as, and to the extent we need it. There can be no limitation upon it except our requirements, our will, and our force of arms.

Mr. President, if that is the true construction of the Monroe doctrine—and I am not questioning that view, although I am not admitting, and I do not think that I shall ever admit, that our Monroe doctrine gives us an unlimited control over everything in this hemisphere—I will admit, so far as he claims, that what we have done in the past, what the Monroe doctrine declared to be the doctrine, is the doctrine. Then, by recognizing the Monroe doctrine specifically, all nations have recognized that construction. The Senator says that it becomes an agreement, a mutual world agreement, and not an American doctrine or policy. That, Mr. President, is not a just construction of the provision. The provision says:

> Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

When these nations thus recognize the Monroe doctrine they recognize an American Monroe doctrine, because there is no other and never has been any other Monroe doctrine, and therefore they are not making it a doctrine by agreement but a doctrine by acquiescence.

In the same language, you will observe, by which they recognize the Monroe doctrine, they also recognize treaties of arbitration and other understandings between nations. Would you for a moment contend that by recognizing a treaty between nations A and B by the nations C, D, and E, the latter three nations become parties to the treaty between A and B? Why, Mr. President, the subject of the treaty between A and B might have no possible application or relation to any other nation, and it would be most improper to say that by recognizing a compact between A and B, which might provide any means for its enforcement between those two nations, such contract becomes a mutual agreement between all five of these parties.

That is not the true construction. I am forced to the conclusion that what these Senators really want is not that all nations shall agree to our Monroe doctrine, but that they should not agree, so that our pride, our vanity, may be satisfied in asserting it as a policy of defiance rather than a policy in which other countries acquiesce. It is a rather strange position for a great nation to take.

I shall not at this time discuss what the Monroe doctrine does mean in all its possibilities, but I will take the time here to dissent from the view indicated at least by the Senator from Pennsylvania, that we have any right to say to a South American Republic that it shall not permit whomsoever it may see fit to accept to settle in its territory as immigrants. We have no right to say to Brazil, "You shall not allow Germans to settle in your country"; or to Argentina, "You shall not allow Chinese to enter your domains." Our Monroe doctrine does not go that far, and ought not to go that far. Whenever the conduct of any country, Germany or Japan or China, is such as to indicate that their purpose is not settlement, but is conquest or the acquirement of territory for the home country, then our right of interference is unquestionable under the Monroe doctrine.

I agree that the Monroe doctrine does include our right to determine that not an inch of American territory can be bargained, sold, or given away to any European power. And as that principle is recognized in recognizing the Monroe doctrine, there can be no possibility that this would not be a subject for international dispute, and I am equally certain that if this league provision should be adopted the Senator from Pennsylvania would be among the last to say that we had surrendered that right.

REASONS FOR CREATING BOTH A COUNCIL AND AN ASSEMBLY.

It might be well asked right here why two distinct bodies of representatives of the several world states are provided for? I can not answer this from any inside information. I can not attempt to state what arguments were presented in its favor. I can, however, see reasons for it. We may very properly divide the nations of the world into two general classes: First, the great and powerful nations; second, the weak and less powerful nations. We may reclassify them again into the stable and reliable and the unstable and unreliable nations. And when we have so classified the second time we will find that for the most part the great and powerful are also the stable and reliable nations. These nations, therefore, must be the very backbone of this league. The erratic, quarrelsome, though more numerous small states of Europe on the Asiatic borderlands and the revolutionary republics of South and Central America, where one autocrat succeeds another as regularly as the ebb and flow of the tides, must not exercise such a preponderating influence or voting power as shall overrule the saner policies of the truly self-governing nations on whose power and judgment the world must rely for any advancement toward the goal of world peace. And so these nine great nations are specifically named as member nations of the council.

Had there been no war the framers of this instrument would undoubtedly have limited the membership in the council to the powerful and stable governments only. But the heroism displayed and awful sufferings endured by some of the smaller nations, like Belgium and Greece, together with the fact that they were parties to this war, seemed to those who drafted the league to entitle them to a membership in the council. These framers were compelled to conform the instrument to meet the very many conditions which faced them. They could not be expected to be more logical than were the framers of our Constitution when they gave the tiny Colonies the same power in the Government as the mighty and destined-to-become-more-mighty States of the Union. All that we can be sure of is that the instrument comes to us as a compromise, and in it is the soul of a future world freedom. It is within our power to strangle the body but the soul will live and ever seek reembodiment in some future international organization.

But as the council could only embrace these nine nations, it was most proper that there should be some forum where the voice of each and every other nation could be heard, and to meet that requirement the assembly as a distinct body was provided for. In its chamber the small and the great meet on equal footing and the woes and wrongs of any country, no matter how backward or unstable its people, may receive consideration.

LINE OF DEMARKATION BETWEEN JURISDICTION OF COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY NOT CLEARLY DEFINED.

Mr. President, I regret that there is not a more definite line of demarkation between the powers and duties of these two bodies, the council and assembly. Much confusion, I think, has arisen because of that weakness and much opportunity afforded to misrepresent the voting power of each nation. Article 3 of the proposed compact creates the assembly, a body in which all the nations constituting the league are represented.

Article 4 creates the council, in which the nine leading nations of the world are represented. The third paragraph of article 3 declares:

> The assembly may deal in its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

The fourth paragraph of article 4 declares:

> The council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

The wording is the same in each case. It is well to understand, however, that the word "deal" as used in each paragraph does not carry with it the right to make binding judgment by either the council or the assembly. How either party may "deal" with the question is limited and defined in other sections of the instrument itself.

COUNCIL AND NOT ASSEMBLY HAS ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF DISPUTES.

Let us not forget that the council and not the assembly has original jurisdiction in the matter of international disputes. Article 12 declares:

> The members of the league agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or an inquiry by the council.

Not by the assembly. Therefore, while the assembly may discuss any matter brought before it, any dispute likely to lead to war—and that is all the word "deal" means so far as the as-

sembly is concerned—the submission of the dispute must in the first instance be to the council and not to the assembly. It may be removed to the assembly under certain conditions under another provision of the instrument which I shall consider in a moment.

It will next be observed that each nation under the provisions of article 12 has the unquestioned right to determine whether it will submit the matter to arbitration or simply for inquiry. Of course, no nation will submit to arbitration any matter which affects its authority over its domestic relations. Therefore if there was nothing more in the instrument said about domestic questions there is no possible way by which the council could obtain jurisdiction over the domestic affairs of any country except through the consent of that country. But to make it doubly clear that purely domestic questions are not subject to its jurisdiction, provision is made that the council shall make no recommendation as to such questions. Therefore no non-justiciable questions will ever come before either the council or the assembly for any final decision without the free and full consent of the nation itself. If a nation, however, submits a justiciable dispute—that is, a dispute that does not involve its sovereignty or domestic right—it is, of course, in honor bound to conform to the decision.

But under article 13 each member of the league agrees that where diplomacy fails it will submit a question which it recognizes to be justifiable to arbitration and others to inquiry. Of course, therefore, it must itself recognize the question to be justifiable. If it does not, it is only submitted for inquiry. What then happens in case the question is submitted to inquiry only? Well, the first thing the council does is to endeavor to effect a settlement of such dispute. And if its efforts are successful it will make a public statement giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement as the council may deem appropriate.

If the dispute is not settled the council shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard to it. That is the extent of its power. If the award is unanimously agreed to by the members of the council other than the representatives of the disputing parties, these disputants agree by entering the league that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendation of the council. But this is only binding upon them in case the report is unanimously agreed to by all the members of the council except the disputants.

If the report is not unanimously agreed to by the members other than the disputants, then the members of the league—and here we get back to the members of the league and not the council—reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice. What is the meaning of that? It simply means that in such case the council has failed to bring about the reconciliation, and all members of the league, not the council or the assembly, but members of the league, may consider the matter and attempt a reconciliation outside the council.

Mr. President, most jealously has each nation guarded against the possibility of any real danger to its independence and sovereignty. But those who are fearful of some hidden danger in the possible removal of the question from the council to the assembly should read the ninth paragraph of article 15, which provides:

> In any case referred to the assembly all the provisions of this article and of article 12 relating to the action and powers of the council shall apply to the action and powers of the assembly.

Now, what are the provisions of article 12 which shall apply? Simply those I have enumerated, that they will submit either to arbitration or inquiry any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, and that they will in no case resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report of the council, and that under article 15 the endeavor to secure a settlement will be as just stated. The only modification is this:

> *Provided*, That a report made by the assembly, if concurred in by the representatives of those members of the league represented on the council and a majority of the other members of the league, exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the council concurred in by all members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

Nothing is granted in the action of the assembly that is not granted and circumscribed in the provision relating to the settlement of disputes by the council. In other words, when the matter goes to the assembly, all the nations agree to do is either to submit their matter to arbitration or to inquiry. If they submit it to arbitration, it is of their own volition; if they submit it to inquiry only, a report of the facts is made, and it is assumed that the report will bring about a reconciliation. If it does not bring about a reconciliation in the assembly, then, as suggested, it must hark back to the league itself. When the council or the assembly fails the several members of the league reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice. (Art. 15, par. 6.)

I am not here attempting to say that this is the best scheme, because I do not think that in any case these final important decisions should be removed from the council. But I am simply trying to ascertain what the scheme means.

Mr. President, in 20 years' service in the Senate I have known but one instrument whose terms have been so willfully misinterpreted and so grossly misrepresented as the covenant for a league of nations. That some of it is vague I know, and some portions objectionable from particular viewpoints may be freely admitted, but that it discriminates against us, is unfair in its treatment of our country, or that it imposes upon us any obligation or burden that is not equally borne by every other nation I most emphatically deny. It is regrettable that the mighty power of eloquence, a power that often overthrows reason and sets the emotions afloat upon painted wings that dazzle and mislead, is used to defame and distort the true meaning of an instrument, the most important that ever appealed to the heart or the soul of man.

EFFECT OF REFUSAL TO JOIN.

Suppose we now refuse to join with the rest of the world in some scheme to prevent war, what will happen? Mr. President, as surely as the sun shall rise every great nation of the world will proceed to devise means for the wholesale destruction of nations. The nation which is most learned, most thorough, and assiduous will take the lead in this nefarious design to manufacture gas bombs that will wipe out of existence in a single night raid New York or London or Paris or Berlin. The science of both aircraft and chemistry for war purposes is at present only in its experimental stage. The old glory of noble and honorable battle will give way to the evil necromancy of chemistry, to insidious germ-producing poisons. Even since the date of the signing of the armistice last November we have perfected flying machines ten times more powerful than those used during the greater part of this war. I am credibly informed that we now have in fair prospect of completion bombs which, if dropped by a single fleet over a great city like New York or London, would, not by mere explosions or fire but by poisonous and insidious gases, destroy all life in such city. The nations first and foremost in the invention of such satanic methods will be triumphant over the nations whose hearts rebel against such hideous purposes. Though the civilized world was against Germany in this war that country, through her preparedness and her plodding study of death-dealing devices, destroyed two lives to offset every German killed in battle. Her development of the U-boat enabled her to sink 50 tons of enemy shipping for every ton sunk by all of her enemies. It enabled her to send to the bottom of the ocean 404 warships with a loss of only 216 of her own warships. It enabled her to destroy the property of civilians of the value of fully $25,000,000,000 without the loss of a dollar's worth of her own property.

So desperate will be the next war that all the hate and all the venom created by this struggle will be infinitesimal compared with the next. Nations now wounded and bleeding, struggling with desperate effort to build up their industries, must so live and so slave as to be able to devote the greater part of their energies in creating implements of war for their own safety.

And against what races will all these weapons of death be used? Against the great white race. We talk about the yellow peril. Mr. President, the greatest peril to the white race of the world is the peril of internecine war. If there is to be no check to wrong or crime by nations, all the yellow race need to do is to wait in patience and bide its time; the white race will accomplish its own extinction.

Mr. President, some of the policies of the present administration followed during this war have grated most harshly upon my ideas of national policies, and I have opposed some of the measures recommended by the President. But, partisan as I admit I am, strong as my conviction of party fealty, I hope I shall never be so hidebound by partisanship or so governed by party exigency as to fail to recognize a just position taken or a truth declared by a member of any opposing party. In supporting a league of nations after this war, a league recommended by Republican leaders before this great death struggle and by Republican statesmen since, President Wilson has but followed the pathway blazed by the greatest American counsellors, Republican as well as Democratic; and no matter how earnestly or how justly we may disagree with the domestic policies of his administration, no words were ever more truly spoken by any

President than that sentence in President Wilson's address on Decoration Day in France when he said:

It is for us, particularly for us who are civilized, to use our proper weapons of counsel and agreement, that there never is such a war again.

Mr. President, I am not the molder of my brother's convictions nor the keeper of his conscience, but speaking for myself as just one American citizen, I could not cast my vote against any reasonable agreement to secure future world peace without a conviction that would follow me to the grave, that I had committed an unpardonable offense against all future generations.

APPENDIX.

ORIGINAL MEMBERS.

Country.	Population.	Area.
China	320,620,000	1,861,000
India	315,156,000	1,802,629
United States	103,500,000	3,026,789
Japan	56,860,000	147,655
Great Britain	45,231,000	121,331
France	39,601,000	207,054
Italy	36,546,000	110,623
Brazil	24,618,000	3,292,000
Poland	12,247,000	49,018
Czechoslovakia	11,000,000	20,065
Canada	8,361,000	3,729,665
Roumania	7,508,000	54,000
Belgium	7,571,000	11,373
Siam	6,000,000	220,000
South Africa	5,980,000	473,090
Portugal	5,957,000	35,490
Greece	4,821,000	46,522
Australia	4,941,000	3,063,041
Serbia	4,600,000	34,000
Peru	4,500,000	683,321
Bolivia	2,520,000	708,195
Guatemala	2,092,000	48,290
Liberia	2,060,000	41,000
Haiti	2,030,000	10,200
Cuba	2,406,000	44,164
Ecuador	1,500,000	116,000
Uruguay	1,225,000	72,172
New Zealand	1,159,720	105,000
Nicaragua	689,000	49,532
Honduras	592,000	46,250
Panama	427,000	32,380
Hedjaz	300,000	96,500

STATES INVITED.

Country.	Population.	Area.
Spain	20,747,000	190,050
Persia	9,000,000	628,000
Argentine	8,574,000	1,139,196
Netherlands	6,583,000	12,648
Sweden	5,757,000	172,876
Colombia	5,472,000	345,278
Chile	5,000,000	292,100
Switzerland	3,880,000	15,976
Denmark	2,940,000	15,388
Venezuela	2,811,000	393,976
Salvador	1,254,000	7,255
Norway	2,391,000	124,129
Paraguay	800,000	97,722

During the delivery of Mr. MCCUMBER's speech,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I think there need be no request that the bill be laid aside in order that I may proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no; the Senator can proceed on the bill.

After the conclusion of Mr. MCCUMBER's speech,

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hesitate even to reenforce what has been said by the Senator from North Dakota, because it has been so clearly said, and with such a broad and such a long vision, and it is such a complete answer to an adroit, cool-headed, and wary politician, and to a diplomatic legalist, but I have here a little article written by Robert R. Reed, of New York, upon the subject of "The Covenant and Sovereignty," and I desire to insert it in the RECORD. It dwells upon some of the very points touched by the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE COVENANT AND SOVEREIGNTY.

To the editor of the Evening Post:

SIR: Much of the discussion over the league of nations seems to be based on a natural misapprehension of a fundamental proposition which, when stated, must be recognized by everyone. Senator KNOX seemed to stumble over it in his first attack on the league covenant. The fundamental proposition is that sovereigns do not part with their sovereignty by agreeing to meet together to discuss and decide international questions and that the creation of an international council composed of sovereign States is nothing more than such an agreement. It is as if several business men agreed to meet at a given time to settle a disputed point, or, as the case actually stands, to meet at stated times to settle any points that might require settlement between them, and also, if they choose, to decide on a course of action in any matter of common interest. They might, if they desired, specifically agree that certain questions should be decided by majority assent, but in the absence of an express agreement neither the undertaking to meet together nor the specification of various matters which they are to discuss and may decide involves any suggestion of a surrender of their individual freedom of action.

There is in principle no analogy, near or remote, between such a council agreed upon between sovereign States and the creation by a single sovereignty of a subordinate legislative or administrative body with power by majority vote to exercise certain delegated powers. The limitations of sovereignty, if such they may be called, are found in the specific restrictive covenants, not in the general covenant nor in the creation of the league executive council. There is also, of course, the very substantial fact that the council may tend to agree, rather than to disagree, and that the spirit of common interest and common action may prove strong enough in time to create an effective superstate. But there is no such creation in the proposed covenant. Nor, I take it, will any lawyer in the Senate or elsewhere be able to spell it out of the covenant.

ROBERT R. REED.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, The Living Church, which is published at Milwaukee and New York and Chicago, on June 14 came out with an editorial entitled "The peace treaty and the Senate." Some parts of it I have stricken out, and I hope the reporters will note that fact. I have run a lead pencil through them, because I thought they were a bit too severe and perhaps personal; but the balance of this article, entitled "The peace treaty and the Senate," I fully indorse, and wish it published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE PEACE TREATY AND THE SENATE.

Will not the press, secular and religious, join us in appealing to the American people to make known their great displeasure at the studied boorishness which is being displayed in the Senate and in some few but well-established daily papers in regard to the peace treaty?

We are not thinking now so much of the fact of opposition to the treaty, quite recognizing that its very immensity must leave portions open to criticism and that, in all probability, no single person, whether of the peace conference or outside, is or could be satisfied with it in all its provisions; but rather of the manner in which so serious a matter is being treated in Washington.

Seldom have we had such cause to be ashamed of certain of our legislators as at the present time. There has always been a small sprinkling of boors in the Senate and probably always will be; but never in our recollection has boorishness seemed to be so willingly tolerated by men who are themselves not boors as at the present time.

Let us remind our readers of the customary procedure of the United States in making treaties. Whether the long, musty records of the past would disclose any exception we can not say, but what has been the usual practice is beyond question.

The treaty is negotiated between the diplomatic representatives of the United States and the other high contracting power or powers. None but the Executive and the State Departments are negotiators on behalf of the United States. Not until it has been completed and signed by the diplomats on both sides is it laid before the Senate. The "advice and consent" of the Senate are then invited; and the Senate, after careful consideration, gives or withholds that "consent," or gives "advice" in the form of amendments—which latter are then returned to the President as the "advice" of the Senate, and he, in turn, either accepts the advice and lays the matter anew before the other party or withdraws the draft of the treaty and drops the matter. The failure of an important treaty with England by the latter method in Mr. Roosevelt's administration will be readily recalled. Of course, the Senate has the right to "advise" the President in advance, but to do so uninvited would be most unusual.

The draft of the now pending treaty has been signed by the diplomatic representatives of the Allies, but it has not yet been signed by those of Germany. It is by no means certain that it is yet in its final form. To submit it in its present form and under present conditions to the Senate would be a gross violation of every diplomatic propriety and precedent. Moreover that would seriously complicate the matter of ratification, since it could not be ratified before it was completed, and it could not be completed before it had been accepted by the diplomatic representatives of all the signatory powers.

When the Senate proceeded to debate a treaty that had not been laid before it, was notoriously not ready for submission and had not been accepted by the enemy powers, it was guilty of a grave impropriety, while the boorish manner in which it has been discussed by certain Senators, the repeated insults in debate to England and English statesmen, not to say to the President of the United States, are such as would have been esteemed deliberate German propaganda a year ago, and are equally contemptible to-day.

Are Americans no longer proud of what this Nation has accomplished? Do they want to go back to the dreary anti-British hatred that we have been trying during these years of war to counteract? Has England, or has she not, given us cause to trust her in this war? Do we wish to be her friends or her enemies?

Let men differ as they will upon political questions at home, but let us all—all of us who deserve the name of loyal Americans—denounce all attempts at making partisan footballs of those sacred matters that have involved the blood of our sons. Mothers who wear the gold star, sons who are still suffering in military hospitals, are insulted by the manner in which their supreme sacrifice is now being treated.

The treaty of peace is a frightfully serious matter. It differs from all previous treaties in three essential characteristics: In the magnitude of the war, of which it is the conclusion; in the attempt to make future wars as nearly impossible as can be made; and in the great number of nations, each with separate interests and varying ideals, which must collaborate and unanimously agree in order that

any treaty whatever may be negotiated. If Japan or Italy could be left out or could be persuaded to accept Anglo-Saxon ideals the treaty could be improved. It is obvious that they can not. The unprecedented circumstances make the negotiation of the treaty probably the most difficult diplomatic feat that was ever attempted, and if it fails the civilization of the twentieth century may almost be said to go down into defeat.

And because the United States is only one of so great a number of interested powers it is next to impossible for the Senate to amend the treaty, though the precedent established by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Root of ratifying it with a declaratory statement of the understanding or position of the United States, as in The Hague conventions, is quite feasible.

* * * * * * *

And the power of the United States Senate to plunge the world into hopeless anarchy by refusing the cooperation of this Government in the treaty that stands for the reconstruction of the world is a power so overwhelming that its wide reach can hardly be overstated. Yet, when this treaty has neither been completed nor laid before the Senate, the partisan debates upon it have been an insult to the intelligence of the Nation and a slap upon the statesmen of those nations with which we have until now been associating as brothers and friends, not to say upon our own.

Let no one suppose that subsidiary questions are germane to this paramount issue of patriotism and sense of national responsibility. It may be that Mr. Wilson has been wondrously tactless in dealing with the Senate; it seems so to us. It may be that he has been unhappy in the choice of some of his associates in the Government. Very likely he has the defects of an exceedingly determined nature. No doubt the surreptitious appearance of copies of the treaty in New York (if they really have appeared) shows a bad leak somewhere—though, at least, as likely to be from German as from American or allied sources—and investigation may well be made. Perhaps some Senators have cause personally to dislike the President. It may be that the President is not easy to work with. All these things help to explain the partisanship into which the Senate and a part of the press and the Nation have sunk, but they do not excuse it.

Whoever treats the treaty as a matter for partisan advantage or personal spite is a traitor to his country, for he is rendering aid and comfort to the enemy in this time of war.

Earnestly, fearfully, do we call upon loyal Americans and the American press to denounce these partisan and personal viewpoints that are so conspicuous in the premature discussions of the subject in the Senate. The blood of our sons, shed upon the fields of France, challenges the irreverent to recognize that in the earnest efforts of the Versailles diplomats to establish a basis of permanent peace they are on holy ground. To discuss those efforts in the manner in which Senators have been discussing them is little less than blasphemy.

When the proper time for discussion arises, which will be after Germany has signed the covenant and the President has formally laid it before the Senate in a dignified manner, the handicap of this premature and improper discussion will reflect serious discredit upon those responsible for it. One hopes that their own constituents will vigorously demand an accounting.

But one also hopes that the group of old-time American gentlemen and patriots in the Senate, regardless of party, will now firmly assert themselves and demand that the current outrage upon the sensibilities of the American people and the dignity of the Senate shall cease.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Smith, Md.
Calder	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
Capper	Kellogg	Newberry	Stanley
Curtis	Kendrick	Norris	Swanson
Dial	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Edge	Keyes	Phelan	Trammell
Elkins	King	Phipps	Warren
Fletcher	Kirby	Pittman	Watson
France	Knox	Poindexter	Williams
Gronna	La Follette	Pomerene	Wolcott
Harding	McCormick	Sheppard	
Harrison	McCumber	Shields	
Henderson	McKellar	Simmons	

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the unfinished business has already been laid aside temporarily.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask, then, that the Agricultural appropriation bill be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over, offered by the committee, will be found at the top of page 77. It is an item relative to enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home. The committee proposes to strike out, on page 77, line 2, "46,280" and to insert in lieu thereof "$76,280."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this is the paragraph that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] asked to have go over. I think the Senator stated that he wished to offer an amendment. Has the Senator that amendment ready now?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I shall offer to the entire bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Would that affect this amendment also?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator might just as well offer that amendment now, then.

Mr. KING. The trouble is, as I understand the procedure, that amendments to the bill are not in order until the committee amendments have been disposed of. I will therefore withdraw that amendment, as I shall offer a general amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I may be permitted just a word, the amendment offered by the Senate committee increases the provision adopted by the House. I have asked the Senator having the bill in charge for an explanation, which he submitted the other day, and which, I respectfully submit, does not explain. I hope that the amendment offered by the Senate committee will be disagreed to and that the House provision will be retained in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee increasing the appropriation to $76,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment of the committee passed over will be found on page 89, where, beginning with the top of the page, the committee proposes to insert the item relating to the Bureau of Markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has already been read. Is there a request that it be read again? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. As I recall, a point of order was made against that provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has a point of order been submitted?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no record of a point of order having been made to this amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. May I have the attention of the Senator from Utah? I do not wish to take advantage of him. Does the Senator raise a point of order against the amendment on page 89 that has reference to the wool section of the War Industries Board? I hope the Senator will not raise the point of order. I have here the law authorizing it, and, of course, I shall be compelled to take the time to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two amendments on page 77 that were passed over and not agreed to. The Secretary will call attention to them.

The SECRETARY. On page 77, in line 9, the committee proposes to strike out "$4,501,980" and to insert in lieu thereof "$5,731,980," so as to read:

In all, for general expenses, $5,731,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Also, in line 10, the committee proposes to strike out "$4,705,820" and to insert "$5,935,820," so as to read:

Total for States Relations Service, $5,935,820.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is that merely a change in the totals to correspond with the action of the Senate or is it an augmentation of the original appropriation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands so; but the chairman of the committee will be able to answer the question of the Senator more accurately.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that this is simply changing the numerals to conform to the amounts as they were increased by the Senate committee.

Mr. KING. There can be no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. Now, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to change and correct all of these totals, wherever they may occur in the bill, so as to correspond to the action taken on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, are we through with the Senate committee amendments now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet. On page 89 there is a committee amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Do I understand from the Senator that he has raised a point of order against that amendment?

Mr. KING. I submitted a point of order yesterday against the amendment, commencing on line 15, page 89, and ending on line 7, page 90, upon the ground that it was general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Chair if that is the amendment we are now considering?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; that is the amendment we have reached, on page 89.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, on yesterday I stated——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wanted to ask what amendment is pending. I think the Secretary has read one amendment and the Senator from Utah has in mind another.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is on page 89, where the committee proposes to insert, beginning with the top of the page, the item relative to the Bureau of Markets, down to and including line 14.

Mr. KING. I withdrew the point of order as to that. I understood that the item commencing on line 15 of the same page and ending on line 7 of the following page was the one which was now before the Senate for consideration; and as to that item I urge the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on the first 14 lines of page 89.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there ought to be an amendment to this amendment if it is going to be agreed to. I called attention yesterday to the fact that on line 1 it says "That hereafter," which, of course, means that this shall apply, if it becomes a law, for years and years, or until legislation is passed to change it; and then on lines 13 and 14 it says "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920." That is quite inconsistent. Either the word "hereafter" ought to be stricken out or else the words "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," ought to be stricken out—one or the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah move to strike out the word "hereafter" on page 89 in the first line?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator having the bill in charge whether he desires to have that word stricken out or the words at the end of the paragraph "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920."

Mr. GRONNA. I think it would be better not to strike out the first part because that would make it a permanent law.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I am perfectly satisfied. All the interest I have in it is to make it consistent. I move to strike out the words "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920."

Mr. KING. Before that is done, I wish to state that in withdrawing the point of order I do not concede that this is proper legislation, nor do I concede that the point of order if pressed would not be entitled to receive favorable consideration at the hands of the Chair; but the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] states to me that perhaps this is a meritorious provision. He is not sufficiently familiar with it and with all the complications connected therewith to make a satisfactory explanation, but he assures me that if it goes to conference the matter will receive full consideration, and that if it shall be discovered that it is not proper and legitimate the conferees will strike it out.

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the Senator that all this amendment will do is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and other persons in his department to administer oaths. That is all there is to the whole amendment.

Mr. KING. No one could give a satisfactory explanation the other day. Several Senators were called upon to submit an explanation and none complied with the request of the chairman. I have assurance, however, that the law will be examined into very carefully and if it shall be discovered that the amendment is improper the conferees will then change it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the words are stricken out in line 13, "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920." Is there objection to agreeing to the committee amendment as amended? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, before I proceed I wish to inquire if the committee amendment on page 83 has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary informs me that the amendment at the bottom of page 83 and the top of page 84 was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. Then the only amendment against which a point of order has been made is the amendment on page 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 89, beginning with line 15 and extending down to and including line 7 on page 90.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, yesterday when this amendment was pending before the Senate the Chair asked if there was any law authorizing the President of the United States to delegate the power in question to any department or to any bureau. I said I believed there was such a power not only in the Overman Act and in what is known as the national-defense act, but that such power will be found in section 5 of the food-control act.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has the act before him?

Mr. GRONNA. I have the act here. Section 5 of the so-called food-control act approved August 10, 1917, provides:

SEC. 5. That from time to time, whenever the President shall find it essential to license the importation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessaries, in order to carry into effect any of the purposes of this act, and shall publicly so announce, no person shall, after a date fixed in the announcement, engage in or carry on any such business specified in the announcement of importation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessaries as set forth in such announcement, unless he shall secure and hold a license issued pursuant to this section. The President is authorized to issue such licenses and to prescribe regulations for the issuance of licenses and requirements for systems of accounts and auditing of accounts to be kept by licensees, submission of reports by them, with or without oath or affirmation, and the entry and inspection by the President's duly authorized agents of the places of business of licensees. Whenever the President shall find that any storage charge, commission, profit, or practice of any licensee is unjust, or unreasonable, or discriminatory and unfair, or wasteful, and shall order such licensee, within a reasonable time fixed in the order, to discontinue the same, unless such order, which shall recite the facts found, is revoked or suspended, such licensee shall, within the time prescribed in the order, discontinue such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory and unfair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice. The President may, in lieu of any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, and unfair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice, find what is a just, reasonable, nondiscriminatory, and fair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice, and in any proceeding brought in any court such order of the President shall be prima facie evidence. Any person who, without a license issued pursuant to this section, or whose license shall have been revoked, knowingly engages in or carries on any business for which a license is required under this section, or willfully fails or refuses to discontinue any unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, and unfair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice, in accordance with the requirement of an order issued under this section, or any regulation prescribed under this section, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any farmer, gardener, cooperative association of farmers or gardeners, including live-stock farmers, or other persons with respect to the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him, nor to any retailer with respect to the retail business actually conducted by him, nor to any common carrier, nor shall anything in this section be construed to authorize the fixing or imposition of a duty or tax upon any article imported into or exported from the United States or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this act a retailer shall be deemed to be a person, copartnership, firm, corporation, or association not engaging in the wholesale business whose gross sales do not exceed $100,000 per annum.

Mr. President, that is the food-control act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there anything in that act which authorizes the President to give to any board on earth the power to determine whether the excess profits are excessive, and, if so, to say how they shall be distributed?

Mr. GRONNA. There is, and if the Vice President does not wish me to take the time to read it, I shall be glad to put it in the RECORD.

The President of the United States issued his proclamation covering all these points. There is in the law a provision authorizing the President to change it from one bureau to another bureau to coordinate it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. GRONNA. There is in the so-called Overman Act a clause, section 120, which I shall also put in the RECORD, authorizing the President to do this.

SEC. 120. Purchase or procurement of military supplies in time of actual or imminent war: The President in time of war or when war is imminent, is empowered, through the head of any department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

Compliance with all such orders for products or material shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual,

firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the Army, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition, or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of War, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of War, then, and in either such case, the President, through the head of any department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement herein provided for, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, to manufacture therein in time of war, or when war shall be imminent, such product or material as may be required, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and by a fine not exceeding $50,000.

The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just.

The Secretary of War shall also make, or cause to be made, a complete list of all privately owned plants in the United States equipped to manufacture arms or ammunition, or the component parts thereof. He shall obtain full and complete information regarding the kind of arms or ammunition, or the component parts thereof, manufactured or that can be manufactured by each such plant, the equipment in each plant, and the maximum capacity thereof. He shall also prepare, or cause to be prepared, a list of privately owned manufacturing plants in the United States capable of being readily transformed into ammunition factories, where the capacity of the plant is sufficient to warrant transforming such plant or plants into ammunition factories in time of war or when war shall be imminent; and as to all such plants the Secretary of War shall obtain full and complete information as to the equipment of each such plant, and he shall prepare comprehensive plans for transforming each such plant into an ammunition factory, or a factory in which to manufacture such parts of ammunition as in the opinion of the Secretary of War such plant is best adapted.

The President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to appoint a Board of Mobilization of Industries Essential for Military Preparedness, nonpartisan in character, and to take all necessary steps to provide for such clerical assistance as he may deem necessary to organize and coordinate the work hereinbefore described.

[Act approved Aug. 29, 1916.]

Section 2 of the act of May 20, 1918:

SEC. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any doubt about the Overman Act authorizing the President to change bureaus and combine them or do anything else.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have the Senator from North Dakota yield just a moment that I may have the attention of the Chair and also the attention of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I do not know whether this explanation was made here yesterday. I do not believe if he understands the facts as they were explained by a representative of the department that he will insist on the point of order, even if the point of order is good.

As I understand it, under the section the Senator from North Dakota has read a proclamation was issued by the President. The order was made and a license was granted to wool dealers to do the business they wanted to do under certain conditions stated in the license. One of those conditions was that they should not charge above a certain price in excess of what they had paid for the wool.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator explain where there was any authority to compel a man who was dealing in wool to obtain a license from the Federal Government?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there is any doubt but that the War Industries Board, under the proclamation of the President, has a right to license him as well as anybody else. Let me finish the explanation. They did it. They went into business, and instead of complying with their own agreement, so we were informed by a representative of the department, they charged excesive prices. They did not abide by their agreement. They charged in excess of what they had agreed to charge if they were permitted to do business, and did not comply with one of the conditions under which the license was granted to them. Some dealers did not do that. Some dealers kept their faith and complied with their agreement. Those who did not do so, of course, made an excessive profit and have kept the money.

Now, this is an appropriation to get after the fellows who violated their agreement, who made the excessive profit, and to get a return of those excess profits. I understand that is the object of this appropriation as it was explained by a representative of the department who was asking for the appropriation.

I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if I have stated it fairly and correctly.

Mr. GRONNA. That is absolutely in accordance with the way I understand the law.

Mr. NORRIS. So this money is appropriated for the purpose of getting from these men something that is in excess of the charges that they themselves agreed to make.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know what the testimony was before the committee, but I have always understood that this amount of money was for the purpose of closing up the account of the wool commission houses who handled the wool for the Government, receiving it direct from the wool producers. I rather think that $25,000 is the proper amount for Congress to appropriate. If the Senator's contention is that the law now gives the Bureau of Markets this power, then all that will be necessary would be to amend the bill by striking out all after the numerals "$35,000" or if it is to be amended to "$25,000" striking out all after "$25,000."

The Senator says they want this for the specific purpose of making the investigation. Then strike out the balance of the amendment, which confers this power upon the Bureau of Markets; and I say to the Senator frankly I believe it is general legislation. I do not believe that section 5 of the pure-food act gives the authority as defined in the amendment, but in order that they may go on with the work it does seem to me that by striking out all after the numerals "$35,000" there would be no necessity for my colleague to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. It is possibly true that from a legal point of view, and that is the sense in which we ought to consider it so far as the point of order is concerned, the Senator from Utah is right; but I would dislike to see stricken out of the amendment the words he suggests be stricken out. Still I have no definite knowledge but that what he says is true. It reads:

The activities to be undertaken under this appropriation shall include the securing and auditing of accounts and records of all dealers, the further collection of excess profits, etc.

They ought to be given authority to audit these books in order to reach an intelligent conclusion as to just what the excess profits are.

I believe if the junior Senator from Utah would think of it for a moment, if I have it right, and all I have is what was laid before us by a representative of the department, he would see the necessity not only of the appropriation but all the language that follows it. We ought not to take away from the representatives of the Government the power to fully investigate and get at the real facts and find out what the profits are. If you only make the appropriation and strike out that language, it seems to me you would cripple them so that they would not be able to get at the truth.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let me get a little information. The Government fixed the price of wool for the woolgrowers. Is that true?

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Government fixed the price of wool for the wool dealers?

Mr. GRONNA. That is true. It had that right under the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And they collected more than the Government fixed as the price?

Mr. GRONNA. They collected more than the price fixed by the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And it is the scheme now to collect it back and give it to the woolgrowers?

Mr. GRONNA. That is the work intended to be done. A part of it has been done. Several thousand dollars have been paid back by the commission men, I will not say to the woolgrowers, but to those who shipped the wool. Of course, it was shipped in large quantities by dealers in wool.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The law which the Senator read was this, if I can understand the law: That the Government had a perfect right to fix the price for the woolgrowers, and did it; the Government had a perfect right to fix the price for the wool dealers, and did it; and the Government in this act furnished a penalty and punishment for the man who charged more.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As I see it, you are trying to change that.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And collect the money back; to turn this bureau into a court and take the money away from the Government and give it to the woolgrowers.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think the Chair has omitted one thing that it was represented to us they are trying to do. In the license granted to the dealer he agreed to this price, and that it would be returned. The Government has not gotten the profit. The Government has not any of the money.

Mr. GRONNA. The Government has none of the money.

Mr. NORRIS. No; the dealers sold it to somebody else. It is simply trying to make the wool dealers comply with the agreement which they made with the Government.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a little outside of the point of order, but the Chair would like to know why if it was collected from some man who used the wool the money should go back to the woolgrower rather than to the man from whom it was collected?

Mr. SMOOT. I wish also to call the Senator's attention to the fact that as far as the excess profits were concerned the Government would collect it.

Mr. NORRIS. This is not a tax which goes to the Government. The Internal-Revenue Bureau will not collect this tax. They may collect the percentage of excess profits that would go to the Government, but that is not what we are trying to do here.

Mr. SMOOT. All I was trying to do is to see if we could not amend the amendment so that a point of order could not lie against it. The Senator having the bill in charge says the existing law gives this same power, and therefore a point of order will not lie against it. If the existing law does give the power, why put the language in here? Why not strike it out and make only a straight appropriation? It seems to me that that is the way to get around it. Then there will be no question as to where the money goes, or any other question.

Mr. GRONNA. If I may have the attention of the Chair for just a few moments I will read the Executive order:

Whereas by Executive Order No. 2868, dated May 28, 1918, I established the War Industries Board, with the functions, duties, and powers outlined in my letter of March 4, 1918, to Bernard M. Baruch, its chairman, and now, by virtue of the armistice and approaching peace, it becomes desirable to provide for the dissolution of said board and for the termination of its activities in the manner hereinafter set forth.

Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Chief Executive and by virtue of the powers conferred upon me by the act of Congress entitled "An act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government," approved May 20, 1918, as well as by virtue of any and all other acts of Congress conferring authority upon me in the premises, do hereby order and direct—

That the War Industries Board and all divisions, sections, committees and subordinate bodies thereof shall terminate and dissolve on January 1, 1919, save and excepting:

1. That if the chairman finds that the proper performance of any duty duly intrusted to him or to the board requires the continuance in office of either himself, or of any member or members of the board or official or officials connected therewith, for a limited period after January 1, 1919, then the board and any such official or officials thereof may, in the discretion of the chairman, be continued for such limited period after January 1, 1919, as may be necessary for the performance of such duty, but in no event longer than the proclamation of peace. The appropriations of the War Industries Board shall be and continue available for any salaries and expenses incident to the performance of any such duty.

2. That the powers and functions of the Division of Planning and Statistics of the War Industries Board shall, on January 1, 1919, be transferred to and thereafter exercised by the War Trade Board. There shall be transferred and assigned to said War Trade Board such officials or employees of the War Industries Board, if any, as in the judgment of the chairmen of the said two boards may be necessary for the performance of the duties herein referred to, and also all papers, files, and records appertaining thereto, and the expenses incident to said duties shall be charged against and paid from the appropriations of the War Industries Board. Upon the completion of said duties the papers, files, and records aforesaid shall be disposed of as may be hereafter directed by me, and the powers and functions hereby transferred shall thereupon cease and be at an end.

3. That the powers and functions of the Wool Division of the War Industries Board, including particularly those relating to the payment by the dealers or buyers of any sums due by them in accordance with the "Government regulations for handling wool clip of 1918," as established by said board on May 21, 1918, and the disposition of such payments, shall, on January 1, 1919, be transferred to and thereafter exercised by the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture until such time as the affairs and duties of said division, uncompleted on said date, shall have been finally completed and wound up. There shall be transferred and assigned to said Bureau of Markets such officials or employees of the War Industries Board, if any, as, in the judgment of the chairman of the said board and the chief of said bureau, may be necessary for the performance of the duties herein referred to, and also all papers, files, and records appertaining thereto, and the expenses incident to said duties shall be charged against and paid from the appropriations of the War Industries Board. Upon the completion of said duties the papers, files, and records aforesaid shall be retransferred by the Bureau of Markets to the liquidating officer of the War Industries Board, and the powers and functions hereby transferred shall thereupon cease and be at an end.

4. That the powers and functions of the Price Fixing Committee of the War Industries Board shall continue until such of the prices already fixed by said committee, as will not expire on or before January 1, 1919, shall have expired, and the appropriations of the War Industries Board shall continue available for expenses incident to such continuance. Upon the expiration of all of such prices the papers, files, and records of said committee shall be delivered to the liquidating officer of the War Industries Board, and the powers and functions of the Price Fixing Committee shall thereupon cease and the committee shall be and stand dissolved.

5. That if any of the orders, directions, regulations, or functions of the board, or any of its divisions, committees, sections, or subordinate bodies (other than such as have heretofore been provided for in this order), can not, in the judgment of the chairman, be finally abrogated, released, complied with, or fulfilled with due regard to the interests involved before January 1, 1919, then the chairman shall designate the same to the War Trade Board, and the powers and functions now possessed by the War Industries Board with respect thereto shall, on January 1, 1919, be transferred to and thereafter exercised by the War Trade Board until such time as such orders, directions, regulations, or functions shall have been finally abrogated, released, complied with, or fulfilled. There shall be transferred and assigned to the War Trade Board such officials or employees of the War Industries Board, if any, as, in the judgment of the chairmen of the two boards, may be necessary for the performance of the duties herein referred to, and also all papers, files, and records appertaining thereto, and the expenses incident to said duties shall be charged against and paid from the appropriations of the War Industries Board. Upon the completion of said duties the papers, files, and records aforesaid shall be retransferred by the War Trade Board to the liquidating officer of the War Industries Board, and the powers and functions hereby transferred shall thereupon cease and be at an end.

6. That, except as hereinbefore provided, the War Industries Board shall continue after January 1, 1919, for the sole and only purpose of winding up its affairs, and of arranging, completing, indexing, and inventorying its papers, files, records, accounts, property, and effects, and of lawfully disposing of the same as soon as practicable and advisable; and for this purpose the chairman may appoint a liquidating officer, who shall have such powers as may be necessary for the proper performance of said work, including the right to submit the papers, files, records, and accounts of the board to inspection by those duly authorized or entitled to inspect them, and with power also, on behalf of the board, to continue and engage and pay such employees and to incur such expenses as may be necessary for the performance of the duties aforesaid; and also, on behalf of the board, through such disbursing officer as he may continue or employ, to draw upon the board's appropriations therefor, and also to draw upon such appropriations for any salaries, expenses, or obligations of the board due and unpaid on January 1, 1919, or thereafter incurred pursuant to this order.

This order shall be effective from its date, the 31st day of December, 1918.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
31 December, 1918.

The War Industries Board ceased to function on the 1st day of January, 1919. It is out of existence. The President has transferred the duties of the War Industries Board to the Bureau of Markets. The Bureau of Markets has functioned in accordance with the proclamations and orders issued under authority of law; first, under section 5 of the food-control act, under the so-called act of national defense, section 120, which gives the President specific authority, and under the Overman Act. It seems to me, Mr. President, that this amendment can not be subject to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not seem to be understood. If there is a law now that authorizes any department of the Government to collect excess profits, as provided in the regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 and distributing such excess profits to the individual growers of the wool upon which the profits were made, then this provision is wholly unnecessary. If there is no such provision, if it is not general legislation the Chair does not know what general legislation is.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from Utah what portion of the amendment he proposes to strike out?

Mr. SMOOT. All after the numerals "$35,000"; in other words, to strike out the following:

The activities to be undertaken under this appropriation shall include the securing and auditing of accounts and records of all dealers, the further collection of excess profits as provided in the regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, and, so far as practicable, the distribution of such excess to the individual growers of the wool upon which such profits were made—

And so forth, down to and including the words "wool clip of 1918," in line 7 on page 90. In other words, this simply means an appropriation direct for the carrying on of the very work that the War Industries Board was doing before under the law the Senator says now exists.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The appropriation proper is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I said.

Mr. GRONNA. Then, rather than take the chances of having the whole paragraph go out, I will consent to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 89, line 20, after the numerals "$35,000," and after the period, strike out the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 7 on page 90.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. I believe that disposes of the committee amendments.

Mr. GRONNA. I have some verbal amendments here which I wish to offer. The total here should be corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be understood that the Secretary has power to correct totals.

Mr. GRONNA. On page 4, line 18, I move to strike out the word "office" and insert in lieu the word "bureau."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. On page 5, line 6, I move to strike out the word "Office" and insert the word "Bureau," so as to read "Bureau of Farm Management" in the heading.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. On page 29, line 13, after the numerals "$103,200," I move to strike out:

Provided, That $9,000 of said amount shall be available for the investigation and improvement of the pecan, and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment has been already agreed to, and this will necessitate a reconsideration of the vote.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that it be reconsidered.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge in view of the prohibition law why the committee——

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator wait until we complete these amendments?

Mr. KING. It is a part of the amendment under consideration. I ask the Senator why the provision for $20,000 "for investigating and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages"——

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that the committee felt that the Federal Government should assist the grape growers of the country in adjusting themselves to the new conditions. I am sure the Senator from Utah will agree with me that $20,000 is a very small amount compared with the amount that will be paid to the entire country in having the change.

Mr. PHELAN. I will say it is done at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; it is.

Mr. PHELAN. While I am on my feet I wish to ask the chairman of the committee why he eliminates the item of $9,000 proposed to be made available "for the investigation and improvement of the pecan, and methods of growing, harvesting, packing, and shipping the same"?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that the department felt there should be no such limitation on that provision.

Mr. PHELAN. Then the pecan interest will not suffer by the change?

Mr. GRONNA. No; it will not.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. On page 60, line 21, in the committee amendment already agreed to, at the end of the line, I move to strike out the period and insert a semicolon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote by which the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered and that change will be made, without objection.

Mr. GRONNA. The next amendment is simply a transposition. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 104 it is proposed to change the position of the paragraph, beginning in line 3 and ending in line 15, by inserting the same paragraph on page 103, after line 7.

Mr. GRONNA. That simply transfers the paragraph to another place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

For biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof, including investigations of the physiological effect of such products on the human organism, $15,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the very subject matter of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is under the Public Health Bureau, and an appropriation has been made for it. I do not know whether the appropriation is in this bill or not.

Mr. NORRIS. The appropriation was in the bill as we reported it to the Senate in the last Congress, and by inadvertence it was left out of this bill. I am familiar with what is being done with the appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator think it would be a duplication of the item?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that the Public Health Service has received appropriations for years and years for this very work.

Mr. NORRIS. This appropriation is used to a large extent, for instance, for the purpose of making experiments and chemical analyses of feeding material for stock. It is purely a scientific proposition which is entirely handled by the chemists of the department. They have made great advances in a great many lines even with this small appropriation. The only objection I have to it is that it is too small to really do the work which they have in hand.

The feeders of the country, those who are feeding cattle and hogs, get a great deal of information from the bulletins which are issued as the result of this particular investigation.

Mr. SMOOT. If it applies only in that direction, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall be perfectly willing to let the matter go to conference.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not offering this amendment merely because I desire to have it pass the Senate. The Senator from North Dakota knows that I desire that it shall remain in the bill and become a law.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course.

Mr. NORRIS. There is not an item in the bill, as far as agriculture is concerned, considering the amount of money that is involved, that is of any more importance to the farmer, or out of which he gets more good, than out of this particular item. The same is also true as to the feeder of live stock.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I understand this item was left out of the bill through an oversight?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. It is not found in the bill as reported from the committee, because nobody brought the matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. McLEAN. It is a matter apparently of great interest to those residing in my section of the country. I think I have received as many requests to endeavor to secure a reinstatement of this appropriation in the bill as any other appropriation in it. I hope that the chairman of the committee will be able to keep it in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

For collecting and distributing by telegraph, mail, and otherwise on the supply, demand, commercial movement, disposition, quality, and market price of peanuts, and its products, $12,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to say, in connection with this amendment, that I have talked to the chairman of the committee about it. The peanut is the only product in reference to which the growers of the article can not get the market conditions. The peanut industry is not a small industry. From one hundred to two hundred million dollars of peanut products are annually produced in this country. Its products include both oil and butter. All we ask is that the growers of peanuts in seven or eight States be furnished the same information as to their product that is given as to butter, tobacco, and other products. For $12,000 the department state they can furnish this information to the peanut growers.

When our peanut growers produce their product the large buyers insist there is a large product in Japan, in China, and in

Spain, and consequently the peanut producers in this country are at their mercy, for they are not able to get information such as is furnished relative to other agricultural crops. All that the people interested in this industry desire is that they shall have the same privilege of knowing the market conditions and the prices as have the producers of other agricultural products. The chairman of the committee and other members of the committee have stated that they thought this industry ought to have the same privilege which has been extended to other agricultural interests.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say a word, the two Senators from North Carolina spoke to me about the importance of having appropriated a fund sufficient to give the market reports as to this particular industry. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that it is a very important industry. We produced last year some 56,000,000 bushels of peanuts. It is an important article of food; it is used in many different ways; and I myself am ignorant as to many purposes for which it is being used. It has, however, become a staple article of food. I stated to the Senators from North Carolina that it was my belief that this matter would be taken care of in the appropriation of $317,000 which is to be expended under the Bureau of Markets. I have since found that it is not there taken care of. I took the matter up with the department, and the department suggested a much larger expenditure than the amount which is now proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I want to say a word for the peanut, my friend from North Dakota having yielded to me for a moment.

One of the greatest health institutions of this country, the Battle Creek (Mich.) Sanitarium, which is conducted by Dr. Kellogg, puts that product as one of the highest in nutrition and one of the best in all respects as an article of food. It is a perfect substitute for meat. The people all over this country are crying out about the high price of meat, and with much cause, and that product, grown in I do not know how many of the Southern States, is a perfect substitute in the chemistry of digestion for meat. It is wholesome; it is palatable; and it ought to receive at the hands of this Government all of the encouragement that can be given to it.

There is a paltry little sum involved in this proposed amendment, and while voting our billions for other things here we ought not to stickle over this.

The peanut is a cheap product, a wholesome product, a perfect substitute for an expensive product. It furnishes in a well-balanced ration the elements that are demanded by the human system; and if this Government can do anything to encourage the people who are engaged in its production, it ought to do it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like also to say that this is exactly similar language to that which is used as to the furnishing of market conditions for other industries; it is an exact copy.

I should like also to say in addition that the department assured me that it is impossible for them to furnish these market conditions and inform farmers how to plant and how to sell without such information as would be furnished by this appropriation. At present the great buyers insist that there is a big crop, as I before stated, in Japan, in China, and in Spain, and consequently the peanut grower, not having knowledge, will be compelled to sell at a low price. All that is asked for this industry, which is growing rapidly—it is doubling and trebling each year—is that it shall have the market reports which are furnished to other agricultural interests.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish merely to say a word in behalf of the peanut growers. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is correct. Peanuts, I think, are not grown in very many States of the Union, but in a few States of the Union the peanut is a very important product. In certain counties of my State it is probably the most important agricultural crop that is grown outside of cotton and possibly tobacco. The production of peanuts in this country is rapidly increasing, and it is really becoming a very important industry, viewed from a national standpoint. Last year it is estimated that the value of the peanut crop in this country was $100,000,000. That is no inconsiderable sum when you consider the small area in which it is possible to grow these nuts.

Mr. President, the real trouble about the situation is this: The peanut growers have no way of ascertaining the amount of the crop. The only people who know anything about the size of the crop—and, of course, the size of the crop to some extent regulates the price of the product—are the buyers of peanuts. Peanuts are bought not by retail, not by the great number of people who consume them, but, in the first instance, they are bought up by great dealers. They are used for the purpose, first, of extracting the oil; a large portion of the product is devoted to the production of certain valuable oils, and only a very insignificant part of the peanut crop is eaten by the people or is used in the making of candy; its chief use is in the manufacture of oil. Of course, the by-product is a very valuable food product. Nobody knows under the present situation the amount of the crop raised in this country and in the world except the dealers in peanuts; and, for the purpose of depressing the price, misrepresentations are made—and they obtain without contradiction, because there is no means of contradicting them—as to the quantity of peanuts produced in this and in other countries.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has alluded to the fact that it is very important to know the amount of peanuts grown in foreign countries for the purpose of determining what ought to be the price of peanuts. It is equally important to know the quantity of peanuts grown in this country and used for the purposes for which they are put on the market. That is difficult of ascertainment and requires a degree and character of investigation that is not required with reference to any other agricultural product, and for this reason—and it will be apparent when I state it to the Senate that my statement is correct: Probably one-half of the peanut crop grown in the South—and I presume that is so everywhere else in this country where they are grown—is never harvested for the purpose of being placed upon the market, but the peanuts are sown in order to serve as a food for hogs. The hogs are turned into the field; they root up the peanuts, which are better than corn, and better than anything else, except the soya bean, for the purpose of fattening hogs. So it is claimed that at least one-half of the peanuts that are grown in this country are never placed upon the market; but the estimates upon which the production in this country is based, when there are any estimates, are upon the known yield per acre, measuring all the acres that are sown to peanuts in the country. In order that there may be anything like a reliable ascertainment of the amount of peanuts put upon the market it is necessary to have investigations that will enable the Government officials or statisticians to segregate that part of the crop which is used for hog-raising purposes from that part of the crop which is used for merchantable purposes. Therefore, Mr. President, it has become of great importance to the peanut growers to have this information.

What reason is there why they should not have it? We provide in our appropriations—and I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill if I am not correct—for estimates as to the fruit crop of the country, do we not?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that we do.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do we not also make similar provision as to the vegetable crop of the country?

Mr. GRONNA. We do.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the case of nearly every other kind of a crop in the country we also provide for an estimate, but as to this important product, the part that is placed upon the market being valued at $100,000,000, and the part consumed in the fattening of hogs being equally as valuable, the entire crop being worth at least $200,000,000 to this country, we have no reliable estimates to help the farmer to ascertain whether or not he is even offered by the purchaser an adequate and compensatory price.

I desire also to say to the Senator in charge of the bill that I think it is equally important that the peanut growers should have the benefit of the market service that is afforded in the case of other agricultural products.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there is one word I should like to add to what the Senator from North Carolina has said. In the southern third of Alabama and of Georgia there is, perhaps, no crop that is found so valuable to the grower of cotton in the fight against the boll weevil as the peanut crop. The production in these two States is rapidly growing and is very large, although but a small portion of the crop is gathered and put upon the market. As the Senator from North Carolina has stated, it is used largely for the purpose of fattening hogs, which are turned into the fields and consume the peanuts in the ground, without the crop being gathered. Peanuts afford a splendid substitute in changing cultivation from cotton, so as to enable a successful fight against the boll weevil to be waged, the change leaving the boll weevil for the year the peanut is planted without any food upon which it can subsist, and in that way ridding sections, temporarily, at least, of the boll weevil, so that a better opportunity may be had the next year to cultivate cotton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. I have here a statement regarding the peanut industry, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the discussion on the amendment itroduced by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

The peanut industry of the United States has been growing very rapidly, until last year it reached the grand total of 56,000,000 bushels, valued at approximately $100,000,000. It is one of the crops that is being profitably used to replace cotton in the boll-weevil sections of the South. However, because of its very great food value, it is of peculiar importance to the consuming population of the entire country.

Despite its importance as a food and feed crop, it has long been neglected by the Government and by the agricultural agencies of the several States. There is no crop of the importance of the peanut that has had so little attention paid to it by Government agencies.

The industry has now reached a stage wnere it is absolutely necessary to have Government assistance, not only to insure its proper development but to maintain its present position.

The assistance that is most urgently needed is an accurate crop estimate and a market news service. The present form of crop estimates is being used to injure the grower and to depress the market. The conditions are such that a commercial crop estimate is absolutely essential. Of the greatly increased acreage in the Southern States it is estimated that over 50 per cent is used for forage, "hogging off" as it is called, and a great per cent of the rest is used for oil. Peanuts used for these purposes do not come in competition with peanuts which are marketed to be eaten as nuts.

However, the present crop estimates do not differentiate between these uses and therefore buyers use the estimates to beat down the market, insisting that all this great increase has to be handled by the manufacturers and that the big crop has knocked the bottom out of the market. What is needed is an estimate that will give us the actual marketable surplus, showing the amount used for forage, the amount used for oil, and the amount marketed as peanuts.

This matter has been taken up with Mr. Estabrook, chief of the Bureau of Crop Estimates, who informs us that it is impossible to take on more work under his present funds. He advises, however, that he could put on the desired service with an additional appropriation of $12,000 and that with the same machinery set up with this money could give commercial estimates on beans, cowpeas, soy beans, and velvet beans. These crops with peanuts aggregate a value of $250,000,000 and a commercial estimate on them would be of incalculable benefit to each crop.

Certainly the appropriation requested is most moderate in view of the value of the service. At present the Bureau of Crop Estimates has only $3,500 to be spent on all these crops, and of this amount only $700 is spent on peanuts.

The information furnished by a market news service is second in importance only to the crop estimates. At present there is no source of price information in regard to peanuts. The growers have to rely absolutely on what the buyer tells them the crop is worth. This creates a condition that is most discouraging and destructive to the industry. This condition would be remedied and the entire industry benefited by a market news service such as is now being rendered on fruits and vegetables by the Bureau of Markets. We are advised by the Bureau of Markets that an appropriation of $25,000 would enable them to set up a market news service station which would furnish the desired information.

It is felt that in view of the fact that the Government had done very little for the industry so far, that peanuts have rapidly grown in importance, that the service is badly needed and costs very little, the Congress should come to our relief and give us this assistance at its present session.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I ask the Secretary to read the notice and amendment which I have heretofore submitted.

The SECRETARY. Mr. PHELAN moves to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI, in order that he may propose to the bill the following amendment:

That the act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products, and for other purposes,'" be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That after June 30, 1919, until the conclusion of the present war, and thereafter until the termination of demobilization, the date of which shall be determined and proclaimed by the President of the United States, for the purpose of conserving the man power of the Nation, and to increase the efficiency in the production of arms, munitions, ships, food, and clothing for the Army and Navy, it shall be unlawful to sell for beverage purposes any distilled spirits, and during said time no distilled spirits held in bond shall be removed therefrom for beverage purposes except for export. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, in regard to the manufacture and sale of distilled spirits and removal of distilled spirits held in bond after June 30, 1919, until this act shall cease to operate, for other than beverage purposes. After the approval of this act no distilled liquors shall be imported into the United States during the continuance of the present war and period of demobilization: *Provided*, That this provision against importation shall not apply to shipments en route at the time of the passage of this act.

"Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions shall be punished by imprisonment not exceeding one year or by fine not exceeding $1,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the object of the amendment is to repeal part of the war-time prohibition provision so as to authorize the manufacture and sale of wine and beer pursuant to the recommendation of the President recently made to Congress in the following words:

The demobilization of the military forces of the country has progressed to such a point that it seems to me entirely safe now to remove the ban upon the manufacture and sale of wines and beers, but I am advised that without further legislation I have not the legal authority to remove the present restrictions. I therefore recommend that the act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products,' and for other purposes," be amended or repealed in so far as it applies to wines and beers.

This is a subject with which the Senate is familiar, and, therefore, I will content myself with saying that the war is over; that demobilization has practically been completed; and there is no reasonable excuse for Congress to persist in its invasion of the rights of the States which, when there is no war, absolutely and exclusively control the subject of sumptuary legislation. The people regard it as a trespass upon their rights; there is a great deal of unrest and discontent by reason of this denial of a constitutional right, and, since the President has seen fit to recommend the legislation to Congress, it is well worth the consideration of Congress.

I would not say that spirituous liquors are without their injurious effects, but what I am pleading for here is beverage beer and wine. I was gratified to read in the proceedings of the Allied Medical Association of America in yesterday's papers as follows:

NEW YORK, *June 16.*

The Allied Medical Association of America, comprising all the various schools of medicine in the country, to-day adopted a resolution at the convention here declaring that properly brewed lager beer was absolutely essential in the treatment of certain cases and favoring the manufacture of beer containing not to exceed 2¾ per cent of alcohol. Light wine, if pure, was indorsed as beneficial in certain medical cases.

The resolution declared that "2¾ per cent beer" was not only beneficial to humanity at large when drunk in moderation, but also admirably adapted as a substitute for stronger alcoholic drinks and as a variant for many kinds of so-called soft drinks.

The resolution presented by Dr. L. M. Ottofy, of St. Louis, declared that many of the soft drinks on the market "can not be recommended without reservations." The continued use of light wines, he urged, would, in a measure, "prevent the increased use of narcotics."

Here is a beverage which is beneficial in cases of sickness, a beverage generally used by the people, especially those who work; in fact, the only beverage many of them have. It has been very properly urged that, under our liberal laws, those who can afford it have stored wines to serve them during their entire life, whereas the poor man, the mechanic and the laborer, not having the ability to invest in beer and wine, is practically denied the privilege which the more opulent enjoy, because there is no law, so far as I know, against the storage of these beverages.

Mr. Elihu Root has declared the law unconstitutional, and Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, president of Johns Hopkins University, is reported in the Morning Post as follows:

A stand against the prohibition of wines and beer by Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, president of Johns Hopkins University, and his urging of a repeal of the law is being discussed by antiprohibitionists. Dr. Goodnow's opinion bears much weight in all quarters, for while not a prohibitionist, he is regarded as an advocate of temperance and an authority on constitutional government.

Dr. Goodnow said it was his opinion that the prohibition clause as it is written in the Constitution is most unwise.

"It marks a new departure from our established order of things, for it is the first time in the history of the Nation 'thou shalt not' has been written in the Federal Constitution," he said.

This reference is to the constitutional amendment.

I beg to remind the Senate that in January next year the constitutional prohibition amendment, so drastic and so revolutionary, will doubtless go into effect, unless the Supreme Court establishes the rule of the referendum. That makes it all the more reasonable why we should request that war-time prohibition, which begins on July 1, be not allowed to go into operation.

California produces about 50 per cent of all the hops grown in the United States and probably 85 per cent of the wine crop. The growers of wine in my State—and the same is true of the manufacturers of beer—will be denied by a law whose constitutionality is questioned the right to engage in this industry. At a time when there is a general concurrence of sentiment in favor of the repeal of war-time prohibition, at a time when the President of the United States sees fit to recommend action by Congress, it seems unreasonable that we should persist in the enforcement of this law. It should be promptly repealed. The grape growers and the hop raisers have for many, many years received every encouragement from the Government and the Agricultural Department. They have perfected their product. The wine of California has attained a great degree of excellence, and now the industry is ruined by the constitutional amendment; but if this war-time prohibition is now repealed by Congress these men will have the opportunity of realizing on this year's crop, which would in a small measure compensate for the labors of their lifetime.

There has been no proposal here to compensate these men for the destruction of their property by law. I do not know why such a proposal was not made; largely, I believe, because it

would perhaps extend into the retailing and the wholesaling of wines and liquors. I have in mind the legitimate producers, the men of the farm and the vineyard. Because this is an industry which is licensed, I believe it has been held that it is wholly within the discretion of the States to deny them the privilege of doing business at any time without notice and without compensation. But what of the vineyardist and the hop grower? The farmer has always been an object—the wheat farmer, particularly, in this Congress—of careful solicitude, and there is no reason why the hop grower and the wine grower in this instance should not receive the same consideration. By repealing the law now you will in a small measure compensate them for their loss.

I therefore move, pursuant to the recommendation of the President, that the rule of the Senate be suspended by which matters embracing general legislation are forbidden to be engrafted upon an appropriation bill, in order that the question may squarely come before the Senate for action.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the speech of the Senator from California convinces me that this question will lead to interminable debate; and I therefore move to lay his motion on the table.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I ask the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota moves to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. PHELAN. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALDER (when Mr. GERRY's name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. I understand that if present he would vote "nay." I will therefore let my vote in the negative stand.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I inquire if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have a general pair with that Senator which I transfer to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair I have with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. May I inquire if the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with that Senator, and am therefore compelled to withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer the pair which I have with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], and vote "nay."

Mr. HARDING. Because of the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I am obliged to withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. McLEAN (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. In his absence I withdraw my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are necessarily detained on public business.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY].

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—55.

Ball	Harris	McNary	Sheppard
Beckham	Harrison	Moses	Sherman
Borah	Henderson	Nelson	Simmons
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Smith, Ga.
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Smoot
Curtis	Kendrick	Nugent	Spencer
Dial	Kenyon	Overman	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Swanson
Fernald	Kirby	Phipps	Trammell
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Poindexter	Warren
Gronna	McCumber	Pomerene	Wolcott
Hale	McKellar	Robinson	

NAYS—11.

Calder	King	Phelan	Wadsworth
Edge	Knox	Reed	Williams
France	La Follette	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—30.

Ashurst	Gerry	Martin	Stanley
Bankhead	Gore	Myers	Sterling
Brandegee	Harding	Owen	Townsend
Colt	Hitchcock	Penrose	Underwood
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Kellogg	Shields	Watson
Fall	Lodge	Smith, Md.	
Gay	McLean	Smith, S. C.	

So Mr. PHELAN's motion was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment of the Senator from California, I ask to have read the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Atlanta, Ga., June 16, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM J. HARRIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that the public press is quoted as saying that organized labor demands that we shall have wine, beer, etc.: Be it

Resolved, That the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Georgia Lodge, No. 866, of Atlanta, Ga., wishes to go on record that we are not in favor of manufacturing any kind of a beverage that contains alcohol in any quantity, and that we urge our United States Senators and Congressman from this district to vote and use their influence against any and all measures looking to this end.

Trusting that you will be victorious in this fight and wishing you much success, we are, yours, for prohibition,

GEORGIA LODGE, No. 866.
P. H. HUTCHINSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice which I gave some days ago, I move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate; and I make that motion in order that I may offer the following amendment:

That at and after 2 o'clock ante meridian on Sunday, October 26, 1919, next, the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, be, and the same hereby is, repealed.

Upon the motion to suspend the rules I do not care to take the time of the Senate, nor do I think it necessary to argue the merits of the amendment which I propose to offer, further than to say that the act which it seeks to repeal was adopted as a part of the war-time legislation; that it never went before the people of this country for consideration by them in any election; that as a consequence they have had no opportunity to indicate that they were willing to accept the radical changes in time which that legislation imposed upon them; and that therefore, Mr. President, we ought to have an opportunity to present this amendment and have it passed upon by the Senate and by the House of Representatives.

All that I am asking up to this point is that the rule be suspended and that an opportunity be given to present the amendment, and, if there is opposition to it, to discuss its merits.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the bill which it is proposed to repeal by this amendment has been the law for nearly two years. Before it was enacted hearings were had upon it before a committee of this body, and those for and against the measure were given the opportunity of expressing their views. I protest that an effort to repeal a law of such great importance to the people of the country ought not to be undertaken on an appropriation bill. Several bills on the subject have been introduced and referred to appropriate committees. Hearings can be had in an orderly way; the opponents and proponents of the legislation can be heard; and then, after a thorough and complete investigation of the advantages and disadvantages of the

law, the matter can be determined by a committee and then by the Senate.

Like the Senator from Wisconsin, I am not going to discuss the matter further. I believe every Senator here knows what the passage of this rider means. It affects every individual in the land. In my judgment the daylight-saving law has been a boon to the people of the country, and if it is repealed the people generally will be sorely disappointed.

I sincerely trust that the Senator's motion will not prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have here a short amendment to which I am sure there will be no objection. Would the Senator mind my offering it now?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will state to the Senator from Arizona that I have an amendment pending.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I thought there would be objection to that. If there is none, of course I do not want to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think we can have a vote on the question of suspending the rules at once, without further debate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall paragraph 3 of Rule XVI be suspended in order to enable the Senator from Wisconsin to introduce the amendment which has been read to a general appropriation bill? The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. DILLINGHAM's name was called). I desire to announce the absence on business of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. He has a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I am advised of the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with whom I have a general pair, and therefore am obliged to withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer as on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his named was called). Announcing the same transfer that I announced on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and being unable to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhole Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with regard to my pair and its transfer that I made on the previous roll call, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STERLING. I have already announced my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. Upon inquiry I find that that Senator would vote the same way that I shall vote; hence, I am at liberty to vote. I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. If that Senator were present, he would vote "nay" on this motion. I will therefore let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY].

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business.

The roll call resulted—yeas 46, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Ball	Johnson, S. Dak.	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Cummins	Kendrick	Nelson	Spencer
Curtis	Kenyon	Norris	Stanley
Dial	Keyes	Nugent	Sterling
Fall	King	Overman	Swanson
Fernald	Kirby	Phelan	Trammell
Fletcher	Knox	Pomerene	Wadsworth
France	La Follette	Reed	Warren
Gronna	Lenroot	Sheppard	Wolcott
Harris	McCormick	Sherman	
Harrison	McCumber	Simmons	

NAYS—20.

Calder	Henderson	Page	Smoot
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Thomas
Elkins	McNary	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	New	Poindexter	Watson
Hale	Newberry	Robinson	Williams

NOT VOTING—30.

Ashurst	Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gay	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gerry	Martin	Sutherland
Borah	Gore	Myers	Townsend
Brandegee	Harding	Owen	Underwood
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Ransdell	
Culberson	Kellogg	Shields	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion to suspend this paragraph of the rules the yeas are 46, the nays are 20; so the motion prevails, and the amendment is in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment, to come in at the end of the bill, just before the last two lines:

That at and after 2 o'clock ante meridian on Sunday, October 26, 1919, next, the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. LA FOLLETTE called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I voted against the motion to suspend the rule. I did so because I am opposed generally to suspending this particular rule. I do not believe in the practice of suspending rules under ordinary circumstances, and this, to my mind, is a very important and salutary rule. In the next place, I am advised that the House has just passed a measure which does carry out the purpose of the amendment now offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I thought it much better to have the substance of the amendment enacted into law in the regular way than to suspend the rule. I voted against the suspension of the rule, but, of course, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I voted against suspending the rule, because, as I have stated time and time again, I intend to vote against the suspension of rules unless it is a question which involves the very life of the country. I shall vote for the amendment offered, but I voted not to suspend the rule, because of the position which I have taken ever since I have been in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, like the Senator from New Mexico, I voted against the motion to suspend the rule, because I do not think it good policy to be suspending rules to accomplish the purpose, but I am emphatically in favor of God's time as against the idea of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. I am inclined to think this whole thing is a reflection upon the intelligence of the American manufacturing capital and the proletariat engaged in manufacturing. They could just as easily agree to go to work an hour earlier or an hour later as any other agreement could be entered into by anybody at any time. They are intelligent enough to do it. I never saw any particular reason why the farm labor of the United States should be subjected to the annoyance and trouble and worry of this legislation.

I am, furthermore, opposed to the Senate and Congress undertaking to usurp not only all the functions of the Government of the United States, dual in their character, State and Federal, but undertaking to usurp the function of God Almighty Himself and to fix the time when the sun shall rise and set and when it shall be at the meridian.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] and withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as on the former vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. DIAL (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). If my colleague were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and also announcing that I am informed he would vote the same way I am about to vote on this question, and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as when we last voted, and I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] on official business. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—56.

Ball	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Kendrick	New	Smoot
Cummins	Kenyon	Norris	Spencer
Curtis	Keyes	Nugent	Stanley
Dial	King	Overman	Sterling
Fall	Kirby	Phelan	Swanson
Fletcher	Knox	Pittman	Trammell
France	La Follette	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Gronna	Lenroot	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Harris	McCormick	Reed	Warren
Harrison	McCumber	Sheppard	Watson
Henderson	McKellar	Sherman	Williams
Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Simmons	Wolcott

NAYS—6.

Calder	Newberry	Phipps	Robinson
Frelinghuysen	Page		

NOT VOTING—34.

Ashurst	Elkins	Kellogg	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Fernald	Lodge	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gay	McLean	Sutherland
Brandegee	Gerry	Martin	Thomas
Chamberlain	Gore	Myers	Townsend
Colt	Hale	Owen	Underwood
Culberson	Harding	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Hitchcock	Ransdell	
Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Shields	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment, without going through the formality of offering an amendment, simply to state in explanation of the date which I wrote into the amendment which has just been adopted that I think it is a great injustice to the people of the country that they should be compelled to submit to this distortion in time until next October. As I introduced the bill, which I requested to have sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was finally incorporated in the appropriation bill in the form in which it was reported, I provided for the immediate repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. I think it should be repealed at once, but I was led to believe, Mr. President, that if I offered the amendment in that form, under the provision requiring a vote of two-thirds of the Senate to suspend the rule, I would not be able to get it through. Therefore I gave notice of a motion to suspend the rule, and offered the amendment with the date fixed at the last Sunday in October.

I merely wish to enter this explanation in the RECORD as a part of this legislation. I refrained from making the statement before the vote was taken because I did not want to protract the debate, lest we might lose a quorum, owing to the lateness of the hour.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the amendment just agreed to add a new paragraph, as follows:

That the field employees of the Department of Agriculture shall have 30 days' leave of absence in each year, and under the same terms as is now allowed practically to all other Government employees.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have little, if anything, to say in regard to the amendment, as it explains itself. I have simply attempted to put these field agents or laborers under the same provision as applies to the great majority, if not all, other employees in the Federal service. I have nothing further to say in support of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 104, after line 2, insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to all nations of the world interested in the manufacture or raising of cotton to appoint delegates or representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1919: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted for the expenses of such delegates or for any other expenses incurred in connection with said conference.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I offer the following amendment as a new section to be added at the end of the bill:

That no person employed under any provision herein which carries a lump-sum appropriation shall be paid at a rate in excess of $2,500 per annum.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I have not had time to examine into the merits of this amendment. I shall not object to letting it go to conference, but I will not agree, of course, to keep it in the bill unless we find that it has real merit.

Mr. KING. That is all I ask the Senator to do. I would like to add this before action is taken: In examining the various pages of the bill I find millions of dollars given in lump sums to be expended by some subordinate without any limitation or restriction whatever. The entire appropriation up to $10,000 could be paid to one individual. I think it is a very vicious and indefensible way of legislating. I say again, there are upon 15 or 20 pages of the bill appropriations aggregating perhaps one-third of the entire amount that are to be expended in this way, and it does seem to me if this amendment, which the Senator accepts, is not agreed upon in conference, some other amendment that will safeguard the interests of the Treasury and the people ought to be agreed upon by the conferees, and the same reported back to their respective Houses.

Mr. GRONNA. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to let the amendment go to conference and we will look into it as carefully as we possibly can.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. If I may have the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge, before I move to strike out the provision found on page 57 I would like to make an inquiry of him. Commencing with line 3 and terminating with line 5 the following provision is found:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizer, $31,340.

I want to say to the Senator that the Interior Department, the Bureau of Mines, and various other agencies of the Government have made extensive examinations with regard to potash and potash deposits and the question of fertilizers and have accumulated a great amount of data respecting those subjects. It seems to me this is a duplication. That work has been committed by former legislation to the Bureau of Mines. It is clearly within the jurisdiction of that branch of the public service, and I do not think it is wise legislation to enact the provision to which I have directed attention. If the Senator believes that it ought to remain in this bill, I may accede to his wishes, but I sincerely believe, with my present information, that this provision ought to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator. I do not know whether it is absolutely necessary or not to have this paragraph retained in the bill.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out all of lines 3, 4, and 5, on page 57.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for a division.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hitchcock	McKellar	Simmons
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smoot
Curtis	Kendrick	New	Spencer
Dial	Kenyon	Newberry	Stanley
Fall	Keyes	Norris	Sutherland
Fletcher	King	Nugent	Swanson
France	Kirby	Overman	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Phelan	Warren
Gronna	La Follette	Phipps	Watson
Harris	Lenroot	Pomerene	Williams
Harrison	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott
Henderson	McCumber	Sherman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is, Shall the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I desire to ask if we can not have an agreement, if there is to be a night sesion, that there will be nothing taken up except the District of Columbia appropriation bill?

Mr. CURTIS. So far as I am concerned, I will agree that nothing shall be taken up to-night except the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has consented that the unfinished business shall be temporarily laid aside so that we may proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. That is all the business which will be before the Senate to-night.

Mr. KENYON. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. With that understanding, I shall make no objection to the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, except amounts to pay the interest and sinking fund on the funded debt of said District, of which amounts one half is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, namely.

And insert:

That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, namely.

Mr. NUGENT. I move that the committee amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "General expenses," on page 2, line 22, after the word "government," to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400," so as to make the clause read:

Veterinary division: Veterinary surgeon for all horses in the departments of the District government, $1,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 1, after the word "storekeeper," to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400," so as to make the clause read:

Purchasing division: Purchasing officer, $3,000; deputy purchasing officer, $1,800; computer, $1,440; clerks—1 $1,800, 3 at $1,500 each, 6 at $1,200 each, 1 $1,100, 3 at $900 each, 7 at $840 each; storekeeper, $1,400; messenger, $600; driver, $600; inspectors—1 of materials $1,400, 2 at $900 each; 2 laborers, at $720 each; 2 property-yard keepers, at $1,000 each; temporary labor, $250.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee. On page 3, line 2, I move to strike out "$1,400" and insert "$1,800."

In connection with this amendment I desire to state that the man who has held this position has been a faithful servant of the Government for 20 years. He is the head of a family and for all these years he has received the salary of only $1,200. I feel that in justice to this man and in recognition of his faithful service the amendment to the amendment should be adopted giving him an increase of $400.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 11, after the word "necessary," to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,800," so as to make the clause read:

Building inspection division: Inspector of buildings, $3,000; assistant inspectors of buildings—principal $2,000, 1 $1,500, 1 $1,400, 10 at $1,200 each; fire-escape inspector, $1,400; temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors for such time as their services may be necessary, $1,800; civil engineers or computers—1 $2,000, 1 $1,500; clerks—chief $1,800; 1 $1,050, 1 $1,000, 1 (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter) $1,000, 1 $900; messenger, $600; assistant inspector $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed, from time to time, to prescribe a schedule of fees to be paid for inspecting passenger elevators and for inspecting hotels, public halls, moving-picture shows, theaters, and other places of amusement which are required to have annual licenses, and for inspecting buildings which are required by law to have fire escapes; and they are further authorized and directed to impose fees for all inspections or service to be performed by any public officer or employee of the District of Columbia under any law or regulation now in force or hereafter enacted, said fees to cover the cost and expense of such inspections or service; and a schedule of such fees shall be printed and conspicuously displayed in the office of the said commissioners, and said fees shall be paid to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia, and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of revenues of the District of Columbia and the United States in equal parts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the chairman of the committee explain this provision?

Mr. CURTIS. Up to a short time ago the District Commissioners fixed a fee for the examination of buildings, and that fee was paid for some time. Eventually the proprietors of the Willard Hotel contested the right of the District Commissioners under existing law to collect a fee for such an examination, and the court held that under existing law they had no right to do it. The hotels, theaters, and other buildings are examined to see whether or not they are safe, their elevators are examined, and it is no more than right that the examination should be paid for. This amendment simply authorizes the District Commissioners to fix a reasonable fee for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 14, after the word "office," to strike out "$124,190" and insert "$124,890," so as to make the clause read:

In all, executive office, $124,890.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 23, before "$900," to insert "storekeeper, $900," and in line 26, after the words "in all," to strike out "$40,100" and insert "$41,000," so as to make the clause read:

Care of District Building: Assistant superintendent, $2,000; chief engineer, $1,600; 3 assistant engineers, at $1,200 each; electrician, $1,400; 2 dynamo tenders, at $880 each; 4 firemen, at $840 each; 3 coal passers, at $600 each; electrician's helper, $880; 8 elevator conductors, at $600 each; laborers—2 at $660 each, 2 at $500 each; 2 chief cleaners (who shall also have charge of the lavatories), at $500 each; 33 cleaners, at $240 each; matron, $600; storekeeper, $900; chief watchman, $1,000; assistant chief watchman, $660; 8 watchmen, at $600 each; pneumatic-tube operator, $600; in all, $41,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 25, after "$900," to strike out "inspector, $1,200" and insert "2 inspectors, at $1,200 each," and on page 6, line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "$13,100" and insert "$14,300," so as to make the clause read:

License bureau: Superintendent of licenses (who shall also be secretary to the automobile board without additional compensation), $2,000; clerks—2 at $1,400 each, 2 at $1,200 each, 1 $1,000, 1 $900; 2 inspectors, at $1,200 each; inspector of licenses, $1,200; assistant inspector of licenses, $1,000; messenger, $600; in all, $14,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 7, before the word "bailiffs," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 8,

before the words "at $1,200 each," to strike out "eleven" and insert "thirteen"; and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "$48,420" and insert "$52,020," so as to make the clause read:

Collector's office: Collector, $4,000; deputy collector, $2,000; chief clerk, arrears division, $2,000; cashier, $1,800; 2 assistant cashiers, at $1,500 each; bookkeeper, $1,600; 4 bailiffs, at $1,200 each; clerks—4 at $1,400 each; 13 at $1,200 each; 4 at $1,000 each (including 1 transferred from assessor's office), 5 at $900 each, 1 $720; clerk and bank messenger, $1,200; 2 messengers, at $600 each; in all, $52,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 22, after "$1,500," to insert "seventh, $1,500," and in line 25, after the words "in all," to strike out "$21,920" and insert "$23,420," so as to make the clause read:

Office of corporation counsel: Corporation counsel, $4,500; assistants—first $3,000, second $2,500, third $2,000, fourth $1,800, fifth $1,500, sixth $1,500, seventh $1,500; clerk and stenographer, $1,400; stenographer and typewriter, $1,200; two stenographers, at $900 each; clerk, $720; in all, $23,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 12, to strike out:

Public Utilities Commission: For salaries (including inspector of gas and meters, $2,000; assistant inspectors of gas and meters—one $1,200, two at $900 each; messenger, $600); in all $33,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $4,000 per annum.

And insert:

Public Utilities Commission: Executive secretary, $4,000; accountant, $3,000; traffic engineer, $3,000; assistant accountant, $2,000; statistical clerk, $1,800; inspectors—one $1,800, one $1,600, one $1,400; inspector of gas and meters, $2,000; inspector of electric meters, $1,800; assistant inspectors—one $1,200, two at $900 each; clerks—two at $1,400 each, two at $100 per month each for seven months; two messengers, at $720 each; in all, $31.040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 5, after the word "necessary," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For incidental and all other general necessary expenses authorized by law, including the employment of expert services where necessary, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 6, after the word "Commission," to strike out "$53,000" and insert "$41,040," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Public Utilities Commission, $41,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 22, after the word "hire," to strike out "$300" and insert "$600," and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "$11,340" and insert "$11,640," so as to make the clause read:

Department of insurance: Superintendent of insurance, $3,500; deputy and examiner, $2,000; statistician, $1,700; clerks—1 $1,200, 2 at $900 each; stenographer, $840; temporary clerk hire, $600; in all, $11,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 23, after "$1,000," to strike out "1 $900, 7 at $840 each," and insert "8 at $900 each"; in line 25, before the word "each," to strike out "$720" and insert "$840"; on page 12, line 1, before the word "each," to strike out "$600" and insert "$720"; in the same line, after the word "copyist," to strike out "$600" and insert "$720"; in line 2, after the word "cataloguers," to strike out "1 $840, 1 $720, 2 at $600 each." and insert "4 at $840 each"; in line 4, after the word "one," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$720" and insert "$900"; in the same line, after "$900," to strike out "6 at $600 each, 5 at $540 each," and insert "11 at $720 each"; in line 6, after the word "collator," to strike out "$600" and insert "$720"; and in line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "$66,120" and insert "$70,840," so as to make the clause read:

Free Public Library, including Takoma Park branch: Librarian, $4,000; assistant librarian, $1,800; chief circulating department, $1,500; director of children's work, $1,500; director of reference work, $1,500; children's librarian, $1,000; supervisor of school work, $1,200; librarian's secretary, $1,000; Takoma Park branch librarian, $1,000; chiefs of divisions—order and accessions $1,200, industrial $1,200; reference librarian, $1,200; chief, catalogue department, $1,200; assistants—1 $1,000, 1 in charge of periodicals $1,000, 8 at $900 each, 7 (including 1 for the Takoma Park branch) at $840 each, 6 (including 1 for Takoma Park branch) at $720 each; copyist, $720; classifier, $900; shelf lister, $1,020; cataloguers—4 at $840 each; stenographers and typewriters—1 $1,000, 1 $840; attendants—1 $900, 11 at $720 each; collator, $720; 4 messengers, at $600 each; 10 pages, at $420 each; 4 janitors, at $600 each, 1 of whom shall act as night watchman; janitor at Takoma Park branch, $480; engineer, $1,200; fireman, $720; workman, $600; library guard, $720; 2 cloakroom attendants, at $360 each; 6 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $70,840.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to correct the total.

The SECRETARY. On page 12, line 12, make the total "$70,960."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. To save time I ask that the clerks at the desk be authorized to correct the totals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses," on page 15, line 25, after the word "division," to insert "assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division," and on page 16, line 3, after the word "officer," to insert "chief of the bureau of preventable diseases," so as to make the clause read:

Telephones may be maintained in the residences of the superintendent of the water department, sanitary engineer, chief inspector of the street-cleaning division, assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division, inspector of plumbing, secretary of the Board of Charities, health officer, assistant health officer, chief of the bureau of preventable diseases, chief engineer of the fire department, superintendent of police, electrical inspector in charge of the fire-alarm system, one fire-alarm operator, and two fire-alarm repair men, under appropriations contained in this act. The commissioners may connect any or all of these telephones to either the system of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co. or the telephone system maintained by the District of Columbia, as in their judgment may be most economical to the District.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 9, after the word "bodies," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,225," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and maintenance, hire of livery, of means of transportation for the coroner's office and the morgue, jurors' fees, witness fees, removal of deceased persons, making autopsies, ice, disinfectants, telephone service, and other necessary supplies for the morgue, and the necessary expenses of holding inquests, including stenographic services in taking testimony, and photographing unidentified bodies, $6,225.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 8, to insert:

For rent of offices of the recorder of deeds, to be expended under the direction of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 2, after the word "fire," to strike out "the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $10,000 made for the fiscal year 1919 is reappropriated and continued available during the fiscal year 1920," and insert "$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For repair of buildings owned and used by the District of Columbia, when injured by fire, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 3, to insert:

Office of the assessor: For lithographing and binding office maps, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Improvements and Repairs," on page 20, line 21, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$220,000," so as to make the clause read:

Assessment and permit work: For assessment and permit work, including maintenance of motor vehicles, $220,000; and any unexpended balance of the appropriation contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 for assessment and permit work, streets, is reappropriated and made available for the same purposes during the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 9, to insert:

Northwest: For paving Euclid Street, University Place to Columbia Road, 30 feet wide, $33,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 11, to insert:

Northwest: For grading and improving Connecticut Avenue, Pierce Mill Road to Chappell Road, $39,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 13, to insert:

Northwest: For paving Georgia Avenue, Buchanan Street to Military Road, 60 feet wide, $122,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to insert:

Northwest: For paving Connecticut Avenue, Chappell Road to Chevy Chase Circle, 60 feet wide, $136,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 17, to insert:

Northeast: For paving Eleventh Street, H Street to Maryland Avenue, 32 feet wide, $17,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "$282,300" and insert "$629,300"; so as to make the clause read:

In all, $629,300, to be disbursed and accounted for as "Street improvements" and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "buildings," to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$20,000"; so as to make the clause read:

For construction and repair of sidewalks and curbs around public reservations and municipal and United States buildings, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 3, to insert:

In view of an urgent necessity for laying a concrete roadway on Howard Road from Nichols Avenue to a point 1,600 feet westward therefrom in the month of November, 1918, at a cost double the average cost of laying such roadways, one-fourth of the cost of said work shall be assessed against abutting property in lieu of one-half of such costs as provided by existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Sewers," on page 28, line 7, after the word "sewers," to insert "including the purchase of one motor field wagon at not to exceed $2,000, and the maintenance of motor vehicles," so as to make the clause read:

For suburban sewers, including the purchase of one motor field wagon at not to exceed $2,000, and the maintenance of motor vehicles, $110,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 9, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation for suburban sewers, 1917, is reappropriated and continued available for the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 19, to insert:

Appropriations contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 for "sewers," namely: "For main and pipe sewers and receiving basins," "For suburban sewers," and "For assessment and permit work, sewers," are made available also for the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Streets," on page 30, line 6, after the word "expenses," to strike out: "$621,000" and insert "$656,000," and in line 7, after the word "*Provided*," to strike out "That any proceeds received from the disposal of city refuse or garbage shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States and the District of Columbia in parts: *Provided further*," so as to make the clause read:

Disposal of city refuse: To enable the commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, dead animals, night soil, and miscellaneous refuse and ashes in the District of Columbia, including inspection and allowance to inspectors for maintenance of horses and vehicles or motor vehicles used in the performance of official duties, not to exceed $25 per month for each inspector for horse-drawn vehicles, $30 per month for automobiles, and $15 per month for motorcycles; fencing of public and private property designated by the commissioners as public dumps; and incidental expenses, $656,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels, places of business, large apartment or boarding houses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Electrical Department," on page 33, line 19, after the word "items," to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

For placing wires of fire-alarm, telegraph, police-patrol, and telephone service underground in existing conduits, including cost of cables, terminal boxes, and posts, connections to and between existing conduits, manholes, handholes, posts for fire-alarm and police boxes, extra labor, and other necessary items, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 24, after the word "items," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to make the clause read:

For extension and relocation of police-patrol system, including purchase of new boxes, purchase and erection of necessary poles, cross arms, insulators, pins, braces, wire, cable, conduit connections, posts, extra labor, and other necessary items, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 23, after the word "items," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000," so as to make the clause read:

For extension and relocation of fire-alarm system, including purchase of new boxes, purchase and erection of necessary poles, cross arms, insulators, pins, braces, wire, cable, conduit connections, posts, extra labor, and other necessary items, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public schools," on page 36, line 1, after the word "years," to insert:

Provided, That an employee transferred from another position in the service of the Board of Education to the position of assistant principal of the Central High School shall not suffer a decrease of salary by such transfer.

So as to make the clause read:

Assistant principal of the Central High School, $1,800: *Provided*, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of $1,800 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of $100 per annum for five years: *Provided*, That an employee transferred from another position in the service of the Board of Education to the position of assistant principal of the Central High School shall not suffer a decrease of salary by such transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 16 on page 37.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to offer what was really an amendment overlooked by the committee. It was in the last bill. On page 37, line 16, I move to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,200," so as to include group A of class 6.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Washington that the Senate is now acting under an order adopted that committee amendments should be first considered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that, but this is really a committee amendment. While it was not formally authorized by the committee, it was simply overlooked, and if adopted would be included among the amendments of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 18, before the word "each," to strike out "$950" and insert "$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

Class 5, 136 at $1,000 each, including vocational and trade instructors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 20, before the word "each," to strike out "$850" and insert "$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

Class 4, 498 at $1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 22, before the word "each," to strike out "$800" and insert "$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

Class 3, 543 at $1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 24, before the word "each," to strike out "$800" and insert "$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

Class 2, 364 at $1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 1, before the word "each," to strike out "$800" and insert "$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

Class 1, 90 at $1,000 each: *Provided*, That all teachers and librarian and clerks herein provided for shall be entitled to the full amount of any increased compensation granted for the fiscal year 1920 regardless of the increase herein made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 7, after the word "teachers," to strike out "$1,813,700" and insert "$2,094,600," so as to make the clause read:

In all for teachers, $2,094,600: *Provided*, That no part of said appropriation, or any appropriation herein, shall be used for the payment of any teacher to give instruction in the German language or for the purchase of any books for use in such instruction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 13, before the word "clerks," to strike out "and three" and insert "three, four, and five"; so as to read:

The salaries appropriated herein for teachers in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, clerks, and librarians in all classes during the fiscal year 1920, shall be in lieu of the present basic or initial salaries for such classes and the present rates of longevity increases of pay for the said classes shall apply to the basic or initial salaries appropriated herein.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In line 13 I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I move to strike out between the words "four, five," the word "and," and after the word "five" to insert "and group A of class 6."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 3, before the word "each," to strike out "$840," and insert "$1,000," and in line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$31,600," so as to make the clause read:

Ten librarians in high and normal schools in class 5, at $1,000 each; 30 clerks in class 4, at $720 each; in all, $31,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 7, after the word "schools," to insert "and playgrounds"; in the same line, after the word "and," to insert "directors, officers"; in line 8,

after the word "schools," to insert "and playgrounds"; and in line 9, after the words "also be," to insert "directors, officers"; so as to make the clause read:

Vacation schools and playgrounds: For the proper care, instruction, and supervision of children in the vacation schools and playgrounds, and directors, officers, supervisors, teachers, and janitors of vacation schools and playgrounds may also be directors, officers, supervisors, teachers, and janitors of day schools, $14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 11, after the word "For," to insert "school officers"; in line 13, after the word "and," where it occurs the second time, to insert "school officers," and in line 14, after the words "also be," to insert "school officers," so as to make the clause read:

Night schools: For school officers, teachers, and janitors of night schools, including teachers of industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, and school officers, teachers, and janitors of night schools may also be school officers, teachers, and janitors of day schools, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 19, to insert:

Americanization work: For Americanization work and instruction of foreigners of all ages in both day and night classes, including a principal, who shall give his full time to this work, at $2,500 per annum, and teachers and janitors of Americanization schools may also be teachers and janitors of the day schools, $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 41, to insert:

For contingent and other necessary expenses, including books, equipment, and supplies, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 7, after the word "same," to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$210,000," so as to make the clause read:

For repairs and improvements to school buildings and grounds and for repairing and renewing heating, plumbing, and ventilating apparatus, and installation of sanitary drinking fountains in buildings not supplied with same, $210,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 17, to insert:

For the complete equipment of the machine shops of the new Central High School, $50,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill explain the situation that makes this amendment necessary?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Central High School, as the Senator from Tennessee well knows, is equipped with everything except machine shops for the benefit of the young men and young women who are attending it. There are a thousand young men there who wish to take the course of manual training in the machine shop. The Commissioners of the District, and also the Board of Education, very strongly recommend it. This additional appropriation will completely equip the Central High School.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, the last clause read being as follows:

For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, $30,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I desire to make an inquiry respecting the item just read which is not an amendment. I should like to direct the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to lines 24 and 25 on page 48, and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, on page 49. I recall that there was some discussion when the last District of Columbia appropriation bill was before the Senate relative to the feasibility of appropriations of this character. As I recall, there was a great deal of criticism about this or a similar item, and the impression which I then obtained was that the appropriation was temporary, and that even the proponents of the then temporary appropriation would not ask for any further appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I know nothing about the understanding to which the junior Senator from Utah refers, but I do know that those in charge of this work came before the committee at this session and asked for an appropriation of $60,000. That was not recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the subcommittee refused to allow the $60,000, and the full committee refused to allow the $60,000, but did allow $30,000, which was estimated for by the District Commissioners.

There has been, as has been said by the junior Senator from Utah, some objection and some doubt as to this work, but the District Commissioners felt that they ought to ask for $30,000 to continue it for this year. We hope by the next session of Congress to have a full and complete statement of the work that is being done and an itemized statement of all the expenses, which I hope will be of interest to other Senators, as I know it will be to members of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when the amendments reported by the committee shall have been considered and passed upon, unless there is some additional explanation of this item, I shall move to strike it out.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 49, after line 18, to strike out:

Hereafter the board of education is authorized to use all necessary floor and room space in the Franklin School Building for office purposes.

The mendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Metropolitan police," on page 53, line 4, before the word "captains," to strike out "11" and insert "12"; in line 19, before the word "lieutenants," to strike out "20" and insert "21"; in line 20, before the word "sergeants," to strike out "54" and insert "57"; in line 24, before the word "privates," to strike out "187" and insert "197," so as to read:

Major and superintendent, $4,000; 2 assistant superintendents, at $2,500 each; 3 inspectors, at $2,000 each; 12 captains, at $2,000 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, $2,000; clerk (who shall be a stenographer), $1,800; clerk and stenographer, $1,500; clerks—1 (who shall be assistant property clerk) $1,200, 1 $1,200, 3 at $1,000 each, 1 $700; 4 surgeons of the police and fire departments, at $840 each; additional compensation for 35 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, $16,800, or so much thereof as may be necessary; additional compensation for 14 privates detailed for special service in the various precincts for the prevention and detection of crime, at the rate of $120 per annum, $1,680, or so much thereof as may be necessary; additional compensation for 1 inspector or captain and 1 lieutenant detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, at $400 each; 21 lieutenants, 1 of whom shall be harbor master, at $1,600 each; 57 sergeants, 1 of whom may be detailed for duty in the harbor patrol, at $1,400 each; 493 privates of class 3, at $1,320 each; 86 privates of class 2, at $1,200 each; 197 privates of class 1, at $1,080 each.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I wish to inquire in relation to the item on line 4, page 53. It seems that with the termination of the war there would not be the necessity for the number of captains of police that there was during the past year. Did evidence disclose the necessity of increasing the number?

Mr. CURTIS. It did. They really asked for more than the committee was willing to give them. It is desired to organize a traffic squad so as to relieve the regulars from some of the work that is now being done by them. There is no question that these additional officers are needed in the District.

Mr. KING. Speaking generally, I desire to say that I observe an increase in very many of the items with respect to the police force provided for in this bill. I had been led to understand that with the termination of the war and our getting back to normal conditions there would be no necessity for such an increase.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to say that as to the police force there will be an amendment offered, and I think after the reasons for it shall have been given the junior Senator from Utah will consent to an additional increase. Conditions are such in the city now as to require an additional police force in order to protect the lives and the property of the people here. There will be an amendment offered not by the committee, but an amendment to the committee amendment covering that matter. I hope the junior Senator from Utah will listen to a letter which has been sent here in support of the amendment. I should have proposed the amendment myself, but having been authorized to stand by this amendment the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] will offer the amendment to which I refer instead of your humble servant.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting "237" instead of "197," on page 53, line 24, before the word "privates," and I want to call the attention of the Senate to the reasons why I offer the amendment. Perhaps it would be well to read a letter received from the Acting Secretary of State relating to this amendment, and then explain why it has not been thought best to grant the full 135 asked for. The Acting Secretary of State, Hon. William Phillips, on June 17, 1919, wrote to Hon. HENRY C. LODGE, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 17, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE:

Recent developments have made it necessary that the following important matter should be brought to your attention as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the hope that it may be given the most sympathetic and favorable consideration possible.

There are in the city of Washington 41 representatives of foreign governments accredited to the Government of the United States.

Many of them occupy embassy or legation buildings which are the property of their governments, in which are housed, in addition to their families, their official archives. It is of the greatest international importance that the embassies and legations of foreign nations should be given most thorough police protection at this time because of the unrest and unsettled conditions in this country and abroad.

After conference with the superintendent of police, I find that it is not possible to detail men from the police force at each of the embassies and legations, because of the great need of patrolmen for general police service in every section of the District of Columbia, which as you are already aware has an area of approximately 70 square miles and more than 510 of opened and used streets. During the war patrolmen have been stationed at certain of the embassies, but the number of men who could be spared from other police duty to permit of the constant presence of an officer during each of the three eight-hour periods of the day made it necessary so greatly to increase the area to be covered by each man as to render ineffective the protection which he was depended upon to afford.

It would take 123 patrolmen to provide one for each of the 41 embassies and legations during each eight hours of the day and night, and to provide for sick and annual leave it would be necessary to increase the number to at least 135 men.

After careful consideration of the whole question the superintendent of police believes that it may be feasible so to arrange the territory to be patrolled by each officer as to make it possible to afford reasonably adequate protection with approximately 80 additional privates in the Metropolitan police force at a salary of $1,080 each per annum. This is approximately one-half the total number which should be used if one man were kept on duty at each of the 41 embassies or legations during each eight-hour period of duty; but in view of the fact that a number of the legations are located within a square or so of one another, an effort could be made to arrange to have one patrolman cover two, or perhaps three, missions located in close proximity to each other.

You will, I am sure, at once recognize the importance of affording adequate police protection in the existing conditions of unrest to the foreign representatives, who are in a very real sense guests of the United States. It would inspire a feeling of national humiliation if, through lack of the police protection which could be afforded at small cost, a representative of a friendly Government should suffer loss of life or property at the hands of irresponsible individuals. American diplomatic, and even consular, representatives in foreign countries are as a rule afforded most ample police protection upon request, and it would seem that the United States could hardly afford to give less adequate protection to foreign representatives in the National Capital than that afforded its own representatives in the capitals of the world.

I earnestly request that you will give this matter your attention and endeavor to have added to the District appropriation bill now pending before Congress a provision appropriating the sum of $86,400 for 80 additional privates in the Metropolitan police force at $1,080 each per annum to make possible adequate protection of the foreign representatives and their embassy and legation buildings in this city.

I am, my dear Senator LODGE,
Very faithfully, yours,
WILLIAM PHILLIPS,
Acting Secretary of State.

The Hon. HENRY C. LODGE,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the details as to why we have reduced the number from 80, as suggested by the Acting Secretary of State, to 40; but I wish to say to Senators that we think we now have the matter so arranged that proper protection can be given to all of the embassies by adding 40 privates instead of 80. I do not think it would do any good to state at this time how or why, but I will say to the Senate that if the 40 additional privates are provided for at this time we feel that ample protection will be afforded the embassies and legations. Therefore I offer the amendment which I have already suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 53, lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to strike out "one hundred and ninety-seven," and in lieu thereof to insert "two hundred and thirty-seven."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 54, line 4, before the word "telephone," to strike out "eight" and insert "ten"; and in line 11, before the word "drivers," to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "forty," so as to make the clause read—

ten telephone clerks, at $900 each; 18 janitors, at $600 each; laborer, $720; messenger, $600; inspector, mounted on horse, $480; 38 captains, lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on horses, at $480 each; motor vehicle allowance to 20 sergeants and privates at $360 each; 64 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on bicycles, at $60 each; 40 drivers, at $900 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 13, page 54, after the words "in all," to change the total from "$1,224,340" to "$1,249,240."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the amendment just agreed to the total is not now correct, but authority has been given to the Secretary to change the totals, so that will be taken care of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That action will be taken.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 55, line 14, after the word "expended," to strike out "*Provided*, That the War Department may, in its discretion, furnish the commissioners, for use of the police, upon requisition, such worn mounted equipment as may be required" and insert "*Provided*, That the War Department may, in its discretion, furnish the commissioners, for use of the police, upon requisition, such ordnance, worn motor, mounted, or other equipment as may be required."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 11, before the word "each," to strike out "$600" and insert "$720"; in line 12, after the word "janitor," to strike out "$600" and insert "$720"; and in line 16, after the words "in all," to strike out "$16,920" and insert "$17,760," so as to make the clause read:

House of Detention: To enable the commissioners to provide transportation, including purchase and maintenance of necessary horses, wagons, and harness, and a suitable place for the reception, transportation, and detention of children under 17 years of age, and, in the discretion of the commissioners, of girls and women over 17 years of age, arrested by the police on charge of offense against any law in force in the District of Columbia, or held as witnesses, or held pending final investigation or examination, or otherwise, including two clerks, at $1,000 each; two drivers, at $780 each; six guards, at $720 each; janitor, $720; three matrons, at $720 each, to possess police powers of arrest; miscellaneous expenses, including rent, fuel, gas, ice, laundry, meals, maintenance of motor station vehicle and other necessary expenses, $7,000; in all, $17,760, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 18, before the word "each," to strike out "$600" and insert "$720"; and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$5,600," so as to make the clause read:

Harbor patrol: Two engineers, at $1,000 each; two firemen, one watchman, and two deck hands, at $720 each; in all, $5,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "$8,500" and insert "$9,100," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $9,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Fire department," on page 58, line 12, after the word "items," to insert: "cost of installation and maintenance of telephones in the residences of the superintendent of machinery and the fire marshal," so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, horseshoeing, furniture, fixtures, oil, medical and stable supplies, harness, blacksmithing, gas and electric lighting, flags and halyards, and other necessary items, cost of installation and maintenance of telephones in the residences of the superintendent of machinery and the fire marshal, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 23, to insert:

For one concrete and frame drill tower to be erected adjacent to No. 8 engine house, on North Carolina Avenue, between Sixth and Seventh Streets SE., on land owned by the District of Columbia, $10,368.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health Department," on page 59, line 8, before the words "at $1,200 each," to strike out "nine" and insert "twelve"; in line 11, before the words "at $1,400 each," to strike out "two" and insert "four"; and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "$87,190" and insert "$93,590," so as to make the clause read:

Health officer, $4,000; assistant health officer, $2,500; chief clerk and deputy health officer, $2,500; chief, bureau of vital statistics, $1,800; clerks—1 $1,600, 5 at $1,200 each, 4 at $1,000 each, 2 at $900 each, 1 $720; sanitary inspector—chief $1,800, assistant chief $1,400, 12 at $1,200 each, 2 at $1,000 each, 3 at $900 each; food inspectors—chief $1,800, assistant chief $1,400, 4 at $1,400 each, 5 at $1,200 each, 6 at $1,000 each, 5 at $900 each; chemist, $2,000; assistant chemist, $1,500; chief of bureau of preventable diseases and director of bacteriological laboratory, $2,750; serologist, $2,500; 2 assistant bacteriologists, at $1,200 each; laboratory assistant, $840; skilled laborers—1 $720, 1 $600; 2 messengers at $600 each; 2 chauffeurs, at $720 each; poundmaster, $1,400; watchman, $600; laborers, at not exceeding $60 per month each, $3,120; in all, $93,590.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 13, after the word "service," to strike out "$360" and insert "$600," so as to make the clause read:

For the maintenance of one motor vehicle for use in the pound service, $600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 13, to insert:

For one motor ambulance at a cost not exceeding $2,500, and for equipping, maintaining, and operating the same and keeping it in good order, $600; in all, $3,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 4, to insert:

For clinical examination, advice, care, and maintenance of children under 6 years of age, under a contract to be made with the Washington Diet Kitchen by the health officer of the District of Columbia, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Emergency Fund," on page 68, line 6, after the word "commissioners," to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$10,000," so as to read:

To be expended only in case of emergency, such as riot, pestilence, public insanitary conditions, calamity by flood or fire or storm, and of like character, and in all cases of emergency not otherwise sufficiently provided for, in the discretion of the commissioners, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Courts and Prisons," on page 68, line 24, after "$1,200," to insert "electrician, $900," and on page 69, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "$16,020" and insert "$16,920," so as to make the clause read:

Courthouse, District of Columbia: For care and protection, under the direction of the United States marshal of the District of Columbia: Engineer, $1,200; electrician, $900; 3 watchmen, at $720 each; 3 firemen, at $720 each; 5 laborers, at $600 each; 6 messengers, at $720 each; 2 elevator conductors, at $720 each; clerk to jury commissioner, $720; telephone operator, $720; attendant in ladies' waiting room, $300; in all, $16,920, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 2, after the word "court," to strike out "$27,200" and insert "$29,600," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of bailiffs: For not exceeding one crier in each court, of office deputy marshals who act as bailiffs or criers, and for expenses of meals and lodging for jurors in United States cases and of bailiffs in attendance upon same when ordered by the court, $29,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Charities and Corrections," at the top of page 71, to insert:

For purchase and equipment of motor ambulance, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 2, to strike out:

For the maintenance of one motor ambulance, $600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 3, to insert:

For the maintenance of two motor ambulances, $1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reformatories and correctional institutions," on page 72, after line 14, to insert:

For purchase of apparatus for operating room, including Lumbard's airway, gas oxygen apparatus, and electric ether suction apparatus, $350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 14, after the word "harness," to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the clause read:

Transportation of prisoners: For conveying prisoners to Washington Asylum and Jail, including salary of driver, not to exceed $840, and purchase and maintenance of necessary horses, wagons, and harness, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 15, after the word "Jail," to strike out "$194,475" and insert "$195,325," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Washington Asylum and Jail, $195,325.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 11, to insert:

For an additional amount for extension of colored women's ward, $13,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 14, after the word "Infirm," to strike out "$73,392" and insert "$86,392," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Home for Aged and Infirm, $86,392.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Charities," on page 76, after line 20, to insert:

For repairing the elevators in the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital and for the purchase and installation of a new elevator in said hospital, $22,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 8, after the word "sidewalks," to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the clause read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, including roads and sidewalks, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 9, after the word "Hospital," to strike out "$72,640" and insert "$73,140," so as to make the clause read:

Tuberculosis Hospital, $73,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Child-caring Institutions," on page 78, line 21, after the word "Agent," to strike out "$1,800" and insert "$2,000"; and in line 25, after the words "in all," to strike out "$18,200" and insert "$18,400," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries: Agent, $2,000; clerks—one $1,200, one $900; stenographer, $900; placing and investigating officers—two at $1,200 each, one $1,000, nine at $900 each; record clerk, $900; messenger, $500; laborer, $500; in all, $18,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 10, after the word "Guardians," to strike out "$207,200" and insert "$207,400," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Board of Children's Guardians, $207,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Temporary homes," on page 82, after line 10, to insert.:

National Library for the Blind: For aid and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1729 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 15, to insert:

Columbia Polytechnic Institute: To aid the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind, located at 1808 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 13, after the words "Assistant superintendent" to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,800," in line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "$30,900" and insert "$30,700," so as to make the clause read:

Reformatory: Assistant superintendent, $1,800; chief clerk, $1,200; assistant clerk and stenographer, $1,000; steward, $1,500; captain of day officers, $1,200; 6 instructors, at $1,200 each; 10 day officers, at $900 each; captain of night force, $1,080; 6 night officers, at $720 each; parole officer, $1,200; overseer, $1,200; in all, $30,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 8, after the words "in all" to strike out "$162,900" and insert "$162,700," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $162,700, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the commissioners.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Anacostia River and Flats," on page 88, line 15, after "$100,000," to insert:

Provided, That whenever the Secretary of War, in pursuance of authority conferred on him my law, causes proceedings to be instituted for the acquirement by condemnation of any lands, easements, or rights of way needed for the said work, the United States, upon the filing of the petition in any such proceedings, shall have the right to take immediate possession of said lands, easements, or rights of way to the extent of the interest to be acquired and to proceed with such public works thereon as have been authorized by Congress: *Provided further*, That certain adequate provisions shall have been made for the payment of just compensation to the party or parties entitled thereto, either by previous appropriation by the United States or by the deposit of moneys or other form of security in such amount and form as shall be approved by the court in which such proceedings shall be instituted. The respondent or respondents may move at any time in the court to increase or change the amounts or securities, and the court shall make such order as shall be just in the premises and as shall adequately protect the respondents. In every case the proceedings in condemnation shall be diligently prosecuted on the part of the United States in order that such compensation may be promptly ascertained and paid.

So as to make the clause read:

For continuing the reclamation and development of Anacostia Park, to be expended in accordance with the plans specified in the item for the reclamation of the Anacostia River and Flats, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, $100,000: *Provided*, That whenever the Secretary of War, in pursuance of authority conferred on him by law, causes proceedings to be instituted for the acquirement by condemnation of any lands, easements, or rights of way needed for the said work, the United States, upon the filing of the petition in any such proceedings, shall have the right to take immediate possession of said lands, easements, or rights of way to the extent of the interest to be acquired and to proceed with such public works thereon as have been authorized by Congress: *Provided further*, That certain adequate provisions shall have been made for the payment of just compensation to the party or parties entitled thereto, either by previous appropriation by the United States or by the deposit of moneys or other form of security in such amount and form as shall be approved by the court in which such proceedings shall be instituted. The respondent or respondents may move at any time in the court to increase or change the amounts or securities, and the court shall make such order as shall be just in the premises and as shall adequately protect the respondents. In every case the proceedings in condemnation shall be diligently prosecuted on the part of the United States in order that such compensation may be promptly ascertained and paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water Department," on page 90, line 25, after the word "chief," to strike out "$1,750" and insert "$1,800," and on page 91, line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "$91,560" and insert "$91,610," so as to make the clause read:

For distribution branch: Superintendent, $3,300; engineer, $2,400; assistant engineers—1 $1,800; 1 $1,700; master mechanic, $2,000; foreman, $1,800; assistant foremen—1 $1,275, 1 $1,200, 1 $1,125, 1 $900; steam engineers—chief $1,800, 2 at $1,200 each, 3 assistants at $1,000 each; chief inspector of valves, $1,600; leveler, $1,200; inspector, $1,200; draftsman, $1,050; clerks—1 $1,800, 1 $1,500; 3 at $1,200 each (one transferred to assessor's office); stores clerk, $1,500, 2 at $1,000 each; timekeeper, $900; 2 rodmen at $900 each; 2 chainmen at $675 each; 4 oilers at $720 each; 3 firemen at $900 each; janitor, $900; drivers—1 $700, 1 $630; 2 messengers, at $600 each; in all, $91,610.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 12, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$450,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the extension of and maintaining the high-service system of water distribution, laying necessary service and trunk mains for low service, and purchasing, installing, and maintaining water meters on services to such private residences and to such business places as may not be required to install meters under existing regulations as may be directed by the commissioners, said meters at all times to remain the property of the District of Columbia; to include all necessary land, machinery, buildings, mains, and appurtenances, and labor, and purchase and maintenance of horses, wagons, carts, and harness necessary for the proper execution of this work, not to exceed $450,000 of the amount available in the water fund during the fiscal year 1920 after providing for the expenditures hereinbefore authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, after line 14, to insert:

For completing the purchase, installation, and maintenance of water meters, to be placed on the water services to the United States buildings, reservations, or grounds in the District of Columbia, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, said meters to be purchased, installed, and maintained by and remain under the observation of the officer in charge of the Washington Aqueduct, to be available until expended, $9,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, after line 22, to insert:

That on and after July 1, 1920, all users of water furnished through the water supply and distribution system of the District of Columbia, including all departments, branches, and agencies of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia, shall be required to pay for all water so furnished, at rates determined by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and approved by Congress. Payments for said water shall be made by officers of the United States and the District of Columbia, respectively, in charge and control of all buildings and plants of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia from any appropriations available for said purpose. All such payments shall be made to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia, who shall deposit same in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the water fund. Said commissioners shall submit with their estimates to Congress at the beginning of its session December, 1919, and annually thereafter, a schedule of proposed water rates.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill please explain this item?

Mr. CURTIS. The various Government offices in the District of Columbia have water furnished them without charge. There would not have been very much complaint if it had not been for the fact that there is a great waste of water in all the departments. The evidence showed that in one department there is enough water wasted in one day to supply a city of 30,000 people. The committee—not only the subcommittee, but the full committee—thought they were justified in putting in this provision first to put in meters so that we would know the amount of water used and so that some steps could be taken to reduce the consumption of water to the amount actually necessary; second, to compel the departments to pay, not what is paid by the citizens of the District of Columbia, but about what the water costs. The committee—not only the subcommittee, but the full committee—thought that would be only fair and right; and we do hope we can retain this provision in conference, because something of this kind must be done, on account of the scarcity of water in the city of Washington. The Senator will remember that last summer orders were issued restricting the use of water at the residences in the city of Washington while the departments went on wasting water just as they had been doing before; and something ought to be done to save the water for the citizens of the District.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the item. The explanation offered by the chairman of the committee seems to be very convincing. I did not know what the item meant, and I simply wanted an explanation.

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad the Senator asked the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 7, page 98, line 21, after the word "activities," to insert:

In every case where any material, supplies, including food supplies, and equipment coming under the provisions of this section shall have been purchased from any other source than the various sources of the Government, it shall be affirmatively shown that the provisions of this section have as far as possible been complied with.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That the commissioners and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations contained in this act, so far as possible shall purchase material, supplies, including food supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, from the various services of the Government of the United States possessing material, supplies, and equipment no longer required because of the cessation of war activities. It shall be the duty of the commissioners and other officials, before purchasing any of the articles described herein, to ascertain from the Government of the United States whether it has articles of the character described that are serviceable. And articles purchased from the Government, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government of the United States are authorized to sell such articles to the municipal government under the conditions specified and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office material, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities. In every case where any material, supplies, including food supplies, and equipment coming under the provisions of this section shall have been purchased from any other source than the various sources of the Government, it shall be affirmatively shown that the provisions of this section have as far as possible been complied with.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, after line 11, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to appoint a commission of five members, three of whom shall be selected from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and one from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and one from the engineering department of the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to make full investigation of the sources of water supply from rivers and streams in the proximity of the city of Washington, with the view to increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia, and to report their findings and recommendations to the Secretary of War at the earliest practicable time, said report to be accompanied by data and other information as to such sources of supply, together with estimates of the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water sufficient to augment the present water supply of the District of Columbia commensurate with present and future needs, including the territory embraced within the jurisdiction of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and Federal military reservations contiguous to the District of Columbia. Such report shall be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War with his recommendation. And for the purposes herein authorized there is hereby appropriated the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by and under the direction of said commission upon vouchers to be approved by the Secretary of War, and a detailed statement thereof shall accompany the commission's report.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, about 12 years ago it became apparent that there was going to be a shortage of water in the District of Columbia; and Congress, in an appropriation bill, appropriated $20,000 to investigate the water supply of the city of Washington, and incidentally connected with it to ascertain whether Great Falls out here could be harnessed and electricity furnished for this District. In pursuance of that appropriation the proper persons were appointed, a survey was made, and a man placed at the head of the investigation who is or was at that time perhaps the best hydraulic engineer in the United States and perhaps in the world.

They made a detailed survey, a minute survey, of all of the supplies that could possibly be used for water for the city of Washington. They went into a minute investigation as to its cost. They spent the $20,000; and I am not charging that a dollar of it was wrongfully spent. They made a report to Congress, consisting—I do not happen to have a copy of it here with me now—of perhaps 200 pages, in which they described every possible means they could discover of increasing the water supply of the District and analyzed each one of them.

There were three main sources of supply for increase. They went into detail as to every one. There is the most complete official report now on file that ever was made in the investigation of any proposition of this kind anywhere in the United States. They told how you could increase the water supply to any extent and how much money would be necessary to carry it out. There was not a detail left out; and they reported it to Congress.

Unfortunately, however, connected with that report was also a detailed description of the way in which the price of electricity could be reduced to the consumers of this Capital City. They found the amount of power that could be developed and the amount of money that it would take to develop it. They carried it out to the substations all ready for distribution, so

that it included a water supply away beyond the present necessities of the city. I have forgotten what the population was, but the plan provided for supplying a city much larger than Washington is now. That report went into a pigeon hole, and it is in the pigeon hole yet.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator recall whether there were any other sources of supply than the Potomac River?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; there were three sources—two besides the Potomac River.

Mr. KING. Did this commission recommend either of the sources of supply except the Potomac River?

Mr. NORRIS. They recommended the Potomac River.

Mr. KING. I was quite interested in the Senator's statement, for the reason that a number of years prior to that, when I was in the House, I was charged with the duty of making an investigation of this subject, and, after spending several weeks in making the investigation, I secured an option upon the Great Falls for approximately $500,000.

That would have given not only the riparian rights to the city for the Government but also the power, the water, the riparian rights, and the bed of the stream, so far as the owners of the property could convey, and in addition it would have extinguished a judgment against the city for a sum which, as I now recall, was in excess of $300,000, and would have settled a suit which was then pending for three or four hundred thousand dollars for diverting the water from the Potomac River, and thus lessening the quantity flowing over the falls and to that extent diminishing, of course, the value of the falls for power purposes. So that the city at that time could have acquired the entire river—that is, the riparian rights and the falls—for approximately $500,000, and, as stated, could have extinguished or satisfied the judgment, and prevented or settled the lawsuit. The proposal was beaten in the House by several distinguished gentlemen, whose names it is not necessary to mention; but a very full examination was made at that time by myself, and I reached the conclusion that the Potomac River was the most available source of supply for water, and would furnish an indefinite amount of power for the city all the time.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator was unfortunate, just like this commission, because he coupled with his water supply a power supply, and that is wrong, and so we must not develop Great Falls. The plan of this commission under the famous engineer who made these recommendations, if carried out, would have made electricity so cheap in the city of Washington that men and women would not have taken time to turn it off in the daytime. It would have operated every street railway that there is in the District. It would have turned every wheel by power supplied by God Almighty that is going to waste now running over the falls and doing nobody any good. But it did come in contact with the Potomac Electric Power Co., and for that reason it was unjustifiable.

That is not the only investigation that has been made of this subject, Mr. President. There have been various others made. If I had known that this item was in the bill and was coming up this evening, I would have been supplied with sufficient documents to take until to-morrow morning showing the various investigations that have been made. I am not tied up to any one of them. I only think that this one for which the taxpayers of this country paid the sum of $20,000 was the most complete in every detail that was ever made of any project. It could not be done now for the same money I realize, but when that was done it was realized by Members of Congress and others that the time was going to come when there would be a shortage of water in the city of Washington if the city kept on going. But that was before the installation of meters in this city. After that report was made there were meters installed, and that brought about great economies in the use of water and the emergency was put off further.

It was always impossible to get anything through Congress. It was impossible really to get favorable consideration from most of the officials of the Government to any proposition looking to the carrying out of the plan that this commission had recommended. You could have separated, and you could to-day separate, in some of these propositions as I remember them, the water supply from the power supply. As I remember it some of them contained no proposition about power, because the two other sources would not seek to build a dam in the Potomac River to get power from other streams that are in the District.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I heartily agree with the Senator that we should save the power and water possible at the Great Falls. I have never looked at it without regretting the waste. I have wondered whether there were not several months in the low seasons of water when it would fail to generate the power on which we could safely rely for a sufficient supply. I have seen the Potomac River extremely low, and I have seen it run as much water as I thought there was anywhere in the world in any one river. Does this report show that in the low-water season the city could depend on it for electric power and light, or for the consumption of the water itself, by a proper utilization of the water and the power at Great Falls?

Mr. NORRIS. The Sentor has put his finger on the only objection that was ever made to the proposition I have ever heard that had any merit whatever in it. But, Mr. President, the Potomac River has been measured as accurately and as long, perhaps, as any other river in the United States. We have, as the records show, a minute detail of the amount of water which flows down the stream in the various years—in the wet years and in the dry years. That was all taken into consideration in this report. There was not anything of that kind omitted. The Senator must remember that I am speaking now from memory.

I have given some of the facts before to the Senate, but I have not looked at the report or any of the investigations that I made in connection with it now for two or three years, so that the figures I give may not be accurate. This report showed on an average of 15 years, as I remember it, exactly how much power would be developed under this plan every day in the year. In the tables that they made up from the history of the flow of the river, as I remember it now, there would be on an average one day in 15 years when the power would be down to 1,500 or 1,600 horsepower. The average of the time the flow was between 60,000 and 70,000 horsepower, as I remember the figures. So that would have turned all the wheels and run all the elevators and all the street cars and lighted all the houses. There would have been a few days in the average year when they would have had to supplement it by steam power, which we already have and which the various concerns that generate electricity now own.

A good water-power system usually needs a steam system as well. If we had been starting in anew and had had to use these power systems there would have been more in the argument. It would have been very seldom when that would have been necessary. They analyzed the increase that would be necessary as the population increased.

Remember, Mr. President, this report did not pretend to utilize all the power of Great Falls. The proposition was to build a dam across the Potomac River very near the District line. As I remember it now, the dam was to be 115 feet high, and to build a dam on the District line 115 feet high will dam the water up in the Potomac River to the foot of the falls and not at all interfere with the falls. That was done to help out nature there, so that the beauty of the falls would not be interfered with. They could have very easily increased the power by making a lake about 9 miles long. They could have increased it, as I remember it, about one-third more than they took into consideration in any of their estimates or any of their tables by utilizing the power of the falls proper.

Now, the only objection to the proposition is that the Potomac River varies. When there is too much water coming down you do not get as much power and when there is too little water coming down you do not get as much power. It is the average that gives the maximum amount of power.

While this plan did not go into the subject of reservoirs, privately Col. Langfitt, who had charge of the matter, told me himself—and if this had gone through that would have been another proposition he would have presented—there were three places above the dam on the Potomac River where at a comparatively cheap cost great reservoirs could have been constructed which would have obviated high water and low water and made the flow of the stream practically the same the year round with wet or dry; and with that put in, with the falls properly utilized, if Congress ever wanted to destroy its beauty by such a utilization, the average power would have been more than double, and there never would have been a day in any year when any steam power would have been necessary.

Now, Mr. President, connected with this water development was the supply of additional water to the city of Washington. As I said, at that time meters had not been installed. When they were installed, and that was done soon afterwards, it was said we do not need any more water in Washington, we are economizing with it now, we will not need to bother about the increase of the water supply, and a great many honest people lost interest in the proposition on that account. It was not until the war came on that the enormous increase in popula-

tion in the city made it apparent that we were going to have a shortage of water, no matter how economical we might be in its use.

But, aside from Great Falls, I might speak of some other plans that other engineers proposed; some much less expensive; some that utilized simply the falls proper by increasing the existing dam just a little, constructing a canal around to this side of the falls, where the wheels could be put in at a cost perhaps half or less than the great scheme Col. Langfitt and his assistants had recommended, a plan not nearly so elaborate and one that would not necessarily interfere with the other. You could put in one now, utilize it to its full capacity, and in a year or 10 years from now put in the other without interfering with the first in any degree whatever. Then you could take up the reservoir proposition above and develop that as rapidly as you saw fit.

But there was a Great Falls water-power company—I think that is the name—that a good many years ago got and claims to own now a lot of riparian rights and other legal claims round about the Great Falls. The name of the corporation, incorporating in Virginia, would indicate that it was organized for the purpose of developing Great Falls. As a matter of fact, it was organized for the purpose of permitting the development of Great Falls, owned by the Potomac Electric Power Co. or one of these street railway companies. One of the street railway companies and one of the electric-power companies and the Great Falls company are all mixed up together. I think while the Great Falls company had considerable money invested it never had any income, of course. It simply owns the property up there to keep somebody else from using it. So, in order to pay dividends, it is necessary for the other companies that own its stock to pay enormous dividends in order to get anything on that stock. When the street car company is making too much money it can transfer stock to the electric-light company and thus reduce its dividends where they want them reduced and increase them where they will not excite any suspicion, and then change it back when the thing is reversed. That has been going on for years. In the meantime we are short of water. In the meantime every citizen of the city of Washington is paying at least twice what he ought to pay and paying three times what he would pay if that development had been made according to the estimates and the plans of Col. Langfitt.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DIAL. About what was the estimated cost per horsepower?

Mr. NORRIS. I can not give that to the Senator now. As I said, perhaps when he was not in the Chamber, I did not know this question was coming up and I am speaking entirely from memory. I was once very familiar with the subject, and it is all a matter of record now. I can not even give to the Senate the number of the document, although I think the copies have been long since exhausted, and it is perhaps impossible to get it unless you get the document from some one who obtained it a year or two ago. I have two or three copies in my office somewhere that I would be glad to supply to any Senator who would like to look it over.

The result has been that nothing has been accomplished. When a bill was introduced here to authorize the Secretary of War to carry out the recommendations of this commission, it was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia several years ago and they referred it to the Secretary of War and also to the Commissioners of the District. The commissioners promptly made a report, recommending legislation. The Secretary of War did not report on it, and after waiting quite a long while I remember I wrote a letter to the Secretary of War asking him about the delay and he said that there was an objection on file, that some engineer had written an article in some magazine in which he said the plan was not feasible, or he had some objections to it. After some further investigation I found the magazine and found the engineer and talked with him. I could not see any possible objection that he had set forth. Incidentally, it developed that while he said at the time he wrote the article he was not in their employ, he had been one of the engineers of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for quite a good many years.

When Secretary Baker came into office I thought then, with the reputation standing behind him, certainly Great Falls would be developed, and I lost no time in taking it up with Secretary Baker. I wish I had the correspondence that took place after he had made an investigation such as he wanted to make. Remember, this commission was a long time, perhaps a year or more, in making the investigation, using the $20,000. But Secretary Baker, contrary to his past record, judged by what we read of him, took a stand against the development of Great Falls instead of favorable to it. After a while he finally said that he would appoint a commission to look into it and see what they would say about it. He appointed some engineers, and after going out and viewing the landscape through the periscope of a War Department limousine they decided that it was not advisable to spend this money and make this development.

One reason was that we did not need any more water then, that we had plenty of it; and another reason was that the bill which provided for its development seemed to be hinged on the constitutional peg that the Government of the United States could make this development because the Government had a great many buildings in the city of Washington to light and elevators to operate, and that was true. But he said if the development is made under the bill and the Government spends all the money simply to furnish light for its own buildings and power to run elevators in its own buildings there will still be an enormous amount of power left that can not be used and, therefore, it will be a very expensive proposition. As I remember the letter of the great progressive Secretary, he said that electricity was already supplied to the people of Washington at a very reasonable cost, and it would not be a good thing for the Government to go into competition with a great philanthropic institution that was already doing such noble work in giving the people of Washington cheap electricity.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator is, I know, very familiar with the previous investigations which have been made. In view of what he has stated to us, what in his judgment is the necessity for this additional legislation?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there ought to be any such legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If there is need for it, would it be wise just to insert, before the word "supply," in line 21, page 100, and again in line 2, on page 101, the words "and power," and the department would have to report on power as well as water? I think that would be a very proper thing to do.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that ought to be included if there is anything to go in. Of course, while I realize that estimates made 15 or 10 or 12 years ago are not accurate now, to me it seems like a foolish proposition to keep on appointing commissions to do the same thing over again, and when their report comes in, let the report go into a pigeonhole to die.

The District is just the same now, so far as streams are concerned, as it was 50 years ago. I do not believe that one can start out and obtain any new information—information that is not already a matter of record—so far as the flow of any stream in the District of Columbia is concerned. Neither will you get any more information as to the necessary dams, filtration plants, pumps, and similar apparatus which it would be necessary to supply. You can get such information in all degrees. Every alternative, every possible divergence that could be made in this broad investigation, has been run down to the end, and there is a record of it somewhere.

I think we need more water here. Since the war has occurred there have been engineers here—so far as I know, moved entirely by patriotic motives—some of whom have made expensive outlines, charts, and maps showing other methods of development of the Great Falls, some of them connected with the water supply and some of them not.

I should not want to do anything, Mr. President, which would interfere with the necessary supply of water for this city; but so far as making any more surveys or examinations are concerned, I do not believe there is any necessity whatever for them. If there were a proposition to utilize any of the various methods which the records now describe, it would be a different matter. Therefore, Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the amendment is clearly subject to the point of order, but I desire to state, on behalf of the committee and for myself, that this is the first time I have had charge of this measure. Neither the attention of the subcommittee nor the attention of the full committee was called to the report which has been referred to by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. Just one moment, if the Senator please. Such a report, if it were made, would go to the Committee on

the District of Columbia and not to the Committee on Appropriations. When this matter was first presented last January or February, at the time the item was added to the bill, on the floor of the Senate, if I remember correctly, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] offered an amendment including the words "hydraulic power." When that amendment was presented to the committee the engineer stated that he thought it would make the amendment objectionable, and asked that it be left out, and the committee left it out.

The District Commissioners advised the committee that they desire to investigate three projects. The Great Falls is one, and there are two others. I think perhaps since the Senator from Nebraska has made his speech—and I gather it from what he says—that perhaps they refer to the same project; I do not know. Anyway, the commissioners say they desire to investigate as to the three projects, and they requested this amount of money in order to secure the information so as to determine which of the three would be the best for the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. While I think it is unnecessary to make another investigation, for I think it would be an almost useless expenditure of public funds, I will withdraw the point of order if the Senator from Kansas will include an amendment which will provide for an investigation of the power possibilities of Great Falls as well as its possibilities as a source of water supply.

Mr. CURTIS. I should very gladly, on the part of the committee, accept an amendment of that kind.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. CURTIS. Let me first suggest——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will remind Senators that the point of order has not yet been decided, and it is not debatable.

Mr. CURTIS. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to say that he would withdraw the point of order, provided there was a modification made of the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I am willing to withdraw the point of order if the amendment shall be so modified as to include an investigation as to the water power possibilities of the Great Falls. I think a large portion of the appropriation should also be stricken out, for there is not any necessity of using so much money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska withdraw the point of order?

Mr. NORRIS. For the time being I withdraw the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point or order is withdrawn. The question is upon the——

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just a moment. The Chair was about to——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me ask——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Tennessee suspend for just a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair had not finished the announcement. The point of order made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is withdrawn and the question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. No; Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill by whom was this matter brought before the committee?

Mr. CURTIS. It was brought before the committee by the District Commissioners, and the statement was made to the committee by Col. Kutz, the Engineer Commissioner.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will this appropriation include additional compensation to the five commissioners?

Mr. CURTIS. There would not be any extra pay to the commissioners who are now drawing salaries from the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, then, is the amount of $15,000 appropriated?

Mr. CURTIS. That is to pay for extra help which they naturally would have to employ. They could not take men away from the War Department to do this smaller work.

Mr. McKELLAR. In view of the very minute examinations which have been referred to by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], it seems to me that the greater part of the work has already been done, and that it will merely need going over that to a large extent to ascertain the present condition.

Mr. CURTIS. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I know nothing about that. This is the first time I ever heard of the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that no such minute report has been given to the committee, and was not given to the committee when the request was made, does not the Senator in charge of the bill feel that it ought to have been done in fairness to the committee and to the public, and that this appropriation ought not to be made until a fuller examination is had by the committee?

Mr. CURTIS. I think that the committee should have had its attention called to the fact that there was another report. I desire to say in this connection, however, that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] tells me that he knows something about this report, and should like to say something regarding it; and I trust the Senator will do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will give me his attention for a moment. I am fully aware of the report which was made—and it was a most exhaustive one—as referred to by the Senator from Nebraska. That report is in existence to-day, and no doubt if this examination and survey are made as provided for by this amendment, the information in that report will be made use of.

I call the attention of the Senate, however, to the fact that that report was made for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of water in the Potomac River and how it could be utilized for the purpose of creating hydroelectric power. I think it is one of the most exhaustive reports that could possibly have been made of the Potomac River for that purpose; but the investigation provided for by this amendment and the survey authorized by it are not for that purpose at all. The question of the quantity of water which we have in the vicinity of the District for utilization for the purpose of increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia is a very small part of this proposed work.

It is stated that, in order to increase the water supply of the District of Columbia, there must be an expenditure of at least $3,000,000. The object of this appropriation is not only to ascertain which one of these three sources of water is the best, but it is to make a complete report as to what it is going to cost to put in a plant for the distribution of the water, to make the water available for the people of the District, and to ascertain where and how that can best be brought about.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If I understood the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], he was speaking of a survey for hydroelectric power, and he referred to a dam 150 feet high so far below Great Falls as not to interfere with the beauty of the falls. What was the estimated cost according to that report of building that dam for hydraulic power? What it is hoped to get under a proper survey is information as to the water supply, to ascertain if a sufficient quantity can be obtained for the city. If at the same time that additional water supply is provided the dam referred to by the Senator could be built, that would be all well and good; but this is an emergency question having to do with the necessity of supplying the city of Washington with water. The other project is so expensive that I should say it would be impossible to consider it now.

Mr. SMOOT. And not only that, but I call attention to the wording of the amendment. It provides not only for a survey as to where the water supply is—because it is admitted now that there are three sources from which water can be drawn—but it is further provided, "together with estimates of the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water sufficient to augment the present water supply of the District of Columbia commensurate with present and future needs."

That is where the great work will have to be done, and this money is to be expended in ascertaining how that may be accomplished. It is for that purpose that the committee thought that the amendment ought to be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why not include also hydraulic power, so that we may know about that, too?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not believe any report can be made to-day that would be any more perfect or exhaustive than the report already made, which has been referred to by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. That report applies to the water supply as well as to hydraulic power.

Mr. SMOOT. I say that that report will no doubt be utilized if this amendment is agreed to, but this amendment is to make provision for an examination as to the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water. That is what we have to find out.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all in the report to which I have referred. The transmission of the water is included in that report.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean for the District of Columbia?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; there is not any question about that. That report deals with the transmission of the water from the places where it may be obtained.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that if an amendment is permitted to include an investigation into the question of hydraulic power as well as the water supply, I shall make no point of order against the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I intend to offer such an amendment. I have the amendment now ready to propose as soon as I can get the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that point is covered, I shall not make the point of order; but if it is not covered I shall make the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. I intend to offer such an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment which I am going to suggest will meet the situation. I wish Senators who are interested would follow me. I have drafted it here at my desk, and it may need some correction. After the word "supply," in line 19, page 100, I move to insert the words "and hydraulic power," so as to read "full investigation of the sources of water supply and hydraulic power from rivers," and so forth; then, after the word "to," in line 21, on the same page, to insert the words "developing hydraulic power and," so as to read "with the view to developing hydraulic power and increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia"; and on page 101, in line 1, after the word "for," to insert the words "the development of hydraulic power and," so as to read "of the probable cost of a project or projects for the development of hydraulic power and the transmission of water sufficient," and so forth.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The SECRETARY. On page 100, line 19, after the word "supply," it is proposed to insert "and hydraulic power"; in line 21, after the word "to" and before the word "increasing," to insert "developing hydraulic power and"; and on page 101, line 1, after the word "for," to insert the words "the development of hydraulic power and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the report referred to by the Senator from Nebraska I have had the pleasure of reading in years past. I think I also have a copy in some place where it is convenient of access. The Senate appears to have forgotten the difficulties inherent in that investigation. The report did have reference to the sources of water supply in the District of Columbia and vicinity. That, however, was merely an incidental part of the report. The main part of that report, and the larger part of the investigation which engrossed the efforts of the engineers in charge, was to find a method of developing the hydraulic power. That, to all intents and purposes, is a report on power, not a report on water supply. What the city of Washington needs at this time is water, and not power.

There is no very long-sustained complaint about the use of power, except in the transmission of power to the street car companies engaged in surface transportation here. There is an adequate supply of power for what little manufacturing there is in this District and for the running of elevators and incidental needs of that kind. Outside of the traction lines there is no particular request for more power. There is some complaint, as there is in every city of the United States, about the prices for the light and power furnished by the local company, but the emergency that faces the city of Washington now, Mr. President, is one of water.

There is an existing emergency, and has been for some time, here in Washington. In the event of a breaking down of the water supply or its exhaustion there would not be enough water in case of a fire of any considerable extent in Washington at certain times during the spring—and this is true even of periods during last winter in the midst of some of the severe weather—to extinguish a conflagration if one should break out in this city during a high wind. That is the existing trouble, and that is the trouble that led the Commissioners of the District to ask for this small item.

I do not know whether a report by the most learned engineers or hydraulic experts in the country would add anything to the water-supply information that already exists in the report referred to by the Senator from Nebraska. It might not; but it would serve probably one useful purpose, namely, to give some departmental officer an opportunity to appoint another one of the numerous commissions, boards of river engineers, or some similar body with which the whole country is literally loaded down. It would tend to sustain and keep departmental officers in their normal health. That is the only useful purpose, apart from the emergency I have mentioned.

The weakness I see in the whole scheme is that when it gets into the hands of an officer at the head of some department it will slumber for years. Why, the Secretary of the Treasury can not get action himself short of six months now. If there has been a governmental operation by a Cabinet officer of any kind short of 90 days to a year and a half on the most trivial subject, I do not know what it is. The only objection I have to it is that it ought not to be in any department at all. Instead of being in the hands of the Secretary of War, it ought to be in the hands of the police magistrates, or the police judges, or the police department, or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or Maj. Pullman, or somebody who has arrived at the perfected principle of at some time making up his mind what to do. No Cabinet officer knows. I am sure that this will lodge just where the rest of them have lodged if it is burdened with these amendments. I know exactly what will happen.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest another amendment to the Senator. Instead of the Secretary of War, suppose it were provided that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia should be the persons named?

Mr. SHERMAN. That would improve it.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so myself.

Mr. SHERMAN. Just as far as you can get it away from a Cabinet officer, that much better it grows toward some final practical result.

I am not in charge of the matter, but I will not raise any objection if the Senator will offer the amendment. I am sure the commissioners will get something out of it by going and getting some engineer who has some knowledge of the matter, and will get a "move on" themselves much quicker than some of these gentlemen who are loaded down with matters of state so that they can not give any attention to it.

Mr. NORRIS. We have at least one commissioner now who is very well posted on the subject, and who is one of the best engineers, I think, that there has been in the Army.

Mr. SHERMAN. I quite agree with the Senator on that, but let me make this further suggestion: Just as certainly as you hook up a hydraulic-power controversy with the effort to find more water for Washington to meet the emergency I have mentioned just that certainly you will not get a water supply. The instant you start out on that kind of a double-headed investigation you will run up against the local power company. I am not complaining about it. I am not trying to settle the question here. Maybe the local power company has a right to complain. Maybe it has not. I shall be glad to discuss that question when we get to it. It is not a part of this controversy. What I wish, though, is to get water, and so certainly as we invite by a $15,000 appropriation a controversy with the local power company of this city and with its affiliated concerns we will get delay and not water. We will have investigations piled upon investigations. We will have constitutional scruples of various kinds. We will have bales of information. Reports that will raise the price of print paper on the open market will be the normal result of that investigation, but we will not get any water.

Primarily, the commissioners here had no thought of raising that ancient controversy, and I wish to say that it is 25 years old. I say to the Senator from Nebraska that when we were practicing law and appealing to our constituents for various local offices and haranguing juries in Nebraska and Illinois this was an ancient question in Washington about developing power at Great Falls. Why, I heard of it down in the Mississippi Valley before I ever had any ambition to come to Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Right along that line I want to say that one of the first surveys that was ever made here was made by George Washington, and he was the engineer that started to

construct a canal and started in then to develop power at Great Falls.

Mr. SHERMAN. And the most out-of-date authority in Washington to-day is George Washington himself. Nobody has paid any attention to him around the administration, or not many of us, for a long time. I know there is a wall out here along the river that I have investigated and found, and the remains of an old mill race, where he developed or sought to develop in the early times water power. That was before the days of steam or electricity. He had an idea then that it could be profitably done. But I wish the Senators here would remember that this hydraulic question is older than the official terms of most of us in this body. I believe there is hardly a Senator whose memory will go back to the time when this actual controversy started that is before us now on the question of power development.

What I am interested in for the city of Washington is getting some water. We are much more interested in having an adequate water supply for sanitation, for fire protection, or if it should happen to be a dry summer, for actually good drinking water, healthful and fit for four or five hundred thousand people in Washington to drink, than we are in developing power.

I hold no brief for any power company in this country, in Washington or elsewhere. I have no interest in them. What I am interested in is seeing that the power companies and their affiliated interests—and I do not blame them for looking after their own affairs—do not come in and check the development of the water sources that we may possibly develop by the $15,000 appropriated here. What I want is solely an investigation for water, and not to have it hampered or tied up with a controversy about developing power from Great Falls, with the local company here opposing it. If we put it in this form it is useless, and I say right now that if it goes in the bill in this form I propose to raise the point of order against the amendment myself, and I should like to see somebody compromise me out of it. You can either take that out or I will raise the point of order; I serve notice now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. I raise the point of order, Mr. President, against the amended amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. It is subject to a point of order, and I hope the Chair will sustain it without argument.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Illinois has very properly and very forcefully stated what appears from the history of this proposed development to be absolutely true. So far it has been impossible ever to get anywhere with the development of a water-power proposition to which the Potomac Power Co. of the city of Washington is opposed, and it may be that that is the silent influence, in indirect and various ways, that prevents it; but it seems to me that we are making an admission that is not very creditable to the Senate or to the Government when we say that we can not develop water power in the city of Washington because a local corporation and its affiliated connections are opposed to it.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraksa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment.

Another statement that the Senator from Illinois made, which I think he is mistaken about—I am speaking from memory, however, just like he is—is that this Langfitt report did not go into the water supply of Washington. I am just as satisfied from my memory that it went into the details of that subject as I am that it went into the details of the development of hydroelectricity.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator probably did not get the trend of my remarks. It was not that this commission did not investigate fully the water supply, but I said the paramount and principal purpose of that investigation was to develop power, and not to discover water. That was the chief motive of the investigation.

Mr. NORRIS. My recollection is that there were two propositions contained in the resolution appropriating the money. I do not know; some Senators and Representatives might have thought more of one, and some more of the other; but there was not any difference, as far as an observer could see, as to which one was the paramount or the more important. The fact is that they were both fully investigated, and just as much attention was given to the water supply as to the development of power.

I yield now to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DIAL. I wanted to ask if it would not be well for us to have the former report revised? Could not that be done at very small expense? It would not be necessary, would it, to have an entirely new investigation?

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is true. I did not want by any possible means to interfere with the water supply, of course, and I was willing even to spend some more of the public funds, if it were absolutely necessary, although I do not believe it is at all necessary, although, since the Senator from Illinois has made the point of order to the amendment in the amended form, it has to go out of the bill anyway.

Mr. DIAL. It would cut down the expense very much if we could simply ascertain, through a revision of the report, the difference in cost of material and labor necessary to bring it down to date.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is all that is necessary.

Mr. DIAL. That could be done at very small expense, and it would be worth a great deal in this country to have that power developed, because of the example it would set to the whole United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to be understood with regard to the ruling he has just made. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois raised the point of order against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that there can be no point of order raised at this moment except against the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to suggest to the Chair, as a parliamentary proposition, that if the Senator from Illinois makes a point of order against the amendment which I have offered, it must be overruled, of course, because it is like a demurrer in a pleading; it is taken back to the petition if it is made against the answer; and a proposition that is itself subject to a point of order can be amended by any germane or material amendment, even though it, standing alone, would be subject to a point of order. But I understood the Senator from Illinois to make his point of order against the committee amendment as amended by my amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. It was against the entire amendment as it now stands, as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. And it is all subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment has not been amended as yet.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Illinois understood that the question had been put; but, as the Chair says, there has been no vote taken on it yet.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that the parliamentary situation may be entirely clear, the question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs upon the amendment proposed by the committee as amended; and to that, the Chair understands, the Senator from Illinois presents a point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I raise the point of order against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SHERMAN. Probably I was premature before, but I thought it had been adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 101, after line 14, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 11. That all of the provisions of the act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," are hereby extended to employees of the government of the District of Columbia so far as they may be applicable, except to those members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia who are pensioned or pensionable under the provisions of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved September 1, 1916; and there is hereby appropriated the sum of $5,000, said amount to be set aside as a separate fund in the Treasury to be known as the District of Columbia employees' compensation fund, which fund, including all additions that may be made to it, is hereby permanently appropriated for the payment of such compensation under the terms of said act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, that the commission provided for in said act shall award to employees of the government of the District of Columbia, which awards shall be paid in the manner now provided by law for the payment of the general expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

And the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall submit annually to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, estimates of appropriations necessary for the maintenance of this fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and call the matter to the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

Damages and payment for ground on account of condemnation proceedings: To pay Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller for ground taken and damages on account of condemnation proceedings in square No. 2838 in the city of Washington, $3,820.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, that item has been put in the bill a number of times on the floor of the Senate, and I am perfectly willing that it shall go to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$40,000," and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "there is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purpose."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make this statement about that particular amendment: It merely restores the language which has been in the bill for a good many years. It seems that the appropriation which is to be used does not apply to street improvements, as was contemplated by the committee, but it is for the purpose of acquiring land to carry out the highway plan that was arranged some time ago.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to the amendment going to conference.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not like to object to that course, but it does seem to me it is a very dangerous precedent to make an appropriation without limiting the amount, merely stating whatever may be necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. I had already taken it up with the chairman of the committee, and he had no objection to it. I will state to the Senator that this has been in the appropriation bill since 1914. I have a memorandum here, and I ask unanimous consent to print it as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave will be granted.

The memorandum is as follows:

This amendment merely restores the language that has been carried in every District of Columbia appropriation bill since 1914, and is offered that the orderly development of the city may not be interrupted.

This appropriation does not apply to street improvements, but merely to the acquisition of land necessary to open, extend, and widen streets and highways to conform to the highway plan adopted years ago for the District of Columbia.

Every cent expended under this appropriation is reimbursed from benefits assessed upon land which will be advantaged by the proposed opening. The procedure is that the commissioners institute condemnation proceedings for the necessary opening or extension of a street. The jury, under the law, must find damages to the extent of the value of the land taken for highway purposes, and must also, under the law, assess benefits against lands found to be benefited which will total the amount of the damages found plus the costs of the proceeding. The benefits collected may be paid in installments over a term of three years, but in that event the deferred payments bear interest. Not a dollar of money is expended except that which will be reimbursed.

On the other hand, the commissioners must show affirmatively to the court that they have the funds wherewith to pay damages for property taken, else the court is compelled, under the law, to throw out the proceeding. At the present time the total damages that will be found under pending proceedings may possibly aggregate over $250,000. The limitation in the bill as reported, of $40,000, will mean that these cases will be thrown out of court, and the expenses already incurred will then in fact become a charge on the revenues of the District of Columbia, since the reimbursement contemplated by existing law will have been made impossible.

In nearly every case a large amount of the benefits are assessed against the same land for which damages are found. For instance, in the recent case of the widening of Wisconsin Avenue the total damages were about $107,000, all of which sum had to be available to validate the condemnation proceeding, but of the benefits assessed about $65,000 was against this same land; so that the net amount paid out of the appropriation will be only about $52,000. And that $52,000 will be reimbursed by the assessments upon land which was found to be benefited but which was awarded no damages.

The Treasury can not suffer by reason of this indefinite appropriation; but, on the other hand, the limitation of $40,000 practically will tie up all proceedings now in court, will for the first time make a net charge on the revenues on account of these street extensions, and will tie the hands of the commissioners with respect to the future provision of highways for the growing city.

Mr. McKELLAR. Briefly, according to the plan that was arranged some years ago, the city acquires the land and then it assesses the damages and assesses the benefits to the adjoining property. It does not cost the city anything at all. It does not cost the Government anything at all. The plan arranged by the commission provides for making the property owners along these streets pay more than the cost of acquiring the land. It has never cost the city anything since it has been in the appropriation bill, and I am assured by the commissioner that it will not do so now; and it actually saves the $40,000 proposed to be appropriated here.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this question was thoroughly discussed in the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee as a whole decided that it is a very unsafe plan to put into the law a provision with no limitation whatever to the amount of money that is to be expended. For that reason I sincerely hope the Senate will not support the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment. All that the committee thought it was possible to expend for this purpose profitably or justly is $40,000, and so we included the amount of $40,000 for that reason. I think the Senate ought to consider for a long time before they make an appropriation of an unlimited amount.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit an inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will in just a moment, in so far as I can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom, if to anyone, does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand from the commissioners that this provision has been in every appropriation bill since 1914. Is that correct?

Mr. SMOOT. The first act providing for a change in the payments of benefits was passed in 1914.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I will ask this further question——

Mr. SMOOT. I want to state the reason why it was then put in the appropriation bill. At that time there had been no estimate made as to the amount of work that would be done the coming year on the new basis of work, and the commissioners assured the committee there would not be more than a certain amount of money expended. That assurance was given, and I think was lived up to. But now the city has extended in all directions and are we prepared to say here there shall be no limit? I think we ought to hesitate a long time before doing that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator this question——

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit an inquiry I think we can settle this matter in a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I had yielded to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Tennessee would add this amendment, would it not obviate the objection made by the Senator from Utah and meet the desire of the Senator from Tennessee? Add to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee:

Such amount, however, not to exceed the sum of $40,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand sometimes they have to pay a great deal more than that to acquire the land, and that is immediately taxed up to the adjoining lot owners. I understand they made a report showing that it had never cost the city anything at all, but that the entire cost and expense is charged up and collected. That is the assurance given to me by Mr. Brownlow, one of the commissioners.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the existing law, the law that has been in force for years in the District, though I will state it was amended three or four years ago, for the assessment on the abutting property we specifically provided for the percentage that shall be paid not only by the District but by the property owners benefited by the improvement. This does not change that law at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. But it allows them to operate under this law so as not to cost the city or the Government anything.

Mr. SMOOT. The District of Columbia has to pay finally whatever percentage the law provides on every improvement made on every street.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SMOOT. That is all I have to say.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. When this question was up before the subcommittee a showing was made conclusively that there were two or three streets improved that could not have been improved with this limit of $40,000. Wisconsin Avenue is one of them. The District Commissioners say it is utterly impossible for them to get along with $40,000. Here is the language of the commissioners:

There is really no drain on the Treasury, because the entire cost, including the cost of the proceedings, is assessed against the property benefited, and even in the deferred payments, so far as the assessments are concerned, the deferred payments bear interest at from 5 to 6 per cent.

It seems to me, in view of the fact that this cost is assessed against the property holders and the extensions are made at their request, the commissioners ought to be given authority to do the work that is required to be done upon the streets.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Under the law the owners along the street must pay all the damages?

Mr. CURTIS. That is what the commissioners say.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that is the law, but it has always seemed to me that that very often would bring us to a place where it would be an utter impossibility to enforce the law. Take Wisconsin Avenue, for instance, where the street must be widened. A man's house may be standing within 4 or 5 feet of the street and the improvement will cut off a part of his house. It may take so much of his lot that he has not enough left to put the house on. Does the Senator say that any court would require him after he had lost his lot to pay damages in addition? Even though that is the law, it seems to me that in very many cases it would be impossible to enforce it. Wisconsin Avenue is too narrow and they want to widen it. It is not for the benefit of the man who lives on Wisconsin Avenue any more than the benefit of the man who lives on East Capitol Street. In fact, it may be a damage to the man on Wisconsin Avenue if it would take a portion of his house and cost him a whole lot of money. He ought to be paid something from some source, and I should think that ought to come out of all the taxpayers rather than out of any individual, and as a matter of constitutional law it would have to come from there or we could not get it, because you can not take a man's property without giving him compensation for it.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to state in answer to the Senator that I know of no case ever having gone to court. There was one man whose property was taken, and it was supposed that he was greatly damaged, but instead of that they assessed benefits. They took some property he had just purchased. The man did not go to court. The proposition has been brought in here and gone to conference half a dozen times and the House has never yielded to the Senate on the question that the man should have some compensation for the damage because his property was taken from him and he was damaged instead of benefited by the windening of the street.

Mr. NORRIS. That might very often happen; but, of course, many times it might be a benefit, and if he gets a benefit he ought to pay for it. But it does not follow that when you are going out and taking property a man ought to pay or could be required to pay all of the damages. You might take all the property he had.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GRONNA. May we have the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, line 23, strike out "$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "there is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purpose," so that the paragraph will read:

To carry out the provisions contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, which authorizes the commissioners to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, there is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purpose, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the proposed amendment the following words:

Such amount, however, not to exceed the sum of $40,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to be added at the end of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the bill the following as an additional section:

SEC. 12. That the loitering of public cabs and hacks or vehicles of all descriptions around or in front of the hotels, theaters, or public buildings in the District of Columbia, either by stopping, except to take on or discharge a passenger, or unnecessarily slow driving is hereby prohibited, and any driver of any such cab or hack who willfully causes the same to loiter either by stopping or slow driving as aforesaid shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and punished in the Police Court of the District of Columbia by a fine of not less than $10 nor more than $40 for such offense. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to make any regulations that may be necessary in furtherance of the purpose of this act, and are hereby given authority to revoke the license of the driver of any public hack or cab who is convicted of a violation of this act.

Any driving at a rate of less than seven miles an hour is loitering or unnecessarily slow driving within the meaning of this provision. A third conviction under this provision shall work a permanent revocation of the license of the offending driver.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it. The noes have it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I would like to have the yeas and nays if I can get them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the Senator will not do that. The amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator will listen to me——

Mr. CURTIS. I assure the Senator I shall make no objection to his proposed amendment, and I will be very glad to take it up in conference. I hope the Senate will let it go in.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is not satisfactory to me, Mr. President. I think those Senators who voted against it are not acquainted with the situation. If the Senate is advised of the purpose, and I will take not over five minutes to tell it, then if the judgment of the Senate is against it, I have no objection. That is all I ask.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona has demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; I withdraw the demand, with the understanding that I may make a brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The demand for the yeas and nays is withdrawn.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Wait; I have not yielded the floor. I have said I withdrew the demand for the yeas and nays, and I had already stated that, with an explanation to the Senate of what the amendment is, if the Senate's judgment is against the amendment, I have no objection to the Senate rejecting the amendment. I have an explanation to make, and that is all I want to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona desire a yea and nay vote?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have withdrawn that request.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask a question? Has the Chair passed upon the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has ruled upon it, but will reconsider its own ruling and will put the question again.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Pending that I want to explain the amendment to the Senate. As I understand the present parliamentary situation, the question is at this time on the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair so stated a moment ago. The Chair will put the question again.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Before the question is put, in support of the amendment I would like to speak of a little experience about the hack drivers in the city of Washington. Any man who lives in the downtown part of this city, who is so unfortunate as to have to live in a hotel, has seen around it, and especially around Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets, and Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street one continual almost solid procession going at the slowest possible rate, and on every one of them a sign "For hire." If you try to drive in with your own machine, if you are so fortunate as to have one, you have to wait until that funeral procession passes, and if you speak a

little roughly to any of them the chances are you will get run into. They block the streets and stop the passengers.

I have seen the street railway cars blocked in front of the hotel, and I have gone down the street and seen other hotels in the same condition. They have had the same difficulty at the Union Station. I have seen the commissioners on the subject. They want the matter put in their hands so that this nuisance may be stopped or in some measure be abated. When those drivers are called before the court, the court can fine them from $1 up to $40 I believe, and the court will fine for offense after offense, one man $5, another $1, and the result is that they go right back to the same business again on the streets without the least regard for other people who are trying to drive on the streets of Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the Senator to say that under present conditions they are fined by the court?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. They are fined a dollar or two dollars, and sometimes they are not fined, until they have about quit arresting them at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Why are they not fined heavier, at least for the second or third offense?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I can not understand why they are not.

Mr. NORRIS. The point I am trying to get at is that we must have some kind of a law that permits fining them now.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There is a law that permits fining them, and the court usually puts the fine at so insignificant an amount that no attention whatever is paid to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Then why would not the proper procedure be to amend the existing law by increasing the penalty, instead of passing a new law, and thus having two laws?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Because I have designated the places in the amendment where this practice is worst, and I offer it at the suggestion of the commissioners and the superintendent of police.

Mr. NORRIS. I am in entire sympathy with the Senator in trying to bring relief. I understand somewhat the situation; but I was afraid if we now have a law on the statute books, we will not get any relief by simply putting another on and providing another penalty for the same offense. If the penalty is not sufficient in the existing law, I think we might reach the proposition by increasing the penalty.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have failed to make the Senator understand that the amendment carries more than a mere increase in the fine.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not an amendment of the existing law?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is not an amendment, except where it changes the amount of the fine, and it designates the particular places.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask the Senator whether the language of the amendment follows the existing law or simply changes the amount of the fine?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If it did, I should have done nothing more, and the commissioners would have asked nothing more, than to have changed the amount of the fine.

Mr. NORRIS. I am asking the Senator if, in the amendment he offers, he uses the same language as that in the existing law, except as to the penalty?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have answered the Senator as plainly as I could. If it were nothing more than merely changing the existing law, the commissioners and the superintendent of police would not have asked for some relief. The suggestion of this matter came from them.

Mr. NORRIS. It may be that it is my fault—I presume it is—but I confess I do not believe that the Senator from Arizona has answered my question, and I am asking it in perfect good faith to get at the facts. I desire to know whether the Senator's amendment follows existing law, with the exception of the penalty? I think we ought to know that.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It does not.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the amendment at least ought to contain a provision repealing existing law, if there is already a law on the subject, before we enact another law.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Oh, no; not unless this would be in conflict with it. The Senator from Nebraska is too good a lawyer not to know that.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator understand, if it is not in conflict, that there are going to be two trials, two judgments, and two fines for the same offense?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should not offer the amendment if it were in conflict with another law. If it were so, there would be no necessity for it. I am trying to show to the Senator—and it is rather my fault than his that our minds do not meet probably—that there is no existing law covering the particular cases here attempted to be covered, except, perhaps, on parade days or some occasion of that kind. The amendment is designed to stop the practice complained of every day in the year in front of hotels, public buildings, the railroad depot, theaters, and similar public places.

The practice referred to has become so notorious that complaint has become general. I myself went to the Commissioners and also to the Superintendent of Police in regard to it, and it is at their suggestion that I have offered the amendment which is now before the Senate. I know the condition is one which ought to be relieved.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do.

Mr. McCORMICK. Do the commissioners suggest that 7 miles an hour is to constitute loitering?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No.

Mr. McCORMICK. I was going to ask what would constitute scorching?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the Senator from Illinois slows his machine down and runs it at a rate of 7 miles an hour in the streets of Washington, he will be the only man in the city who does not think he is loitering. If the Senator will imagine 10 automobiles in a line, the driver of each calling to a prospective passenger, "Don't take that machine; take this one," and all the while moving at 6 miles an hour in a solid procession around and around, he will realize the nuisance of which we complain. That is all I have to say.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I offer as a separate section to the bill, to come in at the end thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, to be known as section 13, as follows:

SEC. 13. That no judicial order, decree, or judgment for the recovery of possession of real estate in the District of Columbia, or any room, suite of rooms, or apartments in any apartment or other house in the District of Columbia now or hereafter held or acquired by oral or written agreement of lease or by operation of law, or for the ejectment or dispossession of a tenant therefrom, when the tenant has paid or tendered the agreed rent and performed the other conditions of the tenancy not inconsistent herewith, shall be made, unless the tenant shall have had at least 90 days' notice in writing from the landlord or purchaser thereof to quit the said premises, notwithstanding any waivers of statutory notice heretofore made by any tenant. All laws and parts of laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I hope it will not be made, and that the amendment may go to conference for investigation. In a word, the purpose of the amendment is this: Senators are familiar with the so-called Saulsbury joint resolution. I have been reliably advised that a good many of the real estate owners, particularly the apartment-house owners, have gotten together, and have already entered into some sort of an agreement whereby the tenants are going to be ejected at the earliest moment possible, and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] tells me that 80 ejectment suits were begun on yesterday. The day will soon be here, we all hope, when the proclamation of peace will be issued, but these tenants ought to have a reasonable time in which to turn around.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is getting late, and I want to get this bill through to-night. In order to avoid discussion, I am willing to accept the amendment and let it go to conference.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well; I will consent to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 54, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

For allowances to be applied only toward uniforms actually purchased by uniformed employees of the Metropolitan Police department, $67,490, to be expended under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That all payments for uniforms shall be on itemized vouchers and paid in the same manner as are other District of Columbia government expenses.

Mr. CURTIS. That amendment was not submitted to the committee; it is not estimated for; we have had no time to consider it; and I make the point of order against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, on page 47, line 7, after the words "special schools," I offered an amendment which I think was simply over looked by the subcommittee. It does not at all increase the appropriation. I think the Senator in charge of the bill will have no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 47, line 7, after the words "white special schools," it is proposed to insert "the chief medical and sanitary inspector of schools."

Mr. CURTIS. I think that amendment should be added. It was in the last bill. It is to take care of an officer who, I understand, was in the Army and has returned. The item was left out because it was not called to the attention of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out, on page 48, lines 24 and 25, and on page 49, lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. I invited the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to this provision some time ago and stated that if the explanation which he offered was the only one that could be made I should move to strike it out after the committee amendments had been passed upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 48, after line 23, it is proposed to strike out:

For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, $30,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CURTIS. If that provision goes out, it will go to conference, and then we can make the inquiry the Senator desires and secure more information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. At the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], who is detained from the Senate by important official business, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 54, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$9,498.66: *Provided*, That hereafter all privates of class 1 who have served as such for a period of two years shall be promoted to be privates of class 2, if the conduct and intelligent attention to duty of such privates shall justify such promotion. Privates in said force who have served as in class 2 for a period of three years shall be promoted to be privates of class 3, if the conduct and intelligent attention to duty of such privates shall justify such promotion."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to explain the amendment in a word. As I understand, at the present time in the case of privates in the police force it requires eight years to pass from class 1 to class 3. This is the only city in the United States requiring such a long period of time. The amendment will reduce to five years the period in which policemen may pass to class 3, which will mean to them a slight additional compensation. I think the amendment will right a manifest wrong that exists now in the law.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am compelled to make a point of order against this amendment. In the first place, it is not estimated for; it has not been reported by a standing committee of the Senate; and, further than that, the word "hereafter" is used, making it a permanent law. I make the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

To the Georgetown University and to the George Washington University each the sum of $25,000 toward the maintenance of the Schools of Medicine and Dentistry and the hospitals of said universities: *Provided*, That an amount equal to this appropriation shall be expended by each of the said universities out of its own funds for the said purpose.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the two universities mentioned in the amendment have been in existence in the neighborhood of a hundred years. They have never received any support from the Government, although they have taken care of the sick and the indigent in their hospitals. They are educating young men; they are class A colleges, so classified by the great collegiate association of the country, and they absolutely need help now. If these institutions were in any State of the Union they would receive help from the State, as similar institutions located elsewhere have received help from the respective State governments.

I hope that no Senator will make a point of order against this amendment, because these institutions absolutely need this money if they are to exist. The District is proud of them; they have been in existence for a century or more; they are doing a great work, and are, as I have said, taking care of the sick and afflicted. I know something of the work their hospitals have done in the District.

I know the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I ask the Senator in charge of the bill not to make the point of order, but to allow the amendment to go to conference and investigate the matter there as to whether this money ought not to be appropriated for these two great institutions of which, I repeat, the District is so proud.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment on page 98, line 22, was agreed to. There is a typographical error in line 25. The word "sources" there should be "services."

Mr. CURTIS. I hope that the suggestion of the Senator from Maine will be complied with, and that the amendment suggested by him will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment on page 98, line 22, was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move that the word "sources" be stricken out and that the word "services" be inserted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment on page 98, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the word "sources" and insert in lieu thereof the word "services."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I merely wish to make one remark before this bill is passed. It perpetuates the system known as the half-and-half. I very much disapprove of that system. I think it is unfair, and if it were not so imperative that this bill be passed speedily I should make some effort to secure a change in the method of taxation. I think it very unfair to perpetuate a system that does not, in my opinion, fairly tax the property of the District. I believe that the system ought to be to tax the property of the District in a fair and just manner, and that whatever deficit may be involved in conducting the municipal affairs of the city should be met by the General Government. I do not feel, in view of the present emergency, like raising the question upon this bill; but I wish to give notice now to the Senator in charge of the bill and to the members of the committee that the next time they bring in a District of Columbia appropriation bill, if the system is still perpetuated, they may look for some discussion.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 19, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *June 18, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of light and life and love, dispenser of all good gifts, let Thy blessing descend upon us, to clarify our minds, purify our hearts and make us strong for the work before us; that we control our passions, giving no offense to our brethren; striving to do unto others as we would be done by; possessing our souls in patience and peace. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

An act (S. 1028) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to amend the laws for preventing collision of vessels, and to regulate the equipment of certain motor boats on navigable waters of the United States," approved June 9, 1910.

An act (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York.

CORRECTION.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the other day in the debate on the resolution to furnish the investigating committee with lawyers, stenographers, and so forth, and about our universal unpreparedness when the war began, I stated that Gen. SHERWOOD was the only man in Congress who ever set a squadron in the field. Col. LITTLE called my attention to the fact that he set several squadrons in the field in the Philippines, being a lieutenant colonel in command of a regiment; and our good friend Maj. STEDMAN, one of the best loved men in the House, rose to the rank of major in the Civil War, and Col. CRAGO had a large experience in the Philippines. I simply wanted to set that matter straight. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on military intelligence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on military intelligence. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of aviation in the Navy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on aviation in the Navy. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. Speaker, I offer for consideration a privileged resolution, No. 14, and I move that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged.

The SPEAKER. To-day being Calendar Wednesday, that is not in order.

Mr. GOOD. This being Calendar Wednesday, will the action on the conference report which was under consideration when the House adjourned yesterday come up the first thing this morning?

The SPEAKER. It will not be in order until to-morrow.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that it will take but a few minutes to dispose of the conference report. It is a conference report on the deficiency bill, and it ought to go to conference again immediately, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on H. R. 3417.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the conference report under consideration at the adjournment yesterday be taken up and finished to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, the only question remaining is the decision of the Speaker, and possibly a roll call on the proposition?

Mr. GOOD. I hardly think there will be a roll call.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. I have not the floor.

Mr. BEE. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] a question. On page 1304 of the RECORD of yesterday he is credited with this statement:

> If we have more facilities than we need, as the Secretary of the Treasury says, why did he buy, at a cost of $1,500,000, a new building at Corpus Christi, Tex., on the 7th day of June?

I direct the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that the item was $150,000, and on final settlement $140,000 for the purchase of that land.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected to show the correct figures. In the meantime, I would like to say that the Secretary of the Treasury has already sent a communication to the House calling attention to the necessity for the construction of a hospital here in the District of Columbia and some other places, asking legislation upon the subject, in the face of the fact that the letter from the Secretary read by the gentleman from Iowa yesterday indicated that there was no necessity for any hospital facilities.

Mr. BEE. Did the Secretary of the Treasury include Corpus Christi?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a Memorial Day speech by Gen. John J. Pershing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Chair to hold that on a call for the regular order the conference report on which the previous question has been ordered is not the regular order, in spite of its being Calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. That was the ruling of the Chair. The Chair thinks that that will come up to-morrow.

The Clerk began the call of committees.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Was not a unanimous-consent agreement entered into some days ago to the effect that the clerk-hire proposition would come up this morning after we finished the regular business, or something of that kind?

The SPEAKER. The calendar so states, but, according to the statement of the calendar, that comes up after the business of the calendar is disposed of, although the Chair's recollection was that the unanimous consent was to be considered on that day, on Monday or Tuesday, but the Chair shall abide, of course, by the Journal. It comes up immediately after the calendar is considered.

Mr. CALDWELL. If a committee is called and the committee gets started on something, the unanimous consent does not amount to anything.

The SPEAKER. It depends upon how long the consideration of other business is in the House. It says that on Wednesday, immediately after the consideration of the calendar, it is in order to take this business up immediately after consideration of the calendar, and the calendar has not yet been considered.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the further call of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with. Can not we do that; would it be in order to move now to dispense with the further call of the calendar?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order to move to dispense with the business of Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MONDELL. But the gentleman would have to be recognized for that purpose.

Mr. CALDWELL. If the Speaker will recognize me for that purpose——

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he ought to recognize any gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on that motion. Does the gentleman from New York desire to speak to his motion?

Mr. CALDWELL. Only to say, it seems to me, that this little matter of clerk hire ought to be taken care of, and taken care of now, or otherwise it would not be taken care of before the 1st of July, and we will find ourselves in an unfortunate position, and I think it ought to be disposed of; that is all.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield? [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request to be heard in opposition and ask for a vote.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

The Clerk proceeded with the call of the calendar.

REPEAL OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. ESCH (when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was called). Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to call up the bill H. R. 3854, a bill for the repeal of the daylight-saving law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls up the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3854) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration upon the measure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts raises the question of consideration upon the measure.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were—ayes 104, noes 34.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order there is no quorum present, and evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 259, nays 96, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

YEAS—259.

Alexander	Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Rhodes
Almon	Doremus	Kearns	Ricketts
Anderson	Doughton	Kendall	Riddick
Andrews, Md.	Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Robinson, N. C.
Andrews, Nebr.	Drane	Kincheloe	Robsion, Ky.
Ashbrook	Dunbar	King	Rodenberg
Aswell	Echols	Kinkaid	Romjue
Ayres	Elliott	Kitchin	Sanders, Ind.
Babka	Ellsworth	Kleczka	Sanders, La.
Bacharach	Esch	Knutson	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Saunders, Va.
Bankhead	Evans, Nev.	Lampert	Schall
Barkley	Fairfield	Langley	Shreve
Bee	Ferris	Lanham	Sims
Begg	Fields	Lankford	Sinnott
Bell	Fisher	Larsen	Sisson
Benham	Flood	Layton	Slemp
Benson	Focht	Lazaro	Small
Black	Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Smith, Idaho
Bland, Ind.	Frear	Lesher	Smithwick
Bland, Va.	French	Lever	Steagall
Blanton	Fuller, Ill.	Little	Stedman
Boies	Gandy	Luhring	Stevenson
Booher	Gard	McCulloch	Stiness
Bowers	Garner	McFadden	Strong, Kans.
Box	Garrett	McKenzie	Sweet
Brand	Godwin, N. C.	McKeown	Taylor, Ark.
Brinson	Good	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Taylor, Colo.
Brooks, Ill.	Goodwin, Ark.	McPherson	Taylor, Tenn.
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	Magee	Temple
Browne	Gould	Major	Thomas
Browning	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Thompson, Ohio
Brumbaugh	Green, Iowa	Mason	Thompson, Okla.
Buchanan	Greene, Mass.	Mead	Tillman
Burroughs	Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Timberlake
Byrnes, S. C.	Hadley	Michener	Tincher
Byrns, Tenn.	Hamilton	Miller	Towner
Campbell, Kans.	Hardy, Tex.	Monahan, Wis.	Treadway
Campbell, Pa.	Hastings	Mondell	Venable
Candler	Haugen	Montague	Vestal
Cannon	Hawley	Mooney	Vinson
Cantrill	Hayden	Moore, Ohio	Voigt
Caraway	Hays	Moore, Va.	Volstead
Carss	Hernandez	Morgan	Wason
Carter	Hersey	Mott	Watkins
Christopherson	Hickey	Neely	Watson, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Hill	Nelson, Mo.	Watson, Va.
Classon	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Weaver
Cole	Holland	Nicholls, S. C.	Webb
Collier	Houghton	O'Conner	Webster
Connally	Howard	Overstreet	Welling
Cooper	Huddleston	Padgett	Wheeler
Copley	Hudspeth	Park	White, Kans.
Cramton	Hulings	Parrish	White, Me.
Crisp	Hull, Iowa	Porter	Williams
Curry, Calif.	Hull, Tenn.	Pou	Wilson, La.
Dale	Hutchinson	Quin	Wingo
Davey	Igoe	Ragsdale	Winslow
Davis, Minn.	Ireland	Rainey, H. T.	Wood, Ind.
Davis, Tenn.	Jacoway	Raker	Woodyard
Dempsey	Jefferis	Ramseyer	Wright
Denison	Johnson, Ky.	Randall, Wis.	Yates
Dent	Johnson, Miss.	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed, N. Y.	Zihlman
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, Wash.	Reed, W. Va.	

NAYS—96.

Barbour	Ganly	McGlennon	Phelan
Bland, Mo.	Garland	McKiniry	Radcliffe
Briggs	Glynn	McLane	Rainey, J. W.
Britten	Goldfogle	McLaughlin, Mich.	Ramsey
Burdick	Griffin	MacCrate	Randall, Calif.
Burke	Hardy, Colo.	Madden	Reber
Caldwell	Haskell	Maher	Riordan
Carew	Hicks	Mapes	Rose
Casey	Humphreys	Mays	Rouse
Chindblom	James	Minahan, N. J.	Rowe
Cleary	Johnston, N. Y.	Moon	Sabath
Coady	Juul	Moore, Pa.	Scott
Crowther	Kahn	Moores, Ind.	Siegel
Cullen	Kelly, Pa.	Morin	Smith, Mich.
Currie, Mich.	Kettner	Newton, Minn.	Smith, N. Y.
Dallinger	Kreider	Newton, Mo.	Snyder
Darrow	LaGuardia	Nichols, Mich.	Stephens, Ohio
Dunn	Lehlbach	Nolan	Sumners, Tex.
Dupré	Lonergan	O'Connell	Tinkham
Elston	Longworth	Ogden	Valle
Fitzgerald	Lufkin	Oldfield	Vare
Freeman	McAndrews	Osborne	Walsh
Gallagher	McArthur	Pell	Welty
Gallivan	McDuffie	Peters	Wilson, Ill.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Emerson

NOT VOTING—73.

Ackerman	Graham, Pa.	Mudd	Smith, Ill.
Anthony	Griest	Murphy	Snell
Blackmon	Hamill	Oliver	Steele
Butler	Harrison	Olney	Steenerson
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	Paige	Stephens, Miss.
Costello	Hersman	Parker	Strong, Pa.
Crago	Husted	Platt	Sullivan
Dewalt	Jones, Pa.	Purnell	Summers, Wash.
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	Tilson
Dooling	Kennedy, R. I.	Rogers	Upshaw
Dyer	Kiess	Rowan	Walters
Eagan	Lee, Ga.	Rubey	Ward
Eagle	Linthicum	Rucker	Whaley
Edmonds	Luce	Sanford	Wilson, Pa.
Evans, Mont.	McClintic	Scully	Wise
Fess	McKinley	Sears	Woods, Va.
Foster	MacGregor	Sells	Young, N. Dak.
Fuller, Mass.	Mann	Sherwood	
Goodall	Mansfield	Sinclair	

So the House decided to consider the bill.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. BUTLER (for consideration) with Mr. STEELE (against).

Mr. FOSTER (for consideration) with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (against).

Mr. LEE of Georgia (for consideration) with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts (against).

Mr. TILSON (for consideration) with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. MURPHY (for consideration) with Mr. LINTHICUM (against).

Mr. WARD (for consideration) with Mr. COSTELLO (against).

Mr. HARRISON (for consideration) with Mr. SANFORD (against).

Mr. WOODS of Virginia (for consideration) with Mr. ROGERS (against).

Mr. SNELL (for consideration) with Mr. PAIGE (against).

Mr. RUBEY (for consideration) with Mr. HASKELL (against).

Until June 20:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. OLNEY.

Until further notice:

Mr. DYER with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. CRAGO with Mr. WISE.

Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. LUCE with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. MACGREGOR with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. PLATT with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. EVANS.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. EAGLE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the hour allotted to each side under the rule on Calendar Wednesday be controlled on this side by myself and the other side by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Tennessee opposed to the bill?

Mr. SIMS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] asks unanimous consent that the hour on each side be controlled, one hour by himself and one hour by the gentleman opposed to the bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask further unanimous consent, that the time for general debate be extended one hour, the extension to be equally divided. There are so many requests that it seems impossible to accommodate all the gentlemen unless the time be extended one hour, to be equally divided by 30 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent——

Mr. SIMS. I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended one additional hour, the time to be equally divided. As there is only one amendment to the bill, there will be but little debate under the five-minute rule. There are so many gentlemen who have asked to express themselves that I ask for this extension.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended one hour, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] and himself.

Mr. ESCH. I reserve the right to object, for the reason that when we get through with this bill I want to call up the bill for the return of wire lines.

I believe if we hold to the rules we can get full expression from the Members of the House, and those who desire to speak and can not get time can extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3854) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, is hereby repealed, effective at 2 o'clock a. m. of the third Sunday after the approval of this act, when by the retarding of one hour the standard time of each zone shall be returned to and thereafter be the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone as defined in section 1 of said act approved March 19, 1918.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

In lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "at 2 o'clock a. m. of the third Sunday" and insert in lieu thereof "on the last Sunday of October, 1919."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I only wish to occupy 10 minutes, and I prefer to use that time without interruption.

The act approved March 19, 1918, provided for saving daylight and for standard time for the United States. The proposed bill seeks only to affect section 3 of that act, which provides for the pushing ahead of the clock for one hour on the last Sunday of March and retarding it one hour on the last Sunday of October of each year. The remaining provisions of the original act remain intact. These provide the fixing of zones based upon meridian lines indicating mean astronomical time. We do not seek to change those sections, but we do believe that section 3, which provides the pushing ahead of the clock on the last Sunday of March should be repealed, and the repeal should become effective on the last Sunday of October this year. The reasons we believe in the repeal are these: When the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the original act, divided the country into five zones, based upon meridians 75, 90, 105, and 120, and 150, it made sections of this country on the outer margins of each one of these zones where the discrepancy between the mean astronomical time of that zone and the true time was at least 30 minutes. That is to say, on the western and eastern margins of each one of these five zones the clock time would be 30 minutes different from the mean astronomical time of the zone. Now, then, when section 3 became operative the clock was advanced one hour in addition to the discrepancy of the 30 minutes created by these zones. That makes a total discrepancy of 1 hour and 30 minutes on the eastern and western limits of each of the five zones. That discrepancy was so marked in the regions affected as to cause great inconvenience and great dissatisfaction.

That is not all. When the Interstate Commerce Commission fixed these zones it changed the limits, in some respects, of the zones that for 10 or 15 years had been observed by the railroad companies. A marked illustration of such a change occurred in the division line between eastern and central time. As the railroads have created this line, it ran practically parallel or near to the Ohio-Pennsylvania line. The commission shoved it westward, so that it began at Toledo, Ohio, passed through Columbus, down to Huntington, W. Va., Nashville, Tenn., Atlanta, Ga., and Apalachicola, Fla. That shoved the western line of the eastern zone 125 to 150 miles farther west and embraced, therefore, over half the State of Ohio. Now, then, that change caused the clocks to be advanced one hour in that territory beyond what the time was before. Then comes section 3 and adds another hour by pushing ahead the clock, making practically two hours, a discrepancy in time which necessarily resulted in great inconvenience and loss to the millions of people living between what was the former western limit of the eastern zone and the new limit of the eastern zone.

Now, this same difficulty has occurred in other parts of the United States where there were changes made by the commission over the zones used by the railroad companies. But owing to a less density of population in those sections there has been less of complaint. For instance, in eastern Ohio, where the clock has been shoved ahead one hour and two hours, there have been many complaints coming from the truck farmers and gardeners of that region.

There has also been complaint coming to the committee from the miners of Indiana and Ohio and other regions. The fact is that these miners do not live at the mine mouth; they live miles away. They must come to the mine to work on train or trolley or other conveyance. That means that they have got to get up so much earlier in order to get their breakfast and take their train and reach the mine in time for their work. That means that the housewife must get up so much earlier in order to prepare breakfast for her husband in order that he may get to the mine in time to begin work. The complaints from the mining regions in the Middle West is universal, and the miners ask that we should restore the time to the normal.

But that is not all. The man most affected is the farmer. I will not have time to go into that, because there are other speakers who will deal with it. But suffice it to say that the farmer is largely inconvenienced because he is put out of joint with the situation in his market town. He must get up earlier in order to do his chores, to milk his cows, if he is a dairy farmer, and to take that milk to the station in order that it may get to the city in time for your breakfast table. Some States require that the milk, before being sent to market, must be cooled to 60°. Some States require that this milk must also be pasteurized before it is sent to market. All these processes take time, and that time is simply robbing the farmer of that much rest and sleep. These are the incidents in connection with the operation of this law which none of us, possibly, contemplated when we voted for it.

I know it will be said on this floor, "Why can not the farmer adjust himself to this new situation, instead of making us, the dwellers in the cities, adjust ourselves to the situation?" The reason is plain. Adjustment on the part of the farmers requires a greater sacrifice than adjustment on the part of the citizen in the towns to the new situation.

The farmer must deal with weather conditions. He must deal with other contingencies. He is not the master of his own destiny. He can not get into relationship with the people in his market town. The citizens in the town, the people working in the great stores and factories and mills, could adjust themselves to this new situation even if we did not push the clock ahead. Why can not the thousand or two thousand employees of Macy & Co., New York, by agreement set their clock ahead an hour, notwithstanding the repeal of the law? Why could not men in the large factories do the same thing, and thus by voluntary action get all the advantages they claim are due to this daylight-saving law?

Then there is a serious question on the farm as to hired labor. The hired man on the farm, gentlemen, is assimilating some of the doctrines of organized labor in the cities; in many parts of the United States the hired man has been feeling the influence and the effects of an eight-hour day, and he is claiming an eight-hour day in many sections. He is called to work; he goes to the farm. Supposing he reports to the farm at 6 o'clock in the morning, clock time. The dew is yet on the grass and on the fields. He can not work until the dew has been dissipated, or he engages in some unimportant work until he can get to the fields. That is really lost time to his employer. But when the whistle in the nearby town sounds 5 o'clock, he stops. His eight hours are accomplished.

The result of it is there has been an increase in the cost of production. Food is costing more by reason of this situation, and as Mr. Atkeson, who is the representative of the Grange, the Patrons of Husbandry, stated to our committee, that the daylight-saving law has practically added from 12 to 20 per cent to the cost of production. If this is true generally, we must realize that the inevitable result of the law will be an

increase in the cost of food instead of a saving in the cost of food. If the dwellers in the city, therefore, want to pay an increased price for food, due to the operation of daylight saving, let them do so knowingly, because an increase in the cost of labor on the farms is inevitably bound to follow.

Mr. RANDALL of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I regret I can not. I have but a limited time.

Who are those favoring the repeal of this law? Briefly these: Over 300 farmers' papers, magazines, and organs; every farmers' organization in the United States; the Grange, the Patrons of Husbandry, who through their representatives came to us urging us to repeal the law. This organization claims to have 750,000 paying members, and a total membership of over a million. Various town, village, and county organizations, through their respective officials, have appealed to us to repeal the law. Four State legislatures have memorialized this Congress to repeal the law—Arizona, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Illinois—States which in the aggregate have a population of over ten millions of people. Who else?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ESCH. One minute more, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed for one minute more.

Mr. ESCH. Over at Atlantic City the other day the American Federation of Labor protested against a resolution opposing the repeal of the law by a vote of 480 to 150, indicating that that organization in strongly for the repeal. The Labor Federation of the State of Illinois adopted a resolution against the daylight saving. These then are some of the people who are opposed to the law, and I offer these as an answer to those who say nobody favors the repeal of daylight saving.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak further as to the effect of daylight saving on health, but I will not use further time, and will now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. [Applause.] I herewith add as a part of my remarks the report I presented to the House in support of this bill:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3854) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it pass, with the following amendment:

Strike out the last two words of line 5 and up to the word "after" in line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "on the last Sunday of October, 1919."

The act approved March 19, 1918, entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States" was enacted as a war measure. A leading argument made in its support was to increase war production. That as France, England, Italy, and other warring nations of Europe had followed Germany's lead in this matter, we, too, must follow. With the signing of the armistice the war practically ended, and our people believe that normal conditions of living and also of production should be restored as speedily as possible.

The above act, besides providing for pushing ahead the clock one hour on the last Sunday in March and retarding it one hour on the last Sunday in October, established five zones, the standard time of the first zone being based on the mean astronomical time of the seventy-fifth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the third zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; and that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree, which only includes Alaska.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has fixed the limits of these zones, and the standard time of the zone governs the movements of all common carriers engaged in interstate commerce. The seventy-fifth, ninetieth, one hundred and fifth, and one hundred and twentieth meridians pass approximately through the centers of their respective zone; there is, therefore, a discrepancy of at least one-half hour from the mean astronomical time along each meridian at the eastern and western boundaries of each zone. When, therefore, under the act clocks are advanced one hour, this discrepancy is increased to one and one-half hours. It is this wide and unnatural discrepancy which has given rise to much of the opposition to daylight saving.

For years the railroads of the country had arbitrarily divided the country into zones largely corresponding to the zones fixed by the commission in its order dated October 24, 1918. The commission made many radical changes in the limits of the several zones. This was particularly true as between the eastern (seventy-fifth degree) and central (nineteenth degree) time zones. Under the older railroad-zone system the division line ran close to the Ohio-Pennsylvania boundary line. It now starts at Toledo, Ohio, and passes through Columbus, Huntington, W. Va., Nashville, Tenn., Atlanta, Ga., and Apalachicola, Fla. It will thus be seen that over one-half of the State of Ohio is now in the eastern-time zone. The millions of people living in this territory had their clocks advanced one hour by action of the Interstate Commerce Commission taken pursuant to the above act. This in itself would have created sufficient confusion and inconvenience, but when in addition to this one hour the clocks were advanced another hour under section 3 of the act, widespread discontent and resistance have resulted. Other like conditions have been created in other parts of the country, but owing to a lesser density of population fewer complaints have been heard.

The hearings disclose that there is almost universal complaint from the coal miners, truck gardeners, and farmers in eastern Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The coal miner, as a rule, does not live at the mine mouth, but in a town or city some miles distant. He must get up before sunrise to get his breakfast, make his train or car for the mine to start the day's toil at one hour ahead of sun time. His wife must get up even earlier than he does to prepare his breakfast. He finishes his work while the sun is still high and returns home, but must go to bed while it is still light in order that he may secure sufficient sleep for his next day's work. For men engaged in such dangerous and arduous work as coal mining Congress should legislate to lighten their burdens, and their comfort and necessities should more strongly appeal to us than the pleasure and convenience of others.

DAYLIGHT SAVING AND THE FARMER.

The most numerous class opposing the present law is the farmers. Their objections are well founded. As they must maintain their relationship to the public school, the church, the store, and the bank, they feel compelled to observe the law, notwithstanding the fact that the law is not mandatory. They find it difficult and often impossible, if they observe clock time, to get assistance from their children in doing the customary farm chores if the children are to reach school at the advanced hour each morning. Village and city stores observing the present law close at 5 o'clock sun time—the very best hour in the whole day for harvest work. The movies and other places of amusement begin while he is still in the midst of his work. Churches close their evening services while it is yet daylight. As to all this, proponents of daylight saving urge that the farmers ought to be willing to adjust themselves to the new conditions notwithstanding the inconvenience and loss such conditions may entail. The farmer with greater reason might ask that the dwellers in cities should do this adjusting; that as his labor produces the food for both urban and rural populations and during this war for the armies and people of Europe, he is entitled, now that the war is over, to enjoy the normal conditions which existed since the birth of the Republic.

The present law works a hardship upon the dairy farmers and truck gardeners, in that they must get up early enough to get their milk and vegetables to the depot for shipment to the cities in a sanitary condition, and, as to milk, early enough for the breakfast table. This means early rising for the housewife and for all members of the family. It disturbs nature's plan for both man and beast. Under the statutes of some States milk, after milking, must be cooled to 60° and even pasteurized before being put aboard milk trains for the market. All this takes time and compels early rising.

A most frequent cause of complaint arises from the inability of farmers and their hired help starting early in the morning because of the dew. From one to two hours are lost waiting for the sun to dry the fields. Under sun time at least one hour would be saved and could be added to the latter part of the afternoon. This hour, as every farmer knows, is the best for harvest work of the 24. Under the present law hired farm labor in many parts of the country, and in rapidly increasing extent, quits with the blowing of the whistle in the near-by town. With stated hours of labor, time lost or unprofitably employed for the first hour or two of a clock-time day means loss to the farmers and will inevitably result in an increase in the cost of food.

The disparity between present time and that observed before the enactment of the daylight-saving law in the eastern half of Ohio, as above set forth, and in other sections like circumstanced, places the farmers living therein under a severe and unfortunate handicap.

That hired labor on the farm is rapidly assimilating the hours and methods of labor in the industries was brought to the attention of the committee by Thomas C. Atkeson, representative of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, the largest organization of farmers in the United States, with State organizations in 33 States and with 750,000 dues-paying members. Mr. Atkeson said:

"We are adopting rapidly the eight-hour day on the farm. On my own farm it was done to some extent last summer. If that eight-hour day was the standard time, and we are about halfway between these two standard times, between the eastern and the central standard time, a large percentage of the farm operations can not be carried on successfully and profitably in the early morning. We can not begin cutting wheat with our binders because it is too wet, first, as a mechanical proposition, to be successfully handled; it is too wet to be put away, and so we loaf around an hour in the morning waiting for the dew to dry off, and then we go to work, or maybe two hours, if it is a damp morning. But our men quit at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and they have done maybe six hours' work when they ought to have done eight. There are certain crops, like beans and potatoes, and some others, that every farmer with a grain of horse sense knows ought not to be cultivated when the dew is on, and so if it is the time for cultivating those crops he loafs or does some chores that are unprofitable, and at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, which is 4 o'clock by the standard time, as you move up, and then the sun is at an angle of 45° or more, and you have the productive energy that the farmers curtailed anywhere from 12½ to 25 per cent. It would not be so bad if we could continue to begin in the morning at 4 o'clock and work until 8 or 9 o'clock at night, as was the universal practice some 40 or 50 years ago on the farm. But our labor-union people have taught us a lesson, and we have come to a place now where the farmers of this country are going to advocate that no farmer's boy shall strike a lick until he is 16 years of age, and that no farmer's wife shall cook a meal except she gets credit on an eight-hour basis."

"If you want to cut off 25 per cent of the productiveness of the American farmer, just keep this law on the statute books, and we have not any fear if it does cut off our food productivity 25 per cent, because our Agricultural Department is authority for showing that the smaller the crop the larger the pay we get. We are not going to pay if this is cut off. I want to serve notice on everybody to that effect, and we will make it a six-hour day, if you want it, and this is what this does in many farm operations. We will stand just as much of that as anyone, and we have reached that place in this country where we may say this with every assurance.

"You can pass laws for the soldiers going back on the farm, but they are not going to go there without it is more profitable than some place else.

"If my theory is right, that this law will decrease the productivity of the country 12½ to 25 per cent—and there is not a single farmer in the country who will not agree that that is true—somebody will have to pay for that 12½ per cent, and we will sit around for the dew to dry off while that bill is paid. That is just as demonstrable as mathematics can demonstrate it."

HEALTH AND DAYLIGHT SAVING.

A chief argument for daylight saving is that it promotes health, especially that of the dwellers in cities, by affording a larger portion of daylight for outdoor work and sport. This may readily be conceded to a certain extent, but not to the extent claimed. Work in war gardens, if continued now that peace has come, is healthful and in a way productive to those who are able to own or lease the necessary land, but means nothing to the teeming thousands in the crowded

tenements who are the very ones who would be most benefited. They, in the heated season, after their day's toil, find little relief in the hour of added daylight. What they want is relief and an opportunity to sleep.

We live in a fast age; we can not crowd enough into the ordinary day so we by law rob night, or the normal period of rest, of an hour. Our soldiers grew healthy and strong because a sufficient time was prescribed for sleep. With twilight as late as 9 o'clock, by clock time, "sitting up late" is becoming a habit with thousands of children as well as of grown-ups. Some writers and teachers have called attention to the growing irritability of children and to a reduced efficiency in school work, due to a marked shortening of the hours of sleep. What children, as well as older people, need in these days of tension and excitement is not so much an increase of the hours of daylight as of sleep—"sleep that knits up the raveled sleeve of care."

SAVING OF COAL.

Much stress has been laid by proponents of daylight saving upon the fact that about 1,250,000 tons of coal were saved last year. The claim is not capable of demonstration. When it is remembered that our total coal consumption last year amounted to about 600,000,000 tons, this alleged saving is quite inconsequential. The shortage of coal last year, due to congestion of traffic and inclemency of weather and to the need of strictest economy on the part of the people in all sections, renders any claims of coal saving based on the present daylight law very questionable.

WHO OPPOSE THE LAW?

Practically every farmers' organization in the United States.

Over 300 farm papers and magazines.

The Legislatures of Arizona, South Dakota, Illinois, and Wisconsin, which have sent memorials to Congress. These States have a population of over 10,000,000. Many village, township, and county organizations through resolutions adopted by their respective officials.

The Illinois State Labor Federation.

The Federation of Labor on the 10th of this month, at its annual convention now being held at Atlantic City, N. J., by a vote of 450 to 180 voted down a resolution protesting against the repeal by Congress of the daylight-saving law.

Canada after enforcing daylight saving as a war measure has, since the signing of the armistice, repealed it.

THE AMENDMENT.

The committee recommended an amendment of the bill by making the repeal of the third section effective "on the last Sunday of October, 1919," instead of the third Sunday after the approval of the act. It was persuaded to do this because the legislatures of the States of New York and Pennsylvania had enacted laws in conformity with the Federal act. If Federal repeal became effective on the third Sunday after approval, it would result in great confusion and conflicts which would result in litigation. This, it was asserted, would be true with reference to contracts of insurance, negotiable instruments, contracts of deliveries, service of legal papers, etc.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE.

The title of the bill should be amended so as to read:

"A bill providing for the repeal of section 3 of an act entitled 'An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States,' approved March 19, 1918."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for one hour.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this act was passed, as stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], and approved on the 19th of March, 1918. It has been in operation only one season, and that was last year, from the last Sunday in March to the last Sunday in October.

In every arbitrary disturbance of existing conditions somebody is inconvenienced, some few, at least. That few will always demand a repeal of the law which produces the change. The daylight-saving bill was considered by the Senate and House together for more than one year, and my recollection is that when it passed the House there were only 40 votes against it on a yea-and-nay roll call.

Simply as chairman of the committee I had charge of the bill. It was not my personal bill. It was a Senate bill, introduced by a Republican Senator, Mr. CALDER, from New York. We amended the bill in the House committee by adding two months' additional time called summer time, so that the law should apply from the last Sunday in March instead of the last Sunday in April and the clock be retarded on the last Sunday in October instead of the last Sunday in September, as provided in the Senate bill.

That amendment was made upon the argument of an existing war condition requiring the application of the law for the additional month to save coal. Some have said this was a war measure, presented and advocated alone as a war measure. Nothing is further from the fact. The fact that a war existed was used as an argument in favor of passing the law, in order to save fuel and the expense of one hour's additional lighting at night by electric and gas light; but there was not a word in this law from beginning to end providing that it should terminate upon the termination of the war or at any other time. Every strictly war bill that was passed provided on the face of it when it should cease to operate, the railroad bill in 21 months, the wire-control bill upon the proclamation of peace, war prohibition upon the demobilization of the Army, and so every war measure provided on the face of it a limitation when it should automatically cease to exist.

There was absolutely no limitation in that bill. It was not strictly a war measure. The fact that war conditions then existed was one of the arguments urged for its passage. The results of those same war conditions still exist, in the high cost of living. One object in passing this bill was to encourage village and city gardening, the planting of gardens to produce vegetables that otherwise would not be produced, to reduce the cost of living to that extent; and moving the clock forward one hour, with the month when the days and nights became equal, and retaining it for a month after the days were shorter than the nights, was done alone with a view to encouraging the increased production and gathering of food vegetables. Now, food is just as high as it ever was. Why should we repeal this law until conditions resulting from the war cease to operate, if at all?

Now, the amendment put on by the committee, that the repeal shall not take effect until the last Sunday in October, is a very proper amendment, and if the bill passes, that amendment, of course, ought to remain in it; but I have a surmise that that amendment may not be agreed to. In that case the bill would go into effect immediately upon its approval, and every city and village gardener who has planted his garden, with a view of having this extra hour in the afternoon to cultivate his garden, will have his garden destroyed. No wonder the truck gardeners are in favor of this bill, because it removes one element of competition; that is, the gardens of the people who live in cities and villages. One-half the population of the United States live in towns and cities of 2,500 and over. The last census showed 46 per cent of the population living in towns and cities of that size, and the towns are all the time on the increase over and above the increase in the country.

I have always been taught that legislation was proper which provided for the greatest good to the greatest number. Every county in my district is an agricultural county. In every county in my district agriculture predominates, and I have received only one letter, and that since the bill was reported, in opposition to the daylight-saving law. Not a letter from the State of Tennessee have I received in favor of the repeal, not a letter have I received from any State in the South in favor of the repeal. Not a letter have I received from anywhere, except where adverse propaganda seems to have been carefully fostered and public sentiment built up by it.

Now, how does it affect the farmer? The farmer who cultivates his land with his own labor and that of his family is not affected at all. There are no hours of service on the farm. Seasonal and weather conditions control work on the farm. Farmers plow from sunup until sundown when the land will do to plow and the weather is clear. When it is too wet to plow, they do not plow at all. So no hours of service law can possibly apply to farmers as a class and to farming as a business, as they apply to industrial, manufacturing, commercial, and professional occupations.

Again, a very small per cent of the labor on farms is performed by hired labor. There are no service hours and there is no service law in effect in any State in the Union touching agricultural labor that I am aware of. There is no compulsory education law that I know of in any State in the Union that prevents the farmers' sons working upon the farm before they become 16 years of age, as there are in many cities. Now, who does it affect, except as a mere matter of convenience? Remember, we had arbitrary standard time zones when this law was passed. In 1883 the railroads determined for themselves, without warrant of law or authorization of Federal or State laws, that they would divide the country into operating zones, having arbitrary clock time in each zone. The zones were about 1,000 miles wide, from east to west, and it was 12 o'clock at the same time in every portion of each zone by all the clocks, while by meridian or sun time it was not. The people at the start complained of these things. Many cities had both railroad time and sun time. In a little while those people who had complained voluntarily abandoned their old sun time and adopted the new railroad standard time. And even now some gentlemen on the floor of this House talk about repealing this law and going back to sun time. They are so young that they do not know that we have not had any sun time in the United States since 1883. Every farmer in the United States to-day can operate his farm without any reference to this law.

Where is the great trouble? It is in the great wheat-growing States of the Union, especially in the State of Kansas, where they are growing the largest crop of wheat that was ever grown by any State since it was a State, with a Government guaranteed price of $2.26 a bushel at the primary markets, to be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, unless the world's

market for wheat during this and next year continues above that price.

Now, really it takes only about two or three weeks to harvest the wheat crop. The harvesting is nearly all done by machinery. It is true that during the harvesting period the wheat-growing States have to hire extra labor for these two or three weeks, but they can hire labor by the hour as well as by the day. It is just as easy to pay a man 50 cents an hour and let him work 8 hours or 10 hours as it is to pay him a per diem wage, for $4 or $5.

Now, as to the inconvenience caused by changing the boundary of some of the zones, and I have only heard of much complaint as to one zone. The eastern boundary of that zone was moved west about 100 miles and it did bring inconvenience in the eastern part of the old zone. But that cause of complaint can be obviated when the railroads return to private operation. If in eastern Ohio the central time zone works a hardship, rather than repeal a law applying to 110,000,000 people, why not let Congress exercise the power that it has and reestablish the eastern boundary of that zone?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman was speaking a moment ago about the opposition that comes from the farmers to this daylight-saving law. I want to ask the gentleman whether he has given consideration to the very great interest in the repeal of this measure by the electric light and gas companies who have been deprived of an hour of service throughout the land since the daylight law has been in operation.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, that is so clear that it hardly needs to be referred to. When midnight comes an hour earlier than it otherwise would, every gas company and every electric light company and the public-service companies that operate them lost revenue for one hour that they would otherwise have received, and the picture-show people are affected to some extent.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Did I understand the gentleman correctly in saying that it takes the Kansas farmer three weeks to produce a wheat crop?

Mr. SIMS. Oh, no; I said the cutting and harvesting the wheat took two or three weeks; that it does not take more than three weeks to cut the wheat.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman know that the dew affects alfalfa and other crops as well as wheat, and does he know that the Government has never been out a dollar for the guaranteed price of wheat in Kansas?

Mr. SIMS. If the Kansas wheat grower and the Kansas hay producer can not work on account of the dew, then many millions of people can not cultivate their gardens in the morning on account of the dew, and you want to deprive them of the hour that they could use in the afternoon for the benefit of these gentlemen in the great wheat-growing States, who want to get 10 hours' work for 8 hours' pay and who are not willing to pay for overtime work in the wheat fields. There has not been an acre of wheat or of alfalfa or an acre of oats lost by reason of this law during the last year, and there will not be one acre lost on account of the law this season.

Mr. TINCHER. Is it not a fact that there was but one person that had a garden who protested against the repeal of this law?

Mr. SIMS. Not one, but thousands of them.

Mr. TINCHER. The chairman says that there was but one.

Mr. SIMS. Perhaps he did not get all the protests.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. If I have time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that no gentleman on the floor who opposes this repeal can obtain time from the chairman of the committee to discuss this matter?

Mr. SIMS. No; I did not know it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A Member opposed to the repeal of this law can not get a minute's time from the chairman of the committee. In view of the unanimity expressed for the bill, I thought——

Mr. ALMON. We who are in favor of the bill can get no time from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. The reason of that is that I have to yield to everybody on the other side who opposes the bill as well as on this side.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And additional time which was asked for was objected to on that side of the House.

Mr. SIMS. It was objected to by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I could get the time to read the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] when he was in favor of this bill, I would be satisfied to let my argument rest on his speech.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this House who is more anxious to foster and promote the interests of the farmers than I am. I was brought up on the farm, but unfortunately while my father was a farmer he was a tenant and not a farm owner. As the son of a poor land renter I had an opportunity by sad experience to know what a hard lot falls to all those in a like situation. During my boyhood life, year in and year out, I had to help in cutting bushes and briers and digging up grubs and roots on fields that had grown up with briers and brushes while lying uncultivated during the War between the States, and it often happened that after I had by slavish labor prepared a field for easy cultivation the landowner would not let us have that field for the following year, but would take it for himself and offer us another overgrown field for like treatment or else get off his land and go elsewhere. It was often impossible to get land at all except upon such hard terms.

It was not a question of "dew upon the grass" or "hours of service" with the tenant class. It was work from daylight until dark or starve. My hope and my only hope was that at some time in life I might be able to own land enough for one man to cultivate, so that I would not have to move every season or else clear up a new briar patch every year.

Little wonder that the land renter grew weary of such a life for himself and family, left the farm, and went to town and city and sought employment in industrial and mechanical pursuits. For such reasons, in part, the trend for the last decade or two has been from the country to the cities, and will continue so to be until the life of a tenant farmer has been made at least more tolerable than it has been heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, the true policy for this country is to adopt such a course as will increase the number of farm owners and decrease the number of farm tenants and farm wage earners. But, I regret to say, the opposite tendency has been in evidence for the last 20 years. While the average size of farms is on the increase, the number of farm owners is on the decrease, with the natural result of an increase in tenancy. I know of but one thing that can or may be done to change this tendency, and that is by both Federal and State legislation to put a graduated land tax upon farm holdings, so adjusted as to discourage large holdings of agricultural lands and to correspondingly encourage small holdings. In this way only, in my judgment, can we build up and increase rural population and increase by several fold the per acre yield of our farms.

But, getting back to the practical questions involved in the repeal of this law, I beg to call attention to the very serious effect it will have upon the smallest of all farmers and of all persons those least able to bear the loss that will come to them. Multiplied millions of people and a large per cent of them from the country who live in towns and cities and in nearby farms and suburbs depend for a considerable part of their food supplies upon gardens. The food supplies thus secured are almost without cost, as they are produced in back yards and gardens without additional payment of rent or taxes and without labor cost as they are cultivated late in the afternoon after the day's work in the city or town has been done. These garden vegetables can not be cultivated in the early morning hours, as it is very injurious to cultivate them while the dew is on them, but they can be cultivated in the late afternoon when no dew is on them. During the long summer days by advancing the clock one hour either on the last Sunday in March or April and retarding it one hour on the last Sunday in September we enable these millions of people to put in one hour of each working day during the five or six months, as the case may be, of each year in producing valuable food vegetables without any additional cost to them and without any loss of time from their daily occupations. No freight, interest, or distribution charges are to be paid on the food products so produced.

These farm products are a clear net reduction in the cost of living to every family producing them, and the repeal of the daylight-saving law will in effect add to the cost of living to each family who will be deprived of these farm products so produced by depriving them of one additional hour in the afternoon in which to produce them.

The farmers in the country where no hours-of-service laws, customs, or regulations exist can so adjust their hours of work upon their farms as not to lose any time suitable for work, but the city and town garden farmers can not so adjust the hours they have to work in stores, factories, and shops as to give

them the one additional hour in the afternoon without the benefit of the daylight-saving law.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that if it was generally known by the farmers throughout the country what a great saving the daylight-saving law has been and will continue to be to the millions of people who live in the cities, who by their daily labor can barely earn enough to keep soul and body together, would not demand the repeal of this law until the cost of food products are materially less than they are now.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, at the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to the pending bill to make it go into effect immediately upon the approval of this act. [Applause.] In my district I have 8,500 coal miners of voting age. There are many other coal miners too young to vote. I have heard from most of these men, directly or indirectly, about this daylight-saving legislation. They are entirely out of patience with this character of war legislation hanging over and regulating their affairs after hostilities have ceased.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman offers an amendment If so, he should send it to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I want to introduce the amendment before the time closes, but I have not the amendment prepared, but will do so. These 8,500 men in Indiana did not complain at turning up the clocks an hour when it was regarded as essential to whipping the Kaiser. Coal miners of my district did all they could do to help the allied cause, but a peculiar condition applies to them in connection with the daylight-saving regulation. They have a right to complain that we are not getting back to a peace basis in this and other matters.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. No; in the short time that I have I regret that I can not yield to my good friend, Maj. LAGUARDIA. The miners of my district refused to begin work at 7 o'clock under the new time, and either struck or were going to strike, but it was agreed finally between operators and miners that they could go to work at 8 o'clock in the morning. Well, some of the advocates of retaining daylight-saving will say, "Why isn't this satisfactory with them." I will tell you why. When they get back home in the evening, after they have come in from the coal mine and have their suppers, they find the stores closed and everything they desire to attend to in the city has been regulated by the new time, and therefore they are greatly inconvenienced.

They can not go to work at 7 o'clock in the morning because many of them go out on miners' trains many miles, ofttimes as far as 15 miles, or they drive a half dozen miles, or they walk 3 or 4 miles. They must get up early even under the old time, and their families are dragged out at an early hour in order that the breakfast may be prepared and the bucket for the miners filled for their noonday meal. I think our coal miners rightfully refused to further obey the daylight-saving act, and anyone who studies their side of the case is going to agree with them; but it is a hardship to have this law still in effect, as I have just explained, and it should be repealed—not repealed, gentlemen, to go in effect next October, when the clock, under the law, is turned back anyway, but it should go into effect immediately upon approval, and if you adopt my amendment this is exactly what will happen.

The farmers of my district are almost unanimously opposed to it, and their reasons are good. They have been enumerated here this afternoon, and I am not going to take the time to go over that subject matter again.

I am told that the chief objectors to the repeal of this law are the golf players and the men who work short hours and want long afternoons for their pleasure and amusement. [Applause.] We do not play much golf down in our section of the country. Playing mumblety-peg and pitching horseshoes are among our finest sports. However, that does not require very much time or any special part of the day.

If New York and Pennsylvania by special legislation have unwisely advanced clocks, their lack of foresight should not be permitted to be the occasion for the punishment of the balance of the great United States, who have had the good sense to get away from the artificial time arrangement as soon as they could.

I know of a town in Georgia where the noon whistle blows at 9.30. I am told that under sun time and the establishment of the meridian lines they are 30 minutes earlier than the sun. The daylight-saving act moved their meridian an hour and the clock was moved up an hour by section 3 of the act, which section we seek now to repeal. It often occurred that fellows would start from an adjoining town lying to the east, 10 miles away, at 7 o'clock and arrive in this Georgia town that is so afflicted and have their breakfast by 5 o'clock in the morning.

In common sense how can anyone advocate the continuance of such absurd conditions. Were we not getting along well enough before this change was made. Hostilities have ceased. Why continue to carry the reminders of this bloody nightmare. Let us take care of those who suffered by reason of the conflict and restore the Nation back to its grand old position of greatness and power, unhampered by unnatural, unwholesome, and unpleasant regulations, occasioned ofttimes of necessity, but no longer essential.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Not now. The sentiment in the Middle West is almost unanimous for the repeal of this law, and I hope, gentlemen, that such action will be taken here to-day as will result in immediately putting into effect the old time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BLAND of Indiana was granted leave to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] that he intends to offer an amendment making the repeal of this act go into effect immediately, I want to say just a word about the committee amendment. The bill as introduced provided that it should go into effect at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the third Sunday after the repeal of the act, and the committee amended the bill so as to make it go into effect upon the last Sunday of October, 1919. In other words, the repeal will not go into effect until the hour when the clock would under the law be set back to the mean astronomical time. The purpose of that amendment ought to be known to the Members of the House before the bill is voted on.

Shortly after the act was passed by Congress providing for the advancement of the clock between the 1st of March and the last day of October the State of New York passed a daylight-saving law corresponding exactly with the act of Congress, and providing that the clocks should be advanced under the State law just the same as under the Federal law. In other words, the State of New York passed a law providing for standard time and for daylight saving just the same as Congress did, and I think since then, and quite recently, the State of Pennsylvania has done the same thing. The State of New York can not repeal its law before next winter, as I understand it, because the legislature of that State will not meet or be in session, unless it is called in extra session for that purpose; and if Congress should repeal this law and make it effective immediately it would leave two standard times in the State of New York and perhaps in the State of Pennsylvania, which would result in great hardship and confusion.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to make the suggestion that the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania will not meet again until 1921?

Mr. DENISON. I understand that the Legislature of Pennsylvania, as the gentleman says, will not meet until 1921. But the legislature of that State passed their law late in May, after the sentiment of the country in favor of the repeal of the law was quite pronounced and was being widely agitated. At any rate, the Legislature of the State of New York will not meet until next winter. It will, no doubt, result in great confusion and possibly a great deal of litigation if there should be a Federal standard time law and a different State standard time law in force at the same time. Therefore the committee amended the bill so that it will go into effect the last day in October, when the clocks will be retarded under the law as it now is.

Personally I would like to see the law repealed now, but the committee thought we should try to avoid confusion and injury and litigation that might result from an earlier repeal if we could do so.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called daylight-saving law, part of which this bill seeks to repeal, was considered in the House on the 15th of March, 1918, and, after one hour's discussion, was passed. It was approved and became a law on March 19, 1918. It dealt with two separate and distinct subjects.

First, it authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to divide the United States into five time zones, each 15 degrees in width; and it established standard time for each of the five zones, to be know as Eastern, Central, Mountain, Pacific, and Alaska time.

In the second place, it provided for advancing the clocks in each of these zones one hour between the 1st day of March and the last day of October each year, and this is the part of

the law that gave it the name of the daylight-saving law. It will be remembered that before 1883 there was no standard time in the United States; each city or community, generally speaking, followed the time of the particular railroad, or some particular railroad, that entered that city or community. A great inconvenience resulted from the lack of uniformity or standardization of the time, and in order to improve this condition as much as possible the American Association of Railroad Managers divided the continental United States, excluding Alaska, into four zones, each 15 degrees in width. Geographers have drawn 360 longitudinal lines from the North Pole to the South Pole, each 1 degree from the other, because there are 360 degrees in the earth's circle or circumference; and these longitudinal lines are numbered east and west from the one running through Greenwich, England. Since the earth revolves from west to east on its axis once in 24 hours, or, as we commonly would express it, since the sunlight travels completely around the earth in 24 hours, it, of course, would travel over 15 degrees on the earth's surface in one hour. As the continental United States, excluding Alaska, is about 60 degrees in width and the sun would travel over it in about four hours, therefore the railroads in 1883 divided the country into four zones of 15 degrees each and established a standard time in each of the zones, the time in each zone being one hour earlier than in the zone adjoining it on the east. Gradually the people became accustomed to this standardization of the time by the railroads until it received general recognition by the courts, the Government, and the people. But this fixing of standard time by the railroads had no legal sanction until the so-called daylight-saving law was passed on March 19, 1918.

The first section adopts the standard time generally in use and established by the railroads as the standard time of the United States, provides a fifth zone for Alaska, and authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the boundaries of the zones.

The second section provides that within the various zones created by the act the standard time of the zones shall be the official time of the United States, regulating its courts, administrative offices, and all legal proceedings done under the laws of the United States, and shall govern the movement of all common carriers engaged in interstate commerce.

The fourth section names the standard time in each zone.

The third section deals with an entirely different subject, and provides that on the last Sunday in March each year the standard time of each zone shall be advanced one hour and on the last Sunday of October in each year the standard time of each zone shall, by the retarding of one hour, be returned to the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing said zone.

It is this third section of the law that has given cause for complaint and that has resulted in a great deal of agitation in different parts of the country, both for the repeal and the retention of the law.

There has been no complaint, and there could be none, about the other sections of the law. Such legislation as that should have been enacted years ago.

The law has come to be known as the daylight-saving law, although the daylight-saving feature of the law is only found in the third section, and the bill now before the House is for the repeal of the third section of the law only.

There was no fundamental principle of political economy or political policy involved in that section of the act which provides for daylight saving, nor is there any involved in its repeal. No personal or political or property rights are involved. The law was passed by Congress after we entered the war and under the stress of war necessities, in pursuance of what seemed to be a general public sentiment in favor of conservation legislation. The European countries—particularly the northern ones—that had for several years been directly or indirectly involved in or seriously affected by the war, had passed daylight-saving laws to conserve their supply of fuel and, as it was thought, to promote the welfare of the great numbers of workmen and workwomen who had been diverted from ordinary pursuits and placed to work, because of military necessity, in the factories where the strain was intensive and the hours of labor long. The thought that a great deal of fuel could be saved by advancing the clock one hour during the summer months, and an extra hour of daylight for rest or recreation or outdoor work could be given to the people living in the cities and those working in the factories, resulted in the enactment of daylight-saving laws in some 12 or 14 countries in Europe; and Congress, following the example of those countries, put a daylight-saving provision in the law which this bill is intended to repeal.

The daylight-saving law was passed as a war measure. I have reread the discussions, both in the House and the Senate, when the law was considered and passed. While there were several Members who advocated the law as wise legislation for the country even in time of peace, most, if not all, of them also sought to justify it as a conservation measure made important, if not necessary, by reason of the fact that the country was at war.

Mr. Borland, who drew the bill and introduced it in the House, and who was, perhaps, more influential than any other Member in securing its passage, said in his presentation of the bill:

> We have also the result of the experience of the European countries, where it has had a practical test for the last two seasons. In both France and England it goes into operation by virtue of executive order, and if it had not fully demonstrated its usefulness as a war measure it would not have been continued through the third season of its trial. It is, in fact, a very important war measure at this time.

Mr. ESCH, the present chairman of the committee that has reported the bill, said in the House at that time:

> It will save time; it will save light; it will save fuel; it will increase the comforts of thousands of people. It will aid in the prosecution of the war, and all these are factors which justify Congress in adopting this act.

Congress was at that time engaged in the consideration of war legislation. We were impressed from every source with the necessity of conserving every national resource. We were willing to enact legislation that would encourage speeding up and conserving any resources that were so necessary as fuel in the prosecution of the war. So I think it can be said without the fear of being questioned that if the country had not been at war, if there had not been an urgent necessity of saving the fuel supply of the country, as well as making the cost of living as light as possible, this daylight-saving law would not have been passed by Congress.

It was an untried experiment in this country, and it has not proven satisfactory. It has, no doubt, been beneficial to some, but it has been an inconvenience and caused discontent to others. I think it should be repealed, like a great deal of other legislation that Congress passed under the stress of war.

As I have said, there is no fundamental principle of political economy or political policy involved. It is a question largely of convenience to certain classes of people. Those who favor the law claim that by advancing the clock an hour each year during the summer months we thereby add greatly to the convenience of the people living in large cities, and especially those working in the factories, by permitting them to leave their work an hour earlier in the afternoon, thereby giving them more daylight time for gardening, for sports, for rest, or recreation, and that you also add to the convenience of the professional men and of the men engaged in various lines of business by permitting them to close their offices or places of business an hour earlier in the afternoon, thereby giving them more daylight time for golf or other sports or for rest with their families, and that it adds to the convenience of certain classes of working people living in the large cities or in the vicinity of large cities by giving them an extra hour of daylight time in the afternoon to do home gardening.

So every argument that has been advanced in favor of the so-called daylight-saving law amounts in its last analysis to a plea for a contribution by legislation to the convenience of certain classes of people in certain restricted localities in the country. The only possible way in which such a law can be said to contribute to the welfare of the people is that by adding to their convenience you contribute to their happiness, and by compelling them to take an hour of daylight time from their work and to use it, if they choose, for rest or recreation or for such other purposes as they may desire you thereby contribute to their health or happiness.

I think it is undoubtedly true that the daylight-saving law has been of some real benefit to certain classes of people in the large cities who work in factories or in other employments that deprive them of outdoor exercise and living.

But the value of such legislation is largely psychological. It is a good illustration of one way we can benefit some people by fooling them. And it goes to prove what a well-known man once said, that the American people like to be fooled. If Congress had enacted a law compelling the people during any part of the year to get up an hour earlier in the morning, go to work an hour earlier, quit work an hour earlier, and go to bed an hour earlier each day than they were accustomed to doing, such a law would have been unconstitutional, and we would have been denounced as usurpers and despoilers of the people; and we might have been run out of the country by an enraged people for such an outrage on democratic government, such an offensive meddling with their personal habits and liberties.

And yet Congress did exactly the same thing indirectly by legislating the clock one hour ahead of the sun; and for doing

so we are from some quarters acclaimed as most wise and able legislators. One enthusiastic witness even told the committee that the daylight-saving law was a law in the interest of true democracy. By setting the clock an hour ahead of the sun we did by indirection what we could not have legally done nor would have dared to do directly.

But the trouble with the law is that its beneficial results have been largely local. While it may have added to the pleasure and the convenience of those living in some localities or engaged in some occupations it certainly resulted in great inconvenience and even injury to those millions who live and work upon the farms and in other outdoor occupations, and to the hundreds of thousands of men who work in coal mines. The evidence heard by the committee almost without exception shows that the farming interests all over the United States are very much opposed to the daylight-saving law and are earnestly urging Congress to repeal it.

Generally speaking, work on the farm, especially during summer harvest, can not begin at an early hour in the morning on account of the dew, and where farm labor is not controlled by labor regulations it continues until sundown of evenings; so that when the farmers and the farm laborers finish their work and go to town the stores have closed; it is too late to attend lectures or places of amusement, and they are thrown behind the rest of the community and are thereby greatly inconvenienced. On the other hand, if it should happen that farm labor is controlled by labor regulations, so that those working on the farms have to quit work at certain hours in the afternoon, it is claimed they can not get in a day's work, because of the necessity of delaying the beginning of work in the morning.

At any rate, the State farmers' organizations in 33 different States, local farmers' organizations in the other States, the farm journals without exception, and the farmers themselves all over the country are protesting against the further continuance of the daylight-saving law and are asking for its repeal. They acquiesced in it during the war for patriotic reasons, but they see no further necessity for it now and ask for its repeal.

The State federations of labor of Illinois, my own State, and of Iowa, and I think of other States, have passed resolutions favoring the repeal of this law, and the local miners' organizations all over the State of Illinois, and Indiana, and Ohio, as I am informed, and even of other States, are almost unanimously asking for the repeal of this law. Coal miners have to live a pretty hard life under the most favorable conditions. Their work begins at 7 or 7.30 o'clock in the morning. Coal mines are never located inside of city limits. They are generally several miles from the towns where the miners live, and very often, if not always, miners have to walk from their homes to the mines. In order to do so they must arise quite early in the morning, and their families must arise even earlier in order to prepare their breakfasts and their lunches which they must take with them into the mines. By advancing the clock an hour during the summer months coal miners and their families are compelled to arise long before daylight to begin their day's work, and this results in a hardship and an inconvenience which they prefer not to suffer simply in order that they may get out of the mines an hour earlier in the afternoon.

After all, it is apparent that the customs and manner of living among those who dwell in the tenements and crowded homes of the great cities and those who work in factories can not, in the very nature of things, be harmonized and made uniform with the customs and manner of living of those who work in coal mines and those who live and work on farms and in the open. A regulation of the hours of beginning and ending work and of arising in the morning or retiring at night that might contribute to the convenience or to the economy or even the health of the one might not do so for the other, and vice versa. This always has been so and always will be so.

And this difference in the habits and the manner of living must be especially so in a country that is so large in extent and so diversified in occupations as the United States. A daylight-saving law that might prove satisfactory and even wholesome for a small, thickly populated country like England or other European countries would not prove so satisfactory or so wholesome to a great country like the United States, where a part of the population who work in factories are thickly congested in the large cities and another great part of the population is engaged in outdoor work, and maybe sparsely scattered all over our extensive domain.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, there is, in my judgment, and always will be a material difference between the manner of living and the manner of working of those who work in the factories and those who work on the farms that can not be reconciled; and when that is true, my own theory is that the Federal Government should not undertake to enact legislation that will have the effect merely of contributing to the convenience or regulating the manner of living of either the one class or the other. Our legislation must be general and must be for the benefit and welfare of all the people, and where the habits of living and of working of one part of the people are so different from the habits of living and of working of another part of the people that legislation enacted for the alleged benefit or convenience of one will result in injury or inconvenience to the other, Congress should refuse to act at all and should leave the people to adjust themselves to the natural conditions which surround them as best they can. If legislation should become necessary it should be by the State or other local authority where the necessity arises.

Therefore, while the daylight-saving law may have been entirely justified when we were engaged in war and when it seemed to be necessary to conserve fuel in every possible way, I think that Congress should now repeal the law and leave the people where they were before the law was enacted. Personally I do not doubt that whenever the community custom of living or of working under standard time, as it was before this law was passed, shall become so inconvenient or inimical to the health or the welfare of any considerable portion of the people engaged in any particular industry or living in any particular locality, some remedy will be found by which the inconvenience or the injury can be overcome. This is an age of developing and increasing interest in social and industrial welfare. Men of means and of brains are giving more and more time and study to the problems of promoting the health and the welfare of workers every year. There is not a factory or a community or even a State in which some method, some regulation, even though it may be voluntary and local, can not or will not be found to change or overcome any condition that may exist that unduly inconveniences or burdens or injures any considerable number of the people. It is not only not necessary, but I think it is unwise for Congress to undertake to regulate the habits of living or of working, especially when the habits of living and of working are and of necessity must be so different among the people in different parts of the country. Let us repeal this law and let the people regulate their own manner of living and working as they choose.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania passed an act approving the daylight-saving law, and it was signed by the governor, according to a telegram received by my colleague [Mr. REBER] on the 23d ultimo, so that the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is correct.

Mr. KEARNS. What date was it that the State of Pennsylvania passed that law?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The act was approved on the 23d of May. The Legislature in the State of Pennsylvania will not meet again for two years, and we will probably have some confusion and conflict with the national law upon this subject.

I am not in favor of passing laws one year and throwing the whole country into confusion by repealing them the next year. That is exactly what is proposed to be done here. We are now asked to repeal the daylight-saving law in order to satisfy certain people. The total number referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] is 10,000,000. That is one-tenth or one-twelfth of the entire population. If he speaks for 10,000,000, then I venture to speak for the other ninety or one hundred million who prefer to have this law stand as it is. [Applause.] The gentleman from Wisconsin, in charge of the bill, and who is very anxious that it shall pass, does not tell you what attitude he took on the bill last year, on March 15, 1918. The gentleman then said he was in favor of the passage of a daylight-saving law. Now he is in favor of its repeal. He said then:

It is not an untried experiment.

To-day it appears he has discovered that it was an untried experiment.

"Twelve or thirteen nations have adopted it," said the gentleman from Wisconsin then. "Every European nation at war has adopted it, and not one of them has seen fit to go back to the old system."

That was in 1918. Now we are to back track and run behind those other allied nations. But the gentleman then further said:

The fact that it has proven a success in every country that has tried it is a sufficient justification for this country to adopt it.

Now, ye farmers, rise and applaud——

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ESCH. It was offered as a war measure and I supported it as a war measure and the House adopted it as a war measure,

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Wisconsin and am willing to accept his statement that he accepted it as a war measure. But I continue to quote from the gentleman from Wisconsin under date of March 15, 1918.

Therefore their days covered by the daylight act are very much longer than they would be in the southern latitude.

And then:

However, in the United States there is scarcely a section that will not be benefited by this act.

Was that due to the war? Let me read on:

It will save time; it will save light; it will save fuel; it will increase the comfort of thousands of people. It will aid in the prosecution of the war, and all of these are factors which justify Congress in adopting this act.

Thus spoke the eloquent and forceful gentleman from Wisconsin in 1918.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not.

Mr. BLANTON. For just one question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Because I have not the time.

Mr. BLANTON. One short question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have not the time. I am afraid I will get into a discussion and then lose my place. Now, those opposing the daylight-saving law, which was working magnificently for 90,000,000 of people for whom I think I have the right to speak as one of them——

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Which has enabled the workmen who labor in factories and furnaces during daylight to have an hour of recreation or an hour for what they would, or to work in their own gardens, is being opposed by those who object to having a little dew on their boots in the morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have two minutes?

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman will use it himself.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will not yield to anyone.

Mr. SIMS. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I got up this morning at 6 o'clock [cries of "Oh"], and having bathed and had a good shave and a breakfast I proceeded down the street at 7 o'clock and enjoyed the experience and entertained the same thought with respect to daylight that Benjamin Franklin did in London very many years ago. I saw this morning in Washington what Benjamin Franklin saw while walking down the Strand—daylight, but stores closed; sunlight and glorious weather, but nobody on the street. Why? Why, because they had stayed up the night before burning gas and electric light, using up their eyesight and nervous energy. They were wasting the beautiful morning hour in bed. [Laughter and applause.] Yes, in one of the best working hours, they were staying in bed. But that is only one side of it.

The use of gas and electric light and the eyestrain resulting from too much artificial light have much to do with it. If the law is repealed, probably the gas and electric light and coal companies will rejoice as much as the farmers. I have not time to go into that, but it is estimated—and I put those figures in the RECORD when this bill was up before—it is estimated by men who are able to estimate on the subject as to the 85,500,000 incandescent lights reported by the census to be in use in 1915, that it requires to keep those lights going for one hour 6,126 tons of coal. For one hour per day from the end of April till the end of September it requires to keep those lights going 937,000 tons of coal. It is believed that 1,000,000 tons of coal per annum is being saved by the daylight-saving law. The eyes of the children and of the men and women who raise them should also be considered before this law is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWEET].

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and it seems to me that when he claims to represent 90 per cent of the people of this country that he has spread himself over considerable territory and therefore very thin. I will say to the gentleman that this bill as originally passed was a war measure and that I am in favor of its immediate repeal. [Applause.] I am therefore opposed to the committee amendment, and when the bill is presented I trust there will be a majority of this House opposed to that amendment and that the bill will pass as originally presented, notwithstanding the action of the committee. As far as the farmers of this country are concerned, gentlemen, the so-called daylight-saving law should be stigmatized as a daylight-wasting law. And why is that so? Why is it so in connection with the farmer? As a result of this law the farmers of this country lose one hour in each afternoon of the summer months, the best part of the day to plow corn, to kill weeds, to dry hay and put up the hay, to harvest grain and put it in the best condition for bundling, shocking, and stacking.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEET. I have not the time. The farmer is in partnership with nature, and his working hours are governed by the unchanged and changeless laws of the universe. His clock should be in harmony with the sun.

If you rob the farmers of this country of one hour of time or any fraction thereof during the summer months, you lessen perceptibly the productive power of the country.

One of the troubles that confront the Nation to-day is that we are short on producers. The high cost of living and the scarcity of food products are positive evidence of that fact. We have too many consumers and not enough producers.

It appears to many of us that the fellows from the large cities are endeavoring to bunko themselves. In a measure they are placing themselves in the position of the dog that bites the hand that feeds it.

The farms of this country are the foundation and source of all wealth. You can not make this country prosperous by passing resolutions in a political convention, or by passing the so-called daylight-saving law, or kindred laws. The wealth of the country must be dug out of the soil. It takes time to do it, and when you take from the farmer an hour in the afternoon you lessen his productive power.

Some have asserted that the productive power of the farmer under the operation of the so-called daylight-saving law has been diminished from 5 to 12 per cent throughout the entire country. If this is true it would materially diminish the surplus that the farmer has to sell. The surplus determines largely the market price of products. The surplus of food products enters directly into the price to be paid by the consumer for the necessities of life. The present high cost of living is largely attributable to the shortage in this country of ordinary food products, such as the farmer has to sell. Let the farmers of this country cease producing for one year and the grass would grow green on the streets of our towns and cities and the railways would stop operating and the whole country would go back to the wilderness from which it sprang.

The producers of this country must be encouraged and not discouraged. A few theorists are continually prating about the saving of coal and gas. There is nothing to this argument as applied to the daylight-saving law. They go on the theory that the people will absolutely follow the clock in rising in the morning and going to bed at night. They also assert that the people of the large cities will have one hour for recreation and play. Is it not plain that if they use that extra hour for those purposes the people will not go to bed any sooner? The coal and gas argument has no foundation in fact. It is a figment of the mind. It is founded solely upon theory. Assertions are easily made.

The farmers are not the only persons interested in the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. The dairymen of the country want it repealed. The coal miners in Indiana and Illinois want it repealed. The truck growers want it repealed. The representatives of the American Federation of Labor at a recent meeting held at Atlantic City, N. J., by a vote of 180 to 154 expressed themselves as opposed to the daylight-saving law.

The people of the large cities seem to be for it, for they contend that it gives them an hour of recreation and play—to engage in playing golf and lawn tennis, in going swimming and fishing, and to participate in other sports. It is really too bad that we can not pass a law that will be satisfactory to the people of the large cities and the rest of the country. It seems to be a contest between the people of the large cities of the East and the inhabitants and farmers of the great prairies of the West. The people of the cities are crying out for more air, sunlight, and recreation. The agriculturists are asking that their business interests be not interfered with, and that they be given a chance to produce as large an amount of food as possible, in order that they may feed the people of the cities. The farmers want more time to work. The people in the cities want more time to play. One is asking for man-made conditions and the other is asking to work in harmony with the laws of the universe. The position of one is artificial. The position of the other is in accord with nature.

The great corn and grain fields of Iowa are more eloquent than brick buildings and crowded thoroughfares. The vast expanse of the prairies is more inspiring and health invigorating than stately mansions and crowded tenement houses.

I do not blame the people of the cities for begging to be relieved from the prison walls of the great cities, from their oppressive, stifling air, from their sweat shops, from their homelessness and hopelessness.

What the country needs is more producers. We have too many consumers. Why do not the people of the cities come out to Iowa and become producers? Why do not they move out to the great Mississippi Valley, where there is plenty of land to till; where there is plenty of fresh air and sunlight; where there is plenty of room for toil and recreation; where every person has an equal chance in life; where "a man's a man for a' that"?

If the people of the cities would move out there they would not now be contending for the so-called daylight-saving law, for they would soon find there is no need for it. Seeing is believing, and this very day I want to extend to you gentlemen of the great cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Boston an invitation to come to Iowa—the New England of the West. We welcome you to the greatest agricultural State in the Union—the State with the least percentage of illiteracy. Come out to Iowa and for the first time really feel that you are out of doors and free men. Come out there and behold our cattle grazing on a thousand hilltops; behold our fields of waving golden grain and cornfields extending as far as the eye can reach. Come out to Iowa and enjoy our institutions of learning and receive the blessings and inspiration that naturally flow from keeping in close contact with the soil and near to the heart of nature. Come out there where the sun shines, children play, and men battle for the right.

Come out there where we do not produce millionaires, mendicants, and anarchists; where wealth is equitably distributed and everyone is prosperous, contented, and happy; where the people are thoroughly in sympathy with the institutions and government under which we live.

Come out there and you will not be continually abusing the Iowa farmer, for your hate will turn to love. Come out there and behold the real Garden of Eden. Come out there and really live as you should live and you will not be endeavoring to work against the mandates and decrees of the Eternal God.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the proposed bill to repeal the daylight-saving law offers the best illustration of a situation where a Member of Congress should vote in strict accordance with the wishes of the majority of his constituents. There is no governmental policy involved, and I think on a question of this kind the convenience of a majority of the people in this district should govern. We can get the will of the majority of the people by a vote from this Congress, and while there will be votes—in my opinion, a number of them—to retain the daylight-saving law, I think the votes of the majority of this Congress will show that a majority of the people of this country are not in favor of the daylight-saving legislation.

In the district which I have the honor to represent there are some eight or nine thousand coal miners, and a large part of the district is agricultural; and then there are some manufacturing interests. The farmers and the coal miners are in favor of this repeal, and the cogent reasons urged by them appeal very strongly to me. I find that those engaged in the manufacturing business are in favor of retaining this daylight-saving bill. However, the daylight may be saved by those employees by commencing work an hour earlier. And that was illustrated by a gentleman from New York, who testified before our committee, Mr. Sidney Colgate. They had a daylight-saving plan there, where a number of employees commenced work an hour later, and they inaugurated it for two years. And he testified as follows:

> We started this daylight-saving plan in the summer of 1915. We tried it, beginning with the middle of July, and we thought we would try it until the 1st of September. Toward the end of August we took a vote as to whether we should continue it to the 1st of October, and we got a vote of 94 per cent to continue it to the 1st of October.

The summer of 1915 was before we had any legislation on the subject, and therefore this illustrates the fact that in the cities, where the employees are close to their work, they really need no legislation in order to permit them to put into effect a daylight-saving plan. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that with the repeal of this bill the great majority of the people of the United States will find that the plan works better with the legislation providing for ordinary sun time, or standard time measured near sun time, and then, with the permission of the employees of these large cities, there may be inaugurated the daylight-saving plan by their own arrangement. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the speeches made upon this bill, especially that of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] in which he said that the great mining interests of the country and the great body of miners were in favor of the repeal of this law.

I want the Members of this House to know that I keep in exceedingly close touch with the people of Eastern Pennsylvania. I have consulted with the Members of Congress representing great mining sections of that State, and up to the present time I have the first owner of a mine or the first employee of a mine to ask for a change of this law.

In the city of Philadelphia, both in my district and in the extreme northern section, there are communities which are regarded as the best produce patches for truck-raising farmers in any part of the country, and not a single one of these truck farmers has asked for the repeal of this law. I have received a great many communications against the repeal, and one in particular is of especial interest. I send it to the Clerk to have it read in my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 4, 1919.*

Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VARE: As one of your constituents, I wish to protest against any change in the daylight-saving law. Under the present law, during the extreme hot weather, a man working in the factory, mill, or any kind of mechanical trade or office work gets the opportunity of working earlier in the day, enabling him to give better service and to complete his day's work without fatigue. He has more daylight to give to his wife and children for recreation.

In the winter it is quite different. It is cold and dark in the morning, making it much better to go to work one hour later. I think my objections are best covered by the chorus of Mr. Harry Lauder's song, which I hereby inclose.

Very truly, yours, JOHN J. JACKSON.

Mr. VARE. I would also like to have the Clerk read the part of the song which I have marked.

The Clerk read as follows:

O it's nice to get up in the mornin'
When the sun begins to shine,
At 4 or 5 or 6 o'clock in the good old summer time;
When the snow is snowin'
And it's murky overhead,
O it's nice to get up in the mornin'
But it's nicer to lie in bed.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, in addition the State of Pennsylvania has enacted laws legalizing and harmonizing State standards of time with the Federal time standards, and if the daylight-saving law is repealed it will bring confusion and conflict in that State which can not be remedied except by acts of the legislature, which will not meet again before the time this repeal would take effect. Such a condition will bring about confusion and litigation in Pennsylvania without any corresponding benefits.

I have spent my entire lifetime in close touch with the workingmen of Philadelphia and I am in full sympathy with their aims and ambitions. I am convinced that they are not only more efficient in the work performed under the hours of the daylight-saving law, but there is less injury to their physical systems. In the name of humanity I hope that this repealer will not pass. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the repeal of this law, and I am in favor of repealing it now. Therefore, I am against the committee amendment. Ninety per cent of the people of my district are opposed to this law. I represent an industrial district. The farmers in the district are unanimously opposed to it, and I estimate that 95 per cent of the men who work in the shops and in the mills are opposed to it. That probably would be sufficient reason for me to vote for its repeal, but I have another reason. My friend from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] would probably call it a governmental reason, but whether it is a governmental reason or what kind of a reason it is, I regard it as a good one, and that is that this law by its operation is an artificial interference with the natural order of things. It is a pretense pure and simple. When it is 6 o'clock according to mean astronomical time, we pretend it is 7 o'clock. It is not 7 o'clock at all. It is 6 o'clock.

Mr. PELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. I do not. Now, I submit, where the natural order of things is interfered with, if any considerable number of people are inconvenienced or disturbed, and a hardship is worked, that is strong argument in favor of a return to the natural order of things.

It has been admitted on the floor here to-day by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is opposed to the repeal that 10,000,000 people have been interfered with and disturbed, and that this

law has caused hardship upon a very considerable number of people throughout the United States.

Now, if that is true—and I think it is true, without a doubt, but I think the number is much greater than ten millions—that is strong argument in favor of a return to the natural order of things; of getting back to normal.

This Sixty-sixth Congress was charged with the responsibility by the American people of getting back to normal and getting rid of these artificial interferences with the liberties of the people, and I believe this is a very good way to begin by eliminating this pretense and making it unnecessary, if you please, for the American people by act of Congress to be compelled to continue to perpetrate a fraud upon themselves, because that is just what this law requires them to do. It forces the people to pretend that something is that is not, and because of the fact that hundreds of thousands and even millions of people are disturbed by it and a hardship worked upon them, I think it ought to be repealed, and I believe it ought to be repealed at once. Therefore, I shall vote against the committee amendment and in favor of the immediate repeal of this law. [Applause.]

To call this a daylight-saving law is a misnomer. It may help some people to save daylight who are unwilling to take the trouble to adjust their own affairs. Those who are unwilling to get up an hour earlier may be benefited by the shifting of an hour of daylight from the early morning to the late evening, but they could save an hour of daylight by getting up the hour earlier in the morning. In other words, the operation of this law does not increase by the fraction of a second the amount of daylight in any 24 hours, but, by the working of the pretense, some people may be able to save. On the other hand, there are millions who can not possibly adjust themselves and their work to the new arrangement without loss and hardship. So that we are in a position of forcing upon these unwilling millions this pretense to enable the few who are unwilling to adjust themselves to be benefited. I do not believe that as national legislators we are justified in continuing a law that has such a result. And the doubt should be resolved in favor of those who are really injured and the law repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, the questions arising under the so-called daylight-saving law—although, perhaps, it might better be called a daylight-using law—are not, as some have suggested, questions of interfering with the law of God or the order of nature, but simply questions of expediency, of the greatest good for the greatest number, and, where there is any conflict as to convenience, the question of mutual accommodation. The questions can not—or, at least, should not—be considered on a basis of selfish interest or of sectional interest. This bill will affect primarily the public health, the production of the necessities of life, and, as underlying both these results, the convenience and happiness of a large proportion of the population of the United States. All these interests and effects are common and interrelated. It is perfectly obvious that it is to the interest of all dwellers in cities, whatever may be their occupation, that food and cotton and all the products of the farms should be produced in as great quantities as possible and at as little cost as possible. Anything that would interfere with this production would injure the farmers and the city dwellers alike. But it is equally true that it is for the interest of the farmers and all dwellers in the city that the necessities of life, which are mainly produced in the cities, such as iron, steel, clothing, shoes, flour, prepared meats, and so forth, should be produced as cheaply as possible. It may be admitted that in some sections of the country and for some crops the farmers, particularly in connection with such labor as they hire by the day, may be put by the present law to some inconvenience. But the story of the crops of 1918–19 seems to show conclusively that it has not resulted in any diminution of crops, which are of record volume. If we come to consider the question of relative inconvenience, it is obvious that we must consider the relative number engaged in farming operations and other productive operations.

The last available official figures are of the Census of 1910, in which the total number employed in all kinds of industry, including farming, is given at 38,000,000, of which number those employed in farming and forestry together are only 12,000,000, while those employed in other occupations which presumably would call for their working indoors are 26,000,000, something over two for one. In a democracy, when it comes to a matter of accommodation, it is at least usual that the minority must accommodate itself to the convenience of the majority, and in this case it would seem obviously easier for the minority thus to accommodate itself, because each farm is an entity, and its work goes on without special regard or dependence on others. It is perfectly clear that the many hundreds of small farms worked by the farmer and his family can choose their own hours of work according to their own profit and convenience. But when it comes to city workers and factory workers it is clear that in any large community the interests are so complex and so interrelated that it is not possible for any particular factory or any particular group to work on hours different from those of the entire community.

As to the benefits to city workers and factory workers from this law, the testimony in favor of the law is simply overwhelming. There are no dissenting voices. Employers, health officials, city officials, all testify to the great benefit to the health and to the morale of the employees. I speak with personal knowledge of the modern factory system, which is absolutely essential to production in these times, and I know that in nearly all modern factories there must be an amount of simple repetition work which has not the interest or variety and which therefore becomes mere drudgery. Where a man or woman does the same piecework hour after hour and day after day it is obvious that the effect on the mind and the nerves is very trying. This means that an effort should be made to give these operatives all the opportunity for leisure and for change of scene and for play which it is possible to give. The testimony before the committee was very strong on this point, and I think it is obvious to everybody without argument. The farmers of this country are intelligent and patriotic men, and if they could know from observation the tremendous benefits which the working class of this country obtain from this daylight-saving law I do not believe that very many of them would ask for its repeal. There is no doubt in my mind that, if the continuance of this law could be assured for a reasonable time, the farming and other communities which are somewhat inconvenienced now could readily accommodate their ways so that the inconveniences could be minimized and the advantages to the great majority of citizens could be saved. I think, therefore, that with so little experience as we have had it is at least premature to repeal this law now. Let us try it for a reasonable time, and I am sure we shall not even be asked to repeal it. To me it seems little less than a national misfortune to take away from the millions of workers in this country this great boon which can be given to them by a simple piece of legislation which produces untold good to the health and happiness of the United States and practical harm to no one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MERRITT. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for two and one-half minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1918, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 253 to 40, passed the so-called daylight-saving law. It was urged then as a great war measure. Philosophers, philanthropists, laboring interests, all in one acclaim, pleaded for its passage. Congress passed it practically by unanimous consent, as the above vote will show. There was little opposition to it; the Congress was in a frame of mind to grant any legislation that would help in carrying forward the war. This law passed as a war measure. The armistice is signed and the war is over; the necessity for this and other war measures like it has passed.

FARMERS AGAINST IT.

I am convinced that the six and a half million farmers of the Republic are practically a unit against this legislation. They want it repealed. They want it repealed now. It is confusing to them. It does not work well with them. They want to get rid of it. They want no more of it. I am in favor of giving them what they want.

ATLANTIC CITY LABOR CONVENTION AGAINST IT.

Members representing labor districts have spoken here to-day both for and against this measure. Members from Pennsylvania have asserted with earnestness that the laboring men in their districts desire its retention. Members from Indiana and other sections of the country representing labor districts are equally zealous for its repeal. The best and most direct information that we have on the subject is the convention of the

American Federation of Labor, which was held in Atlantic City on June 10, 1919, only a few days ago. After spirited debate on the question of the proposed repeal of the daylight-saving law, a vote was taken. Four hundred and fifty delegates to that great convention voted for its repeal and only 183 against its repeal. This discloses that by a vote of more than 2 to 1 the American Federation of Labor, representing the labor interests of the country, has placed itself on record as in favor of the immediate repeal of this law.

CANADA REPEALS DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

During the war our neighbor on the north, Canada, passed a daylight-saving law—passed it as a war measure; passed it believing it would do good—but since the armistice has been signed and the war has been closed Canada has repealed the law.

If there was necessity for it at the beginning the necessity has passed, and she has repealed it. In my opinion, it is proper for us to do to-day precisely as Canada did and repeal it. [Applause.]

TIME.

Time, after all, is such a mystery. Time appears short or long to us as we live the several intervals making it up. After all, its duration, in reality, depends somewhat on us. It is at best a mere measurement of space. It neither lengthens the day nor shortens the night. It is but a convenience, a medium, a guidepost. Some grow old under it before their day. Some remain young to the end. It is but mystery in all its make-up. St. Augustine in "Confessions" says:

> What then, is time? If no one asks me, I know. If I try to explain it to one who asks, I do not know. Yet I say with confidence that I know. But if nothing passes away, there would be no past time. If nothing were to come, there would be no future time. If nothing were, there would be no present time.
>
> Yet these two times, past and future, how can they be when the past is not now and the future is not yet?
>
> As for the present, if it were always present and did not pass over into the past, it would not be time but eternity.

It has been well said "that in the universe of eternity there is no rising and setting of the sun, no day, no night, no years, no centuries. Sun time is merely local time in its relation to eternity." That "human chronology belongs to this solar system alone and we measure time while the sun shines and throws shadows against a background which we call history." Men will come and men will go, but time goes on forever.

For me and mine, the unit of time has been well established. The Republic has grown and prospered under it. Men and women have grown accustomed to it. Business affairs have been adjusted to it. Men and women during these trying times have many things to disturb them. Their disturbances should be reduced to the minimum. This change of time should not longer prevail. The old time should be reestablished. The question should be put at rest. The American people should be given what they ask and what they ask is to sweep away this war-time legislation, which was of doubtful propriety in the beginning and wholly unnecessary of duration.

With this in mind, I introduced on the first day of this Congress House bill 395 providing for the immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law. I have advocated the repeal of the law before the committee. By the introduction of this bill on the first day of the session I am committed to the repeal of the law. I am confident the great bulk of my people favor its repeal. I shall vote for its repeal to-day. I shall vote for its repeal now. I am not in accord with those who desire its postponement.

The nation is best governed that is governed the least and laws which are manifestly unnecessary should not repose in peace on the statute books overnight. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last year when we considered the daylight-saving law, and I voted for that measure purely as a war-time measure.

During the hearings on the bill which we are now considering I listened very attentively to the men who appeared before the committee who were opposed to the repeal of this law, and I want to say to the Members of this House that there was not one person west of the Pennsylvania State line who appeared before our committee and advocated the retention of this law. Most of the men and the women who appeared before the committee in favor of the daylight-saving law came from the Atlantic coast, from New York. Mr. Marks, president of the National Daylight Saving Association, in mentioning the names of some of the prominent men in New York who were in favor of the law, gave the names of bank presidents, superintendents of insurance organizations, and other men of great wealth, who do not have to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning. They arise about 9 o'clock and go to their offices about 10.30. Then they go to the club at 12. They stay there until 2.30. They come back to the office for an hour and then the chauffeur calls for them and takes them to the golf links until dinner time. [Applause.] The district that I have the honor to represent is one of the greatest manufacturing districts in this country, and I can best express the sentiment of the people in my district when I say that the city council of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, a city with a population of 175,000, the city council of Cleveland, Ohio, and the city councils of the large cities of Canton, Massillon, and Alliance, those great industrial districts, have passed ordinances putting those cities back on eastern standard time. You can not send men to bed by the clock. They go to bed by the sun. We have a large number of steel workers in my district who have to get up at 3 o'clock in the morning in order to reach their places of work and go to work at 5 o'clock. They do not go to bed any earlier at night on account of this daylight-saving law. They will not go to bed while the daylight is on. And what does it do? It deprives them of that one hour's rest, that best hour of their rest, that one hour in the morning when it is cool and when they ought to be getting their rest for a hard day's work. The same is true of the school children. Why, the mothers in my own city complain to me every time I go home, telling me that they can not get their children to bed in time to get enough sleep during that critical growing time when they need all the sleep they can get.

Mr. SIMS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COADY].

Mr. COADY. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to this question—one presented by the farmers of the country, based entirely on their convenience, and convenience only. I listened to the arguments made before our committee by those advocating repeal, and convenience was the burden of their opposition. Members of Congress and others who appeared there did not claim that the farmers suffered any financial loss by reason of the law. We were told by them that the farmers were all prosperous—all were making money.

There was another objection to the law advanced by its opponents, and that was that the overworked hired man on the farm got off an hour earlier in the evening and went to the city for pleasure and recreation.

The other side presented showed conclusively that a great saving in fuel has been accomplished, large sums of money saved in consequence thereof, and tired, overworked people given an additional hour of daylight for their pleasure and their recreation.

We live in the richest country in the world. Our resources are boundless, and because of this we have been, and doubtless still are, the most extravagant and wasteful nation in the world. The great war through which we have just passed taught us many valuable lessons, one of which was the pressing need of economy. One of these economies was the saving of fuel, and it was to accomplish this, among other things, that the daylight-saving bill was passed. It may have been passed as a war measure, and the advocates of repeal say because the war is over let us repeal it and go back to the old time. Now, that the war is over we should calmly sit down and take stock of the emergency measures passed during the war, and which were designed to help us win that war, and repeal, and repeal quickly, such measures for the continuance of which no necessity now exists. But we should retain as permanent laws those measures which experience has proved to be of worth and benefit to our people. Such a law is the daylight-saving law. If it gives us an hour more daylight in the evening, it follows, does it not, that we save daily the gas and electric current that would be burned in that hour? This is beyond dispute. I am informed that a report issued by the United States Fuel Administration shows a saving of one and a quarter million tons of coal for the year 1918 effected by daylight saving. The other day I received a letter from the librarian of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, in Baltimore, showing a saving of $430.67 during the first six months this law was in operation.

I could cite you many other instances of saving due to this law.

The viewpoint of the workers in the cities was given to our committee by a bright young woman from Boston who represented an establishment employing about 2,800 people. She quoted statistics showing that only one-third of the people who pursue occupations are engaged in agricultural work, and of this one-third many of them work their own farms and do not employ outside help, and are consequently not materially affected, and she pertinently asked if we intended to make our laws according to the wishes of the majority.

It seems from what was said to the committee by the advocates of this measure, or some of them at least, that the burden of the farmer's complaint is that the overworked and tired hired

man who works early and late has an hour too much recreation in the evening. They want him to work longer down on the farm when the tendency in the cities is to shorten the workday of the workers in the mills and workshops.

The workers in the cities have not the green fields and wholesome atmosphere of the country. Many of them live in crowded tenements and small houses that are insufferably hot in the summer. These men and women, with their children, flock to the parks in the early evening. They patronize the playgrounds and the swimming pools. They now have an additional hour of this much-needed pleasure and recreation. Are you going to rob them of it? That is just what you will do if you pass this bill.

Now, I listened with a great deal of attention to the argument made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND]. I am sorry that in a great body like this any gentleman should make an argument of that kind, saying that this bill is designed for the golf players of this country, trying to array the masses against the classes, trying to bring class hatred into this body. Every man knows that the golf players of this country are men who are not vitally interested in the daylight-saving act, because they have sufficient and ample time for recreation.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COADY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman recall any representative of the laboring classes that appeared before our committee and asked them for a retention of this law?

Mr. COADY. My recollection is that one gentleman representing the laboring classes appeared before our committee asking for the retention of the law.

Mr. COOPER. And did not he state that he represented the American Federation of Labor, and did not a few days after the American Federation of Labor turn that proposition down?

Mr. COADY. The gentleman asked me if any representative of the laboring interests of the country appeared before our committee and I said yes. The gentleman who appeared before our committee does represent some of the laboring people in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE].

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, the daylight-saving law ought to be repealed, and repealed now. [Applause.] I have in my possession numbers of petitions coming from citizens throughout my district expressing their desire to have this law repealed. Farmers—hundreds of them—laborers—scores of them—join in their expression of good will toward me in my efforts taken toward having this law repealed.

Not only is it an inconvenience to the great majority of the laborers in my State when viewed from a proper viewpoint, but it is actually a hardship upon the farmer of this country.

I know, gentlemen appeal for the sustaining of this law from Boston and New York; but there is much territory in the United States outside these cities, and many people are there, indeed, who inhabit the great central and Western States whose most vital interests are affected by this law, which we now seek to have taken off the statute books.

I know much of the habits, customs, and experiences of the farmer and the common toiler and laborer; my life has been spent among them and with them; they constitute the most virile and vital part of our Nation's great reserve force and power from the standpoint of citizenship and development. Without our great farming industry, teeming with its millions of honest, toiling farmers, there could be no Boston; there could be no New York.

Under this law as it stands the farmer finds it necessary to lose much of the day in order to get to the town to do his trading, and the farmer does not blame the merchant or banker for complying with the law, but he does find it, now that the war is practically over, very inconvenient for him—the farmer—and let us now lift this burden and annul or repeal this law.

It should be the policy of this Government as peace comes into sight to adjust the great program of our future to a normal legislative status.

Some of our large cities, especially New York and Boston, seem to want to fix this law upon us permanently. Well, we lived a long time without such a law before the war, and I am sure we will succeed fairly well, at least after this repeal of the law takes effect and when we are once more on a peaceful basis.

Some one has said this law stimulates production and industry by the clock being turned one hour ahead. In answer to that, let me say that the farmer is overwhelmingly the chief producer of feeds and foodstuff throughout this country, and certainly his evidence should be given some consideration in weighing and deciding this question; and when he speaks, what does he tell you? He knows, as I know, and states it, as I now state it, that he desires the repeal of this law. His evidence is convincing; and if, as some state, this law is in his interest, we find him as a witness testifying against interest, which, by all rules of evidence, is an added reason for giving weight and credit to what he says.

He desires its repeal, and it ought to be repealed, and I shall vote to repeal it, and continue so until it is repealed.

Throughout the war which we have gone through we have found the farmer ever ready to meet the demands of the Government cheerfully in his production; let us not permit him now to be embarrassed by hazardous laws, but for him let us invite justice and do justice. Gentlemen, let us now repeal this law. There are those who state that no one desires this law repealed. Such statements come from those who are uninformed and not posted on this matter, I am sure. There is an overwhelming desire for its repeal, and independent of that, however, any thoughtful man under the present status of conditions in this country knows, without any advice or suggestions from any quarter, that this law should be promptly repealed.

And we surely are passing through a period in our country's history when quiet, sober thinking and honest, conscientious judgment needs to be exercised. Sound judgment must not be displaced by sentiment and excitement: We must consider the welfare of our Government, the great public good first before the personal wishes of any individual or residents of a few of the large cities who, indeed, do not know or understand the merit and mysteries of those who till the soil.

I again repeat, let us repeal this law.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving act, approved March 19, 1918, because I believe that it is very clearly shown that the law is detrimental to the very fundamental economics of our rural and commercial life. I am convinced that the fundamental interests of our Nation lie with the farmers and the tillers of the soil, and anything that interferes with the development of our farm life ultimately interferes with the highest and best development of all our national resources. I wish, however, to state that I believe most earnestly in the rights of our industrial institutions and in the welfare of our laborers in the large cities, and shall always insist that the standards of living of our American laborers must never be permitted to be lowered. Indeed, it ought to be our legislative policy in the period of reconstruction before us to insist that the policy of equal rights and complete justice shall be granted to both labor and capital, so that these great industrial giants may join hands with our great agricultural resources for the best interest of the entire Nation. The chasm between labor and capital must be bridged and a spirit of mutual cooperation and mutual consideration instituted for the economic and social well-being of our Nation's life.

This daylight-saving act was passed as a war measure, and the farmers of our country were glad and willing to accept it as a war measure and made no complaint as long as the war was in progress. The farmers responded most heroically and patriotically to the appeals made by Congress and the President of the United States, urging them to till more assiduously the soil and to produce larger crops in order that it might aid in the winning of the war. The appeal was put in a most urgent way that unless the country did produce more foodstuffs it would be impossible for us to win the war. These appeals go to prove that when the Nation is in peril and when the lack of food becomes acute it is to the farmer and the tiller of the soil to whom we must appeal. It is quite evident that the agricultural interests of our country are the foundation stones for the entire superstructure of our economic, social, and political life. Remove these foundation stones and you will have a collapse of the entire structure. Members from New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, and from other large cities who have urged on the floor of the House in a most eloquent way the continuance of the daylight-saving law, and have pleaded for the interest of the city inhabitants (and we honor them for having done so, for we all believe in doing the right and the square thing by the inhabitants of the city as well as by the inhabitants of the country), have failed to perceive the fact that the laborers and the industrial plants in our large cities can easily arrange the hours of labor by mutual agreement between the employer and the employees, and that they can arrive at an understanding under which they can begin their work an hour earlier in the morning and quit an hour earlier in the evening, thus giving to the industrial classes and to the dwellers of the city the advantages which are claimed by the proponents of the day-

light-saving law. Indeed, even before our daylight-saving law was enacted, this was done in a great many centers of industry by the manufacturers, merchants, and industrial plants in order to give the larger freedom and the longer evenings to the urban laborer and city dweller. The industrial plants and the laboring people of New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago and the other large centers, must also remember that they would not be the great commercial centers that they are were it not for the support of the great agricultural regions of their own States and the Middle West, and it is up to Congress, to assist the farmer in every way possible consistent with our democratic form of government, without in any way making it class legislation.

The farmer is not always able to so fully represent his needs in legislation as are our splendid labor and commercial organizations, as he is not yet as thoroughly organized, but we believe that before long he will be, and he should be, not as is so often the case now simply, a political way led by political demagogues, but by a strong farmers' organization that knows the farmers' own peculiar needs and problems, and will present these for solution and adjustment to the legislatures and to Congress in the same manner and in the same way in which other large economic organizations, such as the chambers of commerce, bankers' associations, labor federations, do at the present time. Through such organizations as the grange the farmers have up to date received the largest part of the progressive legislation in their interest. The aim of the grange is a noble one: "In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberty; in all things, charity." May the farmers put aside the leadership of the mere political office seeker, and by organization concentrate their efforts to effect a hearing in our national and State legislative bodies; by so doing they will compel a hearing of their grievances and have their inequalities corrected.

One reason why I am in favor of the repeal of this act is that it adds an onerous burden upon the rural population, and is therefore against the interest of the great movement urged so strongly by ex-President Roosevelt and other great leaders, namely, the movement of the people from the city to the farm. There is no question in my mind that the greatest menace to our national interests to-day is the alarming rapidity of the concentration of our populations in urban centers and the constant stream from the country to the city. It is no question that the reason for this is that the pleasures and the general conditions of ease which prevail in the cities are more attractive to the young people and they leave the farm to go to the city because of the many onerous tasks which are to-day imposed in farm life. It is therefore, in my judgment, incumbent upon us not to add to the onerous conditions already existing in our country life by placing this artificial restriction on the hours of service, but to relieve the farmer of this condition and to help make the country life as easy and as attractive and pleasant as possible.

The rural depletion is a real problem in our country. To stop the ever-increasing flow from the farm to the city and to turn the tide the other way is one of the real questions of fundamental economics and of far-seeing statesmanship. The Thirteenth Census (1900) shows that the loss of the country to the cities is general all over the United States, except in the strictly newer sections. Indeed, it shows that the cities increased, from 1900 to 1910, three times as fast as the rural sections. It shows that while the rural communities have grown 11.2 per cent the cities and towns above 2,500 have grown at least 34.8 per cent. Even in such a wonderfully prosperous State agriculturally as Iowa—probably one of the greatest agricultural States in the Union—reports have it that the farming sections lost nearly 120,000 people from 1900 to 1910. Similar figures are given in many other great agricultural States. Wisconsin, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, dairy States in the Union, reports actual loss in the rural sections in many of its richest counties. I also find that in the census of 1890 the urban population was 22,720,223 and the rural 40,227,491; in 1900 the urban population was 30,797,185 and the rural 45,197,390; in 1910 the urban population was 42,623,383 and the rural 49,348,883. These figures show a consistently growing trend from the farm to the city; and it is up to the best brain and leadership of our statesmen and economists to change the trend if possible. In 1890 the city population was just a little over one-half of the rural, while 20 years later the urban population is only six and one-half millions less than the rural.

This condition is a factor that must be reckoned with in our economic and social welfare. We must plead as never before for a reconstruction program that will invigorate our rural life, for it is the saving salt of our national progress. We must remember what Prof. Gidding so well said:

Genius is rarely born in the city. The city owes the great discoveries and immortal creations to those who lived with nature and with simple folk.

Some one has also said:

The country produces the original ideas, the raw materials of social life, and the city combines ideas and forms the social mind.

The truth of this statement is easily realized by any student of the great questions of rural and urban readjustment to-day. It behooves our Government and our Congress, therefore, to address itself to these questions in a most sympathetic manner and provide all possible aid and development of our rural civilization. Of course, we must not forget the cities and their infinite needs.

I am told by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. ESCH, that one-third of all the telegrams asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law came from lawn tennis and golf club associations and from city athletic associations. Now, I wish it distinctly understood that I have no quarrel with lawn tennis and golf club associations, nor with athletics generally. I am a believer in all of them, and I for one would do everything possible to encourage them rather than discourage them. I believe in wholesome recreation as absolutely important. But when we legislate provisions into our organic laws we must be careful that we distinguish between mere play and constructive work, and that we should not place upon the back of the farmer and the tiller of the soil an arbitrary condition of hardship just for the mere sake of making the athletic conditions a little easier for the people in the city. And, as I have already stated, it is my belief that the city people can make proper arrangements between employer and employee to obtain every advantage and every facility which they claim is to be derived under the daylight-saving law. In my own State of Wisconsin, the legislature unanimously passed a joint resolution pleading with Congress and its delegation in Congress to repeal the daylight-saving law. As a great dairy and agricultural State, the unnecessary hardship imposed upon the farmer by this law does much to retard the real progress of farm life. The farmer who produces the truck and dairy products to be shipped to the city centers must arise at 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning, and it is evident to anybody who has been on the farm that the farmer can not very well in the summer months go to rest at 8 and 9 o'clock in the evening because of the extreme heat. It is clear, therefore, that the farmer and his family are robbed of their night's rest, which is essential to efficiency. In the wheat and dairy area of the Middle West the contention is made that it is impossible to make hay and cut grain in the early morning hours because of the heavy dew, and anyone who has worked on the farm would know that it is equally true that the hour of 5 to 6 is the best hour of the day for harvest and haying. The farmer under the present law is thus robbed of the very best hour of the day for his work, and has imposed upon him an hour of idleness in the morning because of the dew and because in a great many of our districts the farmer is already up against what is known as the eight-hour labor law, which compels him to stop at 5 o'clock p. m. sun time. Wherever the farmers are close to large city centers the laborer leaves for the evening for pleasures in the city environments, and being handicapped to begin early in the morning because of the dew upon the grass and the grain, the loss to the farmers because of the change from sun time can be very much appreciated. What we must insist on is that Nature's own laws and not artificial standards of time must apply to our farm life.

Now, I realize full well that we should do everything possible for the comfort and advantage of the city folks, and no one wishes more than I do to make every condition of city life for the humble city dweller and laborer as pleasant and healthful as possible, and for the thousands of laborers in my own district I am willing to fight in every way possible for their greatest advantage, progress, and well-being. Mr. Speaker, it affords me keen delight to say to the Members of the House that in my own district, with its thousands of laboring people, I have not received a single petition or letter from any laborer or labor organization pleading for the continuation of the daylight-saving law. I want to speak of this as a distinct compliment to these laboring men and these labor organizations, as I believe that they have a fellow feeling for the farmers and the tillers of the soil who are struggling in the northern section of our State for the development of their farms, and thus indirectly support the industrial communities in which they are laboring. It is quite evident that these laborers are willing to forego some of the pleasures which they might enjoy under the continuation of this daylight-saving law in order that they may facilitate the greater interest of the farmer and the farm life. I think, too, that the majority of these industrial laborers in my district feel that they can easily arrange their matters in such a way that an equitable agreement can be made between them and their employers for such hours as will enable them to begin an hour earlier in the morning and be

out an hour earlier in the evening. It appeals to me that the contention made by some Members on the floor of the House that this is not possible is to deny one of the fundamentals of contracts and agreements between labor and capital and between employer and employee. Equitable agreements will take care of our city populations, but nature's laws are immutable, and the dews will fall in the morning in spite of all the legislation that we can do in Congress, and the products of the soil and dairy farms must be brought to the city in the early morning hours, and this enforced hour makes the day too long and the night too short for the laborer on the farm.

I am convinced that in the interest of sound economics, in the interest of our best agricultural development, in the interest of the best life in the cities which must ultimately depend upon the farms, in the interest of the great movement that we are trying to formulate, namely, the movement from the city to the farm, in the interest of fair play, and in the interest of the difficult labor situation which this law imposes upon the farmer, I think that the daylight-saving law should be repealed. I shall, therefore, vote for its repeal, feeling and believing that I am thereby in no way injuring the city populations, that I am in no way injuring the laboring classes in our big centers, but am aiding and helping one of the largest and most fundamental classes of our industrial life—the farmer. And I sincerely believe that the great labor elements of our country, to which we should give every due consideration and to whom we are indebted for a large part of the welfare and continued success of our country, should unite with the farmer in the repeal of the daylight-saving law, and thus make it possible for these two great armies of our industrial and productive life to work in perfect harmony in the development of our broader citizenship.

We are complaining concerning the high cost of living. Such laws as the daylight-saving law inevitably makes it more expensive for the farmer to raise his produce, and that, indirectly, makes the high cost of living still higher. We must so legislate as to lessen, if possible, the cost of production, for by lessening the cost of production we lessen the high cost of living. During the war we instituted many measures that we must now repeal. Many departments and organizations were instituted that in peace are unnecessary, and we must be wise enough to readjust and change all unnecessary and onerous laws and to so legislate as to bring about the greatest good to the greatest number.

I am ready to admit that there were some economic reasons for this law, that there are some savings through this law in the cities, but these are not sufficiently great to overcome the loss of efficiency and production which it entails upon the farm and the farmer. During the war the farmers made no protest. They accepted willingly the task imposed upon them by their great Government to increase the production of the soil in order that we might win the great war. The farmers accepted gladly the situation, made no protest, and said, "We will undergo any hardship, we will respond to any demand by our great Government, if we thereby can win the war." Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it was the combined effort of the farmer and the laborer, the capitalist and the various industries and commercial enterprises, as well as private citizens of our country, that backed up our brave soldiers, sailors, and marines and made our glorious victory possible in this war. The brave boys who pierced the Argonne Forest and Belleau Woods and drove the wedge into the St. Mihiel sector and forced the Hindenburg line at Chateau-Thierry expressed the spirit and devotion of all classes, farmer and laborer, commercial and industrial, of the united devotion and sacrifice of the American people.

The late Mr. James J. Hill, the great railroad and empire builder, and one of the keenest economists of his day, spoke of the farmer and the agricultural interests as follows:

A prosperous agricultural interest is to a nation what digestion is to a man. The farm is the basis of all industry. The soil is the only resource that renews itself continually after having produced value. I do not wish to belittle the importance of manufacture or its relative value in general growth. But for many years the country has made the mistake of unduly assisting manufacture, commerce, and other activities that center in cities at the expense of the farm. The result is a neglected system of agriculture and a decline of the farming interest. But all of these other activities are founded upon agricultural growth of the Nation and must continue to depend upon it. Manufacturer, every merchant, every business man, every good citizen is deeply interested in maintaining the growth and development of our agricultural resources.

In our legislation, therefore, we must encourage, not discourage, the farmer; we must cooperate with him to the end that he may continue even in a larger and broader way to feed and clothe the hungry nations and continue to give our cities the brain and brawn necessary to sustain the awful strain of our modern industrial and commercial life. Our national weal and advancement rests for its foundation upon the farm and upon the man with the hoe. Let us legislate to ease his burdens and encourage his growth. Of course, our modern science and development have made all industries and commercial activities interdependent, and while we should remember the farmer let us not forget the laborer and the industrial concerns. What I plead for is, that an artificial rearrangement of nature's laws should not be resorted to in order to advance any class if by so doing we impede the progress of any other large group or groups. Indeed, I plead for the Golden Rule, which demands justice and friendly cooperation between all social and all industrial groups.

I think the statement of the old Chinese philosopher is still applicable when he says, "The well-being of a people is like a tree—agriculture is its root, manufacture and commerce are its branches and its life; but if the root be injured the leaves fall, the branches break away, and the tree dies." The farmer is the root of our great commercial and financial tree, and we must encourage and enlarge this class in order to enlarge our commercial, social, and economic supremacy. Not only have the luxury and ease and dissipations of the city become a national sin and a national danger, but the constant crowding into the cities of laborers and poor people, who should be on the farms tilling God's rolling and fertile acres, has become a vital reconstruction problem worthy of our deepest study.

Ex-President Roosevelt, one of America's greatest statesmen and one of the most constructive genii in all matters vital to nationalism and Americanism, appointed a Country Life Commission, whose voluminous and comprehensive report to the President and Congress becomes real interesting in connection with this legislation before us to-day, and I wish to quote the following from President Roosevelt's message to Congress:

The farmers have hitherto had less than their full share of public attention along the lines of business and social life. There is too much belief among all our people that prizes of life lie away from the farms. I am therefore anxious to bring before the people of the United States the question of securing better business and better living on the farm, whether by cooperation among the farmers for buying, selling, and borrowing; by promoting social advantages and opportunities in the country life more gainful, more attractive, and fuller of opportunities, pleasures, and rewards for the men, women, and children of the farms. The farm grows the raw materials for the food and clothing of all our citizens; it supports directly almost half of them, and nearly half of the children of the United States are born and brought up on the farms. How can the life of the farm family be made less solitary, fuller of opportunities, free from drudgery, more comfortable, happier, and more attractive? Such results are most earnestly to be desired. How can life on the farm be kept on the highest level, and when it is not already on that level, be so improved, dignified, and brightened as to awaken and keep alive the pride and loyalty of the farmer's boys and girls, of the farmer's wife and of the farmer himself? How can a compelling desire to live on the farm be aroused in the children of the farmer? All of these questions are of vital importance, not only to the farmer but to the whole Nation.

Many of Roosevelt's constructive plans for the farmer and rural life have already been put into successful operation—the automobile, the telephone, the free rural mail delivery. The Federal farm-loan system, the rural health and sanitation plans, and the great work of the Government and of the States through agricultural colleges, county agricultural agents, and rural road construction have already contributed much to improve and to enhance farm life. In many districts the country homes have every modern convenience of the city home, and the social-center work and the improved rural and graded schools as well as township high schools are rapidly making country life bright and cheerful. Improved machinery has done away with much of the old-time mechanical drudgery. The extension work, such as the University of Wisconsin has given for years both through its agricultural extension work and through the extension division proper, has been a most powerful factor to improve rural life and farm conditions. Indeed, the welfare of the farm and rural community challenges our best attention. It must be worked out by encouraging better homes, better schools, better churches, and better physical, social, commercial, and religious opportunities.

When we turn our eyes from our people at home to the blood-stained battle fields of Flanders and France, where our heroic boys, true to the historical traditions of our glorious United States of America, carried the Stars and Stripes—the flag that has never been raised in dishonor or lowered in defeat—to a glorious victory by piercing the Hindenburg line at Belleau Woods, St. Mihiel sector, Chateau-Thierry, and Argonne Forest, and planting Old Glory in triumph on German soil, and forcing the armistice to be signed, and insuring the peace of the world, we are reminded that hundreds of thousands of these brave men who came from the farms we trust will go back to the farms to till our soil again. We owe to these brave boys a gratitude for their undying sacrifices that we can never repay; but let us not only provide for them homes such as are contemplated under the various land bills but let us also make every old homestead in the land an inviting place for his efforts as he returns to the works of peace. Indeed, let us help to make that kind of country life possible that is expressed in the country boy's creed:

I believe that the country which God made is more beautiful than the city which man made; that life out of doors and in touch with the earth is the natural life of man. I believe that work is work wherever I find it; but that work with nature is more inspiring than work with the most intricate machinery. I believe that the dignity of labor depends not on what you do but on how you do it; that opportunity comes to a boy on the farm as often as to the boy in the city; that life is larger and freer and happier on the farm than in the town; that my success depends not upon my location but upon myself, not upon my dreams but upon what I actually do, not upon luck but upon pluck. I believe in working when you work and playing when you play, and in giving and demanding a square deal in every act of life.

While to-day we are lead to plead for the farmer and the farmer's boys, let us not forget to plead also for the laborer and the artisan of the city. In our great reconstruction period, capital must become more generous, labor more faithful. We must utilize all our matchless resources as a Nation. The extremely radical element is destructive and has no promise of constructive achievements or of lasting benefits to the Nation and its people. The future belongs to the man who has vision to see and courage to fight for a square deal to all. There can be no permanent ground for the mere reactionary or destructionist. America has no place for anarchy, I. W. W.ism, or Bolshevism. Let us help to thought and action, we must always and everywhere lower the red flag of anarchy and forever and everywhere raise the Stars and Stripes, the glorious flag of hope and promise, the flag of unity, liberty, civilization, and Christianity. Let us help to make all the streams of our national life to flow swifter, purer, and more equitably for all the citizens of our glorious Union, to the end that all citizens under our benign Government shall always be accorded a free and unobstructed course in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a good deal has been said on the floor of the House this afternoon as to the opposition of the labor element to the present law. I want to say that as far as the industrial people in the great centers of Massachusetts and New England are concerned they are practically unanimously opposed to the repeal of this law. The great question before the American people to-day is the high cost of living, and this hour, in Massachusetts and New England, generally speaking, has resulted in a large increase in the amount of food products, bringing health and happiness to a great many people.

We have heard a good deal this afternoon about the damage that has come to the farmer. That was very well answered by one member of the committee, who said there was no evidence produced at any of the hearings by anybody that the farmers had suffered any injury. In fact, everyone knows that the amount of money that has been reaped by the farmers within the last year, since this law went into effect, has been the most stupendous in the history of the world. There are some millions of farmers in this country, but not by any means do they represent all of the population of the United States, and I am one of those who believe that the farmer does not wish a law that benefits him alone. The great, big bulk of the people who are suffering in this country to-day is the medium class of people, whose wages have not been increased proportionately to the increased cost of living. The United States guarantees to every farmer $2.26 a bushel for his wheat, as against a world price of $1.50 a bushel reached within the past few months. The fact is that in Great Britain to-day, 4,000 miles removed from the wheat fields of the United States, flour is selling for $10 a barrel, while the average man in this country pays $16 a barrel because the United States subsidizes the farmer.

I am not against the farmer, but we are here to legislate for the best interests of 105,000,000 people. Millions of them go to bed hungry every night, and many of these same millions of men and women want this extra hour after work. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of men and women who work in shops in New England, in the factories, in the dry-goods stores, and in all the establishments that employ labor in our part of the country want this extra hour, and they have asked me, as one of their representatives, to fight against its repeal. I received but one letter from my district for the repeal of this law. Every merchant, every labor organization in my district, every person representing the labor interests, the middle-class men, the clergy, the clerks, the men who live on incomes from $1,000 to $3,000 a year, all want this law retained. The father who wishes to get acquainted with his children and spend some time in daylight hours with his family wants the law retained, and that is an important thing in American life to-day—the development of the home ties and family life. This bill allows a man to go home at a reasonable hour, have his supper at 6 o'clock, take his boys and girls and go out into the fields and play baseball and tennis and croquet and those innocent American games. It has cemented the family, and it helps us immeasurably in New England; and, speaking for the city of Boston in part, and I think expressing the sentiments, generally speaking, of New England, there is nobody in that section of the country who does not believe that the American people on the whole are benefited by this law and want it retained. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, it is nonsense for any Member of this House to talk about this daylight-saving law not being a war measure. Who ever heard of a daylight-saving law before the European war? Germany first attempted it, then England, Italy, France, and Canada followed. When it came up here for passage it was advocated as a war measure. The advocates of this bill said that it was a war measure; but even then it did not pass by a unanimous vote, as did other war measures in the last Congress. There were 40 Members of the House who were not convinced of the wisdom of this new-fashion time as a war measure. I was one of the 40 who voted against it. I believe it did more harm than good, even during the war, and when the war was over we should have repealed it. It ought to have been repealed before the first Sunday in March of this year, so that the last change would not have been made. [Applause.]

No one, as far as I know, expected this law to continue in force after the war. I believe everyone will concede that no such measure could have been passed in peace times. The people of the Nation, as far as I know, were satisfied with the old-fashioned time. It was argued that it would save fuel and light during the war, and perhaps it did, but I believe that the harm and inconvenience resulting to the people have more than overbalanced the advantages of the law.

All of the farmers of the Nation are in favor of repeal of this law. It works many hardships upon them, and their objection is well founded. They are forced to maintain their relations to churches, public schools, stores, and banks, and in that way are compelled to observe the law in some respects. It is their labor that produces foodstuff for both the city and country population. They are entitled to our consideration. Now that the war is over we should get back to normal conditions and use the same time which we had during the entire history of our Republic.

The American Federation of Labor, the representative of the labor unions of the country, at a recent convention in Atlantic City declared in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law. I do not believe that we can improve on nature in such things as this. I believe that this Congress will and should regard the expressions of the American people on this subject and repeal this law, which is so objectionable to a great majority of the people, and do it speedily. I believe that two-thirds of the people of the country are in favor of its repeal and that it will pass this House by a vote of 2 to 1. Such a law has already been repealed in Canada, and will, no doubt, be repealed in the European countries very soon after the ratification of the peace treaty. We got along all right with the old-time system. Let us get back to it. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote in favor of this bill. Many of the reasons advanced in favor of the so-called daylight-saving law are fanciful. The reasons why farmers oppose that law are substantial. It has been very gratifying to observe the steady change of sentiment upon the part of Members in respect to the repeal of the law. It looks now as though this repeal bill will pass by a fair majority.

Mr. Speaker, the labor problem is one of the most difficult with which the farmer must wrestle at this time. The so-called daylight-saving law has greatly aggravated that problem. Mr. A. H. Hanson, president of the Benson County (N. Dak.) Federation of Farmers' Clubs, writes me as follows:

The labor problem in this community is a serious one and the change of time has aggravated the situation. You undoubtedly know, from your experience with farm work, that it is impossible in haying and harvest to get into the fields before the dew has dried from the grass or grain, as the case may be, and that even under the old time the afternoon was the longest half of the day. Under the new time this condition is made worse. The labor we get nowadays insists on quitting at 6 o'clock no matter what time they go to work in the morning. We have tried the expedient of working under the old time, but this is more or less of a nuisance, as it throws us out of joint with the business houses and railroads.

Mr. W. C. Allen, the wide-awake editor of the Dakota Farmer, hits the nail on the head in a letter written to me recently. He says:

After a very careful study of the matter, I am convinced that the so-called "daylight saving" works greatly to the disadvantage of farmers in "the Dakota farmer empire."

I fully realize the great advantages of "daylight saving" to city people and even to many in small towns, and until I had made a careful study of the proposition among farmers I was inclined to believe that their complaints in this connection were not justified, but I have changed my mind.

First, I wish to make it plain that the unsatisfactory labor situation has a great deal of bearing in this connection.

Right now we have here in our territory an illustration of how the present method is working to the disadvantage of our farmers. Labor is very scarce on the farms and the great majority of the men working on farms insist on quitting on the new time regardless of when they begin work. As it is generally impossible to begin work in haying, etc., until 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning, when there is any moisture on the grass, this makes a very short day and apparently is going to have its effect in the amount of hay produced in this section this year.

Farmers who produce milk, cream, etc., for town or city market can not go by the "old time" as has been stated by many who oppose the farmer's opposition to the new time, because they must get their produce to market according to the time in vogue in the town or cities.

There are many other minor reasons which I will not discuss at this time. On the whole, it appears to me that the farmers generally are being seriously handicapped by "daylight saving" and particularly so in this section, where we are considerably ahead of sun time on account of being so far west of the point where the time changes.

Mr. Speaker, the repeal of this law will not do any injustice to those living in the cities, and it will confer a great blessing upon those who live on the farms. This repeal bill should pass, and I feel confident that it will pass.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this law was passed as a war measure and should be repealed immediately.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No. It has helped nobody, it has saved nothing, it has inconvenienced many people. Laboring men and farmers are in favor of the repeal of this law, because their houses are so hot in the early part of the evening that they can not sleep at the usual hour for going to bed. At 9 o'clock, when they should go to bed, the sun has just gone down, and their houses are still too hot to occupy.

The laborers and the farmers have to rise by the clock in the morning and go to their work. The farmer can not go into his fields in the early morning on account of the dew. And he must quit because his help quits, early in the afternoon. He loses the best time for an hour's work in the afternoon. If he goes into the fields in the morning when his clothes are saturated with the dew, if the dew works the same as it used to; when you get your clothes saturated with the dew and then have them dry out on your person it makes you feel like repealing almost any law.

That is the way it used to do and I think it still works that way. Those who are in favor of retaining the law, now the war is over, are simply deceiving themselves and attempting to deceive the public. It results in no saving of fuel. The lights that are turned on in the morning are turned off in the evening about the usual hour and the hour is not saved. Somebody said here this morning he walked down the street at 7 o'clock this morning and noted like Benjamin Franklin how time could be saved. Why, at 7 o'clock the sun is up and it is not necessary to have electric lights turned on, and if you go to bed at 9 o'clock it will be almost light enought to read by, so there is nothing saved, nothing good comes of it. Then, too, our contract with the old rooster is that he should begin crowing at 3 o'clock in the morning and it is unfair to him to have him start at 2 o'clock. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I think the logic of the supporters of this bill is summed up in the closing remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas. I do not pretend to know much about farms, but I am quite certain that you are going to have the morning dew whether you repeal this law or not. I think there has been a great deal of camouflage used here to-day by the supporters of this bill. Let us be frank about it. You are not trying to repeal this law at the request of the farmers and laborers; you are trying to repeal this law at the request of the employers of farm help, of the absent landlords who live in our city and play golf, which was so grossly criticized a few moments ago. The gentlemen of this House who are expert farmers know, or should know, that the farm help reports for work at daybreak and quits at 6 o'clock. You are trying to get another hour out of him at the end of the day. If this is a war measure, and you are anxious to repeal all war measures, I ask how many of these gentlemen are ready to repeal war-time prohibition? [Applause.] Let us do that now; the country wants it. [Applause.] Now, I resent the statement that the laborers of New York City are not asking to continue this law. Working people all over the United States want that repeal defeated. The Calder daylight-saving act has been a blessing to the people of this country. Something was remarked about labor representatives. Let me read you this telegram:

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *May 30, 1919.*

Senator CALDER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I understand that there is a bill to be introduced to repeal the daylight-saving law. If so, urge that arrangements be made for a hearing upon the bill, so that those who oppose the repeal of the law will have an opportunity to be heard.

FRANK MORRISON,
Secretary American Federation of Labor.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? Does the gentleman know the convention——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I refuse to yield. Now, gentlemen, I want to say, and I ask the attention of the House to this, that it will work a hardship, cause great loss, confusion, and innumerable litigation in the State of New York if the substitute to the committee amendment suggested is passed.

I call the attention of the House to the memorandum submitted by the attorney general of the State of New York. It is in the hearing, and it is your duty to look up the fact before you vote on the substitute to the committee's amendment. We were compelled under our law in New York to pass a State law to conform with the changed time fixed by the act of Congress. We were compelled to do that because the time was fixed by law in New York to conform to standard time. There is a decision in the Federal court in the case of Globe & Rutger Fire Insurance Co. *v.* David Moffat Co. (154 Fed., 13) holding that the time fixed in New York by the State law is the time to be considered on all contracts, and the attorney general pointed out that as that law was fixed by the decision it was necessary to change our State statute to conform with the change in time by the Federal act. And the State of Pennsylvania did the same. Now, then, our legislature not being in session we have not the opportunity again to amend our law, and, as the attorney general pointed out in his brief, this will affect negotiable instruments, insurance policies, bills of lading, legal papers, and all transactions between the State of New York and the residents of other States. Now, that is something that we can not fairly ignore nor can we upset business conditions in States like New York and Pennsylvania.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do.

Mr. TINCHER. If we should adopt the committee amendment and wait until next October for the repeal of this law, that would accommodate New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It will be at least the decent thing to do.

Mr. TINCHER. If we wait another year that will accommodate Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think it is about time New York and Pennsylvania came into the Union and lived under the Federal law? [Applause,]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The States of New York and Pennsylvania were in the Union long before his State existed. I will say to the gentleman that he is not speaking for the real farmers of his State; he is speaking for the few owners of enormous estates that are exploiting the farmers and laborers, that is all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG].

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the difference between those who are demanding the repeal of the so-called "daylight-saving law" and those who wish to maintain it is the difference between those who must labor 8 and 10 hours a day and those who need work only 6 or 7 hours a day. In Kansas and many other States the farmers need full 10 hours each day to plant, cultivate, and harvest the crops; the afternoon is always the best part of the day, especially as often the dew prevents working in the fields in the early morning. They must often quit work at 6 o'clock in order to take into market their produce and cream and secure their groceries and purchase their supplies because the stores in the towns generally close at 7 or 7.30 o'clock. Hence when the clock is moved an hour ahead, it is a loss to the farmer of the best hour in his day, and the thousands of letters and petitions which these farmers are sending to us bespeak their protest against this law. They loyally accepted the burden this law put upon them during the war, just as they loyally surrendered their sons to our armies, just as they loyally sold their crops and bought Liberty bonds, but now that the war is over they demand the repeal of this law.

The laboring men, I mean those who labor 8 and 10 hours a day, are against this law and are asking its repeal. Those who must go to work at 7 o'clock, have to have breakfast at 6 o'clock which means getting up at 5; they don't like to move the clock ahead and so compel themselves to arise at 4 in the morning. They do not like to do this in order to quit work and go home in the heat of the day. Miners who work underground where it is cool do not want to come out into the heat of the summer in the middle of the afternoon.

The wives of the farmer and the laboring man do not want this law to continue. It compels them to get up an hour earlier to get the morning meal; it requires them to start the preparation of the evening meal in the heat of the afternoon; they must get the children up an hour earlier to get them to school, and they are home an hour earlier in the afternoon.

These are the people, and they are the very backbone of the Nation, who are now asking us by the hundreds of thousands to repeal this unnatural law.

Those who like the law, who "put it over" under the claim that it was one of the "needs of the war," are those who get down to their work at 8 and 9 o'clock in the morning and can afford to work only six or seven hours and want to go home at 5 o'clock in the afternoon so as to have more time for pleasure. Such persons belong to the "Daylight Saving Association," so called, whose president appeared before the committee having charge of this bill and told how the association was formed in 1917 at the Waldorf-Astoria, in New York City; the highest priced hotel in the largest city of our Nation. How many people who really and honestly work more than five or six hours a day do you suppose attended that meeting? It is the people who can afford to stay at the Waldorf-Astoria who, having put this law over under stress of war, now want to continue it. It gives them one more hour for golf, one more hour for pleasure.

They are the ones who have had the chambers of commerce write us to retain this law; they are the ones who can afford to have trained and experienced men come here to Washington and work for keeping this law on the statute books; but, gentlemen, is it just to the men who raise the food of the Nation? Is it fair to the men who labor? Is it fair to the mothers who must get up and get the meals and dress the children in the morning and then get the evening meal in the middle of the afternoon?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG. No. I have not the time to yield.

I would like to ask how many Members would vote to keep this law on the statute book if Congress convened at 7 o'clock in the morning. Would you vote to move the clock ahead so we would have to be here at 6 and have breakfast at 5 and to do so have to rise at 4? Oh! gentlemen, let us be fair. Fair above all things to those who do the work of the Nation; fair to those who produce its food and by their work meet its needs.

Those who do not need to work 8 and 10 hours a day can find plenty of time for pleasure without pushing the day of those who must so work back into the unusual hours before the real day begins.

I speak for the farmer who raises our food, for the laborer who must work, and for the women who make the homes of these men; and who are the mothers of those who fought for us.

I ask you to repeal this law, and I hope you will so vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the question of keeping the law as it is now would be pleasant for a great many in the cities. It would be a very convenient thing. I am willing to admit that. But the repeal of the law is vital to the farming interests. It is a necessary thing. Therefore I shall vote for the repeal. I want to answer my friend from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] about the landlordism out in our section of the country. He says the absent landlords want the repeal. Why, bless the gentleman's heart, there is hardly a man in New York City that can own enough land in southern Minnesota and northern Iowa to employ 15 men on it.

The amount of land held by absent landlords out in our section is hardly worth mentioning. I only know of one New Yorker, Mr. J. S. Tilney, who has extensive holdings in southwestern Minnesota, and his agent, Mr. R. F. Crowley, a prominent farmer and stock breeder, favors the repeal of this law. I can assure the gentleman and Members that this demand comes from the practical and substantial farmers.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this so-called daylight-saving law when it originally passed the House. I was one of that 40 that were referred to a while ago, and I am glad to-day to see so many Members of Congress throughout the country coming around to my point of view and favoring the repeal of this law. It ought never to have been passed, but, having been passed, it ought to be repealed. The farmers, all of them throughout the United States of America, judging from resolutions passed by their organizations, favor the repeal of this law, and by their labor they furnish the products to supply all the balance of the population of this country, and therefore their wishes should have the very highest and most serious consideration. [Applause.] You can not change time by law or make more daylight or less night. The rising of the sun and the going down thereof fixes the time. To try to change it by law makes a double standard of time—one true, one false. God's time is true. Man-made time is false. You make the clocks by this law proclaim a falsehood. When they say it is 12 o'clock it is really only 11 o'clock. Let us repeal this law and have the clocks proclaim God's time and tell the truth. Truth is always best. It is mighty and should always prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER. I regret I have not time enough to yield to my good friend.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER. I am sorry. I had a number of other good reasons I wanted to offer in favor of passing this bill to repeal the law which pretends to create more daylight, but in fact does not do so. God alone can create daylight. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, the regulation of time by government is an absolute necessity in a civilized country, and it is more and more necessary according to the complexity of the life and labor of the people affected. For example, a man doing a one-man business, say, an artist, can begin his work when he pleases and end it when he pleases. The same is true of any individual or family running a farm, which is the case with most farms in this country. They can and do begin when they please. In fact, you can never go into a farm house and find a clock that is right.

When you take the more complex life of a city, rigid coordination is absolutely necessary, and the question of the settling of time is much more important to the residents of cities and to people working there. The heads of business, these gentlemen whom we have cursed out, among whom, in fact, many of our friends are, and who play golf—those men can get up when they please, no matter what time you have. A man running his farm can get up when he wants to. The only person whose time is absolutely set by the clock is the employee, the person hired in factories in the cities to work; and when those men get off, their hour in the afternoon is of tremendous value to them. I have received thousands of letters and telegrams from various constituents in favor of this bill, and not one single word of opposition have I heard. Of course, they were all from city people. Many of them are commuters; many of them live outside of the city. Those people could get back home early enough in the afternoon to make a garden, and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] said, they could see their families. At any rate, they wanted it. It made life very much more pleasant for that class of persons which in this country most deserve our consideration, namely, the poor man in receipt of a daily wage. And I do not feel that we should sacrifice the interests of the large number of employees in our city shops merely because their little farms and little gardens may constitute eventually a serious rivalry to the larger producers of food, nor do I think the advantage should be given up so that people may enjoy better dividends out of their light stock.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's colleague [Mr. LAGUARDIA] intimated that the American Federation of Labor was in favor of this daylight-saving law. Is it not a fact that the convention at Atlantic City refused to indorse this daylight-saving law a few days ago? Is not that a fact?

Mr. PELL. A few days ago, I believe so.

A tremendous number of people are employed in shops and little factories, and there can be no doubt but that there is not in this House a single representative of that class—which is the poorest, and which, as I say, deserve our consideration to the greatest degree—who is not strongly in favor of the saving of daylight. It has benefited the cities to a tremendous extent. It has benefited those communities which are in the neighborhood of cities. People who have independent incomes and men who are doing business by themselves never bother with time, anyhow.

The big mail-order houses, which profit at the expense of the country stores, to which the farmer can not go, not having the time to get off in the evening under the old time, and also the lighting companies favor the repeal of this law. But, as I said, I speak primarily in the interest of those people who have to live absolutely by the clock, to whom 1 minute one way or the other means something, and to whom 20 minutes or half an hour means a great deal, while it means nothing to the farmer. Five minutes means a great deal to the citizen who——

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I want to ask the gentleman a question merely as a matter of information. Supposing this law were repealed and you were the proprietor of an establishment which employed 50,000 men and all these men got off an hour earlier. What is the reason why they could not agree to go to work at 6 o'clock in the morning instead of 7, if they wanted to do it?

Mr. PELL. Because of the extreme complexity of city life. The farmer can do as he pleases on his own farm, and it affects nobody but himself. [Applause.] My constituents are obliged to regulate their lives according to the customs of the community.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BURROUGHS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the many and obvious advantages of this legislation retained, provided we could do away with its many and equally obvious disadvantages. It is because I am satisfied that that can not be done at this time that I am prepared to vote now in favor of the repeal of this law, in accordance with the recommendations of the majority of the committee.

Now, I do not altogether agree with gentlemen who argue that because this was a war measure, therefore we ought to repeal it. I think there are some war measures that we ought to retain. We ought to learn some lessons from the war. But I do say that, having passed this as an emergency measure, a conservation measure, a measure that would help us to win the war, now that the war is over the burden of proof is upon those who advocate its continuance in times of peace.

Now, it is because the proponents, the advocates of this daylight-saving bill have not sustained this burden of proof, and have not to my mind met this test, that I am prepared to vote for its repeal unless it can be substantially amended so as to do away with its many and obvious disadvantages. I shall do this because I am satisfied, after having given the matter very careful and painstaking consideration, that this law in its present form is working a real hardship and injustice upon approximately one-half the population of this country. While it is unquestionably beneficial to some classes of our people, especially in the larger centers, that fact, in my opinion, does not warrant my vote in favor of its continuance after it becomes apparent, as it has now become apparent to me, that real and substantial injustice is being done because of it to a very large proportion of our people.

The daylight-saving law was put forward as an emergency war measure. As such we—most of us—voted for it, as we did for pretty much all the other war measures. I felt then and I feel now that this measure, as indeed all the war measures, would have to justify itself by its practical results. Unless it proved beneficial to our people as a whole, when the emergency was over it would have to go. The mere fact that it was pleasing or even beneficial to some classes was not sufficient to justify its continuance, if, in fact, it worked substantial injury to other large classes of our people.

In other words, I felt and still feel concerning this measure and all the other emergency war measures, now that the war is over, that the burden of proof is upon those who would advocate their continuance during times of peace. They must show affirmatively that the legislation is in fact beneficial not only to a particular class but to the people as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district that is about equally divided between an industrial and an agricultural population. About one-half of the people of the district that I have the honor to represent here live in the country and make their living on the farms. These people are substantially unanimous in their opposition to the daylight-saving law. I believe I am speaking within limits when I say that fully 90 per cent of them are opposed to it and strongly advocate its repeal. Protests, in the form of individual letters, telegrams, and petitions, have been coming to me in great numbers from these people in the last few weeks. Many of these petitions, as well as resolutions passed by grange organizations and others, have been placed by me on file with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House.

The Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of New Hampshire, who is a most broad-minded and fair-minded man and a most accomplished official, in close touch with the agricultural interests of our State, has gone on record most strongly against this law. I learn from him that farmers producing market milk in our State and shipping the same to Boston and other places by rail are obliged to load their milk one hour earlier under the new time schedule than under the old. Also, that farmers on the Suncook Valley Line of the Boston & Maine Railroad have to begin their milking at 3.30 a. m. under the new time. This is also true of farmers located in other sections of our State.

Farm help, which is extremely scarce and difficult to obtain at any price at the present time, are as anxious to quit work at the stroke of the clock as are the city workers who drop the hammer at the blowing of the whistle or the ringing of the bell. This of course means that the cows must be driven in from pasture at actually 3 o'clock instead of 4 o'clock in order to have the help milk them in season to close their labors for the day at 5 o'clock, which is really 4 o'clock. The cows will lie in the shade in the heat of the summer afternoon and feed at the time when the shadows begin to lengthen. An hour of feeding just before coming to the barn for milking is worth twice the time of that in the early morning. The reason for this is that the cow has secured practically what she needs during the day to meet the requirements of her body so far as growth and energy grows, and the later-consumed food simply means that more of it goes into the production of milk. If this feeding time is lost, as it usually is under the plan now in vogue, it means a large economic loss to the dairy farmers of New Hampshire.

Another good reason to my mind why the farmers are opposed to keeping the present law in force is because it effects them so seriously during the haying season. The poorest hour of the day for the farmer in haying time is the first hour of the day. This is because of the heavy dews which usually prevail in our State at that season of the year. The new schedule forces the farmer to close his labor in the field so early in the afternoon that the best hours of the day for harvesting the hay are entirely lost to him. Our farmers have found that it is impossible for them to hold their help over the extra hour, even if they are willing to pay them for so doing. Here is another economic loss which our farmers can ill afford to bear.

I learn also from our commissioner of agriculture that when this question of daylight saving was discussed before the Public Safety Committee of New Hampshire sometime ago some of the people in the industrial centers of the State appealed to the committee to take favorable action to prevent the repeal of the law. A hearing was granted, but because of the fact that no notice had reached the farmers they were not present at the hearing. At the close of that hearing the committee voted to approve the suggestions made by the advocates of daylight saving. A few days later, when the farmers learned of the action of the committee, they asked to be heard, and on account of the vigorous protest made at that time the committee reversed its former action.

It is for these and many other reasons that I have not the time or opportunity now to enumerate that I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that it is my duty to vote to repeal this act, unless such modification can be made in it as will remove in large measure the injustice and hardship which I am now satisfied it imposes upon substantially one-half of our people.

I say I have reluctantly reached this conclusion, because personally I like the law. It works no hardship upon me or upon those who, like me, go to their offices at 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning. I know it is a convenience to people who work in stores and banks and offices. I know it has the indorsement in my district of men who are employers of labor, and is, I believe, generally pleasing to our merchants and professional men. Until comparatively recently I had heard little or no adverse criticism of it. Apparently our farmers had accepted it, as we all accepted it, as a war measure, and for that reason no general expression of protest was heard. From the number and character of the protests that have come to me in the last few weeks I am forced to the conclusion that there is widespread dissatisfaction with this law in its practical workings and that in the main this feeling of dissatisfaction rests upon a substantial basis of fact.

The law apparently does not take the farmer into account at all. It fails to take into consideration the facts of nature with which the farmer has to contend. It seems to assume that there is no connection between farm life and the industrial activities

of the city, when, as a matter of fact, we all know that there is a very intimate connection and relation between the worker in the city and the farmer in the country. We all know that the dwellers in our cities are absolutely dependent in most instances upon the dairy farmer and the farmer who raises garden produce for their milk, butter, vegetables, and other food supplies that are essential to their very existence. As a matter of fact, instead of there being no relation or connection between the activities of the country and the activities of the city, there is the most intimate relation between them.

Advocates of this law say that if the farmer is not satisfied with the new time let him make such arrangements and such adjustments as he sees fit. All this assumes that he lives a life separate and apart from the life of the industrial and commercial world and is therefore in position to fix and determine the conditions under which he shall live and work. This assumption is not true; indeed it is very far from being true. The farmer is bound in his work and activity by certain unvarying laws and facts of nature. He can not govern the falling of the dew. He has to "make hay while the sun shines." The labor that he hires is just as anxious to quit with the blowing of the whistle of the near-by factory as is the worker of the city; but if the men quit at 4 o'clock sun time the farmer loses two hours of the best time in the day for harvesting his hay and grain.

Advocates of this law seem to forget that the flow of milk and other farm produce, which is essential to the life of the city, sets in from the country several hours before the activities of the city begin at all. Train schedules are made up with reference to the beginning of the working day in the city. Your city resident has to have his milk and other food supplies brought to him in season for his morning meal. That means that the producer of this milk and produce must get up in the morning in season to deliver his produce either in the city or to the train that shall take it to the city in season for breakfast.

Now, if you advance the clock an hour and thereby start the working-day an hour earlier, it means that breakfast is going to be an hour earlier, and that means that trains have got to run an hour earlier, and that means that the farmer must get up an hour earlier in order to get his milk and other supplies to market. There can be no escape from this.

In other words the starting of the factory an hour earlier means a tremendous disarrangement of lifetime habits affecting a multitude of people, and not only people but domestic animals as well. It is not simply a question of whether it is advisable for the worker in the city to get up an hour earlier during the summer months. He may be able to do that without inconvenience or hardship. But how about the farmer who under sun time is getting up at 4.30 in the morning, and who under the new time must get up at 3.30 in the morning in order to get his milk and other produce to market?

I maintain that that is not fair to him, and I see no way by which that hardship upon him can be removed under the present law.

Ages ago the Roman law provided a variable day adjusted to the variable length of daylight between winter and summer. It was in effect a sliding scale that took into account both ends of the problem. In this respect it was wiser than our modern enactment, and happier, too; at least history does not record any such agitation for its repeal. It can not be said that it was called "scientific," because happily the word had not then been invented, but it met the requirements of its day, and that is all that science can do for us now.

If the clock is to be set by law and not by the sun the need is for a scientific law to correct the astronomical eccentricities of the varying length of daylight in winter as in summer. It should be helpful to the country as well as to the town. It should be considerate to the workers in food distribution. Such a law would not take away all that the present act gives to the city, and yet would give comfort to the country.

If a daylight-saving bill could be drawn upon some such principle as that I would be glad to give it my support, but I utterly refuse to lend my support further to class legislation of this sort that grants a privilege to half of the people at the expense of the other half.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the privilege to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PELL] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for one minute.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I am in favor of the repeal of this law, to take effect at once, and shall so vote. [Applause.] In doing so I shall represent the unanimous sentiment of the farmers of my district and a goodly proportion of the laboring men of my district. [Applause.] After careful consideration I have concluded that the daylight-saving act should be repealed. The reason is fundamental. When we passed the law we tried to "put one over" on Mother Nature, and when you try to improve the natural laws it usually ends in disaster. That has been the result in this instance, and although the law has been in effect only about a year and a half it has worked a very great hardship on the farmer and rural population without corresponding benefits to those who live in the cities, benefits that can now be secured if we repeal the act and go back to the only real standard time—sun time.

There used to be an old adage that "Man works from sun to sun, but a farmer's work is never done." That is not true any more where the farmer employs hired men, and most of them are compelled to do so. The laborer in the fields now quits at the tap of the 6 o'clock gong, the same as his city brother, and he no longer consents to remain in the fields until the twilight drives him home. In the morning, however, it is different. The city employee goes to work at 7 o'clock, or whatever hour he is expected, regardless of the weather. This can not be done on the farm. If it rains during the night the farmer must wait until the sun comes up and dries out the fields; if there is a heavy dew during the night, the same thing applies. As a result many valuable hours are wasted, and this during the very time that hours are the most precious. I have it from competent authority that the loss in a monetary way in my district alone will run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. There is another point to be taken into consideration. All the dumb animals can not tell time, and they govern themselves by the laws of nature. The result is that it is impossible to adjust them to the new order of things, impossible to make them get up an hour earlier during summer, eat their meals an hour earlier, and retire an hour earlier at night. As I stated in the outset, when we try to improve on nature we usually end in trouble, and there is no better demonstration of this fact than the present law.

I appreciate the fact that there are two sides to the question and I have had letters from people living in the city asking that the law remain intact.

However, I see no reason why the manufacturer can not adjust his working hours in accordance with sun time if he so desires. There is no reason why he can not allow his employees to go to work the same time as they do now, even though the clock will register an hour earlier. The manufacturer can adjust his work to suit the occasion, but the farmer must adjust his work to nature, as it is nature that brings the harvest.

There is another element that induces me to cast my vote as I shall. I must be guided in a measure by the sentiment in my district, and judging by the letters I have received it is 3 to 1 in favor of the repeal of the law. Not only does the request for repeal come from the farmers—they are almost a unit in requesting it—but many men from the city favor getting back to standard time and so remaining. I believe the present law should be repealed and we should return to the natural order of things at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for one minute.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of repealing this law. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope all this applause will not come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. QUIN. This law was passed distinctly as a war measure, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Tennessee said. No such European statute could have been put upon the statute books of this country except as a war measure. The war is over now, and all those gentlemen who talk about the laboring men not wanting the daylight-saving law repealed, and so on, must realize that it was God who put the sun in the sky for the illumination and guidance of the farmers and the laboring people [applause], and they do not want to be made to think

permanently that they are fooling themselves by governmental monkeying with the clock. [Laughter.]

The farmers of this country are honest in their contention that this law to some extent has interfered with their affairs, and they want this law repealed. They were willing to be inconvenienced by governmental regulation during the war because they are patriotic citizens. Those patriots expect Congress to repeal this law. I shall vote to repeal it right now. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, of course in a few minutes we can not go into the arguments pro and con on this question, but I want to present to you some facts which ought to have some weight with the gentlemen who allege that they represent the farmers of the United States. How many people are there altogether in the United States who are affiliated with agricultural pursuits? Just 12,000,000 people. Now, as against that there are 26,000,000 people who are identified with manufacturing, trade, transportation, mining, and other industries.

You gentlemen stand up here and talk about the farmers as though the farming interests were the sole interests to be consulted in this country. There are other parts of this Nation which are essential; there are other men and other industries that are necessary in order to carry on the great mission of this country. When you have a Liberty loan or a Victory loan to put through, where do you gentlemen look in order to raise the money? The total subscriptions to the Victory loan amounted to $5,249,908,300, and what proportion of that do you suppose was raised in the New York district? One billion seven hundred and sixty-two million dollars! Practically one-third of the entire Victory loan, was raised by the New York district. You gentlemen rise in this Chamber and talk about the little farmer whose cows can not get used to the new time. [Laughter.] You talk about your farm employees who can not get through the day's work in time to attend the moving-picture shows. Do you not think at all of the hundreds of thousands of poor toilers in the great cities of this Union, in the industrial centers, in the sweatshops, in the manufacturing establishments, in trade, in transportation, and in other industries? Do you not think they are entitled to some consideration? Does the tail want to wag the dog? Yet that is the attitude of the farmers of this country as represented in this House to-day. You represent only 30 per cent of the industries of this country, and yet you want to have everything accommodate itself to your alleged requirements.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have not the time to yield. The State of New York, the great Empire State, with a population of over 10,000,000 people, is against this proposed repeal. And yet New York is no mean State in agricultural interest. It stands tenth in the value of its farms and sixteenth in acreage under cultivation.

The farms of New York State are sufficient for all the needs of its 10,000,000 inhabitants. Contrary to the view of some of our western friends, the people of New York would not starve if they stood entirely upon their own resources. The Empire State's agricultural activities will not only maintain its 10,000,000 inhabitants in plenty but could well support a population five times as large.

It may surprise some folks to learn that in 1918 New York State raised more potatoes than any other State in the Union. Its farms yielded 32,646,000 bushels. Its production in wheat was 7,526,000 bushels; in rye, 1,985,000 bushels; in oats, 53,426,000 bushels. In dairy products New York State stands the second in the Union.

However, we make no pretense to big things in farming. Our farms are small and are generally cultivated by their owners and the members of their families. We have no aristocracy of the soil in the State of New York; no large tracts of land cultivated by corporations or capitalistic farmers who in the West are fast aping the methods of the coal and steel barons. We have heard much talk in the West from the big fellows, but we have heard very little about what their farm hands want. I venture to say that if the farm hands were heard from they would not be loath to take advantage of the increased leisure and opportunity for recreation which the daylight-saving law has given to employees all over the country.

While New York State stands near the head in her agricultural resources, she occupies the premier position in the variety and value of her manufactured products. According to the census of 1910, there were in all the United States 6,615,000 wage earners engaged in manufactures. One million of these—nearly one-sixth—live in the State of New York. The value of their work, as expressed in the value of their products, amounted to $3,369,490,000.

Taking the States which are most vitally interested in maintaining the daylight-saving law to improve the living conditions of their inhabitants, we find that in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio, and New Jersey there are 3,705,004 persons engaged in manufacturing, and that they produce more than half in value of the manufactured articles produced in the United States.

I have letters here from the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, the Chamber of Commerce of the City of New York, boards of trade throughout the State of New York, hundreds of telegrams, and hundreds of letters opposing the repeal of this law.

TELEGRAMS.

Telegrams protesting repeal of the daylight-saving law, from Downey Shipbuilding Corporation; Ward Baking Co.; Babcock & Wilcox Co.; Peters Manufacturing Co.; Cowperthwait & Sons; Peter Ferester; Gas Engine & Power Co.; Capt. W. G. Hawes, 258 Broadway; McKesson & Robbins Co.; Marcus M. Marks, president National Daylight Saving Association; Thomas J. Quinn; S. G. Rosebaum, National Cloak & Suit Co.; Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co.; Smith & Kaufman, 19 East Twenty-sixth Street; Samstag & Hilder Bros.; Mrs. Francis McNeil Bacon, chairman National Civic Federation; A. Duncan Reid, on behalf of 700 employees; Paul Prager, general secretary Merchant Ladies' Garment Association; American Cyanide Co.

LETTERS.

Marks Arnheim Co., 30 East Forty-second Street; Aitken Sons & Co., 417 Fifth Avenue; American Cyanamid Co.; Barrett Co.; Bon Ami Co., 17 Battery Place; A. L. Brown, 68 Nassau Street; Alfred Beyrodt, 759 Hewitt Place; Brooklyn Trust Co.; Columbia Metal Box Co.; Central Federated Union; Crockery Board; Campbell, Metzger & Jacobson Co.; Crowell-Lehnhardt Co.; Donegal Motor Rug Co.; E. A. Caldwell Co.; A. P. Dienst Co.; Expanded Metal Engineering Co.; Felt & Tarrant Manufacturing Co.; Arthur Franstein Co.; G. B. G. Manufacturing Co.; Robert L. Hooks, 26 East One hundred and twenty-sixth Street; Knickerbocker Ice Co.; I. Kaminsky; Kohler Industries; Jacob Leitner, Prospect and Westchester Avenue; Luckenback Steamship Co.; Merchants' Association of the City of New York; Metropolitan Tobacco Co.; H. Muhlstein Co.; Northern Assurance Co.; New York Business Publishers' Association; Amsterdam Casualty Co.; Oil Seeds Co.; Gardner Binding Co.; Periodical Publishers' Association; Remington Arms Co.; United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co.; Gas Engine Power Co.; Charles L. Seabury Co.; Sweet-Orr Co.; Bronx Board of Trade; Bronx Chamber of Commerce of the City of New York; Sargent Co.; Salant & Salant Co.; A. Sulka Co.; Olin J. Stephens, One hundred and thirty-sixth Street and Mott Haven Canal; United States Casualty Co.; West Disinfecting Co.; American Association of Woolen & Worsted Manufacturers; the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York; Carter, Macy & Co., New York City; Campbell, Metzger & Jacobson, 932 Broadway, New York City; W. J. Richardson & Son, 62 Leonard Street, New York; R. J. Caldwell, 15 Park Row, New York City; the Columbia Graphophone Co.; E. R. Durkee & Co., New York City; Fred Fear & Co., 299 Broadway, New York City; Grevatt Bros., New York City; J. L. Mott Iron Works, 118 Fifth Avenue, New York City; Metal & Thermit Corporation, 120 Broadway, New York City; the Miller School, Lexington Avenue and Twenty-third Street, New York City; the National Automatic Sprinkler Association, 80 Maiden Lane; the Hastings Paving Co., 25 Broad Street, New York City; the Insurance Observer, 37 Maiden Lane, New York City; Kirtland Bros., 95 Chambers Street, New York City; the Kohler Industries Co., 601 West Fiftieth Street, New York City; P. W. Lambert Co., 444 Lafayette Street, New York City; the New Amsterdam Casualty Co., 59 John Street, New York City; National Surety Co., 115 Broadway, New York City; the

Oil Seeds Co., 35 South Williams Street, New York City; the Real Estate Board of New York, 217 Broadway; the Retail Shoe Dealers' Association, 130 West Forty-second Street; the Shaw-Walker Co., 60 Franklin Street; Standard Mail Order Co., Fifty-fifth Street and Ninth Avenue, New York; Twenty-third Ward Bank; U. S. Smelting & Refining Co. (Inc.), 120 Broadway, New York City; Amasa Walker, 449 Fourth Avenue.

Will you not give consideration to the needs of others? I think this is a time when a little unselfishness ought to be displayed. The daylight-saving law has been adopted by the most civilized nations of the globe. It was advocated by Benjamin Franklin. It has saved millions of tons of coal, and if let alone will continue to save millions and millions of dollars. If you gentlemen who have trouble with your cows because they will not work according to the new time and with your men because they do not want to go out in the wet dew in the morning to do their work, if you are unselfish, you can begin the day's routine an hour later. Why not wait for the sun and work in harmony with it, if you have such a high and exalted opinion of the sun as the regulator of your particular industry? [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Persons engaged in agriculture in United States.

ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1910.

Males	10,582,039
Females	1,806,584
	12,388,623
Total population of the United States (1918)	105,118,467
Area of United States in acres	1,903,269,000
Acres under cultivation, i. e., devoted to farming	293,794,000
Acreage not used for farming	1,609,475,000
Wealth of the United States (1918)	$187,739,071,090
Value of farms and farm property (1918)	$40,991,449,090

TABLE 1.

Occupation of inhabitants (prior to war).

[World Almanac, 1919.]

	Inhabitants.	Per cent.
Agriculture, forestry, and animal husbandry	12,659,203	33.2
Mining	964,824	2.5
Manufacturing and mechanical industries	10,658,881	27.9
Transportation	2,637,671	6.9
Trade	3,614,670	9.5
Public service	459,291	1.2
Professional service	1,663,569	4.4
Domestic and personal service	3,772,174	9.9
Clerical occupations	1,737,053	4.6

TABLE 2.

Comparison of farm acreage and values in the United States.

State.	Acreage under cultivation.	Standing in acreage.	Value.	Standing in value.
Texas	112,435,000	1	$2,218,645,000	3
Kansas	43,384,000	2	2,039,389,000	6
Nebraska	38,622,000	3	2,079,818,000	4
Missouri	34,591,000	4	2,052,917,000	5
Iowa	33,930,000	5	3,745,800,000	2
Illinois	32,522,000	6	3,905,321,000	1
Oklahoma	28,859,000	7	918,198,000	13
North Dakota	28,426,000	8	974,814,000	12
California	27,931,000	9	1,614,694,000	8
Minnesota	27,675,000	10	1,476,411,000	9
Georgia	26,953,000	11	580,546,000	15
South Dakota	26,016,000	12	1,166,097,000	11
Ohio	24,105,000	13	1,902,694,000	7
North Carolina	22,439,000	14	537,716,000	16
Kentucky	22,189,000	15	773,797,000	14
New York	22,030,000	16	1,451,481,000	10

TABLE 3.

Wage earners and the value of their products in the six largest manufacturing States.

[Census of 1910.]

	Number of wage earners.	Value of products.
United States	6,615,046	$20,672,052,000
New York	1,003,981	3,369,490,000
Pennsylvania	877,543	2,626,742,000
Massachusetts	584,559	1,490,529,000
Illinois	465,764	1,919,227,000
Ohio	446,934	1,437,936,000
New Jersey	326,223	1,145,529,000
Totals for 6 States	3,705,004	11,990,453,000

Mr. ESCH. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I have not asked for this minute of time merely to get Pennsylvania hurried into the Union, as was suggested by the gentleman from Kansas, for Pennsylvania was first in the Union, has never asked to get out, and will never allow any State to go out nor a foreign sovereignty or superstate to break in. But I have asked for this time in order to give reasons why I am in favor of the repeal of this law, after having voted for it as a war measure. [Applause.]

It is self-evident, gentlemen, that the manufacturer can better regulate the working hours in conjunction with the workmen than the farmer can regulate the weather, and now, in the presence of the high cost of living, which continues to mount higher and higher every day, we should not further interfere with the free flow of the productive energy of the farmer in supplying the things that sustain human life. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in response to constant calls from both farmers and laboring men in my district, I feel it my duty now, after the war is over, and having regarded this law as purely a war measure, to vote for its repeal, as well as the repeal of many other war measures which harass and oppress an indulgent and patriotic people. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN].

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in looking forward to my duties and associations in the Sixty-sixth Congress I had fully expected that it would require from six months to a year before a new Member could summon sufficient courage to bring himself to the point of attempting to speak on any subject, but the thoughtful and kindly information vouchsafed to new Members from both sides of this House from day to day since Congress convened has been so inspiring and encouraging that a new man's timidity is completely vanquished, and he is constrained to add his voice and convictions to those expressed by older and more experienced Members. The radiant light that has flashed from the eyes of the old-time sages here from both sides of the House and the irrepressive waves of knowledge that have flowed forth from their active minds and liquid tongues have been so all compelling and reassuring that new Members have lost their sense of timidity and restraint and have become so thoroughly inspired and informed that they are compelled to speak. Silence is impossible under such associations as are found here.

My object in arising at this time is to set forth some reasons why I believe the so-called daylight-saving law, enacted by the Sixty-fifth Congress, has been and is one of the greatest inconveniences and outrages ever forced upon the long-suffering American people, and to express the hope that this Congress at a very early day will bring about its repeal. In view of the inconveniences that result from this law it is to be regretted that any Member of this body should have exercised his right on a point of order to prevent its repeal from being attached to the Agriculture bill, which was the unanimous recommendation of that committee.

The fact that harvest in the South and Southwest is now on and that earnest memorials have been coming in from every agricultural section of the United States pleading for the repeal of this law before harvest affords the most urgent reasons for the earliest possible reinstatement of nature's time. A careful study of the operations of the law reveals the fact that the only benefit it brings to anybody is the extra hour in the afternoon it provides for the amusement of those who want to play golf or attend the functions of some club. The law does not benefit to exceed 10,000,000 people out of 110,000,000, and it does work a real hardship on the 100,000,000, as I shall proceed to show.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances under which this provision became a law in the Sixty-fifth Congress were about as follows: Every department of the National Government was urging upon the people of the country the necessity of conservation and thrift, to the end that we might "win the war"; and our great patriotic citizenship, irrespective of political affiliations or resident locality, responded to that call. The people were so anxious to heed every advice and admonition of the administration, to the end that unity might be preserved and the highest degree of efficiency reached in the prosecution of the war, that they did not stop to ask the question for the time being whether some of the requirements of the Government were reasonable or unreasonable or whether they would carry out the purposes for which the provisions were designed. Everything else was set aside in an attempt to comply with the one slogan, "Win the war." The gentlemen in this House, as well as those in that other body—which I have learned through the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is unmentionable here—according to the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD, at the time this bill was before Congress, presented arguments in favor of it about as follows:

First. Twelve European countries had already adopted the provision.

Second. Turning the clocks ahead an hour would get people up an hour earlier in the morning and give them an hour more of daylight in which to accomplish their labors.

Third. Laborers would be released an hour earlier in the evening and have more time at home with their families.

Fourth. The business and professional men, having their entire leisure time in the afternoons, could devote themselves to the raising of war gardens, thus increasing the Nation's food supply.

Fifth. Great savings of coal would be realized because of the consumption of less light in cities and manufacturing plants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a fair investigation of the reasons advanced in support of the daylight-saving law reveals the fact that they are not valid and were not worthy of the credence given them by the Sixty-fifth Congress.

What matter is it to us that 12 European countries had adopted a similar provision? Our valiant boys who are returning from their victorious achievements on the world's greatest battle field inform us, which information agrees with my previous convictions, that the less the United States apes Europe the better off she will be. It is of no moment to us whether 12 European countries or any other number, greater or less, have adopted a so-called daylight-saving law. If Europe had been less arbitrary in passing laws and issuing mandates curtailing the legitimate liberties of her people she would be far better off today. The star of progress as well as the star of empire for the United States is to the west and not to the east. [Applause.]

In the next place, it has been found—and if the gentlemen who argued this point in the Sixty-fifth Congress had used their almanacs they would have discovered the fact—that during April, May, and September the so-called daylight-saving law yields another hour of darkness instead of an hour of daylight. The laborers who go to work at 7 o'clock in the morning and the thousands of young people who attend 7 o'clock college and academy classes throughout this Nation must arise not later than 6 o'clock in the morning—which by the new time means 5 o'clock—in order to get to their work or their studies in time.

As to saving coal in factories, as one who has had some experience in firing up in the morning getting plants ready for operation by the time others arrive for duty, I know that even by the old time it is necessary to light up and fire up before daylight, and when you bring your working forces on an hour earlier in the morning you of necessity require just an additional hour of artificial light in preparation for their coming that would not otherwise be required.

The claim of the Fuel Administration that over a million tons of coal was saved last winter because of the daylight-saving provision will not stand the test either of reason or of fact. There were three things that occasioned this saving in coal that are very obvious to any practical man when presented. The first is, our people had been constantly admonished to save coal and had been warned that there would probably be a great shortage. The cartoon of the shovel with a caution to save tied to the handle was published in nearly every newspaper in the land until people became obsessed with a desire to save coal. In my own home a year ago last winter we burned more than twice as much coal as we did for the same number of months last winter. I know many others who experienced the same result in their individual coal savings. In the next place, because of the warning that there might be a coal shortage, railroad companies and other large consumers in the latter part of 1917 and early 1918 laid in vast supplies of coal. I know of one division railroad yard that had coal stored on a 20-acre tract of ground in anticipation of a shortage in the winters of 1918 and 1919, and there are tens of thousands of tons of that coal still on that ground unused. In the third place, the winter of a year ago, with which the Fuel Administration compared last winter, was the severest on record—the thermometer in a number of places registering 20° below for a month at a time—whereas the winter of 1918 and 1919, through which we have just passed, was one of the mildest winters we have experienced since the Weather Bureau has kept records. I distinctly recall that during the month of January last, out in our Nebraska country, the weather was so mild that I did not wear an overcoat during the entire month.

As to the argument used in favor of this law that it gives men an hour more in the afternoon to devote to garden purposes, it must be conceded at this time that no considerable number of city people are using their time for garden purposes. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this law as it now stands serves only a few clubmen of our country, who want a little extra time for pleasure. In substantiation of this statement I have received, as no doubt other gentlemen here have, letters and memorials from various clubs of New York and other large cities pleading, in substance, "Do not take away from us our extra hour of pleasure."

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, for this Congress to enact a piece of legislation that yields only an hour of pleasure to less than 10 per cent of our population and at the same time brings great inconvenience and handicap to all the agricultural and labor forces, upon whom we are all absolutely dependent, constitutes an act for which we should be ashamed, and for the removal of which we should take immediate steps.

In summarizing just a few of the many legitimate objections that can be made to this law, I want to call your attention to 10. I have adopted for convenience the 10 reasons which I read the other day in the New York Commercial, a paper published in the State from which hails the distinguished gentleman [Mr. LAGUARDIA] who raised the point of order on this measure a few days ago. Here are the 10 reasons summarized in the New York Commercial:

1. Daylight saving adds one hour of darkness instead of daylight to the farmer's day.
2. Farmers shipping milk or other perishable food supplies must meet trains an hour earlier than before April 1.
3. Farm children frequently go long distances to school, and mothers must get them ready by lamplight.
4. During haying and harvest it takes four hours for the dew to evaporate so hay or grain can be baled or stacked or the binder operated.
5. The hottest part of the day is from 12 to 1 o'clock, old time. Under new time a farmer must send his hands and his horses to the field during the most intense heat.
6. Extra labor hired during harvest, haying, and thrashing is usually from the towns and used to working according to the clock. Such hands insist on quitting at 6 o'clock, new time, or 5 o'clock, old time, when the sun is still three hours high.
7. Farmers attending prayer meetings, neighborhood and community gatherings, and entertainments must quit an hour earlier than they would under old time and thus lose an hour of work time.
8. To get into the stores or banks in towns, which operate under new time, the farmer must start an hour earlier than he is accustomed to start.
9. There is constant friction and loss of time while exchanging work with neighbors, a custom that is necessary during haying, harvest, and thrashing. Farm hands refuse to work by new time one day and by old time the next.
10. Thrashing is interfered with when part of the crew works according to new time and part according to old.

These reasons are set forth especially from the viewpoint of the agriculturists, but the farmer is not the only one that suffers because of this law. The opposition to the law among the rank and file of the laboring men is just as pronounced as is that of the farmer. In many coal-mining communities laborers are working under old time, having absolutely refused to observe the new hours. The provision is so unpopular in the packing plants at Kansas City that these plants are operating under the old time, men having positively refused to rouse their wives and families before daylight in the morning to speed up breakfast and get ready for work by 6 o'clock natural time.

I have been learning that the letters and petitions that come to this body from so-called labor leaders often do not represent the convictions of the laboring men at all; and statements that may be made here that a majority of the laboring men favor this law are not true according to the facts. It can be shown that a large majority of the industrial forces of the country are opposed to the law. Thus we find that the 30,000,000 of our population engaged in agricultural pursuits, together with a large majority of the laboring men of the Republic, come to us with a unanimous request to repeal this useless and obnoxious law. While it may be regarded by some who are not in touch with the heart and pulse of these people as a matter of minor importance as to what time is observed, the petitions and appeals that are coming in to this Congress by the thousands from every agricultural section from New York to California and from Canada to the Gulf praying for the repeal of the law reveal the fact that no other legislative act that this Congress can perform will meet with such unanimous approval of the American people as the repeal of the daylight-saving law; and, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, any Representative who is so thoughtless as to pass lightly over this mighty appeal that is coming here from the heart of the great American people is unmindful of his duty as a Representative.

It has occurred to me since coming here that one of the wisest things the Government could do would be to take a few of its Representatives and give them a six months' trip on full salary and all expenses and carry them to every part of the United States and let them see people's interests and industries in their entirety, to the end that they might fairly represent the whole people instead of seeing only the neighbors near their own dooryards.

For the convenience of the great army of producers this law should have been repealed last spring. Because tens of thousands of our farm boys are of necessity serving in the Army,

mothers and sisters and wives have been compelled to go into the field and do a man's work in order that the Nation's food supply might be maintained. I have seen women during the past two years plowing in the field, harvesting grain, hauling grain to town, pursuing dairy work; in fact, doing all kinds of work that is required of men on the farm. Now, what does it mean under this new time when these women are compelled to go to the field as they have done and are doing uncomplainingly? It means this, that instead of being at home to get dinner at the regular noon hour from 12 to 1, the hottest part of the day, when both men and horses are supposed to be at rest and refreshment, these women must repair from the field to the house an hour earlier—at 11 o'clock, former railroad time, and 10.30, if you please, sun time, almost midforenoon—and prepare the dinner for the working forces and then take the field again at 1 o'clock, either to work from six to eight hours at one shift or else take time again in the middle of the afternoon for the preparation and serving of a lunch. Furthermore, if it is necessary, as it often is, to go to town in the evening to make purchases, practically all of the stores throughout the country close not later than 6 o'clock and many of them close at 5 o'clock or earlier. When these stores close at 5 o'clock, which is 4 o'clock former railroad time, or 3.30 in the afternoon sun time, it is necessary for the farmer or some of his help to leave the field in the middle of the afternoon and hurry off to town to make purchases before the stores close.

Let me call your attention to another inconvenience to the American mothers which alone has sufficient weight to influence this body to repeal this law and to do it now. I refer to the fact that every child in the country who, under the direction of his mother or nurse, has been led to form habits of retiring at a certain hour in the evening, ranging from 7.30 to 8.30 o'clock, are obliged under this provision to form new habits entirely and to retire while the sun is yet high in the sky and while it is blazing daylight. My wife, who makes an earnest endeavor to obey all laws, no matter how unreasonable they may be, has had the provoking experience, both last year and this year, of attempting to get our smaller children in the habit of retiring according to the new time, so that the household may arise according to same time; but with one full summer and about two months of another having passed, she has utterly failed to supplant the habits of these children as to their sleeping hours. Ours is only one home among the millions in this land. The old saying that children and fools tell the truth still obtains. Older folks through certain reasoning processes, based on false premises, may lead themselves to support almost any delusion, but children are closer to nature and can not be so easily deceived.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the purpose of legislation is to advance the legitimate liberties of people and not to curtail them, to contribute to their comfort instead of adding to their discomfort. If the case of the daylight-saving provision were tried under natural law it certainly would not stand the test. The idea of attempting to compel the people by mandate to do their work and establish their customs an hour and a half ahead of the sun, which by nature regulates the days and seasons, is utterly preposterous. There may be some Moseses here, a few Elijahs and one or two Solomons, but there is no Joshua here to command the sun to stand still. Nature fixes time, and even wise men can learn a few things yet from nature. I am glad the control of Congress has been changed, for if we had continued to follow the precedents established during the past four years we might soon have laws passed attempting to regulate the volume of air a man should breathe, suspend the law of gravity, or change the colors of the rainbow. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that all of our law-making bodies, both State and National, cease to pester and aggravate and handicap the great intelligent American people with foolish, obnoxious provisions and requirements. I have no hesitancy in saying here that the voters of this Nation—both men and women—are thinking more seriously and earnestly than ever before; that they are less tied to any party politically, either Democrat or Republican, than ever before in the history of these parties; and I sincerely believe that if this Congress fails to repeal the daylight-saving law and to act squarely in the interests of the people on every other question that arises we shall witness within the next few years the greatest stampede from both of the great political parties that was ever witnessed in this or any other country.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a Republican from childhood; I believe in the principles of true republicanism; I love the party of Lincoln, of Grant, of Garfield, of McKinley, and of Roosevelt. I am frank to confess that, in my judgment, the fact that too much legislation has been enacted in the past in the interests of the few as against the interests and welfare of the many has prepared the soil in this country for the inception and growth of seeds of discontent. A part, at least, of the rumblings and complaints that threaten our whole social and governmental fabric at this time is the direct result of dangerous and unfair legislation. We can and must relieve the situation by removing as far as it is within our power all grounds for righteous complaint, and then much of the extreme and rabid agitation and conduct that now obtains will cease. We must put the salt of justice into the poisoned waters of the body politic. The people are looking to this Congress for the relief to which they are by right entitled. Where no moral issues are involved, legislators must listen to the voice of the people.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of the 6,000,000 farmers and their families, composing a population of 30,000,000 souls; in the name of 10,000,000 laborers with their families, constituting 50,000,000 more of our population; in the name of millions of mothers and children, I appeal to my colleagues in the Sixty-sixth Congress to repeal the daylight-saving law, and to do it now; the longer the provision continues the greater the injustice to the great common people, of whom "God has made so many."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I want to say so to-day and say that I stand squarely on that statement. [Applause.]

In contravention of the claim that labor is unanimously in favor of the repeal of daylight saving I want to read the following letter from the secretary of the Union County Central Labor Union, with headquarters at Elizabeth, N. J.:

JUNE 16, 1919.

Hon. ERNEST R. ACKERMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting this evening our organization, representing 30,000 union men in Union County, unanimously went on record opposing the repeal of daylight-saving law, notwithstanding the action of the American Federation convention.

We trust you will use your best efforts to prevent the repeal of the measure.

Respectfully, yours,

GEORGE J. REISS, *Secretary.*

[Applause.]

This bill affects the interests of all people—men, women, and children. It touches their lives, economically and socially, as does no other proposed legislation, and comes more closely to the regulation of their domestic and home activities than any other bill pending in Congress.

Utilization of one additional hour of sunshine during summer was authorized by Congress while our country was at war. Many things were being done then to increase our efficiency and effectiveness as a Nation for the struggle before us. That saving daylight helped us in the fight I have never heard contradicted. That it will materially aid in our readjustment to normal conditions and in payment for the wastage of war I firmly believe.

I am in favor of the repeal of some of the laws enacted as war-time measures and which are still in operation. In this way they are being tested as to their worth during times of peace. Daylight saving is also operating on a peace basis, and judging from the reports coming to me as to its advantages I am convinced that it should be continued. This opinion is not entertained regarding some of the other measures.

As our most important work is to legislate for reconstruction, prudence and good judgment would dictate that we keep war-time measures that are workable and advantageous and repeal those which have no justification when hostilities have ceased.

Daylight saving is economically and humanly good legislation. It is a fuel saver and food producer. By permitting laborers, factory and office workers to get more time in their gardens, it is a boon to these people. Fair treatment has always been given the farmer, and it is rather remarkable that he should not be more considerate of those who are unable to make their living as he does, in the fields and open air, when they ask for a little time in which to enjoy the benefits of the great "out of doors." It is folly to say he is envious, just as it is unjust to charge that he fears for the market for his products. That he is impatient with the law and regards it as a new-fangled notion and a fad for city folks can not be denied, and there has been no reply to the question as to why the outdoor man wants to keep the indoor man in.

The average farmer will not admit it, but the real basis of his hostility to the daylight-saving law comes from his dislike to change his long-established mode of living and do things differently from the old time-honored way. Many of the city men of to-day were the farmers of yesterday, and they will tell you in all of their years of farming the new time schedule was followed long before it was adopted by law. All of these men now favor the retention of the measure and vigorously assert that the farmers can adapt themselves to it if they want to.

The people who favor the continuance of daylight saving have shown themselves to be 100 per cent patriotic in every war activity. They have "gone over the top" with Liberty bonds, Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., Knights of Columbus, Salvation Army, and other kindred subscriptions; they have sent their sons and daughters into the field; they have worked night and day in their private and public capacities, frequently at great physical and financial sacrifice, to win the war. Surely they are entitled to some consideration by Congress.

Then, too, how about those who have gone to the front and are now coming home to us? They have become accustomed to live and work in the open air. Many of them will resume their work indoors and will find it hard to again accustom themselves to the change. Do you not think they will utilize every minute so as to be out of doors and are they not deserving of the extra hour of recreation this bill will deny them? [Applause.]

We hear complaints about the things that have been done during the absence of the soldiers and without their wishes being consulted or any opportunity being afforded them to declare themselves. There is merit in their contention, whether they would ultimately be agreed with or not. The passage of this bill will merely add another to the score on which they will call for a settlement some day.

Daylight saving is one of the things on which capital and labor are in thorough accord. We are all familiar with the unrest in many of the industrial centers because of readjusting labor conditions. In all of these centers the retention of daylight saving is strongly urged by both sides to whatever controversies exist on other questions. In my judgment, therefore, the repeal at this time would tend to aggravate an otherwise unsatisfactory condition and render it more difficult to handle.

As an indication of the interest displayed in this measure by those who as yet have no voice or vote regarding the regulation of their domestic and public affairs, I want at this time to quote from a letter received from a school in Summit, N. J., one of the most enterprising towns in the district I have the honor to represent. The letter was written by Miss Anna S. Woodman, assistant principal of Kent Place School, apparently after discussion with the pupils regarding this repealer, and is as follows:

> Our local paper says you are actively working against the repeal of the daylight-saving bill. You may be interested to know that in this household, 17 States are represented, and every one of these representatives of States from the Pacific to the Atlantic, from Michigan to Florida, is bitterly opposed to the repeal of this excellent measure. We all trust that you will continue the work and will meet with success.

In the metropolitan zone, of which New York City is the center, over ten millions of people have their existence.

The period during this year that the extra hour of daylight will be enjoyed amounts to 210 days for each one of those individuals, or 2,100,000,000 hours of community activity.

Let us presume that 10 per cent of this number are not in a position to be affected one way or the other in this respect and we will have a net figure of 1,890,000,000 of hours of activity to be participated in by the people immediately affected in the zone comprising the greatest metropolitan center in the world. Reduced to figures that the mind can more readily grasp, that number of hours equals 215,753 years of daylight participation in health-giving and labor-producing activities by only 10 per cent of the country's population.

This is equivalent to thirty-five times the amount of time that is supposed to have passed since the traditional beginning of the world, 6,000 years ago.

Inasmuch as New York is the center of foreign commerce of the United States, and as we are by every means in our power endeavoring to increase our foreign trade, we will, by repealing the daylight-saving law, dislocate the daily touch we now have with the exchanges in European countries with which we do the bulk of the country's export business, which should cause us to stop and consider such a step before it is too late.

Of course, if we can induce those countries to change their habits and customs, what I have just said will not be pertinent, but it is very doubtful if we can, and they will be active and efficient while we are enjoying an unwarranted ease by not appropriating the possibilities of conservation that are within our grasp.

I appeal therefore to your good judgment not to repeal this law.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, by way of reply, I want to congratulate the 36 Democrats, all of them from the South but 3, who voted against the passage of the daylight-saving bill, for taking a strangle hold of the leaders of the Republican Party on the other side, and especially the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Kansas, and converting them all in a lump. Thirty-six Democrats voted against the passage of the enactment of the law, while only 4 Republicans voted against it. But practically the whole Republican Party on this floor have now determined that the 36 southern Democrats are the real true-blue friends of the farming interests of the entire country.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. No; I have not the time. What I hope is that these 36 Democrats will continue leading these Republicans on all things and then perhaps they will all have a chance to go to heaven when they die. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable to hear gentlemen get up and claim that the daylight-saving bill was exclusively a war measure, with no limitations in the bill, when it passed, and that since two of the greatest States in the Union in resources and population—New York and Pennsylvania—by State law, not simply to last during the war but as permanent law, have established standard time in both States to conform to the law of Congress now sought to be repealed.

Gentlemen who are for this repeal bill must think that in New York and Pennsylvania the legislatures did not know what they were doing. They did not know that these gentlemen here had all voted for the bill exclusively as a war measure. It is almost absurd for gentlemen to make the argument that this was exclusively a war measure. It was claimed to be a good thing both during the war, and afterwards if it had a good effect during the war it was expected that it would be continued. All of the Republicans except four voted for it, and inasmuch as the chief reason for its enactment remains, the high cost of living, which was brought about by the war, how are you going to excuse yourselves for its repeal? Oh, you are a great Republican Party to come in now and repeal a Republican law, or a law introduced by a Republican Senator and passed by every Republican vote in this House except four, and I know you all felt sorry for those four at the time they voted. I congratulate the 36 southern Democrats on this side, because the South remains in the saddle not only in committee assignments but in leadership, thought, and legislative purpose. The whole Republican outfit now almost break their necks to vote with these Southern Democrats. Seriously [laughter]—oh, I did not mean that the other was not serious—but I could not see why gentlemen on the Republican side flopped so quickly and suddenly and so all together, simply to be in harmony with 36 Democrats. Nine times as many Democrats voted against the law as did Republicans, and now you Republicans are running over each other pell-mell to keep up with the 36 Democrats. I am almost mortified to see that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who constitute the brains of the Republican Party, both of long experience, now trail along behind the leadership of TOM SISSON and ZEKE CANDLER—excuse me for mentioning them by name—and these other recalcitrant Democrats from the far South.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the almost unanimous desire of my constituents that the daylight-saving law shall be repealed. Indeed, an immediate repeal of the same would conform to the desire of all classes in the fifteenth district of Ohio, and the same conditions obtain in the greater portion of Ohio.

During the course of this debate an effort has been made to make it appear that no one except the farmers desire the repeal of the daylight-saving law. The expressed desire for a repeal of this law comes from the employer and the employee, from the miners, the farmer, the truck grower, the clerk, the stenographer, and the housewife. In short, from all classes of our citizenship.

The measure was enacted, we were told, as a war measure; and if so, it has served its purpose. Our people tried to observe the provisions of the law, even though it caused great confusion, inconvenience, and dissatisfaction. In many cities in the State of Ohio to-day there is confusion which arises from the fact that the railroads will be operating according to one time and other organizations will be using another.

It has caused confusion in the public schools and churches, a situation which did not exist before the passage of the daylight-saving law.

It is true that the farmer protests vigorously against the law, as it affects the work on the farm. The granges, representing thousands of farmers and their wives, have properly requested its repeal.

Our desire, as legislators, should be to bind together the people who pursue occupations in this land of diversified industry, and not to estrange one class from another. It is certainly our desire to encourage the producer in every possible way, and for this reason the interests and claims of the farmer should be protected and encouraged. I can illustrate the hardship that the daylight-saving law imposes upon the producer by referring to one of many conditions that have been called to my attention. The truck growers in the southeastern part of Ohio are now unable, because of the change in time on the railroads, to prepare their produce for market early in the morning so that it can be delivered in good condition on the same day. The same is true of many farmers and producers who would ship the products of the farm while it is fresh, marketable, and in good condition.

I find that the employer as well as the laboring man is in favor of the repeal of this law. To illustrate, representatives of employers and employees in southeastern Ohio representing possibly 8,000 miners or more jointly passed resolutions urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law. Before anyone casts his vote against this bill which will repeal the daylight-saving law, I hope he will think of many miners and their wives who must arise before the break of day in order that the miner may take a train very early in the morning to get to his work, and then return in the heat of the day and try to sleep early in the evening, when it is still hot, in order that he may arise very early the next morning for his day's work. Not only is this true of the miner but of other laborers as well. The Central Labor Union of Cambridge, Ohio, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and representing practically all units of organized labor, after investigation passed resolutions urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law. This is a representative body and we can not pass it by without giving careful and earnest consideration to its appeal.

I deny the suggestion advanced by some one during the course of this debate that the support, worthy of consideration, given to the Government in the purchase of Liberty bonds, came from the large centers, and therefore they are entitled to primary consideration in this matter. There is enough honor for all, and I would give it to everyone everywhere to whom it is due. I would not array one class or section against another, but relatively I doubt if there was a single class, according to their financial ability, who did as much in supporting the Government in a financial way as did the laboring man. He bought his Liberty bonds often beyond his ability and worked incessantly that he might produce the thing that his Government needed. Indeed, the laboring man did more than this, for from every mine, factory, and industry hung the service flag, representing their sons who had enlisted in the service of our country. I am willing to give due credit to all who have supported the Government, but submit that the laboring man did his full share as compared with any class. I am sure that this is true of the people for whom I speak and whom I have the honor to represent.

I submit that the repeal of the daylight-saving law will promote good feeling among our people, remove confusion, and permit us to return to a situation that was satisfactory before the enactment of the law.

In behalf of the farmer who produces the necessaries of life, the laborer who toils, the churches, the schools, the housewife, and all classes that are required to observe unusual and inconvenient hours for sleep and work I urge the immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time there was a thing called Canadian reciprocity. For a while it sailed serenely along the great newspaper sea of popularity in the columns of the press. The producers of patent insides praised its benefits. Paid pamphleteers extolled it. Young editors for the metropolitan dailies wrote essays in its behalf. A President of the United States interpreted these voices as the voices of the people. The great producing element of the Nation finally awoke to its danger. While they were busy in the fields Canadian reciprocity nearly became an accomplished fact. But being once thoroughly aroused and united against it, the political rain began to fall and the political winds began to blow and the "house fell, and great was the fall thereof." Personal ambitions were wrecked. A great party was divided and its leader, who listened to the false voices, repudiated, overwhelmingly defeated, and cast into the outer darkness of political oblivion.

It might be well for us to take note of this incident now, for never since those days have we been called upon to witness such unpopularity and universal condemnation of a piece of legislation as now prevails among these substantial people of the Nation with regard to the so-called daylight-saving law. The quicker it is repealed and allowed to rest in the great graveyard of congressional errors the sooner we may be forgiven by a patient public for yielding the exercise of common sense in its original passage.

Its passage was founded upon a beautiful theory—the artificial lengthening of life by setting the clock ahead one hour or theoretically moving the sun back one hour. By legislative action we sought to do that which only Divine Power is recorded once to have done in the case of Hezekiah.

In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And Isaiah, the prophet, the son of Amos came unto him and said unto him, "Thus saith the Lord, 'Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die and not live.'" Then Hezekiah turned his face toward the wall and prayed unto the Lord and said, "Remember now, O, Lord, I beseech Thee, how I have walked before Thee in truth and with a perfect heart and have done that which is good in Thy sight." And Hezekiah wept sore. Then came the word of the Lord to Isaiah, saying, "Go and say to Hezekiah," thus saith the Lord, the God of David, thy father, "I have heard thy prayer; I have seen thy tears; behold, I will add unto thy days 15 years. And I will deliver thee and this city out of the hand of the King of Assyria, and I will defend this city. And this shall be a sign unto thee from the Lord that the Lord will do this thing that he hath spoken. Behold, I will bring again the shadow of the degrees, which is gone down in the sun dial of Ahaz 10 degrees backward." So the sun returned 10 degrees, by which degrees it was gone down.

It has been found that our profane law can not stand the test of experience. It was and is a nonpuncture-proof, psychological fraud. The date of its repeal will be one of great glorification on the part of a vast majority of our people who are just coming out from under the hypnotic effects of the professorial suggestion that they could lift themselves by their bootstraps.

The passage of such a law, which has worked such hardships upon a great mass of honest, trusting people, will, I think, be forgiven by them, occurring as it did at a time when we were in high nervous war tension, provided we act now with reasonable speed in the light of our normal judgment.

The National Farmers' Grange, the Iowa State Grange, the Wisconsin and Illinois Legislatures have all indorsed the repeal of this law. Thousands of petitions adopted at public mass meetings throughout the country have been forwarded to Congress asking its repeal. The Fulton County (Ill.) Board of Supervisors; the Quincy (Ill.) theater owners; the cities of Fowler and Mendon, Ill.; the Osco (Ill.) Grange No. 1782; the Fulton County (Ill.) Agricultural Association; the Adams County (Ill.) Farm Bureau; the Knox County (Ill.) Farm Bureau have condemned the present law. The Ohio Truck Growers' Association, the Illinois Agricultural Association, the Prairie Farmer and Drovers' Journal (both papers having taken a referendum), the new labor party recently formed in convention at Springfield, Ill., and the Iowa State Federation of Labor have all unanimously called for the repeal of this law. On the 10th instant the American Federation of Labor, in annual convention at Atlantic City, N. J., after full debate, refused to demand its retention as a law. The American Society of Equity, representing the farmers of the northwest, met at St. Paul June 5 and urged the repeal of the law on the ground that it was a nuisance.

The cry for the repeal of this obnoxious law did not arise from some mere whim on the part of the people. It is founded upon actual experience with the act. No demand was made by the farmer as long as the war lasted for its repeal, even though he knew as well as he knows now that it was a positive detriment to farm operations—impossible and impracticable—because its proponents labeled it a win-the-war measure. If such was the case, the farmer was willing to remain mute and suffer the hardship. The war is now over. No further excuses remain for a stay of execution.

If a man would farm these days under the daylight law, and considers sleep necessary to the human being, he must go to bed early. He can not long delay his retirement after the upper rim of the sun has cast its last beam athwart the horizon. The absence of the sun's reflection on the western window pane in the farmer's house is a sign from Congress for him to get to bed, an hour ahead of the hens, if he desires to accomplish the necessary work of the following day. If he has some dairy cows and

has to get his milk to the milk train at 7 a. m., new time, or 6 a. m., old time, he must get up at 4.30 a. m., new time, or at the truthful hour of 3.30 a. m., old time, in order to catch the train. And if he is farming without a dairy herd he finds that Congress requires him to change his getting-up time from 5 a. m. to 4 a. m.

The poet Gray in his Elegy speaks of the "breezy call of incense breathing morn"; "the swallow, twittering, from the straw-built shed"; "the cock's shrill clarion"; and "the echoing horn"—all as instruments whereby our ancient agricultural ancestors were in the morning aroused "from their lowly bed." But the Poet Gray, were he writing to-day, could not make his beautiful language applicable to the modern farmer working under the daylight-saving law. On the contrary, it is a habit of the farmer under this law to rise so early that he is the one who rouses the swallow from the straw stack, sounds all the horns and clarions, punches the poultry from the perch, and kicks the sleepy rooster in the slats long before Miss Incense Breathing Morn arrives on the premises.

With difficulty he arouses the children, usually cross and irritable from loss of sleep, early, in order to get them off to the district school on time. The chambers of commerce advise him to put them to bed earlier. Theoretically this is good, but in practice no child wants to go to bed before dark, nor can he be blamed, if his arteries carry red blood. No real American child will go to bed while the sun is still shining. A great authority on children writes of the injurious effect of this law on children, and says:

Children will not go to sleep by the clock, yet by reason of the daylight law must be disturbed by the earlier activities around the house, and this formidable loss of sleep in numerous cases I had under observation resulted in a nervousness and irritability that bodes only ill for the future welfare of our children if the law is continued. While the pleasure of some is to be considered, we feel that the welfare of a single child should be given more weight than the entertainment of a score of adults.

Inasmuch as the sponsors for this legislation—who, it seems to me, belong to that class who believe in the doctrine that the sun, the moon, and the Milky Way can be regulated by legislative acts—failed in passing the act to produce sufficient mesmeric effect upon the live stock on the farm to induce them to desert the ways of nature and get on their feet at an earlier hour, and inasmuch as no provision was made in the law giving the Bureau of Animal Industry an appropriation and authority to send gentlemanly animal trainers to teach by bulletins and lectures these uneducated and backward animals to be less recalcitrant and more progressive, which work could be done by such agents from the Bureau of Animal Industry with greater "economy," "efficiency," "coordination," and with a view of "expediting and stabilizing" the situation if these experts in animal training were likewise educated in household economics, in order that during any period of brain fag on the part of the live stock by reason of taking this educational course they could deliver a few of the department's homilies on "how to make cottage cheese," upon which subject the department always erroneously assumes the farmer's wife knows nothing whatever, and inasmuch as all these errors in legislation have occurred relative to this law and the most grievous mistake made on the part of the Professoriate "sitting in plenary session" at the time of the passage of the law to devise any successful method of inducing the ordinary and common cow to give down her milk at an hour earlier, the farmer therefore is required to rout out his animals at an unnatural hour while they are resting, get them on their feet, satisfy himself with a scanty supply of milk from the hungry cows, and feed his cattle and harness his horses at an unearthly hour, and all for the purpose of satisfying the whim of the New York stock exchanges, which are slightly annoyed and inconvenienced because when the daylight-saving plan is on in England their openings and closings on speculation and the arrival and departure of their mails are somewhat late according to the English standards.

The farmer, trudging along under this law and violating by an hour every rule of conduct for farm and outdoor work as laid down by the everlasting sun, enters his harvest field in the early morning to engage in work, only to find that neither Congress nor the Professoriate have provided any change in God Almighty's regulation of the falling and rising of the dew. On account of this oversight the farmer and his help are required to lose from an hour to an hour and a half each morning during the busiest season waiting for the dew to rise. Frantic manipulation of the hands of the clock will not cause the dew to disappear nor will theoretical legislation stop the law of germination or prevent the spoiling and molding of the hay and grain harvested in watered fields.

The dew having arisen and having fairly gotten a start in the day's work, suddenly the dinner horn is heard at 11 o'clock and the farmer stops his work. The horses and hands leave the field. Legislative and Professorial tinkering with time have robbed the farmer of an hour and the horn of its once beautiful sound. The farmer greets it no longer with exultations, but rather with anathema. Down with the daylight law! Down with Congress! Down with Wilson! Long live the devil! His day has been wrongly divided without his consent. He is required to lay down his work at 11 a. m., thus losing one of the most useful hours of the day to the farmer—from 11 a. m. to 12 m. He must work more than eight hours a day. It is important therefore that instead of being required to eat at 11 a. m. he have his dinner at midday so that he may eat his meals at an equal number of hours apart. This saves himself and renders him more effective in his work. The same rule applies to his horses. It is a most flagrant species of cruelty to animals to require these faithful friends, whether on the farm or in the city, to work from 12 m. to 1 p. m. in the heat of the summer under the boiling and unbearable sun directly overhead. Thousands of horses have thus fallen in the fields, martyrs to theories of the Professors, the activity of the garden and canning tool makers, and the synchronization of time with Europe.

After dinner the farmer again enters the field for his afternoon work at 12 o'clock by the sun which continues to move slowly westward from meridian. Taking a glance at his untruthful watch he finds that it is suddenly 5 p. m., quitting time, but the sun is still high in the heavens. The insects are multiplying and the weeds are growing; to-morrow it is going to be rainy weather. Nevertheless, in order to harmonize with surrounding activities and keep pace with professorial suggestion he must stop and lose the best hour in the day for harvesting hay and grain, and while the golfer may think he gains this hour, the farmer actually loses it. If he desires to purchase groceries from the neighboring town he must quit the fields in the middle of the afternoon. He can not get his necessary work done on Sunday in time to attend church. The only thing the farmer got last summer in the way of entertainment was the Chautauqua, and this only where the management began the entertainment in the evening as late as 9 p. m. and the afternoon meetings later than usual. To work on as he must in the afternoons when the crops require attention deprives him of the movies and the weekly band concert in the adjoining town or city. The few pleasures afforded under ordinary conditions to himself and family are denied him, as all entertainments are ended by the time chores are done. A friend writes, "There was a debate at the church the other night. We all wanted to go. I had to stop plowing in the middle of the afternoon to get there." The main engagement, therefore, of the farmers these days is to race all day long to keep one hour ahead of the sun.

Great opposition is to be found against the present daylight law from all classes of businesses where the horse is necessary; especially is this true among teamsters and draymen. They claim that their animals are running down, depreciating, by reason of requiring them to get up and feed at an unnatural hour in the morning, forcing them to eat at 11 a. m. and labor in the direct ray of the summer sun from 12 m. until 1 p. m.

The coal miners of the Middle West are probably made as uncomfortable by this law as any one class of our people. They must eat their breakfast in the dark, and their main meal occurs so early in the day that they have to go to bed at night hungry. The law has been roundly condemned by them in numerous mass meetings.

Business men of the smaller cities have found that if they desire to accommodate their country trade they must keep their places open as late as 10 o'clock at night in order to give the farmer, who must work late, the opportunity to secure his provisions.

CITY FOLKS ARE FOR REPEAL.

It is to be admitted that all the people who are for the retention of this law live in the cities. But it is not to be admitted that all the people who live in cities are for its retention. The old-line Bourbons are against the repeal. So are the secretariats of the chambers of commerce and all the Tory newspapers and Toryism generally, so often lined up with telegraphic rapidity. If you will listen to what Carlyle calls the "inarticulate cry" of the masses, who do not have the wherewithal nor the time to wire us, but who have so far retained the right to vote, you will find a humble but almost universal plea that the law be abolished.

A few letters out of many hundreds express most clearly what is in the hearts of the multitude:

NEW YORK CITY, *February 20.*

Representative KING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please excuse my liberty in writing you, but I see by this morning's World you are against the daylight-saving law. Keep up your fight to repeal it. The talk, or, rather, ideas, about war gardens make me heartsick. A certain Senator, who favors the daylight-saving

law, only favors the rich who have war gardens, but does he think of the hardship of the plan on thousands of poor working people, who are compelled to live in tenements and flat houses and who have no war gardens?

The working people must get up before daylight to go to work, no matter how early they quit work. They have no war gardens to work in. I am a middle-aged widow, and have to go to work to keep body and soul together, and live in a four-family house which has no garden.

I have to leave my home now at 7 a. m. to go down to my work, and with the daylight plan must leave the house at 6 a. m. in all kinds of weather.

Senators who urge the new system do not have to rise at 5 a. m. and go to work at 6, nor a good many more who can afford war gardens. Why not have a heart, and consider the poor working class. They are human beings, too, and I for one would rather have that hour in the morning and work an hour later in the afternoon, and there are hundreds of others in the same position.

A BRONXITE.

—

NEW YORK CITY, *June 3, 1919.*

Hon. EDWARD J. KING,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a workingman kindly allow me to congratulate you on the earnest fight you are leading for the repeal of the obnoxious daylight-saving law. I wish you Godspeed.

In my work as a collector I travel over greater New York each and every week. I have yet to hear one genuine workingman or working woman speak in favor of retaining this aptly termed freak law.

Is there any record of labor unions having voted for it? I think not. Have we saved on our gas and electric light bills? We have not. What we may have saved at night we have more than burned up in the early morning hours, for not all of us are bank presidents, stock brokers, and likewise.

As I stated in a letter last year to Representative Adamson, this movement for daylight saving, as led here in New York by Marcus M. Marks, is chiefly for the purpose of keeping Mr. Marks's name before the public. I know Mr. Marks personally, also Mr. W. A. Ferguson. The latter was Mr. Marks's secretary when Mr. Marks was borough president of Manhattan.

The latter was repudiated at the polls by organized labor when he ran for borough president again in 1917. Workingmen, regardless of political affiliations, were chiefly responsible for Mr. Marks's defeat.

Mr. Marks championing labor or hypocritically speaking for them is a ghastly joke. Mr. Ferguson likewise; the latter a fourth-rate lawyer.

Both represent real estate, manufacturing, and banking interests. They don't get up at 3 or 4 a. m. sun time. They arise about 8.30 a. m., leave their offices 3 p. m. (sun time), not to go to their dear little garden patch (what bunk), but to the golf links, seashore, or country, automobiling. Sit on those hypocrites and good luck to you.

Yours, sincerely,

CHAS. J. DAVEY.

—

NORTON, MASS., *February 20, 1919.*

Representative EDWARD J. KING.

DEAR SIR: I saw a small item in this morning's Boston Post in which it spoke of bills introduced by you and Representative Doolittle to have the daylight-saving law repealed. I felt as if I must tell you that I am heartily glad if there is some one who is willing to speak for the thousands of people who do not want any such law. I know of no one who has received any benefit from it or who wants it—business men, farmers or housekeepers. I am one of the latter—a widow not well—and I can not afford servants to do my work, but I have to earn my own living—a woman over 60; a woman whose husband was in the Regular Army over five years, discharged for disability acquired in the line of duty.

Yet I, like thousands of others, can not have the privilege of saying what such a law as this, that turns the world upside down, means to me. Women over 50 can not be robbed of that hour's sleep in the morning and rally from it all day long. So many object to this law, but they don't know how to tell it or whom to tell it to or what to do. Oh, I just hope you will do all in your power in every way to abolish such a law.

Yours, respectfully. Mrs. E. M. JENKINS.

—

NEW YORK, *June 3, 1819.*

Representative KING.

SIR: Seeing you are putting up a great fight for repealing the daylight-saving law, pardon me taking the liberty of writing you these few lines. There are 20,000 railroad men like myself ready to sign a petition for its repeal. Upon us it works a great injustice and we suffer very much. For instance, these hot, sweltering nights it is of no use to go to bed early, as one can not sleep, and we must arise at 4 a. m., which means 3 a. m., thereby losing an hour's sleep.

And I might state it is greatly undermining our health. Kindly bring this argument to bear upon the meeting. This law may suit a few that wish to enjoy themselves, but it is not for the poor workingman that must work hard to support his family. We pray that you will be successful. I am, sir, your obedient servant.

L. TURNER,
340 West Forty-first Street, New York City.

—

ALBANY, N. Y., *June 4, 1919.*

Hon. EDWARD J. KING,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read in yesterday's New York World that you had appeared in favor of proposed bill repealing the so-called daylight-saving law. Your arguments ring true and have the support of facts.

I have discussed the daylight-saving law with farmers in this State, and from what they tell me I can see that they have good grounds for complaint. They say that the suggestion of the advocates of the law that the farmers work by the sun is worthless, for the reason that farm products to be shipped by train and cartage must be gotten out in accordance with the clock schedules under which trains run and city markets are open, and that this arrangement results in a loss of time in the morning and in the afternoon, with a consequent reduction in production. This condition standing alone would be sufficient cause for the repealing of such a law.

Newspapers in favor of the scheme and other advocates who, by the way, presume to state they represent pretty nearly everybody in the country, stultify themselves when they claim that the working of that law results in benefits to health and promotes industrial efficiency. The fact is that workers are turned loose in the heat of the afternoon, after an exacting day in a hot mill or factory, and they have the privilege of sweltering until bedtime, which they defer to an hour later than when living under the old time, as it takes a few hours for the heat to partly disappear in the city. Last year a friend of mine, who is manager of a good-sized concern, told me that he lost an hour's sleep a night owing to the fact that he had to stay up an hour later to give his house a chance to cool off. I have asked a number of men, both mental and physical workers, about this phase of the plan, and all agreed that loss of sleep was the result of the law. How an additional hour of heat a day, coupled with a perhaps equal loss of sleep, is of any benefit to the health of the worker I do not understand, nor do I perceive how this work could be as good as if he had the proper amount of sleep. Of course, the health of the large employer and man of wealth is probably benefited by the opportunity to spend an extra hour on the links, at his country home, or motoring. The suffering of the multitude crowded in the cities praying for the relief which darkness brings does not intrude upon the pleasures of wealth.

It is well known that petty annoyances and changes in the customary manner of living cause more unrest than great sacrifices which people are called upon to endure. Vicious, and perhaps merely thoughtless and inconsiderate, laws as this go a long way toward illustrating the difference between classes. Bolshevism does not attract followers in this country for its principles, but is often used as an available agency for the expression of discontent. Men fortunate enough to be in a position to enjoy the good things of life are not to be condemned on that account; nor is it wise to add to the burden of those less fortunate by legislation. A law like this would cause all kinds of dissatisfaction without the victims of its provisions knowing just what was their grievance. I always had the notion that the weakening of resistance of men as a result of the operation of the law last year had something to do with the inability of apparently rugged men to withstand the ravages of the epidemic last fall.

The citizens of Albany gain nothing from the law, as the illuminating company increased the price of gas from $1 to $1.30 per thousand, and a lawsuit resulted, the outcome of which looks well for the company.

Senator CALDER probably feels that his constituents want the law to stand, but I have my doubts about the extent of that desire in this State. If I am any judge of public opinion, the citizens of New York State would be well pleased to have done with the fad.

As I see the situation, you are really performing a notable public service in seeking the repeal of a wicked and senseless law.

With best wishes for success, I am,

Respectfully,

ARTHUR R. CONWAY.

P. S.—Vegetables can be bought much cheaper than amateur gardeners can raise them for, so there is no saving there.

—

WATERBURY, CONN.

Representative KING, *Illinois.*

DEAR SIR: Be good enough to overlook the liberty I have assumed in writing to you, but I have felt I would like you to know that the majority of the people East would gladly help in repealing this law for an extra hour of daylight during the summer months. Therefore I am writing to you in hope you will win out and that you will fight this law hard enough to win out before it goes through. Why any sane person can honestly say that they want to see an extra hour of torturing sunlight added to an already too long day is what very few can understand. Take the last two summers we have had in the East here. We have never suffered from such torrid heat; but very few remembered its equal; and where is the man, woman, or child, after suffering through this inhuman heat, did not long and crave for the sun to go down in hope the night settling down would bring them relief? The last summer, with this extra hour of daylight added, was about the most inhuman act that could have been forced on the people. To nine out of every ten persons the day seemed, during that torrid heat, without end. Daylight until 9.30 p. m. when mercury reaches 100 during the day is not a natural day or for the benefit of the majority of the people's health, and a day that lengthens into that hour of the night should not be allowed during the summer months. Take the people who had to work in factories or any place the last summer, when every nerve was strained to keep up the work to help our boys over there, night and day. Thousands and thousands would be glad of the chance to tell of their sufferings during their working hours, shut up in the factories, during that trying heat. Men carried out bodily every 10 or 15 minutes that it required more than a day to bring back to life. This does not include the young girls and women who had to give up completely—simply could not face back to those factory rooms during that heat. If they did, it meant death for more than one. How many times can I recall hearing these poor, suffering people exclaim, "Will the day ever end?" "Oh, if the sun would only hurry up and go down!" Why, it was nothing short of murder to lengthen the days during that heat of the summer months, and not one sane person can say it was not. True, we were making this sacrifice, and more than willing to make almost any kind of a sacrifice, to help our boys to go "over the top," but such a sacrifice will not be necessary again this coming summer, and the public at large, especially the working people, should not be compelled to suffer through another such prolonged day of heat. Last summer, even though it brought death and suffering to thousands, it was a very good thing and helped out in numerous ways, this extra hour of torturing daylight; but last summer was an abnormal one, one we hope we never have to witness again. Things are getting down to normal now; and for the last 50 years we have always kept the same time, regardless of prosperous times or not. We did not find it necessary to change the time to make the country prosperous; and to-day we find ourselves at the head of the world; and because Europe, Asia, or Africa does this or that and wants to take a chance at anything, have we got to imitate them? Looks that way, a little, when we have to change our time because England does. We are getting to be imitators, not good, sound thinkers for ourselves and the welfare of our own people; and I say that to add this extra hour of daylight to the torturing heat of a summer day is nothing short of murder to the larger majority of people, especially the working people, regardless of the kind of work they do; and as for trying to say it is a boon to the farmers, why, there isn't a farmer in this part that paid any attention to that extra hour of daylight. If there was, they were few and far between. The farmer kept his own time, and intends to keep it again this summer, regardless of the new time. What we will need this summer is more work and not more daylight. Give the working people the work and they will produce the goods, as they have more than proved. They can and did during the last three years of this

war. More attention should be given to the working people, and given at once. We are practically neglecting our own country and its people right now. We have more than done our bit for those people on the other side. Let us forget them for a while and turn our attention at once to what is facing us here in our own country, with the working conditions constantly growing into the state they are. It sounds more than ridiculous to the majority of the people to hear all this talk about Germany and other countries we have to feed and must be fed. What about the millions that will have to be fed right here in our own country before six months if they do not get work? That is the question that should be settled. We need all we have and can get to feed our own right now, not to mention the future. We did our bit for those people over there and more than paid the price, and are willing to still help if we can; but if in doing that we are going to, with our eyes wide open, jeopardize our own, it looks as if we need the attention of a brain specialist. Let us give the working people our attention right now and not to daylight saving that is absolutely unnecessary—rot, even. I say give the workingman a shorter day in the summer time. Let us get up at an hour earlier, get through our work an hour earlier, and let us have the nights longer in place of shorter during the summer months, and if the results are not 100 per cent better, everything taken into consideration, then something is wrong.

I have the opinions of the very best of medical men and nurses, who I have worked among last summer, who have said that to add this extra hour of daylight again this coming summer was simply nothing else but murder to the working people. Their health can't stand that prolonged heat. Why, that extra hour which brought daylight into the night, until 9.30 p. m., seemed to thousands like three hours in place of one. It is not natural or human. We have got to look after the welfare and health of the working people if we want to make a working class of people who will be physically fit to produce results in their work. If we work them regardless of what that work or the time they have to work through does to their physical conditions, then we are in time going to see our working people in future generations become a nation unfit for almost any kind of hard labor. That is nothing but plain, common sense. Look at the death rate among the working people and the poor people, children included. Does not that prove who suffers the most during the summer heat? Does it not prove where the attention should be given most? Take last summer: Men who never suffered from the heat before, hardly, suffered intensely, due, as anyone of them will honestly say, to the prolonged daylight. After a day of torrid heat, the most of the working class are anxious to get home and hang around until it gets dusk. Then he can go out, throw himself on the grass or the veranda, regardless of the neighbors or anyone else. But the last summer daylight lasted until retiring time for countless numbers. Take the average man that takes any kind of good care of himself, he tries to retire at 10 or 10.30 p. m., to be physically fit for the next day, to show results at his work. These men will vouch that in giving this extra hour to the day, therefore shortening the night, the torrid heat from the day last summer had not left the air long enough at even 10.30 or 11 to make the night air cool enough to warrant them even two or three hours' rest. It's a fact no one can deny. What is the result? After days of toiling through this heat, then to go home and not even get one good night's rest out of six. It means that we lose at our work and our health suffers in some cases beyond repair. With positive proof of the above conditions, can any sane person say or believe that any law or idea that brings about such detrimental results to human beings is worthy of consideration of the smallest kind? Regardless of the savings it may mean in one or two other things, we can't afford to lose any more of the working people. We have lost far too many already of the best of the land through that other side. What we have left we need and need them physically fit. Why torture them through a season of the year that is hard enough to live through already, with the daylight lasting until 8.30 p. m., during the heat of the summer months, that is a day more than long enough for the welfare and health of the average person. There are thousands of things that must be taken into consideration before some laws are enforced; and some of these men who crave for something new continually, and will enforce any law or act, regardless of what detrimental results it may have on everything in time to come, should not be allowed the right to put these laws into effect. What law can be called a gain in any way that brings death to the human race, which this daylight law, of prolonging the torturing summer day into another hour longer, has and will do? Put aside this law for daylight for the future, because it is only a fad. Let these men who have introduced this craze for notoriety give their attention this summer to getting the people plenty of work, and they will do all the saving necessary for themselves and the country also. Unless something of this kind is done, the future of this country does not look any too bright. This is not pessimism, either. Let us give our attention to things of vital importance. The day will be long to produce results, and lasting results, without trying some new fad to make it longer. And as far as a saving to electric-light plants are concerned, why, I say we do not need electric-light signs, etc., during the summer months. They only add to the heat of an already too heated season. That is plain, common sense. Our greens in the center of the cities do not require electric lights of countless numbers lit during the early hours of the evening. Say half of these electric lights lit during the nights, after the trying heat of the day, would cool off a city to enough degrees to make it worth trying. What is the common sense of causing the people a lot of unnecessary suffering if we can save them from it? Isn't that what we are trying to do for the Allies—help them and save them from suffering? Are we honestly as interested in our own country and its people? We have not much proof just now that we are to the extent we should be, and time is going to prove it mighty true.

I believe I have offered enough good, plain, common-sense arguments to show that we do not need this change in the time, and trust there will be enough good men of good, sound judgment to see that we do not have to have it. I am a social-welfare worker. I have talked from experience—not fad ideas. I have seen enough suffering the last two years to make some people, if they heard it all, believe there was nothing else in the world for the working people but suffering. If I had the time I would like nothing better than to have a personal talk with some of these new-idea men who are putting into law a lot of their freak ideas. I can honestly say that before I left them they would admit my ideas on this craze for daylight saving are right. There is nothing that proves right like experience. I trust you will keep after this daylight law. Get enough together to kill it, if we have to have public meetings, and trust we will have luck in killing it without that trouble. This letter is for anyone whom you should care to have read it. I regret any inconvenience I may have caused you, but I feel that if in writing it I benefit the people for their health's sake, especially the working people, I shall be well rewarded. I have done settlement work for the last 10 years in the larger cities. Last summer I came to Waterbury to help out during the summer months, and I should not want to see another such summer in any other city in the United States as I witnessed here, conditions which were the results of overcrowding, due to the abundance of work here. The suffering during those heat spells was frightful among the working people, regardless of their positions; and I honestly believe that it would have been 50 per cent less if the day had even been left at the old time in place of making it an hour longer.

Hoping that we do not experience another such summer, I am

Respectfully, yours,

WINIFRED C. MERRIMAN.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., *June 12, 1919.*

Congressman KING,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I see in the current issue of the Literary Digest that you are endeavoring to have the daylight-saving law repealed. It is the most unnecessary piece of legislation ever imposed on a long-suffering people, and I trust that you will be successful in your efforts.

Can repeal be secured at once? I wrote to our Senators and Congressmen at the close of last session of Congress, but of course nothing was done; and now must we submit to this change of time until November?

Down here we women feel very kindly to the Republican Party for putting the suffrage measure over, and I am sure the great majority of people throughout this section will feel most grateful if that party will use the most forceful method possible and change this obnoxious daylight law.

I live in the largest city in North Carolina, a place of about 50,000 people—we have no large cities—and am in close touch with the people of the city and of the rural community as well. I have never heard such universal dissatisfaction with any law. And the chief complaints are from the hard-working people of the city, those who, as a mail carrier expressed it, have "to lose an hour of good rest in the morning and then get an extra hour to loaf in the hot afternoon."

I hear complaints from carpenters, mail carriers, motormen, milkmen, dressmakers, and great numbers of that strata of society who work day in and day out, and who can not have the pleasure of motoring and playing golf during the extra hot hour of the afternoon. Children will not go to bed until late hours at night, because dark does not come until 9 o'clock down here, and then they can scarcely be gotten out of bed in the mornings. Parents have to pull down the shades to shut the daylight out to endeavor to get their young children to sleep. The law simply disarranges the entire living system of the masses of the people.

I have never heard a single argument in favor of the law that was not a selfish one of the individual—that it gave him more time for golf, etc. Can you not help further and get the law repealed at once? If you can suggest anything that I might do to aid I should be glad to do so. Please pardon the fact that I have not your full name, but I wished to write at once, and only saw that you were working for the repeal, on yesterday, and can not delay to secure first name.

With kind regards,

Very sincerely, Miss JULIA M. ALEXANDER.

P. S.—Under this law we have in this section during the summer months a long, hot day of nine hours from noon until twilight.

It is from such letters as these and from suggestions from people of our own districts that we should draw our legislative inspiration. The first lesson for a Member of Congress to learn is not to be afraid of manufactured propaganda, conveyed to him in telegraphic or typewritten form from the secretaries of divers bureaus, associations, and chambers of commerce having their individual axes to grind. Give them due and proper consideration, but fear no evil.

WHO "PUT ONE OVER" ON THE FARMER?

Incidentally in connection with our efforts to repeal this unfortunate law, the people would be glad to know just what influence prevailed in urging Congress to enact the so-called daylight-saving law. After considerable consideration the answer seems to be found in the following conclusion: Its hurried passage through the House under a special rule was the result of three influences—no corruption being in any degree present, however:

1. The New York Stock Exchanges.
2. The manufacturers of garden and canning tools.
3. The Professoriate.

It is a well-known fact that the original suggestions that a daylight bill be adopted in this country came from the New York stock speculators. They desired the change in time. The old time had become a matter of inconvenience to them, by reason of the fact that during the summer months when the daylight law was in operation across the ocean the time of opening and closing the exchanges and the arrival and departure of mails was late according to European standards. This reason was given by the late Representative Borland, an advocate of the measure, and for whose memory I hold a deep respect, for its passage. These operators, together with numerous friends within the zone of their influence and being in the saddle, were enabled to raise such a howl through the papers by the use of specious arguments that they soon won the hearty and jolly support of the chairman of the committee of the House to which the bill was referred, who without a hearing being given to those opposed to the bill reported it out with a recommendation that it pass and caused the Rules Committee to bring in a special rule for its assistance.

One of the most important factors in passing the daylight bill was a one-man private institution known just before the

war as the National Emergency Food Garden Commission and later as the war came on changing its name to the National War Garden Commission. One Charles Lothrop Pack was the originator of this institution and remained its sole inspiring genius until very lately. He wrote a book in order that history might preserve a record of his work, tendered himself a banquet at one of Washington's high-priced food emporiums, and, after making the most fitting and eloquent speeches congratulating himself on his personality and patriotism, closed up his office in the Maryland Building, "folded his tent like an Arab and silently stole away."

The business done by Pack under the name of this commission was perhaps the shrewdest piece of advertising, taking advantage of the excitement of the times and the trusting patriotism of the people, extant during the war.

For littleness and gimlet-eyed trickery it will receive the highest place when by the truthful historian the inside history of the war shall be written. In the first place the very name of his commission was a deceit. The word "national" was incorporated into it to make the people think it was a governmental activity. The word "emergency" and afterwards the word "war" were used by him to give the false impression that in some way he was commissioned to conduct the affair as a governmental agency engaged in a great and win-the-war enterprise. The fact that millions of people never knew otherwise proves that he was successful in his deceit. In fact, he was nothing more than an advertising agent for the manufacturers of garden tools, canning equipment, evaporators, driers, and other similar paraphernalia.

Early he published two bulletins—one in 1917, which he called "Home drying manual for vegetables and fruits," and one in 1918, which he designated "War vegetable gardening and the home storage of vegetables." Both of these were largely copied from free Government bulletins. By reason of their close resemblance to Government publications many were inadvertently sent out under the Government frank. He resorted to a form of sharp practice with the newspapers that netted him thousands of dollars' worth of free advertising. Here is one of his advertisements sent out to a country newspaper without the knowledge or consent of the Member referred to:

[From the Woodhull (Ill.) Dispatch.]

CAN AND DRY.

Through the courtesy of Congressman EDWARD J. KING, we are in receipt of two manuals published by the National Emergency Food Garden Commission, 210–220 Maryland Building, Washington, D. C. One treats "Home canning of vegetables and fruits" and the other "Home drying of vegetables and fruits." The preservation of vegetables and fruits by these two processes is a patriotic duty and a national war-time need. America is responsible for the food supply of her European Allies. The American family can do nothing more helpful in this emergency than to can all fruit that can be canned. In this way the abundance of the summer may be made to supply the needs of winter. It is time for every woman to enlist in the army of canners and driers. Copies of these manuals may be obtained upon request and 2 cents in postage.

But the most brazen thing Pack did, which was, of course, the main basis for his operations, was to inclose in his near-Government publications the following patriotic advertisements:

CANNING AND DRYING OUTFITS AND DEVICES.

Published by the National Emergency Food Garden Commission, Washington, D. C.

In response to thousands of requests for information, the National Emergency Food Garden Commission submits herewith a list of manufacturers of outfits and devices for canning and drying vegetables and fruits.

CANNING EQUIPMENT.

Aluminum steam canners and cookers: Denver Pressure Cooker Co., 332 Broadway, Denver, Colo.; Herman G. Pfaehler, 488 Second Avenue, New York.

Steam canners: Sprague Canning Machinery Co., Chicago, Ill.; Henninger & Ayres Manufacturing Co., 47 First Street, Portland, Oreg.; Northwestern Steel & Iron Works, Eau Claire, Wis.; A. K. Robins & Co., Baltimore, Md.; Toledo Cooker Co., Toledo, Ohio.

Hot water bath canners: Modern Canner Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.; F. S. Stahl, Quincy, Ill.; Farm Canning Machinery Co., Meridian, Miss.; Home Canner Manufacturing Co., Hickory, N. C.; Monarch Manufacturing Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.; Phillips & Buttorff Manufacturing Co., Nashville, Tenn.; Southern Canner & Evaporator Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.; Royal Home Canner Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Utility Co., Hickory, N. C.; T. H. Raney, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Atlanta Woodenware Co., Atlanta, Ga.

Trays for boiler: Mrs. Hermine Baehr, 29 Garrison Lane, Baltimore, Md.

Water-seal canner: Florida Metal Products Co., Jacksonville, Fla.

Automatic can sealers, tin cans: Burpee & Letson (Ltd.), South Bellingham, Wash.; Henninger & Ayers Manufacturing Co., 47 First Street, Portland, Oreg.; Bowers Can Seal Co., 146 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; American Can Co., 120 Broadway, New York.

Metal bottle caps: Crown Cork & Seal Co., Baltimore, Md.; American Metal Cap Co., Summit Street and Commercial Wharf, Brooklyn, N. Y.; New Process Cork Co., Fifteenth and Garden Streets, Hoboken, N. J.; Anchor Cap & Closure Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Phoenix Hermetic Co., Chicago, Ill.

Bottle cappers: Crown Cork & Seal Co., Baltimore, Md.; the Enterprise Manufacturing Co. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Economy jars: Kerr Glass Manufacturing Co., Sand Springs, Okla.

Glass-top jars: Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, W. Va.; Smalley Fruit Jar Co., 26 Dock Square, Boston, Mass.; Hall Bros. Glass Manufacturing Co., Muncie, Ind.; Schloss Manufacturing Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Travis Glass Co., Clarksburg, Va.

Rubber rings: Boston Woven Hose & Rubber Co., Boston, Mass.; Smalley Fruit Jar Co., 26 Dock Square, Boston, Mass.

Tin cans: American Can Co., 120 Broadway, N. Y.; Continental Can Co., Chicago, Ill.; United States Can Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Southern Can Co., Baltimore, Md.; Wheeling Can Co., Wheeling, W. Va.; Tennessee Can Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.; Virginia Can Co., Buchanan, Va.; W. W. Boyer Co., Baltimore, Md.; John Boyle Co., Baltimore, Md.; F. F. Stetson & Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; E. F. Kirwan & Co., Baltimore, Md.

Vacuum-seal jars: Staunton Jar Corporation, Ellicott Square, Buffalo, N. Y.

Earthenware jars: Western Stoneware Co., Monmouth, Ill.

Evaporators and dryers: Stutzman Manufacturing Co., Ligonier, Ind.; Edward B. Fahrney, Waynesboro, Pa.; Southern Canner & Evaporator Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.; The Grange Sales Association, Lafayette Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; The Dehydrator Manufacturing Co., 16 East Thirty-third Street, New York.

There is no doubt in my mind but what this entire advertising scheme was laid out in advance by Pack and the scheme presented to the advertisers, and there is no doubt, in view of the fact that these bulletins and slips were distributed by the millions through various war activities, that the volume of business of these concerns was enormously increased. The advocacy of the daylight law by Mr. Pack through his access to the columns of the press, which printed his arguments in full and suppressed all articles to the contrary, was but natural. It appeared to him at once as a means to further advertise his commission and to further increase the sale of his advertised goods among the populace. He was the first to inject the argument that the people needed the extra hour to work in the garden. His assistance was accepted by the originators of the law, and they soon stepped into the background. The gardening cries soon drowned all other voices. It has since, however, proven itself to be based on hypocrisy and deceit.

The third influence operating in the passage of the daylight bill was the support which it received from the impractical, the Utopians, the theorists, political astrologers, medicine men, and the advance agents of the millennium. In other words, the impractical nature of the proposition appealed to that intangible Professorial influence which we all recognize as occupying a sort of dictatorial attitude here during the war and whose decrees we have often observed and felt.

The Professorial aura so prevalent here during the war was most noticeable, whether the individual radiating it was clothed in military or civilian dress, and I pause to make note of it here in the interest of history.

This body of Professors may be, for convenience, referred to as the Professoriate. It rarely sat in the flesh, but often sat in the spirit in plenary assemblage. It was never referred to by a name. It published no decrees in writing. Its laws were never digested. Its efforts were never written up by a Mr. Creel at public expense in the Official Bulletin. And yet its actions and its ukases were powerful and effective. Many of its members were sincere chasers after the beautiful colors of the rainbow, others were molding clay in the hands of designing persons. Others were candidates for Carnegie pensions. Others were lovers of art, especially when exhibited in the gilded halls of the rich. Others were mere pamphleteers in the pay of less educated but very influential men with the sole idea of corralling the few remaining and scattering dollars in the hands of the middle classes. They were all unanimous, however, when it came to a proposition based upon pure Utopian theory involving with it a chance to teach the common people.

Tending to illustrate how the Professoriate rushed to the aid of the daylight-saving act, and in explanation of their tendency to do or attempt to do the impracticable thing, many minor acts by that body during the war might be cited which some practical persons might not concede to be wise. On one occasion it is related a Professor in uniform had purchased 25,000 bathtubs in one place and the fixtures for the same in three different places, and he was much surprised when he gathered them all together to find that they would not fit. It therefore became necessary to set the tubs upside down on a near-by tract of land with a high-priced plumber astride each one for six months waiting for proper fixtures to arrive. This did not seem to bother him very much. The Professoriate told the people of Washington one day in winter that there would be a coal shortage. The people, believing, began to gather coal, rich and poor. The poor, black and white, newspapers wrapped around their feet, were plowing through a foot of snow hauling small loads of the precious article on sleds and wagons to their various homes. A few days later the Professoriate stated that there was plenty of coal, and had been all the time, and that they made the announcement that there would be a shortage of coal simply that they might observe and record the psychological effect upon the people. The Professoriate suggested that the

street cars in the city of Washington, in order to save coal, be not heated in the winter months, and this was tried awhile, until the old folks began to die of pneumonia, resulting from colds taken on the cars. How well we all remember the Professorial suggestion that the women should wear furs instead of wool to help win the war, the notorious substitute order, and the closing of the factories in order to save coal, thus bringing hunger and misery to thousands thus thrown out of work.

The latest enunciation which very well illustrates this university spirit under which we must all soon live, and will no doubt be ratified by the Professoriate, is the late statement of Dr. John B. Watson, professor of psychology at Johns Hopkins University, that "the mother who cuddles and kisses her baby when he cries should be punished by law."

The daylight bill and its impracticability, with the possible opportunity of applying the pedagogic whip to the backs of what they deemed the unruly and uneducated people, presented a golden opportunity of imposing upon them "the university spirit" as enunciated by the President in his Paris speech as bound to rule the world, and which advantage the professoriate at once grasped.

For lack of time I say no more upon that subject, but sometime shall crave the indulgence of the House to further dilate upon the work of the Professoriate during the war.

I believe I have touched upon some of the characteristics of the Professoriate sufficient to illustrate that when such an impracticable idea as fooling the people into thinking that they could lengthen life by turning the clock ahead prevailed in its councils it did not hesitate for a moment to join hands with the daylight law's more practical advocates, the New York stock speculators and Pack's war-garden advertising matter, forgetting in their theoretical air navigation both God and nature.

The war necessity for this law, if any, is over. It can not be justified as a peace measure. Australia has already repealed a similar law. Never has there been a law passed which has hurt the farmer so much. The party which stands for it will be placed by the farmer in the same category as those who stood for Canadian reciprocity. It was prophesied that the law would result in greater food production, yet it has lessened the food production, resulted in a loss of time, and injured crops and animals upon the farm. The passing of the daylight law has done untold harm to the back-to-the-farm movement, disturbed the city workers, injured their health, and stamped the word "liar" across the pure, white, innocent face of the clock, upon which the human race for centuries was wont to look in confidence.

Let us at once repeal this freak legislation and let it at once take its place in the sepulcher of popular hoax along with Dr. Keeley and his motor, Dr. Cook and his North Pole, and Garabed Giragossian and his free energy.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. When the time for amendment comes, would it be in order to consider an amendment, to have the law go into effect immediately, prior to the consideration of the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the committee amendment would take precedence.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes upon this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to talk on this question?

Mr. GARLAND. I am.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. On which side is the gentleman going to talk?

Mr. GARLAND. The gentleman ought to know, for I asked him for time and he refused it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the repeal of this law. I have heard many assertions in respect to the position of the miners on the subject. I am a Representative at large from the State of Pennsylvania. There are 1,000,000 miners in the United States and 325,000 of them are in the State of Pennsylvania alone. They are organized, and they have not asked for a repeal of this law and they are opposed to it. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. Not now. I have only five minutes. I heard it stated here that there was only one person who appeared before the committee saying that labor did not want this bill passed. I asked the committee how many appeared on the other side, speaking for labor to have the bill passed, and found that none did. This ought to be an argument against its repeal.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG] said that the contest on the bill now is one between the short-hour advocate and the 10-hour advocate. I agree with him. That is true. This law has had a tendency to reduce the hours of labor, and the vote for its repeal means that you intend to keep the hours of labor longer, to increase the hours of labor. The daylight-saving bill has had a forward effect with the laboring man. Do you want to retard him and take him back? That is the position. It is true that there were twelve hundred and fifty thousand tons of coal saved by this daylight-saving bill. Does that mean something? Does it mean that the light companies are behind the repeal of this law? Perhaps it does; they are affected. They sell less light and consequently they are in favor of the repeal of this law.

The largest number of men working in rolling mills anywhere in the world work in the State of Pennsylvania. There is no protest there against the law. Some one said that over at Atlantic City at the convention of the Federation of Labor they had voted against action on the daylight-saving bill. Is that because they are against it? Not at all. Often in those conventions it becomes not good policy to take subjects up for various reasons, not that they are opposed to it, and that is just what happened over there in Atlantic City.

It is contended that the State Federation of Labor in Illinois resolved for the repeal of this law. Now, there are 47 other States in the Union and as many State Federations of Labor, and all of them had meetings, yet none of the 47 took action for its repeal.

I hope you do not pass this bill. If the committee had been in earnest in bringing a repeal at this time, it would have been defeated. You were afraid of it, and you put it off until October when automatically it goes back until next spring. Why not wait until October; why not get some evidence in reference to this? Have there been extensive hearings; do people generally know about its intended repeal? Oh, no; but you come fearing it can not pass now; you put off the time of going into effect until it automatically goes into effect. Why not wait until that time and pass it? Wait until it does go into effect automatically and see if the people will stand for the repeal of it. You are afraid of it, and you come in here and try to get something through which ought not to be put through now. If you did put it into immediate effect, it would be defeated overwhelmingly. The State of Pennsylvania has amended their laws, so has the State of New York. They did that, and then you say it was passed because of the war. My recollection was that Germany, England, and the most of those countries which were quoted as having adopted it adopted it long prior to the war. It is said it was agitated in this country on the theory it was a war measure. It was not a war measure; it was never claimed to be a war measure when before the House, and now it is intended to repeal it as being a war measure. Go ahead and repeal it if you will, and you will have every laboring man in the United States on your back; and surely you ought to, because it will tend to increase the hours of labor. [Applause.]

It is contended that the State Federation of Illinois resolved for——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Cries of "Vote!"] The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move a substitute for the committee amendment if it is the proper time to do it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "at 2 o'clock ante meridian of the third Sunday" and insert in lieu thereof, "on the last Sunday of October, 1919."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana offers a substitute for the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "effective" strike out all of lines 5, 6, and 7 to the word "after," in line 7 and insert the word "immediately."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, is there an opportunity to oppose the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks there is no opportunity for debate under the rule.

Mr. GARRETT. By unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. Certainly, it can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, unless it can be open to others who desire to take a position on this amendment, I shall have to object.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes also.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to all requests.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman object to my request?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not object to the two gentlemen, but if it is going to be opened up generally I do object, but I do not object to the gentlemen's request——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the request again. The gentleman from Tennessee requests that he may have five minutes and the gentleman from Indiana five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent I may have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I could not get any time and I object to the request.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to offer a substitute to the substitute.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order.

Mr. WHEELER. I mean an amendment to the substitute.

The SPEAKER. That is in order. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "effective," strike out "on the last Sunday of October, 1919," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "10 days."

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that is not an amendment to the substitute; that is an amendment to the original bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That would be in order.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order it is not an amendment to the substitute, but in the nature of a substitute itself.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman's motion will be in order later on.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], or the substitute rather, put the whole thing right back to the original bill? Does not the language of the original bill and the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana amount to precisely the same thing?

Mr. ESCH. No; the language of the bill originally put it on the third Sunday after the approval of the act. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] makes it immediately effective and that is the danger of it. They ought to have two or three weeks' time to notify the railroads.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the substitute.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLAND of Indiana) there were—ayes 19, noes 203.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] ought first to be recognized. The Clerk will report his amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "effective," strike out "on the last Sunday of October, 1919," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "10 days."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is that an amendment to the amendment or an amendment to the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then it would be in order. The way it was read I understood it was an amendment to the bill.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TINCHER. I want to know if I am right in this: If we vote down the committee amendment which provides the law shall take effect on the last Sunday of October, 1919, we then leave the bill providing that the law shall take effect on the third Sunday after the approval of the act?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 133, noes 65.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands the yeas and nays. [The Chair proceeded to count.]

Mr. BLAND of Indiana (during the count). Mr. Speaker, I make the point there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Not a sufficient number has arisen to demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I made the point that there was no quorum present before the Speaker made the count.

Mr. MADDEN. The count has just been made.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. But pending the count and before the count was announced, I made the point of order that there was no quorum present. Now, can the count of the Chair be valid after the point of no quorum was made?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count in order to ascertain whether or not there is a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman interrupt the count being made to determine whether there is sufficient to secure a roll call in order to make the point of no quorum?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-six gentlemen, a quorum, are present.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARLAND and Mr. CALDWELL demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 232, nays 121, answered "present" 5, not voting 72, as follows:

YEAS—232.

Alexander	Brand	Connally	Evans, Mont.
Almon	Briggs	Cooper	Evans, Nebr.
Anderson	Brinson	Cramton	Evans, Nev.
Andrews, Md	Brooks, Ill.	Crisp	Fairfield
Andrews, Nebr.	Brooks, Pa.	Curry, Calif.	Ferris
Ashbrook	Browne	Dale	Fields
Aswell	Buchanan	Davey	Fisher
Ayres	Burroughs	Davis, Minn.	Flood
Babka	Byrnes, S. C.	Davis, Tenn.	Focht
Bankhead	Campbell, Kans.	Denison	Frear
Bee	Candler	Dent	Fuller, Ill.
Bell	Cannon	Dickinson, Mo.	Gandy
Benham	Cantrill	Dickinson, Iowa	Garner
Benson	Caraway	Dominick	Garrett
Black	Carss	Doughton	Godwin, N. C.
Bland, Ind.	Carter	Dowell	Good
Bland, Va.	Christopherson	Drane	Goodwin, Ark.
Blanton	Clark, Fla.	Dunbar	Goodykoontz
Boies	Clark, Mo.	Echols	Gould
Booher	Classon	Elliott	Graham, Ill.
Bowers	Cole	Ellsworth	Green, Iowa
Box	Collier	Esch	Greene, Vt.

Hadley	Knutson	Padgett	Summers, Wash.
Hamilton	Kreider	Park	Sweet
Hardy, Tex.	Lampert	Parrish	Taylor, Ark.
Harrison	Langley	Pou	Taylor, Colo.
Hastings	Lanham	Quin	Taylor, Tenn.
Haugen	Lankford	Ragsdale	Thomas
Hawley	Larsen	Rainey, H. T.	Thompson, Ohio
Hayden	Layton	Raker	Thompson, Okla.
Hays	Lazaro	Ramseyer	Timberlake
Hernandez	Lea, Calif.	Randall, Wis.	Tincher
Hersey	Lever	Rayburn	Towner
Hickey	Little	Reavis	Treadway
Hill	Luhring	Reed, N. Y.	Upshaw
Hoch	McArthur	Rhodes	Venable
Holland	McClintic	Ricketts	Vestal
Houghton	McCulloch	Riddick	Vinson
Howard	McFadden	Robinson, N. C.	Voigt
Huddleston	McKenzie	Robsion, Ky.	Volstead
Hudspeth	McKeown	Rodenberg	Wason
Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Romjue	Watkins
Hull, Tenn.	McPherson	Sanders, Ind.	Watson, Pa.
Ireland	Martin	Sanders, La.	Watson, Va.
Jacoway	Mason	Sanders, N. Y.	Weaver
Jefferis	Monahan, Wis.	Saunders, Va.	Webb
Johnson, Ky.	Mondell	Schall	Wheeler
Johnson, Miss.	Mooney	Shreve	White, Kans.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ohio	Sinnott	Williams
Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Va.	Sisson	Wilson, La.
Jones, Tex.	Morgan	Slemp	Wingo
Kearns	Mott	Small	Wood, Ind.
Kendall	Nelson, Mo.	Smith, Idaho	Woodyard
Kennedy, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Smithwick	Wright
Kincheloe	Nicholls, S. C.	Steagall	Yates
King	O'Connor	Stedman	Young, N. Dak.
Kinkaid	Oldfield	Stevenson	Young, Tex.
Kitchin	Overstreet	Strong, Kans.	Zihlman

NAYS—121.

Ackerman	Gallagher	McLane	Ramsey
Barbour	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Mich.	Randall, Calif.
Barkley	Ganly	MacCrate	Reber
Bland, Mo.	Garland	Madden	Riordan
Britten	Glynn	Magee	Rose
Browning	Goldfogle	Maher	Rouse
Burdick	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Rowe
Burke	Griffin	Mays	Sabath
Byrns, Tenn.	Hardy, Colo.	Mead	Scott
Caldwell	Haskell	Merritt	Siegel
Campbell, Pa.	Hersman	Michener	Sims
Carew	Hicks	Miller	Smith, Mich.
Casey	Hulings	Minahan, N. J.	Smith, N. Y.
Chindblom	Humphreys	Montague	Stephens, Ohio
Cleary	Hutchinson	Moore, Pa.	Stiness
Coady	James	Moores, Ind.	Sumners, Tex.
Costello	Johnston, N. Y.	Morin	Temple
Crowther	Juul	Neely	Tinkham
Cullen	Kahn	Newton, Minn.	Vaile
Currie, Mich.	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Dallinger	Kettner	Nichols, Mich.	Walsh
Darrow	Kleczka	Nolan	Walters
Doremus	LaGuardia	O'Connell	Webster
Dunn	Lehlbach	Ogden	Welling
Dupré	Lesher	Osborne	Welty
Edmonds	Lonergan	Pell	White, Me.
Elston	Longworth	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Fitzgerald	Lufkin	Phelan	Winslow
Fordney	McAndrews	Porter	
Freeman	McGlennon	Radcliffe	
French	McKiniry	Rainey, J. W.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Bacharach	Emerson	Moon	Tillman
Butler			

NOT VOTING—72.

Anthony	Goodall	Major	Sears
Baer	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Sells
Begg	Griest	Mansfield	Sherwood
Blackmon	Hamill	Mudd	Sinclair
Brumbaugh	Heflin	Murphy	Smith, Ill.
Copley	Husted	Oliver	Snell
Crago	Igoe	Olney	Snyder
Dempsey	Jones, Pa.	Paige	Steele
Dewalt	Kelley, Mich.	Parker	Steenerson
Donovan	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Stephens, Miss.
Dooling	Kiess	Purnell	Strong, Pa.
Dyer	Kraus	Reed, W. Va.	Sullivan
Eagan	Lee, Ga.	Rogers	Tilson
Eagle	Linthicum	Rowan	Ward
Fess	Luce	Rubey	Whaley
Foster	McDuffie	Rucker	Wilson, Pa.
Fuller, Mass.	McKinley	Sanford	Wise
Gard	MacGregor	Scully	Woods, Va.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. WARD (for) with Mr. BACHARACH (against).

Mr. FOSTER (for) with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (against).

Mr. TILLMAN (for) with Mr. DONOVAN (against).

Mr. TILSON (for) with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. SNELL (for) with Mr. PAIGE (against).

Mr. RUBEY (for) with Mr. HASKELL (against).

Mr. BRUMBAUGH (for) with Mr. SCULLY (against).

Mr. MAJOR (for) with Mr. PLATT (against).

Mr. LEE of Georgia (for) with Mr. SANFORD (against).

Mr. SMITH of Illinois (for) with Mr. CRAGO (against).

Mr. WOODS of Virginia (for) with Mr. ROGERS (against).

Mr. BEGG (for) with Mr. SULLIVAN (against).

Mr. BAER (for) with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts (against).

Mr. MURPHY of Ohio (for) with Mr. LINTHICUM (against).

Mr. BUTLER (for) with Mr. STEELE (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. KIESS with Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. FESS with Mr. McDUFFIE.

Mr. McKINLEY with Mr. IGOE.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present." I have a pair with Mr. WARD, of New York.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BACHARACH, and he answered "Present."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear in this House. A mistake was made in the record on the other roll. I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. STEELE, and the clerk has recorded him as voting when I know he is 250 miles away from this city at this moment. I propose to make it plain. I do not want to come here to-morrow and rise to have the correction made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BUTLER. The roll is wrong. I have endeavored to have it corrected. I desire to withdraw my vote. I voted "aye." I am paired with my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. STEELE. I would like to have his pair put up. He is opposed to this bill, and I am in favor of it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BUTLER, and he answered "Present."

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from New York, Mr. DONOVAN, vote?

The SPEAKER. He did not vote.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask leave to withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "present," and I would say that if Mr. DONOVAN were present, he would vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. TILLMAN, and he answered "Present."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I heard the first call. I came here on the second roll call, but my name was not called; but under the circumstances I believe I will only vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. MOON, and he answered "Present."

Mr. LUFKIN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. ROGERS, has been called to Massachusetts on important business. If he were here, he would vote against the repeal and in favor of the continuance of this law.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I will state that my colleague, Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to print their remarks in the RECORD, the remarks not to include telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH ACT.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I call up Senate bill 120, the so-called wire-control bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls up Senate bill 120. The bill is on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself——

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the consideration of this bill is not concluded to-night, it be made the unfinished business to-morrow, to follow the decision of the Speaker on the question of order on the deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that if this bill is not finished to-night it be taken

up to-morrow as unfinished business, following the deficiency bill. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman that the sundry civil bill will be reported this afternoon, and it is our purpose to call up that bill to-morrow morning immediately after the disposition of the conference report on the deficiency bill. I do not think that anything ought to displace at this time the appropriation bills; it is so important that they should be enacted and sent to the Senate at the earliest possible date, and while it might not take long, it might take a great deal longer than the gentleman now anticipates.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, so that I may ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. How long does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] think it will take to dispose of this bill after the two hours of general debate?

Mr. ESCH. There are some four or five sections, and every section has some committee amendments. I understand, also, some amendments will be offered on the floor, so that there may be some considerable time occupied under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MONDELL. Will it take a couple of hours?

Mr. ESCH. I should not think so.

Mr. GOOD. I thought yesterday that our conference report would not take an hour, but it took all day, and we did not conclude it. You can not tell about these things.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman from Iowa may see his way clear not to object. I realize his proper insistence on proceeding with the sundry civil bill, but this is also a very important matter, and I am very much in hope that the House will dispose of it in an hour and a half at the most in the morning.

Mr. GOOD. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that gentlemen understand perfectly well that if the wire bill does not become a law for a few days it will not cause the disturbance which the failure to enact the sundry civil bill before the 1st of July will cause. We must get that bill started and through the House at once if it is to go through the House this week. That will give only a week for the Senate committee to hold its hearings, consider the bill, put it through the Senate, send the bill back to the House, get it into conference, get a report from the conference committee, and get the conference agreed to in both Houses, an almost herculean task at best. I do not think we should be asked to step aside and wait for a bill which may require a whole day or two. The length of time it will take is guesswork. There are a lot of gentlemen who want to speak on the wire bill, and you can not tell how long it is going to take.

Mr. ESCH. General debate is limited under the rule.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but not the five-minute debate, under which great latitude is allowed at all times.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman realizes that there is a rule now in the possession of the chairman of the Committee on Rules relative to this wire bill.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that.

Mr. MONDELL. That rule could be brought forward at any time.

Mr. GOOD. I know that, but I do not believe it would be adopted if it was offered now, in view of the present congestion of the appropriation bills, and I do not think it ought to be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why not make arrangements to take up this wire bill and debate it for two hours and then have an agreement that it shall follow the appropriation bill?

Mr. GOOD. I am not interested in any agreement further than that it shall not displace the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that, but there are two hours yet for general debate on that bill this afternoon, and you can not have more than two hours debate unless you get an extension of time, and if anybody undertakes to stretch that time out beyond the two hours I will object.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman. I am glad he feels that way about it. I think we can dispose of the bill in an hour and a half to-morrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggested that we debate this wire bill two hours now, with an agreement that the sundry civil bill shall come up after two hours' general debate on this bill, and then after the sundry civil bill is disposed of we can go on with the wire bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is just as important that this bill be given early consideration as it is that the sundry civil bill be taken up at once. It is a bill that affects all the telegraph and telephone activities of the United States. Every citizen of the United States is affected by it. Everybody is being charged excessive prices for what he has to do in connection with the telephones and telegraphs. The time has come when there ought to be some adjustment of the situation. I do not think that the consideration of the wire bill now will so delay the sundry civil bill as to embarrass Government activities, and I do think that if this wire bill does not come in until after the sundry civil bill is passed it will continue a burden on the backs of the American people that they ought not to be compelled to bear, and the sooner that burden is lifted the better. This is no local matter. It is a matter of great consequence, and I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will make a mistake if he insists that this wire bill shall not be given the right of way to-morrow morning, because it can be disposed of to-morrow without doing any damage whatever to the sundry civil bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the gentlemen who have engaged in this colloquy to the fact that this is a Senate bill, and that there are only a few House amendments upon it; and if the House should delay passing it for a few days it would not entail the delay in its becoming a law that would be entailed if it were a House measure that had to go to the Senate and be considered there anew. I submit that the sundry civil appropriation bill is a vastly more important bill than the turning over of the wires that are now being operated by the Government, because if the sundry civil bill fails to become a law by the 1st of July it will block the operations of a number of the Government departments, and if this wire-control bill should be delayed for three or four days it would then pass and go over to the Senate, and take no time at all, probably, to concur in the House amendments.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, this wire bill can not become a law, no matter what the House or Senate does, until it is signed by the President.

Mr. MADDEN. Neither can the sundry civil bill.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but you are delaying consideration of the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Only one day, and to-day is only the 18th of June. The gentleman has got 12 days more before the end of the month.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I shall be compelled to object to the request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The House automatically resolves itself——

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ESCH. If the House should start consideration of the wire bill on Calendar Wednesday and not conclud it, would it be possible to procure consideration of the bill under a rule before next Calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would be possible to do that by a special rule.

Mr. MONDELL. If we begin consideration of the wire bill this afternoon, I think, under the circumstances, we should conclude the consideration of it this evening.

The SPEAKER. If the previous question should be ordered to-night it would be in order to-morrow as unfinished business.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield? Would it not be helpful if the gentleman from Wisconsin or the gentleman from Wyoming, in view of the public emergency, should announce that the House will sit to-night until the bill is passed?

Mr. MONDELL. That was my thought—perhaps I did not clearly express it—that the House should remain here this evening at least to the point of ordering the previous question on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this statement in connection with the statements that have been made as to this matter that it is very important to consider the wire bill at once.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order now; there is no request pending. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MOORES of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk reads as follows:

An act (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate

the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin as to the control of the time.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided, and that one half be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the time be equally divided, and that one half be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill ought to be considered as speedily as possible, and I want to make an inquiry whether an arrangement for time can be had in Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. MQORE of Pennsylvania. If objection is made, would we proceed at once to read the bill under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two hours' debate, and the first reading of the bill has been dispensed with.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that the gentlemen have an understanding as to the matter.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to occupy 15 minutes. The act of July 16, 1918, under which the wire systems were taken under control by the President, limited the time of such control and possession to the duration of the war. As to compensation for rental of the wire systems under the original act, the President was empowered to fix such compensation. If that compensation did not meet with the approval of the owner, he could accept 75 per cent of the compensation as fixed by the President and then could go into the Court of Claims and secure the additional amount, which, with the amount allowed, would make due compensation.

The pending Senate bill 120 seeks to repeal this joint resolution, approved July 16, 1918, in so far as the period of control is concerned, retaining, however, the proviso as to compensation as provided in the original joint resolution.

I wish briefly to call the attention of the committee to the changes and modifications made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Senate bill. The first material amendment is as to the time of the taking effect of the resolution itself. The Senate provided that the control now exercised by the President through the Postmaster General under the joint resolution shall cease forthwith—that is, upon the approval of this act by the President. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommends as a substitute that the repeal should become effective at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved.

The reasons which led the committee to make that change in the Senate provision rest largely if not wholly on the fact that if the Senate provision prevailed, and the repeal came at any day in a month aside from the last day of the month, it would necessitate a tremendous amount of extra bookkeeping on the part of the wire companies; that these extra expenses might run into the millions of dollars, owing to the fact that there are some ten million stations in the United States, and that these stations would necessitate an enormous amount of accounting.

Then in many cities phones are paid for on measured rates. In other places they have toll tickets, and different methods of charging the user for the phones. Each system requires a different form of accounts.

Now, if the repeal became effective, say, in the middle of the month, the companies would have to make an accounting for the first half of the month and another accounting for the remainder of the month. Whereas if according to our committee amendment this end of control was coterminus with the end of the calendar month in which the resolution was approved by the President, the accounting to the Government would be the same, practically, as the accounting to the companies themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In the meantime, if this bill was passed on the 2d of the month there would be a continuation of the control to the end of the month and the charges and accounting would be for 30 days more?

That would continue the charges for 30 days longer than they ought to be continued for. That would amount for the telegraph charges to more than $20,000 a day. That does not take into account the charges made for telephone service to the American people at all.

Mr. ESCH. It would necessitate this complicated accounting system even though the change or the approval happened the second day of the month.

Mr. MADDEN. We would save $600,000 to the American people.

Mr. ESCH. The next considerable change in the bill is in the elimination of the last five or six lines of section 1, declaring the intent of Congress. The committee believed these lines should be stricken from the bill as not good practice and not good legislative form, believing an act should so clearly indicate its purpose and intent as to not need a further provision declaring such intent.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Just on that amendment, I notice that it provides that these rates shall continue not to exceed six months, provided they are not sooner changed by contract or voluntary reduction.

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Suppose they are not changed either by the State commissions or by the Interstate Commerce Commission or by contract or by voluntary conduct, what will happen at the end of six months? Will we go back to the old rates that prevailed before this increase of rates? Is any provision made for that contingency at all?

Mr. ESCH. I ought to have called attention to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina. We do modify the Senate bill with reference to the period of time when the rates should remain effective as ordered by the Postmaster General. The Senate provided they should remain effective for a period of 90 days. We recommended that the existing toll and exchange telephone rates as established or approved by the Postmaster General on or prior to June 6, 1919, shall continue in force—and here is the change—for a reasonable period, not to exceed six months after the act takes effect, unless sooner modified or changed by the public authorities having control or jurisdiction of such tolls and rates.

When the proper time comes I shall offer an amendment modifying the committee amendment in this particular—to reinsert, in lines 12 and 13, page 2, the words "State, municipal, or otherwise," and to strike out the last word "such" of the proposed amendment in line 15 of the same page.

It has been indicated by some that as we have recommended the changes to the House there might be some ambiguity as to the rates which should continue in effect for a maximum time, not exceeding six months. There were some who contended that if the provision went in as the committee recommended it, the wire companies could come in and say to the State commissions, "These are legal rates, and they must continue for the period of six months, and you can not have authority to change or modify them during the interim." The amendment I suggest would make it clear that these rates made through the Postmaster General can only continue to a maximum of six months, subject to change by the State, municipal, or other regulatory body, and I believe that the House, when it comes to consider the language suggested, will approve of that amendment. The question now arises why we fix the period of six months in lieu of the period of 90 days, as recommended by the Senate bill. We had very strong testimony before the committee advocating the maximum of one year. That position was taken by the First Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Koons, a member of the wire control board. It was also advocated by Mr. Kingsbury, who is, I think, the vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and, I believe, was also advocated by Mr. Carlton, the president of the Western Union, and other witnesses. Mr. Elmquist, who represents and is solicitor for the State railway public utilities, took this position; in his opinion, upon the ceasing of control the prewar rates will immediately revive.

Your committee did not take that position, although admitting that it was one as to which there was grave doubt and one upon which very eminent counsel differed; but there was no difference in our committee as to the power of Congress to extend the Federal rates beyond the proclamation of the declaration of peace, that these rates created under the war power could by act of Congress be projected into the future beyond the procla-

mation of the declaration of peace, and in all likelihood this maximum period of six months will extend these rates beyond the declaration of peace. In connection with that we have cited in the report numerous cases, acts of Congress, where we have done this very same thing. So that while we have no question as to our authority to extend these rates into the future and into a time of peace, there may be doubt as to the validity of the war-made rates immediately upon the cessation of Federal control.

On the whole we believe that we have kept within the limit of constitutional bounds in the amendments we have proposed. After reviewing the testimony of those who advocated the maximum of 1 year, those who advocated less than 90 days or even 90 days, the committee came to the conclusion that 6 months would be a sufficient time for the various regulatory bodies—Federal, State, and municipal—to readjust the rates in accordance with the needs of the company and in accordance with justice. Whether that period meets with the approval of the House remains to be seen, but we believe that it will be a sufficient period, and I have received or have seen telegrams which have been sent by something like 35 State commissions, and, in large measure, they believe that there should be some extension of the time beyond the cessation of Federal control in order to enable the commissions, those regulatory bodies, to adjust the hundreds of claims that will be perhaps suddenly thrust upon them when the period of control ceases. It is a matter of physical impossibility for some of these commissions to adjust the numerous claims that will be presented within the 90-day limit, as proposed by the Senate. Why, there are some States in which there are no less than 4,000 or 5,000 or 6,000 telephone companies——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 15 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. I will take three minutes more—and those will no doubt speedily present their claims for adjustment of rates. To do that they must have time to prepare the data upon which their application is founded, and when they have done that they must adjust their schedules according to the data as found, and then they must present these schedules to the commission, and then the commission must grant a hearing, and all of this takes time, and for that reason the committee believes that six months would be a reasonable time.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ESCH. I will.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the committee take into consideration the question of the cost that will be entailed on the State commissions to adjust these rates? Was that taken into consideration by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. ESCH. No specific testimony was presented in regard to that, but many of these telegrams from the State commissions indicate a desire and readiness to undertake the work as speedily as possible, but they contain no objection on the ground of expense to the commission for doing the work.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman think there will be a good deal of expense entailed on the commissions by reason of it?

Mr. ESCH. There is no doubt of it, but that is unavoidable. The last amendment I wish to call attention to is that relating to the period in which a full accounting of the acts of the President should be filed with Congress. The Senate bill provided 60 days. We have enlarged it to 90 days. The Senate bill required those reports to show in detail the financial results of the operation of each separate wire system. We have modified that so as to require a showing in detail of the financial results of the operation of wire systems. I shall offer an amendment when section 4 is reached, recommended by the committee modifying the last portion of section 4 so that instead of requiring two reports, one from August 1, 1918, when the wires were taken over, up to March 31, 1919, and then another report from that date to the date when control ceases, we require only one report which would cover the detailed report from August 1, 1918, up to the time when control ceases, for we can see no reason why we should require two reports, which would cover largely the same subject matter, and in the interests of economy and expeditious action, we hope the committee will adopt that suggestion in requiring but one report. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is utterly impossible to discuss intelligently the questions that are involved in the wire proposition now before the committee, much less could I read in this time some letters and documents that bear strongly upon the question, both from the Postmaster General and from the companies, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may make an appendix to the few remarks I am submitting to-day of certain letters from the Postmaster General and from the telephone companies on this subject, that they may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the letters indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. And I will ask that they follow my remarks and come in the order in which they appear as to date. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if I could have even an hour to speak to this House upon this question and present to the House even in a very limited way that which has been done and accomplished in the Post Office Department for the last six years I could not in that time tell half that ought to be told. Of course, in the few minutes that I have I can only touch upon some of those questions.

Now, I have no opposition to the passage of this bill provided that there are certain very essential amendments made to it. I am not going to enter upon the discussion of the power of the Government to control the telegraphs. You who have looked into that question know that under the post-office clause of the Constitution—the construction that the department and courts have made upon it—the right and power of the Federal Government to take the telegraph and make it an adjunct to the Post Office Department, either in time of war or time of peace, exists. It is absolutely plenary. The Congress of the United States built the first telegraph line in the United States, and when, turning that over to a private corporation in order that that service might better be developed, it reserved in the third section of the act of July 24, 1866, the right to take back at any time that telegraph and all others. Why? Because it was recognized then, as every intelligent man must recognize now, that it was an essential function of government; that it belonged to and is very essential to the Post Office Department. Why? Because under the Constitution the Post Office Department has an absolute monopoly in the communication of intelligence. A telegram is only a letter by wire. Who will assume that in a State or between the States that there is any power to control the mail except the Federal Government? When you take a wire and make it a means of communication, the exclusive power belongs to the Federal Government. It is a function of government that we are temporarily letting private corporations exercise, and that is all. And, furthermore, that distinction exists between the ownership of the telegraph as a means of communication, adjunct to the Post Office Department, that distinguishes it entirely from every other public utility. The Federal Government can not go into the States and own a railroad that is not interstate, but you could go into every State of the Union under this power of the Constitution and reserved rights of Congress and law, in pursuance of the Constitution, and take hold of not only the interstate but all the intrastate telegraph and other means of communication of intelligence.

Let me warn you, too, that as long as you shall refuse to exercise those powers that belong to the Federal Government under the Constitution, as long as you shall let them lie dormant, just so long there will be trouble and conflict as to jurisdiction between the States and the Federal Government, just so long you will form the basis of an organization for socialism, because your Constitution itself contains very deep in its vitals the seeds of socialistic government, which you must some day eradicate.

You may say it is not wise to assume this power; that it looks like socialism in the beginning; but if you do not exercise the power in the Constitution for the protection of the Federal Government some party will come that will demand it, and they will present this very issue to you as a constitutional basis for socialistic government. They will tell you to take the railroads; they will tell you to take the laundries, the bakeries, the factories; and that is all that socialism is. But it is just one single step from socialism to communism. Communism and socialism are identical, with the exception that the commune goes one step further and enforces the doctrine of the ancient agrarian and takes the lands of the country to divide between the electorate. Then comes what? Then come chaos and ruin in government; then come massacre and death; then comes the dissolution of government. And then, if liberty is to be preserved, there comes the hour when the power, like it was after the Battle of Actium, must be conferred upon one in order to preserve human government.

You are on a dangerous question. You have been fighting capitalism in the United States for years. It is pretty well conquered in many of its respects as to its control of legislation. But you have another power within the Government that

threatens to be stronger than the Government itself. It is that organization of the forces that would overthrow the present order and establish a socialistic government that will be the result of its action. There is but one government in which human liberty is safe, and that is a constitutional, representative government, and that government can only be preserved on the soil of this Republic by the enforcement of every Federal right under the Constitution and the protection of every right of the private citizen and the enforcement of the reserved rights of the States. [Applause.]

But, gentlemen, I had not intended to go so far in the discussion of that question. I want to say in reference to the discharge of the duties of the Postmaster General, that it has been my pleasure, having been the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for the last eight years, to observe the course of that official during that time. Every man who knows him knows that he is a clean, honest, brave, intelligent man; that he is patriotic, and that he has looked to nothing but the welfare and interest of his country. Of course, in these times of war there have been, and necessarily are, mistakes. You complain of your mail going wrong. You do not know that it did not go wrong until after it had been placed in the hands of the War Department and when under the provisions of law it was taken from the Postmaster General at New York, and its distribution in Europe made by the War Department. But the War Department did as well as could possibly have been done under the circumstances.

When the present Postmaster General went into office you had a large deficiency; when he went into office the railroads of this country were drawing from your Treasury unlawfully eight or ten millions of dollars per annum. It was through the influence of this administration that the Congress enacted the law that changed from the weight basis to a space basis the compensation for railroads. What has been the result? A net profit of more than $12,000,000 to the American people, and fixing the basis of compensation in such a way that wrongs and injuries perpetrated by these roads can not be perpetrated again.

Take the parcel-post proposition which has been developed, and see what a magnificent success it has been. I have not the time. I wish I had. I could talk to you an hour upon the accomplishments of that office. But what I have to say to-day, not only to the Democrats but to the Republicans, who are insisting upon investigations in the various departments, is, God speed you in your investigation, if you want to make it. If there has been anything wrong, uncover it and expose it, and let the criminal be punished. You have not attempted, except incidentally in a way, any investigation of postal affairs, and the triumph came to the department upon that. I challenge you to an investigation of the Post-Office Department. Make it! That department will make good in every branch of the service for the people of the United States. Cease your calumny; cease that unmanly tirade that is made from time to time against this great public official who is at the head of that department.

I know there are three or four classes of men who complain. There are some honest, just men who think, without knowing the facts, that something wrong has been done. There are men who do not care anything about the truth of a situation who, from partisan reasons and for partisan purposes, are willing to traduce men who stand above them morally, socially, and politically. There is another class, too numerous, that have neither reason nor honor, that low, contemptible, dirty, scurvy pack of dogs that will always howl at the feet of a great and honest official who stands firmly by the rights and interests of his country. Come with your investigation! We want it. We dare you to make it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, much more I would like to say along this line, but I am admonished, of course, that my time is very short. I shall offer, sir, at the proper place to this bill two amendments that I now desire to go into the RECORD and treat as pending. I will discuss each one of them very briefly.

After the word "reduction," on line 16, page 2, insert,

Provided further, That no reduction of wages of telegraph or telephone employees now in effect shall be made so long as the rates fixed by the Postmaster General are effective.

Now, what do you say to that proposition? You turn over the wires to these companies. It is all right. It is not perhaps the proper time to keep them. You are giving back to them the control at a rate 50, perhaps 100, per cent higher than they got before Government control. You complain that the department has not administered this service well. Of course, every just man knows that a service like this, involving the whole Union, the whole territory of the Union, could not be taken over and be properly adjusted in a week or probably six months. But the proofs are before this committee to this effect, that the service is just beginning to be properly maintained, and the rates had to be increased in order to do it, and that the continuation of this service for a few months longer would make no deficiency on that account to the Government of the United States.

You have done much in this bill, have you not, for the corporations that are exercising the functions of Government which you are pleased to have them continue to exercise?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MOON. I thank my colleague.

That you have done. We are making no complaint about it. Under the old resolution the termination of this service is after the proclamation of peace. You are terminating it before. You are not giving the department the time to perfect the service that it ought to have. However that may be, you are doing it, and we are consenting, and those papers which I have obtained consent to place in the RECORD explain very fully the reasons.

Now, are you taking the wires back and turning them over to the companies to enable them to reduce the wages of the laborers who are performing this service for them? If you are, then you will vote down this amendment. But if you are willing for them to have the benefit and, along with them, the men who perform the labor, you will maintain the price of this labor as provided in this amendment during the period of the Government control. That is up to you. Are you for the corporations? Are you for the laborer? Or are you going to be honest enough to do justice to both?

Now, I am going to offer to you another amendment a little later, after that, to this effect:

Provided further——

Mr. MAPES. Where does it go?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; where does it go?

Mr. MOON. That will come in after the one I have offered.

Provided further, That until the rates fixed by the Postmaster General are changed, as authorized herein, any excess of net revenues arising from the operation of each telegraph and telephone system, in excess of an amount equal to the compensation fixed by the Postmaster General during Federal control, shall be applied to any deficiency which may result from Government operation.

What do you think about that? Are you proposing to give to the corporations the power to exercise the functions of your Government which belong to you under the Constitution? You are giving them back their property. Their compensation was fixed upon the valuation of their property. We propose and I hope you will agree to give to the laboring people the benefits of this increase under the operation of the Government. Now I ask you to do something for your country, to do something for the Treasury of the United States. Why should not the excess of profits over and above the high compensation fixed under the act and under the rules of the department go to the Government to defray the deficiency during the period of Government operation? Is there any reason why that should go into the coffers of these companies, when under the law as it was intended the relinquishment of this claim should not come until peace had been proclaimed? Are you willing that the people of the United States shall have some benefits, or are you going to shoulder the deficiency, whether rightfully or wrongfully made, and say to the corporations, "We turn back these wires to you improved in condition. We turn them back to you with a higher rate of compensation than you ever had before. We turn them back to you with a guaranteed compensation on a valuation far in excess of that which the proof shows your companies have?" For instance, most of the complaint is being made by the Postal Telegraph Co. The others are not complaining much. The Postal Telegraph Co. turned in their properties to the Interstate Commerce Commission under the law and fixed their value at $4,480,000. Yet they are receiving, according to the statement of their company, compensation on the basis of a valuation of $29,000,000. And yet the Postal is not wholly a national organization. It has the cream of the service in a thousand offices in the United States, while the Western Union supplies the people from 25,000 offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Would my friend like five minutes more?

Mr. MOON. I would be glad to have one or two minutes. I do not want to take all the time.

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. MOON. That is more than I ought to take, although it is impossible to discuss the question in the short time. I want to appeal to this House in the settlement of this question to deal justly with the wire companies, to turn this property back to them fairly. If there has been any wrong or injury done to them, they are entitled to compensation.

They are being compensated upon a basis of valuation far in excess of the real value to-day. It is but right that the benefits and burdens should go together. Let the wires go back to them for the present. Let the labor of the people employed by these companies be maintained at the present wage during occupation. You are not willing, are you, to turn back these wires without any guaranty that the wages of these men and women shall be kept up? If the deficiency came at all, it was caused by the increased wages of these people. Or do you propose to turn back the wires and let them reduce wages and keep all the profits that may arise from the operation of them in excess of the compensation that they were entitled to under the provisions of the original act? This is a question of common decency and honesty that you have to pass upon. I take it you all want to do what is right about it. I know you will not do right unless you pass these amendments.

I will not leave this floor until I make one suggestion to you. I am harking back for a moment, because my mind goes back very strongly to this question. The time is not far distant when you have to realize you have to strengthen your Government along certain lines, and you have to liberalize it along others for the support of your Government and for the suppression of a tendency which is so untoward, a tendency to too great a democracy, a tendency to socialism.

You have to make the American people feel that the Federal Government is their Government, that it is not a Government of strangers set up over the States. You must see to it sooner or later that your Federal judges, your Federal district attorneys, your Federal collectors, and your postmasters are elected by the people whom they serve and not appointed and commissioned from Washington.

You have to liberalize your Government in that respect so as to draw the people nearer to it. It will be an antidote to socialism along that line, and still further you have to strengthen the Federal Government by the exercise of all the dormant powers of the Government itself to maintain its power and supremacy, and some day I hope to discuss all of these before you along the line of the supremacy of the Federal Government in the exercise of its powers. The Government will yet, I predict, in support of its power, have to own two great telegraph systems and the two great transcontinental railroad lines in these United States. [Applause.]

The following is the appendix referred to by Mr. MOON:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
April 12, 1919.

The wire board has made available the figures upon which is based the increase of telegraph rates made necessary by the increased wage scale and higher cost of materials used in telegraph operation.

While the price of products and service of various industrial, mercantile, and miscellaneous corporations of the United States has increased 100 per cent, telegraph service has been rendered to the country at prewar prices throughout a period when industrial and business profits were unprecedented. The increase of 20 per cent in telegraph rates should be considered in comparison with the 100 per cent increase in other prices, and it is less than that found necessary to add to the railroad freight rates and is no greater than has been made generally in other public-utility rates in order to obviate financial collapse.

The purpose of the wire control board is to make the lowest rate that will maintain the service required by the public. In making a rate sufficient to maintain the telegraph service of the country discrimination could not be made between two companies performing this service.

A service might be maintained within certain limited fields, where the cost of operation is light in comparison with the volume of concentrated business, at a considerably less rate than is necessary to cover a service extensive enough to meet the public needs.

During the six months from August, 1918, to January, 1919, the Postal telegraph system carried only approximately one-sixth, or about 17 per cent, of the business of the country, and only about one-twelfth, or 8⅓ per cent, of the Government business, which is unprofitable. The Western Union therefore carried approximately five-sixths, or about 83 per cent, of the business of the country and eleven-twelfths, or 91⅔ per cent, of the Government business.

The extension of the telegraph service into fields that are less profitable than are the great business centers and the handling of Government business, claimed by both companies to be at a loss of 50 per cent of the operating cost, are a charge upon the gross revenues which is escaped by a company which avoids the rendering of this necessary public service. If all telegraph operations that are not sufficiently profitable were done away with, regardless of the public needs, no increase of rates would be necessary to maintain a service limited to the profitable fields, as is the acknowledged plan of the Postal system. If both telegraph companies so limited their service it would be disastrous to the industries and business of the country.

If the telegraph rates were made sufficient to meet only the cost of operations covering one-sixth of all the service of the country, so arranged as to tap only the most profitable business, much of the telegraph service for all the rest of the country would be destroyed. This would be advantageous to those who luxuriated in the cream of business, but would be disastrous to the public.

The increase of the business of the Western Union Telegraph Co. in 1918 over 1916 was 38 per cent; that of the Postal system was only 9 per cent. Yet the earnings of the Postal system for the month of January last, after adjustment for depreciation and wage increase, were $222,297. During 1919 the increase in the operating expenses of the Western Union, due to an increase in the number of employees, and in the wage rate combined will be $13,000,000 in excess of the increase in its gross revenues.

The number of employees of the Western Union was increased 59 per cent, while the gross revenues increased but 54 per cent. The reason why the increase of traffic was proportionately greater than the increase of gross revenues was that the Government business, which is carried at approximately 40 per cent of the commercial rates, was fourteen times greater in January, 1919, than in January, 1916. We are informed that the Postal Telegraph avoided carrying the unprofitable Government business as far as it was possible for it to do so, and the Western Union carried about eleven-twelfths of the entire volume, and that in some instances instructions were issued by the officials of the Postal system to their subordinates to avoid this Government business whenever it could be done, a plausible excuse being suggested, such as shortage of operators, etc.

If the policy of operating the wire service at only such points of concentrated business as would make the service highly profitable and of eliminating Government messages were applied to both telegraph companies there would probably be no occasion for an increase of telegraph rates to meet the increased cost of material and wages in the operation of the system.

The burden of increased cost of labor and material has been rendered heavier by the fact that the volume of business has fallen off since the signing of the armistice and has produced a situation where it is no longer possible to render telegraph service at prewar rates.

Under the stimulus of war demands American prices, as shown by the index number of wholesale prices prepared by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, have risen steadily since the latter months of 1915. By July, 1917, the price level had risen to 185 per cent of the 1914 prices. At this point price fixing by the Government agencies checked the rise for some months. But by January, 1918, the level of 185 per cent had been recovered, and the prices continued to advance until they reached 207 per cent in September. Despite the signing of the armistice they have receded but slightly from this point.

During all this period the prices for telegraph service have remained at the prewar level. Materials and supplies which the telegraph companies purchase have, however, followed the course of general prices. Public regulation does not limit the prices which utilities must pay for material and supplies; they must therefore pay the same price upon the market as other buyers. They were confronted by a steady and enormous increase of all costs entering into their operation, while retaining a fixed low price for service.

It requires only common sense and elementary arithmetic to disclose that this course inevitably brought the properties to a point where revenues were no longer adequate to cover cost. Following the signing of the armistice the telegraph business fell off.

The question of necessity for a rate increase to meet past wage increases is answered by a review of the Western Union Telegraph Co.'s operation. In January, 1916, the land-line revenues of this company amounted to $3,805,000. The total pay roll for the employees in the commercial and traffic departments and in nonfunctional offices amounted to $1,408,226. The pay roll at that time amounted to 37 per cent of the gross revenues and was at the rate of $51.92 per employee per month. By January, 1919, the revenues from the land line had increased to $5,860,000, and the pay roll of these employees had increased to $3,300,867, or an average of $76.63 per employee. The pay rolls of these employees amounted to 56.3 per cent of the total revenues, as against 37 per cent in January, 1916. The number of employees increased by 59 per cent, and the gross revenues of the company by 54 per cent.

The average increase per employee per month on commercial, traffic, and nonfunctional pay rolls was $24.71, or approximately 48 per cent. The number of employees at present averages 45,000. The increase in rate of pay therefore amounts to $13,343,400 per year. The increases since June, 1918, amount to $7,786,000, and since January, 1918, to $9,277,000. The monthly pay roll has increased from $1,408,226 to $3,300,867. This is an annual increase of $22,711,692. If the rate of wages of these employees had remained the same as on January 1, 1916, the increase in the pay roll would have been at the rate of $914,155 per month, or $10,969,865 per year. The company would then have had a profit larger by the difference between $22,711,692 and $10,969,865, or $11,741,827. In addition to the increase of wages for this class of employees that for those in the plant department amounted to $2,438,830. Therefore the increases in operating expenses traceable to wage increases alone amount to more than $14,000,000. The increase in operating expenses due to the larger number of employees and the higher wage rate combined will amount to $27,608,000. The gross revenues of the Western Union for 1919 under the old rates are estimated at $68,000,000, as against $54,000,000 for 1916. The increase in the revenues is $13,000,000 short of the increase in wages. The 20 per cent rate increase now made will yield approximately $12,000,000 additional revenue per annum on this property.

The wage increases during the year 1918, including the increase effective December 31, brought wages in January, 1919, to the point where they are $10,500,000 per annum in excess of a year ago, and $8,500,000 in excess of June, 1918. The operations of the company have been carried on with this increased wage schedule since January 1, 1919. The increase in the telegraph rates now made is estimated to add $9,000,000 to the revenues of the Western Union for the remaining nine months of the calendar year.

The Postal system has not had a similar increase in operating expenses. No figures are available as to the pay roll, but the total operating expenses amounted in 1916 to $9,543,972, in 1917 to $10,401,876, and in 1918 to approximately $10,500,000. This smaller increase is explained principally by the smaller growth of business of the Postal system.

The following table shows the gross revenues of the Postal and of the Western Union for the years 1916, 1917, and 1918:

Land line gross revenues.

Year.	Western Union.	Postal System.	Total.
1916	$54,016,171	$13,644,987	$67,661,158
1917	66,528,711	14,907,097	81,435,808
1918	74,505,512	14,930,896	89,436,408
Increase 1918 over 1916.....per cent..	38	9	32

The relative growth of traffic on the Western Union was even more rapid than the figures of gross revenues indicate, because its increase in the volume of Government business carried was much more rapid than that of the Postal system.

Even with its small increase of business, it is clear that the increase in the operating expenses of the Postal telegraph system could not have been limited to 10 per cent if the same increase in wage rate had been made by that system which was made by the Western Union.

The net earnings of the Postal telegraph system have not fallen to the same extent as have those of the Western Union. During the six months, August, 1918, to January, 1919, the net earnings of the Postal, as shown by their accounts, were $1,832,821. After adjustment for depreciation awarded them by the Postmaster General and for the wage increase for the month of January these earnings were $1,652,821. The earnings for the month of January, after wage and depreciation adjustment, were $222,296.

Some persons jump to the conclusion, since the earnings of the Postal telegraph system were still substantially under the old rate, that the increase in rates was unnecessary. The Postal telegraph system is not a national system in the sense that it furnishes service at all points where it is desired in the public interest. It has approximately one-tenth as many offices as the Western Union and carries one-sixth of the telegraph business of the Nation. It competes for much more than one-sixth of the Nation's business, however, because its offices are located in the larger cities. Two-thirds of the telegraph business of the country originates in these business centers. The Postal telegraph system is, therefore, in a position to select from all the business offered that which can be most profitably handled, and this it seems to have done in most efficient manner. The fact that the Postal company could continue to carry business at the old rates and still earn its compensation is of practically no significance in constructing a fair schedule of rates for the country as a whole. Such rates must cover the cost of rendering service to all points, including just compensation for the property used. The Postal system reaches only a fraction of the points at which telegraph service is rendered, and at the points which it does reach it could not carry one-half the business offered. Sound public policy dictates a schedule of rates which shall give all the people telegraph service. Under such a schedule of rates the Postal system will reap the benefits that come to the competitor who strives only for the more profitable business, but this situation is inevitable as long as this condition exists in the telegraph field. The fact that the Postal company could operate at its present rates and still make profits is of little significance in passing upon the general schedule of rates.

A comparison of the effect of increased prices upon general business profits with that upon the telegraph profits is enlightening. The net income of the industrial, mercantile, and miscellaneous corporations reported to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue increased from $2,897,618,000 in 1913 to $6,697,000,000 in 1916, to $8,300,000,000 in 1917, to $7,500,000,000 in 1918, and it is estimated will not fall below $5,000,000,000 in 1919. While there has been a rise of 70 per cent in the general wage schedule, this is more than offset by the rise of 100 per cent in the price of products and service sold by the corporations. During this period our national dividend, which represents income of all the people, including wage earners, has increased from $35,000,000,000 to $72,000,000,000. The number of people reporting incomes of $3,000 and over increased from 357,598 to 697,055, while their incomes amounted to $7,500,000,000 in 1917 as against $3,900,000,000 in 1913.

As against this, the earnings of the telegraph company which renders a national service have been extinguished for the year 1919 unless rates are increased. These comparisons are the more significant when we realize that 80 per cent of the telegraph service is rendered to the very industries and establishments which have made these large profits in 1916 and subsequent years. It should also be noted that it is these industries which have sold to the telegraph companies the materials and supplies at largely advanced prices, and it is their competition for labor, together with the increased cost of living brought about by the high prices of their products, which has been directly responsible for the increase in wages and has necessitated the present advance in rates.

The time has now come when it is no longer possible to render telegraph service to the industries of the country at prewar prices.

—

OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
April 28, 1919.

The Postmaster General has recommended to the President that the Government return the cable lines to their respective owners. This action is made possible by the fact that the congestion resulting from war conditions has largely passed. The enemy commercial blacklist has been abolished and the tremendous volume of Government cable messages from and to the War Trade Board has ceased. The bar to commercial code messages has been removed, thus materially lessening the cable loads. The use of the cables in connection with the peace conference has been greatly diminished.

The Postmaster General hopes that the return of the cables may be effective not later than May 10.

The Postmaster General will also recommend that the telegraph and telephone lines be restored to their respective owners as soon as legislation can be secured from Congress safeguarding the interests of the owners in every way that it is possible to safeguard them.

The information of the Postmaster General as to the condition of the wire companies convinces him that it is imperative that such legislative action must be had before the various telegraph and telephone lines are returned.

This is not true as to the cable lines, which are in a condition to be returned at once.

—

OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, *April 29, 1919.*

Postmaster General Burleson to-day gave out the following statement:

"By direction of the President, the requisite orders have been issued restoring the various cable lines to their respective owners, effective May 2, 1919. The telegraph and telephone lines will be returned to the various companies as soon as legislation can be secured from Congress safeguarding the interest of the owners thereof.

"For a number of years the Postmaster General has advocated the Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone systems and has urged that they should be blended with and become a part of the postal establishment as essential agencies of communication. He is firmly convinced if such a policy were entered upon that where there are now three telegraph and telephone pole lines, and sometimes four, occupying the same highway, entailing immense waste, better and cheaper service could be given by one coordinate wire agency; that by the abolition of various supervisory forces of the wire systems, which would then be unnecessary; by complete unification of the systems, thereby eliminating the operating cost of the useless system; by thoroughly coordinating the remaining telegraph and telephone services; by the consolidation of offices and the utilization of post-office buildings where practicable; by the use of stamps as a means of eliminating costly and complicated accountings, and the utilization of the auditing and accounting forces of the Post Office Department, thereby largely eliminating those of the wire systems, that such savings could be effected that would enable those in authority, during normal times, to materially reduce the cost of the wire service to the people.

"As to the wisdom of this course the Postmaster General has not changed his views. At the time the Government took over the control of the wires extraordinary and abnormal conditions existed, resulting in a constantly increasing and very high operating cost, which has necessarily continued. The early coming of the armistice, the accentuated cost of operation and diminishing revenues, the uncertainty in the period of Government control, presented such a situation that those in charge for the Government were able to accomplish but little by way of unification or to go forward with their policies of economy, and consequently were soon brought face to face with a very serious but quite simple problem, to wit: Given increasing cost of operation plus diminishing revenues equals what? There can be but one answer—increase of rates. This action was taken. It was quite unfortunate and was taken with deepest regret, but it was imperative. To an intelligent mind this increase of rates constitutes no sound reason for a change of view on the original proposition that it is economically wise for the Government to own the wire systems as a part of the postal establishment and in no sense tends to refute the soundness of the contention that through such ownership savings would be effected that would result in a reduction of rates. For example, street car companies and other public utility organizations throughout the country, which are being operated under private control, are in many cases on the verge of bankruptcy and are petitioning for an increase in rates for their services, and, when having been granted the increases sought, often return with petitions for still further increase, basing their claims upon the higher wages and increased cost of material. The Wire Administration could not escape this condition, which extended throughout the country in relation to every form of service, public or private.

"There is quite a difference between Government ownership and Government control for a limited and very uncertain period. The present control affords no more a test of the virtues of Government ownership than could be had through a temporary receivership in a court proceeding.

"That the contention of the Postmaster General for a complete unification of the various wire systems is both wise from an economic standpoint and supported by sound business principles has been confirmed by the ablest experts on electrical transmission in America. That it should be brought about the Postmaster General still believes, preferably through Government ownership and operation as a part of the postal establishment, but if this is not done, then through some means of unified control by private ownership, over which the Government should at all times exercise a wholesome regulatory supervision. About the desirability of this the Postmaster General has had no reason to undergo a change of mind. However, for some time it has been apparent that the first of these alternatives does not meet with the approbation of the new Congress. Such being the case, there is but one course to pursue, and that is to return the various wire properties to their respective owners after urging proper legislation to safeguard the interest of all the properties, in fairness to the investors, and to insure proper service to the public.

"Having reached this conclusion, the Postmaster General does not hesitate as to his line of action."

—

Postmaster General Burleson to-day sent the following letter to Representative MOON:

"MAY 22, 1919.

"Hon. JOHN A. MOON,
"House of Representatives.

"MY DEAR JUDGE MOON: I have before me the House resolution No. 2 introduced by the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, proposing the termination of Government supervision, control, and operation of the telegraph and telephone systems. In my opinion, the enactment of this resolution, without legislation to properly safeguard the various interests involved, would be very unwise. The vexatious problems confronting the wire companies will not be satisfactorily solved by a mere return of these properties to their owners. The extraordinary increased cost of operation and maintenance which has been fastened on them as a result of the war will continue for some time after control passes from the Government. These increased costs of operation and other difficulties confronting these companies are not the result of Government control, but had been imposed on these companies as a result of the war. That this is true is conclusively shown by an examination of the conditions of the street railway systems of the country or of any other public utility. These wire properties can not, in fairness to the owners or the general public, be returned under the burden of these increased costs of operation without assurance of revenue sufficient to meet such increased cost; for otherwise the deterioration of the properties and the service will inevitably result, and the public, as well as the owners and investors in the securities of these companies will be disastrously affected. Manifestly the former rates are inadequate to produce the necessary revenue to meet existing requirements to maintain and operate these properties. New materials must be purchased at market prices, and skilled labor employed at prevailing wages. Because of these extraordinary changes in the operating conditions of these properties, a serious responsibility rests on the Government to adopt every means possible, consistent with sound policy, to protect the public and enable the owners to operate their properties free from the dangers of receiverships or the serious impairment of their values or the deterioration of this important service. In my opinion, some legislation to meet this situation is imperative.

"In response to your verbal request, I will give you the views of the Wire Control Board on the legislation which, it is believed, should be enacted before these properties pass from the control of the Government. The members of the board are unanimously of the opinion that in order to provide the most efficient wire service the various systems should be coordinated as to operation. This does not require monopoly of ownership but is necessary, so that there can be a consistent and harmonious regulatory policy. Through this means only can the attempts at wasteful competition and the economic loss occasioned by duplication of plant and force be avoided. It is believed that this desirable end can be reached by amending the law so as to provide that, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, any telegraph or telephone company doing an interstate business may purchase the property of any telegraph or telephone company, or any part thereof,

or consolidate with any other telegraph or telephone company, or pool its traffic and facilities with any other telegraph or telephone company, under provisions which will protect the interests of the public and of near-by companies.

"The Wire Control Board is also convinced that it is impossible to secure any uniformity of rates or to maintain adequate revenue for the service where a multiplicity of unassociated, independent authorities or commissions, with full authority to act, are attempting to function. Whereas it is recognized that the State has control over traffic purely intrastate, yet it is believed that it is no longer open to question that this power can not be exercised so as to interfere with interstate traffic.

"In the matter of electrical communications the intrastate and interstate activities are so interdependent that what affects one affects the other, and the character of this traffic has so changed through development that the interstate features have become the dominant and controlling factors. Hence it is believed that the law should be so amended as to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates for telegraph and telephone companies, subject to the provision of the act, and that any telegraph or telephone company whose lines are located entirely within a State but which transacts direct interstate business, through switching or other arrangements with other lines, should be made subject to the act.

"The public interests demand the most efficient wire service possible. In order that this end may be attained, adequate revenue must be provided. The plant and equipment must be of the best construction and of the very latest development of the art and must be properly maintained and depreciation and obsolescence, with reasonable reserves for surplus and contingencies, must be provided for, and also a reasonable return on the value of the property used to furnish the service. In order to make certain the maintenance of these conditions the rates of the telegraph and telephone companies falling under its jurisdiction should be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission so that they shall produce revenues sufficient to yield a reasonable return on the value of the property used in rendering service, after paying operating and maintenance expenses and providing for depreciation, obsolescence, and maintenance of such adjuncts as may be necessary for the development of the art and reservation out of income for surplus and contingencies.

"The board is also convinced that in order to provide satisfactory wire service the most efficient personnel must be secured. In order to secure and retain the service of such employees there must be assured proper working conditions, advancement of wages on the basis of demonstrated efficiency or capability, and these conditions can only be brought about by the adoption of a sound policy in the treatment of such employees. In order to assure this, a tribunal should be provided upon which the public, the employee, the managerial force, and capital shall be fairly represented and before which all parties may be heard, so that prompt redress may be had for just grievances.

"The Wire Control Board also suggests that it be provided by legislation that hereafter when any change of wage schedules for employees is contemplated the same shall not become effective until submitted to and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that when same has been given approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission the commission shall contemporaneously order such modification of rates as will meet the proposed changes in the wage schedule.

"I feel constrained by sense of duty to urge upon the committee dealing with this important matter that before action is taken a serious and unbiased consideration be given to the necessity of some such legislation before these properties are returned to their owners.

(Signed) "A. S. BURLESON, *Postmaster General.*"

—

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 9, 1919.*

Hon. JOHN A. MOON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Any legislation which proposes to turn the telephone properties back without any provision whatever in respect to the changes which have taken place, and the changing conditions which have to be met, would produce a most unfortunate situation.

For years there had been no appreciable change in the average telephone charges; the continual but steadily increasing cost, including wages, had been met by economies resulting from improvements in methods of construction and in apparatus and operating methods.

The abnormal increases due to the war could not be so met. Before the Federal control of the wire systems there was under way before the regulatory bodies in the different States a campaign of readjustment of rates to meet the abnormal increases in costs—particularly wages.

As far as determination had gone, the request had been fairly met, and there was every prospect of adequate provision being granted. When Federal control came in, all this action was suspended.

The rates approved by Federal authority and sustained by the Supreme Court were in lieu of this State action, and were based upon the same causes and needs—that is, to meet the increases in cost, and particularly in wages, already made, about to be made, or under consideration.

It is impossible from any standpoint to make any reduction in expenses—particularly wages. The service depends, in a telephone system as in no other utility system, upon the morale and interest taken by the employees. Wages must be relative to wages paid for similar class of work, the very highest paid, in order that there may be continuity in service.

To abrogate these rates for service and continue the increases will not only make further wage increases impossible by destroying the net operating revenue but will also destroy the credit of the operating companies. None of these revenues goes to paying anything more than reasonable charges on capital or is more than sufficient to establish the credit of the companies.

The maintenance of credit is necessary that the demands for extensions and expansion of service may be met.

The increase in stations in the telephone systems for the first three months of this year was greater than the total of the last year. For the next two years the estimated requirements for new cash are about $125,000,000. Each new or added subscriber's station calls for approximately $200 or upward invested in new plant and equipment, upon which the gross annual revenue averages less than $45; of this gross annual revenue over 50 per cent goes to wages.

This investment money can not be obtained without credit; without good credit the increased cost will be from 50 to 100 per cent more. Credit decreases the wage of capital and increases the possibility of good service and of meeting the demands of the public.

It will take the regulatory bodies of the various States having jurisdiction time to examine, consider, and decide equitably and intelligibly these questions.

During the period of Federal control expenses have been increased not because of Federal control but following the course of all business.

The rates approved during Federal control were based on these increases in wages and other costs.

To continue the increase in expenses, which it is impossible not to do, and not to continue the increase in revenue, which it is possible to do, is not equitable nor is it consistent with the spirit of the law authorizing Federal control or with the arrangements made with the various systems, all of which contemplated fair and just treatment, as well as compensation, and the return of the properties in as good shape as when taken.

It is only fair to the State commissions to give them an opportunity to act and not precipitate a crisis upon them which they can not avert and for which they are not responsible.

It is not asked that any power or authority which the State regulatory bodies should have be taken away. It is only asked that the Federal rates authorized to meet the increased expenses during Federal control be continued until full and proper consideration can be given. There are hundreds of important systems and many thousands of separate conditions.

At least one year's continuance of Federal rates, unless determination is reached before, should be authorized.

In our opinion this is the only way to avert a crisis which will seriously affect a service upon which the daily activities of the public are so dependent. It is not a question of capital and labor, it is a question of the public and the service.

Very respectfully,
AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.,
By THEO. A. VAIL, *President.*
THE UNITED STATES INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
By F. B. MACKINNON, *Vice President.*

—

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS, UNDER ITS WAR POWER, TO TEMPORARILY AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF FEDERAL TELEPHONE RATES BEYOND THE PERIOD OF THE WAR.

It is generally admitted that the present condition of the telephone industry of the United States is so unfortunate that it may lead to disaster. It is here sought to briefly outline the situation.

I. REMEDY SUGGESTED.

That the rates and tolls made effective or approved by Federal authority and held to be valid by the Supreme Court shall continue in effect after the passage of the pending act for not more than one year or for such time after the passage of the act, until the various National, State, or municipal regulatory authorities shall, within their jurisdictions, prescribe reasonable rates to replace them.

II. EXISTING CONDITIONS.

(1) During or because of the war, wages of telephone employees increased more than 50 per cent from 1915 to 1919; and there was a similar increase in costs of material for maintenance and extensions.

(2) The cost of capital for the business increased from an average of 6 per cent per annum before the war to an average of 8 per cent per annum in 1919. So that in 1915 improvements costing $1,000,000 would pay an interest charge of $60,000 per annum.

While in 1919 the same work would cost $1,500,000 and require an interest charge of $120,000 per annum.

(3) Before the war extension of telephone service averaged about 7 per cent annually.

During the war such increases practically stopped because of the military need of such labor and material. Since the beginning of 1919 increases have averaged at the rate of more than 13 per cent per annum, with an increased cost therefor of more than 50 per cent.

III. INCREASED RATES.

Before Federal control the telephone companies were seeking and obtaining from the States increased rates to meet their increased expenses. Federal control stopped such proceedings, but instead prescribed its own rates and tolls to care for its large increase of expenses, which have been held valid by the Supreme Court and are now, or soon will be, in effect. These may cease with the termination of Federal control, unless otherwise provided.

IV. INCREASED EXPENSES.

These increased expenses will certainly continue beyond the period of the war. Because of peculiar requirements and limitations of their State statutes, many State authorities will not soon be able to provide adequate rates and revenues to meet these pressing conditions of increased service, extensions, and maintenance. So the above remedy is suggested for temporary use only during this emergency.

V. EFFECT ON STATES.

Under this measure no State or municipal regulatory authority is deprived for one day of any of its regulatory functions; and no individual will be compelled to pay one cent for rates or tolls above the reasonable rates prescribed by the regulatory authorities of his own State or community.

VI. CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR REMEDY.

"That under its war power Congress possessed the right to confer upon the President the authority it gave him, we think needs nothing here but statement." (Chief Justice White in Dakota Central Telephone Co. *v.* State of South Dakota and other telephone cases, decided by the United States Supreme Court June 2, 1919.)

AFTER THE WAR.

Congress has similar authority under its war power to continue such rates and tolls beyond the period of the war, to provide for conditions arising during and because of the war.

The case of The United States *v.* Gettysburg Electric Railway Co. (160 U. S., 668), decided that the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893, creating the Military Park at Gettysburg, and the act approved June 4, 1894, granting the power of condemnation for the purposes of such park, were valid under the war power of Congress. These acts were passed 28 years after the close of the Civil War.

Justice Peckham, for a unanimous court, stated at page 681: "Upon the question whether the proposed use of this land is a public one, we think there can be no well-founded doubt; also in our judgment the Government has the constitutional power to condemn land for the proposed use." * * * "Congress has power to declare war and to create and equip armies and navies. It has the great power of taxation to be exercised for the common defense and general welfare. Having such powers, it has such other and implied ones as are neces-

sary and appropriate for the purpose of carrying the powers expressly given into effect. Any act of Congress which directly tends to enhance the respect and love of a citizen for the institutions of his country and to quicken and strengthen his motives to defend them, and which is germane to and intimately connected with and appropriate to the exercise of some one or all of the powers granted by Congress must be valid. This proposed use comes within such description. The provision comes within the rule laid down by Chief Justice Marshall in McCulloch v. Maryland (4 Wheat., 316), in these words: 'Let the end be legitimate and within the scope of the Constitution and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adequate to that end, which are not prohibited, or inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.'"

The Second Legal Tender case of Knox v. Lee (12 Wall., 540) held that the war power of Congress warranted its legal tender statutes, which were valid not only as to transactions before but after its enactment, and after the conclusion of the war.

The case of Stewart v. Kahn (11 Wall., 493) held that the "stay laws" were constitutional and operated in 1866, one year after the conclusion of the war. At page 506 the court stated: "The Constitution gives to Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies and navies. Congress is authorized to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into effect granted powers. The measures to be taken in carrying on war and to suppress insurrection are not defined. The decision rests fully in the discretion of those to whom the powers involved are confided by the Constitution. In the latter case the power is not limited to victory in the field and the dispersion of the insurgent forces. It carries with it the power to guard against the immediate renewal of the conflict and to remedy the evils which have arisen during its rise and progress. This act falls within the latter category. The power to pass it is really implied from its power to make war and suppress insurrection. It is a beneficent exercise of this authority."

There seem to be no cases to the contrary, so there should be no question as to the authority of Congress to extend the war rates and tolls for a reasonable period beyond the close of the war in order to properly adjust and care for conditions which have arisen during and because of the war.

This situation and the measures to meet it are respectfully presented for your consideration.

UNITED STATES INDEPENDENT
TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
(Signed) By FREDERICK C. STEVENS, *Counsel.*
WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 9, 1919.*

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the story of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MOON]. He seems to be very much agitated lest somebody gets something the Government ought to have. He wants to be certain that the compensation earned under Government operation by the telegraph and telephone companies in excess of the contract obligations of the Government by these companies shall be retained by the Government when the Government ceases to control them.

Well, the obligation of the Government of the United States to the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. is far in excess of the revenue. The compensation under the contract between the Postal Telegraph and the United States, if there is such a contract, and I think there is not, because I do not believe the Postal would agree to it, gives the Postal Telegraph Co. about 40 per cent of its earnings. Of course under the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee nobody would suffer except the Postal Telegraph Co. I assume that the excess receipts over the earnings of that company which might go into the Treasury of the United States would be handed over to the Western Union Telegraph Co. to pay the deficit under the contract.

Mr. MOON. Why does the gentleman assume such a thing as that?

Mr. MADDEN. Because I know the facts as they came out in the hearings before the Post Office Committee.

Mr. MOON. I know the facts as brought out before the committee that the Postal Co. was being paid on a valuation of $29,000,000, when under its oath it only swore to $4,000,000 valuation.

Mr. MADDEN. They did not receive any payment, and other companies were receiving payment under contracts far in excess of their earnings. The gentleman seems to be very solicitous to see the maintenance of the wage scale fixed by the Postmaster General when we turn the wires back. Most of the men that I have talked with say that they want to fix the standard wages with their own companies; that they do not want to fix the standard wages with the Postmaster General; that he has been an enemy of labor, and the evidence of that is apparent every day in the public press.

I am in favor of turning the wires back, not 30 days after the signature of the President of the United States, but immediately on the approval of the act. Why? I am in favor of turning them back immediately on the approval of the act because I have assurances that I want to give to the country that the 20 per cent increase in commercial telegraph rates forced on the Postal Telegraph Co. will be taken off immediately upon their assumption and control by the company. Of course that means that the other telegraph companies will have to meet the rates, and that means that the people of the United States will have saved $600,000 a month in telegraph rates alone. So I am not in favor, because it may cost the telegraph company something to make an accounting and report in the middle of the month, of making the American people pay $600,000 a month merely to retain another month's control by the Government. And then, too, I am in favor of declaring in that law exactly who is going to regulate the rates after we turn them back. I do not want anything ambiguous about it. I do not want any litigation to result from turning back the wires, and so I am in favor of saying in the bill that the rates fixed by the Postmaster General shall remain in effect only until the proper State and municipal authorities, naming them, shall have fixed the rates.

I am also in favor of having this bill provide that the existing toll and exchange telephone rates, as established or approved by the Postmaster General, shall remain in effect only as to such rates as were being charged prior to June 6, 1919. Some one says that they simply affect Chicago and relieve it or its people from further charges, because the charges there went into effect on the 16th of June; but it affects more than 20 States in the Union whose charges have not yet gone into effect but will go into effect under the direction of the Postmaster General, notwithstanding the fact that he is no longer to have control. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] talks about the surplus that may result from Government operation. I think it has cost the telephone users of the United States about $40,000,000 in the last year to have Government operation.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOON. Did I understand the gentleman to say a moment ago that he opposed the amendment that would permit the operators to have the same wages during the time——

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, the gentleman did not understand any such thing. The gentleman understood me to say——

Mr. MOON. No; I did not say that I understood him to say anything. I asked him what he said.

Mr. MADDEN. I said the employees I have talked to said they preferred to negotiate on the wage question with the companies rather than with the Postmaster General.

Mr. MOON. The question I asked the gentleman is how he stands on that?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman will find out when the time comes. I am going to be for what I think is legitimate. The gentleman's proposal is intended simply to embarrass somebody, and he can not embarrass me.

Mr. MOON. Oh, I know that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. I am ready to make an issue, and I am ready to turn these lines back to their owners, with the right of the State utilities commissions and the municipalities all over the country to fix the rates; and I am in favor of permitting the companies and their employees to negotiate, either by collective bargaining or in any other way they can agree upon, for compensation for labor performed.

Mr. MOON. Now the gentleman is getting at the point that I had in mind. He favors that during the Government control?

Mr. MADDEN. I am in favor of doing the thing not only during Government control but after Government control is over. I do not believe it is competent for us to legislate as to what rate of compensation shall be paid to the men who are employed either by the telephone or the telegraph companies, and I think the legislation proposed by the gentleman is a piece of subterfuge, a piece of political bunk, and he knows that just as well as anybody else does.

Mr. MOON. I know the gentleman from Illinois is very capable at dodging the truth.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Tennessee and I get along very well, and, of course, I know that he is trying to see how much mud he can throw in the eyes of the public now in order that he may be able to curry a little favor for the Postmaster General, who is not in good favor with the public or telephone or telegraph employees.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. MADDEN. The Postmaster General is a personal friend of mine. I would not have said a word about him if it had not been for the political legerdemain that the gentleman proposed in his amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. The gentleman, I am afraid, is that kind of a friend of the Postmaster General who is very kind and considerate in his presence, but who, when he is away from him, slanders and traduces him.

Mr. MADDEN. I never have done that. I have defended him when everybody else was slandering him, defended him every-

where and whenever it was necessary to defend him, and I shall defend him, regardless of what everybody may think of it, when he is right; but when it comes to a public question upon which I think the Postmaster General is wrong, I retain the right to criticize him, just as I give him the right to criticize me. We are public functionaries, subject to the criticism of the people, and I consider myself one of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I am very sorry, because I would like to say a few more things.

Mr. ESCH. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know that I can say much in that time. I first want to say in this connection, although I am starting at the front when I ought to be at the back, that we never ought to have taken these telephone or telegraph lines over; and I want to say to you, without having authority to say it from any official standpoint, that I believe they never would have been taken over if it had not been for a lot of gentlemen who own securities in these companies, a majority of whom believed the Government of the United States would retain the lines as Government property, and that they would receive Government securities in lieu of the securities they now hold, so that when they passed away they could turn these Government securities into their estates and thereby insure a standard revenue to the estate after they had passed away.

Mr. MOON. May I ask the gentleman to allow me to interrupt him for a moment for an explanation?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. MOON. Why, the gentleman is altogether surmising. The fact about it is that the thing that made it necessary in the opinion of the President and of his Cabinet to take over the telegraph wires was that under the management that then existed all foreign news in reference to the war was leaking before it got to the President and to the Cabinet.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say that foreign news did not come over the land wires.

Mr. MOON. Well, over the cables.

Mr. MADDEN. And the cable lines were never taken over until after the war was over, and the men who urged and insisted that the Government control the telegraph and telephone wires were not the President but the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Postmaster General, each of whom said before the committee, before whom they appeared, that he was in favor of Government ownership of those utilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. And that is why they wanted to experiment at the expense of the Government and at the expense of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to discuss two features of this bill as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Before I do it I desire to correct the gentleman from Illinois in one particular. In his last statement he said that the Postmaster General and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy all in their testimony before the committee, when this bill was originally passed, advocated Government ownership and operation of the telegraph and telephone wires permanently.

Mr. MADDEN. I said they were in favor of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only advocates were the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of War, according to my recollection, did not state that he was in favor of Government ownership of telegraph and telephone wires.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I am two-thirds right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which is a very high rate of correctness for the gentleman from Illinois, and I compliment him on being that near right. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the question of when this law shall take effect. When the bill passed the Senate it provided that the law should take effect immediately upon its approval by the President; that is, that the telephone and telegraph wires should be immediately turned back as soon as he signed this bill. In considering this matter before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under the testimony not only of representatives of telegraph companies but of the telephone companies themselves and the Post Office Department, it was shown that it would be very much better from every standpoint if those properties should be turned back and the question of accounting be brought to an end at the end of the calendar month; that by reason of the intricate system of bookkeeping that is carried on between the Government now and these various companies to turn them back and stop that procedure in the middle of the month, at any date during the month, would bring about unnecessary bookkeeping and accounting and bring about confusion in the settlement of accounts. Therefore our committee felt that it would be better that these financial transactions should end at the end of the calendar month in order that there might be no confusion or delay or extraordinary amount of work in settling the accounts between the companies and the Government, because there are about 15,000 different companies in the United States with which we are keeping books now in order to determine their compensation and determine the question of revenue, outgo, income, and so on. So that from the standpoint of the Government and from the standpoint of the telephone and telegraph companies we thought better that the control be terminated at the end of the calendar month. Now, it was our hope and desire this might occur on the 30th of June, and it is still our hope that that may occur; but by reason of the fact that the President is in France and this bill when enacted must be sent there by courier and that it might not be possible for him to approve the act in order that it may take effect by June 30, we provided that it shall take effect at the end of the calendar month in which he approves the act. If he should approve it under the Senate provision on the 3d of July, of course it would go into effect immediately at midnight of that date and there would be three days of bookkeeping and accounting and adjustment of compensation and all of these intricate financial transactions between the Government that would bring endless confusion and make unnecessary work for the Government, the employees, and these companies.

Now, as to the period of time, we provided that these rates would be effective after the law takes effect. I do not think there is any doubt Congress has the power to extend the operation of Government control of any of these facilities that have been taken over beyond the period of the declaration of peace.

In the railroad-control act we provided that Congress might retain control of the railroads for a reasonable period after the declaration of peace, that reasonable period not to exceed 21 months. In various acts of Congress passed during the war we have provided that they shall extend beyond the declaration of peace, beyond the end of the war, for a reasonable period, not to exceed so many months or so many years. As a matter of fact, the question of what is a reasonable time is a judicial question and one upon which Congress as a matter of law can not pass; but we have exercised a function which has been exercised in previous Congresses, of fixing a date or a period which would be a persuasive suggestion before any court as to what was a reasonable time. In this case the testimony of all the telegraph companies, with the exception of the Postal Telegraph Co., whose testimony showed that notwithstanding the raise in wages and in cost of operation they would be able immediately upon the termination of Government control to go back to the prewar charges for the sending of their messages and still be able to make sufficient dividends—as I say, the testimony, outside of the Postal, of the telephone companies and the Western Union Telegraph Co. showed conclusively, not only by their own testimony, but by the testimony of the officials of the Post Office Department, that that was not true and could not be true with respect to any of them except the Postal Telegraph Co., which, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] said awhile ago, has only about 1,000 offices in the United States. It gets the cream of the business. It has not a single telegraph office anywhere that does not pay a profit on the business that is received through that office, whereas the Western Union Telegraph Co. has over 25,000 offices, established in villages all over the United States, many thousands of which offices do not pay a profit, but are a dead loss to the company. And, therefore, what is true of the Postal Telegraph Co. is not true of any other telegraph company or of any of the telephone companies. The testimony before our committee showed that since 1914 the wages of the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. have increased $65,000,000, nearly 100 per cent; that their pay roll during 1918 was $175,000,000, and that $65,000,000 of that $175,000,000 represented an increase in the compensation of their employees since 1914. Similar increases have occurred with other companies.

The testimony also showed that the cost of materials, both raw materials and manufactured materials, had increased nearly 100 per cent since 1914, and that the cost of capital represented by the increase in the rate of interest paid upon money they must borrow to carry on their operations has increased about 50 per cent. So that we were compelled as a committee to take into consideration all these increases in wages, these increases in the raw and manufactured material, and the increase in the

cost of capital, all together making up the increase in the cost of operation which made necessary the increases in rates that were inaugurated by the Postmaster General.

Now, in respect to this increase of rates by the Postmaster General, I think it is fair to say this, that those rates would not have been increased unless it had been absolutely necessary to do so; and I think we may fairly assume from the testimony of the witnesses of the telephone and telegraph companies that, if the Government had not taken over these properties, the increase in rates would have been greater under private control and operation than under the Government.

In fact, the representatives of the independent telephone companies and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. stated before our committee that they were already in the process of having their rates increased, and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. had already secured an increase in the aggregate of over $6,000,000 in its rate before the Government took over these properties, and that they had filed before State commissions and municipal authorities applications for increases which they believed would be granted, when the Government came along and took over the properties, and therefore terminated all proceedings before the various commissions applying for an increase in rates.

Therefore, having the power, as we have exercised it, to extend the entire field of Government operation to a period beyond the war, we hold we had the power to extend any part of that control to an equal length of time beyond the war, and if we had the power under the Constitution, and the decisions are numerous that we have that power, to extend to a reasonable time beyond the period of the war the conditions that arose out of the war, if we could extend the period of Government operation and control, which includes the fixing of rates, we could extend the period in which a partial control should be in operation, to wit, the fixing of the time to which these rates already fixed by the Government should extend, unless sooner rescinded either by a revision or approval of the existing rate by the various regulatory bodies existing in the States or municipalities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I have two or three minutes more?

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] any time? Could the gentleman yield to me two minutes?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. These various telephone and telegraph companies desired a year's extension of time upon the theory that if we granted them a year's time these various commissions in the States would immediately get busy and regulate these rates, because the burden would be upon them to act immediately in order that the existing rates might not extend throughout the entire period of one year.

But we felt that we would not be justified in extending these existing rates for a period of longer than six months, and the testimony that came to our committee from the various commissions throughout the United States was to the effect that they could, operating under the machinery that governs them in the application and the determination of applications for increase or readjustment of rates, within a six months' period—and some of them stated they could within 90 days thereafter, either after holding hearings or upon evidence that was already before them—pass upon the question whether or not the existing rates were fair and reasonable. Some of them went so far as to state that they were ready without any further hearings to pass upon the question; but some of them said it would take six months for them, in the procedure which they have adopted of hearing and passing upon questions of that sort, to determine whether the rates inaugurated by the Postmaster General ought to be continued or be reduced.

Taking everything into consideration, and taking into consideration the fact that the Senate fixed 90 days for the extension of these rates, while the Post Office Department recommended 12 months and the telegraph and telephone companies desired 12 months, our committee thought we were within the range of a reasonable determination of that difference in fixing six months' time in which these rates shall be continued unless the various regulatory bodies in the States sooner determined the question.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield for a short question.

Mr. STEVENSON. Suppose they do not act. Is it the idea of the committee that the old rate is reestablished by the expiration of six months if the body charged with that duty in the State does not act within six months?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The burden is upon the State commissions to act. They can end these rates in 30 days if they desire to do so, and if there is any great desire or necessity or demand for the reduction of these rates in less than six months, then public opinion will be brought to bear upon the various commissions to compel them to act in a shorter period of time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Has the gentleman any doubt as to whether or not the State commissions have jurisdiction to fix intrastate rates? In view of the amendment cutting out the State commissions and municipalities that are found in section 1, does the gentleman believe that we yet leave to the State commissions the power to fix rates?

Mr. BARKLEY. We eliminated that language, I will say to the gentleman, as mere surplusage and as being unnecessary, because we substitute for it the various regulatory bodies having control of the fixing of rates. That includes State commissions and municipalities. That also includes the courts where there is no State commission or municipality organized to govern the fixing of rates.

For instance, in the State of Iowa the State commission has no jurisdiction to fix rates, and if there is no municipal organization authorized to fix rates somebody must go into court and attack a rate that has already been fixed before it can be changed as being unreasonable. So we submitted the determination to State commissions, municipalities, and courts, as the case might be.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I just wished to ask the gentleman what his idea is in a case where neither the courts nor the commission acts within six months. What rate is to prevail?

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is any State commission that does not act at the end of six months, it is my belief that the prewar rate shall go back, because it is the intention of Congress to give these authorities six months in which to act. If there is neither a State commission nor a municipal authority that has the power to regulate rates, then the people of that State, where that condition may exist, are relegated to the remedies they had before the Government took over those properties. In other words, they must go into court and attack the reasonableness of the rate.

Under all the conditions and by unanimous testimony adduced before our committee, we felt that 6 months is a more reasonable period than either 90 days or 12 months. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with some general remarks that I wish to make I want to say just a word in reference to the comments of some of the Members on the changes made in the Senate bill by the House committee.

Of course, it must be remembered that the expenses of telephone companies are not regulated by law in any of the jurisdictions that I know of, but the rates that the telephone companies can charge the public for their services are regulated. The companies themselves must control the expenses of their organization, which consist largely of wages, the cost of materials, and the capital they have to borrow for the conduct of their business.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. have $100,000,000 surplus in their treasury.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, my friend apparently knows more about that than I do. I do not know what their surplus is.

Now, during the period of Government control the cost of capital has increased, the cost of materials has increased, and the Postmaster General has raised wages, the cost of labor, so that when the Government turns back these properties to their owners, as we are proposing to do in this bill, we shall turn them back burdened with these increased operating or current expenses. Now, if the bill makes no provision for an extension of the increased rates which the Postmaster General has authorized, then immediately upon the taking effect of the act the increased rates must cease, because there will be no law authorizing them. I assume that in every jurisdiction in the United States there is a telephone rate authorized by the State, municipality, or other local regulatory authority. But those legal rates that are authorized in the various States have been suspended during the period of Government control, and when the period of Government control ends by the repeal of the law, then the

State rates will be revived, unless we provide in the act that the rates established by the Federal Government shall continue for a reasonable time. Of course, the bill only provides that these rates shall continue until other rates can be authorized in the different States, and in no event over six months.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will yield.

Mr. JACOWAY. I suppose the gentleman heard the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the effect that if the State or municipality did not act and Congress did not act, then automatically the prewar rates will prevail. Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; if we do not provide for an extension of the Federal rates after the termination of Federal control, the rates that are now authorized in the various States and localities will be revived and take effect at once. Now, the committee provides in this bill that the Federal rates shall continue for a reasonable period, not to exceed six months, unless they are changed in the meantime by the State regulatory authorities. But if the State regulatory authorities do not take hold of the question and fix a new reasonable rate within the six months, then at the expiration of that time the rate authorized by Congress will cease automatically, and the telephone companies will revert to the prewar rates authorized by law.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. JACOWAY. Is the gentleman prepared to show what the increased cost has been to these telephone companies, and what the increased cost of operating has been as compared to their income?

Mr. DENISON. That is shown in the hearings, but I am sorry I can not give it to the gentleman from memory. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] gave a brief statement of that. I have forgotten exactly what the increase amounts to, but I think it shows that the increase in wages is 50 per cent as compared with 1915.

Mr. JACOWAY. Did they get more out of the increased rates than the increased cost of labor and material amounted to? In other words, was there a deficit or not?

Mr. DENISON. Since the Postmaster General has put into operation the 20 per cent increase in rates there is not a deficit, except as to those companies where the Government has been enjoined by the courts from putting the new rates into effect. That has been done in a number of places, and particularly in the city of Chicago.

Mr. MADDEN. It has been done in 18 different States.

Mr. DENISON. The evidence before our committee did not show how many, but in a number of places the Government was enjoined from putting into operation the increased rates of the Postmaster General on the theory that under the law he was not authorized to make new rates. The Supreme Court has recently handed down a decision holding that he had that authority, and the injunctions are being dissolved.

The reason why this bill provides for the extension of the Federal rates is that if it is not done the companies will revert automatically and immediately to the old prewar rates, whereas their expenses will not revert to the prewar expenses. The result will be that the telephone companies will either have to immediately curtail their expenses by the reduction of wages, if they can do so, or they will go into financial difficulties and even bankruptcy.

The testimony before our committee was that a great many would be forced into bankruptcy unless they were given this remedial legislation.

As the evidence was presented to the committee it seemed that that was true, and the committee thought that we ought to afford them this remedy.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What about the increase in telegraph rates? It is not mentioned in this language.

Mr. DENISON. I am glad the gentleman has called my attention to that. As to the extension of rates established by the Postmaster General, that only applies to telephone and not to telegraph companies. The committee could not agree that we ought to extend the rates in the case of the telegraph companies the same length of time that we do in the case of the telephone companies. In fact, the president of the Western Union Co. came before the committee and said frankly that they did not ask for remedial legislation. "All we ask," he said, "is the return of the wires to the company, and in the face of that request of the president of the Western Union Co. the committee did not feel disposed to give them what they did not ask for.

On the other hand, the general attorney, Mr. Reynolds, of the Postal Telegraph Co. came before us and said, "All we want is for you to return the wires to us at once and we will at once reduce the rates to what they were before the Government took over our property."

Mr. WALSH. Of course the people are paying these charges. If we are going to turn back the telephones and effect a reduction of rates, how about the increase in telegraph rates?

Mr. DENISON. The telegraph companies can not continue the rates because they will not be authorized by law, unless this bill is amended by the House. If the bill passes as reported by the committee, the telegraph rates will revert immediately, in my judgment, to the prewar rates.

On July 16, 1918, the joint resolution authorizing the President, in time of war, to take possession and assume control of the telegraph, telephone, and cable systems and to operate them in such manner as might be desirable for the duration of the war was approved; and on August 1 following the President issued his proclamation taking over all the telegraph and telephone systems of the country. The act authorized the President, whenever he deemed it necessary for the national security or defense, to take possession and assume control of telegraph, telephone, and cable systems and to operate them for the duration of the war. So that so far as authority is concerned, the President acted within the authority conferred upon him by Congress when he took over the telegraph and telephone systems on August 1.

It was necessary to confer this extraordinary authority upon the President, who, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, was responsible for the successful prosecution of the war. Congress could not determine in a practical way when such necessity would arise. The power to act and the discretion as to when such action should be taken had to be lodged in some one, and logically it belonged in the President. We had the right to assume that the President would not exercise the extraordinary power conferred upon him unless there was an urgent necessity for such action.

As to whether or not the national security or defense was so far threatened or endangered as to justify the President in actually taking possession of the telephone and telegraph systems of the country on August 1, 1918, the people will themselves have to decide. So far as I have been able to learn there has never been shown to the country any necessity for such action, except merely the bare statement of the President in his proclamation that he deemed it necessary for the national security or defense.

It does not seem unreasonable to have expected that the President, or some one for him, would have given to the public some statement of the facts which showed that the national security or defense was endangered, and which convinced him that it was necessary for him to take over the telegraph and the telephone systems of the country at that time. If such a statement of facts has been published I have not seen it, and in the hearings upon the pending bill which is to repeal the law granting this authority to the President not a single witness has appeared to testify to any facts which even tended to show either the necessity or the wisdom of the action of the President in taking possession of the wire systems.

On the other hand, even if it should have appeared to the President that the service of the telegraph and telephone systems of the country was not as efficient as it should be, or even was not adequate in all respects to the needs of the Government during the emergency, it is not unreasonable to assume that the President would not have used the authority conferred upon him and taken over the possession and control of the wire systems, with the tremendous financial and administrative burdens and responsibilities such action would entail, unless it were clearly apparent that the efficiency of the service would be improved and greater adequacy would be realized under Government control and operation.

Yet there has not been given to the public any statement of facts upon which the President or anyone else could reasonably hope for a more efficient or more adequate telegraph and telephone service under Government ownership than under private ownership, and no witness who testified at the hearings on this bill gave the committee a single reason which would justify the President or anyone else in believing that the telegraph or telephone service of the country would be improved under Government operation.

To the contrary, every witness who testified and who was interrogated upon that question stated that the Government received nothing in the way of greater efficiency in service under operation by the Government that it would not have received under operation by the private owners of the wire systems.

The bill now before the House is a bill to repeal the power and authority conferred upon the President by the act of

July 16, 1918, and to return the wire systems to their private owners immediately, before the termination of the present war. Inasmuch as the original act conferred the power upon the President during the continuance of the present war and until the proclamation by the President of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty, and inasmuch as the present bill is to repeal that power before the termination of the war and before the proclamation of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace, the practical effect of the passage of this bill will be to rescind and, I think, to disapprove of the action of the President in taking over the wire systems and operating them by the Government.

Under such circumstances, therefore, it is fair to assume that if there was any danger to the national security or defense which made it apparently necessary for the President to take over the wire systems, or if there was any reasonable basis for the belief that by taking over the systems and operating them by the Government the efficiency of the telegraph and telephone service would be improved, some one would have been before the committee to speak for the President and defend or justify his action. Notice of the hearings was published and the Postmaster General was invited to come before the committee and make any statement he desired to make. And yet no one presented any facts to the committee either tending to show any apparent necessity for the national security or defense that would justify the President in taking possession of the wire systems or any facts upon which the President could hope or expect to obtain more efficient telegraph or telephone service under Government operation than was obtained under private operation.

If we may judge the situation from the information that has been furnished to the people by those representing the President, or by the testimony that was heard by the committee on this bill, there can be but one conclusion as to the reason which prompted the President in taking over the control and operation of the wire systems. It was the fulfillment of a desire, the realization of a hope, the consummation of a purpose that had been an obsession with Postmaster General Burleson for a number of years. Of course, it is well known that the Postmaster General has been an earnest advocate of Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone systems for years. He has spoken for it and advocated it in his annual reports. And when this power and authority was conferred upon the President to use whenever it should appear necessary for the national security or defense during the present war, the Postmaster General could not allow the opportunity of realizing his pet scheme to pass.

There can be no just criticism of Congress for conferring this power upon the President. His representatives came before the Congress and asked for it. They told us that it was necessary in the prosecution of the war for the President to have this power to use as he should deem necessary for the national security or defense. The Republicans of the House, in harmony with the policy of our party since the very beginning of the war, voted almost solidly to confer this power upon the President when he asked for it and told us it was necessary.

If the President made any mistake in using the authority conferred upon him, and I think he did, his mistake was in allowing the Postmaster General to dictate his policy. I claim that the Postmaster General is subject to just criticism and condemnation for taking advantage of the power conferred by Congress upon the President to use only in a national crisis for the national security and defense, in order to consummate a theory which with him had been a hobby for years.

In the last annual report of Postmaster General Burleson, he says:

In previous reports the Postmaster General has urged that legislation be enacted declaring a Government monopoly over all utilities for the transmission of intelligence and that steps be taken as soon as possible to make these utilities a part of the Postal Establishment. The experiences as a result of the present war have fully demonstrated that the principle of Government ownership of the telegraphs and telephones is not only sound but practical. It has been necessary as a war-emergency measure for the Congress to consider legislation authorizing the President to assume control of the telegraph and telephone systems of the country. While such control is temporary and will exist only until the ratification of the treaty of peace, yet the best results can be accomplished only when these systems are owned by the Government, made a part of the Postal Establishment, and operated solely with a view to serving the public and not of making profit or guaranteeing returns on the investment. Government ownership of the telegraphs and telephones should no longer be delayed, and the action of Congress in this matter is urgently recommended.

It was true, as the Postmaster General said, that it became necessary as a war-emergency measure for the Congress to consider legislation authorizing the President to assume control of the telegraph and telephone systems of the country. But it was not necessary for the President to use the power conferred upon him at the time he did, because the national security or defense was not threatened in any manner which could be improved by taking over the telegraph and telephone systems. With the Postmaster General still officially urging that the Government take over and own and operate the telegraph and telephone systems of the country the reason is quite apparent why they were taken over when they were.

If the Members of the House will read the hearings on this bill, the conclusion can not be avoided that the Government made a serious mistake in taking over the wire systems.

First. It resulted in a deterioration rather than an improvement in the efficiency of telegraph and telephone service.

Second. The great asset of any telephone or telegraph system is the morale and the spirit not only of the personnel of its management but of the employees in its organization, and every witness, I believe, who was interrogated upon that question testified that Government control and operation had resulted in a decrease in the morale of the telegraph and telephone organizations.

Third. Financially the operation of the wire systems by the Government has resulted in a deficit, and there will be a considerable deficit in the accounts when the systems are turned back to their private owners.

Fourth. There have been increases in expenses and expenditures by the wire systems which would not have occurred under private management. And these increases in current expenses have made it necessary to increase current revenues by general increases in telegraph and telephone rates and charges. These increases in rates and charges must be continued by the Government for a time after the wire systems are returned to their owners.

Fifth. The operation of wire systems by the Government has discouraged and even prevented extensions and improvements in the service to an extent which I do not believe would have happened under private management.

Sixth. The people have been given poorer service at a greatly increased price as the result of Government operation.

These facts, I think, were clearly shown in the hearings, and the result has been that there is practically a unanimous demand from all parts of the country for the immediate termination of Government control and the return of the wire systems to their owners.

As to the cables I do not think there was ever a more bold and inexcusable abuse of power by a public official than was committed by the President in taking over the cable systems after the signing of the armistice with the enemy. Everyone knew that when Germany signed the armistice with the allies she was defeated. There was no hope of her renewing the struggle, and there can be no stretch of the imagination by which it could be reasonably said that there was at that time any "necessity for the national security or defense" which would justify the taking over of the cables. Our enemies had already been defeated and were begging for peace. No outside enemy was threatening our security or defense. If there is any Member who has information of any danger that was threatening the security or defense of the Nation at the time the cable systems were taken over by the President, he should give the country the benefit of such information now. In the absence of at least some convincing facts we are entitled to conclude, as I think the country has already concluded, that the cables were taken over for some other purpose not connected with the national security or defense.

It was shown in the hearings that the current expenses of operating the wire systems have increased considerably since the beginning of the war, and particularly during Government control. The increase in wages to the employees of the Bell telephone system amounted to $20,800,000 during the year 1918, and for the first three months of 1919 was $11,200,000. There has been a considerable increase in the cost of material, both raw and manufactured, and an increase of about 2 per cent in the cost of capital. These increases in the cost of raw and manufactured materials and in the cost of capital, together with the large increases in wages that have been granted by the Postmaster General during Government control, have added enormous burdens to the wire systems, and in the judgment of the Postmaster General has made it necessary for him to increase telephone and telegraph rates, tolls, and charges.

The most serious question before the committee was as to what should be done by way of remedial legislation to protect the telephone companies in the increased tolls and rates author-

ized by the Postmaster General after the wire systems are returned to their owners. The bill provides remedial legislation. It provides in section 1 that the telephone companies may lawfully charge the rates that were authorized and established by the Postmaster General prior to June 6 for a reasonable time after the return of the systems to their owners, but not to exceed six months, unless in the meantime such rates are changed by the State, municipal, or other proper regulatory authorities.

This provision of the bill, I think, is just and fair, and should receive the sympathy and approval of the House.

Upon that question it must be remembered that the wire systems were taken over by the Government without the invitation or consent of their owners. The country was at war and the owners patriotically acquiesced in the action of the Government. But, so far as I am concerned, I am unwilling to see them punished or penalized in any way by the action of the Government. Congress can not afford to take any action that will inflict an injustice and a serious financial loss upon any part of the people.

It has been shown in the hearings that the operating expenses of the telephone companies have been very largely increased during the period of Government control, due not only to the increase in wages allowed by the Postmaster General but to the increase in the cost of materials and the cost of capital as well. To meet this increase in operating expenses the Postmaster General, as I have said, found it necessary to increase the operating revenues of the companies by at least 20 per cent, and even with that increase some of the companies are being operated at a loss. The moment that the Government control ceases and these properties revert to their owners the new schedules of tolls and rates authorized by the Postmaster General during Government control will become unlawful because they are unauthorized and unapproved by the various State, municipal, and other regulatory authorities, and the various telephone companies of the country will automatically fall back to the prewar rates authorized by the various regulatory bodies before the war unless Congress shall by remedial legislation provide that the rates authorized by the Postmaster General shall continue until changed by the various State regulatory authorities. The telephone companies claim that unless they are given this remedial legislation and allowed to continue charging the increased rates and tolls authorized by the Postmaster General until other reasonable rates can be established according to law most of them will be seriously injured financially and many of them will be forced into bankruptcy. Their claims in this respect seem to be reasonable and, so far as the hearings disclose, are undisputed.

Personally, I feel that the telephone and telegraph rates that have been authorized by the Postmaster General during Government control are too high and should be reduced. I feel that he has placed an unjust burden upon the people of the country who have to use the telegraph and telephone systems. But this is one of the penalties which the country must suffer as a result of too much Burleson.

Mr. Burleson took advantage of the power conferred by Congress upon the President and launched the Government into an experiment of socialism, and the people, as usual, have to pay the price. So long as the theorists and the dreamers are given power to try out their theories of socialism and other isms that are so prevalent in the world to-day, the people must know that, after all, the cost of the experiments must be borne by them.

In the end it may be that Mr. Burleson's little excursion into the realm of Government ownership may prove a blessing. I am sure it will do so if, as a result of it, the people learn that the Government can not conduct a business enterprise with the same economy and efficiency as can business men who conduct the business under the stimulus of competition and the fundamental advantage that comes from personal interest. Our experiment in Government ownership of the telegraphs and telephones under Mr. Burleson's plans will prove expensive to the American people. What Congress should do is to get away from it as soon as possible, remembering that we must do justice to those whose properties have been taken from them without their consent, while we at the same time endeavor to see that the loss to the public is made as small as possible.

The committee has endeavored to do justice to the owners of the telephone companies by providing in section 1 of the bill that the rates authorized and approved by the Postmaster General shall continue as lawful rates after the properties are returned to their owners for a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, unless before that time they are modified by the various State or local regulatory authorities.

The Senate bill legalizes the rates only three months after the properties are returned. We thought three months too short a time in which to allow the telephone companies to file their schedule of rates and allow the State commissions to grant hearings and determine the new rates to be authorized under changed conditions. In Minnesota, I believe, there are over 1,000 local telephone companies, and there are large numbers in other States, of course. It will be an immense task for the State commissions or other regulatory authorities to consider all of the schedules of rates proposed by the different telephone companies and determine what rates shall be reasonable. In the judgment of the committee three months was not sufficient time. If the rates authorized by the Postmaster General are only continued for a period of three months, after which the telephone companies must drop back to prewar rates automatically, the inevitable result would be that the different State commissions or other regulatory authorities would be unable or unwilling to undertake in that short time complete hearings on all of the schedules filed by the different telephone companies under their jurisdictions, and it would result in inaction upon their part, because they would know that by refusing or failing to act during that time the telephone rates would revert to prewar rates anyway at the end of the three months. Therefore, by fixing the time too short, Congress would encourage inaction on the part of the State regulatory bodies, whereas it is our purpose to encourage action upon their part as early as possible.

It was the judgment of the committee that the rates should be continued a reasonable time after the return of the properties to their owners, not to exceed six months, unless during that time the State commissions would act. And I believe that by fixing the time at six months the people themselves and the various State commissions or other regulatory bodies will be encouraged to give early consideration to the new schedules that are to be authorized, in order that the people may be quickly relieved of the burdensome rates fixed by the Postmaster General, if such rates are in fact unreasonable.

The question has been raised as to whether or not Congress has the constitutional authority to authorize telephone tolls and rates after the properties have been returned to their owners and after the Government control has ceased, and indeed after the war has ended. This is a question of constitutional law that is interesting and not entirely free from doubt. The wire control act of July 16, 1918, was passed purely as a war measure under the war powers of Congress, and it authorized the President to operate the wire systems "in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war," and expressly provided that the "Government supervision, possession, control or operation should not extend beyond the date of the proclamation by the President of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace."

This bill repeals the law before it would otherwise terminate under its provisions and before the declaration of peace. But provides that after the President's power shall terminate the rates authorized and established during the period of Government control shall continue a reasonable time thereafter, not to exceed six months. The date fixed in the bill for the return of the wire systems to their owners is the last day of the calendar month in which the act is approved by the President. If this bill is passed and approved by the President during the calendar month of June, the wire systems will, under its terms, be returned to their owners on the last day of the present month; and the telephone tolls and rates authorized and approved by the Postmaster General will continue not longer than the last day of December next, unless they are sooner changed by the State or other regulatory authorities.

If the war should not end, or if the date of the proclamation of the President of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace should not happen to be before the expiration of the six months after the return of the wire systems to their owners, then the question of the constitutional authority of Congress to authorize the continuance of rates would not arise, because if Congress under its war powers had the constitutional authority to pass the original act authorizing the President to take over and control and operate the wire systems during the war, it must necessarily follow that Congress would have the authority during the continuance of the war to provide for the continuance of rates fixed by the Government during its period of control, for this bill really amounts to an amendment of the original wire-control act, in that it terminates completely the Government control and operation, but continues for a reasonable period, not to exceed six months thereafter, the rates fixed by the Federal Government. And in my judgment there can be no question as to the full authority of Congress in that respect.

But if the treaty of peace should soon be signed, as we all hope it will, and if shortly thereafter the President should issue his proclamation of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty

of peace, there might arise a serious question as to the constitutional authority of Congress to extend Federal telephone tolls and charges for a period of several months after the wire systems have been completely returned to their owners and after the war has legally ended. Inasmuch as the provision for the extension of telephone rates applies equally to intrastate as well as interstate rates, the validity of that provision would rest solely upon what is known as the war powers of Congress.

That provision of the Constitution which authorizes the Congress to declare war has been construed to include the power to carry on war that has once been declared; and the courts have uniformly held that where an express power is given to Congress by the Constitution all those powers which are necessary to or which may fairly contribute to the complete exercise of the power conferred will be implied. Whatever may be said to be reasonably necessary to enable Congress to fully carry out its express power of conducting war will be implied, and I think it is equally true that the powers which the Congress may constitutionally exercise during the actual period of hostilities it may continue to use for a reasonable period after the termination of hostilities and while the conditions growing out of the war continue to exist.

It was upon this theory that the railroad-control act authorized the President to continue in possession and operation of the railroads for a period of 21 months after the end of the war, and other acts of Congress passed in pursuance of the war power provide that the power shall continue for a reasonable time after the end of the war.

Wherefore, if it be granted, and I think it must, that under its war powers Congress could properly authorize the President to take over the wire systems and control and operate them during the continuance of the war, then it must follow that Congress can under the same power properly extend the telephone tolls and rates for a reasonable period, not to exceed a fixed time, after the end of the war and while the conditions brought about by the war continue to exist.

Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheat., 316), said of the implied powers of Congress:

> Let the end be legitimate and within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adequate to that end, which are not prohibited or inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

In the case of the United States *v.* Gettysburg Electric Railway Co. (160 U. S., 668) the Government sought to condemn certain private property on the battle field of Gettysburg, Pa., for the purpose of securing title in order to enable the Government to erect monuments and markers and construct roads and boulevards through the battle field. And the action was begun under acts of Congress passed for that purpose in 1893 and 1894. The validity of the acts of Congress authorizing the Secretary of War to proceed as above indicated was challenged by the owners of the property. The court, in a unanimous decision, said:

> Congress has power to declare war and to create and equip armies and navies. It has the great power of taxation, to be exercised for the common defense and general welfare. Having such powers, it has such other and implied ones as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of carrying the powers expressly given into effect. Any act of Congress which directly tends to enhance the respect and love of a citizen for the institutions of his country and to quicken and strengthen his motives to defend them, and which is germane to and intimately connected with and appropriate to the exercise of some one or all of the powers granted by Congress, must be valid. This proposed use comes within such description.

During the Civil War Congress passed what was known as a "stay" law, or an act suspending the limitation laws, and providing that where service could not be had on account of war conditions actions would not be barred until a certain time after war conditions had ceased. This amounted to a suspension of the period of limitation for bringing actions until a time more than a year after the end of the Civil War, and the validity of the act of Congress was questioned on constitutional grounds. It was claimed that Congress had no authority to pass a law of that kind that should continue in effect for that length of time after the end of the war. In passing upon the case the Supreme Court said, in the case of Stewart *v.* Kahn (11 Wall., 493.):

> The Constitution gives to Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies and navies. Congress is authorized to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into effect granted powers. The measures to be taken in carrying on war and to suppress insurrection are not defined. The decision rests fully in the discretion of those to whom the powers involved are confided by the Constitution. In the latter case the power is not limited to victory in the field and the dispersion of the insurgent forces. It carries with it the power to guard against the immediate renewal of the conflict and to remedy the evils which have arisen during its rise and progress. This act falls within the latter category. The power to pass it is really implied from its power to make war and suppress insurrection. It is a beneficent exercise of this authority.

In the recent telephone cases in which the authority of the Postmaster General to fix telephone rates under the wire-control act of Congress of July 16, 1918, was challenged, the Supreme Court held that under its war power Congress possessed the right to confer upon the President the authority it gave him, and expressed the view that the purpose was so plain that it needed nothing more than a bare statement of it without further argument.

I think Congress is clearly authorized under its war power to provide for the extension of the telephone rates authorized and established by the Postmaster General for a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after the return of the properties to their owners, and that this is true even though the time of the extension of the rates may reach beyond the end of the war.

Mr. Chairman, when the President represented to Congress that it was necessary in the prosecution of the war that he be given power to take over the telephone, telegraph, cable, and radio systems of the country during the continuance of the war, I voted for the act which conferred upon him that authority, because I was unwilling to withhold from him any authority or power which he, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, said was necessary to enable him to successfully prosecute the war. I think Congress properly granted him this authority. But I do not believe the President was justified in taking over the telegraph, telephone, or cable systems when he did so. I do not believe that the national security or defense was threatened or endangered to such an extent that it was necessary for the President to take possession and control of the telegraph and telephone systems and operate them as a Government agency. And even though the telegraph or telephone service may not have been as efficient as it should have been, or may not have fully answered the necessities of the Government, I still do not think the President acted wisely in taking the systems over, because there was no hope or promise of improving the service under Government ownership and operation.

I believe that the wire systems were taken over by the Government upon the advice and the request of the Postmaster General and other members of the Cabinet who for years have believed in the Government ownership of these utilities and who took advantage of the war power conferred upon the President to experiment with their theory and accomplish a purpose which they knew could not be accomplished under normal peace conditions. I believe that the action of the President in taking over the cables after the armistice had been signed was wholly without justification or proper excuse. It could not have been done for national security or defense and must have been done for some other purpose which the President has not yet chosen to disclose.

I think that the wire systems should all be returned to their owners at the earliest possible date. In doing so, I do not think Congress should by any action on its part punish or penalize the owners of these properties, but rather should we protect them from loss or injury as a result of their possession and control by the Government. Their properties are turned back to them by the Government with added burdens, and we should protect them for at least a reasonable time by authorizing the increased rates until such time as the State, municipal, or other regulatory authorities under which they operate have time to hear them and determine what rates they may lawfully charge. We must make the burdens of the public as light as possible, consistent with justice and fair dealings to the owners of these properties. But whatever the additional burdens of the public who use the telephones may have been during the period of Mr. Burleson's reign or whatever they may be hereafter until the rates can be properly readjusted must be charged up to the folly of Government ownership and the unfortunate determination of the Postmaster General in forcing the country into this expensive experiment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 33 minutes out of 60.

Mr. SIMS. How much has the gentleman from Wisconsin left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 18 minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this legislation should have been enacted at the last session. The telegraph and telephone wires should have been restored as soon as the emergency that caused them originally to be taken in hand by the Government ceased to exist.

I would like to state generally on this question of the telegraph and the Government that I had thought prior to this war and our Government experience with the telegraph and telephone lines that the argument in favor of postalizing, at least of the telegraph, was justifiable in the public interest. I am not so sure at this time whether it is not a debatable question, but certainly my faith has been very much shaken in the proposition by the experience in the operation by the Government since we took them over during the progress of this war.

I would like to make a few frank comments as to the situation that has developed out of this matter. I shall not do so with the thought that this is a political question or that it involves in the slightest degree any criticism of the distinguished gentleman who is Postmaster General.

I doubted in the first instance the actual necessity of taking over the wires, and yet upon suggestions made at the time I voted for the legislation just as did many Members on both sides of the House.

It was only a war emergency or necessity. The owners of these properties understood, the people of the country understood, that when the emergency which induced taking of them over ceased they should be returned. The Government, or the Post Office Department as the administrator of the wires, in good faith should not have attempted to scramble these properties, but should have striven to return them as far as possible in the same condition as when taken over.

I have one criticism to make of the condition that existed while these wires were being administered by the Government. It was an inappropriate time in which to attempt to postalize them or to institute a propaganda for Government ownership. Whenever we come to consider the question of the ownership of the wires and their operation by the Government it ought to be as a separate and independent proposition, not at a time when we hold the wires under the sovereign war power of the Government. It ought to be under conditions where the Government and the owners each have their rights safeguarded, so that the right of the owners to just compensation and the exercise of sovereignty by the Government may be considered and undertaken with equal justice to the Government and to the owners of the property. And with great respect to whoever is responsible for it, I believe a mistake has been made, one which was unfair, inappropriate, and untimely, in the institution of a propaganda for Government ownership while the sovereign held these wires under its power in time of war.

Government operation has been unfortunate, and if we are to take the experience of the Government as one which would follow postalization and ownership and operation of the wires, as a part of the postal administration, we have certainly experienced very little to encourage that proposition.

The service has deteriorated. The efficiency of the employees has depreciated. In other respects the public have been inconvenienced and embarrassed. I am not undertaking to fix responsibility for those deficiencies. I do not know whether it was the fault of the administration or was inherent in the fact of Government operation, but to whatever the condition may be attributed, it has been extremely unfortunate, and has created almost a universal desire on the part of the American people for a return of these properties to their owners. I do not wish to think, because I do not desire to be critical, that it was the fault of the Post Office administration, but rather that it was due inherently to the attempt of the Government to operate the telephone and telegraph wires for the public. There have been conflicts, dissensions, disagreements between the administration of these public utilities and the owners of them. Criticisms and charges have been made by one of the great telegraph companies—the Postal—as to unfair compensation paid to them, and as to the compensation paid to the other great telegraph company, the Western Union. Constant friction has existed between the administration of these utilities and the employees of these utilities. Wherever the fault has been, and I do not attribute it to the Postal administration, it has created a settled conviction in the minds of a large majority of the American people against the wisdom either of ownership or of operation of the telegraph and telegraph lines as a part of the Post Office Department.

I believe the time has come when we ought to return the wires, and ought to return them immediately. I think the committee acted wisely in not attempting to perpetuate even for a definite length of time the rates of the telegraph companies, because it has appeared in the public prints and in information which has come to the membership of the House that one of those companies, at least—the Postal Telegraph Co.—intends to restore immediately the rates which existed prior to the time they were taken over by the Government, and presumably its chief competitor—the Western Union Telegraph Co.—will be compelled to do likewise. They seem to be both of one mind upon that subject—that there should be no interference by legislation against the restoration of the rates prevailing before they were taken over by the Government.

I hope the convenience of the President may enable him to return in time to sign this bill before June 30, in order that by midnight at the end of this month these lines may be restored.

There are questions of compensation to the telegraph companies. There will be more complicated questions as to compensation to the telephone companies, and it was wise on the part of the committee to recommend full time for the adjustment of this matter by the Government. It is provided in the bill, and wisely so, that if there shall be any reduction in the rates or adjustment voluntarily, or if there shall be any adjudication by the public authorities before the end of the six months, that it take effect immediately, the period of six months being only a maximum time such existing rates may continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. I am not sure that I shall consume the time. Mr. Chairman, I have great admiration for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the former chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

But frankness and honesty with myself leads me to disagree to the two amendments which the gentleman says he will offer to this bill. One of his amendments attempts to continue during the six months' period the rate of wages paid to employees by both the telegraph and telephone companies. Now, there is nothing in this bill continuing for six months the present telegraph rates, and presumably they will be reduced to the original rates existing prior to their taking over by the Government, and it ought to be left to the telegraph companies and their employees to fix wages just as it is between the employer and employee of every public utility company in the United States, subject only to governmental agencies by way of arbitration or otherwise as are authorized to adjust them. I do not think such amendments appropriate even to the telephone companies.

Mr. MOON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. If you are going to continue the present high Government rates of telegraph and telephone companies, is it fair to the laborers to reduce their wages? If you are going to leave that question at all open, ought not you to provide in the bill for an immediate turning over of everything and let them have control of all, and so long as they are in Government control ought not the wages to be what the Government fixes them at inasmuch as you maintain the compensation which is excessive and beyond the ordinary compensation to a corporation? In other words, can the gentleman stand once for the labor interests of this country as against the corporate power?

Mr. SMALL. I will not only stand once, but I will stand all the time.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman does not do it now.

Mr. SMALL. I stand for whatever is fair and just, but I object to selecting one public utility in the United States and fixing the wages of employees by legislation, when every other public utility must fix the scale of wages by agreement with its employees. I am informed that the employees prefer to deal directly with the telegraph and telephone companies.

This does not appeal to my sense of fairness. Then there was another amendment that in the account with the telegraph and telephone companies during those months that those rates remained, or for a lesser time, I suppose the gentleman meant, that any amount they earned in excess of the former fixed compensation should be paid back to the Government for the purpose of meeting any deficit which may have been created during their operation. I am sorry any deficit was created. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] stated, and I have also seen it in the public press, that the Postal Telegraph Co. have earned millions of dollars more than the compensation which the department attempted to fix for them, while the other great telegraph company has earned very much less than the department agreed to pay them as compensation.

Mr. MOON. I will say to the gentleman that he is mistaken in his facts.

Mr. SMALL. In the facts?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin yield me a minute more?

Mr. ESCH. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman says I am wrong in my statement to the effect that the Postmaster General entered into an

agreement with the Western Union to pay them a much larger sum than that company actually earned, while he offered to the Postal Telegraph Co. a sum or compensation less by several millions than this company earned. I think I am correct and that the records will sustain me. The gentleman from Tennessee is ordinarily so accurate in his statements that I hesitate to disagree with him, unless I have immediately at hand official evidence to the contrary.

Mr. MOON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SMALL. I have only a minute more. I do not wish to ask for any more time. I do wish to say in conclusion, though, and this is the crux of the whole matter regarding this amendment and regarding the relationship of the Government to these companies, that they were taken over only by reason of the exigencies of war. Such legislation would not have been constitutional in time of peace. Now that the war has been concluded they are entitled to be returned to their owners as far as possible in the same shape as they were when they were taken over in every respect. That appeals to me as a fair and just proposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise. This is for a temporary purpose.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORES of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 120) to repeal the telephone and telegraph act, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

REPEAL OF TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH ACT.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 120.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana took the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry, not so much addressed to the Chair as to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]? Is the program here this afternoon to be pursued to the conclusion of this measure?

Mr. ESCH. I will say to the gentleman it is intended to get to the previous question and then rise and make it the unfinished business to-morrow, and thus get it out of the way of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I had been so informed, but I wished to confirm the information which I had previously been given. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, at the last session of Congress a resolution somewhat similiar to this one was introduced and referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, of which I am a member, and we went into considerable hearings on the general situation of Government operation of the telegraph and telephone lines, and also as to the proposition of turning them back to their owners, and at the end of these hearings we favorably reported a bill that would have relinquished their control on December 31st of this year. The reason that we made it of that date, and not sooner, was because the facts presented to us in our hearings had shown our committee that there were certain difficulties in the way of readjustment of rates, increased operating costs, occasioned by war conditions, and other related matters, which would seem to indicate that some degree of consideration must be given the companies in turning them back from Government operation and control. The interests of the public, the employees, and the companies, all seemed to us to demand this.

The committee that has had under consideration the present bill proposes to relinquish the operation and control of these wire systems on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved, and which no doubt will be the present month of June, and to keep the rates heretofore ordered by the Postmaster General in force for a period of six months, unless otherwise changed by the public utilities commissions of the several States or the municipal authorities. So I regard this bill as substantially the same solution of the problem as the bill we brought out at the last session of Congress, and therefore I shall give it my very willing support.

I am in favor of turning these companies back to their owners. I have no criticism to offer of the Postmaster General and his able subordinates in the conduct of the service during the time that the Government has had possession of these systems. They have labored under many difficulties incident to war conditions, and, now that these difficulties have passed in a large measure by reason of the signing of the armistice and the stabilizing of conditions, I believe that good faith on the part of the Government demands that there be no delay in turning these lines back. They were taken over as a war emergency, whether wisely or not, and now that emergency is past and I think we are nearly all agreed that Government control and operation should end.

A good deal of criticism has been directed at the Postmaster General in the public print and certain avenues of propaganda—not much of it on the floor of the House this afternoon—on account of the fact that he increased the rates both as to telegraph and telephone lines. But the public should bear in mind the fact that since the outbreak of the war the general level of wages in this country has increased more than 70 per cent. We have the authority of Mr. Royal Meeker, Chief of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, for that statement, and I am sure he does not overestimate it. In many industries such as the steel and textile industries this increase has been as much as 100 per cent since 1914. Now, the hearings show that during this same period of time the increase of wages to telegraph and telephone companies was only about 30 per cent. Thus we have a general level of raises of more than 70 per cent and only 30 per cent to telegraph and telephone employees during this same period of time.

Now, the telegraph and telephone companies have made a good showing, both before the Senate committee and the House committee, that in granting the 30 per cent raise in wages, to which I have just referred, they did so out of economies of administration and other savings in operation. They met those difficulties for the most part not by raising rates but by good business judgment—by economies of their own. But they had reached that point where they had about exhausted these means and could no longer meet the situation by increased economies and give the public the service that was required. I speak, of course, for the companies in general and the situation as a whole. No doubt there were some companies which could have made it all right without any increase at all. But I am sure it will be readily conceded that the Postmaster General in dealing with the situation had to deal with it as a whole and not isolated instances here and there. And, therefore, in view of the indisputable facts the Postmaster General had no alternative except to make some increases in rates.

Now, how much are these increases? A great deal of misapprehension and misunderstanding has existed throughout the country as to that fact. I think that a reading of the hearings will show that the telephone companies throughout the country will have an increase of receipts of about $40,000,000 per annum. Now, let us see what are their annual receipts. As most of us know, all telegraph companies and all telephone companies that have annual receipts of more than $5,000 have to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission. In their reports for the year 1917 it is shown that as to the telephone companies which received more than $5,000 annual income in any one year their total receipts amounted to $391,476,926. Therefore if there is an annual increase of $40,000,000 in their total gross receipts, it is just a little more than 10 per cent, taking it throughout the country.

Now, it is true that in some States where the public utilities commission had made low rates the percentage is much greater than 10 per cent; but when you take these rates as a blanket and spread them over the whole United States you find that the increases which the Postmaster General has made are just a little more than 10 per cent as to the telephone companies.

Now, no one is further from being an advocate of Government ownership than I am, because I have always announced my position unhesitatingly in the House on that question, and no one is in doubt where I stand; but I do not think that criticism should be hurled at the Postmaster General for things for which he is in no wise responsible. It is not just. It is not fair play.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] rather suggested the idea that the Postmaster General has attempted in a sort of a way to conduct a propaganda for Government ownership while he has had charge of the wires. I know of no such propaganda, I have heard of none, and I do not believe there has been any.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Knowing, when the wires were taken over, that the Postmaster General was unqualifiedly in favor of Government ownership, would it not be presumed that he would not in advance do anything that would unpopularize that theory unless it was a thing necessary to be done?

Mr. BLACK. I think the gentleman has the correct idea about the matter. I recall very distinctly reading the Postmaster General's statement before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House at the time the original bill authorizing the Government to assume control of the wires was pending, and he very frankly stated to the committee that he was in favor of Government ownership of the wire systems. "But," he said, "I am not urging that as the reason at all for taking them over at the present time."

Then, there is another question that I want to advert to just for a moment. A great deal of criticism has been heaped upon the Postmaster General on account of his attitude toward organizations of Government employees and also the employees of the telegraph and telephone companies. I think that quite a good deal of misapprehension and of misunderstanding as to the Postmaster General's position on that question exists. I believe that when his attitude is well understood, that most right-thinking men will approve it. Last week you will recall that Mr. Noonan, who is president of the Electrical Workers' Union of America, consisting of, I believe, about 130,000 members, gave order for a general strike to take place on Monday of this week, and in a statement of his, which he gave out, he set forth certain demands that would be made by the union, and among those demands the first one was this: The right of labor to organize without interference. Well, that sounds all right, and is all right, and it was entirely agreeable to the Postmaster General. I have never understood that he took any contrary position. The next demand was that "there should be no discrimination against organized employees." Now, that, too, is all right; it sounds all right, and is all right, and the Postmaster General does not object to that demand, and never has so far as I know.

But there is an inquiry that I want to submit at that point, and that is this: Is organized labor willing to indorse the reverse of the proposition, which is: That no honest, capable workman should be denied employment because he is not a member of a labor union? [Applause.] In other words, will they admit the justness and fairness of the open shop? That is what I contend for and what the Postmaster General contends for. I admire him for it, and I only wish we had more Government officials of his backbone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield me two minutes more?

Mr. SIMS. I have no time that I can yield.

Mr. ESCH. We have only one other speech on this side.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; I will yield him a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. BLACK. I just wanted to amplify this thought further.

In the same newspaper in which I read the demands of the electrical workers' union, to which I have already referred, I also read where four motormen and conductors in Muskogee, Okla., were beaten into insensibility by striking employees becaused they dared to exercise their free-born American privilege of working without belonging to a labor union. The account of this damnable outrage is as follows:

ISSUE WARRANTS FOR STRIKERS CHARGING INTENT TO KILL.

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *June 11.*

Warrants charging 11 men, including J. J. Green, president of the local street car men's union, with assault with intent to kill were issued by County Attorney W. W. Cotton to-night.

The warrants resulted from an attack yesterday upon four motormen and conductors. The men were "beaten to a pulp," physicians who dressed their wounds said. The police declare they were pummeled with pieces of iron and bricks.

Mayor John L. Wisener to-day instructed Chief of Police Hughes to swear in 150 special policemen. Under the protection of these special officers, the cars will again be run Friday.

W. T. Chapman, a strike breaker, was taken from his room in a hotel to-day and severely beaten.

Lieut. Gov. Trapp has refused "temporarily" Mayor Wisener's request for State troops.

I would not refer to this act of lawlessness if it were only an isolated instance and one of rare occurrence, but every Member here knows that these things are of frequent occurrence and are symptomatic of a condition that must be corrected by a firm and unyielding enforcement of the law, or the failure to do it is going to give us serious trouble sooner or later. When strikes occur I see no objections to members of labor unions trying to induce the working employees by reason and persuasion to join the union, but the method of doing it by intimidation and violence and denouncing all workers who do not belong to the union as scabs and calling them other vile names is outrageous, un-American, and intolerable to a free people, and it is my opinion that if organized labor does not purge itself of these methods and the elements which advocate them it is going to reap the harvest of its sowing. It is sowing to the wind and will surely reap the whirlwind.

The great body of American people believe in law and order and organized government and the protection of the citizen in his life, liberty, and property, and they are going to have it if they have to deport or put in jail every anarchist and law defyer in the country. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. SMALL were given leave to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ESCH. Has the gentleman exhausted his time?

Mr. SIMS. No; I have seven minutes remaining.

Mr. ESCH. I have only one other speech on this side.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, the course of the debate has covered almost every feature of the subject embraced in the bill. Having been chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the time this wire-control resolution was reported by the committee and passed by the House, I remember distinctly that no witness before the committee advocated the taking over of the wires for the purpose of Government control and operation with a view of trying to popularize or advance Government ownership. The Secretary of War distinctly disclaimed anything of the sort, and so did the Secretary of the Navy; and the Postmaster General said frankly, "Government ownership of all means of the communication of intelligence is one of my hobbies, but I do not ask for the passage of this bill in support of any purpose of that kind."

Now, the resolution provided no revolving fund, no appropriation. Not a dollar of money was furnished to the Postmaster General, or to whoever was to take over and operate the wires. Under the resolution which passed the House nobody knew who the President would authorize to carry out its provisions, though it was generally supposed it would be the Postmaster General. When the Postmaster General took charge of the wires there was only one possibility in sight for him, and that was to operate the wires out of current receipts, and in order to make a success of it, of course, expenses could not be increased without a relative increase of rates, and I think I personally know that it almost broke the heart of the Postmaster General to authorize an increase in rates. He started out by reducing some of the rates on night messages and long-distance messages, as Members no doubt will remember; but the cost of wages and material advanced far beyond what it was supposed was likely to take place at the time the wires were taken over. It was impossible for the Postmaster General to advance wages and not produce a deficit, unless he could also advance rates sufficiently to cover the additional expense incurred by the advance of wages. In some instances, perhaps not all, where applications were made to advance wages, he consulted the local authorities having the power to grant increases of rates, and in nearly every case, as far as I now recall—I can not remember them in detail—the rates were authorized to be increased equal to the increase in wages for particular localities. Wages were thus advanced and rates were advanced accordingly, but suits in many cases were brought to enjoin the increases of rates, and naturally no suits were brought to enjoin the increase in wages, so it was utterly impossible for the Postmaster General to prevent a deficit unless he could increase rates to the extent of the increase in wages, and of course he could not ignore an injunction by a court of competent jurisdiction. Injunctions were granted in many jurisdictions. The Chicago case is a notable one, on account of the vast amount involved. These injunctions were granted upon the theory that the Postmaster General did not have the power to increase rates, while he might have power to increase wages. One of those suits was determined by the

Supreme Court of the United States upholding and sustaining the power of the Postmaster General to increase the rates.

Now, all the time that these injunctions have been in force no increase in rates was in effect in the jurisdictions covered by the respective injunctions, which thus produced a deficit. The object and purpose of the amendment spoken of by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], which he is proposing, will have the effect to prevent the administration receiving the rate it would have received if the injunctions had not been sued out, and it will have the effect to permit the companies in those localities that sought the injunctions to receive a direct appropriation out of the Federal Treasury to the extent that the Government fails to collect the rates that were legally authorized.

Now, I suppose, such action is in the power of Congress, but it certainly would seem very unjust to the general taxpayer by such an amendment to give the localities that sued out the injunctions the benefit of the lawsuits that they lost. Certainly, I feel constrained to oppose any such amendment, because it is equivalent to a direct appropriation to these cities of the amount they have failed to pay from the time the injunctions were sued out.

I want to say that the evidence before the committee, by every witness that I remember who discussed the matter, was to the effect that the Postmaster General said all the time to the gentlemen operating the wires, "Do the best you can to protect the public interests," and that he in no instance acted contrary to and regardless of the advice that he received, except in one particular instance, and that was where he was advised by one official of the Western Union to increase the Government rates pending Government control.

Mr. Chairman, no doubt this resolution will pass, and at an early day the wire systems will be returned to their owners, therefore I think it is fitting and proper that this discussion should not close without placing in the record of this debate what the Postmaster General has to say for himself and in behalf of those who cooperated with him, covering the period of Government operation of the telephone and telegraph systems and cables. This I shall now proceed to do. But, of course, the time at my disposal will not be sufficient to do more than give a synopsis of what was done by the administration during this trying period of our country's history.

The policy of the Wire Control Board in the administration of Government control and operation of the wire systems was to establish a unified system of wire communication giving an extended service through the coordination of the various lines, facilitating service, and eliminating wasteful expenditures through duplications of operating expenses, overhead charges, and competitive duplication of lines.

As a public utility of universal necessity, the wire service was sought to be operated so as to provide a service to as large number of patrons as possible and to be as widely extended as practicable. To provide a service so extended as to meet the needs of the public at a fair charge for services, it was essential that wasteful expenditures through the multiplication of separate organizations should be eliminated. An extended survey of the situation by the Post Office Department disclosed that through unification of control and operation the inherent defects of competing and duplicating systems, which add enormously to the cost of wire operation, could be eliminated.

By far the largest items of capital invested in these public utilities are those for permanent plant and equipment. The maintenance of separate plants and equipment by each of a great number of competing companies, each with its corps of administrative and operating officials, rental charges, and construction, operation, and upkeep of competitive parallel lines involve both extravagance in operating expenditure and the inconvenience to the public of a divided and incomplete service.

By coordination and unification a very heavy duplication of expenditure could be avoided and a more extended and convenient service given to the public by the linking together of all of the wire systems. Those best qualified by long experience in the management of the wire system agree, and common sense dictates that economy, efficiency, and the widest extension of the service for public convenience can be procured only through the operation of the wires under one system as far as practicable.

On this subject Mr. Theodore N. Vail, president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., said in a communication to the Postmaster General:

> If the uses of combined plant can be multiplied, extended, and utilized, it will mean not only reduction in the investment relative to increased utilization, it will mean one charge for taxes, maintenance, depreciation, and obsolescence, all of which will be reflected in the cost of operation, for, broadly speaking, upon the cost of operation charges for service are based.

The former general manager of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co., who was designated by Mr. Clarence H. Mackay, president of that company, to confer with the Postmaster General shortly after the President's proclamation taking over the wire systems, submitted a statement in writing, in which he said:

> In the past, under competition, a great many agencies were necessary to maintain successful competition, and under a unified management many of the agencies employed by competing companies can be discontinued to an advantage. * * *
>
> Branch offices in large cities that have been established for no other reason than to pick up business in a given locality, because the other company has maintained an office in that locality or in that building, should be discontinued and operators therein sent to other offices where their services are needed to supplement the present supply of operators.

In a statement issued July 23, 1918, on taking over the control and operation of the wires, the Postmaster General announced:

> I realize the immensity of the task which has been entrusted to me by the President's order. The telegraph and telephone service as conducted by those who have had the responsibility under conditions heretofore existing has been remarkably successful, considering the unusual additions to their task and the unprecedented difficulties in the way of its full performance which have arisen out of the war, difficulties which could be overcome only by a unity of administration, particularly a unification of the use of the telephone and telegraph lines, which could not be realized without the aid of the Government.
>
> Under the President's order conditions are changed and greater opportunity is afforded to effect improvements and economies and a larger use by the people of these facilities which have become an imperative need in their everyday life. Whether advantage can be taken of these opportunities to improve this service to the public remains to be disclosed by experience. Every effort of the department will be directed to the accomplishment of this end. It will be the purpose of the Post Office Department to broaden the use of the service at the least cost to the people, keeping in mind that a high standard of efficiency must be maintained. I shall avail myself of an early opportunity to consult with those who have heretofore had the responsibility of directing the affairs of the various wire systems taken over and I doubt not will be greatly benefited by suggestions they may be kind enough to offer me. The operation or control of what are commonly called farmers' telephone lines will be interfered with only for the purpose of facilitating their connections with the longer lines. There will be no change affecting the press-wire service, except to improve it wherever possible. Of course, no general policy has been decided upon, and will not be until a most careful survey of the whole situation is had and a grasp of conditions as they now exist secured. I shall freely avail myself of all advice and suggestions which those in a position to make same valuable may be good enough to offer me.
>
> Whenever it is necessary to inaugurate any changes of policy, announcement of such will be made through the Postmaster General.

On the 6th of August, 1918, the Postmaster General appointed a committee to investigate and determine the extent to which branch telegraph offices should be consolidated and coordinated with branch postal stations. On November 18, 1918, the Postmaster General issued the following:

> In order that the telegraph facilities may be used to the fullest extent and the transmission of messages expedited, the telegraph systems shall hereafter be operated as one, and effective December 1, 1918, all telegraph offices shall acept for transmission all classes of messages now accepted by any one of them at the prescribed tariff rates.

An operating board, of which Union N. Bethel was made chairman, was appointed December 13, 1918, for the operation of the "unified telegraph and telephone service."

In the unification and the operation of the wires as one system, as I am informed, the Postmaster General had the cooperation of all parties concerned, except the president and other executive officials of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.

The Postmaster General anounced in a bulletin issued August 7, 1918, that the Government operation and control of the telephone systems of the country would undoubtedly cause the coordination and consolidation of competing systems wherever possible. "Investigations by the committee in charge of telegraph and telephone services," he said, "shows that negotiations were already under way for the consolidation of a number of competing telephone systems at the time the Government assumed control. These negotiations, as well as those for changes in rates, should be continued. When an agreement is reached for changes in rates or in the matter of consolidation, it should be submitted to the Post Office Department for approval. Where consolidations should be made but negotiations have not yet been begun there is no objections to companies taking up such negotiations."

In an order issued August 15, 1918, the Postmaster General directed all telephone companies to proceed as expeditiously as possible with all plans heretofore instituted for consolidating and unification of the telephone plants and properties. Plans for consolidating the plants and properties where consolidation is manifestly desired by the public, where it can be effected on fair terms and in accordance with law, should, he said, be formulated as soon as practicable and submitted to the Post Office Department.

> Wherever two telephone systems—
>
> The order says—
>
> are operated in the same area the managements concerned should cooperate in making extensions and betterments, in order that unification and the elimination of waste in money, man power, and material

may be brought about as expeditiously as possible, in an orderly way, and with due regard to the rights of the owners of the properties and the convenience of the public.

In a bulletin addressed to all telephone companies November 18, 1918, the Postmaster General said:

To enable the public to use the long-distance or toll-service facilities to the fullest extent, any telephone company not having such facilities, but desiring them, should make application therefor in writing to the Postmaster General, who will, if upon investigation it is found practicable to do so, order the connection established.

An estimate submitted by the Western Union Telegraph Co. showed that an economy of about $6,000,000 a year—equivalent to 40 per cent of the combined net earnings of both telegraph systems—could be effected by consolidation, through savings in rent, light, and heat and annual charges on equipment; by combining forces and supervisory organizations; and by stabilization, cost of getting business, and so forth.

The conditions under which Government control and operation of the wire systems was assumed, especially the uncertainty as to the duration of time within which Government authority would be exercised, compelled the department to depend upon the negotiations of the companies themselves to bring about the coordination and unification desired. Before this policy, essential to the most economic and efficient service, could be put in full operation it became apparent that Government control would not be of long duration. If the Wire Control Board, in the exercise of its authority, had ordered a complete unification of the systems many companies might have been left at a great disadvantage through the sudden return of the properties to their respective owners, out of which heavy claims for damages might have resulted. The signing of the armistice and the manifest purpose of Congress to return the wire systems to their owners at an early day rendered it impracticable for the Postmaster General to bring to completion his plans for the unification of the systems. Though much was accomplished in the way of economy of administration and the betterment of service through cooperation, many of the economies which could have been effected through a completely unified system were impossible so long as the organization of each company had to be intact with a view of the properties being returned to their owners with the same status which they occupied prior to Government control.

The earnings of the wire companies were at a low ebb when the Government assumed wire control. Increased rates of wages, high cost of material, higher interest rates, and a general increase of all operating expenses, had materially reduced the net earnings of all companies, and many were under severe strain. During Government operation the cost of labor and material was at the highest level.

No provision was made by Congress to meet any deficiency which might result from the cost of operation exceeding the revenues derived from the service. The Postmaster General was required to pay the owners of the properties a just compensation, and also to pay all operating expenses out of the revenues derived from the users of the service. The department was confronted with an insistent, and, to a large extent, a just demand for a substantial increase in the wage scale, and the requirement to pay high prices for all material needed for the upkeep and betterment of the service. The revenues were not sufficient to meet these demands. Considerable was accomplished through economy of administration by coordination of operation, but increases in the wage scale could be provided for in no other way than by an increase in the charge for service to the public. The only alternative would have been the creation of a deficiency for which there was no authority of law and no provision for liquidation. This situation necessitated careful consideration of what increase in service charges could be made without injustice to the public and what increase in the wage scale could be met by the revenues so augmented. There was a limit to the charge for service which the public could be justly called upon to bear, and consequently the increase of the wage scale had to be made to conform to this limitation. The very large increase demanded would, if granted, have been ruinous to the public service, but as large increase in the wage scale was made as the revenues, augmented by higher charge for service, would bear.

Prior to Government control the net earnings of the three groups of telephone companies whose gross revenues were $10,000 and above and the net earnings of the telegraph companies had declined steadily since 1916, and were at the lowest point when taken over by the Government in August, 1918. At the same time the gross earnings, which represent the cost of the service to the public, had increased each year, but the increase, and considerably more, of the gross revenue had been absorbed in higher wage scale, greater cost of material, interest charges, and so forth.

Destruction of the financial standing of some of the companies was threatened at the time they were taken over by the Government, August 1, 1918. The earnings of even the most prosperous companies had receded during 1917, but these were still able to stem the tide of increasing wages and labor shortage and make a fair showing during the first half of 1918. But by June and July of that year the situation had become grave, as shown by the detailed figures for specific companies made to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Some of the most prosperous companies were at that time earning hardly more than one-half of what they had earned during 1916 and 1917. Rate increases were imminent and imperative if the companies were not to lose their ability to borrow money for extensions and if their security holders were not to find the securities greatly depreciated on the market.

The reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission for class A, B, and C telephone companies show that out of 830 companies of these classes 38 did not in 1917 receive revenue sufficient to cover their operating expenses and taxes, to say nothing of interest, and 100 companies did not earn enough to pay their interest charges on bonds and other indebtedness. The law authorizing the taking over of the wire systems by the Government required that all companies should be paid a just compensation, and this had to be provided for by the Postmaster General out of the revenues of the wire service.

Figures are now available showing the earnings and expenses of the more important companies for the eight-month period under Government control from August 1, 1918, to March 31, 1919. These figures cover about 90 per cent of the telegraph and telephone field, and indicate fairly accurately the condition in which the companies would have been in the absence of Government control and the charge upon the public which was necessary to maintain the financial position of the companies during this critical period of unsettled conditions and increasing operating costs.

The gross earnings of these telegraph and telephone companies in 1916 aggregated $390,000,000; in 1917, $437,000,000; in 1918, $475,000,000. These were the gross earnings. The net earnings, without deductions for interest, were in 1916, $107,000,000; in 1917, $103,000,000; in 1918, not to exceed $95,000,000.

The net earnings for the first eight months of Government operation were approximately $43,000,000, without deducting interest. The Government has obligated itself by contracts with 42 companies for compensation during this period amounting to $55,000,000. In addition to this are the telephone companies doing a gross business not to exceed $10,000, with whom no compensation contracts are made, and who are not included in these figures. Compensation for these will approximate $3,000,000, making the Government's total obligation during the eight months about $58,000,000 as against net earnings of $43,000,000. By increased rates put into effect by the Postmaster General approximately $10,000,000 was added to the revenues collected during the eight months. Without this increase the deficiency of revenue to meet the Government's obligations would have been $25,000,000 instead of $15,000,000, as shown above.

This $25,000,000, representing revenue from increased rates and Government's obligations above the amount of revenue received, covered wage increases and has enabled the Wire Control Board to maintain an efficient wire service and to sustain the financial position of the telegraph and telephone companies and made it possible to carry the immense volume of Government business which involved a heavy loss to the telegraph companies. The Government business is carried at approximately 40 per cent of the regular commercial rate and about 50 per cent of the actual cost of service, so that the volume of business carried for the Government represents approximately a corresponding loss. The Western Union Telegraph Co. in 1916 carried $308,309; in 1917, $2,016,000; and during eight months from August 1, 1918, $3,331,000, which is at the rate of about $5,000,000 a year during Government control.

The wages of telegraph employees were increased about 28 per cent during the year 1918.

By an order dated December 31, 1918, a wage increase of between 8 and 9 per cent, amounting to $3,500,000, was made. In this order the Postmaster General said:

The above increases are made after careful investigation of a petition filed by the employees of one of the telegraph companies, through its officers, who recommended that certain increases be made. The department feels that the telegraph employees are entitled to an increase, but revenue conditions at this time would not justify these increases hereby authorized unless by a careful plan of elimination of waste incident to duplication and by effecting other economies which will not impair the efficiency of the service the revenue conditions can be made to meet such increases.

The Postmaster General announced on December 14, 1918, that he had received and approved the first report of the committee appointed by him on the standardization of rates, having for its object the equalization of toll and long-distance rates throughout the United States, removing disparities and preferences and providing a scientific basis for future reductions contemplated as unification of telephone and telegraph wires proceeded.

By this action is was provided that—

A night-service rate, which is one-half of the day rate, is established between 8.30 and 12 p. m. Between midnight and 4.30 a. m. the night rate is one-fourth the day rate. These are greater reductions in night rates than have ever been made in any country and doubtless will be extensively used, especially for social and family purposes. A person might talk from San Francisco to New York for about $4, whereas the day rate is approximately $16.

A station-to-station service is established such as now exists in the balance of the world; that is, when a connection is established with a man's house or office the opportunity to converse is provided and the station-to-station rate, which is the basic rate, applies and is payable whether the particular person desired responds or not. This rate up to 24 miles is at the rate of 5 cents for 6 miles and for greater distances 5 cents for each 8 miles, or about 6¼ mills a mile. The distance is computed by air-line methods and not by pole line or public highways. The air-line distances are commonly about 100 miles, when the others would run 150 miles. It is stated by the committee that more than 60 varieties of toll rates have existed in the United States up to the present time. The effect of this uniform or basic rate in the station-to-station service is to reduce or not affect about 70 per cent of the rates though necessarily slightly raising about 30 per cent in the process of standardization.

It requires about two and one-half times as much work to establish connection with a particular person than the station-to-station service. Hitherto the rates have been the same for both kinds of services, nothing being paid, however great the services performed, on the failure of the telephone institution to secure the particular person. The particular-person service has also been used to defraud the Government out of its toll revenues. Designing persons employ codes under which, although the desired telephone is reached, the particular person is said not to be there, but words of explanation given from his phone answer all the purposes of the call under the code arrangements. The particular-person service is not discontinued, but the rate therefor is so modified as to prevent these abuses and compensate the telephone service in part for the extra expense of labor and plant involved, and a charge of 25 per cent of the station-to-station rate is made for such service when the particular person is secured, and a report charge of 25 per cent of the station-to-station rate is made when the house or office telephone is obtained and his whereabouts or refusal to talk reported. It is pointed out that the system of making no charge whatever in such cases when the man's telephone had been reached and the answer given was like expecting the street-car fare to be refunded to the visitor when he did not find his party in when he arrived, although all the work of carrying him from one point to another had been done.

In many large sections of the country the smallest toll rate has been not less than 15 cents. Under the new scheme for short distances the rates are reduced to 5 cents and 10 cents, and for the cheapest form of service the person can talk 5 minutes, as compared with 3 minutes now, or in some cases only 2 minutes or 1 minute. Free-toll areas, where the exchange rates were designed to cover the free service or a low charge therefor, are not affected by this order, which will go into effect on the 21st day of January, 1919.

The extraordinary increase in cost of operation and maintenance of the systems and demands for wage increases, together with the uncertainty of the period of Government control, which rendered complete unification impracticable, made a reduction of wire rates out of the question. On the contrary, these increased burdens had to be met by an increase in the charge made upon the public for service.

A most careful survey of the entire situation by the Wire Control Board showed that while the price of products and service of various industrial, mercantile, and miscellaneous corporations of the United States has increased 100 per cent, telegraph service has been rendered to the country at prewar prices throughout a period when industrial and business profits were unprecedented. The increase of 20 per cent in telegraph rates should be considered in comparison with the 100 per cent increase in other prices, and it is less than that found necessary to add to the railroad freight rates and is no greater than has been made generally in other public utility rates, in order to obviate financial collapse.

The purpose of the Wire Control Board is to make the lowest rate that will maintain the service required by the public. In making a rate sufficient to maintain the telegraph service of the country discrimination could not be made between two companies performing this service.

A service might be maintained within certain limited fields, where the cost of operation is light in comparison with the volume of concentrated business, at a considerable less rate than is necessary to cover a service extensive enough to meet the public needs.

During the six months from August, 1918, to January, 1919, the Postal Telegraph System carried only approximately one-sixth, or about 17 per cent, of the business of the country; and only about one-twelfth, or 8½ per cent, of the Government business, which is unprofitable. The Western Union therefore carried approximately five-sixths, or about 83 per cent, of the business of the country, and eleven-twelfths, or 91½ per cent, of the Government business.

The extension of the telegraph service into fields that are less profitable than are the great business centers, and the handling of Government business claimed by both companies to be at a loss of 50 per cent of the operating cost, are a charge upon the gross revenues which is escaped by a company which avoids the rendering of this necessary public service. If all telegraph operations that are not sufficiently profitable were done away with regardless of the public needs, no increase of rates would be necessary to maintain a service limited to the profitable fields, as is the acknowledged plan of the Postal System. If both telegraph companies so limited their service it would be disastrous to the industries and business of the country.

If the telegraph rates were made sufficient to meet only the cost of operations covering one-sixth of all the service of the country so arranged as to tap only the most profitable business, much of the telegraph service for all the rest of the country would be destroyed. This would be advantageous to those who luxuriated in the cream of business, but would be disastrous to the public.

The increase of the business of the Western Union Telegraph Co. in 1918 over 1916 was 38 per cent; that of the Postal System was only 9 per cent. Yet the earnings of the Postal System for the month of January last, after adjustment for depreciation and wage increase, were $222,297. During 1919 the increase in the operating expenses of the Western Union, due to an increase in the number of employees and in the wage rate combined, will be $13,000,000 in excess of the increase in its gross revenues.

The number of employees of the Western Union was increased 59 per cent while the gross revenues increased but 54 per cent. The reason why the increase of traffic was proportionately greater than the increase of gross revenues was that the Government business, which is carried at approximately 40 per cent of the commercial rates, was fourteen times greater in January, 1919, than in January, 1916. We are informed that the Postal Telegraph avoided carrying the unprofitable Government business as far as it was possible for it to do so, and the Western Union carried about eleven-twelfths of the entire volume, and that in some instances instructions were issued by the officials of the Postal System to their subordinates to avoid this Government business whenever it could be done, a plausible excuse being suggested, such as shortage of operators, and so forth.

If the policy of operating the wire service at only such points of concentrated business as would make the service highly profitable and of eliminating Government messages were applied to both telegraph companies there would probably be no occasion for an increase of telegraph rates to meet the increased cost of material and wages in the operation of the system.

The burden of increased cost of labor and material has been rendered heavier by the fact that the volume of business has fallen off since the signing of the armistice, and has produced a situation where it is no longer possible to render telegraph service at prewar rates.

Under the stimulus of war demands, American prices, as shown by the index number of wholesale prices prepared by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, have risen steadily since the latter months of 1915. By July, 1917, the price level had risen to 185 per cent of the 1914 prices. At this point price fixing by the Government agencies checked the rise for some months. But by January, 1918, the level of 185 per cent had been recovered and the prices continued to advance until they reached 207 per cent in September. Despite the signing of the armistice they have receded but slightly from this point.

During all this period the prices for telegraph service have remained at the prewar level. Materials and supplies which the telegraph companies purchase have, however, followed the course of general prices. Public regulation does not limit the prices which utilities must pay for material and supplies; they must therefore pay the same price upon the market as other buyers. They were confronted by a steady and enormous increase of all costs entering into their operation while retaining a fixed low price for service.

It requires only common sense and elementary arithmetic to disclose that this course inevitably brought the properties to a point where revenues were no longer adequate to cover cost. Following the signing of the armistice the telegraph business fell off.

The question of necessity for a rate increase to meet past wage increases is answered by a review of the Western Union Telegraph Co.'s operation. In January, 1916, the land-line revenues of this company amounted to $3,805,000. The total pay

roll for the employees in the commercial and traffic departments and in nonfunctional offices amounted to $1,408,226. The pay roll at that time amounted to 37 per cent of the gross revenues, and was at the rate of $51.92 per employee per month. By January, 1919, the revenues from the land line had increased to $5,860,000, and the pay roll of these employees had increased to $3,300,867, or an average of $76.63 per employee. The pay rolls of these employees amounted to 56.3 per cent of the total revenues, as against 37 per cent in January, 1916. The number of employees increased by 59 per cent and the gross revenues of the company by 54 per cent.

The average increase per employee per month on commercial, traffic, and nonfunctional pay rolls was $24.71, or approximately 48 per cent. The number of employees at present averages 45,000. The increase in rate of pay therefore amounts to $13,343,400 per year. The increases since June, 1918, amount to $7,786,000, and since January, 1918, to $9,277,000. The monthly pay roll has increased from $1,408,226 to $3,300,867. This is an annual increase of $22,711,692. If the rate of wages of these employees had remained the same as on January 1, 1916, the increase in the pay roll would have been at the rate of $914,155 per month, or $10,969,865 per year. The company would then have had a profit larger by the difference between $22,711,692 and $10,969,865, or $11,741,827. In addition to the increase of wages for this class of employees, that for those in the plant department amounted to $2,438,830. Therefore the increases in operating expenses traceable to wage increases alone amount to more than $14,000,000.

The increase in operating expenses due to the larger number of employees and the higher wage rate combined will amount to $27,608,000. The gross revenues of the Western Union for 1919 under the old rates are estimated at $68,000,000, as against $54,000,000 for 1916. The increase in the revenues is $13,000,000 short of the increase in wages. The 20 per cent rate increase now made will yield approximately $12,000,000 additional revenue per annum on this property.

The wage increases during the year 1918, including the increase effective December 31, brought wages in January, 1919, to the point where they are $10,500,000 per annum in excess of a year ago and $8,500,000 in excess of June, 1918. The operations of the company have been carried on with this increased wage schedule since January 1, 1919. The increase in the telegraph rates now made is estimated to add $9,000,000 to the revenues of the Western Union for the remaining nine months of the calendar year.

The Postal System has not had a similar increase in operating expenses. No figures are available as to the pay roll, but the total operating expenses amounted in 1916 to $9,543,972, in 1917 to $10,401,876, and in 1918 to approximately $10,500,000. This smaller increase is explained principally by the smaller growth of business of the Postal System.

The following table shows the gross revenues of the Postal and of the Western Union for the years 1916, 1917, and 1918:

Land line gross revenues.

Year.	Western Union.	Postal System.	Total.
1916	$54,016,171	$13,644,987	$67,661,158
1917	66,528,711	14,907,097	81,435,808
1918	74,505,512	14,930,896	89,436,408
Increase, 1918 over 1916	38 per cent.	9 per cent.	32 per cent.

The relative growth of traffic on the Western Union was even more rapid than the figures of gross revenues indicate, because its increase in the volume of Government business carried was much more rapid than that of the Postal System.

Even with its small increase of business it is clear that the increase in the operating expenses of the Postal Telegraph System could not have been limited to 10 per cent if the same increase in wage rate had been made by that system which was made by the Western Union.

The net earnings of the Postal Telegraph System have not fallen to the same extent as have those of the Western Union. During the six months August, 1918, to January, 1919, the net earnings of the Postal, as shown by their accounts, were $1,832,821. After adjustment for depreciation awarded them by the Postmaster General and for the wage increase for the month of January these earnings were $1,652,821. The earnings for the month of January, after wage and depreciation adjustment, were $222,296.

Some persons jump to the conclusion, since the earnings of the Postal Telegraph System were still substantially under the old rate, that the increase in rates was unnecessary. The Postal Telegraph System is not a national system in the sense that it furnishes service at all points where it is desired in the public interest. It has approximately one-tenth as many offices as the Western Union and carries one-sixth of the telegraph business of the Nation. It competes for much more than one-sixth of the Nation's business, however, because its offices are located in the larger cities. Two-thirds of the telegraph business of the country originates in these business centers. The Postal Telegraph System is therefore in a position to select from all the business offered that which can be most profitably handled, and this it seems to have done in most efficient manner. The fact that the Postal Co. could continue to carry business at the old rates and still earn its compensation is of practically no significance in constructing a fair schedule of rates for the country as a whole. Such rates must cover the cost of rendering service to all points, including just compensation for the property used.

The Postal System reaches only a fraction of the points at which telegraph service is rendered, and at the points which it does reach it could not carry one-half the business offered. Sound public policy dictates a schedule of rates which shall give all the people telegraph service. Under such a schedule of rates the Postal System will reap the benefits that come to the competitor who strives only for the more profitable business, but this situation is inevitable as long as this condition exists in the telegraph field. The fact that the Postal Co. could operate at its present rates and still make profits is of little significance in passing upon the general schedule of rates.

A comparison of the effect of increased prices upon general business profits with that upon the telegraph profits is enlightening. The net income of the industrial, mercantile, and miscellaneous corporations reported to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue increased from $2,897,618,000 in 1913 to $6,697,000,000 in 1916, to $8,300,000,000 in 1917, to $7,500,000,000 in 1918, and, it is estimated, will not fall below $5,000,000,000 in 1919. While there has been a rise of 70 per cent in the general wage schedule, this is more than offset by the rise of 100 per cent in the price of products and service sold by the corporations. During this period our national dividend, which represents income of all the people, including wage earners, has increased from $35,000,000,000 to $72,000,000,000. The number of people reporting incomes of $3,000 and over increased from 357,598 to 697,055, while their incomes amounted to $7,500,000,000 in 1917 as against $3,900,000,000 in 1913.

As against this, the earnings of the telegraph company which renders a national service have been extinguished for the year 1919 unless rates are increased. These comparisons are the more significant when we realize that 80 per cent of the telegraph service is rendered to the very industries and establishments which have made these large profits in 1916 and subsequent years. It should also be noted that it is these industries which have sold to the telegraph companies the materials and supplies at largely advanced prices, and it is their competition for labor, together with the increased cost of living brought about by the high prices of their products, which has been directly responsible for the increase in wages and has necessitated the present advance in rates.

In response to an inquiry from Representative Dudley Doolittle the Postmaster General, February 5, 1919, said:

The purpose of the new schedule of telephone toll rates is to standardize the long-distance service throughout the country and to establish uniform charges. The toll service is not local in character, and, unlike exchange service, is largely conducted over the lines of more than one company and across State boundaries. When the Postmaster General took over the operation of the telephones the differences in toll rates and in the methods of handling toll business on many routes were such as greatly to complicate the quoting of through rates. The result was unnecessary delay and waste of effort in handling long-distance traffic and corresponding inconvenience and expense to the public. Under the toll rates now established the toll service is an intercommunity, interstate, and interregional service, available to all Americans at all times, everywhere.

In preparing the new toll rates the telegraph and telephone administration has endeavored to introduce additional forms of service required by the public, to establish conditions with respect to the long-distance business which will result in economies of operation, to make substantial reduction in rates where they were excessive, and to increase the charges for certain kinds of service where rates were inadequate. For example, the distinction between calls for a particular person and those for any person at a particular station was established for the whole country. This distinction is based on sound engineering principles. Messages handled by the person-to-person method requires more labor on the part of the telephone operators than those handled by the station-to-station method. The former also tie up the lines, which in the case of many long-distance calls represent a heavy investment in copper wire and other equipment for a longer period of time. Heretofore the telephone caller who was satisfied to reach any party at a particular station often contributed toward the extra cost of serving the particular personal long-distance talker. Hereafter the charges in such cases will be better proportioned to the cost of service and to its value to the user.

The introduction of station-to-station service is not a new departure. A large part of the toll business of the country has long been handled by this method. The basic schedule under the new rate order is that for this class of service. The rates are generally lower than the toll rates formerly in effect throughout the country. This reduction was

possible only through the economies in the method of operation which have been accomplished.

Similar considerations justify the new report charges. The information reported to the telephone user, who pays the report charge, may not always be of value to him, but it has been obtained at considerable expense. It is fairer to charge the expense against the party who originated the call than against other completely innocent parties. Moreover, in many cases, regrettably, reports from stations that the particular person called for was not available have been made a medium of conveying important information. Thus the parties were enabled to evade payment, and gross fraud was successfully perpetrated upon the company. From every standpoint it seems desirable to make a reasonable charge for this class of service.

Charges for particular-person service under the new schedule, unlike those for station-to-station service, are generally higher than the former rates. But it ought not to be forgotten that many users of this class of service formerly escaped a portion of the charge that should have been made if other users had not been helping to meet the cost. Moreover, the Government took over the telephones in a period of advancing rates. Already in 1918, during the period preceding Government operation, several of the telephone companies had secured the approval of the State public-service commissions having jurisdiction over their lines to substantial rate increases. Many had applied for permission to make increases. Others would shortly have been compelled to seek authority for similar increases if the Government had not come to their relief.

The Postmaster General is required, under the terms of the resolution authorizing the Government control of the wire systems, to pay a just and reasonable compensation to each of the companies whose lines have been taken over. This is an imperative obligation. Any adjustment of rates should therefore be on such a basis as to guarantee sufficient revenue to meet these requirements. The policy of the Postmaster General is to make the rates for service as low as possible, keeping in view the operating cost and the obligation of compensation to the companies.

The standardized rates are not only based on the requirement of revenues to meet definite obligations, but also are designed to bring about a more equitable distribution of charges with respect to the kind of service required by the subscriber. By reducing night rates to from one-quarter to one-half the standard day rates an extraordinarily cheap service is provided for those to whom economy is the prime consideration. Those who demand the best service will, on account of improvements in operation which the new schedule makes possible, receive a better service than ever before. In short, the new toll service is the most economical and efficient that the present-day science of telephony can provide. If the telephone users will study their own needs and all the conditions pertaining to their toll calls, they will be able to benefit greatly by the new schedule.

The new rates are tentative. They can be reduced as fast as conditions will warrant. The whole subject of the relation between toll rates and local exchange rates is under investigation. The Postmaster General is in a position to make readjustments between the rates for the different kinds of service with a single eye to the good of the whole body of telephone users throughout the country. He does not intend to collect tolls which are higher than is necessary to maintain a satisfactory standard of service; and he will not permit the quality of the service to suffer on account of insufficient revenue.

On the taking over of the cable systems by the Government, the Postmaster General made the following statement:

Originally the cable systems were organized and operated independently of the land-line systems. The transmission of messages commenced and ended at the termini of the cables and the communications destined to points beyond the terminal were physically transferred to other lines. To-day the transmission is continuous for land and cable lines. The distance of continuous transmission is bounded neither by continents or oceans.

Effective communication, therefore, demands intimate relations under which a continuous circuit can be established, not from one terminal to another, and, so far as authorized under the joint resolution from destination to destination. The effectiveness of the service is dependent upon the extent of the common control of circuits which should be to the farthest point possible.

This necessity of continuity and common control between land and cable lines is most conclusively shown by the fact that each of our telegraph systems have their independent cable systems.

The Mackay Co., originally a cable system, finding that the land lines were indispensible to the cable system, constructed a land system to make more effective its cable system.

The Western Union, while organized primarily as a land company, although there were large cable facilities working in connection with it belonging to other companies, yet for its own interest were forced into constructing and otherwise obtaining effectual control of the trans-Atlantic cable companies which had theretofore been independent, but which worked in connection with the Western Union and which did not belong to or work in connection with the Commercial or Mackay interests. The other cable companies through their contractural relations became more or less a part of the telegraph system so far as transmission and continuity were concerned and their operation in this way was made as effective as it would be through ownership or common control.

There never was a time in the history of this war for which this joint resolution was passed giving the President the right to control the wire and cable systems which called for such a close control of the cable system as to-day and will continue during the period of readjustment. The absolute necessity of uninterrupted, continuous communication should be apparent to all. The Postmaster General is now operating all the telegraph and telephone lines in one system. The recent breakdown in connection with one of the cable systems has demonstrated the absolute necessity of being able to utilize at will the facilities of either cable system with all of the land-line systems in order that traffic may be adjusted in the same hands as it is on the land lines.

There are many other reasons for taking over the cables which have been suggested by the experience so far in Government control of land lines, but I only think it necessary to state the determining factors.

In a statement on April 29, 1919, announcing the return of the cable systems to their owners and the contemplated return of the land wires as soon as suitable legislation could be had, the Postmaster General said:

For a number of years the Postmaster General has advocated the Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone systems and has urged that they should be blended with and become a part of the Postal Establishment as essential agencies of communication. He is firmly convinced if such a policy were entered upon that where there are now three telegraph and telephone pole lines, and sometimes four, occupying the same highway, entailing immense waste, better and cheaper service could be given by one coordinate wire agency; that by the abolition of various supervisory forces of the wire systems, which would then be unnecessary; by complete unification of the systems, thereby eliminating the operating cost of the useless system; by thoroughly coordinating the remaining telegraph and telephone services; by the consolidation of offices and the utilization of post-office buildings where practicable; by the use of stamps as a means of eliminating costly and complicated accountings; and the utilization of the auditing and accounting forces of the Post Office Department, thereby largely eliminating those of the wire systems, that such savings could be effected that would enable those in authority during normal times to materially reduce the cost of the wire service to the people.

As to the wisdom of this course the Postmaster General has not changed his views. At the time the Government took over the control of the wires extraordinary and abnormal conditions existed, resulting in a constantly increasing and very high operating cost, which has necessarily continued. The early coming of the armistice, the accentuated cost of operation and diminishing revenues, the uncertainty in the period of Government control presented such a situation that those in charge for the Government were able to accomplish but little by way of unification or to go forward with their policies of economy, and consequently were soon brought face to face with a very serious but quite simple problem, to wit: Given increasing cost of operation, plus diminishing revenues, equals what? There can be but one answer—increase of rates. This action was taken. It was quite unfortunate and was taken with deepest regret, but it was imperative. To an intelligent mind this increase of rates constitutes no sound reason for a change of view on the original proposition that it is economically wise for the Government to own the wire systems as a part of the Postal Establishment, and in no sense tends to refute the soundness of the contention that through such ownership savings would be effected that would result in a reduction of rates. For example, street car companies and other public-utility organizations throughout the country which are being operated under private control are in many cases on the verge of bankruptcy and are petitioning for an increase in rates for their services, and when having been granted the increases sought often return with petitions for still further increase, basing their claims upon the higher wages and increased cost of material. The Wire Administration could not escape this condition, which extended throughout the country in relation to every form of service, public or private.

There is quite a difference between Government ownership and Government control for a limited and very uncertain period. The present control affords no more a test of the virtues of Government ownership than could be had through a temporary receivership in a court proceeding.

That the contention of the Postmaster General for a complete unification of the various wire systems is both wise from an economic standpoint and supported by sound business principles has been confirmed by the ablest experts on electrical transmission in America. That it should be brought about the Postmaster General still believes, preferably through Government ownership and operation as a part of the Postal Establishment; but if this is not done, then through some means of unified control by private ownership, over which the Government should at all times exercise a wholesome regulatory supervision. About the desirability of this the Postmaster General has had no reason to undergo a change of mind. However, for some time it has been apparent that the first of these alternatives does not meet with the approbation of the new Congress. Such being the case, there is but one course to pursue, and that is to return the various wire properties to their respective owners after urging proper legislation to safeguard the interest of all the properties, in fairness to the investors, and to insure proper service to the public.

In a letter to my colleague, Hon. JOHN A. MOON, May 22, 1919, with reference to legislation essential to the proper maintenance and operation of the wire systems on being returned to their owners, the Postmaster General said that the wire properties could not in fairness to their owners or to the general public be returned under the burden of increased cost of operation imposed by war conditions without assurance of revenue sufficient to meet such increased cost. Otherwise deterioration of the properties and service would inevitably result, affecting disastrously the service to the public as well as the interests of the investors in the securities of the companies.

It was given as the unanimous opinion of the Wire Control Board that in order to provide the most efficient wire service the various companies should be coordinated as to operation. This, in their opinion, does not require monopoly of ownership, but is necessary so that there can be a consistent and harmonious regulatory policy. Through this means only can the attempts at wasteful competition and the economic loss occasioned by duplication of plant and force be avoided. It is believed that this desirable end can be reached by amending the law so as to provide that, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, any telegraph or telephone company doing an interstate business may purchase the property of any telegraph or telephone company, or any part thereof, or consolidate with any other telegraph or telephone company, or pool its traffic and facilities with any other telegraph or telephone company under provisions which will protect the interests of the public and of near-by companies.

The Wire Control Board is also convinced that it is impossible to secure any uniformity of rates or to maintain adequate revenue for the service where a multiplicity of unassociated, independent authorities or commissions with full authority to act are attempting to function. Whereas it is recognized that the State has control over traffic purely intrastate, yet it is believed

that it is no longer open to the question that this power can not be exercised so as to interfere with interstate traffic.

In the matter of electrical communications the intrastate and interstate activities are so interdependent that what affects one affects the other, and the character of this traffic has so changed through development that the interstate features have become the dominant and controlling factors. Hence it is believed that the law should be so amended as to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates for telegraph and telephone companies subject to the provision of the act, and that any telegraph or telephone company whose lines are located entirely within a State but which transacts direct interstate business through switching or other arrangements with other lines should be made subject to the act.

The public interests demand the most efficient wire service possible. In order that this end may be attained, adequate revenue must be provided. The plant and equipment must be of the best construction and of the very latest development of the art and must be properly maintained, and depreciation and obsolescence, with reasonable reserves for surplus and contingencies, must be provided and also a reasonable return on the value of the property used to furnish the service. In order to make certain the maintenance of these conditions the rates of the telegraph and telephone companies falling under its jurisdiction should be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that they shall produce revenues sufficient to yield a reasonable return on the value of the property used in rendering service, after paying operating and maintenance expenses and providing for depreciation, obsolescence, and maintenance of such adjuncts as may be necessary for the development of the art and reservation out of income for surplus and contingencies.

The board is also convinced that in order to provide satisfactory wire service the most efficient personnel must be secured. In order to secure and retain the service of such employees there must be assured proper working conditions, advancement of wages on the basis of demonstrated efficiency or capability, and these conditions can only be brought about by the adoption of a sound policy in the treatment of such employees. In order to assure this a tribunal should be provided upon which the public, the employee, the managerial force, and capital shall be fairly represented, and before which all parties may be heard, so that prompt redress may be had for just grievances.

The Wire Control Board also suggests that it be provided by legislation that hereafter when any change of wage schedules for employees is contemplated the same shall not become effective until submitted to and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that when same has been given approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission the commission shall contemporaneously order such modification of rates as will meet the proposed changes in the wage schedule.

The adjustment of wage questions has required the most scrupulous care on the part of the Postmaster General to insure justice and fairness to both the wage earners and the public, and to protect all classes of labor against discrimination, interference, or injustice of any character.

On November 19, 1918, the Postmaster General announced that he had had a committee at work for some six weeks considering the subject of wages and conditions of employment of the telephone and telegraph employees.

"The subject," he said, "is not an easy one to deal with. Both wages and conditions differ materially in different parts of the country and even in the same State. Added to this are the violent disturbances of employment conditions occasioned by the war and the circumstances that telephone rates have not been generally readjusted to meet rising costs as in other employments. It is my wish to be just to these faithful workers, and to act as promptly as an intelligent disposition of the subject will permit. Meanwhile the employees should keep in mind that just as public employees are paid higher and enjoy better conditions in the long run than private empolyees, so changes can not be made as rapidly as by an individual employer. I have urgently requested the committee to reach a report without avoidable delay."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this resolution which proposes to turn the telegraph and telephone wires back to private operation. There can be no question about the proposition that there was no necessity for ever taking over the telephone and telegraph wires. There has been some defense of the Cabinet members who appeared before the House committee originally urging the permanent policy of Government ownership. I do not know just how much the Cabinet members expected the views expressed before the committee to bear upon the policy to be pursued by the Government in taking over the telegraph and telephone wires, but I do know that what they said was definite and clearly pointed to the fact that they believed in the Government-ownership policy.

The ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, now our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, asked the Postmaster General at that time this question: "And do you agree with the other Secretaries that this resolution is primarily a war necessity?" to which the Postmaster General replied, "Undoubtedly, the necessity for action now grows out of the exigencies of the war, and if the same efficient management and direction is given to the telegraph and telephones that has been given to the Postal Service the probability is that they never will be returned to private control."

That was an expression of opinion by the Postmaster General. And then he said later in his testimony, "And if Government control was a failure they would undoubtedly be returned."

The Postmaster General, after the present Senate committee had reported a bill compelling him to return the wires and after a similar committee of the House was just ready to report a similar bill, made a partial return of the wires to private control. This was a confession that the Government control was a failure.

Another Cabinet member of the present administration, Secretary Baker, during the same hearing, said this, and this is pretty definite: "If I had my way about it, there would not be any limitation of time put in. That is the position I would have taken on the subject of railroad legislation." That is not so strong as the Postmaster General's, but the Secretary of the Navy was as forcible in his views as the Postmaster General. He made this statement: "If you wish my view, I would say that it ought to last forever" (referring to Government control).

There are two pretty clear statements and one pretty clear intimation. The purpose may have been to aid the war. I say the result has shown that it did not aid in any way in the conduct of the war, and the only useful purpose that I see in the Government operation of these wires was to convince the country at large, and perhaps some of the Cabinet members in the present administration, that Government operation as a permanent policy is not wise.

I do not believe that the Government ought to be in business. I think the function of a government is to deal with governmental matters, and whenever the Government of the United States steps out of that sphere into the sphere of dealing with the business of the country just so far the Government cripples its own function and just so far the business of the country suffers. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. To the extent that the parcels post carries merchandise, it is not purely a business arrangement? And is the gentleman opposed to it?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I am sure that I would not want to launch out from this discussion of Government ownership onto the question of parcels post, but I do know this, that the Postmaster General who had charge of this whole matter has given very unsatisfactory service to the public so far as the results are concerned. There has been inefficiency in the operation of the telegraph and telephone lines. The millions of laboring people who have been under his control are dissatisfied, as shown by a resolution passed by the American Federation of Labor this afternoon. I do not say this for the purpose of criticizing the Postmaster General, but for the purpose of criticizing the policy of Government ownership and Government operation. He has been dealing with these employees, and while some them, like the rest of us, may not always be fair, yet this resolution passed this afternoon by the American Federation of Labor was passed unanimously, according to reliable reports. I do not read it for the purpose of criticizing the Postmaster General, as I say. After reciting a number of facts in the case, the resolution passed to-day by the American Federation of Labor at Atlantic City, concludes as follows:

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor, in convention assembled, speaking directly for 4,000,000 organized wage earners, and firm in the belief that this reflects the vast majority of the American people, requests that President Wilson immediately remove Postmaster General Burleson from office.

There you have the Postmaster General controlling the telephone and telegraph wires, and you have the public served by these telegraph and telephone wires dissatisfied. No one can deny that, and here you have the laboring men employed in the operation under the Government control asking for the removal of a Cabinet officer under whom they are doing their work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. No; I have not the time. There is not any great difference of opinion as to whether these wires should be returned to private control, but I think that Congress, in the face of a great sentiment in favor of the immediate return of these wires, and in face of criticism of some of the rates, needs to guard very carefully to see to it that in the return of the wires justice is done, not only to the people but to the companies who have owned and operated the wires and whose property we have taken.

Last August we took over these properties, and great advances have been made in the expense of running them. They were in no position to apply to the State regulatory bodies for advances, for the Postmaster General had exclusive jurisdiction to fix rates. If we are to return these wires immediately, and these rates are immediately to go back to what they were prior to the taking of them over by the Government, it would be an injustice. It may be that these rates are not exactly correct in all particulars, but these rates now established by the Postmaster General are the only rates that we have fixed by a governmental agency after the great increase in operation. We can not, of course, go into the rate question and fix them pending this adjustment. We must either turn them back to prewar rates—which would be unjust, because great increases in the operating expenses have occurred—or else we should leave the rates until the State regulatory bodies have time to fix the rates. I am not in favor of these rates established by the Postmaster General enduring for one moment after any municipality or other regulatory body can go into the hearings and determine what is just. I think those questions ought to be determined. I know the Postmaster General could not go into them thoroughly, and he has not done so. If the city of Chicago one week after this bill is passed can determine the proper rates, then I think the rates in the city of Chicago should be as the regulatory body provides. I think if the State of Tennessee or the State of Wisconsin in two weeks after this bill goes into effect can consider and determine what rates are proper, that immediately those rates should be adopted; and the provisions of the Senate bill, as amended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, makes just that provision. There is not any keeping of the rates in effect for six months. There is merely provision that these rates shall endure until the regulatory body can pass on the question, and in no event more than six months. So six months is not a time given for the rates made to remain in effect, but six months is the limitation put upon these companies and the regulatory bodies within which they must act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 154 of the acts of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved on the 16th day of July, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, repealed: *Provided, however*, That the existing toll and exchange telephone rates as established or approved by the Postmaster General on or prior to June 6, 1919, shall continue in force for a period of 90 days, but not longer, after this act takes effect, unless they shall be sooner modified or changed by the public authorities—State, municipal, or otherwise—having control thereof prior to the time the Government took possession of the telephone systems under the act of July 16, 1918, or by contract or by voluntary reduction, it being the intent that after the approval of this act the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and all the authority of the States, municipalities, or other public control over the properties of which the United States assumed the possession and operation under the act of July 16, 1918, shall be immediately restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

One page 2, line 5, after the word "repealed," insert the words "to take effect on midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I think the motion ought to be put. A good many Members might want to vote against it. I shall not vote for that amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes had it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is too late.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, at the beginning of the line, insert the word "reasonable," and after the word "period" strike out the words "of 90 days, but not longer," and insert "not to exceed six months."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "unless," strike out the words "they shall be."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "authorities," strike out the language "State, municipal, or otherwise."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to reinsert those words.

Mr. HASTINGS. Just vote down the amendment to strike out. There has been no action taken.

Mr. ESCH. Very well.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the word "control" strike out the words "thereof prior to the time the Government took possession of the telephone systems under the act of July 16, 1918," and insert, "or jurisdiction of such tolls and rates."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment just read by striking out the word "such," being the last word in line 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment, page 2, line 15, at the end of the line strike out the word "such."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "reduction" strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, after the word "reduction" I propose to offer an amendment. I make the parliamentary inquiry whether the committee amendment should be completed before the amendent is offered at this point or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment comes first.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard in opposition to the committee amendment. I am not going to detain the House but a minute. Mr. Chairman, I am jealous of State control of intrastate rates. I do not see that it will do any harm to leave that language in. It makes it absolutely clear what jurisdiction the Interstate Commerce Commission has and that all the authority of the State, municipal, and other public control, local or otherwise, over the properties of which the United States assumed the possession and operation under the act of July 16, 1918, shall be immediately restored. There can not be any doubt about it if that language is left in and we can not make any mistake by leaving the language in the bill. By striking out the language there may be some ambiguity, but I assume there is not as much since we have left in the language above in lines 12 and 13 and voted down that amendment which leaves in "State, municipal, or otherwise." Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am in favor of leaving this language in here at the end of section 1 so as to make it absolutely certain that the State corporation commissions and the various municipal authorities shall have the same jurisdiction and control of rates, supervision and control of these properties that they had before July 16, 1918. We all know that if there is any dispute about it and jurisdiction is assumed by the Interstate Commerce Commission that the average citizen can not get the ear of the Interstate Commerce Commission like they can the members of their own State corporation commission. I desired to use this opportunity to express my opposition to this amendment and I hope it will be voted down. There should be no doubt about the language. I would rather use too much language than too little on a matter of such importance to the people.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of the committee in striking out the last part of the paragraph was simply because they thought it was unnecessary to have it in there, and it was not exactly in proper form for a bill. Now, the House is passing a bill which ought itself to show what its intention is, and it seemed to the committee that the bill, after it has gone ahead and expressed the will of the Congress, ought not to contain a further clause stating what the intention of Congress is.

If the language of this first section of the bill is not plain enough to state the legislative intention we ought to amend the language so that it will state it. We ought not to have to repeat and state what our intention is.

Mr. HASTINGS. What does the gentleman say to striking out the words "it being the intent" and leaving the rest of it, so that you would have after the semicolon "that, after the approval of this act," and so forth, "the jurisdiction would be the same?" So it would be absolutely clear the jurisdiction is retained. Then you make it absolutely clear that the various State commissions retain the control they had before July 16, 1918.

Mr. DENISON. In reply I will state that if you should strike out the words "it being the intent," then the language following would have no meaning at all, because the language above states that these rates shall continue unless the various regulatory authorities, the State regulatory authorities, the municipal regulatory authorities, or the Interstate Commerce Commission shall otherwise change them. Now, that can not be misunderstood.

Mr. HASTINGS. You can not misunderstand it if you leave it in there.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman will yield, Congress has no power, either legislatively, affirmatively, or by implication, to say either of these various regulatory powers is not restored, either upon the ending of the six months' period or the readjustment of rates. So as a matter of authority of law this authority is restored; and if not, the language of the bill as we have already adopted it, certainly it leaves no ground of mistake as to what Congress intended.

Mr. DENISON. I think the gentleman from Kentucky is right. If the bill said nothing about it at all, then the jurisdiction of the State regulatory authorities are restored automatically. With the language of this section above as plain as it is, the committee thought this provision that was stricken out was wholly unnecessary and if omitted would leave the bill in better form.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] is recognized.

Mr. MOON. I have an amendment which I wish to offer, but I notice there is still another amendment pending to that section. Would it be proper for my amendment to be offered at this point or to wait until the committee amendment below is acted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. MOON. Who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. By agreement, the gentleman from Tennessee has the floor. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mine is a proviso. I have no objection to yielding to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut has an amendment to the text of the bill.

Mr. MOON. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee yields, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT: Page 2, line 7, after the word "existing," insert the words "telegraph rates."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, the resaon for suggesting that amendment is obviously only to do justice to all the wire companies. The telegraph companies have been subjected to the same increase of expenses in every way that the telephone companies have, and there is no reason that I can see why the telephone rates should be continued and the telegraph rates returned to the prewar scale.

On that subject I venture to read some of the testimony of Mr. Carlton, the president of the Western Union Telegraph Co., because it relates partly to the company and is partly an argument on this amendment. He says:

As to wages, I know in the year 1918 my own company increased wages almost $11,000,000, which amounted to 25 per cent increase in pay roll. Everybody knows what has happened to material prices.

This bears on the point the gentleman from Tennessee raised.

Everyone who possesses a spark of national feeling knows also that unless we find some way to treat labor better than we have been treating it in the past democracy will be nothing but a name. I do not need to lecture you gentlemen on that. We of the Western Union are ambitious to give labor a greater participation in the fruits of the telegraph business. Heretofore, and up to the present time, the telegraph employee has been very modestly paid, too modestly paid.

And then he quotes Mr. Vail, the president, as saying:

There is no use trying to have a decent telegraph system until we get some spirit into the heart of our workers. They are dispirited. They are discouraged. They have only stuck to the telegraph business because there were no other means of livelihood open to them.

Then he goes on to ask, if the rates are not retained what will be the effect? He says the necessary effect will be to reduce the rates, and, he asks:

Who is to pay for this reduction? Labor is going to pay for most of it. If the public service companies and the workers are to adopt a system of participation in the profits, whatever form that participation may take, there must be reasonable profits for distribution. We can not treat labor as it deserves to be treated by starting reprisals on our competitor.

That relates to the proposition of the Postal Telegraph to reduce their rates 20 per cent. He suggests another factor, alluding to the fact that the Western Union Co. differs from the Postal Telegraph Co. in that it strives to reach every town in the United States. His testimony shows that the Western Union Co. has some 26,000 offices, of which some 20,000 do not pay, whereas the Postal Co. does not try to reach small towns. He shows that the Postal Co. competes for 80 per cent in dollars of the business but only receives 15 per cent of the business. Then he goes on to show how a reduction in the rates, brought about by a reduction under the law, would affect the service, and then he says that if the rates were reduced it would affect wages, and he shows how it would affect the service. Then he adds:

If they are successful in carrying out this reduction and we are successful in instituting reprisals to do them damage, and they build a plant in time to carry an important volume of traffic, we shall have to curtail by closing many small offices which do not pay, thereby depriving almost 50 per cent of the population of this country of adequate telegraph service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is not a question that admits of very elaborate argument. I think a plain statement of the facts carries its own conclusion. It seems to me that—it being evident to all of us that, owing to increased rates and increased expenses, the expense of carrying telegrams has been increased, and they have been operating under the rates established by the Postmaster General—there is no reason whatever why the same fair treatment that is accorded to the telephone companies should not also be accorded to the telegraph companies, and therefore it seems to me that the amendment I have proposed is not only just to the companies but just to the employees and just to the country. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, is there going to be any opposition to the amendment? If there is no opposition to it, I do not care to occupy the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a division on that important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 9.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOON: After the word "reduction," on line 16, page 2, insert:

"*Provided further*, That no reduction of wages of telegraph or telephone employees now in effect shall be made so long as the rates fixed by the Postmaster General are effective."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. Does the gentleman care to discuss it?

Mr. MOON. I do not care to discuss it unless some one else does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 32.

The CHAIRMAN. So the amendment is rejected.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MOON. I made the point that there was no quorum before that point was made.

The CHAIRMAN. We can rise without a quorum.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move a call of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You can not do it in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You can not have it in Committee of the Whole. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum is raised. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven gentlemen are present—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alexander	Fordney	Little	Rodenberg
Anderson	Foster	Longworth	Rogers
Andrews, Nebr.	Frear	Luce	Rowan
Anthony	Freeman	McArthur	Rubey
Bacharach	French	McClintic	Rucker
Baer	Fuller, Ill.	McCulloch	Sabath
Bankhead	Fuller, Mass.	McDuffie	Sanders, La.
Barbour	Gallagher	McFadden	Sanders, N. Y.
Begg	Gallivan	McKenzie	Sanford
Benson	Ganly	McKeown	Saunders, Va.
Blackmon	Gard	McKinley	Scully
Bland, Ind.	Garland	McKinley	Sears
Bland, Mo.	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sells
Booher	Godwin, N. C.	McPherson	Sherwood
Britten	Goldfogle	MacGregor	Shreve
Brooks, Ill.	Good	Magee	Sinclair
Browne	Goodall	Maher	Sisson
Brumbaugh	Goodykoontz	Major	Slemp
Burdick	Gould	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Mansfield	Smith, Ill.
Burroughs	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Butler	Griest	Mason	Smith, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Griffin	Mays	Smithwick
Byrns, Tenn.	Hamill	Monahan, Wis.	Snell
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton	Montague	Snyder
Cannon	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Va.	Steele
Cantrill	Hardy, Tex.	Morin	Steenerson
Carter	Haugen	Mott	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Hawley	Mudd	Strong, Pa.
Coady	Heflin	Murphy	Sullivan
Copley	Hersey	Neely	Summers, Wash.
Crago	Hicks	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Cramton	Hill	Nolan	Taylor, Colo.
Crisp	Hoch	O'Connell	Thompson, Okla.
Crowther	Huddleston	O'Connor	Tilson
Dallinger	Hulings	Oldfield	Tincher
Davey	Hull, Iowa	Oliver	Tinkham
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Tenn.	Olney	Towner
Dempsey	Husted	Overstreet	Treadway
Dent	Ireland	Padgett	Vaile
Dewalt	James	Paige	Vinson
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Ky.	Parker	Volstead
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnson, Miss.	Pell	Walters
Dominick	Johnson, Wash.	Peters	Ward
Donovan	Jones, Pa.	Phelan	Wason
Dooling	Kahn	Platt	Watson, Va.
Doremus	Kearns	Pou	Weaver
Drane	Kelley, Mich.	Purnell	Webb
Dunn	Kendall	Quin	Welty
Dyer	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	Whaley
Eagan	Kettner	Rainey, H. T.	White, Me.
Eagle	Kiess	Rainey, J. W.	Williams
Echols	King	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Evans, Mont.	Kitchin	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, La.
Evans, Nebr.	Knutson	Rayburn	Wilson, Pa.
Evans, Nev.	Lampert	Reavis	Wingo
Fairfield	Lazaro	Reed, W. Va.	Wise
Fess	Lee, Ga.	Rhodes	Woods, Va.
Fields	Lesher	Riddick	Woodyard
Fitzgerald	Lever	Riordan	Yates
Flood	Linthicum	Robinson, N. C.	Young, N. Dak.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORES of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having under consideration the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, found itself without a quorum; whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 186 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he reported the names of the absentees to be printed in the Journal and the RECORD.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded as present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the committee resumed its session, with Mr. MOORES of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. MOON. I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOON: After the word "reduction," in line 16, page 2, insert:

"*Provided further*, That no reduction of wages of telephone or telegraph employees now in effect shall be made so long as the rates fixed by the Postmaster General are effective."

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOON. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. ESCH and Mr. MOON.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 58, noes 83.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOON: Page 2, line 16, after the word "reduction," insert:

"*Provided further*, That until the rates fixed by the Postmaster General are changed as authorized herein, any excess of net revenue arising from the operation of each telegraph or telephone system in excess of an amount equal to the compensation fixed by the Postmaster General during Federal control shall be applied to any deficiency which may result from Government operation.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the amendment that it is not germane to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. MOON. What has the gentleman got to say in favor of his point of order?

Mr. ESCH. The bill relates to the return of the wire system, and prescribes a period for the operation of rates made by Federal control. It has no relation to the matter of wages, no relation to excess rates, or the application of such rates to a reduction of any deficiency which the Government would be subjected to by reason of Federal control.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a general bill on the subject of telephone and telegraph wires and turning them over from Government control back to the individual corporate control. It deals with the question of rates, it deals with the question of wages, it deals with the whole question affecting the telegraph system. Any language is germane and in order that pertains to the disposition of this question. The Government has got the wires now, and under the very law we are holding them now it provides the company shall have a certain fixed compensation according to the value, and the excess goes into the Federal Treasury under the general law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the original act by which the property was taken over the Government entered into contracts with the various companies for compensation during the period of Government control. Now, the Government is bound by that contract which it entered into between various companies, and the terms of the contract end when the Government control ends. Therefore this is an amendment, not providing for anything cared for in the bill, but reaches over into the period beyond Government control and adds to the contract they made under the law by which the properties were taken over.

Mr. MOON. It does not do anything of the sort; it provides for the period during Government control.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Government control ends whenever the property is turned back, and the rates continue after Government control ceases. I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in response to the contention made by the gentleman from Tennessee that this is to apply to the period during which the Government is in control, I beg to direct the Chair's attention to the fact that the very language of this paragraph repeals the act, not the paragraph, but the entire act under which Government control was instituted. The amendment which the gentleman has offered is seeking to reduce the amount received in excess of that received before Government control was put into operation, and it is not germane to this particular paragraph or to the bill which is repealing the act providing for Government control.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the only justification that this committee can have for extending these rates for six months is the justification that we had for passing the wire legislation. This Congress has no jurisdiction to fix rates for telephones or telegraph companies unless it is a continuous jurisdiction arising out of the war measure by which we took over the wire lines. That is the only authority we can conceive by which we can extend the rates now in existence for the next six months, although the wires have gone back to the rightful

owners. Since we assumed jurisdiction to continue the rates for six months, the gentleman from Tennessee offered an amendment applying certain sums out of funds over which we have assumed jurisdiction, and therefore I think the amendment is pertinent and germane to this legislation, and I think the point of order ought to be overruled. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "General" insert the words "and being charged."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the language proposed in the amendment would have this effect. The paragraph now reads:

That the existing toll and exchange telephone rates as established or approved by the Postmaster General on or prior to June 6, 1919, shall continue in force—

And so forth.

As amended the paragraph would read:

That the existing toll and exchange telephone rates as established or approved by the Postmaster General and being charged on or prior to June 6, 1919, shall continue in force.

Now, the purpose of that is to prevent the inauguration of new rates fixed by the Postmaster General after June 6, 1919. The rates were put into force by the Postmaster General before that period in many of the States, and some of the States sued out injunctions against the enforcement of the rates.

These injunctions are still pending. Immediately after the Postmaster General loses control of these wires the injunctions will be set aside, but notwithstanding the fact that the rates have not yet gone into effect, unless the words are put into the bill, the rates fixed by the Postmaster General at some date in the past before the 6th of June will become operative in about 18 additional States, and it seems to me that that ought not be permitted. These words "and being charged" will prohibit the institution of new rates where they are not already in existence, after the control of the wires has passed from under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] if the effect of his amendment will not be to prevent the collection of the rates that were enjoined from the time they were enjoined or from the time of their effective date until June 6.

Mr. MADDEN. No; not before June 6, but after June 6.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported, not to be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment, without objection.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. SIMS. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: Let us take Chicago. That is one of the places it applies to.

Mr. MADDEN. That is only one, and that went into effect on the 16th of June. This applies to 18 different States.

Mr. SIMS. But one case illustrates all. If the amendment is not adopted, when would this rate apply to Chicago?

Mr. MADDEN. It would apply to Chicago, if the amendment is not adopted, from the time the injunction was set aside, or whatever prevented the collection of the rates, if there was an injunction. Do not make this illustration apply to Chicago, for I do not want it to be understood that I am pleading for Chicago.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, no; not alone.

Mr. MADDEN. I am pleading for 18 different States.

Mr. SIMS. But those States or localities that did not enjoin the rates have been paying them from the time they became effective under the order of the Postmaster General. Is not that true?

Mr. MADDEN. If they slept on their rights—yes.

Mr. SIMS. But I am not talking about sleeping. The Supreme Court having decided that the Postmaster General had the power to put in the rates, lawfully, then if they did not go into effect at the time they were ordered to go into effect, the Government of the United States will lose the difference in the rates that would have been collected and what will be collected.

Mr. MADDEN. The Government of the United States never ought to have put the rates into effect, to begin with.

Mr. SIMS. But I am not talking about that. It amounts to this. It increases the deficit to the extent that the gentleman's amendment prevents the collection of rates that would have been collected had the injunction not been sued out. The injunction having been held to be void, illegal, then the gentleman, speaking for these 18 States—and I am using his expression——

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SIMS. The effect of his amendment is to give those States and localities that sued out an improper injunction all the benefits they would have had if the supreme court had held otherwise.

Mr. MADDEN. Yet at the same time the gentleman from Tennessee is willing to impose the burden upon the people unjustly.

Mr. SIMS. Not unjustly. The Supreme Court has said that the Postmaster General had the right to do it, and the States and localities that did not sue out injunctions have had to pay the rates that were fixed by the Postmaster General, and to adopt the amendment means to increase the deficit, which is to increase the amount that has to come out of the pockets of the general taxpayer, for the benefit of these 18 States, and, I am informed, though the information may not be reliable, that in the case of Chicago alone it will amount to about $2,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know how much it amounts to.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman think we ought, in effect, to sustain the illegal action of a lower court, which has been overruled by the highest court in the land, that we should ignore the action of the Supreme Court of the United States and relieve every locality that sued out and obtained unlawful injunctions of the burden of paying the tolls and charges thus lawfully authorized, to be taken eventually out of the general taxpayers' pockets?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think because the Postmaster General entered into contract with the telegraph and telephone companies to pay them an amount far in excess of the earnings of those companies that therefore the American people ought not to complain but submit to the excessive charges and that we ought not to legislate to relieve them?

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman is taking up my time. If the amendment applied to all people and all rates had been enjoined then it would be equal, but the gentleman's amendment will have the effect of awarding those who obtained injunctions which they had no right under the law to obtain and give them the benefit that the decision of the Supreme Court otherwise deprives them of. Now I want to appeal to every honest man in this House and ask if he wants to tax the people to make good the results of an illegal court proceeding, and that is exactly what this means——

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman submit to one more question?

Mr. SIMS. I can not refuse the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. What percentage of the membership of this House does the gentleman appeal to in appealing to every honest man in the House?

Mr. SIMS. All of them, and especially to the superhonest man who has just taken his seat, for I have often heard him fight dishonesty, or what he thought was in effect dishonesty. To take money out of the Treasury that is put in by everybody and give it to Chicago or any other city or State is not honest, is not right, is not legal, and is unjust. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The rates fixed by the Postmaster General were applied to 90 per cent of the telegraph and telephone business of the United States and were applied in practically all the States. In 18 of those States in this country injunctional orders were secured which restrained the Postmaster General from putting in force the increased rates. The other 25 States acquiesced in the rates fixed by Government authority under the war power. Now, then, it happens that in those 18 States that sought and secured the injunctions restraining the enforcement of these increased rates we find that their position is untenable, because the Supreme Court has held on June 2 that those rates were legal rates and were legal because they were granted under the war power. Now, those 18 States since they got injunctional orders have not been paying the increased rates which were ordered by the Postmaster General. What is the consequence? The A. T. & T. has fallen $9,000,000 behind the amount it was entitled to under its contract with the Government; the Western Union $1,000,000. Had those rates fixed by the Postmaster General way back in March been enforced in those 18 States there would be to-day little or no deficit under the Government contracts with the A. T. & T. and with the Western Union. To come in now and say that these advances in rates shall not be made subsequent to the 6th of June would result in putting a burden upon the Treasury of the United States and an additional burden upon the people in the 25 States who have already paid their respective share of this burden. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "tolls" insert the word "charges."

Mr. MADDEN. Now that, Mr. Chairman, would add to the language so as to make it read "tolls, charges, and rates." Tolls happen to be one thing, rates another thing, and charges still another thing. Now, for example, the telephone companies make a charge for being ready to serve the public. They make a charge under the direction of the Postmaster General which they never made before for the installation of a telephone, and it seems to me that the State authorities or the municipal authorities ought to have control not only over the tolls and rates but also over the charges, and if the House or the committee adopts the amendment which I have introduced it will give control not only over the tolls and over the rates but over the charges as well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, whereas the bill only provides that the exchange charges, which include regular rental for telephones for residence and business places, and the daily charges for messages, shall remain in effect, the gentleman wants to continue the charges for installing new telephones and taking them out?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to continue that.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think so.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Where does it come in?

Mr. MADDEN. After the word "tolls," in line 16, page 2. The mere fact that the committee left the word out and made no mention of the charges is no indication that it abolishes the charges when the lines go back to the owner. It does not give anybody the power to regulate it and my judgment is they have given, by the language of this section of the bill, jurisdiction to the public utilities commissions of the States and municipalities over everything but the charges. That is the way it reads to me.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Now then, your idea is, as I caught it, that the tolls and rates may continue as established by the Postmaster General, but that the charges for installing telephones shall not continue?

Mr. MADDEN. What I want to do is to give control over the regulation of the charges as well as the tolls and rates.

Mr. SIMS. All authority of the Postmaster General over these rates and fares and charges ceases the very moment that the State or other regulating body acts.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that, but you have not given them any power to act.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I make another suggestion?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under this bill the only charges that are continued are the tolls and rates, and therefore all other items of expense automatically follow when the properties are turned back. Therefore the State commissions and municipal regulatory bodies automatically have power to regulate any charges or any expense not continued by this act.

Mr. MADDEN. I know that is the opinion of the committee that reported the bill, and I am quite sure they were sincere in that opinion, but I differ with them.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the gentleman's amendment simply add descriptive language—that is, simply describing authorities that have jurisdiction of all the rates and charges?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. WALSH. It does not increase or curtail them?

Mr. MADDEN. No. It puts it within the power of the State utility commissions and of the local commissions to know exactly what they have charge over, and there is no harm in inserting the words. It can not hurt anything and it may do a lot of good.

Mr. SIMS. It does not take any money out of the Treasury that would otherwise go into it?

Mr. MADDEN. Not a cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to return and deliver forthwith to the respective owners thereof all of the systems, lines, and property taken possession of or received, operated, supervised, or controlled by him under authority of said joint resolution.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, line 24, after the word "directed," insert the words "upon the taking effect of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, line 25, after the word "deliver," strike out the word "forthwith."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the first proviso of said joint resolution prescribing the just compensation to be paid for and on account of said Acts shall continue in full force and effect until such just compensation shall be fully paid and adjusted to and with the owners of said systems, lines and property, in the manner and according to the terms and conditions therein set forth.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 6, strike out the word "Acts" with a capital "A" and insert the words "acts" with a small "a."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 8, strike out the words "to and with the owners of said systems, lines, and property."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That within 60 days after this act shall take effect the President shall cause to be made a detailed and itemized account and report of all his acts and proceedings in connection with the supervision, possession, control, and operation of the telephone, telegraph, and marine cable systems of the United States under the proclamations referred to in section 1, and of all moneys received and expended, and all property and assets acquired or held, and all liabilities or obligations incurred, including contracts relative to compensation awards, such report to show in detail the financial results of the operation of each separate wire system up to and including March 31, 1919, and the financial results of the operation of each separate wire system between March 31, 1919, and the date when the said system shall have been returned to the owners thereof.

With committee amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "sixty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ninety."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike out the words "and itemized."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 21, strike out the words "each separate" and insert "such."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike out the word "system" and insert the word "systems."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, strike out the words "each separate" and insert the word "such."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 24, strike out the word "system" and insert the word "systems."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 1, strike out the words "to the owners thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 3, line 22, after the word "systems," insert the words "from August 1, 1918," and strike out the balance of line 22, all of line 23, and all of line 24 to the word "and," and insert after the word "and" the words "up to."

Mr. ESCH. So that it will read, Mr. Chairman——

The Clerk read as follows:

So that it will read: "Such report to show in detail the financial results of the operation of such wire systems from August 1, 1918, and up to the date when the said systems shall have been returned."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORES of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMALL. I desire to have a separate vote in the House on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

The SPEAKER. There will be opportunity for that.

Mr. SMALL. When will that come?

The SPEAKER. When the previous question is ordered. The question is on agreeing to the motion for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below.

An act (S. 1028) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to amend the laws for preventing collision of vessels and to regulate the equipment of certain motor boats on the navigable waters of the United States," approved June 9, 1910; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 19, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for headstones for graves of soldiers, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 115); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill relating to the marine hospital at Baltimore, Md. (H. Doc. No. 116); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting request that section 73, paragraph 36 of the printing act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stats., p. 616), be amended so as to permit of the printing and distribution of 1,000 copies of the publication Tests of Metals instead of 500 copies, as provided under the present law (H. Doc. No. 117); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 6136) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands to School District No. 21, of Fremont County, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 6137) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate and deliver to each of the 14 counties of the second congressional district of Texas one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 6138) to increase the limit of cost of the public building to be erected at Kenton, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6139) to provide for an investigation to ascertain the feasibility of the construction of a reservoir and irrigation project in the Santa Fe River, Santa Fe County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 6140) for the relief of the survivors of McLean's Pennsylvania regiment and their widows and children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6141) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 6142) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Great Falls, State of Montana, four German cannons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 6143) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Brinkley, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6144) to provide for the erection of a public building at Clarendon, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6145) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Liberty, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6146) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Glassport, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6147) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Braddock, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Port Vue, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6149) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Elizabeth, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6150) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Pitcairn, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6151) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of East Pittsburgh, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of McKeesport, Pa., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6153) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Wilkinsburg, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6154) to permit the exchange of certain lands for the improvement of the Santiam National Forest of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) to permit the exchange of certain lands for the improvement of the Siskiyou National Forest of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6156) for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6157) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Somerset, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 6158) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Louisburg, Franklin County, N. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6159) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Nashville, Nash County, N. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6160) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Raleigh, Wake County, N. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6161) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Smithfield, Johnston County, N. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6162) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pittsboro, Chatham County, N. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6163) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Henderson, Vance County, N. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN: A bill (H. R. 6164) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Eastman, Dodge County, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6165) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hawkinsville, Pulaski County, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6166) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Valley, Houston County, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6167) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Vidalia, Toombs County, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 6168) to amend the act of Congress approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," and including the amendment thereto; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6169) intended to equalize status and pay of officers in the National Naval Volunteers and Fleet Reserve of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6170) to pay retired naval officers in accordance with the duty they are performing during the period of the war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6171) to authorize the refund of duties collected on field kitchens imported during the year 1916; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6172) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Derby, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6173) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rib Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 6174) for the purpose of providing credits for honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who are not owners of homes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6175) to repeal the penalty clause of that portion of section 6 of chapter 433 of the act of the Sixty-fourth Congress relating to the failure to pay gas bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: Resolution (H. Res. 119) requesting the State Department to submit to the House of Representatives a complete report in connection with the reported detention of Dr. William T. Ellis by the British Government, particularly with regard to the attitude of American consular officers in Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: Resolution (H. Res. 120) calling for investigation of telephone and telegraph strike; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) protesting against the interference of any foreign power in the affairs of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 123) proposing an initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of its citizens when they so desire to vote upon constitutional amendments and laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOULD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 124) to provide for a joint select committee of the Senate and House to investigate the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 125) commending the Secretary of War in sending soldiers across the Mexican border to protect the lives and property of United States citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6177) granting a pension to Annie Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6178) granting a pension to Mary A. Strome; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6179) granting a pension to Catherine Foddrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6180) granting a pension to Robert W. Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) granting an increase of pension to Simon T. Hickman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 6182) granting an increase of pension to John Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 6183) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ubert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 6184) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Bingaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 6185) granting a pension to Charles A. Hartley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6186) granting an increase of pension to Stamford W. Rife; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 6187) granting a pension to Ellen W. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6188) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit Amy E. Hall to select any tract of land lying within the Oregon and California land grant which is not otherwise appropriated or reserved in lieu of the homestead entry heretofore lost by her, and authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to her for the lands described in her selection; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6189) for the relief of Mrs. W. Sharp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 6190) granting an increase of pension to William A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 6191) granting a pension to Frank Swartz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6192) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6193) granting a pension to Joseph H. Klopp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6194) granting a pension to James Prosek; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6195) granting a pension to George H. Haverkate; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6196) granting a pension to Florence F. Wellington Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 6197) granting a pension to Adaline A. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 6198) authorizing the payment of compensation for personal injuries to Swanhild Sims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 6199) granting a pension to Samuel M. Deets; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6200) granting a pension to Stanley S. Courtright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6201) granting a pension to Frank Bradley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6202) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6203) granting an increase of pension to George Edward Blackmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6204) granting an increase of pension to Foster D. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6205) granting a pension to Olive K. Jeffries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) granting a pension to Mamie K. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6207) granting a pension to Mary V. Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 6208) granting a pension to Kate Cobb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) granting a pension to Samuel M. Vawter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6210) granting an increase of pension to George Poff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 6211) granting an increase of pension to William H. Salisbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 6212) granting an increase of pension to Magna Samson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6213) granting an increase of pension to Mattie L. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6214) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) for the relief of Jeremiah McCraith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6216) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Surface; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of J. P. Heyman, Robert Day, Mrs. L. J. Smith, sr., Alma Warnke, Mrs. W. H. Pollock, Women's Christian Temperance Union, Mr. and Mrs. J. Dewhiest, Mrs. C. J. Sprowl, Mrs. D. H. Welch, M. G. Delamatre, C. A. Wekel, and A. E. Thurston, all of Huron, Ohio, against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 35 members of the Park Avenue Baptist Church, of Mansfield, Ohio, protesting against the lifting of the ban on wine and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of 534 citizens of Galveston County, Tex., requesting the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by the Farmers' League of Texas, requesting Congress to amend section 13 of the Federal reserve act so as to permit Federal reserve banks to loan money on agricultural commodities certificates issued against stored nonperishable products while in the hands of the producer; also, asking amendment of sections 5200 and 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to permit national banks to make larger loans on longer time upon such certificates; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Arendtsville and Biglerville, Adams County, Pa., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of Woodside Baptist Church and congregation for strong enforcement of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bronx Board of Trade, New York, opposing the prohibition clause against beers and light wines; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of New York Pharmaceutical Conference of Greater New York and Westchester County opposing tax on soft drinks, sodas, and toilet articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Wholesale Coal Association, assembled at Cleveland, Ohio, and representing 30 States, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Committee of the Fur Industry, New York, for repeal of tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY. Petition of George Y. Webber and sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of numerous citizens in various localities in Missouri, asking repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, Brooklyn, etc., protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of A. T. Bellis, of St. Louis, Mo., for repeal of the zone advances law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Nettie Lasar, of St. Louis, Mo., against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of St. Louis, Mo., and other clubs against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ernest Sommer, and sundry other men of St. Louis, Mo., for the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of La Crosse, Wis., urging enforcement of prohibition laws and against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Association of Retail Druggists for repeal of sections 630 and 907 of revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Biscuit and Cracker Manufacturers' Association of the United States, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church, West Liberty, Ohio, in behalf of the persecuted peoples of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Friends' Christian Endeavor, Spring Valley, and United Presbyterian Church of Clifton, both in the State of Ohio, against modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of biscuit and cracker manufacturers of the United States, opposing the repeal of the zone advances on second-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of Dr. M. K. Rose and sundry other citizens of New York and New London, Conn., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. W. Higgins and others, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of citizens from the town of Torrington, Conn., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of National Association of City Editors, demanding that Postmaster General Burleson immediately restore second-class mailing rights to daily and weekly newspapers in the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GANDY: Petition of Croatian Fraternal Lodge, No. 227, of Terry, S. Dak., on the subject of the territorial differences between the Jugo-Slavs and the Italians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Velebit Society, No. 298, of Lead, S. Dak., on the subject of the territorial differences between the Jugo-Slavs and the Italians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Jesus The Good Shepherd Society, of Washington, relating to Jugo-Slav question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of the Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church, First Baptist Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, and First Christian Church, all of Cape Girardeau, Mo., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of Local Federation of All Shop Crafts, Albuquerque, N. Mex., demanding the entire elimination of all aliens from the shops of the Railway Administration except where they have already taken out citizenship papers, and that their places be filled by Americans; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex., that the State of New Mexico and other public-land States be given

unreserved public domain within their boundaries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of American Hampshire Sheep Association, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Presbyterian Church of Taos, N. Mex., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Federation of All Shop Crafts, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Albuquerque, N. Mex., representing more than 1,000 railway employees, supporting the Plumb plan for Government ownership of railways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of residents of Unadilla, N. Y., for repeal of tax on soda water, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Delhi, N. Y., for repeal of tax on soda water, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Binghamton and Johnson City, both in the State of New York, for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda water, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from residents of Worcester, N. Y., against the repeal of war-time prohibition, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Resolution adopted by Local No. 26 of Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, Birmingham, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of T. S. Sheppard and others, customers of United Cigar Stores Co., Birmingham, Ala., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred L. Beavers and other patrons of Fulton Drug Co., Bessemer, Ala., for repeal of tax on soft drinks, sodas, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. A. Davis and others, customers of Robert W. Murray, 4101 North First Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. M. Howard and other customers of Garlington's Pharmacy, Pratt City, Ala., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of military affairs committee of Chamber of Commerce of El Paso, praising Maj. Gen. Cabell and Brig. Gen. Erwin for their action in taking necessary measures to protect American citizens in El Paso on June 14 and 15; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of Wayne, Mich., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Presbyterian Church of Northville, Mich., urging Congress to pass, as quickly as possible, an adequate, permanent code for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Homedale Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Flint, Mich., protesting against the wine and beer amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETTNER: Appeal of the Associated Dairymen of California, Sacramento, Calif., to support a bill to amend section 6 of the act of October 15, 1914, entitled "An act to supplement the existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, request of the California Manufacturers' Association of Oakland, Calif., for discontinuance of Federal Employment Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the California White and Sugar Pine Manufacturers' Association of San Francisco, Calif., against transfer of the national forests to Department of Interior; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union of Corona, Calif., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Petition of George Glover and others of Mobile, Ala., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Federation of Men's Clubs of the East Side Churches of Bridgeport, Conn., opposing the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the employees of Lake Torpedo Boat Co., of Bridgeport, Conn., condemning Bolshevism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: Petition for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream, signed by sundry citizens of Richmond, Va.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition by citizens of Salem, Ohio, praying for the repeal of section 904 of the 1918 Federal income-tax law (H. R. 12863); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition from citizens of Eldon, Mo., eighth congressional district of Missouri, asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York for the repeal of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of The Bronx Board of Trade, New York, opposing prohibition clause prohibiting the manufacture and sale of beers and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. B. Suevilly, President Oil Seeds Co., New York City, favoring Senate bill 692; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of W. E. Ridgeway and other citizens of New York protesting against the repeal of the so-called war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Resolution passed by First Baptist Church of Lewistown, Mont., urging Congress to pass a permanent and adequate code to carry into effect both war-time prohibition and the eighteenth amendment; and petitions of citizens of Opheim, of Chouteau County, and of Hysham, all in the State of Montana, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Assembly No. 339, Slovak League of America, urging that Congress recognize the present Lithuanian de facto government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of several thousand citizens of New York State, protesting against the luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bronx Board of Trade, New York City, against measure prohibiting the manufacture and sale of light wines and beers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Double Seal Ring Co., of New York City, asking repeal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Biscuit and Cracker Manufacturers' Association of United States, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of M. B. Snevily, president Oil Seed Co., favoring Senate bill 692; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal churches in Conesus and Scottsburg, N. Y., urging the passage of legislation enforcing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, without any exception of beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Orleans District Lodge No. 16 and Albion Lodge No. 15, International Order of Good Templars, urging the passage of legislation enforcing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Miss Hattie L. Manning and 10 other residents of Albion, N. Y., urging the passage of a bill defining as intoxicating all liquors containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol, and also urging the passage of legislation enforcing the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 1,600 residents of Cohoes, N. Y., protesting against the war-time prohibition act and favoring its repeal as applied to beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of 29 members of Admiral Coghlan Post, No. 36, against the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; also of numerous residents of Troy, N. Y., against the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEARS: Petition of Mr. Charles A. Schucelm, 2123 Market Street, Jacksonville, Fla., and others in re tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition by citizens of the seventeenth district of Illinois in behalf of the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of residents of Northampton County, Pa., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Rhode Island State Council Knights of Columbus, against the Smith-Towner bills (S. 1017 and H. R. 7), providing for promotion of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Louis Glaser and others of Lawrence, Pa., protesting against the terms of the treaty of peace offered by the peace conference at Paris to the representatives of Austria-Hungary, and particularly protesting against the proposed transfer of certain territory inhabited by

Serbs, Slovenes, and Croatians to the jurisdiction of Italy; and petition addressed to the Sixty-sixth Congress, relating to the controversy between Italy and the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also petitions protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest against the repeal of the daylight-saving law, and a petition urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of St. Brendan Society, composed of citizens of Boston, Mass., for rejection of any league of nations which does not recognize the republic of Ireland, as well as the self-determined government of other oppressed nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UPSHAW: Petition of numerous citizens of Atlanta, Ga., against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition signed by Ellis Mills et al., citizens of Pottstown, Pa., protesting against the luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Asheville, N. C., asking repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June 19, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the God of nations, we come before Thee with our national problems. We thank Thee that we can stand upon the traditions of our people and follow the light that shines along the pathway inspired by Thy truth, followed by men of vision in our day. Grant us, we pray Thee, a due appreciation of the ever-increasing responsibility that is upon us as a Nation, a responsibility proportionate to the blessings that we enjoy, the power that has been committed to us, the wisdom that Thou hast given to us, and the splendid opportunities to which Thou dost call us. Guide us by Thy counsel into the large service for all mankind. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 34)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $2,000 required by the War Department for "Incidental expenses, Tank Corps Schools," for the fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SALE OF CONDEMNED PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 33).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication dated May 19, 1919, from the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, transmitting, in compliance with law, a statement showing the proceeds from the sales of condemned property of the United States in his charge, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3854) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, further insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 to the bill, agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GOOD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Seattle. It recites that the resolution was introduced by former United States Senator Piles, seconded by Gov. Louis Hart and Mayor Ole Hanson. The resolution relates to the reported outrages against the Jews in Poland. I ask that it may be read to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 18, 1919.*

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

At a public mass meeting held in Metropolitan Theater to-night the following resolution, introduced by former United States Senator Samuel Piles and seconded by Gov. Louis Hart and Mayor Ole Hanson, was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas we citizens of the State of Washington in mass meeting assembled in the Metropolitan Theater at the city of Seattle on this 18th day of June, 1919, are satisfied that organized massacres have been directed against Jewish communities in eastern Europe, especially in Poland; and

"Whereas the atrocities committed have been so frequent and cruel that the Congress of the United States has been moved to pass resolutions deploring the acts of violence and cruelties inflicted upon men, women, and children because of their race or religion; and

"Whereas the Right Hon. Cecil Harmsworth, British undersecretary of state, after submitting statistical data with respect to the lives lost and property plundered, intimates that if the Polish-Jewish situation is to be ameliorated concerted action of all the Allies and associate powers is necessary; and

"Whereas Poland was admitted into full membership of the family of nations by the allied and associated powers as a free and independent State upon condition that her responsible Government would protect the rights of all races and religions within her borders; and

"Whereas 746,000 men of the Jewish faith willingly offered their lives in the allied and associated armies that the principles of democracy might be perpetuated, the oppressed nations made free, and to make certain that all would thereafter be protected in their civil and religious liberty; and

"Whereas we, as a free people, are imbued with the old-fashioned idea that those who fought that all might be free are entitled to live and worship according to their dictates of their own unfettered conscience, irrespective of race or creed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this people that Congress, in order to safeguard the interests of civilization and further the cause of humanity in the present assault upon both, should take such action as to it may seem proper to prevent a recurrence of the cruel and wicked outrages that have recently been committed against the Jewish people, and that in the meantime the Department of State be requested to bring to the attention of the Government of Poland our abhorrence of the atrocious wrongs which have so far been inflicted upon, and which even now threaten, those who are unable to defend themselves against the cruel and monstrous outrages that have so profoundly shocked the conscience of civilized people everywhere.

"*Resolved further*, That copies of these resolutions be telegraphed to the Department of State and to our Representatives in both branches of Congress."

NATHAN ECKSTEIN, *Chairman.*

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I present a memorial on Federal paved highways addressed to the President and the Congress of the United States by Leon F. Moss, of Los Angeles, Calif. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Fort Myers, Fla., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against the repeal or any modification of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KING. I have received a large number of letters, statements, and telegrams in opposition to the continuation of the Federal Employment Bureau or Service. One letter, which is a type of many I am receiving, and which has come from the Utah Associated Industries, is before me. I ask that it be read and referred to the appropriate committee having that matter in charge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UTAH ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES,
Salt Lake City, Utah, May 26, 1919.

Re Federal Employment Bureau.

Hon. WILLIAM H. KING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KING: You will remember that some weeks ago we communicated with you relative to the attitude of the Utah Associated Industries on the continuation of the Federal Employment Bureau. At that time we had occasion to urge that the appropriations solicited by the heads of the Federal Employment Bureau be not allowed; that the best interests of the country can be conserved by the abolition of the Federal Employment Bureau; that the bureau, being created as a war-time emergency, has fulfilled its mission, and that its continuation would be a burden upon the taxpayers, and that the problems which they have outlined can and are being successfully dealt with by the individual communities and States.

We respectfully ask, therefore, that you review the situation carefully, and trust that you will share our views that the appropriation asked for be not allowed.

Thanking you for an expression of your attitude in the matter, we remain,

Very truly,

A. C. REES,
General Secretary.

Mr. KING. I have been advised since the letter just offered was sent to the desk to be read that there is a bill pending before the Committee on Education and Labor for the appropriation of $4,000,000 for the perpetuation of this employment service. I move, therefore, that the letter be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented petitions of Local Union No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth their grievances with the War Department regarding working conditions, etc., at Nitrate Plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KNOX presented a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 2, 1919.

Whereas the Government of the United States has heretofore provided pensions for veterans who served in the Civil and other wars when such veterans had reached certain ages; and

Whereas no similar provision has been made for veterans of the Spanish-American War: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does hereby respectfully petition Congress of the United States to adopt legislation providing for the pensioning of all veterans of the Spanish-American War when said veterans reach a certain age.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth forward a copy of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

THOMAS H. GARVIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The foregoing resolution concurred in by the senate June 3, 1919.

W. P. GALLAGHER,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, June 9, 1919.

PENNSYLVANIA, *ss:*

I, Cyrus E. Woods, secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having the custody of the great seal of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that the foregoing and annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of concurrent resolution No. 18–B, passed by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation providing for the pensioning of all veterans of the Spanish-American War when said veterans have reached a certain age, as the same remains on file and appears of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed the day and year above written.

[SEAL.]

CYRUS E. WOODS,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. KNOX presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the Kiwanis Club, of Chester, McKees Rocks, and Williamsport, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Marsteller, Brick Church, Apollo, Barnesboro, Leechburg, and Ford City, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Torrington, Bridgeport, Yalesville, Mount Carmel, Rockville, Abington, South Manchester, and Portland, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of the Rotary Club of Wichita; the Ministerial Association of Wichita; the Chamber of Commerce of Salina; the Industrial Council of Topeka; the Community Labor Board for the First Employment District for Kansas, of Topeka; of the Central Labor Union, of Hutchinson; and of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ of Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 52, S. N. P. D., of Mineral, Kans., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 9, S. N. P. J., of Yale, Kans., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Greenville, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NEWARK BAY BRIDGE.

Mr. EDGE. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 1378) to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the navigable waters of the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey, and I submit a report (No. 20) thereon. I call the attention of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "together with the necessary" before the words "approaches thereto" and insert the word "and"; in line 12, after the word "provisions," to strike out the words "of section 2," and after the word "act," in the same line, to strike out the words "of Congress," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority be, and is hereby, granted to the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the city of Elizabeth, in the county of Union, and the city of Bayonne, in the county of Hudson, in said State, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOSSES TO CONTRACTORS.

Mr. KIRBY. I report back favorably from the Committee on Commerce Senate resolution 83, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 83) submitted by Mr. MCKELLAR on the 17th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, requested to have an examination made and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable moment as to the amount and cause of loss, if any, to the contractors on the following contracts:

In lower St. Francis levee district and first and second Government districts:

Miles 41/ 0– 48/4. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 83/30– 87/14. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 93/15– 96/8. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 130/ 0–140/29. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 168/20–169/30. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 171/32–173/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 173/ 0–175/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 175/ 0–177/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 177/ 0–179/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.
Miles 179/ 0–180/0. Bids received August 24, 1917.

In lower Yazoo levee district and third Government district:
Stations 1513–1575. Bid received November 10, 1917.
Stations 1200–1513. Bid received September 4, 1917.

The Secretary of War is also requested to report as to stage of completion of said contracts, the delay on each, if any, the cause of delay, and what estimate of what the work contemplated in said contracts would cost as of the day of the report.

Mr. KIRBY. This resolution asks only for information as to the present status of these contracts and the amount of losses, if any, sustained by the contractors, and also as to whether the work is being delayed. I ask that the resolution be adopted.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2117) for the relief of Seemann & Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 2118) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2119) to restore Col. Robert H. Peck, of the Regular Army, to the place in the lineal list he would have occupied had he not been separated from the service; and

A bill (S. 2120) for the relief of certain officers in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 2121) for the promotion of educational extension through the United States Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 2122) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Fort Payne, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2123) granting a pension to Charles W. Bechtel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2124) donating a captured cannon or fieldpiece and cannon balls to the city of Benwood, Marshall County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2125) granting an increase of pension to John A. C. Hazel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 2126) for the relief of certain employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 2127) granting a pension to Thomas Thompson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SWANSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $200,000 to enable the Secretary of Labor to continue the Investigation and Inspection Service, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL POLICY.

Mr. SPENCER. I submit the following resolution and ask that it be read and lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate approaches the consideration of the league of nations with entire sympathy and in the earnest desire to cooperate as fully as it may in thus establishing and preserving the peace of the world.

That in the interest of a frank and full understanding with the other nations of the world, and particularly with the signatory nations to the covenant itself, candor and friendship alike require that the danger of future misunderstanding should, as far as possible, be eliminated, and to that end the following declaration should be clearly and definitely made:

First. That the Monroe doctrine is an essential national policy of the United States, and that the necessity and extent of its application and enforcement are matters to be determined alone by the United States as the occasion for interpretation may from time to time arise and without interference, direct or indirect, on the part of any other nation.

Second. That internal questions entirely domestic in character, such as immigration and tariff, notwithstanding certain international results that may from time to time naturally be connected therewith, are matters to be determined entirely by the country in which they arise and are under no circumstances questions for settlement under the provisions of the league of nations.

Third. That inasmuch as the United States is governed by a written Constitution, the provisions of which are supreme and controlling in this Republic over every act, legislative, executive, or judicial, and by such Constitution it is expressly provided that the power either to declare war or to continue war for more than two years is vested exclusively in the Congress of the United States. It is apparent that the United States can not bind itself in advance to either make war in the future or to send its Army or Navy into other lands for purposes of control, which is an act of war, without the express authorization of Congress at the time; and therefore whether the United States, as the necessity for such action in the future may arise, shall by any military or naval force cooperate in maintaining any of the provisions of the league of nations is a matter which the Congress, under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, is and must be entirely free to determine by what in its judgment is at the time consistent with the honor and interest and duty of the American people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. KING. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. Let me state before it is read, if I may, that this resolution was offered at the last session, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably by them, and unanimously passed by the Senate. It was introduced at the beginning of this session and referred to the committee. Inadvertently it was denominated a joint resolution instead of a Senate resolution. I am offering this as a Senate resolution, and in view of the fact that it relates to the same matter which has been considered by the committee, asking for certain information concerning conditions in Mexico, I apprehend there will be no objection to its passage. I have spoken to the chairman of the committee and various other members of the committee, and all are in accord with the terms of the resolution, or rather are not opposed to its consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 87), as follows:

Whereas claims aggregating millions of dollars in compensation for damages to property and for personal outrages and destruction of life suffered by American citizens in the Republic of Mexico have been filed with the Department of State for presentation to the Government of Mexico; and

Whereas some years have already intervened between the commission of such damages and outrages and no progress is apparently being made toward the liquidation, settlement, and payment of such claims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether or not said claims have been presented to the Government of Mexico, and what steps and measures are being taken to prosecute such claims and to liquidate and settle the same, and if said claims have not been presented, then to report to the Senate what steps and measures are contemplated to be taken with respect thereto and when the department will proceed with the same; also to report to the Senate the number of citizens of the United States who have been killed in Mexico since Porfirio Diaz retired from the Presidency of Mexico, together with the number of nationals of other countries who have been killed in Mexico as far as the Secretary of State is advised; also to report to the Senate the amount of claims filed with the Secretary for damages suffered by citizens of the United States in Mexico, and any information which the Secretary has as to the confiscation of property of citizens of the United States and as to the damage suffered by the citizens of the United States in Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. I am advised that on account of official business the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] will be unable to serve upon the conference committee on the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes. I therefore ask that he be relieved from serving as one of the conferees, and that the Vice President appoint a Senator to take his place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made, and the Vice President announces the appointment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, with the permission of the Senate, I shall address the Senate on the league of nations on Tuesday next after the routine morning business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—DAYLIGHT-SAVING LAW.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to announce that if I had been present yesterday when the vote was taken on the motion of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to repeal the daylight-saving law I should have voted "nay."

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 3854. An act to repeal the daylight-saving law was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 18) providing for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harrison	McLean	Smoot
Beckham	Henderson	McNary	Spencer
Calder	Hitchcock	Moses	Sterling
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	New	Sutherland
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Trammell
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Underwood
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	King	Poindexter	Warren
Fernald	Kirby	Robinson	Watson
Fletcher	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sherman	
Gronna	Lenroot	Simmons	
Hale	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. McKELLAR. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are detained on public business.

Mr. KING. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are necessarily detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT Sixty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, so far as possible I shall refrain from any discussion of the proposed league of nations or of the pending peace treaty. A resolution such as this justifies, if, indeed, it does not require, some incursion into the domain which it covers. I have steadfastly avoided any discussion of the treaty, and particularly of its league of nations feature, until it shall be laid before the Senate, thus giving us the official text, together with such information as in all probability will accompany its transmission. It is true that on one or two occasions I have elsewhere expressed myself with regard to some features of the original proposed covenant of the league of nations, but not until the President had himself twice spoken at length regarding it.

The resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], of course, refers to the peace treaty, and is based upon it. I challenge the constitutional power of the Senate to entertain it, and protest the expediency of doing so at this time. I believe, after as careful a consideration as I have been able to give to the subject, that it is not only improper for the Senate either to adopt or to reject it; that it is not only unwise at this time to go on record regarding it, but that, as a part of the treaty-making power, we have no power to advise the peace congress either of our views concerning its work or as to what the treaty should contain.

When this resolution was introduced, I think every one, both in and out of this Chamber, regarded it as a direct challenge to the inclusion of the proposed league within the boundaries of the peace treaty; that its primary purpose was to notify the delegates composing the peace convention that no treaty embracing the scheme of a league of nations could receive the sanction of a constitutional majority here; and that in consequence no such treaty should be sent here for our consideration. That view was confirmed by an interview shortly afterwards published in the Washington and other newspapers of the country purporting to give the sentiments of the author of the resolution to the public. The Washington Star of June 13 published this interview from which I quote:

> Whether the resolution passes or not, it will put the Senate on record in the matter of the league of nations. I can hardly believe, in view of the growing sentiment in the country against the league, but that there will be enough Senators to defeat its passage.

This interview has not been denied; no one has so far asserted that it is incorrect. I am justified, therefore, in assuming that it was published by the authority of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and conveyed to the public his construction of the purpose of the resolution. It was, therefore, Mr. President, with some surprise that I listened to the opening sentences of the Senator's speech day before yesterday when he said:

> The resolution before us does not call for a vote for or against the league of nations; it does not call for even an expression of an opinion either for or against the league. On these points this resolution is wholly colorless.

I am unable to reconcile that statement with the quotation just made from the interview of the previous week. It indicates either that the Senator has changed his mind and that the purpose to be subserved by this resolution has been altered accordingly or that resentments have been voiced in the country that make it expedient to abandon the object for which he prepared it. If this is a "colorless" resolution, either as to this or any other point, certainly the time of the Senate should not now be wasted in its consideration. If it has become a "colorless" resolution since it was introduced and reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, then it should be withdrawn from the calendar, because I am unable to perceive what office it can perform if a vote taken upon it can in no wise "call for even an expression of an opinion either for or against the proposed league of nations."

Before discussing the resolution, let me dispose of another opening statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He said:

> Somewhat experienced in the ills and embarrassments suffered by the Executive branch from opposition (for partisan purposes) to legitimate national activities, I fully sympathize with the position that in foreign affairs we should present a firm and united front. If, therefore, opposition or support of the league becomes a party issue in this country, it will not be upon my initiative nor with my partisan support. But if Senators on the other side continue as a party to oppose all efforts to secure full consideration of this great matter, if they do not cease to listen to and to obey the mere fiat of a partisan Executive, if they remain firm in their stand against the constitutional right of the Senate fully and fairly to consider this question upon its merits, and if they persist in their denial of the sovereign right of the people to deliberate upon and reach a determination concerning it, if this, sir, is to be the party attitude of Senators who oppose, then I say here and now, in all soberness, I shall be the last to shrink from the issue which they so force. And I will say further, if to stand for the rights of the Senate as a coequal part of the treaty-making power is a manifestation of partisanship, then I am a partisan; if to demand that the people of the United States shall have a right to make up their own minds as to whether or not we shall put ourselves under the domination of the balance of the world; if to regard our free institutions as the greatest instrumentalities of government which the world now possesses, and therefore worthy of preservation over all others which exist in the world; if to love my own country and our own people with my whole heart and soul above and beyond all other countries and peoples of the world—if these things are manifestations of partisanship, then, thank God, I am a partisan. Senators of the opposition, you may make this a partisan issue if you choose, but if you do you must pay to the American people and to their posterity throughout all time the penalty which they will exact.

I construe this, Mr. President, as no other than a shrewd attempt by a very able Senator to shift the burden of an obvious partisanship to the opposition and, by assuming a nonpartisan, lofty attitude of patriotism, to declare to the world that it is the Democracy alone which would drag into the mire of partisan politics the mightiest question ever presented for the consideration of the American Congress. I fully agree that this should not be a partisan question. I have protested in my feeble way against any such manifestation wherever I have encountered it. I believe that upon a subject like this the man who votes for or against this treaty for merely partisan considerations has no conception of the duties and obligations placed upon his shoulders by his oath of office.

But if this great subject has assumed or is assuming a partisan character, then I contend that the Republican opponents of the treaty, not entirely, but nearly so, must assume the blame and the burden. One distinguished opponent of the treaty, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], has from the beginning insisted that it was the duty of his party to make the league a party issue, and that his party should array itself against the treaty. The chairman of the national committee does not accept this counsel, but insists—and, I think, most wisely—that an international problem affecting not only our own but the peoples of the world should be divorced, as far as possible, from all partisan considerations and determined upon its merits as a mighty national and international issue.

But, Mr. President, almost immediately after the return of Mr. Wilson from Paris, and upon the eve of the adjournment of the last Congress, a certain number of Senators, more than one-third of the membership of this body, placed their signatures to what is popularly known as a "round robin" protest against the proposed league and inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, thus giving an official manifestation of their attitude upon the general subject of the treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the leader of the Republican Party.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; and I think his name, like that of Abou Ben Adhem, "led all the rest."

Mr. President, if that round robin was presented to a single Democratic Senator before its introduction, I am not aware of it. I am not aware that it was presented to anybody. There must have been some reason for it, and I am not uncharitable when I assert it to have been a partisan one. That justifies me in resenting the attempt of the Senator from Pennsylvania to shift the burden and threaten us with dire consequences should we so far forget our duty as Senators and as Americans as to make this a party question.

The Republicans have control of this body now. They recently organized the Senate, and among other things thoroughly reorganized the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is an open secret that none but opponents of the league were eligible to membership upon that committee in this Congress. I am referring now to the new Members. If that is not true, I hope some Senator upon the other side will rise right now and correct the statement, for I have heard it on several occasions, and I have never heard it denied; and if that is not an evidence of partisanship with regard to a great national question, what is it?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. And it can also be observed that when they organized that great committee they were not content unless they had a majority of three on it.

Mr. SMOOT. The same as they had before.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado permit a brief interference with his argument?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask if he will wait, say, three minutes by the clock for any Republican Senator to dare deny that the Foreign Relations Committee was stacked, and stacked against the President of the United States, by the will and power of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the Republican Party?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I have no hesitation in denying that, both as a Republican Senator and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was stacked against the President of the United States, if at all, only in the sense that he is a Democrat and I am a Republican.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, now, Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. That is the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will excuse me a moment further, it was not only stacked as a deck of cards might have been against the President because he was President and because he was a Democrat, as the Senator confesses, but it was stacked against him because he was the leader of the movement in favor of a covenant of peace for the world.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi may be much more familiar with Republicanism and the trend of Republican thought than I; but it can not be possible that even he thinks that under the new organization of the Senate, with a Republican majority, we should continue a Democratic majority on any committee.

Mr. THOMAS. No; that is not the proposition at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I never said that. I am a partisan.

Mr. MOSES. So am I, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not continue a Republican organization under Democratic rule; but I say that you have stacked an international committee, which is not a partisan committee, against the hope of the world for peace and against the covenant of the league of nations, as well as against a Democratic President.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. You say you did it merely against a Democratic President. That far I go with you if he were a Republican President and I were in the majority.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, no; I can not permit the Senator from Mississippi to misquote me to that extent, Mr. President. I say that the majority of the committee was made up of Republicans, and in that sense only was it stacked against the President, he being a Democrat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the majority of the committee was not only made up of Republicans, but it was made up of Republicans who came out openly and declared that they were against the league of nations and they were against the treaty of peace; and there is but one Republican left upon the committee in favor of the league of nations, and the only reason he was left there was because you dared not remove him. I refer to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Mississippi shows an unwonted knowledge of Republican affairs, Mr. President; but inasmuch as the injunction of secrecy upon the proceedings of the executive session of the Committee on Foreign Relations the other day has been removed, it may suffice to call to his attention the fact that upon every record vote there taken the Democratic members of the committee lined up solidly on one side, and whatever division took place in the committee at all took place on the Republican side, where two Republican Senators occasionally voted with the Democrats.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that also is true, accidentally. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] voted with the Democrats upon every proposition involving the league of nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, was the stacking——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon. If he will wait just a little while, then perhaps I will yield to him.

Mr. THOMAS. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor, and he ought to take charge of it.

Mr. THOMAS. I will soon yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You left just one Republican member on that committee in favor of the league of nations and the hope of the civilized world for peace, and the only reason you left one was that you dared not take him off. Of course, he voted for it and with us whenever the question of the league of nations was involved. There was another member of the committee—there were, in fact, two—who said that unless section 5 of the Knox resolution were stricken out he might vote with us. We voted to keep section 5 in so as to make them vote against you. Politics; yes. You voted to take section 5 out to let them vote with you. Politics; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, the Senator may not camouflage things. He knows as well as I do, and as a man of honor he will not deny, that the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania is not merely the motion of the criminal lawyer with a client about to hang for a continuance, but that it is a motion to defeat the covenant of peace and the league of nations, and that is all that is behind it, and that any man who says that you are merely pleading for further time to think, when if you had any capacity to think at all you would have thought long ago, is simply untruthful and insincere and dishonest.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. You are trying to defeat the league of nations. That is what you are trying to do, and you know it as well as I do; and when I say "you" I do not mean you personally. I do not intend to be personal toward anybody. I mean this whole infernal gang.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. McCORMICK addressed the Chair.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for one moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I will.

Mr. MOSES. Of course I know that the Senator from Mississippi, who sits with me on the Committee on Foreign Relations, does not intend to apply to me personally the epithets which he has just used. So far as concerns the motives which actuated the Senator from Pennsylvania in making his motion in the Committee on Foreign Relations, he fully stated them before the committee, and they are on record in the minutes of the meetings of that committee. My experience with the Senator from Pennsylvania as his colleague here on this floor and as his subordinate when he was at the head of the State Department leads me to believe that he is intellectually and personally honest, and that whatever statement of motive he may have made here, in the committee room, or elsewhere is absolutely sincere and without any reservation whatever.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Illinois for a moment.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, as I came in the charge was being made that the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee was stacked with Republicans.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I made no such charge. It had a right to have a majority of Republicans. I said it was stacked against the covenant of peace and the league of nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. If you please, Mr. President, the charge was made that it was stacked with Republicans against the covenant of peace. It might be replied that the commission in Paris was stacked with Democrats, excluding all Republicans, ready to bow to the will of the chief American representative over there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think that is worth replying to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I trust I have said nothing, and I certainly intend to say nothing, that will reflect in the slightest degree upon my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for whose opinion and for the integrity of whose conscience and intellect I entertain the very highest regard. I am merely contrasting conditions with announcements and protesting against what seems to me to be an effort to shift the burden of partisanship, doubtless for partisan purposes, upon this side of the Chamber. When the Senator says that he has no partisan motive in introducing this resolution, I am bound to accept that statement, but I must nevertheless insist that the action of his colleagues upon a subject like this speaks louder than protestations upon the floor and indicates a partisanship which I regret to see manifested toward any international question.

I want to be entirely fair upon this proposition. The chairman of the Democratic national committee has himself insisted that it should be made a party issue. I deplore that attitude, whether it appears among our own or the ranks of the opposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; he is doing an injustice to the chairman of the Democratic national committee.

Mr. THOMAS. It may be that I am.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He merely said that if the Republican Party chose to make it a partisan question he would welcome the issue.

Mr. THOMAS. I based my statement upon the accounts which I saw in the public press, and I am very glad to learn that they were overdrawn.

We can not, of course, wholly abandon partisanship if we would, even in the consideration of international questions. I can not, and I am charitable enough to believe that others opposed to me can not, do so; but I believe that we can subordinate them, when the occasion requires, to the tremendous problems which we occasionally encounter which bring us in contact with other nations and which are fraught with consequences reaching beyond our shores and far beyond the future of the present generation.

Mr. President, these preliminaries having been removed, let me come to the resolution itself, which challenges the treaty-making power of the Executive by asserting the coequality of the Senate. I refer, of course, to the language of the preamble. I regret that it found the calendar just when the peace congress had prepared and delivered the revised draft of the treaty to the German representatives. I have no doubt they regard it as providential and that it may serve to stimulate their opposition to it. If it were expedient, the resolution should have been offered long ago. If the answer be that the "round robin" was presented long ago, I reply that the "round robin" should have been sufficient and needed no supplement in the shape of this or any other resolution.

The asserted coequality of the treaty-making power of the Senate has no warrant in the Constitution. It is opposed to the overwhelming current of national procedure and the enlightened opinion of the past hundred and twenty years. It has been asserted, but never successfully. It has been assailed, and always with success, and the renewal of it at this time and from a party which is founded upon the principles and the doctrines of Alexander Hamilton, justifies me in also characterizing that as partisan in design and embarrassing, and intended to be embarrassing, to the Executive in operation. The fact that it bears the name of an eminent lawyer and statesman, whose sponsorship of it endows it with its chief claim to serious and exhaustive consideration, makes it all the more remarkable.

It was preceded by the adoption what I may term the Irish resolution, which received the unanimous vote of the Senate with one exception. This can have no other effect——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor intent.

Mr. THOMAS. Than to embarrass the deliberations of our delegation in the peace congress. Since I have referred to that resolution, Mr. President, let me say that it is in direct conflict with the principles embodied in the Knox resolution. I do not know whether the Senator from Pennsylvania voted for the Irish resolution or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He did.

Mr. THOMAS. The principal feature of the preamble of the Knox resolution is that since war was declared for certain purposes by our country, the peace congress, now that we have won the victory, should devote itself to the accomplishment of those purposes and those alone, leaving other questions to be decided hereafter and after more full deliberation.

We certainly did not enter this war with the object of securing the independence of the Irish Sinn Fein. The people of the United States have always sympathized with the wrongs of Ireland. As the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said some days ago, I have about as many friends among the Irish people as anyone in this Chamber. I wish them as well as any man can. But if I had been here when the resolution was considered my vote would have been recorded with that of the Senator from Mississippi.

Now, the Senator from Pennsylvania indirectly gave us the reason for the Irish resolution when he said that the Irish were "the political dynamite of the Anglo-Saxon race," wherefore both sides of this Chamber, anxious either for the dynamite or to prevent its explosion, for political purposes only, by their action have intruded the resolution into the councils of the peace conference, knowing that it had no place there; that it would disturb the proceedings without accomplishing anything whatever. Not a Senator voting for it would as a member of the congress ever move to proceed to its consideration.

Mr. President, the influences in Ireland responsible for the resolution do not represent the Ireland of Parnell, of Redmond, of Michael Davitt, and of T. P. O'Connor, Irish nationalists all, but an element which exhibited but little devotion to the great principles of democracy when fighting for its life in the great crisis of the World War. They were consorting with the enemy, giving him aid and comfort for the undoing of the British Empire.

We did not enter this war to establish the right of a faction to demand autonomy from a peace congress as the essential of a lasting peace or otherwise, whatever the merits of their contention. In entertaining the resolution we intruded ourselves into the domestic affairs of one of our Allies, inspired only by the promptings of partisan selfishness.

Mr. President, Korea has been knocking at the doors of Congress for some time. She hungers for some resolution of similar import. She has been appealing to the American people for many months from the oppressions of Japan. They implore us to recognize their cause and secure them a hearing before and justice from her rulers. Has anyone introduced a Korean resolution here; and if so, would any Senator on either side vote for it? Korea has no votes in America.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment for an interruption, the Senator, contrary to his usual custom, being rather stupid? There are no Korean-Americans, hyphenated Americans from Korea, with votes to reelect Senators and Representatives. The reason is perfectly clear.

Mr. THOMAS. No; and no hyphenated Chinese, either. There is a Chinese question, a very serious one, and one with which I very greatly sympathize, but she knocks at these doors in vain. I imagine that if in the House of Commons some enthusiast introduced a resolution at the behest of the people of Porto Rico or, if you please, of the colored people of the South——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mississippi especially.

Mr. THOMAS. Mississippi especially, as the Senator says, asking the peace congress to give them a hearing, with a view to establishing their independence, the author of the Irish resolution, a most eloquent and distinguished statesman, would be the first and the loudest in his denunciation of the insult, and would rail at the temerity of the British House of Commons interfering with our affairs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And still worse if the British House of Lords did it.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it comes with ill grace from Senators who are unanimous in their support of that resolution within the short space of a week to father another declaring that the American commissioners to the world's peace congress should confine themselves to securing peace only by the safeguarding of the objects for which we waged this war. The inconsistency is so glaring that its statement is all that is needed to expose it.

Now, let me turn to the second preamble of the resolution:

> Whereas the Senate of the United States, being a coequal part of the treaty-making power of this Government and therefore coequally responsible for any treaty which is concluded and ratified, is deeply concerned.

And so forth.

Mr. President, in what does this alleged coequality consist? The treaty-making power of the Senate must be found in the Constitution. There it is provided that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties." If that establishes coequality, then the preamble of this resolution can not be assailed. If that recital does not establish coequality, the assertion of it must fall.

Mr. Webster defines "coequal" as being "on an equality in rank, on a par in age or in extent;" and the Century Dictionary defines the word as meaning "equal with another person or thing, or with one another, having equal rank, dignity, intellectual ability, etc., of corresponding character or quality."

If the Senate is coequal with the President, why has it not long ago selected delegates either from its own members or elsewhere and sent them to Paris? It may advise the President if it sees fit, but it is an established fact, which can not be questioned, that the President may accept or reject that advice as he may think best for the country. It is with him entirely a matter of discretion. Our real function does not begin until the treaty reaches us after it is negotiated. The President's functions are then suspended while the Senate has the treaty under consideration. They are resumed after the Senate shall have ratified it. To assert that this means coequality is to assert that because the President has the veto power over legislation he also is endowed coequally with the legislative authority, which is ours by organic law.

Mr. President, it would be monstrous if a body composed of 96 men, upon such a slender foundation as this, can assert, much less assume, to exercise such extraordinary authority. If this coequality exists, why has not the Senator from Pennsylvania been active long ago? Why did he not assert it at the time the President appointed his commissioners and insist that this body, being endowed with the same right and authority, should not only be consulted in the appointment of our commissioners but appoint commissioners of its own?

Mr. President, never in the history of this Nation until this resolution was introduced has the coequality of the Senate with the Executive been claimed as to a tremendous power, purely administrative. So far as I have been able to ascertain from the records of the Congress, this is the first recorded instance, and no alleged executive encroachment upon legislative authority even by Theodore Roosevelt himself can compare with this asserted encroachment upon the power of the Executive.

I have heard much since I have been a member of this body of the usurpation of legislative authority by the President. It is a song that has been sung in every Congress since Washington was inaugurated, but it comes with ill grace from those who so complain to themselves assert an executive authority which must, if it be established, take its precedent from the Knox resolution.

Before I refer to the precedents let me speak of another peculiarity of the resolution. I say peculiarity, perhaps I should designate it as another unique feature. I refer to the third clause of the resolution, "that the Senate advises, in accordance with its constitutional right and duty," and so forth.

Under the Constitution such advice as the Senate may offer must be tendered to the Executive. If the President needs counsel or if the Senate thinks it wise to give him counsel it has a perfect right to do so. But this resolution does not pretend to advise the President. It advises the assembled delegates of the civilized world. Of course, if we are coequal in power with the President we may have that authority, but whoever before assumed that under this clause of the Constitution the Senate of the United States has the right and that it was its duty to tender its counsel to a world peace conference, to the delegates of other nations duly assembled, to all the people of the world, and to the President of the United States, only if he be a delegate himself?

To adopt this resolution, therefore, would be to establish a precedent which would justify the Senate, pursuant to its coequal executive authority, to take part, of its own volition as a part of its duty, in the exercise of constitutional functions in the councils of every nation where the United States might be interested or involved.

Mr. President, I assert without fear of successful contradiction, first, that the Executive of the United States possesses the sole treaty-negotiating power; that the Senate's power to advise and consent is and must be confined to action upon and consideration of treaties hitherto negotiated and submitted by him to the Senate for ratification or rejection. It then, and not until then, has the power to ratify, to amend, or to reject. If it ratifies, the President, as the depositary of the treaty-making power, may himself reject the treaty and refuse to deliver it. As a corollary, if these positions are not correct, it must be the duty of the Senate to cooperate in the negotiation of all treaties made by the Government, or be faithless to its duty and unmindful of its obligations. That is preposterous.

Mr. President, this controversy in some phase is as old as the Government itself. In the Federalist, Mr. Hamilton gives his views on the subject. They are perfectly sound, and never have been successfully confuted. Afterwards, in 1793, when Great Britain and France were at war with each other, President Washington issued a neutrality proclamation which prompted Hamilton to elaborate the subject. Public sentiment in this country was then overwhelmingly sympathetic with France. It was during the period of our first treaty with France, which some, with much plausibility, contended to be so ample as to require us to act as an ally.

The French minister to this country, with an impudence that has never been imitated, assumed to go over the heads of the President and the Cabinet, and appeal to the people for aid for his Government against what he called the "common enemy." At that time Mr. Hamilton, feeling the need of clarifying the political atmosphere, published a series of letters, defining the extent of the Executive power of the President of the United States under the Constitution. Among other things he said:

> The legislative department is not the organ of intercourse between the United States and foreign nations. It is charged neither with making nor interpreting treaties.

Mr. Hamilton then takes up that clause of the Constitution which declares the Executive power to be vested in the President of the United States of America, and discusses it logically and exhaustively. Among his other conclusions, I find this:

> It deserves to be remarked that, as the participation of the Senate in the making of treaties, and the power of the legislature to declare war, are exceptions out of the general "Executive power" vested in the President, they are to be construed strictly, and ought to be extended no further than is essential to their execution.

These letters created a profound impression, so much so that Mr. Jefferson, as a politician, became anxious for the consequences. He was himself a poor controversialist with the pen. Therefore he appealed to Madison, and wrote him as follows regarding Hamilton:

> Nobody answers him, and his doctrines will therefore be taken for confessed. For God's sake, my dear sir, take up your pen, select the most striking heresies, and cut him to pieces in face of the public. There is nobody else can and will enter the lists against him.

Mr. Madison responded, I think, reluctantly, and, under the signature of Helvidius, he discussed the proposition at length. He was unrivaled as a dialectician, and made the best possible case under the circumstances. His argument became the basis for every subsequent contention against the authority of the President and of the right of the Senate to share with him the power to make treaties. So far as one can learn from contemporaneous history, the argument was with Mr. Hamilton, and public opinion accepted his views and acted upon them.

Some time afterwards—I think in 1825—the then President, Mr. John Quincy Adams, nominated commissioners to what was known as the Panama Congress, which was called by certain South American Republics, Mexico and Nicaragua, I think, being the leading nations in the movement, whose purpose, among other things, was to effect treaties of alliance with the United States, at which time the subject was again involved.

In that connection let me say that that discussion, occurring in 1826, was within three years after the announcement of the Monroe doctrine by the President, which, by the way, was a purely Executive policy. The Monroe doctrine was then assailed in the House of Representatives and in the Senate with a bitterness and a virulence finding its parallel only in the attacks by some gentlemen upon the proposed league of nations.

By way of digression, let me refer to just two specimens of the oratory which at that time ornamented the columns of Gales and Seaton's Register of Debates. I will take, first, Senator Macon, who said:

> What, said Mr. M., had been the constant practice in our own Government? Had it not been a constant increase of Executive power?—

How natural that sounds—

> There was hardly a session of Congress passed but what some power, some patronage was gained by the Executive. We had a very recent and memorable example before us. President Monroe had said that the United States "owed it to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety," and that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by an European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between these new governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security." It was hardly noticed at the time—

That is the Monroe doctrine—

> and now what had it become? He should like to see the letter addressed to the Mexican Government. Now, they were told that this was a pledge, and the United States were to take the front of the battle. If every department of this Government—the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President—did not watch the power which the Constitution had given them, but let it be taken from them by piecemeal, who could tell where it would end?

Now let us turn to the other House. I now read an extract from a speech of Mr. Floyd, of Virginia, who said:

> We are told by the gentleman from Maryland that a pledge was given by Mr. Monroe, then President, to these southern Republics, that we would defend and protect them from the assaults of European armies, or words to this effect; and that since that period this pledge has been renewed by letters from this Government to others, and particularly by our minister to Mexico. Sir, when that message was delivered to this House I then rose in my place and protested against that declaration of the President, as assuming an unwarrantable power, violating the spirit of the Constitution, assuming grounds and an attitude in regard to European powers calculated to involve us in a strife which there existed, and in which we had no interest, and indirectly leading to war, which Congress alone had the right to declare. We are now called upon to redeem the pledge given by Mr. Monroe, the parallel of Ferdinand; not only so, but the further pledge given by Mr. Adams, and that, too, by the correspondence of our envoy with the Republic of Mexico. Here, then, the President has assumed to give support to these nations, even at the hazard of war, without consulting Congress or the representatives of the people. The President has told us that we should not be "palsied by the will of our constituents." This bold claim to unlimited power, if acted upon, extinguishes at one blow the liberty of the Nation. A claim so broad dare not be hinted at by the King of Great Britain; Alexander, Emperor of all the Russias, alone possesses such power.
>
> The daring of this pledge, so contrary to the cautious indecision and irresolution of the former President, caused me to inquire how the circumstances happened, when a Member of Congress, high in the confidence of the President, informed me that the British Government sought a conversation with Mr. Rush, our then envoy and minister plenipotentiary at the Court of St. James, and proposed to him that they should unite upon the subject of South American affairs, and so shape their correspondence as to show to Europe the probable course these Governments would take in the cause of Spanish America. Mr. Rush, who is doubtless as able a negotiator as the Secretary of the Treasury—for the mistake he has made in his report does not exceed five or six millions of dollars this year; but, as it is his first attempt, there is reason to hope he may mend—refused to accede to the propositions unless the British would agree to enter into a treaty recognizing the independence of South America; this did not suit the views of England at that time. This was forwarded to the President, and was then lying on his table, when he issued that bulletin, pledging this Nation to a course which is daily becoming dangerous to the peace of the country from without and dangerous to the Constitution from within.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. I do not wish it to be inferred from what I have said that I am at all committed to the league of nations. I am simply emphasizing the fact that all great forward movements which have become embedded in the policy of this country have been assailed by logic, by abuse, by aspersion of motives, and by gloomy predictions of ultimate

consequences, only to be crystallized into the framework of the Nation's progress.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a moment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have no desire to interrupt the trend of the Senator's argument. I simply wish to ascertain whether the Senator from Colorado read with approval the sentiments which he has just quoted, or whether he adopts the judgment of Mr. Floyd and Mr. Macon with reference to the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, certainly not. I introduced it really as a digression from my remarks to show contemporaneous opinion and criticism of a policy which had been initiated a year or two before by the then President, but which at that time had not crystallized itself into our institutions.

Mr. FALL. I asked the question because the Senator, of course, is perfectly frank and sincere, and I am so familiar with the history with reference to this matter as to know that the statement of Mr. Floyd that no attention was paid to the Monroe doctrine when it was announced——

Mr. THOMAS. This was three years afterwards.

Mr. FALL. Yes; but he makes the statement that there was no attention paid to it, and I know that history would not bear out any such assertion.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, it would not.

Mr. FALL. No.

Mr. THOMAS. But I presume—he seems to have been a gentleman of very strong convictions and prejudices—that he probably meant that relatively it had not excited the attention that would have followed if it had been understood as the supporters of the administration at that time were construing it.

A motion, I think, was offered in the House during the consideraton of these appointments which sought to force the President's hand with regard to his foreign policy, and Mr. Webster's comment upon it was very short but conclusive:

He would recapitulate only his objections to this amendment. It was unprecedented, nothing of the kind having been attempted before. It was, in his opinion, unconstitutional, as it was taking the proper responsibility from the Executive and exercising, ourselves, a power which, from its nature, belongs to the Executive, and not to us. It was prescribing, by the House, the instructions for a minister abroad. It was nugatory, as it attached conditions which might be complied with or might not. And, lastly, if gentlemen thought it important to express the sense of the House on these subjects, or any of them, the regular and customary way was by resolution. At present it seemed to him that we must make the appropriation without conditions or refuse it. The President had laid the case before us. If our opinion of the character of the meeting, or its objects, led us to withhold the appropriation, we had the power to do so. If we had not so much confidence in the Executive, as to render us willing to trust to the constitutional exercise of the Executive power, we have power to refuse the money. It is a direct question of aye or no. If the ministers to be sent to Panama may not be trusted to act like other ministers, under the instructions of the Executive, they ought not to go at all.

The next occasion, Mr. President, for the consideration of this asserted congressional authority arose under the Henry Winter Davis resolution of 1864, which, of course, was aimed at the French then in Mexico. Mr. Davis, one of the great leaders of the House of Representatives during that stormy period, feeling the need of some assertion of the Monroe doctrine as appropriate to the French attempt to subjugate Mexico, introduced this resolution as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States are unwilling, by silence, to leave the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico; and they therefore think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge a monarchical government, erected on the ruins of any republican government in America, under the auspices of any European power.

That resolution passed unanimously.

Mr. Seward, then Secretary of State, in explaining it to Minister Dayton at Paris, wrote:

"It truly interprets the uniform sentiment of the people of the United States in reference to Mexico," yet it is "another and distinct question whether the United States would think it necessary or proper to express themselves in the form adopted by the House of Representatives at this time. This is a practical and purely executive question, and the decision of it constitutionally belongs not to the House of Representatives, nor even to Congress, but to the President of the United States. * * * While the President receives the declaration of the House of Representatives with the profound respect to which it is entitled, as an exposition of its sentiments upon a grave and important subject, he directs that you inform the Government of France that he does not at present contemplate any departure from the policy which this Government has hitherto pursued in regard to the war which exists between France and Mexico. It is hardly necessary to say that the proceeding of the House of Representatives was adopted upon suggestions arising within itself, and not upon any communication of the executive department; and that the French Government would be seasonably appraised of any change of policy upon this subject which the President might at any future time think it proper to adopt."

This dispatch was communicated by the President to the House, and on June 27 of the same year Mr. Davis made an elaborate report thereon from his committee, and concluded with this resolution:

Resolved, That Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States, as well in the recognition of new powers as in other matters; and it is the constitutional duty of the President to respect that policy, not less in diplomatic negotiations than in the use of the national forces when authorized by law; and the propriety of any declaration of foreign policy by Congress is sufficiently proved by the vote which pronounces it; and such proposition while pending and undetermined is not a fit topic of diplomatic explanation with any foreign power.

The resolution came up for debate, and this was Mr. Blaine's conclusive comment upon it:

To adopt this principle is to start out with a new theory in the administration of our foreign affairs, and I think the House has justified its sense of self-respect and its just appreciation of the spheres of the coordinate departments of Government by promptly laying the resolution on the table.

It is true, Mr. President, that these were House proceedings, as was the next, to which I will call attention; but the House, as well as the Senate, during the first 50 years or longer of our national existence, was quite as insistent upon the assertion of legislative prerogatives in the administration and conduct of foreign affairs as was the Senate.

Historically, therefore, the action of the House on the occasions when the subject was considered is quite as important in determining the soundness of this resolution as the action of the Senate.

In 1876 the Republic of Pretoria, afterwards known as the Transvaal Republic, sent to Congress congratulations upon the first centennial of our national independence. Mr. Swann, of Maryland, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations a resolution expressing the high appreciation of Congress of the congratulations. On January 26 President Grant vetoed the resolution upon these grounds:

Sympathizing, as I do, in the spirit of courtesy and friendly recognition which has prompted the passage of these resolutions, I can not escape the conviction that their adoption has inadvertently involved the exercise of a power which infringes upon the constitutional rights of the Executive. * * * The Constitution of the United States, following the established usage of nations, has indicated the President as the agent to represent the national sovereignty in its intercourse with foreign powers and to receive all official communications from them * * * making him, in the language of one of the most eminent writers on constitutional law, "the constitutional organ of communication with foreign States." If Congress can direct the correspondence of the Secretary of State with foreign governments, a case very different from that now under consideration might arise when that officer might be directed to present to the same foreign government entirely different and antagonistic views or statements.

That ended the incident, which seems to have put the general subject at rest until the rejection by the Colombian Senate of the Panama Canal treaty in 1903. That is an incident with which we are all more or less familiar. It occurred at a comparatively recent date in our history. The Senate of Colombia is modeled largely after our own and has the same treaty-making power. It saw fit to exercise that power negatively, which resulted in the rejection of the treaty, followed by a so-called insurrection in Panama, which Mr. Roosevelt recognized in just 1 day, 17 hours, and 41 minutes after the junta's proclamation of independence; his reasons, among others, being that Colombia having sought the treaty and the Senate, from improper motives, having rejected it, Panama had a right to rebel; and having rebelled and declared her independence, he assumed and exercised the right, which the American people seemed subsequently to have approved, of immediately recognizing the new republic born of this insurrection and making a treaty with it. Colombia was thus punished by us because her senate had the temerity to defeat our President's treaty.

When the Colombian treaty comes to us for consideration I shall have something to say in detail upon that subject. I am interested now, however, only in the attitude of the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in this body and his associates with regard to resolutions, somewhat analogous to the present, which were offered, one by the Senator's colleague, the late George F. Hoar, and the manner in which the subject was then considered and disposed of by them.

On the 17th of December, 1903, Mr. Hoar offered a resolution regarding this subject which I will not burden the Senate with reading, but which I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD. It is found at page 316, volume 38, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not, in his judgment, incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate such facts as may be in his possession or in that of any of the executive departments as will show whether at the time of the ratification of the treaty with the Republic of Panama, lately communicated to the Senate, Panama had successfully established its independence, had

lawfully adopted a constitution, and had given authority to the persons with whom said treaty purports to have been made to negotiate and ratify the same.

Also the population of said Republic of Panama at that time, its capacity for self-government, and the race and character of the persons composing it.

Also whether the officials negotiating or ratifying the treaty on the part of Panama had any personal or private interest in or relation to the construction of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

Also whether the constitution of the Republic of Colombia authorized the secession of Panama therefrom, and whether Colombia was prevented by the action of the United States or by any officer or force under the jurisdiction of the same from attempting to assert its authority or to prevent such secession, and what instructions, if any, had been given by the Government of the United States to such officers, whether civil, military, or naval, and, if any action had been taken by such officers without special authority, what action was so taken, and whether such action has been approved or disapproved by the Government of the United States.

Also at what time information of any revolution or resistance to the Government of Colombia in Panama was received by the Government of the United States or any department thereof, and whether any information was received of any expected or intended revolution before it occurred, and the date of such information.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator supported this resolution with his usual exhaustive eloquence, and was thereupon severely criticized by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Foraker, who, speaking of it, said:

It ought to have been made in executive session, if it was to be made at all, not alone because it involved an attack upon the administration but because it involved an attack upon our country as well. There is a treaty now before the Senate with respect to this identical matter, a treaty concerning a great transaction, of which the whole world is witness. All the nations have our action under consideration. It does seem to me that it would have been the part of both patriotism and wisdom, certainly the part of conservatism, for the Senator from Massachusetts to have waited until that treaty, involving all these transactions which he has discussed, could be considered in the committee where it is pending, and then be considered here in executive session of the Senate, where international relations and international questions can be considered without offense to anyone——

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. FORAKER. Wait a minute—and where, Mr. President, all the information called for by this resolution could have been secured just as well as here in the open Senate.

Therefore it is, I say, I criticize that speech because of the fact that any purpose the Senator could have had in mind to subserve, so far as giving information and the benefit of his views to his brother Senators is concerned, could have been subserved better behind the doors in executive session than in the open Senate, where the words spoken will be taken up and spread broadcast before the world as words of criticism coming from the Senate of the United States upon the President of the United States in this great matter. I doubt not the President has acted from sentiments and motives of the highest and the loftiest patriotism and the purest intention to subserve American good.

On the 12th of January following Senator Bacon introduced a resolution relating to the same subject. It will be found in volume 38, page 614, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask leave to introduce that without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCUMBER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the President be respectfully informed that the Senate favor and advise the negotiation, with a view to its ratification, of a treaty with the Republic of Colombia, to the end that there may be peacefully and satisfactorily determined and adjusted all differences between the United States and the Republic of Colombia growing out of the recent revolution in Panama and the consequent secession of Panama from Colombia, and the alleged aid and assistance by the land and naval power of the United States in the successful accomplishment of said revolution and secession through the alleged forcible prevention by said land or naval forces of the assertion and maintenance by Colombia of her sovereignty and authority in Panama, and that full and complete compensation may be made by the United States to the Republic of Colombia for the loss of her sovereignty and property rights in Panama so far as the same may be shown to be due to any act of the United States through the land or naval forces of the same.

Resolved further, That the President be respectfully informed that if it should prove to be impracticable for the United States and the Republic of Colombia to agree through a convention upon the question of the said alleged responsibility on the part of the United States, or upon the question of the amount of compensation to be made when such responsibility shall be established, the Senate in that case favor and advise the negotiation, with a view to its ratification, of a treaty with the Republic of Colombia submitting to the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague, or to some other tribunal to be agreed upon, for impartial arbitration and peaceful determination, all questions between the United States and the Republic of Colombia growing out of the matters herein recited.

Mr. THOMAS. This resolution incurred the opposition of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who then said:

Mr. President, if I rightly apprehend that resolution, it is, in the first place, in the nature of advice to the President to enter upon a negotiation with Colombia. As to the right of the Senate to give such advice to the President I have no doubt; but this resolution, as I understand it, goes further, and instructs the President as to the course of that negotiation. But, Mr. President, my objection to this resolution is much deeper than that. Negotiations, as is well known, are pending between Gen. Reyes and the Secretary of State. They are in communication. What the conditions of their negotiations are we do not know.

Mr. DANIEL. May I ask the Senator whether he is informed as to whether or not those negotiations are ended?

Mr. LODGE. Not to my knowledge. All I can say is that I am not aware that they are ended.

I think for us to come into the Senate with a resolution distinctly in the interest of Colombia would be a most harmful thing. I do not want even to discuss such a resolution. I do not think it ought to be discussed.

I think the Senator was right; and he there stated concisely the fundamental objection to the consideration in open session of the Bacon resolution.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] day before yesterday, referred distinctly to Senator Bacon as an authority supporting his contention, and to the argument which he made in 1906 in support of the Senate prerogative. At least, he recommended the Senator's argument to this side of the Chamber. He must have done so, because it was the only instance in recent time in which a Senator deliberately contended for the constitutional power of the Senate to participate in the negotiation as well as in the making of treaties.

I knew Senator Bacon well. I had the most extreme affection for him. He was a great man. He had his faults. He had the most exalted notion of senatorial authority and dignity. He nearly always referred to himself as an ambassador from the State of Georgia. His insistence upon precedent was sometimes as inconvenient as it was absurd; and he generally succeeded in having his senatorial dignity respected by all with whom he came in contact. Very naturally he was the advocate of everything enhancing the dignity and authority not only of the Senate but of each of its members. What wonder that he should be the surviving champion of such a claim? But he fought in vain. Every position taken, every attitude assumed by President Roosevelt of an Executive character as the outgrowth of the Colombian incident received the unbroken support of the majority in this body, with the single exception of the then senior Senator from the State of Massachusetts, and this side was frequently taunted for its unsuccessful efforts to make a political issue out of the Panama incident.

Mr. Roosevelt's contempt for the Senate was well known. His contempt for every other obstacle to the exercise of such authority as he saw fit at the time to assume is a matter of history; but no one here said him nay. He was supported by the Senate majority enthusiastically, almost unanimously, constantly, and consistently, in his assumption, sometimes proper, frequently extraordinary, of executive authority.

I might weary the Senate by reading one or two extracts from Mr. Roosevelt's writings regarding his conception of Executive power and his own view of senatorial interference, but I will reserve that for another occasion.

Mr. Bacon's argument, to which the Senator from Pennsylvania approvingly referred, was made in 1906, in reply or attempted reply, to the most thorough and exhaustive discussion of the subject that has ever taken place upon this floor. I refer to the speech of Senator Spooner, a synopsis of which can be found in the book entitled "The President's Control of Foreign Relations," by Prof. Corwin, of Princeton University, published in 1917.

His argument has never been answered, and it never can be answered until all our conceptions of the nature of Executive authority and the extent to which it is conferred by the Constitution upon the President of the United States have been profoundly changed. It was inspired by a Rooseveltian episode. The President, as we all remember, had taken occasion about that time, or just previously thereto, to appoint commissioners to the Algesiras conference, the outgrowth of one of the aggressions of Germany upon the coast of North Africa, and designed to involve France in warfare. Senator Bacon denied the power of the President on his own initiative to take part in the conference and also contended that the commissioners named by him should have been submitted to the Senate for their approval or rejection. Senator Spooner rendered a distinct service to that Congress and to his country when he devoted his genius, industry, and abilities to an exhaustive study and exposition of the subject. I will read merely some of his conclusions. After expressing great respect for those who differed with him—and I commend Mr. Spooner to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] as a Roland for his Democratic Oliver—he said:

The Senate has nothing whatever to do with the negotiation of treaties or the conduct of our foreign intercourse and relations, save the exercise of the one constitutional function of advice and consent which the Constitution requires as a precedent condition to the making of a treaty. Except as to the participation in the treaty-making power, the Senate under the Constitution has obviously neither responsibilities nor power.

It is now asserted that we are coequal in this power with the President of the United States.

From the foundation of the Government it has been conceded in practice and in theory that the Constitution vests the power of negotiation and the various phases—and they are multifarious—of the conduct of our foreign relations exclusively in the President. And, Mr. President,

he does not exercise that constitutional power, nor can he be made to do it, under the tutelage or guardianship of the Senate or of the House, or of the Senate and House combined.

I read again:

He may issue to the agent chosen by him—and neither Congress nor the Senate has any concern as to whom he chooses—such instructions as seem to him wise. He may vary them from day to day. That is his concern. The Senate has no right to demand that he shall unfold to the world or to it, even in executive session, his instructions or the prospect or progress of the negotiations. I said "right." I use that word advisedly in order to illustrate what all men who have studied the subject are willing to concede—that under the Constitution the absolute power of negotiation is in the President and the means of negotiation subject wholly to his will and his judgment.

Mr. Hamilton said that the treaty-making power, being executive, constitutional exceptions to it must be construed strictly. This is but an elaboration of his proposition.

I continue reading:

When he shall have negotiated and sent his proposed treaty to the Senate, the jurisdiction of this body attaches and its power begins.

If it then begins, it certainly was nonexistent until then.

It may advise and consent, or it may refuse. And in the exercise of this function it is as independent of the Executive as he is independent of it in the matter of negotiation.

The Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Tillman, here asked for an explanation of the powers and prerogatives of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to which Mr. Spooner answered very clearly, and then he was interrupted by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, who said:

I merely wish to remind him of a fact with which he no doubt is very familiar, that in the administration of Mr. Madison the Senate deputed a committee to see him in regard to the appointment of a minister to Sweden, I think, and he replied that he could recognize no committee of the Senate, that his relations were exclusively with the Senate. I have no doubt the Senator intended to recall that, but as he stated the exact relations as he understood them, it seemed to bear on that point.

On another page Senator Spooner said:

We ratified the arbitration treaty unanimously, I believe. The President, in the exercise of the power which no one can dispute, pocketed it. The President may negotiate and sign a proposed treaty and not send it to the Senate. In such case what would be thought of a resolution asking him to inform the Senate whether he had negotiated such a proposed treaty, and why he had not sent it to the Senate? Having sent a treaty to the Senate, he may withdraw it the next day.

We, as the Senate, a part of the treaty-making power, have no more right under the Constitution to invade the prerogative of the President to deal with our foreign relations, to conduct them, to negotiate treaties, and that is not all—the conduct of our foreign relations is not limited to the negotiation of treaties—we have no more right under the Constitution to invade that prerogative than he has to invade the prerogative of legislation.

Mr. President, that was, in my judgment, a sound proposition then; it is a sound proposition now.

Senator Bacon promptly replied. In the course of his discussion he was interrupted by Mr. Beveridge with these questions:

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Suppose the Constitution had been silent upon the question of the treaty-making power, where would that power have lodged? Or I will put the question in this way: Suppose the Constitution had said nothing about making treaties, would not the complete power of making treaties have been in the President, under section 1 of Article II, which lodges the executive power in the President?

Mr. BACON. I think not. I do not understand the word "executive" to mean anything of the kind.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does not the Senator think that in the natural division of the powers of the Government into legislative, executive, and judicial the treaty-making power has always been considered an executive function, and therefore if the Constitution had been silent upon the subject of treaties it would have been completely under the President's control, under that provision of the Constitution which confides in the President the executive power, and that that section concerning treaties is merely a limitation upon that universal power?

Mr. BACON. Oh, no. The Senator has gone to his favorite doctrine as to extraconstitutional power, which I will not stop to discuss with him to-day. The two continents, separated by the Atlantic Ocean, are not wider apart than the Senator and I upon the subject of the exercise of powers not found in the Constitution. * * *

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will ask this question: If the Constitution had said nothing about the treaty-making power, where would the treaty-making power have been lodged?

Mr. BACON. I have received that question from the Senator several times. I have said that I did not agree with him that it would be with the Executive.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Where would it be?

Mr. BACON. I think undoubtedly in the legislative branch of the Government, for reasons which I will give.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the whole question.

The Senator was thus driven to the necessity of insisting that in the absence of any constitutional mention of executive power it would be lodged in the legislature. He gave some plausible reasons afterwards for it, but to my mind the proposition is simply unthinkable, especially in view of that very specific clause of the Constitution which vests the executive power in the President and those other specific clauses which enumerate such legislative powers as we possess. The Supreme Court of the United States in the celebrated case of Kansas *v.* Colorado emphasized that distinction in its discussion of the general powers granted to the judicial department under the Constitution.

When Mr. Spooner ended his discussion the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, at once took the floor and enthusiastically announced his approval of the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin. Mr. Spooner's position was forecast by Secretary Fish in a letter to Minister Motley on the 15th day of May, 1869, in which he said:

According to the practice of this Government the Senate is not ordinarily consulted in the initiatory state of a negotiation, but its consent and advice are only invoked after the treaty is concluded under the direction of the President and submitted to its consideration.

He there repeated almost word for word the language of Henry Clay in 1824, in speaking in this body on a Senate amendment offered to the African slave-trade treaty with the British Government. Mr. Butler, who has written a work on treaty-making power, is in absolute accord with that view.

Now, Mr. President, except those citations which were submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in his exhaustive speech upon this treaty the other day, I believe I have given to the Senate a concise, if not an intelligible account of every congressional occasion where legislative assertion of executive authority has been made or challenged.

I unhesitatingly declare that while here and there vigorous assertions have been made to sustain the duality of the treaty-making power, and made always until now upon this side of the Chamber, the consensus of opinion and of judgment, to say nothing of the strength of argument, has been with those who have maintained the exclusive control of the President of the United States over foreign affairs. But to-day, the leader of the Republican Party, Mr. LODGE, my distinguished friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], and their associates, find it necessary to appeal to Democratic judgment, to Madisonian and Baconian doctrine in support of this resolution, which of course, means that they now repudiate the great lights of statesmanship with which their own party and its predecessors have been illumined since the adoption of the Federal Constitution.

The Senator from Massachusetts protests that he believes and stands by every utterance of his own upon the subject, but his practical application of them is unfortunate.

His recent performances can not be made to square with his oft-repeated convictions. His equilibrium may continue, but it is the equilibrium of the gyroscope. He keeps his feet by rapid rotation, for he can not otherwise declare that his doctrines of the past are still sound and at the same time square his political course by another compass. I mean no disrespect to the distinguished Senator when I measure his leadership by the crustacean which looks forward while crawling backward, an apt illustration of his attitude toward the President since the Paris congress was organized and his assertion of senatorial prerogative as embodied in this resolution, whose recitals he has indorsed in public interviews and which, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, he heartily supported.

I have endeavored to show that we have not the constitutional authority for the passage of this resolution, and that, assuming that I am wrong, it is inexpedient at this time to do so. Indeed, I am rather of the opinion that this is the present attitude of its author. I had expected that the resolution would be called up on motion, especially after its summary report from the Committee on Foreign Relations and its entrance upon the calendar, but thus far no movement has been made in that direction. The Senator has preferred to discuss it pending the consideration of a distinct item of unfinished business.

I come now to a consideration, very briefly, of some of the other recitals of the resolution. One of them is that—

The treaty as drawn contains principles, guaranties, and undertakings obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations, oppressive of weak nations and peoples—

And so forth.

The Senator from Pennsylvania day before yesterday clarified any obscurity in that recital by the statement that it had reference to that part of the treaty constituting the proposed league of nations. Apart from the accuracy or inaccuracy, from the truth or error of the recital, I want to emphasize the fact that "no weak nation or people" is complaining of that part of the treaty. The Senator called attention to the fact that there were troubles in the Balkans over boundaries; that there were troubles in the newly constituted nations of a similar character; that there were also racial troubles, and appeal was being made by them all to the congress at Paris for settlement. That is true; but those problems are involved in other portions of the treaty, and with which the league of nations has little if anything to do. But, assume that it has everything to do therewith, it is undisputed that all the small nations are in favor of the league. Why, then, should we complain of it in their behalf, especially when, in the judgment of some of us, there is enough to criticize affecting our own affairs?

The appeal, therefore, to the small nations in this resolution as it has now been clarified is an appeal which the situation deprives of all foundation, and, in my judgment, it has no place in the resolution.

It is also declared that—

the people of the United States have had neither time to examine and consider nor opportunity to express regarding it—

This treaty—

a matured and deliberate judgment.

If the people of the United States have not had time to consider and opportunity to mature and pass judgment upon the articles of the proposed covenant for a league of nations, then it is useless, in my judgment, to extend it further. The question of a league of nations, the problems involved in the conception of such a system, have been actively before the American people ever since Germany declared war upon France. Almost immediately thereafter the League for Peace was organized in this country. It was an active league. It had its subsidiaries in every State—I had almost said in every city and at crossroads in the United States. It has supplied them from time to time with an abundance of literature. The opponents of the league have been equally industrious. From the day of the surrender to the present hour the air has been replete with discussions and controversies in advocacy of or in opposition to the league of nations. The printing press has been busy. The mail of Senators has long been crowded to overflow with petitions for and remonstrances against it. If there is a man or woman between the two oceans who has not reflected upon it, who has not discussed it, who has not reached some conclusion upon it, then it argues for his or her ignorance and for the impossibility of their ever understanding or reaching any intelligent conclusion concerning it.

The Senator complains, and perhaps justly, of the waste of time by the peace congress because of their consideration of so many subjects which are foreign to the main proposition, which is peace with the Central Empires. If that be true, then, fortiori, is it true that more time has been given the American people for a full consideration and discussion of this part of the treaty.

If a request had been made for time for the consideration of the treaty, I could understand it. We have only very recently received incomplete copies of the remainder of the treaty. I have given it such attention as I can, and I have succeeded so far in reading it once, and I understand it as little as before. Consequently, I must read it again and again before getting anything like a fair comprehension of it. It is an enormous document, and I concede that ample time should be given and taken not only by the public but by the Members of this body if we may arrive at a full and complete understanding of the vast and far-reaching import of its multitudinous paragraphs.

Mr. President, since this resolution was introduced it has been sadly mutilated. In my judgment, the best part of it has been excluded. I understand that was done to placate the objections of a single member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If I had to vote for it, I confess the rejected portion would appeal to me far more urgently than any other or all other portions of the resolution. It was prepared with much care and designed to cover every important feature then in contemplation as a basis for the presentation of the resolution in the hope of its ultimate passage:

5. That, finally, it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

Consistently with my assurance at the outset, I shall not comment upon the merits of that section, but with regard to its expediency, if this resolution is to be passed at all, that or some substitute for it should be embodied in it. Anybody can protest or object. Few, however, perceive the necessity of accompanying protest or objection with a substitute. If we are to effect or accomplish any purpose whatever with such a resolution, I think it should be through a statement of some definite policy regarding our future world relations. Nobody wants to see another war. All are a unit, whatever the individual opinion of the treaty or any part of it may be, in an earnest hope that some means of avoiding a recurrence of these terrible conflicts may be devised. Hence this resolution, or any resolution which fails to suggest something immediate and essential to the end that wars shall be ended in fact as well as in theory, is incomplete.

I confess, Mr. President, that this eliminated fifth section emphasizes my objection to the whole resolution, because it is a perfect illustration of the declaration of an executive policy by a legislative body. It is a perfect example of the consequences which must inevitably ensue if the new claim of coequality with the President in the control of foreign affairs shall take root in our institutions and become a part of the prerogatives of the Senate of the United States.

I do not think the resolution should have been introduced. I trust it will not come to a vote, and I hope, if it does, for the reasons I have given, that it will be overwhelmingly rejected.

During the delivery of Mr. THOMAS's speech,

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. To-morrow, Mr. President, after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall submit some observations on the influence of the Vatican in the proposed league of nations, which will occupy about 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the Senator that notice has been given for to-morrow morning by another Senator?

Mr. SHERMAN. I did not know that. I will follow that Senator, then, not knowing who he is, for about 30 minutes.

After the conclusion of Mr. THOMAS's speech,

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harrison	McCumber	Sherman
Calder	Henderson	McKellar	Shields
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Simmons
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Dial	Kellogg	New	Spencer
Dillingham	Kendrick	Newberry	Stanley
Edge	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Swanson
Fletcher	King	Phelan	Thomas
France	Kirby	Phipps	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Poindexter	Underwood
Gronna	La Follette	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Harding	Lenroot	Reed	Watson
Harris	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce the absence on official business of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it has been some days since this bill was before the Senate, and I ask the Secretary to state the amendment now pending. I think the committee amendments were not completed.

The SECRETARY. The first committee amendment, on page 1, line 4, was agreed to. The next committee amendment, beginning on line 5, was not agreed to. That amendment is in line 5, after the word "otherwise," to insert "and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation."

Mr. KENYON. May I ask as to the other committee amendments? I should like to know the status of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All other committee amendments have been agreed to, the Chair is informed.

The SECRETARY. An amendment was added by consent of the committee at the top of page 5, where the language "in 1919 or" was stricken out, and the following words were inserted: "between the date of the passage of this act and December 31." That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Are there any other amendments which have not been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are not any, the Chair is informed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the amendment on page 1, line 5, was agreed to? I was called out of the Senate a few days ago, and I did not understand what action had been taken upon the various committee amendments.

Mr. KENYON. The amendment on line 5, inserting the words "and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation," was not agreed to.

Mr. KING. Was it disagreed to?

Mr. KENYON. The amendment on page 1, line 4, striking out the word "occupation" and inserting the word "industry,"

was agreed to. The amendment in line 5, as I understand, is the amendment now before the Senate.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not this bill contemplates the education, training, and rehabilitation of all individuals, young or old, within the States of the Union who have some physical ailment or who have met with some accident or misfortune, so that their ability to perform labor or to discharge their usual work and labor may be impaired.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I explained this bill at some great length a week or so ago and covered that question, as I understood it, at that time. I do not want to take a great deal more time in any extended explanation of the bill, but I am perfectly willing to answer such questions as may be asked, if I may be able to answer them. I see the Senator from Georgia is about to rise.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No, Mr. President; when the Senator from Iowa shall have concluded what he has to say I have a few general remarks which I desire to make about the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Then I think I will give way to the Senator from Georgia, as I have already discussed the bill for an hour and a half. I will, however, proceed to answer the question of the junior Senator from Utah, which involves a somewhat extended statement.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for vocational rehabilitation for men injured in occupations and otherwise. That covers practically all cases of men and women workers, whether in the factory or on the farm, who may be to such an extent injured that the injury amounts to a disability, so that they can not engage in the line of occupation which they had previously been following. I want to be perfectly fair and say that, in my judgment, it goes even further. If one had an occupational disease which amounted to a disability—and that is easy to conceive of, for there may be cases of consumptives, as that trouble, as the Senator knows, is growing—so that there would have to be a new line of vocation for the man in order to earn to his living, it would cover such cases.

Bear in mind, however, please, that this is only a stimulation to the States. Just what is to be done is covered by the States. The rules and regulations that the different boards of the 48 States now operating under the Smith-Hughes Act or the vocational educational act, what plans they devise for this work must be approved by the Federal board before there can be any Federal aid. Their plans can be broad; they can cover the course of study; they can cover the training of the teachers; they can cover the kind of work that these men shall be taught to perform. The only thing for the Federal board is to indorse the rules and regulations of the State boards before the Federal money shall be applied. Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to another question?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The word "vocation," of course, includes every line of employment. It would include all professional engagements. A lawyer, a doctor, an engineer, of course, would be embraced within the word "vocation."

Mr. KENYON. Strictly, technically, and dictionarily speaking, that is true; but this is not intended to cover professional education; it is vocational education.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will excuse me, then there must be a further limitation placed upon the language of the bill, for the word "vocation" includes profession, calling, labor. A lawyer has a vocation under the meaning of the term, as much so as a farmer or a carpenter. The same is also true of the doctor, the dentist, the civil engineer, the mining engineer, the painter, or the artist. They would all come within the word "vocation."

Mr. KENYON. I think that is technically true; but the Senator must rely somewhat upon the common sense of the boards of the States and the Federal board having the matter in charge. There are cases of soldiers who have been so wounded that they can not go on with their former work. There are a few cases where they are taking such soldiers and making lawyers out of them. Their college course may have been interrupted, their law course may have been interrupted, or their studies as doctors may have been interrupted; but there are only a very few of those cases. If the State board and the Federal board in the case of a man who may be mutilated in industry find that he exhibits capacities which, in their judgment, show that he might do better as a lawyer or as a doctor or as a dentist than in some other line of work, it is true that the States could cover that case in their rules and regulations, and the Federal money would go, to some extent, to help in that purpose; and I do not really see any reason why it should not do so.

Mr. KING. And, Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me, as I read the bill it is not limited to those who have already a vocation, profession, or calling, but it would extend to children who are immature in years, not having determined what their course in life should be, and, indeed, fit only for the grade schools. It would permit the utilization of funds for the education of young men and women for vocations, for professions, and for life work if they were disabled; and under the amendment which has been tendered, if it should be accepted, if they were without sufficient means to provide for their own vocational training. So, after all, under this bill, as I read between the four corners of it, the Federal Government could go into the States and aid in educating the boys and girls and in training them for some profession or calling or vocation in life. Certainly that ought not to be the purpose of the bill, as I understand the meaning of the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah must give some credit to State boards for some sense. We have to rely on human beings to do human work. No part of the Federal money is available unless the Federal board indorses the State plan. They would not have to indorse a plan which would permit vocational training to a child unless they desired to do so. So the Senator gets back, in the last analysis, to the action of the State. His complaint seems to be that we are destroying the power of the State. We are not doing that. The States make the regulations. If they are foolish regulations, the Federal board does not have to approve them or to give them one cent of money.

I merely want to say one word more. This bill is indorsed in its general purposes by the National Association of Manufacturers, through a representative whom they have sent before the committee, and it is also indorsed by the American Federation of Labor. It is strange, I think, that a bill is indorsed by these two great agencies in this country, and it is a matter of congratulation that such is the fact.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator will suffer an interruption, I desire to ask him what the outside figure will be which will be required to care for the present industrial accidents; what is the estimate of those? Has the committee any information in regard to the matter?

Mr. KENYON. Only by estimating. That would be a very hard question to answer. There are over 200,000 men functionally crippled as the result of accidents in industry in the country, most of them on the scrap heap, and many of them beggars, mendicants. There is an average of 22,500 deaths a year of men who are hurt in industry; there are about 15,000 cases of men who are seriously injured in industry every year. The Senator from New Jersey can figure perhaps as well as I can what the expense of tuition, training, and subsistence would be. It would amount to a very large sum, of course.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me to make a suggestion to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], I desire to say that this bill covers not only industrial accidents but all manner of diseases, all organic troubles, all disabilities, whether congenital or no matter the causes from which those diseases or misfortunes or infirmities arose. The bill calls for the same vocational rehabilitation with respect to people who are disabled through illness as those who may meet with accidents in their industrial vocations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think, Mr. President, that some instruction in such cases might be wise, and it might be a good public policy, but this is all a question of policy. As I understand, the vocational training bill providing assistance to the States for vocational training in the public schools, the appropriations are automatically increasing year by year until the figures of approximately $8,000,000 are reached. I asked the question of the chairman of the committee to ascertain whether we would have to face very greatly increased appropriations in the future.

Mr. KENYON. May I say to the Senator that I had intended to offer an amendment limiting the period of this appropriation to five years. If this plan shall not be a success in five years it never will be; five years will determine whether or not it can be successfully carried on; and, if it is successfully carried on, there will be no trouble about the funds. Under the bill there will be appropriated $500,000 the first year, $750,000 the second year, and $1,000,000 after that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I have heretofore said, it is all a question of policy as to whether the Federal Government

should appropriate money for this purpose or whether the question of compensation for those injured in industry should be left to the States. I am very doubtful about that. When we are using every effort in this Congress to limit our appropriations and are practically taking an account of stock to see how we are situated in regard to necessary expenditures for the reorganization of our Army and our Navy, and when separate appropriations, a million dollars here and a million dollars there are demanded, for many objects—many of them worthy, no doubt—I think the Congress ought to hesitate. I do not believe that this question will suffer if we postpone it for a year or two. The Vocational Board already have imposed upon them great burdens in the supervision of vocational education under the act of Congress; they are administering now over $3,000,000 and distributing it to the States; and yet they are reaching out seeking wider responsibility, wider and broader authority, and more money from the Congress. The question rests with the Congress whether it is our duty at this time to adopt the paternalistic policy of appropriating money to aid those who are injured in industry. I think that the cause is a very worthy one; but, in the condition in which we find the Public Treasury at this time, we ought to postpone this proposal for a year or two.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to give the Senate a little history of this bill. I introduced the bill at the last session of Congress, and it was substantially tendered as an amendment to the bill providing for the vocational rehabilitation of injured soldiers. I opposed such action at that time, and urged its friends not to press it. I did so because the study of the problem of special training for the injured and the partly disabled had not progressed very far in the United States, and I did not believe it practicable to undertake concurrently at that time special training for injured soldiers and special training for those disabled in other ways. I felt that the first charge upon the Nation should be the injured soldiers; that this responsibility was greater than for those generally disabled; and that we could not go too far in furnishing to the disabled soldier at complete national expense opportunity for any kind of preparation for the battle of life which money could give and which his remaining physical strength and mental capacity could utilize.

At that time I had appeals from all over the United States to add to the bill for the rehabilitation of the soldiers legislation looking toward national aid and stimulation for the rehabilitation of all partly disabled persons. I have here in my hand [exhibiting] a portion of the communications and resolutions received from practically every State in the Union, from the real students of human health and from the students of vocational training.

It was a new subject. We had gone on with our educational system since the early history of our Government without giving any special thought or study to the problem as to what might be done for those partly disabled physically. During the years of the past and until the present war no Government of which I know had studied the problem of repreparing for work the disabled soldier and saving him from the mortification of penury. It is not simply the question of his ability to take care of himself or taking care of him but the privilege of taking care of himself that is even more important.

There had been in Belgium for a number of years a little school where special study had been given to the rehabilitation of the injured. With the first onslaught of the Germans the school was broken up. The leader reached France and there started a school for the rehabilitation of injured soldiers. Then England and other nations took up the work, and it was found that by special study of the individual case and by special study of the fields of occupation it was practicable to do much to prepare for particular lines of occupation those partly disabled. Within the past four years the consciousness has come to the world that the injured and physically unfortunate may be made the object of special study, and that as a result of special study along various occupational lines fields of employment may be opened and preparation for particular occupations given to those who otherwise might be almost beggars.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator know that education is a matter of evolutionary development and that we are employing now in our schools within the States methods of teaching that are very much in advance of those that existed but a few years ago? In the University of Wisconsin, inspired in part by the splendid work of the distinguished Senator from that State [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who was governor and served his State with ability for years, the University of Wisconsin has become not a beggar at the hands of the Federal Government, but has become a shining light upon the pathway of educational development and social and economic progress. That State did not come with cap in hand, bow before the Federal Government, and ask for bounties and aid; it set the pace, and other States, following it, engaged in happy rivalry, and they have made progress——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KING. Let me complete the sentence.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Very well.

Mr. KING. That State and other States years ago made provision for the blind and for the deaf, and have developed wonderful schools to care for those who are unfortunate; so that, little by little, indeed——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I beg the Senator not to do more than ask me a question and let me answer him.

Mr. KING. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will not consume a great deal of time, and I believe I can use it better if I do not have the able speech of the Senator from Utah injected into the midst of mine.

Mr. KING. I apologize to my distinguished friend. I am sure that he will make a far better speech than I, but I wish him to remember the fact that civilization and education are flowers of slow growth; they do not, as Minerva did, spring all at once from the brow of Jove; we have to grow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I agree with the Senator that education is a matter of evolution; I agree with him also that the University of Wisconsin has done wonderful work; I agree with him that we have made progress all over the United States in practically every State in developing schools for the blind and the deaf; but even the great University of Wisconsin did not broadly take up the subject of vocational work for the injured generally, and the University of Wisconsin, through its great leaders, as appears from the papers I have before me, are asking for this contribution in order that a study may be made of the Nation-wide problem by the Nation itself.

Now, let me go on, and let the Senator understand what I mean by the bill. I speak for myself alone. Something over a year and a half ago—about two years ago—when we realized that our own boys would come home to us legless, armless, and injured in many other ways so that their former lines of occupation could not be followed, under the leadership and by the aid of the Red Cross, we sent a commission to Canada to study what they were doing toward the vocational rehabilitation of men injured while in the army; that is to say, toward the study, first, of what lines of occupation might be followed by men partially disabled physically, and then how schools could be opened where the injured could be fitted for various lines of occupation. We had quite elaborate hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor and reported a bill to the Senate providing for the vocational training of our injured soldiers, the work to be done entirely at national expense. It was then from all over the United States that appeals came to me as chairman of the committee to add a provision for the training of all those injured in industry.

The Manufacturers' Association of the United States came forward with an appeal; the railroad organizations came forward with an appeal; those who were connected with industry and knew of the many accidents that happened to their employees came urging the National Government to appropriate money for the study of this question and to help stimulate in the States intelligent attention to the rehabilitation of the injured in any line.

Not only that; all over the country labor organizations, those who did the work, coming from the men who received the injuries, passed resolutions appealing for an amendment to our soldiers' bill adding all injured in industry. I will not stop to read these resolutions to you, but I think I can say that they are from every State, not in the same language, not manufactured by machinery, but coming from the hearts and brains of humans who are really human.

It was hard for me to resist their appeal at that time, but I believed it unwise to undertake then more than the rehabilitation of the soldiers. We had not a sufficient number of men and women engaged in vocational training who had studied this subject, who had specialized on vocational occupations for the injured. Why, indeed, our Vocational Educational Board, as soon as the subject first arose, gladly accepted the offer of the Red Cross, and sent a dozen of its best men and women into Canada, who stayed there two or three months, to see what progress—what evolution, in the language of the Senator from Utah—had been made there toward helping to fit the physically disqualified for profitable occupation.

After conferring with the board and its director, we agreed that it would be best to defer the general work until the board

had had a year or two of developing instructors, studying the problem, and handling the soldiers. This bill I promised to introduce at the time I declined to press it as a part of the vocational rehabilitation of the soldiers. I promised these various agencies then that just as soon as we were well under way with our work for the soldiers, as soon as the Federal Board for Vocational Education believed it was ready and the country was ready to move forward intelligently with a reasonable number of prepared experts toward the training of all injured in industries and otherwise, I would present the bill, and I presented it as a separate measure.

Now let me give you what I contemplate may be accomplished by this measure.

I do not object to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa that we limit this appropriation to five years. It is not my idea that this money is to be a constant appropriation. I think eventually it will be the work of the States alone. I think eventually it should be the work of the States alone. I think eventually it will go into our general vocational educational work, and that the appropriation under our general vocational bill will be ample for the permanent stimulus which the National Government will give to vocational education; and I shall vote for the amendment to limit the appropriation of the million dollars to five years. I am willing to tell the States in advance: "We are only going to help you with information and broad study. We are only going to help you with this start, which you must duplicate to get a dollar of it. You must put up as much as you get from the National Government." The average will be about $25.000, I think, to a State. The State will have to put up an equal sum.

Now, of course, $50,000 from a State will not carry the education of these cripples and these helpless persons. What it will do will be this: It will provide for a line of special study of classes of injured, and carry the result of that special study into the industrial and educational systems of the States. That is my view of it, and that is the view of the Federal board; but it is a subject that has been completely neglected, it is a subject which we had never thought about seriously, and the world had never thought much about until this war, and had never realized the possibilities that may come from the special study and the evolution in training that can grow out of that special study.

What I hope is this: As our soldiers who have been injured pass away from the special training they are receiving, as they finish their special training—which I think will take place, as to most of them, practically all, in two years' time—I think we should stimulate the States to join the Nation in utilizing the forces that we have developed for the special training of the soldiers, and have them take up the training of the injured and crippled generally; and I think this bill now will come right in behind the training of the soldiers and will be an inspiration to the States and a help to the States to take up the work that has been begun, to take up the experts who have been trained and continue that work for all. Now, of course, it would not carry the expense as we do in the case of injured soldiers. It is simply to carry into our schools, into our systems, into our vocational training quickly that which had not been considered prior to the last few years, but that which has recently been found of so much value.

I sat at all the hearings before this committee, where experts came to us from Canada, from the Red Cross, and from across the ocean, telling how injured men have been taught to do something that I would have thought it utterly impossible for them to do. Five years ago if anybody had suggested this to me I would have thought it was idealistic and impossible, but it has been done. The necessities of the situation brought it about.

I want to say that the hearings of the experts about what was accomplished to help the maimed and the halt and the blind, and the chance to serve in that way, touched me perhaps more—the certainty of good and the certainty of no harm—than anything that has happened before in my service in the Senate. We see something that we hope is good, but careful thought suggests the possibility of harm and danger alongside of it; but here is all good. If but one out of ten could be put on his feet, if but one out of ten could be taken from the field of charity into the privilege of independence and self-support, oh, what a blessed thing it is to help that one! The pathos and the beauty with which those engaged in the work told the story of accomplishment would have touched a heart of stone—the joy that had been brought into the lives of those who served from the joy they had brought into the lives of those who were served. It was almost a benediction to have the privilege of listening to them.

Now, Mr. President, what is this bill? It does not propose to have the National Government take charge of this work. It proposes that the National Government, through the Federal Board for Vocational Education, which has general charge of our continuing appropriation, which in 1924 will amount to about $9,000,000 a year, shall, with the aid of the States, first have a fund to continue for itself this study that it has begun for the soldiers, and give that information to the States and to the schools of the States. It provides that in addition to that a small sum of money—about $25,000 average, I think it is—shall go to each State which will undertake the special study and the special handling of the rehabilitation of the unfortunate. That is all; and our hope is to catch them at this moment, when they see their boys who have come home from abroad being helped by special training, to catch their imaginations. This is the hour to do it—to catch their imaginations and their hearts and put them into this work. If we catch them, and they take it up, and they go on with it for three or four years, nothing can stop it. It will not need any more national money. It will become a part then, through evolution, of what they do in the schools. They will have to be shown what has really been accomplished.

I say again to the Senator from Utah that when I came to the Senate I would have voted against any such scheme, because I would not have thought there was anything in it; but I know now that there is something in it, and I want to help to give the unfortunate of my country a chance to derive the benefit. I do not expect this fund to do the work, except by stimulating the State schools and carrying to them the information as to how it can be done. I expect it to be the process of producing in our school systems throughout the United States an evolution that will bring a closer study of all the unfortunates—the physically unfortunate—a closer study in the schools and in the States of their special cases and what should be done for them.

The blind and the deaf suggested to the States that one special work, and they went at it. Just as surely as they start this work and continue it for the five years there will no longer be any necessity for national contribution to it. The Federal board, with the experts that it has gathered around it, with the information that it has gathered, with the possibilities that it will open up to the mind and the imagination and the observation of the educators of the country and the people of the country, will give such an onward movement to this line of work that it will almost carry itself thereafter.

This is my conception of the bill. I am giving you the view as it was brought to me by experts from the Red Cross, by experts from Europe, by experts from Canada, by students of education who have become interested in it and approve it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as a member of the committee which reported this bill, I feel it appropriate that I should give some reasons for my support of it.

I do not think I have witnessed more pitiful scenes in my life than those I have observed from time to time in the homes of people where the breadwinner of the family had met with an industrial accident. I have seen repeatedly men in industrial life who have lost an arm or a leg go home to their families, and then their wife or young children forced away from home and school and obliged to go to work in the factories to earn the necessary money to support their crippled husband or father. Why should the man or woman whose only offense was that he had met with an accident in industrial life be obliged to become a dependent and bring burdens to those who naturally look to him for support? I consider it a reflection upon our foresight that we have not long ago met this industrial problem and found a solution for it. It is the Government's work to solve it.

What is there about our Government that attracts the oppressed and the weak of the whole world to it? It is that our Government does more to promote the happiness and the well-being of the human family than any other Government. There can be no such happiness unless a Government is trying to remove misery, poverty, and suffering; and there is great, unnecessary suffering and poverty now endured by altogether too many through industrial accidents.

Mr. President, so I give my hearty support to this bill, because, in my opinion, it will supply something that the Government owes the unfortunate. Without hesitancy we pass health laws, we provide education for our young people, and we promote opportunities for employment. There is not a Senator on this floor who would vote against the enactment of a good-health law. There is not a Senator on this floor who would vote against the passage of an ordinary educational bill; but the man or woman who is unfortunate enough to have been injured in industrial life we discard, and deny him or her the most humane of all forms of assistance from the Government—another chance to learn an honorable occupation.

It is as proper and necessary a function of Government to take the boys and the girls and the men and women who have met through no fault of theirs with accidents in industrial life

and been impaired in their usefulness and provide them with the education to rehabilitate them, as it is a proper function of the Government to take the child and train and educate him—for what? To be able to earn a livelihood, to be able to prepare himself to take advantage of the industrial opportunities of life, and to prevent his becoming a public charge or a burden for years upon others who must thereafter deny themselves opportunities and comforts that otherwise they would and should enjoy.

So this bill seeks to provide a means of rehabilitating those who now, because they have met with industrial accidents, are obliged to live upon the toil and labor and sacrifices of others.

It is pitiful to think that not until a few years ago did we appreciate the necessity of a workman's compensation law; and that has only gone part way in solving this problem. That has simply removed a part of the financial burden for a time. Here is a long step forward; the Government, through this measure, reaches out its hands to these unfortuates and says, "Here is a chance for you. We will give you a vocational education. We will provide a new opportunity for you to earn a livelihood. We will help you free yourself from becoming a pauper. We will free you from bringing misery and suffering to your family and those dependent upon you."

Mr. President, it seems to me it is a splendid step forward for our National Government to say to the States, "The time has come to do something for this unfortunate class." We owe it to them. We owe it to them because it is our bounden duty to remove misery and suffering and poverty as far as the Government can do it, and especially when it comes without fault through mere chance or accident.

The States have not made much headway with this question, though some of the States have attempted to pass laws on the subject. My own State has given much study to this problem, and our public-spirited citizens have been giving a very great deal of time and attention to it; but for some reason or other there has not yet been devised a satisfactory solution. The National Government now asks the States to interest themselves in this problem, to turn their attention to it, to appreciate that here is an evil and injury that the Government should take notice of and seek to adopt some steps to remove.

Mr. President, for these reasons it seems to me to be a function of Government, a basic one, a fundamental one, as important as the health, as important as the education of the young, the education and the training and the refitting for useful occupation of those who are injured in industry. I, therefore, heartily give my support to this measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I indorse absolutely the eloquent and forceful statements of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. He has put the case splendidly. As a member of this committee, I, too, am very greatly in favor of the bill.

I think the matter can be best stated to the Senate by pointing out, if I may, exactly what a vote on this bill means. If Senators vote for the bill, they vote to aid the maimed and injured who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No, Mr. President; that amendment has not been put into the bill, and I do not think it ought to be.

Mr. McKELLAR. I differ with the Senator entirely. The amendment has been put in the bill by the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall oppose adding that, because, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This money will not go simply to an individual. It will go in training teachers and in special study, and all will get the benefit of it, whether they are paupers, whether they have something, whether they were injured without fault, or whether they are the waifs on the street. It will help teach how to rehabilitate the injured. Only twenty-odd thousand dollars goes to each State, I want to say to the Senator, under this provision, and it will be used in public schools. It will be used in public institutions; and you can not afford to say that because a man's father has something he can not go to a public school or a public institution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the bill as reported out of the committee has the language that I have read. It applies to those maimed or injured persons who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation. I think that limitation should be in this bill. If it is an experiment, as the Senator from Georgia says, we ought to experiment with those of our citizenship who are unable to rehabilitate themselves. Those who are financially able to rehabilitate themselves need no aid from the Government. If the appropriation is small in the beginning, as he says, it is all the greater reason why we should take care of these maimed and wounded and injured who are unable to rehabilitate themselves, and I hope that this amendment of the committee will be agreed to. It should be agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will excuse me just a moment, then I will yield. I had to digress by reason of the interruption of the Senator from Georgia.

I want to say again that I hope no Senator will vote against this bill, and if he does vote against it, I want him to understand what he is voting against. When he votes against this bill he votes against the young men and women who have been injured in industry who are unable to have themselves rehabilitated so that they can earn a livelihood in this great country of ours. It is a direct issue. Are you going to vote for and stand by this helpless class of our citizenship or are you going to vote against this and leave to their own utter helplessness this helpless class of our citizenship? The question is directly up to you in this bill.

Now is the time of all times to put it into operation. Why? We have just established a Federal Vocational Board of training and rehabilitation for maimed and wounded soldiers. This is put under the direction of that board. It is easy enough, with one organization, to do the whole work. There never was a better opportunity. These gentlemen constituting that board are well fitted for the work. They have it in hand. It will just mean an additional class of persons to whom the act applies. Practically no additional overhead charges. Now is the time, and it will do almost as much good if carried out as it will to the maimed and wounded soldiers themselves. I think that the bill we passed last year for the rehabilitation of wounded and maimed soldiers was one of the greatest bills that was ever passed by this body, and this is only second to it; and it ought to be added to it, and added to it without delay and without debate. The wounded soldiers come first, but surely this stricken, helpless, suffering class comes next. We have done our duty by our wounded soldiers in this matter. Now let us do our full duty by this deserving and helpless class.

The Senator from New Jersey says that he is opposed to it now because it is his and our desire to economize. I am always in favor of economy. We ought to economize, but I ask the Senate not to economize at the expense of the helpless, the maimed, the wounded, and injured people of our country. Do not let us economize at the expense of the helpless. Let us cut off some of the appropriations that go to those who can help themselves in this country, but do not let us start to economize at such a place. The Lord knows we can find better cases in which to economize than in this case. It is a false economy not to build up and make self-supporting and happier these deserving cripples.

Both the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] have expressed themselves as being in favor of an amendment to limit this work to five years. I hope such an amendment will not be adopted. It ought not to be adopted. It ought to be the permanent policy of the Government to aid in the rehabilitation of these injured and unfortunate persons.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I am as much in favor of this being made permanent as is the Senator from Tennessee, but there are objections made particularly by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to appropriating a sum that is to run on year after year without end. It was my thought—and I think it was the same with the Senator from Georgia—that this work will show within five years what can be accomplished. There will be no trouble if it is a success as a policy in procuring appropriations from Congress. Five years will demonstrate if it is not to be a success, and then the matter can be dropped. It is because of that feeling against permanent annual appropriations that we felt inclined to make the limitation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to have heard this statement from the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], because I know how he feels on these questions generally. I know he is a forward-looking man, a progressive statesman, and I am glad to hear him say he is still of the view that it ought to be permanent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in just a moment. It ought to be permanent. It is going to be permanent. If we pass this bill, we might as well make up our minds that the people are never going to permit this splendid work to be stopped, and we might as well make up our minds to another matter: It is not started now except in some States, and there in a very meager way, and what this bill is going to do is to start this

splendid work in every State in our Union, and they are going to keep it up when the Federal Congress keeps it up. It is going to be like many other of such policies that we have established in this country, a mutual policy between the States and the Federal Government, and while I think in a sense it is immaterial whether we limit it to five years or not, because succeeding Congresses will certainly keep it in force, yet I am not in favor and I shall vote against the amendment putting a limitation of time on it, because I do not believe there ought to be any limitation on it. I think it ought to be a permanent policy of this Government, and we might as well adopt it now.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to say to the Senator that my willingness to limit the appropriation to five years was in no sense due to any thought that the work would ever stop, but this bill will for the next five years furnish special stimulation and special instruction and special advice. From that time on we will be appropriating $9,000,000 to vocational education, and the rehabilitation of the injured or defective will become a part of our vocational educational system in every State that nothing could stop. That was my view of it. If at the end of five years we shall find that it needs special stimulation, of course I would vote for further special appropriation, but I feel so convinced of its wisdom and so convinced of its value that I have little doubt that this special line of study and special line of instruction will become a thorough and complete part of the vocational training of the entire country.

Mr. McKELLAR. So certain am I that it is going to become a part of our vocational training in this country that I have no doubt whatever about it. I will say I think it is immaterial, but I believe the friends of the measure ought to stand together to make it permanent. I know the Senator from Georgia feels about it exactly as I do; I have heard him express his views on the subject. I know he is one of the strongest friends of vocational education. This is his bill, and I hope he will change his mind and vote with us to make his work permanent. It is a humane undertaking in which we are about to embark, and we ought to fix it right in the beginning and stand by it. We ought to enlarge it instead of curtailing it in any way. There are going to be maimed and wounded and injured young men and women in industry as long as time shall last. They are not for this year or for next year or for five years, but they will be coming on every year. It is a duty the National Government as well as the State governments should perform, notwithstanding the objection of my distinguished friend from Utah [Mr. KING]. I do not know whether he has objected yet or not, but I know that he will, though I hope he will not. I hope there will be no vote against this measure. There ought not to be a vote against the State governments functioning and the National Government functioning in harmony under a law to aid the helpless, injured, and wounded in industry or otherwise. We who are not physically disabled should never let an opportunity pass to restore, to build up, to give larger activity, to give better means of mental and physical occupation to those of our fellow beings who have been so unfortunate as to in part lose their limbs or physical senses. This bill, in my judgment, is the true way to be the just friends of the blind, the deaf, the halt, and the maimed. No nobler or truer function of government can be imagined than of building up this unfortunate class of our citizenship.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this is one of the most difficult bills to criticize that could be brought into this Chamber, because it is directed to the charitable impulses that prevail in every right-minded person's heart. I apprehend that the bill has not yet been interpreted in this body to cover many of the beneficiaries who would not appeal to that charitable impulse if it were understood now what relief is to be extended to the latter kind.

Let me make the suggestion that in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and who are without sufficient means, and so forth, if it is for those who have been injured in the military or naval service of the United States, why not say so? If it is to cover the persons injured in the industrial army in peace, why not say so? Why not limit it, in other words, to the military and industrial part of the population?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I think it is the purpose of the advocates of the bill and those who have drafted it that it shall not apply to the military or naval forces of the United States or to those who have been injured while serving in the naval or military forces of the United States. The bill which was passed during the last session covers the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers and sailors, but it is, as I interpret it, and as I understand the attitude of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], to be devoted exclusively to those who are injured in industrial occupations or who are ill or who by reason of any cause whatever suffer any physical or mental disability or deterioration which precludes them from earning a livelihood.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the Senator from Iowa if the interpretation of the Senator from Utah is correct?

Mr. KENYON. As the Senator from Illinois is aware, we passed a bill about a year ago taking care of the soldiers and sailors. The other day we passed another bill still further taking care of them. They are absolutely precluded from this act. The act does not say so in terms, but that is thoroughly understood. It applies to men injured in occupation and otherwise.

Mr. SHERMAN. Why then No. 3?

Mr. KENYON. What is No. 3?

Mr. SHERMAN. This is No. 3. You have already enumerated two, one passed a year or so ago and one passed a week or so ago.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has explained that when the bill was brought forward a year ago it was considered rather an urgent matter for soldiers and sailors, and while we were importuned also to put in men injured in industry, we thought that that should be left out, to be taken care of in a further bill. No. 2 was the bill passed a few days ago, which I introduced simply to take care of soldiers and sailors who could not secure the vocational rehabilitation because of a certain ruling of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, which excluded those men, so that the first two are really only one for soldiers and sailors. This bill is for those injured in industries and otherwise.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was really a correction of what we did not expect the interpretation of the department to be.

Mr. KENYON. It was to take care of an erroneous ruling by the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. SHERMAN. If this is to take care of the industrially injured, why not limit it so in the bill?

Mr. KENYON. That is a fair question. It is a fair dispute, and it was the subject of dispute before the committee. Shall the bill take care of men merely in industries? And when I say "take care of" I use it merely in the form of a stimulation of the State, because it is not taking care of anything. If so, that does not take care of a man hurt upon a farm. We thought the term "occupation" should be used instead of "industry," as that takes in men on farms and men in factories.

If the Senator will follow me, that was No. 2. No. 3: Shall we go further than that and provide for taking care of men and women no matter how they are injured? That is going a long ways, there is no doubt about it, and there was some opposition to that in the committee, but we finally decided to put it in. It would bring up a fight, we supposed, on the floor.

Let me give the Senator an illustration. I used an illustration the other day, and I will use another one to-day. Here is a bum on the street run over by an automobile—an arm cut off or a leg cut off. He is under this bill. If the State has provided for that kind of a case, this money can go to that use; and I appeal to the Senator why should it not be so used?

If you can take a bum who is a liability upon society and by some kind of training make a good citizen out of him or put him in a place to do work instead of throwing him on the scrap heap for charity or for the poorhouse, have you not really done not only a humane thing but a sound economic thing for the country besides? That is the argument. I admit that there are two sides to it, that it covers a wide range, and possibly we do not want to go that far. Possibly it is too humane, possibly it is too idealistic, possibly we have not reached the point yet where we can see economic value in that thing. That is what we intend to do in this bill. I do not want to deceive the Senator at all; and if that goes too far the Senator can move to strike out the words "or otherwise" and thus raise the point.

Mr. SHERMAN. If it were to further take care of those disabled in military life, so far as this branch of the argument is involved, I do not apprehend there would be any dispute about it. I am willing to go further and apply it to those injured in industrial life and let it extend to those who are injured in agriculture or in any legitimate occupation, limiting it to those who are injured or disabled in a given lawful pursuit. If this is merely cumulative, intended to be supplemental, in other words, to former legislation, some a year or so ago and some a week or so ago, on this branch of it I would have no objection to such a measure.

But we are to go further in this bill, and, upon the merits of the bill as very frankly avowed by the Senator from Iowa

with his usual candor in the discussion of public measures, we are to take up all of the social rubbish—if I may be allowed the expression—all the adult failures, the industrially and vocationally and temperamentally and physically and mentally unfit and regard them as the wards of the States or of the Government, and try the experiment of making over an adult failure. Let that experiment rest on the State. The Government ought not enter upon that undertaking.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator pardon me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PITTMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me throw out this suggestion to the Senator from Illinois. Suppose the State, stimulated under this leadership, had in one of its cities a school to teach the blind how to operate typewriters. Here is a young fellow hurt on a railroad. That is an industry. Here is another one hurt out on a farm who is blind. There are two. Here is another boy who accidentally blew his eyes out with a little powder, not in an industry at all. Would you not allow him to go into that school and learn how to work too?

What I want to impress upon the Senator is that we do not give anything to them. We are not proposing to take them like we do the soldiers and bear their expenses and pay for their board and pay for their clothes. We hope to open up special schools that can teach the injured how to do something. We first started at the industries and stopped there. That was our idea. Then we thought we had to add the farms, and we added them. Then we got to thinking about some in neither. If the chance for training was there, would you exclude them? That was what was in our minds, and in perfect candor I am telling the Senator, because I think it will appeal to him just like it did to us.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Illinois, before he replies to the Senator from Georgia, permit me to propound one question to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Georgia say that the language to which he has just called attention would limit the aid to mere instruction? As I read the language, it would mean that we would have to care for them. I am making no comment upon the wisdom or lack of wisdom, the justice or injustice, of doing so, but these are the words:

> That in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation and their return to civil employment, there is hereby appropriated—

And so forth.

Do not those words, when properly interpreted, imply a duty upon the part of those who accept this appropriation to rehabilitate them and fit them to return to private employment, and in so doing, if the individual is unable to provide food and clothing for himself, manifestly the duty would rest upon the Government and upon the State, through the instrumentality provided, to support him?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think so. I think the amount given, when proportioned to the number to be reached, makes it utterly impossible that that should take place.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Illinois will excuse me. Of course, it makes it impossible to do that; I concede that; but that would merely call for additional appropriations because of the futility of the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that the only purpose, as I understand it, for which this money will be used will be for providing a course of instruction and the placing in employment of disabled persons. If there is any question about it, I have prepared an amendment to introduce to one of the sections covering that feature.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa, if I may still crave the indulgence of my friend from Illinois, if the Federal Government under the limitations of the Constitution, keeping in view our dual form of Government and the duties and obligations resting upon the States, may go into the States and take the individual and educate him, either industrially or intellectually, then I can not see any reason why the Federal Government may not support him while he is being educated. If there is obligation to educate him industrially and intellectually, there is a corresponding obligation upon the Federal Government to feed him and clothe him during that period, particularly if poverty prevents him from clothing and feeding himself. You can not in principle draw the line of cleavage between the mere function of educating and feeding and clothing while being educated, because to educate the individual he would have to be fed and clothed during the process of education.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator from Illinois will pardon me, I would not draw the line personally at all on that. I would not object to seeing the Federal Government take care of him while he was getting this training. But this bill does not go that far, and consequently the Senator can not have legitimately the objection which he raises. This does not go into the States and take charge of the education. It does not go into the States and tell the States what they have to do. It simply says, if you submit plans to the Federal board which are satisfactory to the Federal board, you will have your proportion of this money as set forth in the bill. If you do not want to do that you need not participate in the bill or have anything to do with it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this is like a number of other bills that are pending here. They all land at the same destination finally. It is like the educational bill, which provides for the distribution among the States of a considerable sum of money from the Federal Treasury. It all gets finally to the same place, as far as this particular feature of it is involved. They are no more nor less than bribes, open and direct, to the State authorities.

The States themselves have certain reserved powers. Every Senator is quite familiar with the limitations on those powers, what have been granted away and what of them still remain. Many assaults have been made by Congress, at more or less complaisant sessions, upon those powers. The courts have been full of them. The law libraries are full of cases where Congress has undertaken to destroy these powers by invasive legislation, and the courts have protected these reserved powers. That is another branch of this investigation, and just at the present time I do not care to pursue it further, except to note the fact that destruction or invasion has not been successful because of the guardianship and the watchful care of the judicial department of the Federal Government.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator used an expression just a moment ago that is quite interesting to me, and it reminded me of a similar statement made by former Senator Morgan, the great Democratic Senator from Alabama, whose doctrine at one time was believed in by Democrats, and whom Democrats were proud to follow at one time, but apparently his doctrine is forgotten now, and Democrats as well as Republicans follow false gods with respect to the powers of the Federal Government. Will the Senator permit me to read just a sentence or two?

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. KING. Senator Morgan was speaking of a bill, with which the Senator is familiar, which was introduced in 1886 into the Senate of the United States by Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, for the purpose of appropriating $77,000,000 to the States for educational purposes. There were limitations there, and he said it would be a bad thing to fasten a permanent policy upon the Government such as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has pleaded so eloquently for. In commenting upon the Blair bill and the bribes of the Federal Government, by making contributions to the States and the States thereby relinquishing a part of their sovereignty and a part of their duty, he used this expression:

> This bill assails that class. It assails them not merely with a taxing power, but it takes from their own pockets their own gold as a bribe and holds it before their eyes and asks them to submit to taxation in order that they may receive the sham reward. That is done too often in this country. It is done in many systems of laws against which I always object, for I do not see why it is that we should take money out of one pocket of a laboring man and transfer it to the other diminished by the amount that shall stick to the hands of the middleman as it goes through and flatter him that we are promoting his welfare. This is a bill to create offices. It is a bill to elaborate the machinery of Government. It is a bill to take away from the people of this country the right to make their voluntary contribution for the education of their own children, and to put that sacred duty into the hands of Congress.

I might say in passing, if the Senator from Illinois will pardon me, that this bill takes $200,000 out of the limited appropriation for one year, as I understand it, for salaries for this Vocational Board that already has a multitude of employees who are receiving all the way up to $10,000 apiece, so that more than one-tenth of this appropriation is to be paid as compensation to men who are already drawing salaries from the Government of the United States. We tax the people of Illinois and the people of Iowa and the people of Georgia, and after a part only of it gets into the Treasury, because the overhead expenses are enormous, a portion of it filters back to those States again, filtering through the hands of a multitude of officials who take 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 per cent of it. So when the people of Georgia or Illinois come to get back the original dollar that they paid

in taxes, they will get perhaps 70 or 75 cents on the dollar. That is a little better than bankruptcy, however.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the 40 per cent of this appropriation of $500,000 for the first year, 1919, is all that is to be taken in a pay roll, I am amazed at the moderation of the department having it in charge. I have never known anything to be so reasonable. Usually it is about 60 per cent in these enterprises. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is sound in his criticism, although it is not as bad as it might be or as bad as it will be later on. Those things always grow in due proportion. The Senator has touched an elemental weakness in the whole scheme.

These sums of money therefore are used to invade these reserved powers of the States when Congress or the department has failed to break down those powers by direct assault. It is proposed that every State legislature, and in the interim when there is no State legislature the governor, as provided in one of the sections, will accept the provisions of this bill in order to obtain the distributive share of the sum provided.

Take the limitation mentioned by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], that if the person is an adult and is injured, no reason exists why he ought not to be taken and trained so that he may be able to earn a livelihood. Go that far, if there be merit in it, but if the person is of the kind already subject to the poor laws of the State or has no visible means of support and has had no occupation previous to the time of being disabled, this bill advances beyond that limitation and places a premium upon all the idle social misfits and failures of human society. It is to that part of the bill that I direct my criticism. Take the extreme limit of a part of the population and carry it as far as the Senator from Georgia has suggested. If they are without means and have been of previous industrial life that has not put them in the vagrant class, in the class supported by the poor laws or the habitually criminal, let them have the relief under the bill; but there ought to be a limitation in all human decency so that we do not by this bill place a premium upon the vagrant, the criminal, and the worthless.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. How does the Senator reach the conclusion that it places a premium upon those persons? A man can not have this training unless he is disabled. Surely a man is not going to have his hand or his leg cut off in order to get the training? Where is the premium that is placed upon it?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly I will explain that. A man has, we will say, reached the age of 40 years—to follow out the Senator's illustration given awhile ago—and he is run over by some plutocrat's automobile on the streets of Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. There are no plutocrats in Iowa; confine it to the senatorial automobiles in Washington.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that no Senator ever admits that there is a plutocrat in his own State. Nevertheless their habitat is in every State in the Union. I do not know in all of the States such as belong to that classification, but in many of the States, where I know it is claimed with great vigor that they do not exist, they are nevertheless to be found. I can find them in Iowa. For many years I lived in the Mississippi River district running from above Burlington down to and below Keokuk and down to the Missouri State line. I apprehend that in the river towns, beginning with Dubuque and running down through Burlington, even in towns that are not regarded as the metropolis of the Hawkeye State, if I were to go into the interior, where the soil is richer, where more cattle and hogs are found, and where the forms of wealth are very largely noncorporate in character, belonging to the farmer, whose possessions and person are sacred both against legislation and against the declamations of statesmen, I could find plutocrats in the far interior between Council Bluffs and Burlington. I have known some of them. In fact some of them emigrated in an early day from Illinois and settled in that country when land was comparatively cheap, bought many thousand acres, and by the unearned increment, referred to by Henry George, in time they became most obnoxious plutocrats.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KENYON. One of them, who I am sure has not become obnoxious, emigrated from those same prairies of Iowa to Illinois, and became its governor, and is now its governor.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes. We approve of plutocrats in our State; we elect some of that alleged variety governor; we are not afraid of them; we encourage their settling within our borders, for thereby we are enabled to raise taxes, and if the Senator from Iowa will look at the income-tax returns, both corporate and individual, in the State of their immigration he will find that the reason why we pay many fold more taxes than does Iowa is because we encourage gentlemen of ability to settle within our limits and to remain there. Invidious legislation does not drive them from the borders of our State, nor do we, by public opinion, seek to proscribe them. Therefore when I speak of a man being run over by the automobile of a plutocrat, Mr. President, thereby rendering him, as the Senator says, eligible under this bill to vocational instruction, he wants to know why it ought not at that period be given to him, because that is the only time he has ever been qualified by being disabled to receive such instruction.

I am talking about the man 40 or 50 years of age, not of the juvenile; about the one who has reached that period of life where both habits and mind are settled, where he is fixed in his methods of daily life, whatever they may be, whether they are of a reprehensible or of a commendable kind. In that event, under this bill it makes no difference what kind of a life he is living, he is taken, in part by appropriation under a measure of this kind, and given instruction. If before that time he was an industrious man, if he was not a vagrant, if he was not supported in whole or in part by public charity, if he was not a criminal, I am willing to go on this branch of the controversy that far in the bill, following the lead of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], but for that type of rapidly increasing number in this country I am not willing to say to them that if they suffer misfortune after being of that previous life the Government will thereby take them and make them its wards, educate them, and attempt to make something out of a broken wreck that was merely a sound physical wreck before. I am not willing to go that far, and that is where legitimate criticism of this bill begins.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. If the State of Illinois, for instance, adopted the policy of taking care of that kind of men and giving them vocational training and subsistence during the time, would the Senator object to any portion of the funds of the Federal Government under this act going to the State of Illinois?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENYON. That would be entirely a matter for the State. If the State did not provide for taking care of that kind of men, then nothing would go to the State; it would be entirely up to the State.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I should object to that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the junior Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] will pardon me, this bill goes further than that. While it is true it does not compel the Federal Government to make the appropriations unless it desires to do so, nevertheless the Federal Government may withhold the appropriations unless the plans adopted by the State meet the approval of the Federal board. Therefore this board may dictate the plans, for the State may be so desirous of getting the appropriation that it will yield to the suggestions of the Federal board. So in the end, as we all know, the plans will emanate from the Federal board, and the Federal board will be the omnipotent power that will devise the plans, superintend their execution, and control all of the activities of the State, as well, of course, as of the Federal agency.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it is a very severe indictment of the State boards that they can be controlled by the Federal boards. I am too jealous of State rights, as advocated by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], to believe that any such thing can be brought about.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then, Mr. President, unless the State yields absolutely to the Federal authority, it will receive no money under this bill. If the State goes so far, let it do so; it is its own affair. But the Government ought not encourage it.

Allow me to give you a brief experience on those subjects. These projects are very numerous now, but they are as old as they are numerous in mere precedents. Of late years they have come along very, very rapidly. All such schemes that have been invented in the last 8 or 10 years are legion in number, but some 15 years ago in a certain State I knew of a geological and mineral survey being made by the State. It had appropriated for this purpose an adequate sum of money; the surveys were in progress by a competent corps of engineers, by geologists, by those skilled in that line of work, both on the

surface and below the surface of the earth. While they were conducting their work, from Washington came some one from the geological department connected with the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the United States. He happened to interview the Senator now having the floor, who was occupying a somewhat humble position at that time, but of some authority in the expenditure of money. He said that the Government would be glad to join; that it had a certain amount of money that could be expended for the joint purpose of obtaining a more extensive geological survey of the State than the State was itself likely to give.

I made some inquiry about it. He stated the sum of money, the number of employees he had, and that they would join with those of the State. Everything appeared to be agreeable. I thought probably it would be an arrangement that would be practicable. At the last moment, however, he submitted a requirement that all of the money of the State and its pay rolls should become absolutely subservient to the rules made in Washington in the department. It could not be a partnership affair at all. It must be exclusive; and so we separated. We did not need money that bad. We can yet levy and collect our own taxes adequate for such purposes.

The result was that some States yielded and got the contribution from the Treasury here, but other States did not. My own State did not yield. We therefore received no part of it. We conducted our survey to a conclusion, published it in a volume that I believe to be as valuable as the tomes that go out of the department here, for the coal miners, those engaged in the fluorspar mines, and of zinc and lead and every description in that country from the Ohio River to the Wisconsin lead regions, have been using that volume as an authority. We received none of the Government money because we would not surrender the power of the State; and not only that, but give our money and pay rolls into the custody of somebody in Washington. That was a local affair, and we conducted it to a conclusion as such affair wholly within the power of the State, as it was.

When these rules are to be made here by the Federal board, they will be imposed upon every State authority, and unless a State authority yields to the rules framed in Washington by this board, not one dollar will go to any State. The yielding State that is willing to surrender its own integrity and independence will be bribed by a golden flood of which they themselves pay a part. It is an old method of breaking down the proper power of the State.

Let me say to some of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, you will go on in this way year after year until by custom, by what in effect I will call governmental bribery, by taking taxes that you yourselves in part pay, by breaking down the morale of your own State officers, by drugging the public conscience of your own State, by crossing the boundary until at last the line of demarcation will be obliterated, until finally the Government, acting through Congress and through departmental officers, will be framing your own election laws, and that, too, by some subtle form of bribery will be taken from you, or you will be clubbed, and that power, now one that is peculiarly local to every one of the 48 States of the Union, will be "more honored in the breach than the observance." That is for you to say. We shall take care of ourselves under any kind of a law. It is a question of whether or not you can. When that day comes you will be crying for help, and help, when it reaches that stage of public morale in your State officers and the limitations of the reserved powers of the State, will be very difficult to get.

There is always, Mr. President, a certain number of the population who are failures. It is an unpleasant thing to be compelled to refer to that part of any community. The Senator has asked whether we take care of them in our State. We do. There are two groups. We take care of certain unfortunate, the blind, both the juvenile and the adult; we take care of the feeble-minded, and of those who are mutilated or disabled. In every large State of the Union where there is any industrial life that is done. The phrase employed in this bill is "persons disabled." A person is disabled who mentally does not have sufficient vigor of understanding to learn any occupation by which he can make a living. This bill would invade the schools for the feeble-minded in every State in the Union. It would say to the management, the board of charities, or whatever authority in the State takes care of them, "If you will administer your schools for the feeble-minded under rules framed in Washington we will give you out of the Public Treasury a certain sum of money. If you do not let us take over and administer that power of the State, you can not have a dollar."

When it came to spending the money that is the way all of these sums of which I have had any practical knowledge have been administered in years past. I am not ready to have the schools for the feeble-minded in my State, the schools for the vocational training of those injured in industry, and the schools for those who are blind, either by accident or by disease or from birth, either the juvenile or the adult, turned over to some wise man in Washington who thinks he knows more about how to administer them in States of from six to twelve million population, running from the Atlantic seaboard through Pennsylvania out to Illinois, than we do ourselves. Still that is what this bill does.

The administration of such matters is one of the reserved rights of the States. If a soldier has been injured in the late war he can be taken care of under existing law, supplemented by this bill, if it be so limited. Let it be limited then to the soldier who has been injured and I will make no criticism of that; in fact, I will join with other Senators as cordially as anyone for such vocational rehabilitation. It ought to be done.

I will go further, to restate now the limit: I will help, through contributions from the Public Treasury, the vocational rehabilitation of the industrial army, because a large part of the industrially disabled are engaged in occupations producing merchandise or commodities which eventually go into interstate trade and become a part of the interstate commerce of the country. I will go even further than that and say that any person of previous good life, of industrious habits, who has not been supported by the poor laws, who is not an habitual vagrant and not a criminal, may be included in this bill; but I do object to throwing the benefits of such an act as this around the vagrant, the criminal, the worthless, and the vagabond who never did anything until he had his leg cut off. In that event, as the Senator says, he is to be taken in hand by the Government and trained to become a useful citizen. I simply say, Mr. President, it can not be done. Such a proposal takes no heed of the changeless conditions of human life. After a man has reached the period when he has hardened down into what he is in this world, do you think you can make over the broken instrument, the failure of life? Some Senators may suppose that can be done, but I am not quite that optimistic. Let such failures go to the poorhouse. That is a harsh phrase; I am not saying to the "almshouse"; I am saying the "poorhouse" in the good old way. These are with others enumerated the second group.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. If such a man goes to the poorhouse, who supports him—the State, does it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. The State.

Mr. KENYON. If, instead of going to the poorhouse, you can train that man so that he can support himself, do you not perform a good economic service for the State? Is not that worth while?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the Senator's statement. The kind of individual to whom I refer is the one who, either by the providence of God or the misfortune of the man himself—I do not know what it is and I will not undertake to fix the responsibility—is beyond all human help.

Mr. KENYON. There is no man beyond help; there is no man so low that he can not be helped; there is no man so low that there is not a spark of manhood in him somewhere, and if you get hold of it you can make a man of him. Otherwise you decry all the religion in which we believe.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Iowa has a good theory, but it is utterly inapplicable in practice. I wish he were right; I know he is not. I have lived in a jurisdiction of from six to six and one-half millions of people, containing the second largest city on the Western Hemisphere, and I have dealt with those who came and went out again on the tide of a great population.

Mr. KENYON. They may never have had a chance to do anything else. Give them a chance and see what they will do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have heard from the reformers on the lecture platform that some men never had a chance; but I say, Mr. President, there is not anybody in this Republic of ours with the average wits which the Almighty gave him and of ordinary physical health who did not have a chance.

Such an average person who had no chance does not exist. I have heard from infancy the statement made by the Senator from Iowa, but I repeat that in this country of ours the person of average physical health, of average understanding, whether he had a dollar in the world to begin with or not, who has reached maturity, is an adult and is a failure, has nobody under the blue vault of heaven to complain about but himself.

That is where we vitally differ—upon one of the elemental things of human life—and that is where this bill is basically wrong. It takes no account of that immutable boundary that the Creator has fixed between the failure and the success. I am not ready to put a premium, therefore, on the failures of life. When the Senator asks me how I am able to make such an inference from the provisions of this bill, I reply that that is how I draw that inference, and I think it is fairly a legitimate result of this bill as it is written, beginning with section 1 and running through all of its operative provisions. Let me read——

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. Why does not the Senator make a test on that question? It is a fair question for a test, and it could be easily made by moving to strike out the words "or otherwise," in lines 4 and 5. The Senate could vote on that question. That is a fair matter of dispute. I do not agree with the Senator, but there will be other Senators who will agree with him, and if those words go out——

Mr. SHERMAN. The objection I have just voiced I would not urge further if the words "or otherwise" are stricken out, so that the bill will apply only to those disabled in industry.

Mr. KENYON. I say the Senator can make the test by moving to strike out the words "or otherwise."

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, Mr. President, I anticipate what the result would be. There is a wave of maudlin sentiment washing over this country which will not subside until we have been impaired in our incomes and our charitable sensibilities have been shocked by the worthless element of humanity that abuses those sensibilities. There probably can be no recovery without that experience.

I trust that some one will make the motion referred to. I very seldom offer a bill in this body, and have very seldom done so in any legislative body in which I have ever served. When I retire from the Senate I will have rounded out 26 years of public service, 22 years of which have been in legislative bodies, and in that time I never introduced a bill which matured into a statute, and I have seldom offered amendments, although I have framed new sections; but in that time I am glad to say that I have killed more bills than were ever passed. I believe the man who does that in a legislative body performs the greatest service he can render to his constituents and to the general public, especially in this age of dissolution, of fraud, of maudlin sentiment, of extravagance, of State bribery, of the deadening of every sensibility, of destroying the elements that go to make a self-supporting, self-respecting man. Now is the best time in the world, Mr. President, to take the bills that come in here and dissect and defeat them. The price of print paper has been outrageously increased, as I suggested here the other day, by the immense printing bills of the departments, enhanced very largely by the bills incurred by the Government Printing Office because of matter coming from Congress.

The pending bill would be less objectionable if the words "or otherwise" were stricken out, so that persons disabled in industry and those injured in military life alone would be cared for. As it is now framed it will cover, I repeat, every criminal, every vagrant, every loafing failure inside of our borders—and there is no limitation as to aliens or citizens—and make him a ward of the Government, because this is only a beginning.

It is true there are only a half million dollars appropriated for the first year, but the following year $750,000 are appropriated, and the year following that $1,000,000, and in the two remaining years I assume that the appropriation will be no less. I have seldom known of appropriations growing any less in this body. The usual rule is for them to increase, and I regard this merely as an entering wedge. It will eventually "go the whole hog," because, if once a beginning is had there never is an end.

I have heretofore made remarks here on pay rolls. When a pay roll is once created, the 12 labors of Hercules, as described in mythology, are no comparison with the task of destroying them. They survive with all the vitality that belongs to a law of nature. So the limit of five years, announced here by the Senator from Iowa, will be very easily removed. The five years having provided for these sums of money, aggregating something like five and one-half to six million dollars, will by that time have built around it such a permanent pay roll that it will have become impossible to destroy it, however it lacks in merit.

I wish to read certain extracts from Mr. E. W. Howe, a constituent of the senior Senator from Kansas. It is from Howe's Magazine. It is filled with hard-headed sense:

The greatest fallacy of all time is that the poor man need do nothing to help himself; that the reformers will take care of him by means of resolutions and conventions. The poor man, in popular literature, has never been to blame for anything, particularly for his poverty; the rich man has robbed him, and there is nothing to do but make the rich man give it back.

I lately wrote that: "I had never known anyone in a public utterance to tell the truth about the poor, which is that they are not imposed on."

I meant no more than that there is not now, and has never been, a general disposition to impose on the poor; that there are no laws in the United States discriminating against them. I did not mean, of course, that individuals in all classes are not imposed upon by other individuals every day and hour, but in this one is as bad as another.

So I stand by the statement, though it has shocked many.

I was lately talking to a lawyer of some local note, and made the statement that there are no laws in this country discriminating against the poor, whereas there are many discriminating against the well-to-do. He denied it at first, whereupon I asked him to look over his books. He did this with a rather surprising result. In a week he brought me a typewritten list of 73 such laws, and said he had not completed his search.

The facts are, of course, that laws specially favoring the poor bristle in the statutes of every State, in the national laws, and in the ordinances of every city and town. I do not object to this, and only mention it as further evidence that there is no disposition either in law or custom to impose on the poor; on the contrary that they are the objects of our concern and benevolence. The Bible is notoriously prejudiced in their favor, and this has continued in almost every book to this day.

I know the poor from the inside, having long been one of them, but never have I known of a law oppressing me because of poverty; on the contrary, I have always observed that the laws rather gave me the best of it. I have not encountered in a long life a generally accepted social custom intended to impose on the poor; on the contrary, custom has always begged me to acquire an education and offered me abundant and honorable opportunities to improve my financial condition.

A Washington professor fears I am "an employee of predaceous wealth." I am not; nor am I an employee of predaceous poverty. My case is that as an observer of events I prefer to be reasonably honest.

That is a good phrase, "reasonably honest." Some of us seem to have an excessive dose of it now.

I am tired of those extravagantly good people who praise themselves and abuse their enemies to a point beyond truth and fairness, as mischievous a form of lying as can be indulged in.

When I speak of the poor I do not mean the old or the sick; I mean the shiftless, of which we have a tremendous number in this country. I shall never have the same respect for the shiftless man that I have for his brother who is reasonably industrious and frugal, and who frequently becomes useful, not only to his family but to his community. No one can persuade me that the men who earn $10 a day are not as honorable as those who earn $4, and I believe the $10 a day men are a little more capable than their $4 brethren. And if the $10 a day men are promoted, which is happening to them constantly, I do not believe them less worthy than they were when working for less.

Nor do I think there is any useful thing accomplished by our American plan of forever exalting the poor and crying down the well to do. I do not believe it is any easier for a poor man to get into heaven than it is for a well-to-do man.

Finally, I believe (and the professors may make the most of it) that a thousand well-to-do men will average a little better in usefulness, integrity, and industry than a thousand average poor men.

I believe this because in our fat country extreme poverty indicates an individual below the average, unless it is accompanied by old age or misfortune.

They are taken care of under other laws—old-age pensions, compensation laws, health insurance, and the like.

The most useful men the world has ever known have been well-to-do, with very few exceptions. Let any man perform a useful service for the world, and the world will pay him for it, as it should.

I believe—and every man of ordinary honesty and intelligence believes—that a man who behaves, saves, and works hard is entitled to progress in his finances with age, and provide for his days of inactivity. If he does not succeed in this in some measure, the world blames him, and he blames himself, as much as I do.

When we properly train children, our ambition for them is that they may become not only polite and worthy men and women but successful in life; one result is as much in our minds as the other. You never in your life knew a father or a mother who warned their children to avoid becoming well-to-do. If we have a son who is spoken well of by his employer, and is promoted because of good habits, how proud we are of him! How the neighbors praise him. He is pursuing precisely the course expected of a good boy. Yet this is precisely the course which, if persisted in, will result in his becoming well-to-do, and possibly rich. How apparent, then, is that meanness which declares that such a man, when he has become elderly and properly rounded out his life, is a thief.—E. W. Howe's Monthly.

Ah, let me say to the Senator from Iowa, when he places this bill before the Senate without the limitation, he is placing a premium upon the vagrant, the worthless, and the failures of the community. It is to that part of it that I object.

I know, Mr. President, that it is generally supposed, as indicated by Mr. Howe in his philosophy, that the person who does accumulate anything ought to be penalized. When you get done penalizing the thrifty and the industrious, there will be nothing left to pay old-age pensions to all the accumulated failures of this world. When you get through taxing the people that have something to support the failures, the vagrant, the disabled tramp that is run over by some plutocrat's automobile; when you get through taxing the ones that have something to tax to support the failures, criminal, vagrant, and otherwise, who have nothing to tax, then you will have no community save that of the Bolshevist. That is the philosophy—and I say it with all due respect—that is the philosophy, just about 2 per cent of it,

in this bill, that is applied about 100 per cent in Petrograd and vicinity by Lenine and Trotsky. We have 2 per cent in this bill as compared with 100 per cent in that delectable place governed by Lenine.

I propose to appeal to some of the successes of life, and have the Senators in this body, who wish for their constituency and their support the failures of life, depend upon those failures to put them through and keep them in the Senate. It is time to draw that line. I do not want the vote of any vagrant in the world, unless he voluntarily gives it to me. I do not want a criminal vote. I do not want to be elected by the failures and criminals.

If I can not represent the part of the Caucasian race that amounts to something in the world—that if they get a leg cut off can still get along with the other leg that is left, or with an eye put out can go through life one-eyed and still make a living—if I can not be the representative of that kind of people, I do not want to be the representative of the man that can not make a living or live at all unless the Government takes him and holds him up and feeds and clothes and shelters him and gives him an opportunity that he says he has never had before. If the philosophy of this bill is sound, it is a misfortune if a failure lives to be 50 years old before he loses a leg. He ought to have it cut off in infancy, and then the Government would salvage him early. It would save him from wasting 30 or 40 years riding on a brake beam or chasing a job that is always a few days ahead of him.

I have heard enough of that, and it is time to call a halt. I do not know how much such sound sense will be found on this subject, but I intend to take the measure of it. I intend to draw the line between maudlin sympathy, perverted, misdirected charity, and those who are entitled to the great, charitable impulses of organized government.

If this be limited by striking out all of the type I have indicated, then that criticism can be withdrawn and I would not urge it further. As it is, though, this bill with that feature remaining in it is a misdirected measure of charity. It is in that respect an effort of scintillating decay. It marks the decadence of social institutions. There is no real progress in such a measure. This is called a humanitarian measure. The most suspicious characters in the Western States are some of the professional humanitarians. I find when I search the private conduct of such a professional humanitarian that he is always exploiting somebody else's pocketbook but he never gives anything himself, not even his own services, unless he is paid a very liberal salary to relieve the poor at somebody else's expense.

The Senator from Georgia says that it was never thought of before; that we have discovered one of the great humanitarian impulses of our generation. Why, it was practiced in ancient Egypt, the gateway of civilization. The races that preceded the Aztecs in Mexico and Central America, with the altars and ruins of their forgotten temples, exercised as humane a charity as we are exercising in any of our institutions to-day. The indications show it. We think we have discovered everything. We are in the kindergarten, not only of charity but of government and in the perpetuity of what we expect to preserve. There is not very much that is original in either. We borrowed our laws from England. We borrowed our Constitution from the Netherlands, from the States General. We took our great elementary act of habeas corpus from an act of Parliament in 1679. We have borrowed our charities from the laws of England. We are behind England 15 years in legislation on compensation laws, on old-age insurance, on all forms of industrial relief for the sick, the aged, and the disabled. We are trotting along, probably going as fast as public sentiment wishes to go; but the last two or three years has been a peculiarly prolific time to take everything, call it by the name of a war charity, and throw the cloak over it, so that every vagrant that falls out of a box car, every rider of the brake beam, every bronzed, blistered, odoriferous knight of the tomato can, every perambulating mendicant haunting the back door is to be regarded as the misfortune of society, a petted sacrifice to economic environment. He is not to blame for anything—never! He is a victim of social injustice.

Notwithstanding he may have reached the age of 40 or 50 years, wearing a pair of shoes rescued from the ash can, and living upon the free lunch that comes out of the alley, and quarreling with the neighborhood dogs for his nutrition, notwithstanding that he has not had a bath since he was born, that he has constitutional scruples against it, that he would go to Russia, where baths are forbidden for common people, if he only had a railroad ticket, or could swim far enough to get over the Atlantic, that he is that kind of a man—now, notwithstanding all that, he is to be taken at 40 or 50 years of age—

> One more unfortunate
> Weary of breath,
> Rashly importunate,
> About to go to his death—

if I might paraphrase Tom Hood—because society will not do something for him. He is to be taken, why? Because he has been an ignoble failure all his life. He has been either criminal or semicriminal. He has not improved his chances, or has been a chronic idler. He is exalted into an industrial hero because he fell out of the box car and had his leg cut off. He is to be taken up by human society, exalted into a student of some industrious art, converted into the beneficiary of human society, converted into some kind of an industrial agent, where a one-legged man or a man with no arms can make a living, when he could not or did not do it when he had both arms or legs.

Why, we have that now, Mr. President, in most of the States, the large States, where they have any considerable population of that kind. If a Senator were disabled, and had not saved anything out of his salary because of the high cost of living in Washington during the last few years, and came to my State, they would take care of him and give him an occupation in a public institution, but we do not want any help from the Government. The feeble-minded are educated; they are taken care of from infancy until they are matured, and then we have provision for caring for them later on. The blind are cared for, both the juvenile and the adult. The blind are trained in childhood in the Braille system of writing and reading. The typewriter invented for their benefit is at their command. They learn the raised alphabet. When they reach adult years, they are taught occupations without cost. That is given by the State. They are allowed to fit themselves for any occupation—basket weaving, piano tuning, typewriting, the preparation of books for the blind, music. Over 100 occupations are taught the totally and stone blind in these institutions.

We do not want any help from the Government. If there is a State that is too weak to support itself, if any one of the 48 States has become industrially dependent, if it wishes to become a mendicant, begging at the threshold of the Federal Government for alms, let it disgrace itself and lose its own self-respect by making the application, if this permissive legislation is granted. But any State that has any self-respect left, that exercises its reserved powers, ought to have too much pride of its own citizenship to apply for or receive from the Treasury what is its own duty to support, what every State does that is worthy of its local sovereignty.

There is a feature here that I am quite loath to advert to, but I conceive it to be my duty to do it. We have had an employment agency, a United States Employment Service, for some time. There are $272,000 appropriated in the deficiency bill, which is yet in conference, or was a few hours ago, paying for a deficiency for the United States Employment Service. In due time there will be fourteen or fifteen million dollars coming in here to be appropriated to perpetuate that service. I might just as well announce now that I am opposed to it. First, where any unemployment exists in any considerable degree the States take care of that by free employment agencies of their own. Next, for every person who is not willing to receive gratuitous service there are honest and well-conducted private employment agencies to which we have access, and to which many self-respecting, self-supporting people go and pay a reasonable charge for the service and receive it.

I know what will be the natural result, and I can foretell it, without being possessed of either the gift of tongues or prophets.

Look at the various things that may be done, all of them, running up to some six in number, saying what shall be done by this board, found on page 5 of the bill:

> It shall be the duty of said board (1) to examine plans submitted by the State boards and approve the same if believed to be feasible and found to be in conformity with the provisions and purposes of this act.

In other words, if the bill passes as it is now, they take in everybody, the deserving and the undeserving.

Still reading on page 5:

> (2) To ascertain annually whether the several States are using or are prepared to use the money received by them in accordance with the provisions of this act; (3) to certify on or before the 1st day of January of each year to the Secretary of the Treasury each State which has accepted the provisions of this act and complied therewith, together with the amount which each State is entitled to receive under the provisions of this act; (4) to deduct from the next succeeding allotment to any State whenever any portion of the fund annually allotted has not been expended for the purpose provided for in this act a sum equal to such unexpended portion; (5) to withhold the allotment of moneys to any State whenever it shall be determined that moneys allotted are not being expended for the purposes and conditions of this act; (6) to require the replacement by withholding sub-

sequent allotments of any portion of the moneys received by the custodian of any State under this act that by any action or contingency is diminished or lost.

It then provides that an appeal may be taken from any State to Congress in the event there is a difference of opinion about whether the State is rightfully deprived of any payment or installment.

With this, coupled with other provisions of the bill, it puts it in the hands of the board to lay down the details under which this money is to be paid. The great part of it is industrial life—occupations of some kind.

What has been the result in the United States Employment Service? The United States Employment Service has mingled itself with every undertaking it ought not to put its hand upon, all the way from underwriting Mr. Mooney for a new trial down to insisting that no man be given an occupation unless he joins a union, even when he came out of the Army. He would not have this beneficial service of the Government unless he belonged to a union. That I will bring out here in due time. I only inferentially refer to it to show the abuses that have been practiced by Government officials and the use of money for that perverted purpose. There ought to be no discrimination between a union and a nonunion man, between the equally deserving in any occupation, whether they be of military or civil life, giving preference to the military life in the first instance.

In these same undertakings, Mr. President, it will be Government officials. They deal with finding places for the unemployed. I asked the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] if under the present administration, to say nothing about the future, whether it be of one political party or another, the persons enforcing this law and finding vocational rehabilitation for the persons concerned will not be members of some labor union in the first instance?

Mr. KENYON. Not at all. There are a representative of labor on the vocational board now, a representative of agriculture, a representative of manufactures, and some members of the Cabinet. That question does not enter into it at all.

Mr. SHERMAN. The representatives not of the union are in the minority.

Mr. KENYON. There is one representative of labor on the vocational board, Mr. Holder.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not question that the Senator believes that, but the first time I have a gold brick to sell and he is in Iowa, I will hunt him up.

Mr. KENYON. I will send it over to Illinois where they buy them much more frequently than we do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know better than the Senator about that.

Mr. KENYON. There are representatives of the manufactures on the board and a representative of agriculture. Why does the Senator say the board is composed of representatives of union labor?

Mr. SHERMAN. Because in everything having to do with employment they have controlled and now control. That is why I say it.

Mr. KENYON. This is an educational board.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, well, educational.

Mr. KENYON. A vocational educational board.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; educational.

Mr. KENYON. That is evidently what the Senator is talking about. The bill before the Senate is not in the nature of an employment bill. If he is talking about an employment bill, that is not before us.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is concealed with the euphonious phrase "vocational rehabilitation"; but every time a man is vocationally rehabilitated he has to have something to employ his rehabilitated talent; otherwise it is a failure, and that naturally will become a part of the system. I know the Senator too well, with his mental acumen and his great legal experience and his knowledge of men, and I think his charitable impulses and the kindliness of his heart have run away with his usual good judgment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator pays me a compliment which I do not deserve. I should be very glad to have been the author of this bill, but I was not. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was the author of the bill. So while I enjoy the delightful references of the Senator, in order to be fair he should take the Senator from Georgia into the sphere of his compliments also.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will transfer them to the Senator from Georgia and return to the Senator from Iowa by saying that I did not merely apply it to the authorship of the bill, all of which is deserved. I was applying it to the somewhat optimistic idea that I feared the Senator from Iowa had, that there would be no labor-union discrimination in the application of the bill. I think he is overly hopeful.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator know who is the director who has been selected by the Vocational Board to have charge of vocational training under the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I know who it is at present.

Mr. KENYON. Dr. Prosser.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know who at the present time are administering it.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator would not claim that Dr. Prosser was influenced in a wrongful way by any labor union or anything else? He is one of the strongest men in the country.

Mr. SHERMAN. He will not administer this; he will delegate it to somebody else.

Mr. KENYON. He is very deeply interested in it and will undoubtedly be the moving factor in the whole problem.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, yes; I understand the moving factors in all these great uplifts. I have witnessed their operation for many years. We have one in Paris now, and the difficulty is that the right hand knoweth not what the left hand is doing here at home.

Mr. KENYON. That has not anything to do with this bill. I am not willing to get into that controversy about this bill. The gentleman at Paris will not have anything to do with this bill. The Senator has a little disease about Paris.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is quite justified. Certainly, the Executive Department is running without the absent one at Paris. He will likely have something to do with continuing the gentleman of high character referred to by the Senator from Iowa, if he remains, and he was either directly or indirectly responsible for his selection.

Admitting that the gentleman named is of high character and ability, which I concede, if he administers it there might be no possibility of abuses of this kind. Still he can not attend to everything. He must delegate that power to somebody else, and insensibly in the gradations of that delegated power it will go from one to another, and finally in its application it will be in the hands of another Densmore. That is where this will go finally, and these vocationally rehabilitated gentlemen will be handled by the same kind of agency as the United States Employment Service. That is where practically it will land.

Mr. KENYON. I do not know why the Senator says that. The board is now constructed, all the machinery is in operation for the educational side of the vocational training. That same board is to carry it on. Dr. Prosser is the director, and I suppose he will continue as the director. Can the Senator think of a better man to do the work?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no criticism of him.

Mr. KENYON. Then why bring Mr. Densmore in? He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Because he will get a Densmore before he finishes up. My prediction is just as good as that of the Senator from Iowa on that proposition.

Mr. KENYON. No; it is not, because I am bringing the situation that exists and the organization that exists ready to go on with this work, while the Senator is simply engaging in idiosynchronatic terms about it. I was trying to use some of the Senator's language, but I am not very good at it.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is entirely satisfactory in the application. There are no dreams in this administration. They are all horrible realities of the morning after. There is not a theory that has not turned out to be a neurotic delirium. When I make a prediction when information is given by legislation of this character of what will happen, I base it upon what has already happened, not upon the high character of somebody at the head of a bureau or department who can not possibly attend to all the details of it himself, but must delegate it out where inevitably it will fall into the same lamentable condition of other departments and bureaus that are now existing and in operation.

Therefore, Mr. President, leaving the objection I have been urging at present, upon the ground that we ought to have some reasonable limit, that is my basic objection to the bill. There should be some reasonable limit for the deserving and worthy part of the population and unless that limitation is placed in the bill it ought not to pass.

There is no use saying that it does not place a premium upon the incapable, the worthless, and the criminal. It is said they are to be relieved. Well, they are, but I believe in putting their relief upon the right basis. Put it where from time immemorial and by the solemn experience of mankind it belongs. If a person is a criminal, or semi-criminal, let him take the consequences of it. If he is a vagrant, let him bear that burden. If he is a failure let him take the result of his failure unless it proves to be a misfortune before he reaches adult years. If he is an adult failure and then becomes disabled, if he is disabled in industry, give him a chance; but if

he is a disabled vagrant I do not believe in taking money out of the Treasury. Even if the State has gone so far in its sympathies as to do so, the Treasury of the United States should not contribute. These are the limits. There ought to be some encouragement for a man to be industrious, to do something in the world.

We are drifting to a point where the only hero in the industrial world is the worthless willful failure. The only object of criticism is the man who succeeds. He is the one who is pointed out to be discriminated and legislated against. We have become hero worshippers of the vagrants and the failures, and that is the type idealized in this bill.

I thought, Mr. President, it was my duty to object and to take the time necessary to state my objections, and I have done so. I wish here solemnly to say not only to the Senators in this Chamber but to the general public outside that we are traveling the gait and in the direction that will ultimately make failures out of the successful American people. It is 2 per cent Bolshevism now in this bill, and like every other blood poison that gets into a healthy anatomy it can spread with the greatest rapidity until the whole system is affected.

There is no substitute, Mr. President, for industry, for thrift, for taking care of yourself, for the God-fearing and self-respecting man and woman. We have lost sight of that type, of the old New England type that came over with the Puritans, of the old Virginian ancestor who came to the banks of the James River in an early day, the genuine American with the English blood who settled in that country and in Massachusetts. They laid the foundation of American character. It is the fashion now to decry it, and I have heard it in the pulpit. Shame eternally upon the doctor of divinity who teaches such creeds to his congregation. I have heard ministers of the Gospel say that the old New England idea of thrift was a hateful idea, because it made a man stingy and mean; it killed the generosity of the human heart. I have heard them criticize the white blood of the Southern States by saying that their chivalry was a humbug, that their ideas of honor and keeping faith belonged to a generation of fox-hunting squires and owners of race horses.

Anything to belittle the thrift that belongs to the character on which this Republic was built. It is that character to which I refer and I am defending it in my remarks on this bill.

This bill is based on an attack upon that character, upon the best system of private individual life I believe the Caucasian race ever saw, whether it be in the Southern States, in New England, or in the far West. I believe it is the highest type of the white blood ever known. I believe it has built up the solid substructure on which this Republic has been founded. It is upon the individual responsibility that belongs to the man and the woman. In this age we are dissolving that responsibility, legislating it away. I believe it would be a good thing, Mr. President, if there was a little more of Billy Sunday orthodoxy preached in this country, a little more individual responsibility, that we catch hades when we deserve it. That is his creed. But we are legislating, and on the lecture platform and in the raveled out magazines of a sensational character with the professors of economy from learned universities introducing a new system of economy that idealizes and makes heroes of the failures of the earth, it has done away entirely with the character of the American self-respecting, thrifty man and woman who laid the foundation of empire in years past. They are the ones who are to-day the objects of execration and ridicule.

Oh, it is a good deal better now to keep going as long as you have a dollar. I have a young friend who came to the depot one time with me. He wanted to call a cab for me, but I said, "No; I will take a street car." I had a couple of grips. He said, "You do not want to carry those to the street car?" I said, "Yes; I do." He said, "Let me carry one." I let him have it. He did not have muscle enough to carry it. He was a runt. He was a fair-sized fellow and had a cigarette in his mouth and he lived upon fine victuals every day. He fared sumptuously and his raiment was like that of the days of Solomon, but he could not lift the gripsack up on the step of the car. As he went in and sat down he said, "I hate to carry a gripsack into a car. It is bad form. It makes me blush to carry baggage. We ought to have had it in a cab or had somebody carry our baggage. This is a pretty good-sized city and they notice it." I said, "Yes; and they ought to notice that you have not yet paid for that $60 overcoat you bought two years ago and are wearing to-night, that you have not paid for and likely never will." I said, "Get red in the face over that, my boy." I will never get his vote, but I do not want it. If I can not be elected by somebody other than the deadbeats of the world I never want to hold another office. And still you are putting a premium on deadbeats and vagrants and criminals and loafers of the human race here by the 2 per cent that ought to be cut out of this bill before it even has a chance of going to roll call in this body.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. I am talking about the five-year limitation.

Mr. KENYON. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. SHERMAN. I reserve the right to talk upon other amendments and upon the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think it is quite apparent that we can not reach a vote on this measure to-night. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and at (5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *June 19, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast ever ministered abundantly unto Thy children and who holdest in the hollow of Thy hand the destiny of men and of nations, continue, we beseech Thee, Thy ministrations unto us as a people, that we may continue to grow in all that makes a nation great and glorious.

Make us great in peace as we have been great and magnanimous in war, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done, in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MASSACRES IN POLAND.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at a public mass meeting held in Metropolitan Theater, in the city of Seattle, on the 16th day of June, 1919, protesting against the organized massacres that have been directed against the Jewish communities in eastern Europe, especially in Poland.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the resolutions referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that a few days ago a similar request was made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE], which was objected to. I am frank to say I think it was properly objected to.

Mr. MILLER. These were resolutions adopted at a mass meeting and were presented by a former United States Senator and were seconded by the governor of the State and the mayor of the city.

Mr. GARRETT. The resolutions referred to by the gentleman from Virginia were adopted at a mass meeting held in the city of Richmond, but I do not know who the participants were. I think the resolutions should be introduced in the regular way and go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

THE MEXICAN SITUATION.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] may proceed for five minutes on the Mexican situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] may address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to beg the pardon of this House for encroaching upon your time at this moment, realizing that I am a new Member and that new Members, like my father used to say about his children, "should be seen and not heard."

But, gentlemen, I am being importuned every day by my people of El Paso and along the border to secure protection of Americans living in my city and in my district and Americans residing in Mexico.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD] on Tuesday, I believe—I was not present in the Chamber at that time, but was taking up a matter with the Secretary of State relative to the telegrams I had received as to conditions then prevailing and asking for protection for Americans in Mexico and in my city—the gentleman from New York, I understand, criticized the Secretary of War for sending troops across the river into Juarez for the purpose of protecting the Carranzistas stationed in that city. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that after the

Columbus raid there was an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico—you may term it a gentleman's agreement if you please; it was not a part of the treaty—there was an agreement entered into at that time when the lives of citizens of one country were in peril that country had a right to send troops across the river into the other country to protect those citizens.

The gentleman may not know of that agreement, but I am reliably informed that it is in existence. In pursuance of that agreement we sent troops across the river, not to protect the Carranzistas but for the purpose of protecting the Americans against the bullets of both factions that might come across the river. [Applause.] If the gentleman has any doubt about that I will read an article from the daily paper—the Morning Times—a reputable newspaper of large circulation in my home city of El Paso concerning that matter.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I decline to yield, for I have only five minutes, and I do not want to take up the time of the House.

Mr. KAHN. Just a question.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Very well.

Mr. KAHN. How about the statement of Gen. Aguilla, the son-in-law of President Carranza, protesting against our sending troops into Mexico if there is such an agreement as the gentleman refers to?

Mr. HUDSPETH. There is an agreement, and the gentleman can satisfy himself by calling up the Secretary of State. I want to state, if the gentleman has read the newspaper reports as I did, he would know that Gen. Aguilla made the statement on his own initiative. I think it was never ratified by that bewhiskered gentleman who claims to be President of Mexico.

Mr. KNUTSON. What was the object of throwing shrapnel shells into the race track at Juarez?

Mr. HUDSPETH. To protect American lives in El Paso, where I have lived a good portion of my life. That was the object. Does the gentleman sanction that? [Applause.]

Mr. EMERSON. I do not care whether we have an agreement or not. I uphold the position taken by Secretary of War Baker in going across the line and defending American lives and American property. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. I uphold him, and I believe every other red-blooded American upholds him in sending troops across the river to protect American lives. I want to say, gentlemen, if you had seen what I have seen, if you had stood on the streets of my city and seen Americans shot down by Mexican bullets when they were pursuing their lawful business and their daily vocations, you would say that the Secretary of War was right in sending troops across the river to protect American lives in that city. [Applause.] I have no criticism to make of the Secretary of War. I am glad he has done his duty in protecting American lives. [Applause.] For eight years the town of Juarez, having a population of 20,000, across the river from the city of El Paso, has been in the hands of first one band and then another of Mexican revolutionists. We go to bed in El Paso with Juarez under one government and awake in the morning to find it under another, and in almost every instance the taking of Juarez has been accompanied by loss of life in my home city of El Paso. As I have stated before, good citizens, going about their daily business upon our principal streets, are the victims of Mexican bullets. We have stood this for eight long years. I ask you, gentlemen, as Americans, as Representatives of a red-blooded, self-reliant, self-respecting people, how long must we continue to suffer? The gentleman from New York calls it an unwarranted invasion, without authority of law and Congress, and now proposes an investigation by Congress of the Secretary of War for the recent sending of troops into Mexico. Let me say to my friend from New York, in all kindness, but with all the vigor of my 6 feet of manhood, if the Secretary of War has decided that it is his duty as a representative of this Government to protect the lives of Americans who have a right to live along the border and pursue their businesses both on this side and in Mexico, my God, sir, do not hamper him in any way or retard him in the discharge of his duty.

Ah, you say, let Uncle Sam keep out, we have had enough war, Carranza will protect Americans. Let me say to you, my friends, I am neither a jingo nor an agitator, but I am a Texan and an American first, and an American pursuing a lawful business is entitled to protection from this Government wherever he may happen to be on this great globe, and so far as Carranza protecting him, let me say to you, that, in my candid judgment, that bewhiskered gentleman who has the title of President of Mexico has neither the desire nor the ability, if he had the inclination, to protect Americans in Mexico. He is too busily engaged, or was, sending felicitations to Kaiser Bill on the anniversary of his birth, and wishing him many happy returns, to give much thought to Americans or their welfare or security. I understand his latest spasm is to demand an apology from our Government for last Sunday night's little episode. What for, I ask you? When he could not or would not protect Americans in El Paso, and bullets were falling like hail on our streets and snuffing out the lives of our citizens, some of them in their homes under their beds being wounded, Uncle Sam sent his khaki-clad boys in and stopped it, and probably, incidentally, relieved Carranza from a terrible thrashing at the hands of Villa; and for this he demands an apology. Well, I want to say this: I am just a west Texas Congressman, but if I were in charge of affairs international of this Government, that flowing crop of whiskers would grow to the ground and sweep out his tracks before Uncle Sam doffed his hat and apologized to that spineless cactus of Mexico.

Sad as it makes my heart to recall it, I witnessed—and 80,000 people in the great city of El Paso were plunged into mourning, our homes darkened, and the shadow of death passed over our streets—one instance of Carranza protecting and safeguarding Americans in Mexico. No! He utterly failed, through criminal negligence, to protect Americans in Mexico, after his chief lieutenant, Obregon, had stood in a banquet hall in El Paso, tendered by the business men of my city, and stated it was then time for Americans to return to Mexico, and they were invited to do so and would be given every protection by the then Carranza government; that Mexico asked them to resume their business and would aid them in every way. Eighteen of our best citizens accepted that invitation and left for their mines in southwestern Chihuahua. They were foully murdered by Mexicans at Santa Ysabel, 40 miles west of Chihuahua, whether by Villa men or other bandits I do not know, and two days after their departure their bodies were brought back to El Paso, cold in death, mutilated in the most fiendish manner. That is one of the many instances of his failure to protect Americans. I say, Mr. Speaker, the clock has struck the hour, and it has been striking that same hour for eight long years, when this Government should say to both Carranza and Villa, "You must keep your unholy hands off of our citizens, and if another American life is sacrified at your hands I will put my armies into your country and visit upon you the wrath of a long-suffering and outraged people." I tell you, gentlemen, it will not necessitate a war if we act on all occasions with the promptness of last Sunday night. Ah, you say our troops went in only to protect Carranza solely.

Whether that be true or not, if they stop the shooting of my people in El Paso I indorse the action; but I do not believe it to be true, for I have in my possession a telegram from Hon. Charles Davis, the splendid mayor of El Paso, commending Gen. Cabell and Gen. Erwin, which I here insert:

EL PASO, TEX., *June 17, 1919.*

Hon. C. B. HUDSPETH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

No intention to criticize local military commanders for their entry into Juarez, as we believe firing into our city has been effectively stopped. We commend Gen. Erwin, as he acted on information sufficient to himself, although we believe Carranzistas equally guilty as Villistas for casualties in our city. Can't something be done to protect lives and property of citizens in interior of Mexico? Can't all factions in Mexico be put on notice that no one will be allowed to fight within 5 miles of our border anywhere or our troops will stop same?

CHARLES DAVIS, *Mayor.*

Also a telegram from the military committee of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce strongly commending these two efficient officers for their prompt handling of the situation, and I also wish to insert this telegram:

EL PASO, TEX., *June 18, 1919.*

Hon. C. B. HUDSPETH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We, the military affairs committee of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, unqualifiedly commend Maj. Gen. Cabell, commander of the Southern Department, and Brig. Gen. Erwin, commander of the El Paso district, for their prompt action in taking the necessary measures to stop the firing across the American border, and thereby preventing further loss in El Paso during the fighting in Juarez on June 14 and 15, 1919.

MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
EL PASO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

I also wish to insert an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Times, and which meets with my approval and coincides exactly with my views:

While England has flying machines patrolling the air above and near Berlin, the United States has flying machines patrolling the borders of Mexico.

Mexicans want to know why the United States sent troops onto Mexican soil after shots across the border had killed six Americans. Americans wonder not why the troops were sent in but why they were called out. If it is desirable to keep an American army of occupation on German soil because Germany may do something more to Europeans, why not have an army of occupation in Mexico, where the genial but excited Villista brigands are actually shooting across and killing Americans now?

I hold in my hand a copy of the San Antonio Express, of San Antonio, Tex., stating unequivocally that the War Department

ordered the troops in to protect American lives, and that only, and not to take sides with either Carranza or Villa. Villa is a bandit, full of venom and prejudice, and this act in protecting El Paso on the part of our Government will in all probability enrage him and imperil the lives of American citizens in his wake. I urge upon our Government the great importance of keeping him under the strictest and closest surveillance at all times, even to the extent of sending a well-organized troop to follow on his trail and swoop down upon him with the vengeance of an outraged country if he attempts to harm a single hair on the head of an American.

To further strengthen the statements heretofore made, according to the information I had received from what I considered an authentic source, that our troops entered Mexico for the sole purpose only of protecting American lives and American lives only, I herewith submit a letter from the War Department as a part of my remarks, and which was in response to a protest I made upon receipt of a telegram from Mayor Davis, of El Paso, against the withdrawal of our troops:

Hon. C. B. HUDSPETH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of a telegram from the mayor of El Paso concerning the entry of United States troops into Mexico and referred by you to the Secretary of War. In reply, permit me to say that the entry of these troops was in accord with general instructions for the purpose of protecting the lives and property of American citizens. The decision was made upon conclusive evidence that the followers of Villa were firing into the city of El Paso and after several citizens and United States soldiers had been wounded by these shots. No question of sides was involved. The troops quickly accomplished their mission by scattering and dispersing Villa's band and were promptly withdrawn to United States territory. The department is in receipt of a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce, El Paso, expressing satisfaction and gratification for the prompt protection thus afforded residents of that city.

Very truly, yours,
HENRY JERVEY,
Major General, United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Staff, Director of Operations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDSPETH. May I have five minutes more, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. I am compelled to object. We must proceed with the appropriation bills.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I would like just two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to say to you gentlemen that I know Mexican revolutionists. If you have never seen the average Mexican revolutionary army, you ought to travel miles to see it. You will see breechclouts, bows and arrows, men with sandals on their feet, and every character of gun, from an old flintlock to a modern Mauser. People talk about Carranza starving those revolutionists into submission. Let me say to you that the average Mexican revolutionist can live for 30 days on a tortilla a day, and when the tortilla is gone he smokes a cigarette stump, tightens up his belt, and is good for 30 days longer. Yet they talk about starving him out! [Laughter.] I want to say to you gentlemen that I indorse the Secretary of War in sending our troops into Juarez. I indorse that splendid American, Gen. Cabell, in San Antonio, who responded so promptly to the call of my city and ordered the troops to cross. I indorse Gen. Erwin, the commander at El Paso, for promptly sending troops across the river and protecting the lives of Americans. Was Villa in command? Yes. I know Villa as well as I know any member of the Texas delegation. There he was on his white horse, leading his charge at that time. And I say to you that this report, which I have not the time to read, shows that the American troops went across the border by orders of the Secretary of War, under the same kind of orders that sent Pershing into Mexico to pursue Villa after the Columbus raid. I want to say to you that the life of every American in Mexico is in peril at this time. You have friends there. Possibly every man in this House has friends in Mexico, pursuing their business, opening their mines, engaged in useful work, and I say to you that I believe the only mistake made was in withdrawing the troops before the last moment of danger was passed. [Applause.] We ought to keep them there. I feel I have attempted to perform my duty and lay this matter before you as calmly as my nature will permit. Sir, I would not give the life of one good American for the entire Republic of Mexico. I love my country—every part of it. I love that flag over the Speaker's desk; it stands for the protection of Americans, their lives and property, all over the combined world. [Applause on both sides.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; I can not yield. I have not the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the daylight-saving repeal which passed the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the repeal of the daylight-saving law. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has permission under the general leave granted yesterday.

Mr. ESCH. There was a general order yesterday giving leave to print for five days.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. There are two matters of unfinished business. One is the deficiency appropriation bill, on which the previous question was ordered on Tuesday and upon which a point of order is pending. Then there is also the wire-control bill, on which the previous question was ordered yesterday. The Chair thinks the deficiency bill has precedence, as it is the one on which the previous question was first ordered; so unless anyone asks unanimous consent for a substitution, the Chair lays before the House the conference report on the deficiency bill. There is a point of order pending. The conference report itself was agreed to, and there is pending a Senate amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919 (Public Act No. 326, 65th Cong).

The last paragraph of section 6 of the "Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows: The sum of $1,500,000 is hereby authorized to be held as an emergency fund for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of buildings or for the purchase of land and buildings, and the remodeling thereof, suitable for hospital and sanatoria purposes, which the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to select and locate for the uses of the United States Public Health Service, if in his judgment the emergency requires it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] moved to concur in this amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Treasury, until further authorized by law, shall take no further action under the authority granted in sections 6 and 7 and such portions of sections 8, 9, and 10 that relate to the acquisition of land and hospitals and the expenditures of funds authorized in sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, approved March 3, 1919': *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress within the next 30 days the contracts or obligations entered into and the sums expended under the authority granted in said act, together with his recommendations as to what action, if any, should be taken in the matter of acquiring any of the hospitals authorized to be acquired by said act."

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman wish to make any new suggestions to the Chair on the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understood that debate closed on the matter on Tuesday night last.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter in the discretion of the Chair, and if anyone has anything new to present to the Chair the Chair will hear him. If not, the Chair is ready to rule.

The point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is not germane to the Senate amendment. The rule on germaneness is very simple—

No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

While the rule seems simple, of course the difficulty always lies in deciding what is strictly the subject under consideration. In this instance the original bill gave the Secretary of the Treasury power to establish hospitals in several different places, and also other powers in respect to hospitals. The Senate amendment compelled him to build one of these hospitals, where before he simply was given authority to build it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] moves an amendment to the Senate amendment to repeal the whole law which gave the Secretary the discretion to build these hospitals. It seems very clear to the Chair that if the only clause in the Senate amendment was to compel building the Chicago hospital, then an amendment which repealed the whole law giving the Secretary authority to build all these hospitals would not be in order. Indeed, it would be questionable, under the precedents, whether

an amendment which forbade the Secretary to build the Chicago hospital alone would be in order. That, at least, would be open to debate, for although that in one sense is "the subject under consideration," yet it has been held, for instance, that a bill authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate a claim can not be amended to provide for payment of that same claim. The subject under consideration was not simply the claim, but the action to be taken concerning the claim. And so it might be argued that to forbid the Secretary of the Treasury to build one hospital is not germane to an amendment which compelled him to build it. But the question here is broader than that. The question here is, When an amendment orders the Secretary to build the hospital, is it germane to repeal the whole law under which the Secretary previously had power to build that hospital and others? The Chair thinks it clearly would not be germane if that was the only subject in the Senate amendment.

But in the Senate amendment there is another proposition which applies to a different part of the law to be amended. There is a clause in the original law setting aside a special fund of $1,500,000 to purchase land and buildings. That clause is amended by the Senate amendment to authorize the Secretary not only to purchase buildings but also to erect buildings. That, of course, is a minor paragraph in the original law and this is a rather insignificant amendment. Yet it is argued, and argued plausibly and forcibly, that when more than one clause or section of a law is amended that fact brings the whole law before the House, and an amendment would then be in order to repeal the law. There is one notable precedent for that, but the Chair thinks it is clearly distinguished from this. In the case to which the Chair refers the amendments were numerous and went to the heart of the bill, and changed the bill in a vital way. In that case it was held that a motion to repeal the whole law was in order, but it seems to the Chair that in the case before us the two sections referred to by the Senate amendment are easily segregated from the rest of the law, and that they do not affect the whole law, and that a motion to repeal the whole law is not fairly germane to an amendment which simply changes those two paragraphs. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be kept straight, I want to call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the amendment I have offered does not repeal the whole law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. GOOD. The law provides for turning over these buildings and it provides for a great many things.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is orderly procedure that the matter should be further argued, but the Chair is glad to have any correction of statement made. The gentleman's correction is quite proper and the Chair thanks him for calling attention to it. The Chair did not state the facts accurately. He stated what in his mind was the general result rather than the exact reading of the amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman does not, of course, repeal the law, but it does absolutely take away from the Secretary of the Treasury authority to complete these buildings, and, therefore, while it does not repeal the law, it makes nugatory for a time the provisions of the law and is equally within the line of reasoning of the Chair.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 21 and agree to the conference asked.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VAILE. The Speaker having ruled out of order the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, would it now be in order to move to recede and concur with an amendment that is germane?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered, and no further amendments would be in order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to further insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment No. 21 and agree to the conference asked.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. GOOD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union——

The SPEAKER. There is another matter of unfinished business before the House, and that is the wire-control bill, on which the previous question was ordered. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina demands a separate vote on the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "existing," insert the words "telegraph rates and."

The SPEAKER. Before putting this question the Chair will ask if a separate vote is demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment in the nature of a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. That will come later.

Mr. MOON. I know; but I wanted to ask if it is in order now to ask unanimous consent that this motion be considered as pending under the rules for action later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that a motion which he states is in the nature of a motion to recommit may be pending now and considered later. The gentleman will have the right later to make that motion. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], which the Clerk has just reported.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MERRITT) there were—ayes 42, noes 152.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOON moves that this bill S. 120 be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment at the close of section 1 of the said bill, as follows:

"*Provided further,* That no reduction of wages of telephone or telegraph employees now in effect shall be made so long as the orders of the Postmaster General fixing present rates are effective."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order upon the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. That this motion to recommit contains matter which is not germane to the subject matter either of the section or of the bill, and it would not be in order in the House directly to amend the bill in this respect and therefore it is not in order to recommit the bill for the purpose of amending it in a manner which is not germane to the provisions of the bill. Now, I direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that if we were legislating to continue Government control over these utilities this matter might perhaps be considered germane, but, if the Speaker will note, the act which was approved July 16, 1918, and which contained the authority for the control of these facilities, is repealed. It is an outright repeal. We are repealing this authority of law under which the telegraphs and telephones were taken over and controlled by the Government. We are making a provision as to certain existing rates which were fixed during the period of control, but there is nothing in this law which refers in any way to the wages of the people who will now become employees of private corporations, and I submit that it is not germane to include a proviso touching a matter which is not contemplated in the bill, particularly when we repeal the very law under which we might have legislated perhaps upon that subject, and I think that even that proposition is doubtful.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I had not supposed the Chair would want to hear from the gentleman from Tennessee on a proposition like this. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a bill which provides for the turning of the telegraph and telephone companies of the United States back to their owners. Now, it carries provisions for the rates that are now existing under the orders of the Postmaster General. It provides the means by which those rates may be changed by the utilities commissions

of the States. It provides the method by which the companies may, with the consent of the controlling bodies, either reduce or control their rates, under the same orders of the Postmaster General, who fixed those rates and fixed the wages of the employees. It seems to me that it is a very simple question, that the whole question of wire control, rates, and wages is involved, that the means is provided to determine what the rates, pending the control, shall be and how they may be changed. It also must necessarily involve the power to say whether the funds the companies are accumulating under the bill shall be used for the benefit of the companies exclusively or increased by a reduction of the wages of the employees and protection afforded employers. Now, there was no question made upon this yesterday. The motion to recommit is changed a little from the amendment that was voted on yesterday by the committee. It will be observed that the motion now provides that so long as the orders of the Postmaster General are effective as to rates that the wages of the laboring people performing this service shall not be reduced. Now, of course, I understand the Republicans do not want to vote on this question; of course, I know they do not want to put themselves on record——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. MOON. I am making this statement in order to get to the point of order a little closer. I know gentlemen do not want to vote on this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Let me ask the Chair if I desire to express my view of the question how else shall I do it?

The SPEAKER. It can be done in debate, but not in connection with the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, if it is so thoroughly determined in this House that nothing shall be said in the interest of these employees, I do not desire to discuss the question further.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point of order is very clear. The law as amended says the existing law——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is a strange thing that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] sat here yesterday with all the rest and let them vote on this identical proposition and never opened their heads about it.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I "opened my head" about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You did not get ruled out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to have the point of order debated. The Chair does not think that anything outside of that is proper.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was debating the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will permit me to state, I will say that I was not present when the amendment was offered yesterday. If I had been, I should have made the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thought the gentleman was always present.

This proposition is simply part and parcel of the bill proper. The bill proper undertakes to give back to the companies that own these wires the wires themselves. But they have six months in which to do this thing unless the municipalities and other instrumentalities intervene. Now, if we are going to mulct these people that send telegrams according to the old rates, the pretext for which was that they needed them in order to pay these operators more wages, it seems to me it follows inevitably as a matter of common sense that these wages be kept up. It is a fair proposition, and this is the only way to get a record vote on it.

Mr. ALMON. It seems that while the wires were in control of the Government the Postmaster General fixed the rates and payment of employees. Now, this bill expressly provides that the rates fixed by the Postmaster General shall remain in force for six months. And this provision simply provides that the rate of wages fixed by the Postmaster General shall also continue.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. This bill as it stands now only provides that telephone rates shall remain in effect, not the telegraph rates. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair, in ruling, has nothing to do with the question raised by the gentleman that this amendment would be reasonable and proper. The Chair has no right to consider the merits of the amendment. The only question before the Chair is whether it is germane. This bill simply provides that the telephone rates as established in the existing law shall continue, to which the gentleman from Tennessee makes the motion that no reduction of wages shall be allowed. The bill does not refer at all anywhere to the question of wages, and therefore that question is obviously not germane to the bill, and it is clear that the Chair must sustain the point of order.

Mr. MOON. We do not think so, and I appeal from the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Is it not really germane? This is going back to the question, however——

The SPEAKER. It is too late to argue the question. The gentleman from Tennessee has appealed from the decision of the Chair. The question is on laying the appeal on the table.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOON. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee demand the yeas and nays?

Mr. MOON. Yes, sir; of course I do.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of laying the appeal upon the table will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 161, answered "present" 2, not voting 78, as follows:

YEAS—189.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Layton	Rose
Anderson	Focht	Lehlbach	Rowe
Andrews, Md.	Fordney	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Andrews, Nebr.	Frear	Lufkin	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Freeman	Luhring	Schall
Barbour	French	McArthur	Sells
Begg	Fuller, Ill.	McCulloch	Shreve
Benham	Garland	McFadden	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Glynn	McKenzie	Sinnott
Blanton	Good	McKinley	Slemp
Boies	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Gould	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Ill.
Britten	Green, Iowa	MacCrate	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Mass.	MacGregor	Steenerson
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Stephens, Ohio
Browne	Hadley	Magee	Stiness
Browning	Hamilton	Merritt	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Hardy, Colo.	Michener	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Haskell	Miller	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Haugen	Monahan, Wis.	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hawley	Mondell	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Chindblom	Hernandez	Moore, Pa.	Thompson, Ohio
Christopherson	Hersey	Moores, Ind.	Timberlake
Classon	Hickey	Morgan	Tincher
Cole	Hicks	Mott	Tinkham
Cooper	Hill	Mudd	Towner
Costello	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Treadway
Cramton	Houghton	Newton, Minn.	Vaile
Crowther	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Currie, Mich.	Hutchinson	Nolan	Vestal
Curry, Calif.	Ireland	Ogden	Voigt
Dale	Jefferis	Osborne	Walsh
Dallinger	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Walters
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Porter	Wason
Davis, Minn.	Juul	Radcliffe	Watson, Pa.
Denison	Kearns	Ramsey	Webster
Dickinson, Iowa	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	White, Kans.
Dowell	Kendall	Randall, Wis.	White, Me.
Dunbar	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis	Williams
Dunn	Kiess	Reber	Winslow
Echols	Kinkaid	Reed, N. Y.	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kleczka	Reed, W. Va.	Woodyard
Elliott	Knutson	Rhodes	Yates
Ellsworth	Kraus	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Elston	Kreider	Riddick	
Esch	Lampert	Robsion, Ky.	
Evans, Nebr.	Langley	Rodenberg	

NAYS—161.

Alexander	Box	Carter	Doremus
Almon	Brand	Casey	Doughton
Ashbrook	Briggs	Clark, Fla.	Drane
Aswell	Brinson	Clark, Mo.	Dupré
Ayres	Brumbaugh	Cleary	Emerson
Babka	Buchanan	Coady	Evans, Mont.
Bankhead	Byrnes, S. C.	Collier	Ferris
Barkley	Byrns, Tenn.	Connally	Fields
Bee	Caldwell	Crisp	Fisher
Bell	Campbell, Pa.	Cullen	Fitzgerald
Benson	Candler	Davey	Flood
Black	Cantrill	Davis, Tenn.	Gallivan
Bland, Mo.	Caraway	Dent	Gandy
Bland, Va.	Carew	Dickinson, Mo.	Ganly
Booher	Carss	Dominick	Garner

Garrett	Larsen	Nichols, Mich.	Steagall
Godwin, N. C.	Lazaro	O'Connell	Stedman
Goodwin, Ark.	Lea, Calif.	O'Connor	Stevenson
Griffin	Lesher	Oldfield	Sumners, Tex.
Hardy, Tex.	Lever	Overstreet	Taylor, Ark.
Hastings	Linthicum	Park	Taylor, Colo.
Hayden	Lonergan	Parrish	Thomas
Hersman	McAndrews	Pell	Thompson, Okla.
Holland	McDuffie	Phelan	Upshaw
Howard	McGlennon	Pou	Venable
Huddleston	McKeown	Quin	Vinson
Hudspeth	McKiniry	Rainey, J. W.	Watkins
Hull, Tenn.	McLane	Raker	Weaver
Humphreys	Maher	Randall, Calif.	Webb
Igoe	Mapes	Rayburn	Welling
Jacoway	Martin	Riordan	Welty
James	Mays	Robinson, N. C.	Wheeler
Johnson, Ky.	Mead	Romjue	Wilson, La.
Johnson, Miss.	Minahan, N. J.	Rouse	Wingo
Johnston, N. Y.	Montague	Sabath	Woods, Va.
Jones, Tex.	Moon	Sanders, La.	Wright
Kelly, Pa.	Mooney	Scott	Young, Tex.
Kincheloe	Moore, Va.	Sims	Zihlman
Kitchin	Neely	Sisson	
Lanham	Nelson, Mo.	Smith, N. Y.	
Lankford	Nicholls, S. C.	Smithwick	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Small Whaley

NOT VOTING—78.

Anthony	Goodall	Major	Saunders, Va.
Baer	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Scully
Blackmon	Graham, Ill.	Mansfield	Sears
Burke	Griest	Mason	Sherwood
Copley	Hamill	Morin	Sinclair
Crago	Harrison	Murphy	Snell
Dempsey	Heflin	Oliver	Snyder
Dewalt	Hulings	Olney	Steele
Donovan	Husted	Padgett	Stephens, Miss.
Dooling	Jones, Pa.	Paige	Sullivan
Dyer	Kahn	Parker	Tillman
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Tilson
Eagle	Kettner	Purnell	Volstead
Evans, Nev.	King	Ragsdale	Ward
Fess	LaGuardia	Rainey, H. T.	Watson, Va.
Foster	Lee, Ga.	Rogers	Wilson, Ill.
Fuller, Mass.	Little	Rowan	Wilson, Pa.
Gallagher	Luce	Rubey	Wise
Gard	McClintic	Rucker	
Goldfogle	McPherson	Sanford	

So the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. DYER with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. ROGERS with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. TILLMAN.

Mr. FESS with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. MASON with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. BAER with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. CRAGO with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. FOSTER with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. KING with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. LAGUARDIA with Mr. RAGSDALE.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. MAJOR.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. GARD.

Mr. PLATT with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. SNELL with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. TILSON with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. VOLSTEAD with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. WARD with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. DEWALT.

Ending June 20:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I just came in. I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not qualified.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. GOOD. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ascertain if we can agree as to time for general debate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have some requests for time. Will the gentleman agree to an hour to a side?

Mr. GOOD. I have some requests on this side. All I desire to do personally is to explain the bill. I think we can get through with an hour on this side. I would not want to consent to longer time than an hour to a side.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the general debate be limited to two hours, one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the remaining half to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to two hours, one to be controlled by himself and one by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman be able to allow me five minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman just this moment approaches me about time. I have a number of other requests, and I can not promise for certain that I can yield to the gentleman five minutes out of the hour.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Chair to notify me when I have consumed 35 minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to acknowledge that because of the very limited time that the subcommittee had to consider this bill, where the estimates were very large and the items involved were numerous, we could not consider all of the items in the sense of having hearings reopened upon them. A similar bill passed at the last session of Congress, but failed of final enactment. The committee there-

fore, except in the case of some few items, did not go into the matter of hearings on the bill generally. It did hold quite extensive hearings upon the estimates for the Emergency Fleet Corporation and some other matters where estimates had been sent to Congress since the adjournment of the Sixty-fifth Congress. But as a general rule, outside of these exceptions we accepted the hearings and judgment of the former committee. In a general way this bill carries quite a reduction over the bill that was passed at the previous session of Congress. Some of the items, however, are largely increased. There are some new items in the bill, made necessary by the enactment of statutes that were approved after the former bill had passed; for example, the act of March 3, which turned over to the Public Health Service all of the war-risk patients, made it necessary for us to appropriate a large sum of money to take care of these soldiers and sailors. There are several such items in the bill made necessary at the time, whereas the appropriation was not apparently needed when the bill was under consideration before.

This bill carries $483,914,850.95. The former bill carried a total of $851,171,859.25. This bill carries $367,257,008.30 less than the amount carried in the bill that failed in the last Congress. It carries $477,099,310.30 less than the total estimates considered.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. So that this bill, taken in connection with the Army and the Navy bills, represents a saving of about one billion?

Mr. GOOD. Something in that neighborhood; that is, as the bills passed the House.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The principal reduction in this bill is found in the appropriation for the emergency fleet. There were a few minor reductions. There are but a few items to which I want to call the especial attention of the committee at this time. This bill provides for an appropriation of $200,000 to take over the functions of the War Trade Board. The War Trade Board has a balance of something like $275,000. By an Executive order the functions of the War Trade Board have been transferred to the State Department. It is necessary, therefore, to provide some force for the closing up of its business. While it was estimated that it would require more than $200,000, it was the judgment of the committee that that amount would be all that would be required to do the work necessary to wind up the affairs of this organization.

The employees in the office of the Alien Property Custodian, about 440 in number, I believe, are complaining, and complaining bitterly—and it seems to us justly so—because they were discriminated against in regard to the bonus of $240 per year that is paid to all Government clerks except those in a few bureaus. One bureau, that of the War Risk, was given a bonus of $120 a year, and it seemed to the committee that we should make no discrimination between the employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance who came in after 1916 and those in the Alien Property Custodian's office. Therefore we carry a provision which is a gratuity, giving them the same bonus that the employees in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance now receive, or will receive next year, of $120 per year.

Mr. ALMON. May I ask if that is to be retroactive?

Mr. GOOD. That is not to be retroactive. In this bill we are only dealing with matters pertaining to the next fiscal year and do not go back to the appropriation for last year.

The next item of importance in the bill is that of the emergency shipping fund. It is a big item in the bill. There was an estimate originally before the committee when we had this matter under consideration of $704,471,855 for this purpose. It was stated before the committee that there are still available authorizations to the extent of $220,000,000; that is to say, that all of the contracts for constructing ships authorized have been let, except contracts to the extent of $220,000,000 for ships. If Congress took no action regarding this limit of authorization, the Emergency Fleet Corporation could go ahead now and let contracts for additional ships aggregating $220,000,000. The committee went into the matter very thoroughly as to the extent to which the Emergency Fleet Corporation should be permitted to engage in the building of new ships. It was the opinion of the committee as a general principle that we should not permit new contracts to be let at all; but if we followed that principle without variation we found that a great deal of material and supplies that had been purchased for the building of ships would have to be salvaged at a very low price. We found also that our fleet would be an unbalanced fleet. We had a large number of steel ships of one type. In the opinion of experts they are too slow, and in order to make the fleet a balanced and workable fleet it is necessary to let some contracts—not many in comparison with the total, but some new contracts—in order, first, to utilize the material that is one of the large items of cost, material that has already been purchased and is owned by the Government and is on hand, and that would largely be wasted. Secondly, that in order to permit some of the contractors who have contracts for building these slow ships to sell the ships and relieve the Government of the responsibility for the payment of them, so that the Government will not lose a dollar in the disposition of these slow ships. Some contractors have said they were willing to take their chances, that if they were given new contracts for larger and faster ships that could be manufactured in part from the material already on hand they would take over the slow ships they have under contract themselves, that the Government is now bound to pay for, so that we would thereby get better ships, larger ships, and faster ships in return for the undesirable ships.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Hurley, the chairman of the Shipping Board, in certain notices that he has sent out to Members of Congress and others, indicated that in order to complete the shipbuilding program he would need about $600,000,000. I do not see any specific sum of $600,000,000 carried in the bill. The first item is for reducing the authorization of $2,884,000,000 heretofore established by $120,000,000. Does Mr. Hurley get $600,000,000 out of that appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. Out of which appropriation?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Out of that item.

Mr. GOOD. I was just going to explain that and to show how the items are made up. When my explanation is made I think the gentleman will be satisfied. I can not explain it all in one sentence.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman if he is going on.

Mr. GOOD. I was just going to explain that. If I can have the attention of Members while I give the explanation I think a good many of the anticipated questions will be answered in the explanation. I was going to say that there remain, therefore, $220,000,000 of authorizations. We are canceling $120,000,000 of the authorizations, so that Mr. Hurley can go forward and let contracts for these larger and faster ships to the extent of $100,000,000 worth of ships.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The total appropriation heretofore authorized is reduced by this bill $120,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. What page is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Page 45. I desire to know about that, and I do not think what the gentleman has said yet has fully explained it.

Mr. GOOD. Of course it has not, and as I said before I can not give the gentleman all the information in one sentence. I am just coming to the details of the matter now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will let me say this, I will try not to interrupt him again. I want to know whether Mr. Hurley and the Shipping Board get $600,000,000 in this bill to complete shipping contracts already made.

Mr. GOOD. I will answer the gentleman, and when he gets the figures he will see how Mr. Hurley gets it and how much he gets.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All right.

Mr. GOOD. Of the $704,000,000 Mr. Ackerson stated that if we cut off $220,000,000 of authorizations and prevented them from building any ships not now under contract, we could take from his estimate of $704,000,000 the sum of $150,000,000; but we did not do that. We only cut off $120,000,000 of the authorization, and in doing that we did take, according to Mr. Ackerson's statement, $80,000,000 from the estimates. The estimates were based on the entire program, and this item, by the way, is tied up very closely with the following item; that is, the using of the proceeds from the sale of ships to pay for the construction of ships. The committee felt the Shipping Board should pursue the policy of disposing of some of these slow ships, and that policy should be inaugurated at once. It was agreed by everybody connected with the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation that our fleet would be a lopsided fleet. We had too many boats of one kind. They were standard ships of a given type that had to be built very quickly, and it is the purpose of the Shipping Board to sell ships of an undesirable type. It was the opinion of the committee that while the United States is the only one of many builders of ships that can make spot delivery we ought to sell the undesirable ships, or ships of an undesirable type, so far as the fleet is concerned, when there was a market for them, and not

hold them until other shipbuilders in the United States and elsewhere could build ships and offer them for sale on the market and compete with our ships. It was the opinion of the officers of this organization that they could easily sell the ships and use $150,000,000 that they would receive in payment for ships we are building and will build.

Now, in regard to what I have said about the undesirable ships, I do not want it understood that they are not desirable except so far as their type is concerned. Even the type is all right, but we have too many of one type. It is this undesirable type of ship that it is proposed to sell. They are too small, mostly all of one size, and they are too slow. Men who came before the committee were of the opinion that no one could operate a fleet of that kind of vessels unless they had some ships of larger tonnage and faster ships.

So it is desirable to sell these ships. So we have taken first from the estimate $80,000,000 on the abandonment of authorization. We have taken $75,000,000 which they say they can get from the sale of the ships and use it for the building of ships. Mr. Rosseter said $130,000,000 could be obtained in this way. In the cancellation of authorization and the using of the money we will get from the sale of ships we account for a reduction of $155,000,000. We want to feel, first, that the organization should sell the ships, the undesirable ones, and, secondly, use the money for the payment of new ships that have been estimated for without asking the Congress to appropriate more money, and when they will have the money in the treasury of the Emergency Fleet Corporation to pay for the building of the ships. Of course, the letting of contracts for new construction will not, and certainly should not, be undertaken until the selling of ships already constructed justifies it.

The original act provided that the $50,000,000 that was appropriated for capital stock of the United States Shipping Board could be used for building ships. That is now being used, in a way, for building ships, but it will be consumed during the year, and it was admitted that by that amount they would have paid for the building of the ships and would not need additional appropriations for the same purpose, and so we allow them to use just what they are using, except it will no longer be a revolving fund. The $50,000,000 was not taken into consideration when they made the estimates.

We found on examination that they had a balance of the fund for building houses at the shipyards. They had an unexpended and unobligated balance, after the building of the houses, amounting to $6,514,230. They also had unobligated and unexpended a balance of $9,874,691 for transportation at shipyards. They had extended car lines, had extended railway lines, bought new equipment for railroads, loaned the money for this purpose to street car companies, but when the armistice was signed that program was stopped. With the stopping of the program they found an unexpended and unobligated balance of almost $10,000,000. So the committee felt that that fund was available for building ships. It has already been appropriated and should be expended, and thereby obviate the necessity to that extent of additional appropriations.

Then we found in the appropriation of $55,000,000 for foreign ships there was a net balance unobligated of $4,176,250, and we applied that in a similar way.

Then there was a fund of $150,000,000, which was appropriated for the purchase of ships that had been already constructed. We found they had only used about $31,000,000 of that appropriation, and that balance of $118,000,000 was available for the acquisition of ships, and we said to the board that that fund was available, and they acknowledged it, for the acquisition of ships. To that extent we have refused to give additional appropriation.

Then there was an unexpended and unobligated balance of $25,111,370 for building more plants. It is not intended to build any more plants, but rather it is intended to sell what plants we have built. And while we have not taken into consideration here anything for salvage, Mr. Hurley, when he made the estimates, estimated that there would be some salvage—I think about $18,000,000—and reduced his estimate from $734,000,000 to $704,000,000 because of such sale.

But there is now an unobligated and unexpended balance of $25,111,000 that could be used now for the payment of contracts for building the ships and for the payment of wages and material for building ships at the yards.

There was also from the operation of ships a considerable sum. The statement before the committee was to the effect that last year, not counting eleven millions that is due the Shipping Board from the Belgian Relief Commission, and not counting about two millions due from the Navy, not counting about forty-five millions due from the War Department for the transportation of the Army, they still have a profit of $12,000,000.

We are launching new ships and launching them fast, and the Emergency Fleet Corporation has a great fleet upon the high seas. The income is enormous, and it was admitted by those in charge of the operation, as well as by Mr. Hurley, that we could very reasonably take $5,000,000 a month, or $60,000,000 during the year, that would be received in the operation of the fleet to go toward the cost of building the ships. In this connection it must be remembered that the Emergency Fleet Corporation has a working capital of $65,000,000; so its working capital will not be impaired unless the estimates are found to be not well founded.

And what we have done here is, as I understand it, with the acquiescence and consent of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. We have found that they can use of appropriations already made, plus advanced receipts from the sale of ships, and also $60,000,000, which they will receive from operations, $428,000,000, and when we subtract that from $704,000,000 we get the amount carried in the bill.

I now yield, if I have not made myself clear, first, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has partly explained what I desire to get at, but so far as the public knows, and the public apparently never gets the details which the gentleman has just put into his speech, Mr. Hurley wanted $600,000,000 more in order to complete the shipbuilding program.

Mr. GOOD. He wanted $704,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We were informed through the various messages received from Mr. Hurley that about $600,000,000 was wanted. If it was $704,000,000, then it was so much more. On page 45, under the head of Emergency Shipping Fund, it is provided that the authorization of $2,884,000,000, heretofore used for the construction of ships, is reduced by the sum of $120,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that the committee is saving $120,000,000 of the $2,884,000,000 by this paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. No. The $120,000,000 is only a reduction in the authorization and except in a general way did not affect the reduction in the appropriation. We have made a reduction in the estimates, and that is tied up with the sale of ships. The two are tied together. We have saved there. Deduct $155,000,000 for these two considerations—sale of ships and reduction in authorization.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has referred to certain sums that were found by the committee not to have been expended.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As, for instance, in housing, and $50,000,000 of the incorporation, and so forth. Were those sums which were so discovered and are now counted included in the $2,884,000,000, or were they separate sums?

Mr. GOOD. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say frankly to the gentleman that I do not find any appropriations in this bill for the Shipping Board, except $276,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. That is all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the utilization of $150,000,000 already appropriated.

Mr. GOOD. But they have a right under the law to use these funds.

Mr. HICKS. Is it not a question between authorization and appropriation? That makes the difference.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand that thoroughly. I want to find out if any of the $2,884,000,000 is still available over and above the $150,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Almost all of the moneys appropriated have been expended. We have the ships for that, and we have let contracts for all the ships authorized, except to the extent of $220,000,000, and now we cancel authorizations to the extent of $120,000,000, leaving available for the Shipping Board to let new contracts to the extent of $100,000,000 more for ships.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Originally we authorized $50,000,000 for incorporation.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is that included in this total of $2,884,000,000, or is that a separate item, because the gentleman has referred to that as something that can now be utilized?

Mr. GOOD. I would have to look that up, but it would not make any difference with regard to that, for the authorization is one thing and the appropriation quite another. We have not appropriated the full amount authorized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of this tremendous lump sum, as it is presented here, $2,884,000,000 previously authorized, we are about to save $120,000,000, if I understand the language in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. We cut off of the authorization that amount.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to know whether there is discretion left in the board to expend any more money or whether there is any left.

Mr. GOOD. Of course they have not enough money to spend, to pay for these ships, or we would not appropriate anything. They need $276,000,000 for next year. After using $150,000,000, as I have explained, that was tied up in the proposed sale of ships and the reduction in authorization, and after using the unexpended balance which I referred to, we still need for the next year $276,000,000. Now, if we do not sell these ships, they will need more money; that is all there is to it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman state in round numbers how much extra Mr. Hurley and the Shipping Board have to expend now in order to complete the ships on the ways or to fulfill contracts, in addition to the $2,884,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. Again the gentleman is confusing the authorization with the appropriation. The appropriation up to this time totals about $1,938,000,000. They get direct appropriation by this bill of $276,000,000.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman is mistaken. They get $120,000,000 less than the whole total authorization.

Mr. GOOD. No; I am not mistaken. They are going to use, as they have a right to use, from operation $60,000,000, and they are going to use, as they have a right to use, $50,000,000 of capital stock, and these other unexpended balances to which I have referred.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. You are bringing in all of those available funds that have not been used and are applying them to the purposes of the Shipping Board?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely—$428,000,000, less $155,000,000 from sale of ships; so Mr. Hurley has to use this year $704,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the only new money this Congress is appropriating for the Shipping Board, apart from what has already been authorized, is $276,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. That is all the new money.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that, put with the funds to which the gentleman has referred, which are now being made available, and such from the sale of ships, and such other income as the board will receive from various sources, will be the fund upon which the Shipping Board will operate next year?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. As I understand, the total authorizations are $2,844,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. We have been gradually appropriating from time to time up to that authorization, but we have not reached it within $704,000,000. Is that right?

Mr. GOOD. The $704,000,000 estimated does not bring the total appropriated up to the amount of authorization. I am not sure how much we will have to appropriate next year, but we will have to appropriate more money.

Mr. ELSTON. Has there ever been any authorization to build ships in excess of this $2,884,000,000? There is no other authorization, is there?

Mr. GOOD. No; not to build ships. There are some authorizations to acquire ships already built, to requisition ships, to buy some ships from Japan and China, but for building ships the amount the gentleman cites is the total authorization.

Mr. ELSTON. That is true. Now, then, in the past we have authorized up to $2,884,000,000, but we have never appropriated up to that amount because we have never built the ships. Now, we are in the course of building ships——

Mr. GOOD. That is not the reason, but we never appropriate money except as the money is needed to pay for the ships as they are built, and there will have to be some appropriations made next year to complete the program.

Mr. ELSTON. I understand, but we are building under that total authorization ships which will have to be paid for. We are now $600,000,000 short of paying for them. Now, this bill appropriates $276,000,000 of that $600,000,000, and you find the rest out of the unexpended appropriations which were appropriated for other purposes which now you gather in, which, added to the $276,000,000, makes up the $600,000,000. Is not that true?

Mr. GOOD. That is not all.

Mr. ELSTON. That is the story.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not the story, because you are getting $60,000,000 from operations; you are going to get something from the sale of ships, a considerable amount.

Mr. ELSTON. I understand, but, as I say, the amount is gathered in from other sources and covered into this particular purpose.

Mr. NOLAN. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. NOLAN. Can the gentleman give the committee some idea of the prices we are receiving for these ships and the cost of ships, to see whether we are on the right or wrong side of the ledger?

Mr. BRITTEN. Before answering that question, I would like to ask something about the appropriation in the bill before the gentleman goes into the selling price.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was informed at Hog Island the other day while there that the board had sold several ships recently at $210 a ton.

Mr. NOLAN. I wanted to get it from the chairman of the committee and find out if the committee got any idea from the Shipping Board.

Mr. GOOD. Steel ships were sold for $222 per ton, according to my recollection. Some have been sold for less, but not much less. Of course, the wooden ship is a different story.

Mr. NOLAN. In other words, the ships they figure do not fit in with the new program; they are getting rid of them at better prices than they will get in the future for them; is that the idea?

Mr. GOOD. Well, if conditions should become normal or anything like normal—of course, it will not soon, if ever, become normal, if by the term normal we take the prices of ships that obtained before the war—but it is understood that these ships will after a few years, after the different countries commence to purchase ships, that the prices will go down, perhaps, as low as $170 or $160—maybe $150—a ton. That is the reason why the committee felt it was desirable to sell the ships of the type described. We have sold several and will sell more and use the money received in the construction of ships.

Mr. NOLAN. Does the gentleman get the information from the Shipping Board as to the price of new ships based on the price of the substitute type of ships?

Mr. GOOD. I can not tell the gentleman that. They can not tell, of course, because it depends upon the labor situation, the price of material, and so forth; but we have carried in the bill a proviso that no contract shall be let on the cost-plus or cost-plus-fee basis. They must be let in accordance with the regular requirements.

Mr. NOLAN. I thought the committee might have some information as to bids on the substitute type of ships.

Mr. GOOD. They have taken no bids recently, and could not state the price at which these ships could be built. My recollection is that the cost of the ships ranges from about $200 to $220 per ton.

Mr. NOLAN. But they have received offers on the substitute type of ships of $165 a ton?

Mr. GOOD. Well, that may be; I can not answer the gentleman, however.

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. BRITTEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 35 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who has been on his feet.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am very much interested in this well-balanced fleet the gentleman is speaking about, but I am a little confused by the gentleman's reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania——

Mr. GOOD. I am yielding for a question, but I am not yielding for any explanation.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am putting the question now. The gentleman said that $276,000,000 appropriated by this bill is new money, which, added to certain other unexpended sums, will make a total of $428,000,000. Is that the net amount the Shipping Board may expend this year for new ships, or is it some amount less than the $704,000,000 as estimated by the Shipping Board?

I am greatly interested in seeing this bill carry enough money so as to enable the Shipping Board to bring into successful conclusion its desires for a well-balanced fleet of cargo and passenger carriers.

I believe this can be accomplished only by an appropriation at the present time of approximately $675,000,000, which I believe is the amount requested by Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the Shipping Board, in a letter to you dated June 4, 1919, when he presented a statement showing cost of administration, cost of shipyard development, and so forth.

I am anxious to satisfy myself that the total amount carried or permitted under this bill will not in any way embarrass the Shipping Board, in which, under Chairman Hurley, I believe the complete confidence of Congress will be justified.

Mr. GOOD. The estimate of the Shipping Board is that they can expend under no circumstances more than $704,000,000 this year. The authorization has nothing to do with the amount carried in this bill, except they do not exceed the authorization, and there will then have to be additional appropriations during the next year, but to what extent we are not able to ascertain at this time. Mr. Hurley will get $704,000,000 from the sources I have stated, unless he falls down on the sale of ships or on his operating income. If the expectations are not met in this regard, then to that extent the appropriation carried will be too little.

Mr. BRITTEN. At that point, will not the further appropriation be in amount approximately the difference between the $428,000,000 carried in this bill and something less than $704,000,000 estimated by the Shipping Board?

Mr. GOOD. If we let all the contracts, approximately so.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman says the value of the ships as determined by the selling price, from $210 to $222, gives a virtual profit to the United States?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; I do not think there is any profit at all. I did not mean to say that, if I said it. The statement was that they were sold practically without loss. But I think some ships, many of them, will be disposed of at a loss.

Mr. SCOTT. Was that statement that they were sold without loss based on the total amount of tonnage supposed to be produced—on the dead-weight tonnage?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose the statement was based on the actual cost of the ships sold. I think in some of the yards it is costing more to build these ships than the cost in other yards. I am satisfied of that.

Mr. SCOTT. Did your committee ascertain from the Shipping Board the total number of ships that are classified in their present dead-weight tonnage which are not now available for transportation purposes?

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look in the hearings, at page 572, he will find the total cost, the total price, and, where ships are sold, the amount paid.

Mr. SCOTT. I am entirely familiar with the table, but I have not found any place where the Shipping Board have indicated the total amount of dead-weight tonnage which is carried on their books as tonnage, but which is not now and never has been available for shipping purposes.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know as to that.

Mr. SCOTT. That is the point I want to find out.

Mr. GOOD. I am sorry I can not inform the gentleman. There is the total of the tonnage sold, the cost of the ship, and the amount paid for the ship. I think the gentleman will find in the tables—I can not state just what it amounted to—the total dead-weight tonnage of all the ships delivered, of all the ships in the wet basin, and the total dead-weight tonnage of all the ships on the ways. That is all in the record.

Now, there was another item of $11,000,000 that was carried in the prior bill to give the Shipping Board the right to instruct the seamen employed by it. It seemed to us that that was not a business proposition, that that item was a part of the operating cost of the fleet. Men and concerns who are in the shipping business train their men in training vessels or in carrying cargoes, and the cost of training is an element in the cost of operation. And after we discussed the matter with the Shipping Board, Mr. Hurley said: "We will withdraw the estimate of $11,000,000 for that purpose." That, I think, tells in a broad way the story with regard to the shipping provision that is carried in the bill.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question for information?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Was the entire authorization of $2,884,000,000 for construction of ships made before the signing of the armistice?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; Congress has not authorized the acquisition of any ship since that. All the contracts were made before the signing of the armistice. There have been no contracts made since.

Mr. ALMON. All this authorization was made prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. GOOD. Before the armistice was signed. My recollection is that the entire authorization was availed of and contracts let, but since that time there have been a good many cancellations; that wherever they found that by canceling a contract the loss would be less than the anticipated loss would be if they completed the vessel, the contract was canceled and damages paid.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he has finished with the shipping question.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman, then, in view of this great saving, why it was found inadvisable to appropriate to the city of Baltimore the $177,000 for that quarantine station which they took over two years ago?

Mr. GOOD. I have not reached the quarantine station, but I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. LINTHICUM. I wanted to know; that is all.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that we were called here on the 19th day of May with nearly all the appropriation bills to consider, and when we took up this bill we unanimously concluded we could not go into the rehearings. It was simply a question of judgment of the former committee, and we accepted their judgment in regard to those matters. And there may be and are many, many meritorious projects that were considered by the former committee that this committee did not consider, because it could not take the time to consider them. We felt it was more important to put this bill through and let it become a law before the 1st day of July than it was at this time to go into an investigation that would take two months to make, and if we took up the quarantine station we would have had to take up at least a hundred other matters that some other Members felt it was just as important to have an appropriation for as the gentleman from Maryland thinks it is important to have an appropriation for his quarantine station.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We felt that having taken over this hospital and having run it for the last two years that, according to the amount the appraisers set, it ought to be paid. We certainly would like to be paid so that we can build a hospital that will be advantageous to the Government as well.

Mr. GOOD. There are some few items that I want to call attention to, and I want to do it now, so that the House may understand some of the things in this bill that they might not otherwise have their attention called to. There has been a question before the House for some time in regard to the Employment Service. There have been those who wanted the Employment Service continued. There have been those who wanted the Employment Service discontinued entirely. The committee has considered both sides of that proposition in a general way, and we carry in this bill not a program for the present Employment Service but we do carry in the bill a provision creating in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Employment that will act as a clearing house in connection with the information sent by States and the political subdivisions thereof. And we have estimated very carefully as to what it will cost to carry on that kind of a service.

There are those who say that absolutely no good has come out of that service. That is not the opinion of the committee or any member of the committee, and I think I am speaking within the limit when I say that. There are on the committee some who think that the sum of at least $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 ought to be appropriated, and that we ought to send out agents all over the country and have agencies in every State and large city for this service. But it was the judgment of the committee that if we could preserve all that was good in the Employment Service by having here in Washington only a bureau that could act as a clearing house, and that would not send its agents and employees to the various States and various municipalities, good results would flow from such action. And so you will find in the bill a provision carrying $200,000, which will be expended in the District of Columbia alone for that service. We do not carry anything for a field service, nor do we create such a service.

Then, too, we found that it was necessary to very largely increase the appropriations in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Before the gentleman leaves that Employment Bureau I would like to understand what the situation is. An appropriation of something like $270,000 was made, was it not, to carry on the work of that bureau until the 1st of July?

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And this appropriation that you suggest now is all that will be available for the entire next fiscal year?

Mr. GOOD. The appropriation made in the deficiency bill carried the Employment Service on a different basis. Practically all of that, or a large part of it, was expended in the field. It was expended for the rental of quarters in various States and cities, and it was expended for the employment of persons scattered throughout the country. This does not contemplate the expenditure of a penny for that purpose. That work in the field will have to be done by States or counties or cities, if it is done at all.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And the sum you name, $200,000, is the entire amount appropriated by Congress for that object for the next fiscal year?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is the entire amount; and I will say to the gentleman that we arrive at this in this way: The estimate for $4,000,000 included $3,600,000 for field service and $400,000 for departmental work in the city of Washington, including $60,000 for traveling expenses; and in giving the $200,000, if we erred at all, it was on the side of liberality, because I do not see how it can expend, under the rate of pay specified in the bill, any more than the amount carried.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I know something of what that field work was, and I think the gentleman's last statement—that he was liberal in appropriating $200,000—is literally true.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to gentlemen of the House that this item is offered not as a matter authorized by law, but we included it because we thought it would enable the department to carry out a program that would permit it to preserve all that was good in the Employment Service and eliminate a great deal of that which was bad in the former administration of that service, and the result would aid the unemployed in securing work. We desire to eliminate the loss caused by unemployment.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. Has the gentleman given any consideration to soldier-placement work, which is now conducted in the Employment Service?

Mr. GOOD. The committee did not take into consideration the employment of any particular class of people, but all the unemployed. We looked at the matter in a broad way, and, of course, the matter of discharged soldiers and sailors will, as the gentleman knows, increase the number of the unemployed, because in some places, of course, the soldier will be given his old position and the person occupying that position will be thrown upon the public for a new place.

Mr. NOLAN. Does not the gentleman know that at the various Army posts throughout the country the United States Employment Service has had different sets of officials who take these men before they are discharged and direct them to the Employment Service, that finds positions for them after they are discharged?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, the gentleman knows that the Army at the present time, in addition to this Employment Service, is maintaining at Army posts and points of demobilization an employment service distinct from the Employment Service that is carried on by the Department of Labor.

Mr. NOLAN. My information, which I think is accurate, is that it is just the opposite. They have detailed officers to take care of this work in conjunction with the Employment Service of the Department of Labor. The soldier does not necessarily get employment at the place where he is demobilized, but he is placed by the Employment Service after he leaves the Army post or point of demobilization.

Mr. GOOD. They can make available all the information which the Army officers send to the bureau here.

Mr. NOLAN. How is this service to be kept in existence?

Mr. GOOD. The part to be performed by the Government will be kept in existence by the appropriation.

Mr. NOLAN. I am talking about the United States Employment Service, which finds positions for the soldiers after they leave the military service.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman this: That if the War Department does not maintain at these posts officers to furnish that information this bill does not carry anything to maintain them there.

Mr. NOLAN. That is what I wanted to bring out, that this bill does not make any provision for the Employment Service in the placement of soldiers throughout the country.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it does. It provides $200,000 for a bureau in Washington to find places for every person seeking employment, whether he is a soldier or sailor or civilian.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. In connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN], I am quite sure that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations does not want to leave the impression on the minds of the members of this committee that this matter was not referred to in the subcommittee. He will probably recall that I stated that 400,000 soldiers had been placed through the Unied States Employment Service.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not a fact that the chambers of commerce and other civic institutions throughout the country are lending their best efforts to find employment for the returning soldiers?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes; in conjunction with the United States Employment Service. They work with the United States Employment Service.

Mr. GOOD. It was the opinion of the committee, at least the majority of the committee, that the States or subdivisions of States would respond, where there was a shortage of labor or a surplus of labor, in furnishing this information, and the State that is not big enough to meet that situation and collect this information without our sending political agents of the Government from the seat of Government here into that State—the State that will not do that is not entitled to much consideration.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Then there are 45 such States in this Union.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. In the State of Illinois there is an employment service, paid for by a State appropriation, and the Chairman now presiding over the Committee of the Whole [Mr. MADDEN] will correct me if I am incorrect when I say that it is liberal and ample, and I am under the impression that in many of the States the same condition exists.

Mr. GOOD. I think that is true. And if the service is worth anything to the citizens of a State, that State will collect its information and report it to Washington. If they will not do that, they are not entitled to much consideration.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will this bill, if it passes the House in this form, result in the closing of these Federal employment agencies throughout the United States that are now existing?

Mr. GOOD. The bill itself, so far as the Federal appropriation is concerned, would have that effect, and, irrespective of the amount carried in this bill, a great many of them have already been closed and are being closed every day, because there were not enough funds appropriated in the former bill, and some of the States and municipalities did not see fit to make appropriations or raise money for that purpose.

Mr. BARBOUR. Did the committee take into consideration the fact that in a great many cities throughout the United States the expenses of these Federal employment agencies were being carried on by public subscription, in the hope that the committee would provide for them in this bill?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the committee took that into consideration, but the committee took into consideration also the fact that the State in which a workingman lives owes some obligation to that person. The National Government can not do everything for him. If the State refuses to do anything we think it is unreasonable to come in here and ask an appropriation from the Federal Treasury of money that is raised entirely by taxation and by loans to do the things that the States say are not necessary to be done in their own communities. We leave that to the States to do, and I think properly so.

Now, we have increased the amount by $7,000,000 for family allowances. The former bill carried $33,000,000. The amount appropriated is $40,000,000. The demands upon this fund will gradually decrease, but the amount carried in the former bill was not sufficient.

The amount carried in this bill for compensation fund is $24,000,000. The amount carried in the former bill was only $20,000,000. At the present rate the expenditure is not quite $2,000,000 a month, but the rate of increase is enormous, and as these boys are discharged and their status is fixed under the law it will continue to increase. We can not tell just what this amount will be, but the amount carried in the bill of $24,000,000 will not be enough. It was evident that the former did not carry enough to supply the service for much longer than the 1st of December, and I am frank to say that this amount was arrived at with a realization that it would be necessary later in the year, when we know more about the matter and the requirements of the service, to bring in an additional amount in some deficiency bill, because these sums are arrived at in the administration of the law, and we will pay whatever is necessary to pay, and when the appropriation falls short it will, of course, be supplemented.

Now, there is an item of $200,000 carried in the bill that was not carried in the former bill, with regard to the Lincoln Memorial. The plans for the Lincoln Memorial contemplate the building of a reflecting pool that will be about 160 feet wide, as I now recall, and something over 2,000 feet long. That pool

is shown in all of the graphic illustrations with regard to the Lincoln Memorial. It is a part of the general landscaping of the part of the park where this memorial is located. It is a question whether we should take this matter up now; but those of you who have been down to the memorial realize that we must secure from some place a large amount of surplus earth to fill in around the memorial itself. By building this pool now we can use that surplus earth for filling in around the memorial, and if it is not built now it will be necessary to buy this earth and haul it from a distance, and then if this plan is carried out, which is the plan that has been adopted from the beginning, it will be necessary to move the earth a long distance. We are carrying in this bill, therefore, an amount sufficient to make this excavation and start this work, so that the memorial may be in some fit condition, so far as the grounds are concerned, when the memorial is dedicated in the fall.

There is also a provision in the bill reducing the amount of the appropriation for the Alaskan Railroad by $1,964,351. That reduction was brought about in this way: The former bill carried the remainder of the authorization. This bill carries the remainder of the authorization, but before we considered this bill and subsequent to the adjournment of the Sixty-fifth Congress, Congress had also by a deficiency appropriation appropriated $1,964,000, and it was necessary to reduce the appropriation carried in the former bill by that amount.

There was a large estimate brought in for the detection and prosecution of crime. Last year the Attorney General had $2,000,000. He estimated $1,500,000 orginally, but later brought in an estimate of $500,000 more. This bill carries for the purpose $1,400,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee was recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I will not object, the gentleman does not mean to use 25 minutes immediately following the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GOOD. No; not right away; I had agreed to yield that amount of time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa has gone very thoroughly into the various items and details of the bill, and it is not my purpose to undertake to discuss the bill in general. I may say that so far as the bill is concerned, and the appropriations contained in it, practically all of them have my approval, except in a few instances. I am not going to take the time of the committee in general debate to discuss these particular items in the bill to which I do not give assent, but I shall expect if the occasion arises later on under the five-minute rule to discuss them.

As explained by the gentleman from Iowa, this bill makes a considerable reduction over the bill that was passed by the House in February and which failed in the Senate. The reduction amounts to about $367,272,401.50. It should be stated that that reduction is brought about by the very great reduction made in the estimates of the Shipping Board, a reduction amounting to something like three hundred and eighty odd million dollars.

As a matter of fact, if the Shipping Board appropriation is not considered this bill really carries an increase of something like $20,000,000 over the bill passed in February by the House and which failed in the Senate. For instance, as the report shows, the amount by which sums in the previous bill have been increased for various activities amount to $13,973,000.

This bill carries appropriations for new items amounting to $6,054,203.50. The total increase over the last bill, excluding the items for the Shipping Board, is $20,027,203.

In so far as the cut in the appropriations for the Shipping Board is concerned, I think it only fair for those who had charge of the former bill to say that that decrease has been made possible by the change of conditions since the 1st of February when the hearings on the sundry civil bill were conducted and when the first bill was framed. It appears that since that time the Shipping Board has entered upon a program of selling a great many ships. It is the purpose, as the gentleman from Iowa stated, of the Shipping Board to sell all of the wooden vessels and a number of the cargo steel vessels.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I rose to inquire whether the gentleman knows of any provision of the law that authorizes the Shipping Board to sell steel vessels without advertising.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know that they are selling them without advertisement.

Mr. CALDWELL. In the press they say they will not give out the terms under which they are selling them until after so many days. I did not know that there was any law passed by Congress that would permit their selling steel vessels without advertising them, so that everyody could bid on them. Has there been any public advertising; and if not, why do they discriminate?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know the statement was made by Commander Ackerman, representing the Emergency Fleet Corporation, that a full and complete notice is given in the newspapers, and in order to protect the Emergency Fleet Corporation from the charge that full publicity was not given the corporation has in its files certain newspaper clippings showing that full publicity is given with reference to all sales made by the Shipping Board.

As I was saying, since the former bill was framed the Shipping Board has not only entered upon a selling program but has proceeded with the operation of ships, and it now develops, as the gentleman from Iowa states, that the net proceeds of the operation of the ships will amount to a considerable sum.

There is no reason under the law, as construed by the Shipping Board, why the net proceeds from that operation, in so far as they can be, and the proceeds of the sales of ships should not go into the general fund of the Emergency Fleet Corporation for the construction of ships.

In addition to the change of conditions which made it possible to make this reduction——

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to know whether, when they are selling these vessels, they are permitted to sell them to other nations and let them become vessels under another flag?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are selling ships both to foreign and domestic purchasers. I may say that it was stated by representatives of the Emergency Fleet Corporation that it is the purpose to sell the more desirable ships, the larger ships, and those of greater speed to domestic concerns with the understanding and agreement on the part of such purchasers that the ships shall sail under the American flag. It is only the type of vessels that are considered not so desirable that are being sold abroad.

Mr. CALDWELL. In other words, the wooden ships?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, nobody cares anything about them.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Are these ships being sold at less than cost?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Wooden ships are being sold probably at less than cost.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Shipping Board is going on and building more ships and accepting more ships——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that they are selling these wooden vessels which are undesirable, of course, for many reasons, and they propose to build such ships as are built in the future of a better and more desirable and up-to-date type. In other words, steel vessels of larger capacity and of greater speed.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman remembers the almost scandal that arose out of the disposition of vessels that had been taken over during the Spanish War, which were disposed of shortly after the war for ridiculously low prices, at least a great deal less than they had cost. The gentleman, I presume, is taking steps in this bill to insure that that kind of a situation will not again be presented to this country.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there is any need for apprehension that the commission and those in charge of the Emergency Fleet Corporation will not fully protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is it left purely to their discretion?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may say to the gentleman that these wooden vessels, as the gentleman knows, are of an undesirable type. They can not possibly compete with steel vessels. They are not built for overseas trade. They were built simply for coastwise trade, in order to release steel vessels that were being used in coastwise trade for overseas trade. Those ships ultimately must be sold, because, as I say, they can not be used in competition with larger and speedier vessels. Manifestly it is to the interest of the United States Government to sell them now, when there is such a great demand for ships, and when the Government is in a position to say that it can make spot delivery and can secure better prices now than if it waits a year or two, when it possibly could not sell them at all.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is it in the discretion of the Shipping Board to sell them for whatever it chooses?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman think that discretion ought to be reposed in them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not see how Congress, sitting here without any knowledge of the shipping industry, and without knowledge of conditions that confront the Shipping Board, could undertake to legislate with reference to the sale of these ships, in so far as the price is concerned. We must trust somebody.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does not the gentleman think that we can safeguard it by providing for publicity and competition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is publicity.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is there any law which requires it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Frankly, I can not say to the gentleman that there is a law which requires it, except the general law which requires publicity when sales of Government property are made; but as a matter of fact publicity is being given to these sales, according to the hearings.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is the point I want to get at. Does not the gentleman think we should have some ample provision of law safeguarding the sale of these ships? Otherwise, the Shipping Board might simply turn them over to somebody for a nominal price, and while I do not question the business judgment or patriotism of the members of the board, it seems to me to be a very objectionable public policy to leave that kind of thing wholly to the discretion of an officer without safeguards or provisions of law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may say that there is a general provision of law which does require publicity in the sale of Government property.

Mr. CALDWELL. But if the gentleman will yield, this Emergency Fleet Corporation is a corporation that is performing governmental functions. It holds title to these ships, and the only way they have any right to sell them at all is upon the theory that they are a corporation, a legal entity, and can do it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is the point I made here. There is no law, as I understand it, that specifically authorizes any branch of the Government to sell any Government property unless a board sits upon it and fixes an upset price and they advertise it, and everything is given full publicity. As I understand it, the sales of these ships have been taken over by, you may say, the board of directors of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and they have to a certain extent made private sales.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have made sales to private concerns.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; and they have made sales in which the terms of the sale have not been what they advertised, so that other bidders would know about it, if we are to believe the Associated Press reports concerning it. I was confused about that, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may say to the gentleman that the Emergency Fleet Corporation has taken pains to let the whole world know that they have ships for sale. Every effort has been made to let all possible purchasers, both in this country and in foreign countries, become acquainted with the fact that these ships are for sale. I do not think there is any question, so far as these gentlemen are concerned, that they have given the widest possible publicity to it, but I do not know whether it would be possible to put these ships up at public sale and sell them to the highest bidder, because, as I say, conditions are changing every day.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to state that the Emergency Fleet Corporation has full authority to purchase, sell, charter just the same as a private concern has. That authority was given to them by Congress.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Do I understand that means without control, that they have absolute discretion to buy and sell at will?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. They are a corporation, created by the vote of the gentleman and the vote of every other Member of this House, and in which the Government owns the entire stock of $50,000,000. They are acting as a corporation, the Government being the sole stockholder, and therefore they have, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] suggests, full authority to sell, to operate, to do anything that a private corporation may do.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does not the gentleman think there should be something to safeguard the publicity and competition in those sales?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think, I will say to the gentleman, that in a matter of this sort, where conditions are changing every day and where in a month from now you may not be able to secure as favorable price for your ships as tomorrow, and where frequently action is necessary to be taken quickly, that we must of necessity put some confidence and some faith in those who are at the head of this Emergency Fleet Corporation, just as the gentleman, if he owned stock in a private corporation, would put trust and confidence in those who were elected to manage and control the corporation in which he was a stockholder.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. WELLING. Can the gentleman say what percentage of losses the Government has sustained in the disposal of these wooden ships?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand that a good price is being paid to-day, but it is anticipated there will ultimately be some loss necessarily in the sale of these ships, because it is not expected that prices will be so good in the future as they have been in the past.

Now, to proceed further with what I was speaking of when I was interrupted—that is, the causes which have resulted in a reduction of these estimates—I referred to the fact that the Shipping Board has now a selling program, and that has enabled the committee, with the concurrence of the Shipping Board, to anticipate the receipts, at least in part, that are expected from the sale of ships during the next fiscal year. In addition to that, I referred to the fact that they are now making money out of their operations, and it is anticipated there will be a considerable sum which can be used from those operations in the construction of ships.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRIGGS. To what extent does the department intend now to sell its steel ships? What percentage of the steel ships does it expect to sell?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not say to the gentleman, and I do not know that the Shipping Board could answer that question. I do not think it is the purpose of the Shipping Board to sell any of the desirable ships, the more desirable types of ships, at this time or until Congress shall determine what is to be done, but they are selling a number of steel ships in order to round out their fleet.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will permit, that depends largely upon the condition of affairs in Europe as to when it would be wise to dispose of those ships.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I do not think the Shipping Board has any idea of selling all their steel ships by any means, regardless of conditions in Europe, but it is impossible for the department now to state how many of those ships they will sell or intend to sell. It depends on conditions, as the gentleman from Mississippi has stated.

Mr. BRIGGS. I desire to ask whether the Shipping Board have any program now for the sale of steel ships or the disposition of steel ships. I understood Chairman Hurley has advocated a certain plan for the disposition of ships, and is this action that is now being pursued of selling steel ships without inviting competitive bids or other methods to be pursued in line with Chairman Hurley's plan of disposing of all the steel ships or is it only applied to a certain percentage of those which are regarded as undesirable ships at this time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My understanding is from the statements in the hearings that he does not contemplate at this time selling any ships except those that the Shipping Board regard as undesirable with a view of rounding out their fleet.

Now, gentlemen, if I may proceed, because I have only a few more minutes, in addition to the saving made possible on account of the two facts to which I have referred, as the gentleman from Iowa stated, it was stated to the committee that something like $45,000,000 could be utilized in the construction of ships, and which is made up of an unexpended balance of the housing appropriation, transportation appropriation, and a certain number of items which I need not mention; in addition to that it developed that at the present time the Emergency Fleet Corporation has claims against the War Department of $45,000,000, $2,000,000 against the Navy Department, $16,000,000 against the Belgian Relief Commission, more than $2,000,000 against foreign Governments, nearly half a million dollars claim against the Food Administration, all of which when collected may be utilized in the construction of ships. Then, as the gentleman from Iowa stated, there is $118,000,000 now in the Treasury as an unexpended balance of the appropriation which was made some time ago for the purchase of foreign

ships, money which has not been used and which will not be used. Then the gentleman from Iowa has referred to the fact that some $80,000,000 would be available on account of the abandonment of the program of ship construction. Personally, I know nothing about that; there is nothing in the hearings so far as I can find to justify that statement; nothing was said in the committee on the part of Mr. Hurley and Commander Ackerman as to that, and I was of the opinion that this sum was taken into consideration when they presented their estimates; however, on the assurance of the gentleman from Iowa, who has conferred with them, that they agree to that, why, I have given my own personal assent to it. Then the gentleman from Iowa referred to $11,000,000 which is eliminated from the appropriations carried in the former sundry civil bill for the training of recruits.

He stated the Shipping Board now thought this sum could properly be carried under operations and should be paid for out of operations. I repeat, while this bill does carry a very great reduction of more than three hundred and sixty odd million dollars, as a matter of fact the reduction was made possible on account of the change of conditions since the 1st of February, when the former bill was prepared and sent to the House. In other respects the bill has actually been increased more than twenty millions for the next year, which does not bear out the assertion that the Republicans are practicing a greater economy than the Democrats.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. In some of the sales that are now being made of ships by the Shipping Board are the estimates of the return from those sales based upon the return to be made in the fiscal year ending in 1920, or are they inclusive of the whole purchase price to be received from those ships? In other words, are not the terms of the sales of the ships that are now being made predicated upon a five-year period, a certain amount of the sale price being paid down—25 per cent—and the balance distributed in four years?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true. And the committee has not taken into consideration the full amount of the purchase price that is expected to be obtained in the sale of ships. But it has only taken into consideration for the next fiscal year a portion of the purchase price that the ship commissioner expects to receive during that fiscal year. In other words, it was stated that probably $125,000,000 or $150,000,000 of ships could be sold. The committee has only taken into consideration the sum of $75,000,000 for that purpose. Now, that may cut too deep. I am not prepared to say it will not. It appeared to the ship commissioners and the others who came before the committee that it would be taking too much from them. But if it does, I will say to the gentleman that they, of course, can come and get a deficiency later on.

Now, I want to proceed, if the gentleman will permit me, to another feature.

Mr. BRIGGS. All right.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, gentlemen, this bill carries an addition of $500,000 to the appropriation which was carried in the former sundry civil bill for the detection of crime. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has already referred to the fact that the Attorney General appeared before the committee and requested $2,000,000 or an excess of $500,000 over and above the estimate that was submitted in the last Congress. The committee on the former sundry civil bill cut the estimate of $1,500,000 to $900,000. This bill carries $1,400,000. This increase was made in order to enable the Attorney General to hunt down and prosecute to the limit the anarchists over the country. I am sure every member of the committee was anxious to give the Attorney General every dollar he wanted for this particular purpose. So far as I am concerned, I would have been willing to have appropriated the whole amount for him if needed to crush out these terrorists and put them where they belong.

The whole machinery of the law should be set in motion to stamp this out and put an end to their practices. We have an Attorney General who is not going to hesitate to apply the full force of the law to them, and if he needs more money I am sure Congress will give it to him.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman explain the $200,000 in reference to the Lincoln Memorial pool down there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will recall that the original appropriation for the Lincoln Memorial carried $2,000,000. Later on the Congress appropriated $500,000, making a total of $2,500,000. That was for the Lincoln Memorial proper—the building. Now, this bill carries $200,000 for a reflecting pool which is to be constructed in front of the building, and is a part of the landscape. It has, as I understand, no connection with the Lincoln Memorial proper, except that it is in front of it and will enhance its beauty and attractiveness.

Mr. GALLIVAN. A part of the grounds?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A part of Potomac Park, a part of the scheme of the Superintendent of Public Grounds and of the Fine Arts Commission, and these other commissions which are interested in beautifying the grounds and buildings of Washington.

Mr. GARNER. This proposed $200,000 is not authorized, then, by the law that authorized the construction of the Lincoln Memorial?

Mr. GALLIVAN. No.

Mr. GARNER. And therefore is not authorized by law at present, and is subject to a point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether it is subject to a point of order or not.

Mr. GARNER. Under what provision of law would you make this appropriation, then?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know.

Mr. GARNER. I judge somebody else will have to find out, then.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think it will be subject to a point of order, unless it can be held in order under the general scheme of park improvement in Washington.

Mr. GARNER. Under that scheme you could build a pool or a monument or anything else, and I do not believe that general scheme is broad enough to carry this.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise, extend, and correct my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in nine long, weary, waiting years that a Republican Committee on Appropriations has had the privilege of bringing before the Congress of the United States a sundry civil appropriation bill, a bill which carries almost a half billion of dollars. There is a reason for the Republicans being in the position of having charge now of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to congratulate the new chairman of that committee on his exceptional work, and also his Republican associates on their work in preparing these supply bills in such speedy fashion, in working until midnight, in working all day on Sundays; and I want especially to mention the names of those assistants to that committee, who have worked until 6 o'clock in the morning for the last three days preparing this bill. First of all, I want to mention the exceptional clerk of our committee, Mr. Marcellus C. Shield, and then his assistants, Mr. W. A. Ryan, Mr. J. F. Scanlon, and Mr. A. K. Barta. They have worked just as faithfully and just as loyally with our Republican Committee on Appropriations as they worked with the Democratic committee, by which they were trained. No committee in any Congress ever had more faithful and efficient assistants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, both of my colleagues on the subcommittee on the sundry civil bill have referred to one item in this bill, namely, the appropriation granted to the Attorney General, which is something over $1,400,000, for the detection of crime due to unrest in the country.

They have laid special emphasis upon it, and they have said to the House that they would gladly vote every dollar asked for—even twice this sum—when the Department of Justice will be able to show the committee that the condition of social unrest in the country is such that the department should have that amount of money. I want the committee specially to fasten its attention upon that item, and in addressing the House at this time my purpose is to draw to the attenion of Congress and of the country the danger that is now upon us, a danger which will probably mean that the Attorney General will have to come back and ask for more money for this fund.

We can not close our eyes to the fact that there is a seething undercurrent of unrest prevailing among all the toilers throughout the country, which is fast developing into expressions and demonstrations of the most radical form. Yes; it has broken out in many places in the most violent form of anarchy, a defiance of the law by an attempt on the part of desperate men to seek vengeance for their so-called wrongs. Conditions, gentlemen, seem to have reached a point where sane and sensible men are saying, "Whither are we drifting?"

The law-abiding, God-fearing people of our country are trying to analyze the causes that are responsible for the recent out-

break of lawlessness and the general feeling of unrest and discontent that now prevails, which makes an appropriation of $1,500,000 necessary in this bill for the detection of criminals.

It seems to me, gentlemen—and I want the attention of every man in the committee—that we do not have to look far for one of the main causes of the present-day conditions in this country. The men who are most directly responsible are those misguided officials in the city of Washington, clothed with authority during the period of the war which has turned their heads. While the President has been in Europe some of these officials seem to have gone mad in their lust for power, and they have blindly blundered in the administration of their departments in such a manner as to aggravate the feeling of unrest which has been referred to by my two colleagues. In my judgment, it would be a great relief—yes, a Godsend—to the people of this country if the President will hurry home and clean house in his official family. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If he will do this, I believe it will do more than any other thing to check radicalism and anarchy and make appropriations of this kind unnecessary.

During the period of the war the press censorship, denial of freedom of speech, and other inexcusable blunders by autocratic officials aroused a spirit of resentment among the people. One of the greatest blunderers of the administration, and I believe one of the worst autocrats that this country has ever had in official life, and the one man mainly responsible for the present condition of social unrest, for which we are providing in this bill, is the present Postmaster General. [Applause.]

Starting out with the administration at its beginning, he had every opportunity to add luster to the Democratic Party and to make a name for himself that would go down in history as a gem. How well he has succeeded in his work as a public official is a matter of record of which any man ought to be ashamed. I can best sum up in a brief way the official record of Mr. Burleson in the words of a writer in the New Republic headed, "The tie that binds."

Suppose Mr. Burleson, either on his own initiative or Mr. Wilson's, were actually to leave the Cabinet. Would the country gain as mightily as we have been told? Have Mr. Burleson's critics, through their agitation, thought their agitation through to the end? Do they see the consequences?

Consider for a moment who it is that wants Mr. Burleson to go. The business men, because he has destroyed the efficiency of the Postal Service. The trade-unionists, because he has fought the interests of organized labor. The owners of telegraph lines, because he has shut them out from their own companies. The users of telegraph lines, because he has raised the rates on messages. The operators of telegraph lines, because he has raised the rates without raising their wages. The publishers of great periodicals, because he has backed the zone law. The mail sorters and mail collectors, because he has backed a nonliving wage. The Republicans, because he is a political messenger in the lobbies of Congress. The Democrats, because he is a drag on the party's chances in 1920.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

You can not dodge the conclusion. To-day, when empires are splitting apart, when vast territories are torn into angry clans, when brother greets brother with a machine gun, what force is it that keeps these 48 States of ours together, a cohesive whole, a single union, now and forever, one and inseparable? What force prompts capitalist to grasp the hand of laborer, Republican to take common counsel with Socialist? What bond unites trade-unionist and banker? What common brief keeps I. W. W. from leaping for the throat of broker? The country rises, rises unanimously, rises, and like the Germans in 1914, cries, "We have one bond and one alone—getting rid of Burleson!"

Let the agitators take heed. Let them, while there is yet time, beware. Lest, like Samson, they pull down upon our heads the mighty temple of our progenitors.

It is the unanimous sentiment of the people of the entire country that Postmaster General Burleson is the biggest and most complete failure as a public official that the country has ever produced.

The chief cause responsible for the failure of Mr. Burleson is "love of power." This weakness is attended by "fear" and out of fear "cruelty" and "brutality" have inevitably developed. By his acts he forced strikes among the employees of telephone and telegraph companies which caused a violent disturbance in business and great financial loss. The strike of the New England telephone operators was only a part of the universal strike of public sentiment which now exists against the Burlesonization of important national interests. A strike maker and a strike breeder is a dangerous sort of man to be in command of such vital enterprises just now. He knew that the women operators in Boston had grievances that would bear scrutiny. He was aware that they would strike. He knew it was his duty to see that no stoppage of business occurred. He was informed that the grievances had not been considered, but with the bullheadedness so characteristic of him he did nothing whatever either to help the girls to a hearing or see that the business people did not suffer a loss. At no time was he willing to meet the workers in a kindly spirit, and at no time did he suggest any way by which a decent adjustment of their troubles could be had. If he had been bent on forcing a strike, he could not have acted a better part in bringing it about. Although the telephones, like the telegraphs, were under the control of the Post Office Department, that branch of the public service was as helpless at the crisis of the trouble as it was weak and inefficient at its beginning. Having done nothing to avert the strike and having left its settlement to private agencies, it is hard to understand how he can reconcile his practice with his Government-ownership theory. Mr. Burleson knew that a vexatious and costly strike was imminent in New England, but he evidently did not care. It came and went in the most approved style of corporations and labor organizations acting solely under the influence of arrogance and greed.

When the telephone employees could not get redress or even proper consideration of the grievances and were forced to strike, Mr. Burleson claimed that "the strike was due to a misunderstanding."

Later, when he forced a strike among the telegraph employees he "got out from under" by turning the management back to the private owners. He has by his actions destroyed all hope of Government ownership of public utilities, notwithstanding his public declarations in favor of it.

The worst thing about Burleson's malpractice in office is that, seizing hold of the very nerves of America, he has wrenched them asunder. There is not a home or a business house that has not felt, in a small measure or great, the wrongs done by the Postmaster General to the mail, the telephone, and the telegraph services. The whole country has suffered from the deterioration of the administration of the domestic postal service under his management, and the defects of the overseas Army mail service have been scarcely less than scandalous. His capacity for mischief has accomplished even more than might have seemed possible to anyone else. As a trouble maker and breeder of discontent among employees of the Post Office Department and by his arbitrary and unwise methods of dealing with these employees, he created a widespread revolt that has driven the members of three out of four branches of the Postal Service into the arms of the American Federation of Labor for refuge and self-protection. The Postal Service is filled with embittered, baffled, underpaid, and overworked men. It would have been in disastrous conflict with State laws and labor unions and an enlightened public opinion long ago were it not sheltered by the unapproachable authority of the Federal Government. The best of Mr. Burleson's critics has very properly called him a "sweat-shopper." The Postmaster General has clashed with labor unions. He has made his service hated by thousands of those who serve in it, because the Postal Department has been administered since he went into office under a rule of tyranny and an economic creed so harsh as to bring disintegration as a natural consequence. Yet Mr. Burleson remains the swaggering reactionary, safe in the Cabinet, a living, breathing denial and contradiction of all that is generous and wise and farsighted in President Wilson's policies.

His attitude toward the employees of the Postal Service was thoroughly out of harmony with the policy of the Government during the war. At the time when the President, under advice of leaders of labor and employers, announced a program of collective bargaining, Postmaster General Burleson was disciplining postal employees who dared to ask for this same right. Some of his postmasters were tyrannizing over these employees, shifting their positions at will, and the men were without redress. He has mistreated and maltreated post-office employees, exploiting them worse than any private profiteer, opposing any increases in their wages, and, czarlike, frowning upon their American rights to organize. No shortsighted corporation slave driver of the old type would have possibly displayed less sympathy and more ineptitude than has Mr. Burleson in his dealings with the employees of the Postal Service. When he first took hold he found it a peaceful and loyal branch of the Government, and he has converted it into one which is personally rebellious and hostile to him.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said time after time that Mr. Burleson received his appointment because of his great political acumen. If he is such a political wonder, let him get out of the Cabinet, take hold of the affairs of my dear old, dying Democratic Party, and try if he can restore it to life. At any rate, the public, whose postal facilities have been destroyed, and the Government employees, who are subject to his autocratic will, are entitled to a new and a fair deal.

Oblivion yearns for Mr. Burleson as it yearns for no other man in public life anywhere. He is inexplicable. The people of the United States whose interest is still concentrated on the towering issues of war, are as yet unaware of the bizarre ruin that he is making of what was once the most efficient and the

most popular branch of the Federal service. He is the greatest misfit in public office that this country has ever known, and his continuance in public service is a standing menace to the future success of the Democratic Party, to which I still pledge my allegiance. [Applause.]

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on pages 26 to 30 in this bill before us for discussion are found items of appropriation for the War Risk Insurance Bureau. This prompts me to take a few moments of the House to present in a simple, businesslike manner a matter which I believe is of general interest to all the Members of Congress. It is a matter which relates itself to the war-risk insurance act, relative to payment of insurance to dependents of men who have died in the service in the line of duty between the time of induction and entrainment by their local draft boards and the examination by the Army surgeon or physician at the camp of mobilization. In my judgment, this act needs amending, so as to permit the War Risk Insurance Bureau to be just and fair in the treatment of thousands of dependents who have lost either their husband, father, or son in the service of their country between the time of induction and entrainment by their local boards and their final examination by the Army camp physician or surgeon and their assignment to their Army organizations at the mobilization camps.

The facts are that a great many of our soldiers died on the train on the way to the camp of mobilization from accident or sickness, others were placed in camps infested with the terrible scourge of Spanish influenza, and thousands of these men died in the course of a few days or weeks. To all intents and purposes a man inducted and entrained by the local draft board becomes thereby a member of the Naval and Military Establishments of the Government and is subject to the orders of the military and naval regulations, so much so that if he attempted to desert or in any way violate any of the military and naval regulations he would be subject to court-martial. In this belief a great many of the dependents of soldiers who died between the time of induction by the local boards and the final acceptance at mobilization camps have applied to the Government for the payment of their claims, believing that they are entitled to the benefits under the war-risk insurance act.

These claims and contentions on the part of the dependents have brought about necessary rulings and interpretations of the act by the War Risk Insurance Bureau. One of these rulings is that no insurance could be justly paid to dependents of men who died between induction and entrainment and before they were reexamined by the Army physicians or surgeons at the concentration camp and assigned to their organizations in the Army service. This condition and this ruling have worked untold hardship and injury to thousands of cases all over the country, and it is my understanding that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as well as the Treasury Department, is very much in sympathy with the just contention made by a great many of these dependents that the Government should pay the insurance in full because the Government took these men from their homes under the selective-draft act in sound body and mind, and in the line of duty, under military regulations, exposed them to accident and contagious diseases, which resulted in their death before they could possibly be reexamined and accepted at the camp of mobilization.

I wish to place before you a concrete case which has come under my own observation and which is typical of thousands of other cases throughout the entire country. I have had this case under consideration for the last six months, and have consulted the War Risk Insurance Bureau with a view of having it properly adjusted. This private was attached to recruit depot, Company No. 6, Camp Shelby, Miss. He was examined and inducted into the service by the local board at Grantsburg, Wis., and entrained for Camp Shelby, Miss., on October 21, 1918. He arrived at Camp Shelby October 24, 1918, and remained in the Army camp under the direction of the military officers from October 24 to October 28, when he was stricken with Spanish influenza and taken to the Army hospital and died November 4, 1918. On November 2, 1918, he took out insurance in the amount of $10,000, payable to his father under insurance certificate No. 4296229. At the time this insurance was applied for—on November 2, 1918—there were confined in this Army hospital nearly 1,200 recruits suffering from Spanish influenza, all of whom had not as yet been reexamined or accepted into the active military service. We all know the great prevalence of this disease, not only in the Army camps but all over the country, and while the Bureau of War Risk Insurance had up to that time refused to accept any applications for insurance from men who had not been reexamined by the Army camp physicians or surgeons and accepted into the active military service, realizing the critical condition of these men, permission was received from The Adjutant General of the Army to accept applications for insurance from these men while they were confined in the hospital, and under this special dispensation of the regular ruling the soldier I speak of applied for insurance while he was in the hospital November 2, 1918, and insurance certificate No. 4296229, referred to above, was issued by the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

The father of the deceased soldier presented his claim for insurance, as he believed he was fully justified in doing, since his son was in good health when he left home for entrainment and mobilization, and that his death was due entirely to the Spanish influenza with which he came in contact when he arrived at the camp.

On March 13 the Chief of the Compensation and Claims Division of the War Risk Insurance Bureau advised the father that the bureau was unable to consider the claim for insurance of his son, owing to the fact that he was never at any time, while at the camp, put through the usual physical examination or accepted by the camp doctor for military service, but in that letter acknowledged all the facts which I have set forth in the beginning of my statement relative to induction and entrainment by the local board and the arriving at camp October 24, and that he was taken to the hospital suffering from influenza, but stating, further, that because he had not been reexamined and accepted into the service of the United States Army the bureau could not consider his application for insurance as being valid and, therefore, could not make payment under the policy. The father sent me this letter, and I again took the matter up personally with the Director of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and in his letter to me under date of April 11 he states that under the rulings of the bureau the application for insurance was invalid for two reasons—first, because the soldier had never been physically reexamined and accepted into the military service of the United States; and, second, because even if he had been physically examined and accepted into the service of the United States, his application for insurance was made upon his deathbed and was, therefore, invalid for the reason that it was deathbed insurance. Now, the second reason for refusing the claim has been overruled by a special order of the Director of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, dated June 9, 1919, which deals directly with the validity of applications for insurance made by soldiers in a dying condition, the director's order being as follows:

> In determining the validity of applications for war-risk insurance and claims based thereon, the fact that the applicants were in a dying condition at the time the applications were made shall be disregarded. Applications for war-risk insurance that have been rejected on the ground that the applicants were mortally ill at the time of making such applications shall be reconsidered and insurance granted thereon if such applications are otherwise valid under the war-risk insurance act. The Compensation and Claims Division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall immediately reexamine all claims for insurance that have been disallowed on the ground that the applications therefor were made while the applicants were in a dying condition, and if such applications are otherwise valid, shall make awards thereon pursuant to the provisions of the war-risk insurance act. The beneficiaries or other persons concerned in such cases shall be notified that the case will be reopened and adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of this order.

This order by the War Risk Insurance Bureau is, in my judgment perfectly sound and correct and helps to deal justly with the insurance claims upon this bureau, and makes it possible for the United States of America to do the right and square thing by its citizenship. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance, I think, is equally anxious to do the just and square thing by thousands of claimants under the ruling given in the director's letter to me of June 4, when he states:

> I regret to inform you that the general counsel of the bureau has decided that the bureau has no authority, under the provisions of the war-risk insurance act, to grant insurance to a drafted man until he has been physically examined and finally accepted for military service by Army surgeons at camp or other point of concentration. The bureau can not bind the Government beyond its authority. The bureau must, therefore, deny that insurance was granted on the life of the above-named deceased soldier.

We must protect equally the sacred rights and interests of our Government and the sacred rights and interests of our soldiers and their dependents. I am aware that the approximately 32,000 local draft boards in the United States sent during the war to the various camps for final assignment to their Army organizations about 300,000 men who were rejected by the Army camp physicians and surgeons. Thousands of these cases were tubercular; some had glass eyes; some had clubfeet and numberless other ailments and diseases. It is therefore perfectly evident that the Government could not establish the precedent of paying insurance to these absolutely unworthy cases, even though they were inducted and entrained by their local boards. The payment of these 300,000 unworthy claims would mean a draft on the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States amounting to the enormous sum of $1,200,000,000, counting an average insur-

ance of $4,000 to each claim. Now, what I am anxious to show is that the War Risk Insurance Bureau is correct in its contentions, as we must protect the Government from these 300,000 unscrupulous claims, which, in fact, are not claims at all upon the Government. And no one desires more than I do to protect the Government and our taxpayers from any unjust claims and drain upon the Treasury. Indeed, I am very much in sympathy with every movement that to-day looks toward the reduction of our taxes and the retrenchment of expenses, and it is a very happy sign indeed that our Army, Navy, and sundry civil bills have been reduced by approximately $1,500,000,000 in their proposed appropriations by their respective committees.

We must eliminate every bureau and department that has sprung into being under war conditions that is no longer necessary in peace times. We must apply the pruning knife most diligently and persistently. We must install the budget system. We must eliminate extravagance and waste wherever found in all the departments of the Government; but in our anxiety to reduce taxes and prevent extravagance we must never forget to do justice to needy dependents of honest men who died in the service of their country.

We must so amend the war-risk insurance act that we will protect the Government from unscrupulous claims and at the same time pay insurance to dependents of honest and brave soldiers who were in sound body and mind when they left their homes and were inducted by their local draft boards and who, by no fault of their own, died in transit, in the line of duty, by accident, or from contagious diseases before they could be reexamined and accepted into the active military service at the camp of mobilization.

I have therefore prepared and introduced a bill, No. 5907, to amend the war-risk insurance act so that it will be possible for the Government to protect itself against fraud and unscrupulous claimants and at the same time deal justly by thousands of dependents who have been deprived of their father, husband, or son. From the home camps as well as from the battle fields of France and Flanders comes to-day a spirit born of devotion, sacrifice, and service that demands a justice and a righteousness defined in the great Rooseveltian phrase of "a square deal to all." I plead for simple justice to the dependent wife, mother, father, or child of the soldier who has made the supreme sacrifice in the line of duty in order that Christianity, liberty, and civilization might be vouchsafed to us and to all mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not know what the real grievance of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is against the Postmaster General, but from the fury and intemperance of his criticism it is certainly of a personal nature. The Postmaster General does not deserve from his bitterest Republican enemy such an unwarranted criticism. Of course, I can not in the short time left discuss his whole record. I can only briefly refer to it. If there has been one Cabinet officer in the history of our Government who has made an honest effort for economy in Government expenditures, it has been the Postmaster General. Those of us who believe in economical government and indorse officials who make an effort for economy should hold up the hands of General Burleson and not condemn him for his honest and courageous efforts to give the people a businesslike administration, and my Republican friends who are now out on a campaign of economy ought not to have applauded so vigorously the statement made by my friend from Massachusetts. This applause, however, was partisan Republican applause because a Democratic official is attacked by a Democrat on this floor. The gentleman from Massachusetts was prompted by some personal grievance and you Republicans are prompted by partisan feeling and prejudice.

I do not know what particular action on the part of the Postmaster General has caused this assault. I do not know whether the Postmaster General's action on the abolition of the pneumatic tubes in the city of Boston had anything to do with it or not, nor do I know what stockholders were affected, but I do know that this House by a large majority sustained the Postmaster General in that position. I do know that it was a nonpartisan proposition, a purely business proposition, and I do know that many Republicans voted with the Postmaster General, along with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. MOON, who led the fight and abolished the pneumatic-tube service. Perhaps the stockholders in this pneumatic-tube corporation would be glad to see our Postmaster General discredited because their profits were stopped. This assault is certainly a personal one and not prompted by any desire to serve the public.

Another thing: I know that the questions that General Burleson has to deal with now and has had to deal with in the past are most difficult to solve without incurring the ill will of those whose salaries are affected, and if you Republicans shall come into power you are going to find that you will have to deal with them, and unless you yield to these demands you will find that your officials are going to be subjected to the same character of abuse. When you do not yield to the demands made on the Treasury by these members of the Post Office Department that belong to the various organizations and affiliate with certain labor organizations, you are going to find that you will be singled out as an object of criticism and abuse.

Postmaster General Burelson, from the beginning of his administration down to this good hour, has courageously met that issue and has endeavored to do what you Republicans say you want to do, economize in the expenditure of public money.

It is true that when you stand between a man and the Public Treasury you always gain his enmity and his ill will. Many of us love Postmaster General Burleson for some of the enemies that he has made. I know that the rural letter carriers, all of whom, as a rule, are a fine lot of fellows, because of their insistent demand for increased pay became angry with the Postmaster General and do not like him because he for a time opposed them. Notwithstanding the fact that Congress did increase their pay and has increased their pay radically, yet they have not forgiven him because he did for a time object and prevent radical increases in that service. And in all the departments of the service the Postmaster General has made every effort to economize in the public expense, and forsooth he is abused.

Now, if an officer of the Government grows unpopular when he tries to economize in public expenditure, and you Republicans fail to hold up his hands, you gentlemen will never be able to carry out reforms which you pretend you will carry out now if you applaud a man who criticizes officials who have been economical. [Applause.]

The issue is squarely drawn, and if you take your stand with the idea that you will condemn everything a Democrat does because he is a Democrat and praise everything that a Republican does because he is a Republican you will look in vain for efficient and economical officers in either party. We should try a man fairly and on his record irrespective of his party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended five minutes in order that I may yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield that time to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, there have been but few beings on the face of the earth that were perfect. I believe they do speak of Enoch as being a perfect man, and God took him. They speak of Elijah as a good man, and he was taken up in a chariot of fire. Christ was the greatest being ever on earth, and He was crucified. I do not suppose you will find any Cabinet officer that will be spirited away like Enoch, and you will not find any one of them to go up in a chariot of fire like Elijah, and none of them want to be crucified like the Master was. None of us are perfect, no not one.

But take the record of the Postmaster General as a whole, and no man will say that there has been on his part any other motive than to give to the people of the United States the best Postal Service he could with his department economically and honestly administered. There has been no charge of any sort of fraud or peculation against the Postmaster General. The only charge made against him is a charge of a nebulous character, and the expression of certain opinions that people entertain in reference to his efforts at economy, and a combined effort on the part of certain people to discredit his standing throughout the United States.

I do not know whether this assault upon him will succeed or not, but I sincerely trust that the President, before he shall take any action in this matter, will look carefully into the record, and if he does, in my judgment he will not find anything that would justify his removal from office, as is now asked for from some quarters, but will find ample and full warrant for saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Gen. Burleson when he was a Member of this House was respected and honored by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

In addition to that, his reputation in this House for honesty and integrity was second to none. That he is a man of strong mind and determined purpose no man who served with him in this House will deny. That he is a man who, having formed his conclusions and arrived at a firm decision, is not

easily shaken, is to his credit, not to his discredit. [Applause.] A man who is not willing to stand up and courageously fight for what he believes to be right does not deserve a seat in this body or a position of honor or trust in the Government.

What has there been in his whole record to justify all of the assaults that are being made upon him, except the fact that he has endeavored to prevent certain influences outside and inside of the Post Office Department making a raid upon the Treasury of the United States? He has been successful in preventing these raids. This is Postmaster General Burleson's chief sin in the eyes of those who would fatten at Government expense and feed out of the Government crib.

Mr. Chairman, if I have any complaint to make against him myself, it would be that he has not been quite as partisan as I would like him to have been in the matter of post offices—not only that, but I am one of those fellows who believe that to the victor belong the spoils. I agree literally with Andrew Jackson that it is utterly impossible for an Executive to successfully conduct a Democratic administration or a Republican administration, as the case may be, unless he has on guard as officials, as his captains and lieutenants, men who are in sympathy with him; and when the people speak at the ballot box they ought to have their sovereign will carried out. Wherever there is discretion to be exercised upon the part of those administering an office, if I had my way about it I would turn all out who did not believe in public affairs as the platform directed. [Applause.]

From what sources comes all of the criticism? First, from the pneumatic-tube service, which Congress abolished and Burleson helped to abolish; second, from the great magazines of the country, who object to the law passed by Congress which deprives them of a part of the $96,000,000 which the Government had been losing on hauling in the mails their magazines—they are bitter; third, certain labor organizations, who object to Postmaster General Burleson because he will not let them run the Post Office Department and fix their salaries and raid the Treasury. Every man in America should indorse General Burleson if he believes in good business administration. You Republicans should not applaud this assault, because he has been doing all in his power to run his department economically, and this now seems to be your chief political asset against this administration. If you are honest in your professions, you should applaud him. No; you assault the War and Navy expenditures and say they were extravagant. Now, be consistent and help hold up Burleson's hands, who has practiced real, judicious, honest, and business economy.

Postmaster General Burleson has on all occasions been absolutely fair to all. He has retained in his department officials down there that you gentlemen know to be just as soundly Republican as you yourselves are. Postmaster General Burleson has always, in my judgment, endeavored to do the right thing, as God has given him the power to see the right, courageously, for the good of the American people and the good of the Post Office Department. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill be limited to 15 minutes, which is already allotted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 15 minutes, already allotted. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, that agreement can not be made in committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves the right to object.

Mr. GOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request and yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish, without discussion, to make a statement of certain facts that it seems to me are very interesting in connection with the treaty which is under negotiation.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, June 16, page 1173, is found a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, which reads as follows:

In the absence of the President and the Secretary of State, and by the President's direction, the undersigned, Acting Secretary of State, presents his compliments to the honorable the Secretary of the Senate, and in response to Senate resolution of June 6 advises that the President states that he would, of course, be very glad to communicate to the Senate the full text of the treaty if that text were complete, which is not the case. The Acting Secretary of State advises, further, that the President states that the treaty is now in process of negotiation; that many points of great moment are under consideration; that the text will, of course, not be complete until it is finally ready for signature; and he (the President) feels that it would not be in the public interest to communicate officially to the Senate a text which is provisional and not definite, and he finds no precedent for such a procedure.

It is true that only in exceptional instances has the President of the United States communicated officially to the Senate the text of a treaty which was only provisional and not definite, yet in view of the many instances in which this procedure has been followed it may be considered possible that the Acting Secretary of State has misunderstood the President and has erred in attributing to him the statement that he (the President) finds no precedent for such procedure.

The following is a partial list of such precedents:

On June 10, 1846, President Polk submitted to the Senate the proposed but incomplete treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the Oregon boundary. By formal vote, two-thirds concurring, the Senate advised the conclusion of the treaty, and thereafter it was signed on June 15 and again submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to the ratification. The vote on ratification was taken on June 18 and the President ratified it on June 19 in accordance with the advice and consent thus given. (Executive Journal VII, 84, 89, 90, 95.)

On December 17, 1861, President Lincoln sent to the Senate for its advice a preliminary draft of a treaty which had been presented to the Government of Mexico and which dealt with the payment of certain claims urged by European powers against that country. (Executive Journal XII, 24.)

On February 10, 1868, President Johnson sent to the Senate for its advice the draft of an unsigned and incomplete treaty with the Dominican Republic concerning the transfer of the Peninsula and Bay of Samana to the United States. (Executive Journal XVI, 163.)

On June 18, 1874, President Grant submitted a draft of a proposed agreement with Great Britain for commercial reciprocity with Canada, and after long deliberation the Senate declared on February 3, 1875, that it would be inexpedient to negotiate such a treaty. (Executive Journal XIX, 355, 502.)

Many precedents exist not only for the submission of a provisional text to the Senate, but also there are many precedents for consultation with the Senate during the negotiation of the treaty, and even before negotiations have begun with regard to the terms that are to be included in it.

President Washington on many occasions followed this course. By special messages of August 4, 1790, August 11, 1790, January 18, 1792, and March 23, 1792, President Washington asked the advice of the Senate as to treaties which were in contemplation between the United States and certain Indian tribes. (Executive Journal I, 55, 60, 98, 116.)

In a message to the Senate of February 9, 1790, President Washington mentioned the difference between the United States and Great Britain as to the Northeastern Boundary and said that he considered it advisable to postpone any negotiations on the subject until he had received the advice of the Senate as to the propositions to be offered on the part of the United States. (Executive Journal I, 36, 37.)

On May 8, 1792, President Washington inquired of the Senate whether it would approve a treaty with Algiers for the payment of ransom and peace money if such a treaty should be concluded.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I am sorry, but I can not, as my time is limited.

This action of the President was in accordance with a written communication from Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, dated April 1, 1792, in which he told the President that it was advisable, whenever possible, to consult the Senate before the opening of negotiations since its subsequent approbation was necessary to validate a treaty. (Executive Journal I, 122, 123. Jefferson Papers, Series 4, vol. 2, 18.)

All these cases are cited and references given in a few pages of "Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement," by Samuel B. Crandall, one of the best known works on that subject. The fact that these precedents are so easily found lends probability to the supposition that the Acting Secretary of State has misunderstood the President's statement.

I wish to call attention also to one other matter that is of interest in this connection.

The statement has been made repeatedly that the text of the treaty made public by order of the Senate on Monday, June 9, shows that there is no important difference between the full text of the treaty and the summary given out some weeks ago.

It may be that a comparison of the summary with that portion of the treaty which had not previously been published in full shows no serious discrepancies. Doubtless many persons thought it entirely unnecessary to compare the newly disclosed

text of the league covenant with the previously published full text of that document, and have therefore not observed one very remarkable and important change.

Article 4 of the revised covenant, adopted April 28, corresponds with article 3 of the original draft first published February 14, and contains the following provision:

The council shall consist of representatives of the United States of America, of the British Empire, of France, of Italy, and of Japan, together with representatives of four other members of the league.

The corresponding provision of the document made public by order of the Senate shows a very important change, of which no previous announcement has been made. It is found in article 4, and is as follows:

The council shall consist of representatives of the principal allied and associated powers, together with representatives of four other members of the league. (RECORD, June 9, p. 804.)

I have not found anywhere in the treaty a definition of the phrase "the principal allied and associated powers," though that phrase is used again in article 440 (RECORD, p. 857), which provides that the whole treaty—including, of course, the league of nations section—shall come into force when ratified by Germany and three of the principal allied and associated powers.

Originally there were to be nine members of the council; now the number is not determined. Formerly, five great powers, named in the treaty, and four smaller ones; now, perhaps, three great powers, not named, and four smaller ones. There may, perhaps, be more than five powers claiming permanent membership on the council; for if the phrase is not defined, who knows how many nations may claim to be of the "principal allied and associated powers"? [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GOOD. How much more time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five and a half minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS].

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], so that I may ask him a question in regard to these treaties?

Mr. GOOD. I have already allotted all of the time that I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RICKETTS] is recognized for five and a half minutes.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since this Congress convened in special session I have not taken up any of the time of the House in discussing legislation, for the reason that I fully appreciated the fact that important legislation was pending, in the form of appropriation bills, which should be considered and passed by the House at the earliest possible date in order that the various departments of this Government might continue to function during the next fiscal year commencing July 1 of this year and ending on June 30, 1920. This legislation failed of passage during the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and it is all important to the country that the various and numerous appropriation bills now pending before the House should be passed by Congress before the 1st day of July of this year.

I have therefore been content to listen attentively to the discussion of these various appropriation matters and have confined my thought to a strict analysis of the arguments presented, both as to the merits and demerits of each and every bill, in order that I might determine the scope of these appropriations and be able to vote for such amendment as would be safe and sane along economic lines and in the interest of the taxpayers of the country.

No Congress in the history of this Nation has had greater responsibilities devolving upon it or has been confronted by greater or more perplexing problems touching the welfare of the country than confronts the Sixty-sixth Congress. We are the Representatives of the people, and the people are expecting us and depending upon us to enact such legislation of a reconstructive nature as will stabilize the business of the country and at the same time reduce the great burden of taxation which rests so heavily upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of the Nation.

ECONOMY.

I have no doubt that the majority party of this House holds that majority by reason of the fact that the people of this Nation in the last election were not altogether satisfied, in many instances, with the disbursement of the funds arising from taxation, both in a direct and indirect way, during the prosecution of the war, and in order to avoid a continuation of such practice or policy, and to prevent the expenditure of fabulous sums of money which, in many instances, were sheer waste of the people's funds and the very climax of extravagance, elected a Republican Congress and gave to the Republican side of this House a safe and certain working majority. Hence, the responsibility of reducing taxation, curtailing appropriations, and of restraining or preventing lavish expenditure and waste of the people's money rests upon the Republicans in this House.

It is true that in all the legislation that has been passed during this session we have pursued a policy of economy. The record shows that in the various appropriation bills which have been passed many millions of dollars have been saved. The House has been slashing and cutting appropriation bills right and left, and to an extent even greater than expected. The estimates of the heads of departments have already been reduced more than a billion and a quarter dollars—$1,350,000,000—and all of the appropriation bills have not as yet been passed. Possibly the largest saving thus far effected has been upon the following bills:

The Army bill, from which $450,000,000 was cut by the House committee; and another $150,000,000 was taken from this bill when the House, by a large vote, reduced the personnel of the Army from 509,000 to 300,000 men.

The Navy bill, already reduced $300,000,000 from Secretary Daniel's estimate, with probably further reduction to come.

The railroad bill reduced $450,000,000, in which the Senate committee has concurred.

The object of these reductions in estimated appropriations is, of course, to reduce taxation in the various tax bills, which means a great saving to the taxpayers of the country. It has a further purpose, and that is to serve notice on the various department heads to curtail their estimates in the future and to abandon contemplated large enterprises.

It is quite clear to me, and I think to the House as well, that many items in these appropriation bills heretofore passed could have been eliminated if the various committees which reported out these bills and the House had the time to have given each item of expenditure that degree of consideration and that scrupulous investigation that it deserves. However, the failure of the Sixty-fifth Congress to pass these appropriation bills in its last session cast upon this House the responsibility of enacting this legislation hurriedly. We are compelled to be expeditious, for, if we should fail to pass the appropriations by the 1st of July of this year, then the various departments of Government would be without funds and would cease to function.

The House in one month has made $75,000,000 a day available for expenditure by the several Government departments. Here is how it has been apportioned:

Railroad appropriation	$750,000,000
War Department	718,000,000
Navy Department	601,000,000
Agriculture Department	32,150,000
General deficiencies	21,350,000
Indian Bureau	15,800,000
District of Columbia	14,150,000
Urgent deficiency	45,000,000
Making a total of	2,197,450,000

This amount trims departmental estimates approximately $1,350,000,000. Only one more appropriation bill remains to be enacted, and that is the sundry civil bill, expected to carry about $600,000,000, which bill is being drafted by the House Appropriations Committee and is scheduled to be reported out at an early date.

RECORD PRUNING.

Never in history has the House sliced appropriation bills as the present one has done. Since the Senate is showing no disposition to make more than minor changes in the House draft of appropriation measures, it is plain that the policy of the majority of Congress is to establish a record for economy.

This special session of Congress has been a great blessing to the taxpayers and the country, for, if the appropriation bills that have been passed by the House during this session had been passed at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, the taxpayers of the country would have been required to have raised on appropriation bills already passed the additional enormous sum of $1,350,000,000.

The following provision in the bill on military affairs, "That no part of any of the appropriations made therein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate," means an additional saving to the taxpayers of the country of a sum of money ranging from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. A point of order was made against this provision and sustained, but fortunately the Rules Committee brought in a rule making

this provision in order, and it was passed by a large vote in the House upon the theory that it would result in a great saving of money at a time when money is so badly needed by this Government in liquidating its outstanding obligations. This provision is not clearly understood by many people who are interested in various projects, but it is the purpose of the majority of this House to carry out every legal contract that has been made by the War Department, or any other department of Government, where there is either a legal or moral obligation to carry out the same. This provision was intended to check expenditures for the present until an investigation should be made, so as to determine what projects should be continued in the interest of the people of the Nation.

The great World War is practically over and the people of this Nation are delighted to know that it is terminated. The soldier boys are returning to their respective homes and the strain of war is rapidly subsiding. What the people want now is peace; prosperity, and happiness. They are tired of war. They can see no good reason why the Military Establishment of this Nation should not be greatly reduced, so as to conform to a peace basis. We have no need now of a large standing Army or a large Navy, and many of the various organizations engaged in war activities through which large sums of the people's money is expended can now be abandoned, and should be abandoned, and every unnecessary experimental expenditure of money in any form of war activity should cease and terminate.

The soldier boys in France and other allied countries who have borne the burden of the war and brought about a state of peace should receive their discharges and be returned to their homes at once. It is not clear to me why they have not long since been returned. They enlisted for the period of the war, and the war has been practically over since the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918. More than six months have elapsed and yet thousands of them are still held on foreign soil. Why are these soldier boys still held on foreign soil? Why not return them at once? Not next month or next year, but immediately.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to another question that to me seems to be paramount at this time in the interest of the citizenship of this Nation, and that is the question of the high cost of living.

Ninety per cent of our population of 110,000,000 consists of people in ordinary financial circumstances. A very large majority of them are dependent upon their labor for the support and maintenance of themselves and their families. The money they earn by honest toil lacks value in purchasing power. It is not a dollar worth 100 cents, but, in truth and in fact, in purchasing power is only worth about 40 cents. These laboring men of the country are straining every nerve to meet their honest obligations and to subsist and maintain and support their families. Every article of foodstuffs consumed in the homes of the United States by the occupants thereof is costing more money than ever before in the history of the country. Why is this? Is it because of a lack or scarcity of the various food products? No; not so. We have an abundance of food stored in the warehouses of the United States that is not being put on the market. In addition to this the War Department and the United States Government has in its possession more than $60,000,000 worth of products that the people need and should have. Many thousands of laboring men and miners in my State, in the Hocking Valley and in southeastern Ohio, and elsewhere, are to-day without the necessities of life because of the fact that they have been thrown out of employment and have not been able to earn a dollar this year. Many of these people are hungry, and it seems to me to be the duty of Congress to relieve this situation by proper legislation. We should take such action, in a legislative way, as will restore the dollar to its par value, and that can be done by releasing the food products now in store in the great warehouses of the United States and by releasing from the War Department and other departments of Government the more than $60,000,000 worth of foodstuffs now withheld from the people.

In a recent hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives it was learned that an approximate surplus of canned meats held by the War Department, as shown by a report of the Director of Sales of the Quartermaster's Department, amounts to a total of 141,000,000 pounds of bacon, beef, corned beef, and corned-beef hash. Why not release these products at once and place them on the market?

The laboring men of the country were loyal, patriotic, and true during the Great War struggle. They unreluctantly contributed of their means to the various war activities. They willingly purchased bonds in the five great war loans, aggregating eighteen and one-half billions of dollars. They subscribed liberally for these bonds. In many instances they mortgaged their earnings far ahead in order to help the United States. They contributed heavily to the various war charities and worked arduously in these various war drives.

Suddenly the great coal boom, due to the demand for coal at home and abroad in the factories of the different nations, subsided and they were left without employment, with their money invested in securities of the Government. Who was more patriotic, more generous, and more charitable than the American laboring man?

The American farmer likewise discharged nobly his duty to his country under the great stress of the World War. He has also been required, and is still required, to pay the highest price for fertilizer, machinery, seed, and all kinds of agricultural implements and equipment. He also was liberal in subscribing for bonds in the five Liberty loans floated by the Government.

Upon these two classes of citizens of the United States depended very largely the success of our armies in the struggle for the protection of American rights. And yet the laboring men of the country are still required to pay the highest price ever known for each and every article that is necessary in order to maintain and support himself and family, and the farmer is likewise required to pay war-time prices for all the equipment that he needs in the successful prosecution of his business.

Something must be done to relieve this situation. Prices have continued to soar since 1912. In the year 1916 it was maintained upon the floor of this House that the high cost of living was due to monopoly, and that the Sherman antitrust law was a failure, that it should be amended, and subsequently this House and the Congress of the United States passed what is known as the Clayton Act, which was supposed to be a very much more severe law relative to the prosecution of trusts and monopolies. But, notwithstanding the existence of the Sherman law and the Clayton law, many of the articles, food products, and commodities used in the homes of the United States have been controlled by the trusts and monopolies of the country.

The people of this Nation can not expect a great reduction in prices relative to the purchase of food products and other articles consumed by the people of the United States until the cause shall have been removed. It is no use to close our eyes to the cold truth. You may advance this theory or that theory, but, after all, when your various theories are analyzed, they are found to rest upon one proposition, and that is the proposition of monopoly—the stamping out of competition. I am not opposed to the combination of capital for commercial and industrial development, and the development of our resources, but I am opposed to any organization that seeks to control and force the American laboring man and the American people generally to pay a fixed price for any article they may need. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, be now closed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the sundry civil appropriation bill be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman allow me to have five minutes?

Mr. GOOD. We are going to give liberal time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BLANTON. The only trouble with that is that under the five-minute rule one is limited absolutely to the subject under consideration.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that sometime during the debate under the five-minute rule I will ask that he have five minutes in which to discuss matters out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I will make the same request of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. I think I can comply with that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6176.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To enable the Department of State to perform the duties transferred by order of the President from the War Trade Board to the Department of State, the sum of $200,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $3,500,000 for the War Trade Board for the fiscal year 1919, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee about this transfer. Was this one of the transfers made under the so-called Overman Act?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose this transfer was made by the President under the provisions of the Overman Act; at least the President has by Executive order made the transfer, but whether it is made under that act or not I do not know whether the proclamation states. I find it was made under that act, and call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on the 12th of May the President issued an order reading as follows:

PARIS, FRANCE, *May 12, 1919.*

I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, under the authority conferred by an act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government, approved May 20, 1918, do hereby order and direct that whenever, in his judgment, it becomes expedient the chairman or the vice chairman of the War Trade Board, at his discretion, shall relinquish and transfer to the Department of State by decrees all or any integral part of the personnel, duties, powers, and functions of the War Trade Board and its records and public property in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States.

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. WALSH. Well, that apparently is an attempt to consolidate or transfer one department under the Overman Act, although I doubt if the Overman Act authorized the transfer of the executive department to Paris to issue orders under its provision. But I should like to ask now what functions of the War Trade Board the Department of State are to perform under this transfer of $200,000, and is there a provision in the bill covering back into the Treasury any unexpended balance over and above the $200,000 so transferred?

Mr. GOOD. Answering the last question first, I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts there is about $270,000 of unexpended and unobligated balances, and there will be covered back into the Treasury about $70,000. As to the functions that are transferred, the vice chairman of the War Trade Board appeared before the committee and pointed out some very important functions that are to be performed by the State Department. For example, the War Trade Board is now issuing licenses to certain countries to bring exports into the United States. They have the power to place an embargo upon the exportation of anything into the United States. So far as Germany is concerned, or Austria-Hungary, they could bring their exports now into the United States without an embargo. They are exercising that authority with regard to certain countries and certain classes of things, especially dyestuffs.

Mr. WALSH. I know, but the War Trade Board expires by limitation at a certain period after the war.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Now, under this transfer of duty under the Overman Act is it contemplated they are going to perform those duties and functions of the War Trade Board during peace times?

Mr. GOOD. Not after the period of the expiration of the power or authority of the War Trade Board under the act.

Mr. WALSH. If this is made available for the entire fiscal year 1920, would it be made available for any period longer than it would have been available under the authority given to the War Trade Board?

Mr. GOOD. The control powers of the War Trade Board expire automatically, under Title VII of the espionage act and section 11 of the trading with the enemy act, as soon as peace is declared. The appropriation to the State Department will not extend this control and no such extension is intended. The money will be used to liquidate the affairs of the board.

Mr. WALSH. But the Executive order, or proclamation, or whatever created the War Trade Board, I think you will find, curtailed its activities to the period of the war and a certain length of time thereafter. Now, apparently under this transfer the Secretary of State can go on and continue this embargo after peace is declared if there is any of this money available.

Mr. GOOD. Well, none of this money will be available very long. My recollection is that they are running on the basis now of about $80,000 a month.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Eighty-five thousand.

Mr. GOOD. Eighty-five thousand, the gentleman from Tennessee informs me. So the gentleman from Massachusetts can see that the functions can not be performed very long.

Mr. WALSH. That is very true, but with respect——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. In reference to the gentleman's last statement, is it contemplated that the entire personnel of the War Trade Board is also to be shifted over there and become a part of the diplomatic branch of the executive branch?

Mr. GOOD. No; they have reduced their personnel, and are reducing it right along. It is their purpose to go out of existence very soon, and this is simply an easy method of bringing about the closing of the entire affairs of the War Trade Board.

Mr. WALSH. And does the gentleman know whether this includes that part of the War Trade Board that was at Paris upon expert work in connection with the making of the treaty?

Mr. GOOD. I can not answer the gentleman as to that.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, the matter I desire to discuss is the motion to recommit that was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] this morning, and which was held not to be in order on the wire-control bill, which ruling was appealed from, and the appeal tabled by the House. On the face of it the motion to recommit made by the gentleman from Tennessee would seem to be in the interest of the employees of the telephone companies of this country, inasmuch as it provided there should be no reduction in wages while the present rates set by the Postmaster General were in effect. The fact of the matter is that during all the time that the wires of this country were under the control of the Postmaster General that official absolutely refused to allow the telephone companies of this country to recognize the principle of collective bargaining and refused to permit the telephone companies to negotiate wage agreements with their employees, so much so that the telephone employees of the country threatened to strike and had set last Monday morning as the day for a nation-wide strike, that would involve the electrical workers and the telephone operators from coast to coast. On the eve of that strike the Postmaster General saw fit to put into effect an order giving the telephone companies the right to negotiate with their employees collectively. Now, the motion to recommit, that was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], on its face would seem to have been in the interest of the employees. The employees are not fearful of any reduction in wages to-day. What they were after and what they intended to strike for was the right to negotiate with their employers for increases in wages. And if the motion to recommit that was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee this morning had been held in order and adoped, it would have given the incentive to the telephone companies of this country, after the wires were returned to private control, to say, "We can not give consideration to an increase in wages, for the simple reason that these wages were based upon rates fixed by the Postmaster General, and until such time as we can secure increases in rates from the public-utility commissions of this country or the other rate-fixing agencies we can not possibly give any consideration to the question of an increase in wages."

So I say to a lot of men on this side of the House and on the other who were doubtful about the effect of that, that if the

motion to recommit made by the gentleman from Tennessee had been passed, instead of it being beneficial to the employees of the telephone companies of this country it would have been detrimental to their efforts to secure increases in wages that were refused them during the time that the wires were under Government control, due to the fact that the Postmaster General of these United States refused to carry out and put into effect the principle the President of the United States enunciated in reference to collective bargaining.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. In a moment.

In other words, the President, in all departments of the Government, and the Government itself, conceded the right of the employees to have a hearing through their organizations and associations. He recommended that to private employers in this country. That was the policy of the War Labor Board; that was the policy of the War Industries Board. He further recommended the principle in his recent message to Congress.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. In one moment.

Mr. MOON. You will not have any time left then.

Mr. NOLAN. I will have some time left.

But the Postmaster General refused to recognize the principle of collective bargaining. He even termed the idea a silly one. These men were on the eve of a strike last Saturday, hundreds of thousands of them all over this country, and it would have crippled the telephone service of the country. This strike was as much to uphold the principle of collective bargaining and the right to organize as it was for an increase in pay. These people meant business, and they forced Mr. Burleson to change his tune, and this motion to recommit looks like one that could readily come from the department to help the companies. If you had written into the bill this morning the provision offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, the wire companies of this country would have used it as an instrument to refuse to raise salaries and wages until such time as they got further increases in rates, and, God knows, they have high enough rates now.

Mr. MOON. Now, the gentleman knows that there is nothing in that sort of logic, but it is simply a pretext to justify the vote against that proposition. That amendment provided simply that so long as the rates of the Postmaster General were in force they should not reduce the wages of employees. It leaves no implication anywhere that after the wires had gone back to the owners under the determination of the Utilities Commission wages could not be increased.

Mr. NOLAN. That is not in answer to my statement.

Mr. MOON. You do not touch that question.

Mr. NOLAN. The employees are willing and I am willing that the employees shall protect themselves. They thought they could protect themselves last Saturday; the Postmaster General thought so; that was why he quit and conceded their right to meet their employers and discuss wages and conditions.

Mr. MOON. Yes; but while you are protecting the corporations you might protect the employees a little.

Mr. NOLAN. If, according to the gentleman's line of reasoning, when you look to the interest of the employees you protect the corporation, then the gentleman's statement might be considered to be in the line of logic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the privilege of collective bargaining, to be sound and all right, should be exercised only when the parties who are to be benefited thereby are willing to the transaction and want the bargaining done in that way. But how about the kind of a case that I called to the attention of the House last Saturday, in the nature of an editorial from the San Antonio Daily Express, the large daily newspaper published in the Alamo city of Texas? In that paper the editor calls attention to the fact that the foreman of his electrical department was ordered by the walking delegate to walk out and strike, and the foreman himself came to the editor and said, "I do not want to strike; I am satisfied with my position; I am satisfied with my hours of service; I am satisfied with the good pay that you give me; I am satisfied with the one day off per week; I am satisfied with everything connected with my service, and I do not want to strike." And yet that man is forced by the order that comes to leave his position and walk out in idleness, his family suffering the consequences.

Let me read to my good friend from California [Mr. NOLAN] a notice that was published in one of our Washington papers—the Washington Post, if you please—last Saturday morning, on our Flag Day, but Mr. Gompers's protest day, as follows, under "special notices":

All members of the Bricklayers' Union, No. 1, D. C., are ordered—

Not requested, not invited, but "ordered," if you please—to meet at Union Station, June 14, 1919, at 1.30 o'clock sharp.

Now listen—

Failing to appear, they shall be fined according to article 24, section 10.—M. A. Wolfe, recording secretary.

That is the result of collective bargaining, if you please, where men whose consciences tell them that they are not in sympathy with a protest against the fundamental law of the land, when they are not in sympathy with a protest against something that vitally concerns their homes, families, and consciences; in other words, when they do not believe in light wines and beer, when they do not believe in saloons, and yet they are ordered to appear and protest against prohibition when they believe in and favor prohibition; and they are ordered to join a protest, if you please, which says to the country, "No beer, no work."

I want to tell you what ought to follow and what will surely and inevitably follow that slogan of "No beer, no work": "Jails and penitentiaries!" That ought to be the corollary to that kind of a slogan in this country. For when men refuse to work, they are forced to obtain a living without working, and only one result follows this method—crime, jails, penitentiary. Collective bargaining may be all right if the parties who seek it want it and will not resort to force in obtaining their demands. But if the parties do not want it, you ought to let them alone and let them go about their business in their own way, and let them earn an honest living by the sweat of their brows if they want to, when they are perfectly satisfied with their condition in life and their situation and their hours of service and their treatment by their employer, as was the case with the good foreman of the electrical division of the San Antonio Express, who was ordered to walk out and let his family suffer, except for the little pittance that his organization gives him every day that he is not at work; ordered to do that at a time when his conscience rebels. I say to the gentleman from California that there is going to be a proper adjustment some day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hoosick Falls, N. Y., post office: For completion, $41,150.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HICKS. I do so for the purpose of asking for some information from the chairman of this committee in regard to these post offices that are being completed and carried forward to completion. I assume from the way this is worded, not having asked for any increase in the appropriation above that authorized by law, that these contracts must be fixed contracts and not based upon the rising cost of material and labor, because they are evidently contracts made in some cases several years ago, were they not?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; some of them were.

Mr. HICKS. Then some of these contractors must be in a very serious financial condition in regard to the contracts.

Mr. GOOD. Some of them are going through bankruptcy now. In some of these cases we carry items for rent of temporary quarters, which under the contract would have to be paid by the contractor, because he did not complete the building within the time specified. But the contractor has failed, and the post office is occupying rented property, and the Government is liable for the rent of it, and while we have a claim against the contractor for the amount of the rent, we can not recover it. All of these items are within the limit of cost fixed by law. In some cases the limit of cost was increased. In some cases Congress increased the limit of cost to make provision for the very things that the gentleman is complaining of.

Mr. HICKS. In those cases where the contractor has fallen down and gone into bankruptcy, what has the Government done to finish those buildings? Has it relet the contracts, or is it holding the bondsmen while work is suspended? What does the gentleman know about those cases?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know about those cases. I will say to the gentleman that practically all of these post offices, except four or five, were carried in the former bill and went through without objection, and we did not examine into them.

Mr. HICKS. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is this committee making any appropriations except those authorized by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. BUTLER. They can not do it.

Mr. GOOD. There is nothing carried in this bill at all for post offices in excess of the limit of cost that has been fixed by Congress.

Mr. DOWELL. What is being done with the building programs where the authorizations are not sufficient to complete the buildings?

Mr. GOOD. They will have to await action by Congress on a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DOWELL. This takes no action on cases of that kind?

Mr. GOOD. We can not appropriate $500,000, for instance, for a public building where the limit of cost is $300,000. Where the department can not get a bid within the limit of cost it has not let the contract and we are not appropriating the money.

Mr. COOPER. I move to strike out the last two words. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for not to exceed 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday, June 14, on the day which has been set aside in honor of our national emblem, there was a demonstration held on the steps and at the east front of the Capitol Building of our Nation. This public meeting was fostered for a threefold purpose. First, to protest against national prohibition of the liquor traffic; second, to ask for the repeal of the war-time prohibition law which becomes effective July 1, 1919; third, to urge that permission be granted in our country for the manufacture and sale of wines and beers containing a certain per cent of alcohol.

For weeks before the demonstration took place it was very widely advertised in the newspapers as a protest against prohibition by organized labor and the laboring classes of our country, and it had the support of some of the labor leaders, including Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor. Now, I want to be frank and I will say that there are thousands of union laboring men in our country who are opposed to prohibition of the liquor traffic, but a large number of these men have been directly or indirectly engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of intoxicating liquor. But I challenge the statement that was made by Mr. Gompers and other speakers at the meeting on the Capitol steps, June 14, that they spoke the sentiments of 3,000,000 members of organized labor in our country. [Applause.] I want Mr. Gompers and the other speakers at this meeting to know that they do not speak for organized labor as a whole on this question, and that there are hundreds of thousands of union labor men that are not ready to adopt the whisky bottle and the beer keg as their emblem. [Applause.]

There are many industrial sections of our country where the workingmen have voted for and helped adopt prohibition. Have you Members of Congress who live in the prohibition States been called upon by the laboring classes from your districts to repeal the prohibition laws? The last State which went dry by a direct vote of the people is the great industrial State of Ohio, the fourth industrial State of the Union. Last fall thousands of union men and skilled workers there went to the polls and registered their protest against the liquor traffic. I call your attention to the great manufacturing district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. This district has the second largest iron and steel industry in the world, and the majority for prohibition in this district when the vote was counted last fall on the question of State-wide prohibition was over 10,000. This is not an agricultural center. It is a manufacturing district which has about 100,000 workingmen in its industries. Youngstown, my home city, has 50,000 men working in the steel plants and factories. We have a large foreign population, and of those in this class who voted about 99 per cent voted wet. All of the professional and business men in this city are not dry, yet under these conditions the workingmen of this great industrial city went to the polls and played a great part in registering a dry majority for State-wide prohibition of over 1,200. Yet Mr. Gompers and other labor leaders come here and on the Capitol steps of this Nation attack prohibition and say that in doing so they are speaking for the working classes of the country.

At this point I insert an editorial from the Youngstown Telegram of June 12, 1919, as follows:

LABOR AND PROHIBITION.

For several months advocates of the dying liquor traffic have been laboring to range the workingmen of the country behind a movement to upset prohibition before the final knell of the liquor business is sounded. The movement has not been in the slightest degree successful. Even in New York—the last stronghold of the wets—the "No beer, no work" campaign soon frayed out because men who work for a living did not care to be classed with the riffraff that made up the bulk of the movement.

Another drive is now under way to make it appear that labor is opposed to prohibition. The movement is rather insidious because the real motive—the complete restoration of the liquor traffic—is hidden. Ostensibly all that is asked is the removal until January 16, 1920, of the ban against the sale of light wines and beer. It is a weak camouflage since nobody is greatly concerned about the half-way postponement of prohibition for a mere six months. Even the most ardent wet admits that if the country is going dry it might as well go dry next month as next January.

Back of the movement for so-called workingmen's protest parades is the campaign for permanent repeal of nation-wide prohibition. If Congress can be impressed by parades in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Washington and thereby persuaded to repeal the war-time prohibition act in so far as beer and light wines are concerned, the first round will be won in the antiprohibition fight. It is that sentimental victory alone that is sought. It is a movement in keeping with the announced determination of the liquor men to submit four antiprohibition proposals in Ohio this fall—and more than four if they can scrape up additional ones—in the hope that one or more may win in the confusion and thereby permit a loud cry to go up that sentiment is changing.

Congressmen are not likely to succumb to this propaganda. Taking the sentiment of their individual districts alone into consideration, they know the verdict is against repeal. Far away parades are not one-half as convincing as votes that have been registered at home.

The movement to throw onto union labor the burden of reviving the liquor traffic is sponsored by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Gompers is an admirable man in many respects and is entitled to the thanks of the country for his good work during the war. It is only regrettable that he is abusing the position he holds and the trust reposed in him by leading the movement to make it appear that labor is solidly wet, whereas labor never was unitedly in favor of the liquor traffic, and certainly there has been less reason than ever in recent years to make it appear wet. Ohio is one of the great industrial States of the Union—the fourth, and perhaps even the third, in rank—and Ohio decisively voted dry last year.

Facts are always more satisfactory than intangible claims, and we do not need to go away from home to get these. Youngstown is the center of one of the great manufacturing districts of the country. It is wholly an industrial city and the Mahoning Valley is wholly an industrial region. Industrial plant employees are overwhelmingly in the majority here, even when ranged against all other workers combined. Professional men, business men, and other men not in the mills did not vote solidly dry last November. There were antiprohibitionists among them, and yet Youngstown gave a dry majority of more than 1,000, while Mahoning County voted dry by upward of 4,000. Canton, Akron, Ashtabula, and other industrial centers of northeastern Ohio rolled up prohibition majorities as well. The great majority of industrial plant employees must have voted dry. Whence comes this demand from labor for liquor is not easy to see.

Youngstown, too, met the situation created by wet obstructionists in the State legislature, who blocked a prohibition enforcement bill by passing a drastic city ordinance against illegal liquor selling. It received a unanimous vote in city council, which does not leave much doubt of sentiment here. Instead of the 40 or 50 "drunks" a day arrested under the old "model" license law, arrests for this cause are now two or three a week. The panhandlers and loafers who deemed it their right to live off workers have disappeared. Efficiency has been greatly increased and the workman who was "a good fellow if it wasn't for the booze" is not heard from any more. The only complaint made here is that the "chain gang" from the city jail that was depended upon for park improvements has gone out of business for lack of recruits.

There seems to be no need of demonstrations when we already have had ballots. In almost all the States ratification of nation-wide prohibition was an issue last fall, and legislatures committed to ratification were elected in all but three States. And the movement for beer and light wines is new in its inception, and yet it has already been given a test at the ballot box. Michigan weighed it against prohibition and indorsed prohibition far more emphatically than it accepted it.

Mr. Chairman, in the industrial centers where prohibition has been tried and tested the labor leaders and the men themselves speak in glowing terms regarding the benefits of prohibition upon the working classes. In no State in the Union where prohibition has been tried have they voted to return to the saloon. On the contrary, wherever they have voted a second time on the question the prohibition majority has been increased.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I will yield when I have finished my statement.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I simply want to correct one statement of the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, in the last hours of its miserable existence the liquor traffic, aided by the German-American Alliance—brewers who, according to the report just filed by the Senate Judiciary Committee, aided our enemies during the war—I say in the last hours of its miserable existence the liquor traffic, aided by the German brewers, are trying to hide behind the broad backs of the American workingmen, taking advantage of the political unrest which comes at the end of the great war. The traffic threatens to ally itself with anarchy and Bolshevism unless it is able to secure some concessions from the Government and society. The liquor interests declare that if the workingmen do not get their beer they will not work, and they are agitating along that line. I have here a button, many of which were worn Saturday—"No beer, no work!" This is an insult to the decent American workingman, who is loyal to his country and loves his family and home. [Applause.]

And no less a person than Mr. Gompers tells us that there are a certain class of people in this country—he says they are mostly foreigners—who will not obey the organic law of this land, and if we attempt to enforce the prohibition laws they will resort to anarchy and Bolshevism. It ill becomes Mr. Gompers to make such a public statement as this, for I do not hesitate to say that when Mr. Gompers makes a statement of that nature in public it will have a tendency to encourage that very thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. COOPER. If I have time after I finish this, I will be glad to yield.

Is this great Government of ours going to set aside the law and a constitutional amendment which has been adopted by 45 out of the 48 States of the Union because a foreign element and the German brewers threaten us with anarchy? No; the American people will not listen to such a threat; but, on the other hand, I want to answer this statement that has been made by Mr. Gompers and the German brewers by saying that from this hour on America is going to be for American institutions and American principles, not for anarchy and Bolshevism.

Just a word relative to some of the speeches that were made on the Capitol steps last Saturday. I listened to John J. Kearney, who is a member of the State Senate from Massachusetts. He confined most of his remarks to an attack upon Members of Congress by referring to them as being spineless misrepresentatives of the people. In answer to him I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a report submitted by Lemuel H. Murlin, president of Boston University; John M. Barker, professor of Boston University; John L. Bates, former governor of Massachusetts; George W. Coleman, president of the Open Forum National Council; Henry I. Harriman, former president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

THE VERDICT.

April–May, 1919.

The committee to secure testimony from the most reliable and representative sources as to the success or failure of prohibition were: Chairman, Lemuel H. Murlin, president of Boston University; secretary, John M. Barker, professor in Boston University; John L. Bates, former governor of Massachusetts; George W. Coleman, president Open Forum National Council; Henry I. Harriman, former president Boston Chamber of Commerce.

Prohibition States May 1, 1919	32
Deduct States where prohibition has not been in effect over 4 months, Florida, Montana, Ohio, Wyoming	4
	28

EXCERPTS FROM REPLIES (APRIL–MAY, 1919) OF THE GOVERNORS OF THESE 28 STATES.

1. Alabama—Gov. Thomas E. Kilby (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1915):
"Prohibition is an unqualified success in Alabama. Drunkenness is reduced to a minimum, crime reduced 50 per cent, and there is a large increase in bank deposits. The new city jail at Birmingham has been empty over a year, and many county jails are without prisoners. The business sentiment of Alabama strongly indorses present prohibition conditions, regardless of former attitude on the subject."

2. Arizona—Gov. Thomas E. Campbell (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1915):
"Prohibition has resulted in a marked decrease in commitments to penal institutions and the hospitals for the insane. The number of destitute families has greatly decreased. The best possible indorsement is that the voters, after a two years' trial, overwhelmingly adopted a more stringent prohibition bill."

3. Arkansas—Gov. Charles H. Brough (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):
"Conditions are greatly improved since State-wide prohibition went into effect. Crimes have materially decreased, though there is considerable bootlegging. Gen. Leonard Wood stated to me that the principal reason Little Rock secured the Camp Pike cantonment was because of prohibition."

4. Colorado—Gov. Oliver H. Shoup (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):
"Colorado has shown a marked advance in many lines. It is safe to say that the State never will revert to the old policy of licensing the liquor traffic."

5. Georgia—Gov. Hugh M. Dorsey (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1908):
"I think prohibition has gone a long way toward helping our people, and especially the negroes and poorer classes. I am very much in favor of prohibition."

6. Idaho—Gov. D. W. Davis (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):
"There is no question of the benefit of prohibition. Countless thousands of our citizens have been benefited directly or indirectly by the elimination of the liquor traffic. We have some cases of illicit selling, but these can not even begin to dim the shining light of the new era."

7. Indiana—Gov. James P. Goodrich (prohibition since Apr. 2, 1918):
"I inclose a clipping from this morning's Star showing the great decrease in the number in our jails which prohibition has brought."

8. Iowa—Gov. William L. Harding (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):
"Gov. Harding was ill when your letter reached here, and has not sufficiently recovered to give any attention to his correspondence."

9. Kansas—Gov. Henry J. Allen (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1881):
"Prohibition has contributed much to our material welfare. Money that was formerly spent in support of the liquor traffic has now gone into better food and those things which mean better social conditions; but great as has been the material advance, it is upon the moral side that Kansas has gained most. Crime has decreased, jails in many counties have been entirely empty for a long period, and pauperism has decreased. The sentiment in Kansas is to-day practically unanimous in its support."

10. Maine—Gov. Carl E. Milliken, by C. E. Owen (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1851):
"At Gov. Milliken's request I am replying to your letter. In the past enforcement was lax, nullification of the law became a system, so that conditions in some sections differed little from conditions under license; but recently prohibition has been enforced throughout the State, and even in the judgment of business men there has been a new demonstration of the value of prohibition."

11. Michigan—Gov. Albert E. Sleeper (prohibition since May 1, 1918):
"Our prohibitory law has already effected results of considerable importance. Arrests for drunkenness all over the State have been cut down to about one-quarter. Business men report that bills are paid more promptly, and the effect of prohibition on general business has been good."

12. Mississippi—Gov. Theo. G. Bilbo (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1909):
"Prohibition has brought a very marked decrease in crime and a marked increase in material prosperity. Our people are delighted with the results."

13. Nebraska—Gov. Samuel R. McKelvie (prohibition since May 1, 1917):
"There is no doubt that if prohibition were to be resubmitted to the people, they would give it a much larger affirmative vote than it received when it was first adopted."

14. Nevada—Gov. Emmett D. Boyle (prohibition since Dec. 16, 1918):
"Business men are pleased with the results. The law is generally enforced without much difficulty, and the closing of saloons has brought noticeably beneficial results."

15. New Hampshire—Gov. John H. Bartlett (prohibition since May 1, 1918):
"Conditions have been so much better under prohibition than under license that many former believers in license are now outspoken for prohibition. We confidently expect even better results after July 1. The comparative arrests for drunkenness in our eight largest cities which were formerly license are: May, 1917, to March, 1918, under license, 6,987; May, 1918, to March, 1919, under prohibition, 1,547."

16. New Mexico—Gov. O. A. Larrazolo (prohibition since Oct. 1, 1918):
"I believe that every decent American is in favor of the closing of the saloon; but when we go further than the teachings of Christ and say that a man shall not take a drink we are adopting a law which is and always will be a failure."

17. North Carolina—Gov. Thomas W. Bickett (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1909):
"The prohibition question is no longer a debatable one in North Carolina. There were many men of character who opposed it. All these have now become convinced of its wisdom and its efficiency."

18. North Dakota—Gov. Lynn J. Frazier (prohibition since Nov. 2, 1889):
"Crime has been greatly decreased. We have had prohibition since 1889, and with the enactment of bone-dry legislation the benefits of prohibition are even more in evidence."

19. Oklahoma—Gov. J. B. A. Robertson (prohibition since Nov. 16, 1907):
"Crime has been greatly lessened, business conditions greatly improved, while the good effects upon the morals of the citizens can not be overestimated. Oklahoma is strong for prohibition."

20. Oregon—Gov. Ben W. Olcott (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):
"Our experience under a bone-dry statute has been all for the betterment of the general public welfare. Industries have prospered. Business conditions are acknowledged to be of the best. Old brewery buildings are housing other industries. A material decrease is shown in the number of men in prison. It is my firm belief that to-day the great majority of the people of Oregon are in favor of prohibition."

21. South Carolina—Gov. R. A. Cooper (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):
"Crime is unquestionably less. If we should have a vote on the question to-day, the majority for prohibition would be larger than when it was first voted. Prohibition has the effect of saving money to those who would drink, and general efficiency, as well as individual efficiency, is enhanced."

22. South Dakota—Gov. Peter Norbeck (prohibition since July 1, 1917):
"Prohibition has brought splendid results. Business has gone forward, bank deposits have increased, all to an unusual degree, and countless homes have been made happier."

23. Tennessee—Gov. A. H. Roberts (prohibition since July 1, 1909):
"As a result of our experience, the prohibition sentiment in this State is overwhelming."

24. Texas—Gov. W. P. Hobby (prohibition since June 26, 1918):
"In our eight largest cities prohibition has reduced the arrests for drunkenness from 14,128 in 1917–18 to 3,337 in the corresponding period 1918–19. I voted against State-wide prohibition, but after seeing its actual operations as shown by the effect upon crime and upon government in Texas, I am convinced of its practical value."

25. Utah—Gov. S. Bamberger, by the attorney general (prohibition since Aug. 1, 1917):
"Our penitentiary population has decreased. The people are happier. More money is being spent for legitimate purposes. Bills are being paid better. More home property is being purchased by the working people, and if the matter were submitted on a referendum to-day I feel Utah would come as near being unanimous in favor of prohibition as it is possible for a State to come."

26. Virginia—Gov. W. Davis, by commissioner of prohibition (prohibition since Nov. 1, 1916):
"Business interests which were the most insistent opponents of prohibition have been the chief beneficiaries of the change, in improved efficiency of labor, the reduction of accidents, and the great increase in the volume of business. It is gratifying to note the gracefulness with which they now admit that their fears have proved utterly groundless. The general benefit of prohibition upon the business interests, criminal record, peace, and prosperity of the State is without parallel."

27. Washington—Gov. Ernest Lister (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):
"There has been a marked improvement in conditions. Even in the larger cities, such as Seattle, Spokane, and Tacoma, the sentiment for prohibition is much stronger to-day than ever before."

28. West Virginia—Gov. John J. Cornwell (prohibition since July 1, 1914):
"No man of intelligence, regardless of what was his position on prohibition, will to-day deny that the benefits arising from the suppression of the liquor traffic have been many. Crime has been reduced, bank deposits have increased enormously, and all collateral benefits have followed."

SUMMARY.

26 governors give a verdict for prohibition.
1 governor gives a verdict against prohibition.
1 has not replied.

28

May 1, 1919. The 10 largest cities where prohibition has been in effect over four months are:

	Population, 1918.
1. Detroit, Mich	850,000
2. Washington, D. C	400,000
3. Seattle, Wash	356,445
4. Indianapolis, Ind	315,000
5. Portland, Oreg	310,000
6. Denver, Colo	268,000
7. San Antonio, Tex	225,000
8. Atlanta, Ga	220,000
9. Birmingham, Ala	212,000
10. Omaha, Nebr	200,000

EXCERPTS FROM REPLIES (APRIL-MAY, 1919) OF THE MAYORS AND CHIEFS OF POLICE OF THESE 10 CITIES.

1. Detroit—Mayor James Couzens (prohibition since May 1, 1918):

"Prohibition has brought a decrease not alone in drunkenness but in larceny, disorderly conduct, assault and battery, nonsupport, vagrancy, etc.—a decrease in all punishable misdemeanors of 26,140 over the previous year. Admissions to the poorhouse have decreased from 2,214 to 800. Deaths from alcoholism have decreased from 92 to 17. Savings deposits have increased over $25,000,000."

Detroit—First Deputy Commissioner of Police William P. Rutledge:

"Drunkenness has decreased by one-half and general conditions have greatly improved. I recently read 100 letters from manufacturers saying they would not go back to wet under any circumstances, the general physical and mental condition of their men was so much better. The Detroit Board of Commerce states: 'Detroit's experience has proved beyond a possibility of doubt that prohibition is a most valuable contribution to industrial efficiency, higher productivity, and conservation of man power.'"

2. Washington—Has no mayor (prohibition since Nov. 1, 1917).

Washington—Superintendent of Police Pullman:

"Prohibition has brought good results. Although the law here was imperfect up to March 1, when liquor could be brought in for personal use, drunkenness has been reduced to a minimum and crimes growing out of drunkenness, such as assault, disorderly conduct, etc., have been greatly reduced."

3. Seattle—Acting Mayor W. D. Lane (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Prohibition is a success here from every standpoint. Every effort to restore the saloon has been overwhelmingly defeated. The Seattle Times and many business men who opposed prohibition are now convinced by its practical operation. Business has improved and crime and drunkenness have decreased remarkably. Prohibition is one big reason for Seattle's leadership in shipbuilding."

Seattle—Chief of Police J. F. Warren:

"All intoxicated persons are now arrested, while formerly many were sent home, so there has not been a decrease in the arrests for drunkenness. Business conditions, however, are very much improved, and the business sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of prohibition."

4. Indianapolis—Mayor Charles W. Jewett (prohibition since Apr. 2, 1918):

"Our county workhouse has been abolished, crime reduced, and social conditions improved. Prohibition is a success in Indianapolis."

Indianapolis—Chief of Police George V. Coffin:

"Prohibition has had a salutary effect on such charges as assault and battery, drunkenness, etc."

5. Portland—Mayor George L. Baker (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"When Oregon adopted prohibition the improvement everywhere was so marked that a year later a law was passed making the State bone dry. There was the usual cry of ruining the State, but it did not materialize. Portland's bank clearage, population, building permits, and other business transactions increased. Absolute prohibition has been such a success that there is no longer any talk of opposing it."

Portland—Chief of Police N. F. Johnson:

"Prohibition has been a success. Hundreds of representative citizens who voted against it are now ardent supporters. Buildings formerly occupied by saloons were rented with very little delay. A few months preceding the adoption of prohibition I handled some 1,600 cases of destitution, and in practically every case the head of the family owed a saloon bill. Ten months after the adoption of prohibition I checked 75 corner grocery stores in the district where most of this destitution was, and without a single exception collections from 50 per cent to 75 per cent better were reported. The year preceding prohibition our average daily arrests for drunkenness were 23; the year following the average per day was 2½."

6. Denver—Mayor W. F. R. Mills, by his secretary (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"There is no question but that prohibition has been of great benefit. Money heretofore spent for liquor is now spent for family purposes, and the home life has been immeasurably benefited. Many homes are really homes now that never were before. The family is fed and clothed and sunshine has dispelled gloom. A very large proportion of the business men who opposed prohibition are now in favor of it."

Denver—Chief of police. No reply.

7. San Antonio—Mayor Sam C. Bell (prohibition since June 21, 1918):

These statistics for similar periods tell our story:

	Before.	After.
Vagrancy	2,945	1,832
Drunkenness	3,070	1,214

San Antonio—Chief of Police F. H. Lancaster:

"Crime has decreased, but bootlegging has increased. Prohibition does not prohibit in San Antonio. The only solution of prohibition is stopping the manufacture of intoxicating drinks."

8. Atlanta—Mayor James L. Key (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1908):

"Prohibition has proved a success in Atlanta in every way. Crime, drunkenness, and vice have decreased. The general efficiency of the body of citizens has increased. General business conditions have improved. The law meets with the approval of the community and is enforced as well as other measures."

Atlanta—Chief of Police James L. Beavers:

"Drunkenness has decreased more than 50 per cent. Prohibition has been very successful here and it will be more so when we get the nation-wide prohibition law July 1."

9. Birmingham—N. A. Barrett, president of city commission (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1915):

"Prohibition has been a monumental success in Birmingham. Our main city prison with a capacity of 400 has been converted into a parental school. Our growth under prohibition has been extraordinary."

Birmingham—Chief of Police T. J. Shirley:

"Our arrests for drunkenness in 1918 were 670 compared with 2,453 when we had the saloons. Since January 15, 1919, we have had bone-dry prohibition and a still further gain has been made. We have abandoned our new jail, which has been turned over to the juvenile court."

10. Omaha—Mayor Edward P. Smith (prohibition since May 1, 1917):

"Prohibition has much greater strength in Omaha now than when adopted. Arrests for drunkenness and attendant offenses are less than one-third of what they were. Business was never more prosperous."

Omaha—Chief of Police M. Everstein:

"Crime has decreased more than 40 per cent, drunkenness more than 50 per cent, and this would be even greater if times were normal. Business is excellent."

SUMMARY.

17 mayors and chiefs of police give a verdict for prohibition.
1 chief of police gives a verdict against prohibition.
1 has not replied.

19

10 SUNDRY REPLIES (APRIL-MAY, 1919).

1. Ann Arbor, Mich.—E. M. Wurster, mayor (prohibition since May 1, 1918):

"Prohibition has done wonders for the individual toper and wonders for the whole community. All business runs much smoother than formerly and the jails are practically empty. Many of those who were the greatest objectors to prohibition are now its stanchest supporters."

2. Colorado—Victor E. Keyes, attorney general (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Prohibition has brought most satisfactory results. While we have lost license fees, it has been demonstrated that even from the standpoint of dollars and cents it has been beneficial. Crime has been greatly reduced and the benefits resulting to the State have been very great."

3. Dallas, Tex.—J. W. Ryan, chief of police (prohibition since June 26, 1918):

"Comparing three months before prohibition with a corresponding three months after, I find 1,108 arrests for drunkenness and disorder against 109 now. This gives a fair and impartial estimate of the effect of prohibition. Another offense, wife beating, which was very common during the saloon era, averaging 5 to 6 per day, has now become 'extinct.'"

4. Kansas City, Kans.—H. A. Mendenhall, mayor (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1881):

"We have one of the cleanest and most moral cities in the United States because we have absolute prohibition, which is the first and greatest aid. Our people are contented and happy, and we would not go back to the old state of affairs for any price."

5. Lake County, Oreg.—Fred G. Stickels, sheriff (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Prohibition has been a great success; in fact, so much of a success that I have not seen a drunken man for years. When our county was 'wet' we had all kinds of serious criminal cases, and our jail was nearly always full. Now we have very few prisoners and these mostly for petty offenses."

6. Lansing, Mich.—J. W. Ferle, mayor (prohibition since May 1, 1918):

"I can not say enough for what prohibition has done for Lansing and the State of Michigan. It has worked very satisfactorily to the manufacturers, to business men, and to individuals. Last Monday we voted on the beer-and-wine amendment initiated by the saloon interests and it was turned down by over 150,000 majority." (Final figures, 207,520 majority.)

7. Nashville, Tenn.—William Gupton, mayor (prohibition since July 1, 1909):

"A few days ago Nashville entertained the largest crowd in her history. We had five arrests for drunkenness. A few years back on a corresponding day, with no unusual crowd, we had 73 arrests for drunkenness. Nashville has been bone dry for some time. Bank clearings have increased, business is better, and in general there is a remarkable change for the better."

8. Salt Lake City, Utah—J. Parley White, chief of police (prohibition since Aug. 1, 1917):

"During the 12 months after prohibition we arrested 308 persons for drunkenness compared with 3,353 during the 12 months immediately preceding. All minor crimes have decreased in about the same proportion. Bank deposits have increased to a remarkable extent. Business is much better. There are no vacant houses or business buildings in town. The school children are better clothed and better cared for."

9. Spokane, Wash.—Charles M. Fassett, mayor (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916):

"Not only are those who voted 'dry' satisfied with the three years' experience, but thousands of our citizens who voted 'wet' are now openly and positively for prohibition. Business men who feared that the commercial interests would be injured by prohibition are now practically unanimous in its favor."

10. York County, Me.—Howen A. Roberts, sheriff (prohibition since Jan. 1, 1851):

"Until Gov. Milliken, the present governor, assumed office prohibition has not been properly enforced. To show you that prohibition can be enforced, and what its results are, I give you the following from the records of our jail:

1916, committed for intoxication 119
1918, committed for intoxication 15

"There is no doubt in my mind that prohibition, properly enforced, is a necessary thing."

Additional copies may be obtained from the secretary of the committee by addressing The Verdict, Boston University, 72 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.

Another speaker whose remarks I desire to call to the attention of the House was Mrs. Margaret Rooney, who led a delegation of women from Baltimore who claimed they were advocates of the Personal Liberty League.

I noticed those ladies marching down the Avenue with their purple umbrellas, all dressed up. I wonder who paid for the umbrellas. Mrs. Margaret Rooney was leading that procession

of women. Jack Dempsey and Jess Willard never had anything on Mrs. Rooney when she mounted the Capitol steps, and at the psychological moment she did not take the speaker's stand but jumped upon the speaker's table and said: "I am the first woman to advocate personal liberty in this cause, and you can bet your life we'll go to hell to get it." There was great applause from the crowd. I want to ask those who applauded that sentiment of Mrs. Rooney if they thought she was expressing the sentiment of the American mothers of our country. Shame on the woman who would stand on the Capitol steps of this Nation and use such language as that. Why, Mr. Chairman, if Emma Goldman were to stand on the Capitol steps and make such a statement as that she would probably be indicted under the espionage law and given a penitentiary sentence. I say such actions as those by Mrs. Rooney are insulting to American motherhood. [Applause.]

In conclusion let me say that the German brewers can howl their heads off, they can spend their millions, but prohibition is here, and it is going to stay regardless of any action or threats on their part. [Applause.] Now I will yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I did not intend to make any comment on the gentleman's argument, but to suggest a correction in his statistics. He said, if I understood him, that no State which had adopted prohibition had ever abandoned it.

Mr. COOPER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. One State after about 50 years of prohibition went to local option, and after having local option for 12 years resubmitted it, and it confirmed that local option by a majority twelve times greater than when it originally adopted it. I want to say that I sympathize with a great part of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. RANDALL of California. If the gentleman will permit me, is it not a fact that the State that the gentleman from Vermont refers to afterwards ratified the prohibition amendment?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I may say that in the instance of the adoption of local option it was done by a popular vote, whereas the ratification of the prohibition amendment was by a legislature, where my friends on the other side are anxious that it shall go rather than to a popular vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman from Ohio repeat the quotation that he made from Mr. Gompers's speech last Saturday?

Mr. COOPER. I will be glad to.

He said:

> The United States contains people of many nationalities, most of whom are, as I have said, accustomed to the use of beer and light wines. Conceive the opportunity thus given to agitators, anarchists, and the apostles of Bolshevism to go to these people, in their homes, in their factories, in their mills, their mines, their associations, their unions, and say, "Look here. This is what Congress has done to you. It has even taken away your glass of beer!"
>
> It may sound but little to those who are accustomed to comfortable homes, to luxurious hotels. It may sound trivial to those who have never known the use of beer or wine. But to people so accustomed it is a source of constant discontent and never-ending nagging. It irritates and annoys and unsettles. And it puts them in a receptive mood for the deadlier propaganda that will follow.
>
> The "No beer, no work" agitation is sure proof of this. It is claimed to be the work of agitators, the I. W. W., or the Bolsheviki.
>
> Well, suppose it is? Who placed in the hands of these agitators the material to work with? And how are you going to tell whether it is their work or not?

In other words, Mr. Gompers says that Congress and the legislatures of 45 out of 48 States of the Union by legislating on prohibition placed into the hands of these people the material with which they will resort to anarchy. Mr. Chairman, I wear upon the lapel of my a coat a little emblem which I feel proud of. It is the emblem of one of the great labor organizations of our country, and as long as I am a member of this body I will defend till the last the thousands of decent, industrious, sober workingmen against the insults that were cast upon them last Saturday, June 14, by the unpatriotic, un-American brewers. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Houghton, Mich., post office: For completion, $19,500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What the gentleman who has just taken his seat has said in his reference to Mr. Gompers, as indicated in his formal speech on the floor, and what Mr. Gompers actually said makes an entirely different proposition. I asked the question because I did not want it to go out before the country that Mr. Gompers made any such statement as intimated by the gentleman. I regard Mr. Gompers as one of the greatest American patriots of the day, a man who would be the last man in the world to spread riot or Bolshevism.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is not my intention to go into the question of prohibition at this hour, because I appreciate the fact that this sundry civil bill ought to be considered and gotten out of the way. But I will take advantage of the couple of moments the House has allowed me to say that we who oppose prohibition have no objection to its being considered and passed and carried out and made operative in every State of the country by popular vote. If the States want prohibition for themselves, they have the power to enact it and can have it. But it is my contention, and the contention of those opposed to prohibition, that in the 48 States of the Union there are so many different conditions of society, so many different atmospheres, that it is not wise overnight, on the 1st of July, to declare the whole United States under prohibition law, particularly against popular protest in many communities.

Now, I am speaking as a man who has preached and practiced temperance all his lifetime. I stated to Senator SHEPPARD and other men interested in the prohibition law that it is not the wise thing to attempt to carry out prohibition on the 1st of July, when this law shall take effect, because all signs point to the fact that the war is over; that peace will have been here and the armies practically demobilized. The men in the liquor business have been engaged in it for years by sanction of the Government. The Government is accepting their money now by hundreds of millions of dollars in every city and town of the United States where license obtains, and the Treasury itself is spending hundreds of millions of dollars gained from liquor fees.

It is only recently that the people have decreed prohibition, and we should go slow in assailing the point of view of men engaged in a business legalized by this Government since its foundation.

When this Congress passed the law it said, "Gentlemen, this law shall take effect in a year from the date of ratification by the last State," and these men, some of whose entire fortunes are in this business, who have carried it on in hotels and restaurants as well as saloons, have paid their taxes into the Treasury of the United States until January next, but they do not know now where they stand. They are looking to Congress to do them justice and see that the provisions of that act which said that this law shall not be operative until a year from January shall be carried out. You men who voted for this law a year ago made that promise to these men, and I simply ask you to carry it out. It is the decent thing to do.

The gentleman from Ohio knows little about the history of this country when he assails by the wholesale the character of the foreign born. Where would this country be to-day if it were not for the foreign born and the native born? Why, hardly any one of us has an ancestry of 100 years in this country. One of President Wilson's parents was foreign born, and numerous other Presidents had a like situation. There are villains among the foreign born, but the so-called native stock has its share.

As for the men in the liquor business, all they ask at this hour is an opportunity to get out of business as Congress agreed. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] talks about the German brewers. The gentleman ought to be above that sort of talk. That is gone by. Let us stick to the facts. Why should the people of North Carolina and Texas tell us up in Massachusetts how we should regulate our personal habits?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman that I shall not object to the two minutes but I shall object to any further extension of this sort of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let us get down to the State of Massachusetts—a pretty good Commonwealth. From 1620 until the hour the Twenty-sixth Division, from Massachusetts, drove the Germans at Chateau-Thierry her reputation has been unassailable. What are the facts in regard to that Puritan Commonwealth on the prohibition question? In the only popular elections that have been held in that State during the past six months, since this prohibition amendment went into effect, because of the manner in which that amendment was enacted, practically every town and village that has voted upon the

proposition of license has voted for license. Towns and villages down in Plymouth County and in other agricultural portions of the State, that never voted for liquor, voted for license, and liquor is being sold in those places now. The great, big city of Boston voted 2 to 1 for license. The great, big city of New York voted 5 to 1 for license, and in the great, big city of Chicago, in a recent election, they voted 3 or 4 to 1. The women of Chicago voted against prohibition. To hear the gentleman talk, all these people are anarchists. The gentleman spoke about Mrs. Rooney. That woman made a mistake. She said so when she got down from the table. She corrected her statement when she realized what she said. We do it here every day. Why is she not entitled to the same chance. She got excited. She did not step upon the table; I was there. She was lifted upon the table, and it is not fair to use the indiscreet language of an excited woman as an argument for prohibition. [Laughter.] Mrs. Rooney the gentleman from Ohio classes with the German brewer. She is just as much a German as MADDEN is. Everybody knows that. I thank the Chairman and the House for the courtesy extended to me. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Orange, Tex., post office: For completion, $10,000.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend page 7, line 22, by striking out the item authorizing $10,000 for the Orange, Tex., post office. I move to strike out the entire line. The purpose of that is, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, strike out line 22.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is line 22?

The CLERK (reading)—

Orange, Tex., post office: For completion, $10,000.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact this item came over from the former bill and is made for the purpose of enlarging the appropriation heretofore made, that is now wholly inadequate. The original appropriation was made in 1913, and I prefer to have this item eliminated, in order, at the proper time, to bring it before the committee and discuss the matter and get a proper appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in this item for Orange, Tex., the law authorizes a building there to cost $60,000. There has already been appropriated $50,000 of the amount, and this is for the completion of that building. If this goes out, there will be no appropriation to complete that building at all in this Congress. This is for the next year, and I want the gentleman thoroughly to understand what he is doing. I am just as anxious as he is to make the bill as small as possible, and if Orange, Tex., does not want it I am willing to have it go out, and I will say to the gentleman if it goes out there will be some time before he will get some money down at Orange, Tex., and work will be stopped when the $50,000 appropriation is expended.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I desire my position to be understood, and to say that no work has started on the project. The specifications were submitted, bids were rejected—nobody would undertake the work at the price named—and the amount is wholly inadequate. I would like very much to take up this project before the committee at the proper time.

Mr. GOOD. This is not the proper committee, and I will say to the gentleman he will never get more than $10,000 in the report for this building from the Committee on Appropriations until Congress has made a new authorization, and that may be some years——

Mr. BOX. Then I will withdraw my amendment on the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to execute and give effect to the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 30, 1908 (35 Stat., p. 537): For additional salary of $1,000 for the Supervising Architect of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1920; foremen draftsmen, architectural draftsmen, and apprentice draftsmen, at rates of pay from $840 to $2,500 per annum; structural engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from $840 to $2,500 per annum; mechanical, sanitary, electrical, heating and ventilating, and illuminating engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from $1,200 to $2 400 per annum; computers and estimators, at rates of pay from $1,600 to $2,500 per annum; the expenditures under all the foregoing classes for which a minimum and maximum rate of compensation is stated, not to exceed $176,800; supervising superintendents, superintendents, and junior superintendents of construction and inspectors, at rates of pay from $1,600 to $2,900 per annum, not to exceed $206,650; expenses of superintendence, including expences of all inspectors and other officers and employees, on duty or detailed in connection with work on public buildings and the furnishing and equipment thereof, and the work of the Supervising Architect's Office, under orders from the Treasury Department; for the transportation of household goods, incident to change of headquarters of supervising superintendents, superintendents, and junior superintendents of construction and inspectors, not in excess of 5,000 pounds at any one time, together with the necessary expense incident to packing and draying the same, not to exceed in any one year a total expenditure of $7,500; office rent and expenses of superintendents, including temporary stenographic and other assistance in the preparation of reports and the care of public property, etc.; advertising; office supplies, including drafting materials, specially prepared paper, typewriting machines, adding machines, and other mechanical labor-saving devices, and exchange of same; furniture, carpets, electric-light fixtures, and office equipment; telephone service; not to exceed $6,000 for stationery; not to exceed $1,000 for books of reference, law books, technical periodicals and journals; not to exceed $10,000 for transporting drawings, miscellaneous supplies, etc., for public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department; contingencies of every kind and description, traveling expenses of site agents, recording deeds and other evidences of title, photographic instruments, chemical plates, and photographic materials, and such other articles and supplies and such minor and incidental expenses not enumerated, connected solely with work on public buildings, the acquisition of sites, and the administrative work connected with the annual appropriations under the Supervising Architect's Office as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and specially order or approve, but not including heat, light, janitor service, awnings, curtains, or any expenses for the general maintenance of the Treasury Building, or surveys, plaster models, progress photographs, test-pit borings, or mill and shop inspection, $489,050.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee the necessity of providing for the additional salary of $1,000 for the Supervising Architect for the Treasury for the fiscal year of 1920. It is a provision that has been carried for some time, and yet during the last two years, I do not know but five or six years, possibly not quite as long as that, there has been no Supervising Architect of the Treasury. Now, it seems to me that there is no necessity for carrying an increase of salary for an official who has not been appointed, and if we are not going to have a Supervising Architect of the Treasury, why should not we appoint the executive officer down there who has carried on this department for all these years, increase his salary to that of Supervising Architect, and eliminate the Supervising Architect?

Mr. GOOD. Well, I agree that there ought to be something done with regard to fixing the salary of the Supervising Architect and that the salary should not be carried in two bills. As the gentleman knows, we carry in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill an item of $5,000 for the salary of this official and then have been carrying $1,000 here. That was adopted sometime ago, and has been followed, as the gentleman has stated, for several years, and now, while we do not have a Supervising Architect of the Treasury, yet, I suppose, when the amount was estimated for it was contemplated to appoint some one to this vacancy. The matter was thoroughly considered by the former committee, and we simply adopted to this extent the former bill. We had no hearings upon this proposition. It is a matter that has been carried in the bill for a number of years, carried in the bill as reported and passed by the House, and we have carried it again here.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Tennessee make the familiar explanation as to why we have no Supervising Architect of the Treasury?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee can give the gentleman from Massachusetts no information as to why that position has not been filled further than the statement that for a number of years past Mr. Wetmore has been Acting Supervising Architect. I forget the name——

Mr. WALSH. Executive officer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; but I say I forget the name of the last Supervising Architect. Now, I can not give the gentleman any information as to why this position has never been filled.

The bills have been carrying the salary, but the salary, as a matter of fact, has remained in the Treasury, and it has not been used. I think it would be unwise to drop it, because the position exists. It was created by law, and in the present situation, if the executive officer was for any reason to leave the office, it would be necessary to have some man of equal competency, and this position would probably be filled. Now, I have understood that the real reason this place has not been filled by the promotion or appointment of the present executive officer is that he is not a recognized or graduate architect, and under the law it would be necessary to appoint as Supervising Architect some one who is a recognized architect. Now, Mr. Wetmore does not come up to that specific requirement, regardless of the fact that we all know he is splendidly qualified as executive officer.

Mr. WALSH. How do we get around the provisions of law that require plans, and so forth, to be approved by the Supervising Architect when we have not a Supervising Architect?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He is the Acting Supervising Architect.

Mr. WALSH. Then, if he is the Acting Supervising Architect, I think the committee having the matter in charge would see to it that he should get the architect's salary. He has the Supervising Architect's responsibilities and duties.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have just stated to the gentleman that, as I understand it, under the law, he can not be appointed to the position of Supervising Architect, because he has not the qualifications set forth in the law, in that he is not a qualified architect.

Mr. WALSH. Well, one of the reasons I am not rabid for this salary is that the executive officer of this department is performing the duties of an official who is getting $6,000 while he himself is getting only $3,500, and he ought to get the former salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Architectural competitions: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for architectural services under contracts entered into prior to the repeal of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain plans and specifications for public buildings to be erected under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and providing for local supervision of the construction of the same," approved February 20, 1893, including additional commissions accruing under certain of said contracts due to increase in the limits of cost of certain buildings, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, and including payment for the services from July 1, 1912, of the architect of the Hilo, Hawaii, building, specially selected under the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1911, the unexpended balances of the appropriations for architectural competitions, public buildings, for the fiscal year 1919, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is continued and made available for said purposes during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information from the chairman of the committee in reference to the delay in the payment of this architect's compensation. I would like to know why this matter has been running so long?

Mr. GOOD. You have reference now to the Supervising Architect?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. To this architect on the Hilo, Hawaii, building. You are now providing for compensation from July 1, 1912, to 1919.

Mr. GOOD. That does not relate to the compensation for architect back to July 1, 1912. That is the date of the contract.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is the way I read it, beginning in line 7 and reading through line 8, "including the payment for the services from July 1, 1912, of the architect of the Hilo, Hawaii, building." I want to know why this man has not been paid out of this item right along?

Mr. GOOD. This matter was one of the items that passed the House before without objection, and the present committee did not hold any hearings on it at all, and the hearings before the former committee are not very extensive. There are just two or three questions and answers, as follows:

Mr. BYRNES. Under architectural competitions you are asking a reappropriation?

Mr. WETMORE. Yes, sir; we have been carrying that amount from year to year.

Mr. BYRNES. What have you on that account?

Mr. WETMORE. We have only two buildings under that. One is the proposed building at Honolulu, and the other is the New Haven building.

That is the only information that was given in the former hearings. As I said before, we took the bill as a basis where no objection was made or no new estimate was made. We simply did not have the time to go into the former hearings or hold new hearings on those items.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I merely call the chairman's attention to the item at this time, and I may ask the chairman to consent to return to it if we get some information on it before we conclude the bill. It seems to me unusual that the salary of this architect should have been running along since 1912, and we now propose to pay him for the service.

Mr. GOOD. I shall be very glad to get the information for the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Operating supplies: For fuel, steam, gas for lighting and heating purposes, water, ice, lighting supplies, electric current for lighting and power purposes, telephone service for custodian forces; removal of ashes and rubbish, snow, and ice; cutting grass and weeds, washing towels, and miscellaneous items for the use of the custodian forces in the care and maintenance of completed and occupied public buildings and the grounds thereof under the control of the Treasury Department, and in the care and maintenance of the equipment and furnishing in such buildings; miscellaneous supplies, tools, and appliances required in the operation (not embracing repairs) of the mechanical equipment, including heating, plumbing, hoisting, gas piping, ventilating, vacuum-cleaning and refrigerating apparatus, electric-light plants, meters, interior penumatic-tube and intercommunicating telephone systems, conduit wiring, call-bell and signal systems in such buildings (including the customhouse in the District of Columbia, but excluding any other public building under the control of the Treasury Department within the District of Columbia, and excluding also marine hospitals and quarantine stations, mints, branch mints, and assay offices, and personal services, except for work done by contract or for temporary job labor under exigency not exceeding at one time the sum of $100 at any one building), $2,300,000. The appropriation made herein for gas shall include the rental and use of gas governors, when ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury in writing: *Provided*, That rentals shall not be paid for such gas governors greater than 35 per cent of the actual value of the gas saved thereby, which saving shall be determined by such tests as the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to contract for the purchase of fuel for public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department in advance of the availability of the appropriation for the payment thereof. Such contracts, however, shall not exceed the necessities of the current year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

What is the purpose of authorizing these contracts for fuel in advance of the appropriation for the payment and to restrict the contract to the necessities of the current year? Does that mean the fiscal year or the current calendar year?

Mr. GOOD. The current fiscal year.

Mr. WALSH. Does it mean that?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. That was the intention. The department finds that it can not go in the market now and make its contract for coal after the 1st day of July, whereas all other concerns and industrial establishments let their contracts for fuel along in the months of March and April. Now, under the present arrangement and without this legislation they can not let contracts for the fuel until after the appropriation is made. Now, if this provision is carried next spring it will permit the Treasury Department to make their contracts for fuel in advance of an actual appropriation, but not to exceed the necessities for the current year.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I do not agree with the gentleman that the phrase "current year" means the current fiscal year. I think you will find that means the current calendar year.

Mr. GOOD. They have not so treated it.

Mr. WALSH. They have not so treated it because it was not in the authorization before. And I think in order to make that free from doubt you should insert the words "current fiscal year."

Mr. GOOD. I move, then, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order——

Mr. GOOD. I move that after the word "current" the word "fiscal," in line 20, be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 20, after the word "current," insert the word "fiscal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HICKS. As I understand the chairman of the committee, this proviso was put in there, of course, with the idea of saving money.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it was.

Mr. HICKS. Because in the spring of the year you can buy coal more cheaply than at any other time in the year. It seems to me that is a wise provision and will stand for economy in Federal expenditures.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and they will be assured of a supply.

Mr. HICKS. Does the gentleman know how much we shall save in this department, figuring the price of coal in April or May as compared with the price in August of this year?

Mr. GOOD. We did not go into that at all, except as to the principle.

Mr. HICKS. You went into the principle, but not into the details?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of all necessary employees, other than employees required for the administrative work of the bureau of the class provided for and specified in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, and plate printers and plate printers' assistants, $2,300,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, including $8,400 for custody of dies, rolls, and plates: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of larger denomination than those that may be canceled or retired, except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act "To define and

fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Will the chairman of the committee state why this item is increased some $140,000 over the February bill and more than $1,500,000 over the last year's appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and his assistant all are of the opinion that they will use all of this money. They complained very bitterly because their estimate had been cut in the former bill, and they took this view of the matter, that if the reduced appropriation as carried in the last bill were adopted it would be necessary for them to reduce their force and also reduce the wages of the employees in order to get the work done. While the committee called their attention to the fact that their expenditures would depend upon the amount of work they would actually do, yet they were positive that they would be compelled to do at least all the work they had estimated for, and that if the estimates were reduced they would take it as an invitation by Congress to reduce wages. We felt that was a matter over which Congress had no control, and we knew nothing about the wages, whether they are right or wrong. But we felt that the Director of the Bureau was rather "passing the buck" to Congress in regard to establishing wages when we knew nothing about it at all and could not investigate it at this time.

Mr. WALSH. Of course that is the usual practice. They have not got to print any Liberty bonds down there in the future, and there was a lot of work that was put on the bureau during the war that will be eliminated. Of course they will say, "If you do not increase our appropriation, we will have to cut down wages or have to reduce our force." That would be a public calamity in the view of the chiefs of these departments. But it seems to me there ought to be some better excuse than the fact that they are afraid that if they do not keep everybody busy down there they will have to reduce wages.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I think it was developed at the hearings that they have reduced their force a thousand employees, and that every day they were reducing their force. To be exact, they have reduced their force by 1,600.

Mr. WALSH. Well, we have increased the appropriation $140,000 in a few months' time. I do not think there is very much consistency or sound financial reasoning in such a policy as that. Last year we appropriated only $1,800,000, and they managed to struggle along on that and print all these Liberty bonds, and, if I mistake not, a lot of these thrift stamps and war-saving certificates. All that work will have been eliminated by the time this appropriation will be available, and yet they have increased the amount $140,000 over the amount reported in the bill which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] had charge of last February. I would like to know if the committee was informed as to any extra work or new kind of duties or responsibilities that were to be imposed upon the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing which make this appropriation necessary?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the persons who are being discharged in the main are employees who were engaged on the bond work, which is not paid for out of this appropriation at all. The engraving of the bonds was taken care of out of a special fund. This fund is intended to pay for the work specified in lines 21 to 24. I agree with the gentleman that the excuse is not a very good one. I think that the bureau ought not to say to Congress and say to their employees that if Congress does not give the full amount they will have to reduce wages. The manly thing for the bureau to do would be to say, "The wages are so much, and if we have enough work that must be done and Congress has not appropriated the necessary money, we will ask for an additional appropriation."

But that was not the proposition that was put up to the committee at all. Somebody encouraged employees to come by the scores representing the bureau, saying that if we did not give this amount of money they would be discharged in many instances and in other instances their wages would be reduced, in order to do this amount of work with a given amount of money.

Now, last year they did appropriate $1,960,000 all told; but I will say to the gentleman that there is before the bureau an estimate for a large increase in this class of work, and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the Secretary of the Treasury anticipate that they will have enough work at the present scale to use up this entire appropriation. At any rate, I will say to the gentleman that the committee did not see that it could go into the question of wages at all; that it was not up to the committee to assume the authority that had already been delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury. Therefore we felt that while we were giving an enlarged amount it was not an invitation to employ more people than were necessary, it was not an invitation to pay a cent more than the work was worth, but was only an appropriation that was wrung from the committee in this way, in order to prevent what might be the happening of a disaster if they should reduce wages below a living wage and then throw all the blame upon Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Suppose we grant this increase upon that argument and contention. Where are we going to be with the rest of the Government departments if they come drumming up appropriations with the same kind of an argument? Are we going to grant these unwarranted increases in the appropriations that will mount up to nearly a billion dollars?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman understands that they have an established scale of wages in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. WALSH. It has been increased within a year or so.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not understand that this contemplates the slightest increase in the scale of wages, but the statement was made by the director of the bureau that he can not do the work which he will have to do during the next fiscal year with the appropriation that has been made, and that he must have an increase. I will say to the gentleman that the increase he said he must have was considerably more than the committee allowed. He was very frank in saying to the committee that he would have to come back for a deficiency. My idea is that in these bills we ought to appropriate what we know the Government will need for the next fiscal year, when it can be ascertained, and not force a deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact: They asked for $269,000 more than the bill carries. We gave them $140,000 more than the former bill. But one of the principal contentions, in which, I think, there is some merit, is that the former bill, caring for the plate printers, in lines 19 to 25, carried practically all that was asked for, whereas this item was a reduction, and that there is a corresponding relation between the two, and that if that item was cut to that extent, then they claimed this other item ought also to have been cut. But they did not cut that. The former Congress permitted them to have practically what they asked for the plate printers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WALSH. In line 8, page 24, strike out "$2,300,000" and insert "$2,160,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 24, line 8, strike out "$2,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,160,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the amount that was carried in the other bill, and it would seem from the statements of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] and his colleague upon the committee [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee] that the requirements of the bureau are no different than they were when the bill was reported in February—that that bill covered practically the same amount of work to be done and the same number of sheets, with a few changes, perhaps, and, as far as the committee knows, the same scale of wages paid. I think we ought not to encourage a demand for unwarranted increases unless it can be shown that the work of a particular department has been greatly increased. I submit to the committee that, even though they have increased the estimates, they have not shown the necessity for jumping up the appropriation in this respect $140,000. I trust the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not feel that there was anything sacred in the amount fixed by the former committee and the amount adopted by Congress. There was no discussion over the item. The action of the former Congress reduced the estimates by $269,000. We have added $140,000 to the amount carried in the former bill, and even that is $129,000 less than the estimate. The committee felt that Congress could not afford to say how many men the Bureau of Engraving and Printing should employ. We could not say how many bills the Government would actually en-

grave, and we had to take the advice of some one, and we rather anticipated that they might be able to make some reduction, and therefore we made a reduction of $129,000. I admit it is a guess.

Mr. WALSH. How did the committee arrive at $129,000? How does the gentleman know that will not cripple them before the end of the year? How is it that you did not give them the entire amount if you have such faith in that branch that you can not say how many employees they will have?

Mr. GOOD. It was the judgment of the committee that a reduction would bring this item more into harmony with the item that follows.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MCKENZIE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, had requested a conference with the House upon said bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wages of plate printers, at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the rates usually paid for such work, including the wages of printers' assistants, when employed, $2,035,455, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of larger denominations than those that may be canceled or retired, except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes, approved March 14, 1900: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be used to increase the wages of plate printers until all printers' assistants receive not less than $2.24 per day.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman a question, if I may be excused. I was absent from the Chamber meeting a delegation when page 18 was read. On that page you appropriate money for the mechanical laborers with the custodian of the public buildings under the Treasury, bottom of page 18 in the bill. I want to inquire of the chairman if that was for the purpose of bringing the rate of wages up to the standard paid for the same service in the localities in which these men are employed? I understand the fact to be that all over the United States the men who have been in the employ of the custodians of public buildings doing mechanical work—plumbers, electricians, carpenters, bricklayers, blacksmiths, all trades requiring skilled labor—have not received an increase in their wages notwithstanding the fact that there has been an enormous increase in the wages throughout the communities in which they live. It seems to me to be a great hardship and I wondered if this was to rectify that, and if not, I think we ought to.

Mr. GOOD. I think there is some increase in the bonus that these men will be entitled to. During the present fiscal year they are entitled to, I think, $120, and under the provisions of the law now they will get $240 a year. This item is an increase of $150,000 over the appropriation of the present year.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did the committee give them all they asked for?

Mr. GOOD. They asked for $3,775,000 and we have carried $3,650,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does the gentleman remember the reason why it was cut $125,000?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that one of the reasons for increasing the estimate——

Mr. CALDWELL. I am not criticizing the increase; what I want to know is why the men are not paid the prevailing wages, because the Government ought to be the best employer of labor.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman will have to go to the Secretary of the Treasury; the Committee on Appropriations has nothing to do with the wages.

Mr. CALDWELL. But they ask for $3,775,000.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and when they asked for that they did not know that the increase in bonus would be made and the bonus is paid from another appropriation.

Mr. CALDWELL. I see; and that is what I wanted to know.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, $10,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to inquire about the provision on line 10 for rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, $10,000. What is that item for?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, a part of the Arlington Building will not be ready for occupancy for at least 60 or 90 days. When that addition is complete that building will be of sufficient size for housing the entire bureau, but it is not sufficient now to take care of it. The bureau is occupying the Southern Building at a rental of $40,000 a year, which is something over $3,300 a month. This is simply to pay the rent on that building by the month until the new addition to the Arlington Building is complete, and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance can be moved in there.

Mr. HICKS. Then I understand this $10,000 for that building provides for a contract which may be terminated at the end of the month? We have not a yearly arrangement?

Mr. GOOD. No; it is a month-to-month contract.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For distinctive paper for United States currency, national bank currency, and Federal reserve bank currency, 142,800,000 sheets, in order that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing may deliver 136,000,000 sheets of United States currency, national bank and Federal reserve bank currency, including transportation of paper, traveling, mill, and other necessary expenses, $685,440; expenses of officer detailed from the Treasury Department, $50 per month when actually on duty, $600; 3 registers, at $1,380 each; 6 counters, at $800 each; guards—1, $1,000, 4, at $900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $840 each; in all, $701,260.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is somewhat of an increase in this item. Last year it was $630,985 and is not $701,260. Is not this a part of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. A part of the force that is printing these sheets?

Mr. GOOD. This is for paper entirely. No part of this can be expended for personal services.

Mr. WALSH. Well, there is a provision there for six counters, at $800 each, and for guards.

Mr. GOOD. Those people are not stationed in the bureau at all. They are at the mills and are detailed in the mills where the paper is made for counting purposes, and so forth. That is not for any work on the paper. The increase is accounted for because of the fact that it is an increased quantity of paper that is to be purchased.

Mr. WALSH. Fifty dollars per month when actually on duty means these counters when they are at the mill?

Mr. GOOD. That refers to one officer detailed from the Treasury, when he is actually on duty.

The Clerk read as follows:

Scales for customs service: For construction and installation of special automatic and recording scales for weighing merchandise, etc., in connection with imports at the various ports of entry under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, $75,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so to ask the chairman why that item on page 30, beginning on line 11, was increased to $75,000. The year before it was $27,000. What is the reason for that tremendous increase?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, last year an appropriation was made of $27,000, and the unexpended balance was reappropriated. This year they practically have no unexpended balance and are asking for a considerably larger sum. They asked for $130,000 for automatic electric weighing machines to weigh sugar at certain ports. I think they have already installed some of these weighing machines at Boston, and they desire, because of the safety, and they think of the saving and prevention of fraud in the weighing of sugar, to install the modern automatic machines at other points. The committee gave them what would be sufficient to install machines in some other ports where sugar is admitted.

Mr. HICKS. The experts think these machines would obviate such frauds as we had perpetrated seven or eight years ago in the weighing of sugar?

Mr. GOOD. That was their opinion, that it would eliminate fraud in the weighing of sugar and expedite the work.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I read some days ago that people were smuggling goods into our country by means of aeroplanes. Can the chairman inform me if any amount of this $10,000,000 is to prevent such smuggling, or whether that question was taken up at all by the committee?

Mr. GOOD. I understand the $10,000,000 or any part of it may be used to prevent frauds upon the customs service. That is a pretty broad term. I should think it could be used pretty generally to prevent the smuggling of any goods in any way which would be a fraud upon the Government.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I wanted to know whether the subject had been brought to the attention of the committee when they were considering this special appropriation. I refer to the question of smuggling by aeroplane.

Mr. GOOD. No; the committee did not hear any statement on that, but accepted the item carried in the former bill.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to find out from the chairman of the committee in reference to this $10,000,000 appropriation in line 10. Is that an annual affair? Is that what we are spending each year?

Mr. GOOD. Last year it was $10,500,000, and this year we are carrying it at $10,000,000, but that is practically the amount that has been carried, as I understand, for the last few years.

Mr. KREIDER. It seems to be quite a large amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, trachoma, influenza, or infantile paralysis, to aid State and local boards, or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, $400,000: *Provided*, That a detailed report of the expenditures hereunder shall annually hereafter be submitted to Congress.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise to put in an amendment by saying "or other epidemic," so that if it becomes necessary they can quarantine or guard against some new disease coming along? For example, we had the influenza this year.

Mr. GOOD. The department itself has not asked for this, and if we did adopt the suggestion some officer might think anything an epidemic and thereby commence spending this money that is only intended for the prevention of epidemics which are epidemics that might result in injury to health or life in a general way. I think the gentleman can see the objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. The word "influenza" is put in this bill for the first time.

Mr. GOOD. That is at their request.

Mr. CALDWELL. The bill did not have it in before, and if they had had it in before it could have been used against the influenza.

Mr. GOOD. There was a special appropriation, as is suggested to me by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There is no special appropriation here.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of equipment and furniture for the additional building of the Hygienic Laboratory, $20,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROWNING, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BURDICK, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MURPHY, for one day, on account of illness in his family.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted—

To Mr. FULLER of Illinois to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Lizzie M. Worster (H. R. 5882, 1st sess., 65th Cong.) and in the case of Ruth McClay (H. R. 9725, 2d sess., 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

To Mr. ASHBROOK to withdraw the papers in the case of Annie Myers (H. R. 15602, 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, June 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reference to the letter of January 28, 1919, printed as House Document 1746, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, containing a list of 156 buildings and 7 extensions of Federal buildings which had been authorized and not yet constructed (H. Doc. No. 124), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NOLAN, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 49), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6217) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Knoxville, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Indianola, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6219) increasing the limit of cost of a public building and site at Tullahoma, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 6221) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the Osage civilization-fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 6222) to remove a certain tract or lots of land in Cristobal, Canal Zone, from the operation and effect of the Executive order of the President of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the act of Congress of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., ch. 390, 565); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6223) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Montesano, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hoquiam, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Centralia, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6226) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Camas, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kelso, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chehalis, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sumner, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate the city of Puyallup, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Stadium High School, Tacoma, Wash., one German or Austrian cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) providing for the payment of mileage to certain officers of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) authorizing the Secretary of War to remove or dispose of timber on the Three Tree Point Military Reservation and the Fort Canby Military Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to increase the monthly salaries of registers and receivers of local land offices; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6236) to provide for an investigation to ascertain the feasibility of the construction of a reservoir and irrigation project in the Canjilon and Cebolla Rivers, in the county of Rio Arriba, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LAZARO (by request): A bill (H. R. 6237) to revive with amendments an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 6238) to provide a tariff and to obtain revenue in connection with the metallic contents of zinc ores and products thereof, and repealing existing laws fixing the rates of duty on such commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 6239) repealing section 630 of the act to provide revenue, and for other purposes, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 6240) to amend section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6241) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greencastle, Putnam County, Ind., four German cannons or field pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Danville, Hendricks County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newport, Vermillion County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6244) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Terre Haute, Vigo County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6245) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Brazil, Clay County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6246) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rockville, Parke County, Ind., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6247) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Poplarville, Pearl River County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6248) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Waynesboro, Wayne County, Miss.; to the Commitee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6249) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Ellisville, Jones County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 6250) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Alden, Delaware County, Pa., one captured cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6251) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salyersville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 6252) to increase pensions for total deafness; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 121) requesting the President to furnish information as to the need for continuing the censorship of mails; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 122) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish copies of correspondence pertaining to Mexican affairs from January 1, 1915, to date; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 123) to investigate in re payment of interest and principal on Russian bonds; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WINGO: Resolution (H. Res. 124) to print 2,500 copies of the Soil Survey of Miller County, Ark.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 125) to print for the use of the House 1,000 copies of the speech of Hon. F. C. HICKS on the American flag; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 126) to thank the women of America for their splendid devotion to the cause for which their country entered the great World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, urging enactment of a measure relating to the Federal home-loan bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, urging enactment of a measure relating to Federal home-loan bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the enactment of a measure relating to Federal home-loan bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, for modification of the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 6253) for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Lighthouses; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6254) for the relief of Ethel Fredrickson and daughter Ethel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6255) for the relief of estate of J. P. Dieter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6256) for the relief of A. H. Rebentish; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6257) granting a pension to Charles W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 6258) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Christy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to George H. Bruckner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6260) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. I. Beall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 6261) granting a pension to Henry Hazlett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6262) granting an increase of pension to Michael Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6263) granting a pension to Irwin R. Troxell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6264) granting an increase of pension to Reuben P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6265) granting a pension to Alwill Hacklander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6266) for the relief of Alexander Read; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6267) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Tyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6268) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint William Shelby Barriger captain of Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6269) for the relief of the heirs of James A. Frey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6270) granting a pension to Joseph B. De Langevin, alias Joseph Louis Lansberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6271) granting a pension to Timothy O'Neill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6272) granting a pension to Peter Thomassen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6273) granting a pension to Fidelia A. Baker-Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6274) granting a pension to Jane Mathilda McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6275) granting a pension to Charles Youngblood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6276) granting a pension to Aurelia E. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6277) granting a pension to Amanda Ball Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6278) granting an increase of pension to William D. Vaughn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6279) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6280) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hanshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6282) granting an increase of pension to Ione D. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6283) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) granting an increase of pension to Riley A. Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6286) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Cortright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6287) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6288) for the relief of George F. Weaver; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6289) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Laird McCormick, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6290) for the relief of William McCutcheon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) for the relief of E. Willard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) for the relief of Thomas J. K. Looney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6293) for the relief of Augustus Sipple; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6294) for the relief of Lon Lewis, alias Alonza E. Schneider; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) for the relief of Tacoma Tug & Barge Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6296) authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians residing in the State of Washington to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6297) granting an increase of pension to John H. Schoonover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 6298) granting a pension to John P. Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 6299) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 6300) for the relief of Herbert R. Cornforth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 6301) for the relief of Nathan Manzer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 6302) granting a pension to David Rushlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6303) granting a pension to Ferdinand Lambert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6304) granting a pension to Eliza M. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) to correct the military record of Benjamin Jadwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) to correct the military record of Jesse Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6308) granting a pension to George Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6309) granting a pension to Isaac Slygh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6310) granting a pension to Margaret Howell Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 6311) for the relief of Patrick Doonan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 6312) granting a pension to Harry L. Frizzell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6313) granting a pension to Thomas Spurrier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 6314) granting an increase of pension to George Bellamy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 6315) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Hasson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6316) granting an increase of pension to Israel W. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6317) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Brubaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6318) granting a pension to James R. Burroughs; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers' Association, New York City, urging retention of zone advance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Joe A. Corpo, Prost G. V. Conti, P. Americo, S. Paruelli, E. Fersarino, P. Matteo, Joe Monaco, representing 100 members of Italian Society, for justice in Italian affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of C. H. Smith and other citizens, of Cleveland, Ohio, to remove tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Slova, No. 173, S. N. P. J., Slavanian Society, for justice in Jugo-Slav questions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: Petition of citizens of Tangier, Va., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of citizens of Galveston and Harris Counties, Tex., requesting repeal of revenue tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream when served at soda fountains and ice-cream parlors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSS: Petition or memorial of soldiers and citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of residents of Ohio against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers' Association of the United States urging retention of zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COLE: Petition or memorial of Hancock County Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Findlay, Ohio, protesting against any measure being enacted to discontinue war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of residents of Cleveland, Ohio, and vicinity, requesting repeal of section 904 of revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against taxes on candy, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of city council of Cleveland, Ohio, urging the loaning of money for the construction of homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for legislation to enforce national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, for the repeal of sales taxes on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition and memorial of sundry citizens of Hancock County, Ill., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, as recommended by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of National Guard Association of United States of America for the establishing of

a National Guard Corps of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of The Bronx Board of Trade of New York against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers' Association of the United States, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of Jobs Corners Grange, No. 1110, Millerton, Pa., protesting against any repeal of war-time prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Williamsport and Newberry, Pa., favoring a repeal of tax on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Maryland Bankers' Association, the Baltimore Clearing House, and numerous trade bodies of Baltimore, Md., for prompt return of railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lyon, Conklin & Co. (Inc.), Baltimore, Md., favoring the budget system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry Wampole Co., pharmacists, Baltimore, Md., against House bills 3458 and 3461; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, numbering almost 1,000,000 women, for war prohibition and against any repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Garrett Park Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, with membership of over 400, Baltimore, Md., asking for enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of over 4,000 residents of the District of Columbia, urging repeal of section 630 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of churches of Portland, Oreg., on subject of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of United War Work Campaign, urging passage of bill for support of expenses of war work; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Public Library, relating to reading matter for the blind and approving House bill 2847; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of Beekman Lodge, 576, in relation to enforcing prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of California Pharmaceutical Association, protesting against the excise taxes as mentioned in sections 630 and 907 of the revenue bill for 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hon. John Joy Edson, chairman of the board of management of the bureau for placing returning soldiers and sailors and marines in the District of Columbia, indorsing the work of the United States Employment Service and asking for an appropriation to carry on the work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Manufacturers' Association of California against the Federal Employment Service and asking for the discontinuance of the same; to the Committee on Approriations.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Robert Schwatz, of New York, for the repeal of the war-time prohibition so far as it relates to beer and light wine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John B. Densmore, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the repeal of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Ernest A. Fay, of New York, for the home-loan bills now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, by Alfred Reeves, general manager, of New York, for the repeal of taxes on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the members of the Union Congregational Church, of Churchville, N. Y., urging the early passage of adequate enforcement legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEIGEL: Petition of Young Men's Hebrew Association of New York, protesting against pograms in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Homer City, citizens of Foxburg and vicinity, favoring repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of Clarion churches, Clarion; United Presbyterian Church and Methodist Episcopal Church, Freeport; Methodist Episcopal Church, United Presbyterian Church, Eddyville Reformed Church, Rev. L. O. Carbaugh, and Rev. G. W. McIntyre, Dayton; Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Armstrong County, Appolo; Rev. L. E. Elbel, Shippenville, all of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pioneer, Ohio, protesting against the proposed enactment of the war prohibition act eliminating beer and wine from its provisions, also urging the speedy enactment of the war and Federal constitutional enforcement code to enforce constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Lion Society of Christian Endeavor, Marion Township, Henry County, Ohio, protesting any modification of the prohibition law and urging immediate enactment of stringent laws for the strict enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from business men of Ridgway, Colo., urging repeal of war tax on sodas, ice creams, soft drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Glade Park, Colo., protesting against light wine and beer amendment to national prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Delta County, Colo., urging the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition for repeal of taxes on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Franklin County (Me.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union convention, asking for legislation to make effective the eighteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of various citizens of Fort Smith, Ark., urging repeal of tax on ice cream and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June 20, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pause at the threshold of another day, a day inviting us to service, labor, and sacrifice, to spend one sacred and holy moment in Thy presence, believing that if we lift up reverent and loving hearts to Thee we shall go out upon the tasks of the day better equipped for the service that we may render, that we shall know better the meaning and import of the tasks of life, and that we shall read more clearly the final issue and the eternal relation of the questions which we must face. So we pray Thee to guide us this day by Thine own unerring counsel. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINS) took the chair.

PETER GOELET GERRY, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. LEVER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Timewell, Ill., remonstrating against the modification or repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the civil-service retirement bill, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of Local Union, No. 558, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Sheffield, Ala., setting forth their grievances with the War Department regarding working conditions, etc., at Nitrate Plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of the city commission of Hot Springs, Ark., praying for an investigation into the high cost of gasoline and oils, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLT presented two telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens of Providence, R. I., praying for self-determination in the matter of Fiume, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Providence, R. I., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of the third congressional district of Kansas, praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to submit for the consideration of the Senate a petition numerously—in fact, almost unanimously—signed by the citizens of one of the thriving, prosperous agricultural communities of Greenbrier County, W. Va., protesting against the league of nations. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a memorial of the District Conference of the Southern Methodist Church, of Bluefield, W. Va., and a memorial of the congregation and the Sunday School of the Twentieth Street Baptist Church, of Huntington, W. Va., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KNOX presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *June 18, 1919.*

Whereas the Frankford Arsenal, located in Philadelphia, is in danger of being closed for lack of sufficient appropriation by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the closing of this arsenal will deprive hundreds of men of employment and bring suffering to a large community; and

Whereas these employees gave their best services to the Government during the war with Germany and had said arsenal turning out ammunition 24 hours of each day; and

Whereas in return for their patriotic service and loyalty it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to provide ample funds to continue the operation of permanent Government properties, and thereby provide employment for its loyal citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does hereby request and urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate immediately ample funds for the operation of the Frankford Arsenal, and to keep at least 2,400 men continuously employed at said arsenal.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the commonwealth to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

THOMAS H. GARVIN,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The foregoing resolution concurred in by the senate June 18, 1919.

W. P. GALLAGHER,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, June 19, 1919.

PENNSYLVANIA, *ss:*

I do hereby certify that the foregoing and annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of concurrent resolution No. 22–B, passed by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as the same remains on file and appears of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the secretary's office to be affixed the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] CYRUS E. WOODS,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SNAKE RIVER BRIDGE, WASH.

Mr. JONES of Washington. By direction of the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash., and I submit a report (No. 23) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, after the word "that," to insert the words "the State of Washington"; and, in line 5, before the word "said," the first word in the line, to insert the words "said State of Washington and the," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Washington, the county of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington, the county of Franklin, in the State of Washington, or the said State of Washington and the said counties of Walla Walla and Franklin, acting jointly, be, and they or either of them are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, along the route of and continuous with the Inland Empire Highway as officially designated by the State highway commissioner of the State of Washington, and about 3 miles above the confluence of the Snake River with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ZION NATIONAL PARK, UTAH.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 425) to establish the Zion National Park in the State of Utah, and I submit a report (No. 22) thereon. It is a short measure, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Zion National Monument, in the county of Washington, State of Utah, established and designated as a national monument under the act of June 8, 1906, entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," by presidential proclamations of July 31, 1909, and March 18, 1918, is hereby declared to be a national park and dedicated as such for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, under the name of the Zion National Park.

SEC. 2. That the administration, protection, and promotion of said Zion National Park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provision of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," and acts additional thereto or amendatory thereof.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WATER SUPPLY ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 796) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects, and I submit a report (No. 21) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. There is really an urgent need for the immediate passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CURTIS. Let the bill be read first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the operations under the reclamation law is hereby authorized to enter into contract to supply water from any project irrigation system for other purposes than irrigation, upon such conditions of delivery, use, and payment as he may deem proper: *Provided*, That no such contract shall be entered into except upon a showing that there is no other practicable source of water supply for the purpose: *Provided further*, That no water shall be furnished for the uses aforesaid unless the delivery of such water shall not be detrimental to the water service for such irrigation project.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the amendment of the committee be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill, after the word "project," the last word, add the words "nor to the rights of any prior appropriator."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as being in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2128) for the relief of Albert N. Collins; and

A bill (S. 2129) to amend an act approved March 26, 1908, entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public-land laws"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2130) granting a pension to Harry Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2131) to amend section 6 of the act approved March 3, 1919 (Public, No. 325), entitled "An act to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent censuses"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2132) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to prorate the tribal trust funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2133) authorizing the President of the United States to issue buttons of appropriate design to wounded soldiers, sailors, and marines in the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2134) for the relief of Joseph C. Cosley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 2135) granting a pension to John A. McCarthy;

A bill (S. 2136) granting an increase of pension to Marion T. Mitchell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2137) granting a pension to John D. Harkless (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2138) for the relief of James Orange;

A bill (S. 2139) to establish the military record of Marshall M. Pool;

A bill (S. 2140) for the relief of Luther Cline;

A bill (S. 2141) for the relief of Sergt. James W. Kingon;

A bill (S. 2142) for the relief of Caleb T. Holland;

A bill (S. 2143) for the relief of Volney M. Curry; and

A bill (S. 2144) for the relief of Elvira James; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2145) for the relief of Edward N. McCarty; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2146) to regulate insurance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2147) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Zeek;

A bill (S. 2148) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Forbes;

A bill (S. 2149) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Dalzell;

A bill (S. 2150) granting a pension to John S. Dornblaser;

A bill (S. 2151) granting a pension to James D. Davis;

A bill (S. 2152) granting a pension to Charles Diesron;

A bill (S. 2153) granting a pension to John W. Ferris;

A bill (S. 2154) granting a pension to Richard R. Trench;

A bill (S. 2155) granting a pension to Anna Redding;

A bill (S. 2156) granting an increase of pension to Madison O. Rose;

A bill (S. 2157) granting a pension to Harry L. Peebles;

A bill (S. 2158) granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Nelson;

A bill (S. 2159) granting a pension to Flora A. Nelson;

A bill (S. 2160) granting an increase of pension to David Strickland;

A bill (S. 2161) granting an increase of pension to W. S. Lambert;

A bill (S. 2162) granting a pension to George W. Irvin;

A bill (S. 2163) granting a pension to John August Bohman;

A bill (S. 2164) granting a pension to Margaret Boudreaux;

A bill (S. 2165) granting a pension to Hulda Johnson;

A bill (S. 2166) granting a pension to Cora Conzet;

A bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Rebecca F. Cullison;

A bill (S. 2168) granting a pension to William D. Harrington;

A bill (S. 2169) granting a pension to Joshua S. Sneed;

A bill (S. 2170) granting an increase of pension to Frances L. Hay;

A bill (S. 2171) granting a pension to Jacob Hefler;

A bill (S. 2172) granting a pension to Frank M. Gilmore;

A bill (S. 2173) granting a pension to Mary E. Sargent;

A bill (S. 2174) granting a pension to Gustav J. Tichy;

A bill (S. 2175) granting a pension to Selma M. E. Kattner;

A bill (S. 2176) granting an increase of pension to George C. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 2177) granting a pension to Mary W. James;

A bill (S. 2178) granting a pension to James T. Johnson;

A bill (S. 2179) granting a pension to William E. Johnson;

A bill (S. 2180) granting a pension to William Campbell; and

A bill (S. 2181) granting a pension to Otto O. Yaap; to the Committee on Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. NEW. On the 16th instant I submitted an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill relative to persons of foreign birth who have served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, and it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I move that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the amendment and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for topographic surveys in various portions of the United States, including lands in national forests, from $289,000 to $575,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $496,000 for an archives building in the city of Washington, D. C., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment relative to the expenditure of the unexpended balances of appropriations made for the support and maintenance of the Army or Military Establishment in the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the maintenance of heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of continental United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $350,000 for deportation of aliens under the laws regulating immigration, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—CHARLES V. WELLS.

On motion of Mr. POMERENE, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 3697, Sixty-fourth Congress, for the relief of Charles V. Wells, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

REPRESENTATIVES OF IRELAND AT PARIS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the Acting Secretary of State, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, in the absence of the President from the country, has the honor, referring to the resolution of the Senate of June 6, 1919, requesting the American peace commission at Paris to endeavor to procure for Messrs. Edward De Valera and Arthur Griffiths and Count George Noble Plunkett a hearing before the peace conference, to advise the Senate that, the contents of the resolution having been transmitted by cable on June 6, 1919, to the American peace commission, a telegram, dated June 17, 1919, has been received from the American peace commission stating that the full text of the resolution has been forwarded to M. Clemenceau, president of the peace conference, and that his attention has been particularly invited to the request of the Senate that the American peace commission endeavor to procure for Messrs. De Valera and Griffiths and Count Plunkett a hearing before the conference.

[SEAL.] FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 20, 1919.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 21 of the act of Congress approved August 10, 1917, under which the Food Administration was created, I transmit herewith the annual report of the United States Food Administration for the year ending December 31, 1918.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1919.*

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRONNA in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. POMERENE conferees on the part of the Senate.

SOLDIERS' INSURANCE PAYMENTS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a question that I think is worthy of consideration by Congress. In the Daily Digest of Reconstruction News, dated June 12, 1919, issued by the Council of National Defense, Reconstruction Research Division, I find the following under the head of Treasury Department:

Secretary Glass, June 11, approved contract for converted Government insurance held by men in military forces under which beneficiaries may receive lump payments instead of annuity payments over period of 20 years as at present.

As soon as I noticed that I wrote a letter to Secretary Glass, June 16, as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the Daily Digest of Reconstruction News issued by the Council of National Defense, Reconstruction Research Division, dated June 12, 1919, I find under the head of Treasury Department the following note:

"2. Secretary Glass, June 11, approved contract for the converted Government insurance held by men in military forces under which beneficiaries may receive lump payments instead of annuity payments over period of 20 years as at present."

Kindly let me know if this notice is correct.

Yours, truly, REED SMOOT.

June 17, 1919, Secretary Glass wrote me this letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I received your letter of the 16th of June, and in reply allow me to say that the newspaper report to the effect that I had approved the proposal to pay war-risk insurance in lump sums rather than by the month is untrue, as the recommendation of the bureau to that effect has not yet received my approval. The question is now under consideration. In the meantime I have asked the Attorney General for an opinion as to the power to make such payments under the war-risk insurance act.

Mr. President, I am in receipt of a circular letter this morning from the war-risk insurance officials, in which it is virtually stated that this program has been decided upon and agreed to, and it is pointed to as one of the reasons why the soldiers should carry convertible insurance, as the original act provided for. I hope that Government insurance will never be paid in lump sums.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the Senator formed, or does he desire to express, an opinion concerning the power under the existing law to make such a modification in the contract?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I will reach that point as soon as I make a preliminary statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. As I was saying, Mr. President, I hope that lump-sum payments will never happen. The war-risk insurance act was carefully considered by a subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and further by the whole committee, and this very subject was one which was discussed as much as any other provision of that act. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. If there was one thing that was developed at our hearing, it was that if the insurance was paid in a lump sum to the beneficiaries of the soldiers, past experience under the private insurance corporations proved beyond a doubt 40 per cent of the lump sum paid would be expended the first year, and not only expended but much of it wasted, and that at the end of the second year another 40 per cent of it would be dissipated.

Another thing, Mr. President: It was stated that there are only 8 per cent of the beneficiaries of insurance who make a wise use of the money, particularly with a view of taking care of themselves for the future.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. NELSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NELSON. Is there not another objection, too, that it will pile up such an enormous amount in a single year that we could hardly meet it?

Mr. THOMAS. Is it not also true that it is wholly inconsistent and irreconcilable with the life-insurance principle?

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the statements of both Senators. In reference to the question asked by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in section 401 in the act of October 6, 1917, this provision is found:

Any person in the active service on or after the 6th day of April, 1917, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days from and after such publication, becomes or has become totally and permanently disabled or dies, or has died, without having applied for insurance, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance, payable to such person during his life in monthly installments of $25 each. If he shall die either before he shall have received any of such monthly installments or before he shall have received 240 of such monthly installments, then $25 per month shall be paid to his wife from the time of his death and during her widowhood, or to his child, or widowed mother if and while they survive him: *Provided, however,* That not more than 240 of such monthly installments, including those received by such person during his total and permanent disability, shall be so paid; and in that event the amount of the monthly installments shall be apportioned between them as may be provided by regulations.

Mr. President, I want to say now, if the plan is followed out as suggested here, the result will be that when lump sums are paid to the beneficiaries of our soldiers there will be 92 per cent of them within a very few years without a cent on earth; and not only that, but most of them will be applicants for a pension, and it is very doubtful whether the Congress of the United States will deny them. When this question was up before, this very thing was discussed on the floor of the Senate and a similar statement was made.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that Secretary Glass, no matter what the decision may be by the Attorney General as to whether the change can be made under the act or not, will disapprove it, and that whatever insurance is paid to the beneficiaries of our soldiers shall be paid to them in monthly payments.

I will say to the Senator from Arkansas further I think from what I can learn that the War Risk Insurance Bureau claim that the power is granted to them under the provision of the act that allows converting the insurance now in effect into different forms of insurance, and as it does not particularly state how it will be converted into those forms, they did have the power of making a lump-sum payment instead of a monthly payment, as provided in the original form of insurance.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator whether the proposed method of distribution is not also in conflict with the representation and recommendation of Secretary McAdoo to the committee in the argument made before the committee, wherein he urged the establishment of this bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. Secretary McAdoo in his testimony before the committee upon this very point impressed the fact upon the committee, and wanted it to be impressed upon all the soldiers, that this was to take care, in a large measure, of pensions that had been granted to the soldiers of previous wars.

Mr. NELSON. Was it not the theory of the legislation also that it would be a substitute for the system of pensions that had prevailed under the Civil War; that it would take the place of that system?

Mr. SMOOT. Absolutely; and, Mr. President, that was the only reason that the Government had for offering insurance to the soldiers at about one-sixth of what the ordinary insurance companies would have charged.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to reinforce what the Senator from Utah [Mr SMOOT] has said, so far as it is within my capacity. It happens that I was chairman of the subcommittee that dealt with this subject matter.

The idea of all of us was that we were making a liberal and fair allotment for the soldier—infinitely fairer and better than the previous private pension acts that have gone by favoritism; that we permitted him, by making a certain allotment, to insure himself for 20 years—240 months or whatever it is under the act; I have forgotten—beyond all peradventure, all suffering; and that we permitted his wife and his children to have that protection. For fear lest a young woman recently married and a widow might dissipate and throw away the money which

would come to her under this provision, we provided that it should extend during these 20 years—was it not, or what was it?

Mr. SMOOT. Twenty years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was with the idea of protecting her. You all know that a young girl, recently married, perhaps as a war wife, quickly and inconsiderately sometimes, might forget and marry somebody else very shortly after her husband was killed in battle, and that she might want to collect whatever she could of money to help the unscrupulous scoundrel who had married her. We wanted to take care of this situation, as well as of other situations presenting themselves to our minds at the time. So we thought we would make this provision a provision for life, thinking that 20 years would spell life in the great majority of cases.

Then, later on, we agreed that they could turn their insurance into new form; but we never had the idea that the new form should be a total collection at one time, which should be dissipated contrary to the very intent of the act itself, the intent of the subcommittee, the intent of the committee, and the intent of Congress as adopted later.

Mr. President, one of our main ideas was to do away with the old favoritism of pensions. The Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Utah, or the Senator from Oregon comes to the Senate and offers a private pension bill. Somebody in the other House, either from those States or from my State, does the same thing. Such bills are not offered because the person to be benefited is peculiarly worthy, nor are they offered, as a rule, because the service of the soldier was peculiarly great. They are offered merely to get on the pension roll because I have influence, or the Senator from Utah has influence, or some other Senator has influence on the committee. We get the bill through. We know that that is the fact, however much it is to be regretted, and it has been regretted. I am making no attack upon the pension roll or anything of that sort. If anybody is to be proud of the pension roll it should be, I think, the people of Mississippi. We do not enjoy much of it, but we had a great deal to do with creating it.

I hope that what the Senator from Utah has said will sink into the minds of Senators, will sink into the mind of the Secretary of the Treasury, and that we shall not permit this liberal, honest, earnest effort of the American Congress to take care of these soldiers to be prostituted—oh, well, Mr. President, I doubt if I can finish the sentence correctly, but to be prostituted merely to selfish purposes, but that it shall be for national purposes.

Our object in passing this act was to win the war and to fill the souls of the soldier boys with the morale necessary to win the war. We accomplished that; and now, if you are going to turn it into a ride-as-you-ride-can, wrestle-as-you-wrestle-may contest for private pensions in the Congress of the United States, all our labor will have been in vain, and not only in vain but worse than in vain.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO BELGIAN PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President, having said that much as partially pertinent to the issue, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD, without reading, a speech recently made by President Wilson before the King and Queen and the Parliament of Belgium, which I regard as one of the most eloquent things ever uttered on the earth, and one of the most superb appeals to humanity to take care of itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The address referred to is as follows:

WILSON WARNS AGAINST MISUSE OF LEAGUE AS A RETURN TO BAD DAYS OF NATIONAL SELFISHNESS—NATIONS, PRESIDENT TELLS BELGIAN CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES, MUST WORK FOR WORLD'S SERVICE—REFUSAL OF COVENANT IS REJECTION OF MOST TELLING APPEAL EVER MADE TO CONSCIENCE—UNITED STATES TO HAVE EMBASSY IN BRUSSELS.

BRUSSELS, *June 19*.

President Wilson upon his return to Washington will propose to Congress to raise the American legation here to the rank of an embassy and send a United States ambassador instead of a minister in recognition of Belgium's complete independence and equality in the ranks of the free nations. Tremendous cheers greeted the President as he announced this in the course of a long speech in the Belgian Chamber of Deputies here to-day.

The burden of the address was a strong plea for the league of nations, which, the President said, virtually had its beginning in the formation of the "league of rights" that bound the civilized nations of the world together in hastening to the martyr kingdom's defense.

LEAGUE IS "CHILD OF WAR."

Again the chamber broke into tumultuous applause when the President said a plan was now being worked out in Paris to secure for Belgium the necessary priority in getting raw materials, machinery, and credits to tide her over the reconstruction period. He paid a warm and eloquent tribute to Belgium's part in the war.

Briefly touching the "fundamental outrage of all" with which Germany violated Belgium's neutrality, the President denounced the German war methods in bitter terms.

He called the league of nations the "child of the Great War" and said any nation which declines to adhere to the covenant "deliberately turns away from the most telling appeal that has ever been made to its conscience."

WILL PUNISH GERMANY.

By way of indirect indorsement of the peace terms with Germany he spoke of the firm resolve that Germany's violation of Belgium "shall now be punished," while the league, he said, is to prevent the recurrence of such acts. President Wilson said:

"Your majesty and gentlemen: It is with such profound emotion that I express my deepest appreciation of the generous welcome you have given me that I am not at all sure that I can find the words to say what is in my heart to say.

"M. Hymans has repeated to you some of the things which America tried to do to show her profound friendship and sympathy with Belgium, but M. Hymans was not able to testify, as I am, to the heart of America that was back of her efforts, for America did not do these things merely because she conceived it her duty to do them, but because she rejoiced in this way to show her real humanity and her real knowledge of these needs of an old and faithful friend; and these things, I hope, will be dearer in your memory because of the spirit which was behind them. They were small in themselves.

HIGH WORDS FOR BELGIANS.

"We often had the feeling that we were not doing as much as we could do. We knew all the time that we were not doing as much as we wanted to do, and it is this spirit, and not what was done, which deserves, I hope, to be remembered.

"It is very delightful to find myself at last in Belgium. I have come at the first moment that I was relieved from imperative duty. I could not come for my own pleasure and in neglect of duty to a country where I knew I should meet a sovereign who had constantly identified himself with the interests and the life of his people at every necessary sacrifice to himself; where I should be greeted by a burgomaster who never allowed the enemy to thrust him aside and always asserted the majesty and authority of the municipality which he represented; where I should have the privilege of meeting a cardinal who was the true shepherd of his flock and the majesty of whose spiritual authority awed even the unscrupulous enemy himself, who knew that they did not dare lay a hand upon this servant of God; and where I should have the privilege of grasping the hand of a general who never surrendered, and on every hand should meet men who had known their duty and done it.

SOUGHT TO HONOR BELGIANS.

"I could not come to Belgium until I felt that I was released from my duty. I sought in this way to honor you by recognizing the spirit which I knew I should meet with here.

"When I realize that at my back are the fighting standards of Belgium, it pleases me to think that I am in the presence of those who knew how to shed their blood as well as do their duty for their country. They need no encomium from me.

"I would rather turn for a moment with you to the significance of the place which Belgium bears in this contest, which, thank God, is ended.

"I came here because I wished to associate myself in counsel with the men who I knew had felt so deeply the pulse of this terrible struggle, and I wanted to come also because I realized, I believe, that Belgium and her part in the war is in one sense the key to the whole struggle, because the violation of Belgium was the call to duty which aroused the nations.

INITIAL OUTRAGE FUNDAMENTAL.

"The enemy committed many outrages in this war, gentlemen, but the initial outrage was the fundamental outrage of all. They, with an insolent indifference, violated the sacredness of treaties. They showed that they did not care for the independence of any nation, whether it had raised its hand against them or not; that they were ruthless in their determination to have their whim at their pleasure.

"Therefore, it was the violation of Belgium that awakened the world to their realization of the character of the struggle. A very interesting thing came out of that struggle, which seems almost like an illogical consequence. One of the first things that the representatives of Belgium said to me after the war began was that they did not want their neutrality guaranteed; they did not want any neutrality. They wanted equality, not

because, as I understood them, their neutrality was insecure, but because their neutrality put them upon a different basis of action from other peoples in their natural and proper pride.

DESIRED HER PROPER RANK.

"They desired a place that was not exceptional, but in the ranks of free peoples under all governments. I honored this instinct in them, and it was for that reason that the first time I had occasion to speak of what the war might accomplish for Belgium I spoke of her winning a place of equality among the nations.

"So Belgium has, so to say, once more come into her own through this deep valley of suffering through which she has gone; not only that, but her cause has linked the governments of the civilized world together, as if instinctively, into a league of rights.

"They have put the whole power of organized mankind behind this conception of justice, which is common to mankind.

"That is the significance, gentlemen, of the league of nations. The league of nations was an inevitable consequence of this war. It was a league of rights, and no thoughtful statesman who let his thoughts run into the future could wish for a moment to slacken those bonds.

AN APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE.

"His first thought would be to strengthen them and to perpetuate this combination of the great governments of the world for the maintenance of justice. The league of nations is a child of this great war, for it is the expression of those prevalent reasons which grew out of the temporary necessities of this great struggle, and any nation which declines to adhere to this covenant deliberately turns away from the most telling appeal that has ever been made to its conscience and to its manhood.

"The nation that wishes to use the league of nations for its convenience and not for the service of the rest of the world deliberately chooses to turn back to those bad days of selfish contests in which every nation thought first and always of itself and not of its neighbors; thought of its rights and forgot its duties; thought of its power and overlooked its responsibility.

MORAL POWER WILL RULE.

"Those bad days, I hope, are gone, and the great moral power, backed, if need be, by the great physical power of the civilized nations of the world, will now stand firm for the maintenance of the fine partnership which we have thus inaugurated.

"It can not be otherwise. Perhaps the conscience of some chancellories was asleep and the outrage of Germany awakened it. You can not see one great nation violate every principle of right without beginning to know what the principles of right are, and to love them, and to despise those who violate them, and to form the firm resolve that such a violation shall now be punished and in the future be prevented.

"These are the feelings with which I have come to Belgium, and it has been my thought to propose to the Congress of the United States as a recognition, as a welcome, of Belgium into her new status of complete independence to raise the mission of the United States of America to Belgium to the rank of an embassy and send an ambassador.

FRIENDSHIP IN THE FUTURE.

"This is the rank which Belgium enjoys in our esteem. Why should she not enjoy it in form and in fact? So, gentlemen, we turn to the future. M. Hymans has spoken in true terms of the necessities that lie ahead of Belgium and of many another nation that has come through this great war.

"We have shown Belgium, in the forms which he has been generous enough to recite, our friendship in the past. It is now our duty to organize our friendship along new lines. The Belgian people and the Belgian leaders need only the tools to restore their life. Their thoughts are not crushed, their purposes are not obscured, their plans are complete, and their knowledge of what is involved in industrial revival is complete.

"What her friends must do is to see to it that Belgium gets the necessary priority with regard to obtaining raw materials, the necessary priority in obtaining the means to restore the machinery by which she can use these raw materials, and the credit by which she can bridge over the years which it will be necessary for her to wait to begin again.

TASKS FOR BUSINESS MEN.

"These are not so much tasks for governments as they are tasks for thoughtful business men and financiers and those who are producers in other countries. It is a question of shipping also; but the shipping of the world will be relieved of its burdens of troops in a comparatively near future, and there will be new bottoms in which to carry the cargoes, and the cargoes ought readily to impel the master of the ship to steer for Belgian ports.

"I believe, after having consulted many times with my very competent advisers in the matter, that an organized method of accomplishing these things can be found. It is a matter of almost daily discussion in Paris, and I believe that as we discuss it from day to day we come nearer and nearer to a workable solution and a probable plan.

"I hope, not only, but I believe, that such a plan will be found, and you may be sure that all America will be pleased. I will not say more than any other friend of Belgium but as much as any other friend of Belgium.

"This is the healing peace of which M. Hymans so eloquently spoke. You help the nations by serving the nations and you serve them by thinking of mankind."

MADE JUST BY REALITIES.

"Only realities make you wise and just," said President Wilson in a brief speech at the luncheon to-day at the American legation in honor of the King and Queen of Belgium. The President paid a gracious tribute to the royal couple, emphasizing their close association with the Belgian people. President Wilson spoke as follows:

"I want to express my pleasure not only of being in Belgium, but to be personally associated with the King and Queen. We have found them what all the world had told us that they were—perfectly genuine, perfectly delightful, and perfectly devoted to the interests of the people, and not only so, but what is very rare just now, very just in their judgments of the events of the past and of the events that are now taking place.

"I could not help expressing the opinion which I did yesterday, namely, that that must arise from the fact that they had intimately associated themselves in life with their people.

"If you live with the talkers you get one impression; if you live with the livers you get another impression. You come into contact with the realities, and only realities make you wise and just.

"I want, with this very brief preface, in which I am speaking from my heart, to propose the health and long life of his majesty the King and her majesty the Queen."

ARTICLE BY EX-PRESIDENT TAFT.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in addition to that, noticing the good humor of my friend from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], I wish to have inserted in the RECORD some remarks made by ex-President Taft urging the Republicans to oppose the Knox resolution and to save the party's prestige. I know that that will appeal to the Senator from Utah, because of certain utterances of his not very many weeks ago, although perhaps they may have been corrected later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator if he will not allow that to go to the Committee on Printing without reading. Really, I think the Senator from Mississippi ought to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I will not do that. I will read it rather than do that, even though I am taking up the time of the country, which ought to be taken up with more important affairs.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is the case, I think the Senator had better read it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the paper be returned to me in order that I may read it. If there is anything I am good at, it is reading.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded, and that order is reports of committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am in regular order, because I am discussing a question which was raised by the Senator from Utah, and concerning which he addressed himself to the Senate. I am now replying to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator from Mississippi that there is no question before the Senate, and the regular order is reports of committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, what is the report of a committee that is now presented?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no report being presented, but that is the order on which the Senate is now acting. Nothing is in order but reports of committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the order under which the Senator from Utah was addressing himself?

Mr. SMOOT. I was speaking by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah was addressing the Senate under that order, but he would have been subject to a point of order at any time. Are there further reports of committees? If there be none, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

Bills were introduced by Mr. SMOOT, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Mr. SHERMAN, which appear under the appropriate heading.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President, as partially pertinent to the measure which has just been introduced, I wish to read the remarks of ex-President Taft.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Mississippi is not in order for the purpose of reading the article or making any observations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; I will wait until I am in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order now is the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can I not even discuss measures that are introduced?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator can not discuss a bill under this order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought that a Senator could discuss a bill when it was introduced.

Mr. SMOOT. Not before 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not so understand the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, I yield to the Chair's understanding of the rules of the Senate.

Bills were introduced by Mr. MYERS, and a memorial from the Legislature of Pennsylvania was presented by Mr. KNOX, which appear under their appropriate headings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is that, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a memorial presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Are there further bills or joint resolutions? If not, concurrent and other resolutions are in order. If there be none, morning business is closed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the general state of the Union, which I think is always in order, and I wish to have inserted in the RECORD, by unanimous consent, some observations recently made by ex-President Taft, urging Republicans to oppose the Knox resolution and save their party's prestige. If there is any objection to that, I will read it myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD of the address to which he has referred. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that we can not draw the line against every other Senator but himself. The Senator every morning for the past week or so has presented newspaper articles for printing in the RECORD. I know that he would read the article he now holds in his hand if objection were made to his request. The position I take is not because I object at all to the article going into the RECORD as an article upon the subject referred to, or that I object to whatever ex-President Taft may say, but there is an understanding amongst the members of the Committee on Printing, both in the House and the Senate, that all such requests as that presented by the Senator from Mississippi shall be referred to the Committee on Printing and reported from the committee before action is taken.

I know the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] desires to proceed with the bill he has in charge and wishes it to be passed to-day, if possible. I know that under the conditions existing the Senator from Mississippi will read the article into the RECORD if objection is made to its printing, and therefore I am not going to object, but will let the article be printed in the RECORD. I wish to say, however, to the Senator from Mississippi that I believe we all ought to abide by the understanding to which I have referred, or else all have the privilege of printing anything in the RECORD that we may desire.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am claiming no privilege that I am not according every other Senator, and I am not setting myself up as being peculiarly privileged by the Senator from Utah. I understand that if my privileges in this body depended upon the Senator from Utah they would be very small, very few, and very infrequent; but this is a very important utterance, made by a very important man, of the most significant character, and so I have asked that it be printed in the RECORD. I would just as soon read it; in fact, I should a little bit rather read it, because I could emphasize it as I went along.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has my request been granted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

The address referred to is as follows:

TAFT URGES REPUBLICANS TO OPPOSE KNOX RESOLUTION AND SAVE PARTY'S PRESTIGE—DECLARES MEASURE REVERSES HISTORIC TRADITIONS WHICH HAVE MADE G. O. P. PIONEER IN GOVERNMENT—WARNS SENATORS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORLD AFFAIRS—SHOULD AVOID ACTION THAT CAN ONLY HEARTEN HUNS IN REFUSAL TO SIGN.

(By William Howard Taft.)

Chairman Hays, of the Republican national committee, properly refused to be led by the Democratic chairman, Mr. Cummings, into making a partisan issue of the peace treaty. Senator LODGE asserts that the issue is not a party one. It is unfortunate that the action of the Republican committee on committees in the Senate should give color to a different view by a provision that the Foreign Relations Committee should have Republicans enough to give them a majority without the vote of Mr. MCCUMBER, known to be favorable to the treaty, and by a careful selection of Republicans for that majority whose opposition to the treaty has been pronounced. Senator KELLOGG would naturally have been taken before Senator MOSES, a new Senator, and one whose term expires in two years. Senator KELLOGG, however, ventured to make a speech in favor of a league of nations even before the covenant was agreed upon, and declined to sign the "round robin."

DEPLORES BORAH'S INFLUENCE.

More than this, Senator BORAH, who insists that Republicans who decline to make this a party issue and fight the treaty are cowards, had sufficient influence with the Republicans in the committee and with the chairman and the author of the resolution to strike out of it the only section offering a hope of constructive and affirmative aid to the world from the United States whenever again the world got into the same condition which brought us into this war.

It must give those Republicans who now find themselves supporting the Knox resolution a "cat-in-a-strange-garret" feeling when they think of the great traditions of their party and of its historical attitude toward every critical step forward in the history of this country under our Constitution. They must feel as uneasy as those Federalists who fought the Louisiana Purchase as unconstitutional, because it was made by Jefferson, for the Republicans are the legitimate heirs of Washington, Hamilton, and Marshall.

HAS STOOD FOR RESPONSIBILITY.

They have always maintained that this was a Nation, with a big N, able to meet every responsibility that nations should meet; able to do for its people and the world as much as any government, and courageous enough to do it. Read John Marshall's opinions. Not a line is written in them by which the usefulness of the United States under the Constitution is restricted. The glory of that instrument is the way in which its simple comprehensive terms include in the national powers those faculties needed to discharge its duties and work out its destiny as one of the great family of nations.

Always heretofore it has been the Democratic Party which, as new problems have presented themselves, has sought to limit the sphere of our Government by nice interpretation and strained applications of our fundamental law. It was the Democratic Party which exalted State rights to protect slavery. It was the Democratic Party which gave the country a President and Attorney General who found that secession was unconstitutional, but that it was unconstitutional to suppress it. It was the Democratic Party that declared the Civil War was a failure and lent the weight of its party machinery and its constitutional objections to making it so, a circumstance, one might add, which kept that party out of power for 20 years.

POINTS TO PARTY ACHIEVEMENTS.

It was the Republican Party which took over the burdens of readjustment after the Civil War and encountered Democratic constitutional objections at every turn. It was the Republican Party that put through the war amendments against the bitter obstruction of its opponents. It was the Republican Party that gave us the joint high commission and the Geneva arbitration. It was the same party that declared generally in favor of arbitration as a means of settling international disputes.

It was the Republican Party which, after the Spanish War, bravely faced the Cuban and Philippine problems, put its shoulder under the load and met the solid Democratic opposition, which made imperialism the paramount issue, and rested its case again on a strained construction of the Constitution. Then, too, we heard much of the radical departure from our traditional American policy of isolation and the surrender of the Monroe doctrine, but the Republican Party, recognizing its world responsibilities, and with the courage born of past achievements, and with a traditional constructive ability and energy, carried its Philippine policy through, and the awful prophecies of ruin are forgotten. The Republican Party pioneered. The Constitution is inviolate. The Philippine episode has passed into history and the country is still safe.

PUBLIC DISTRUSTS MOTIVES.

Again, it was through the opposition of the Democrats and Senators BORAH, LODGE, and others that the so-called universal arbitration treaties with France and Great Britain were wrecked, though generally supported by regular Republicans, led by Senators Root and Burton. Whether it be true or not, it will be exceedingly difficult, if this treaty is beaten by Republican Senators, to satisfy the country that it has not been beaten because it is laid before the Senate by a Democratic President.

Such Republican Senators are confident of victory in 1920. They are sure that President Wilson has lost popularity with Democrats and Republicans alike. They find much to justify them, both in their resentment against Mr. Wilson for his partisan treatment of them and in their certainty that a Republican victory awaits them in 1920. But are they not, from a mere party standpoint, handling edged tools?

Can they afford to go before the country and uphold their course in defeating the treaty when there is a deep-seated impression that they are in part, at least, prompted in their methods, unusual and not according to constitutional procedure, by personal and partisan motives? Will not many say that had this treaty been proposed by a Republican President or by a President who had consulted the Senate or appointed on the commission leading Republicans or Senators from the Foreign Relations Committee no such obstruction would have been offered?

SHOWS RISK TO PARTY.

The present strength of the Republican Party before the people is due not only to irritation at the excessive use of arbitrary authority and a narrowly partisan administration during a great war crisis, but also to the patriotic course of the Republican minorities in both Houses in helping in every way the Democratic President to carry through tha

war, in spite of his exasperating failure to use Republicans of tried ability when the country's cause needed them.

When he gave specific evidence of his attitude by his appeal to his countrymen to elect only Democrats to Congress and reflected on the patriotism of Republicans as "prowar but antiadministration" and a most remarkable popular rebuke followed instantly, do not Republicans in the Senate, after their most patriotic course in the fighting of this war and their fine standing before the people on that account, run the risk of dulling the fine edge of that course by present action, which many will contend gives support to the ungracious words of the President?

RESPONSIBLE FOR WORLD PEACE.

What is most dangerous to the present Republican position of vantage is the failure of Republican Senators to appreciate their responsibility in world affairs. The lingering tenacity of Bolshevism, the bickering and fighting between the newly established States in central and eastern Europe, the seething unrest all over Europe, reflected in some degree on this side, should command the attention of all world statesmen having to do with this treaty. The Senators can not escape responsibility for the peace, both in its relation to this country and its relation to the world.

The two relations are indissolubly united. With the single exception of Senator LODGE'S luminous speech in the Senate on the necessary scope of the treaty made shortly after the armistice, we have little constructive suggestion to help solve the many difficulties presented to the peace conference, and even Senator LODGE'S subsequent course seems unmindful of the problems he then discussed.

SHOULD WAIT FOR TREATY.

The argument will be further pressed that the Republican opposing Senators have done much, consciously or unconsciously, to hinder the making of a treaty at all by a course tending to weaken the lawful authority of the President in the conference. He is vested with the power and charged with the duty of formulating and initiating the treaty for the consideration of the Senators whose function, unless invited by the President, does not begin until he lays the treaty before them for their advice and consent. If the impression spreads that the Republican Senators are impairing the country's force and influence for good in the world by an attack in the rear upon our constitutional representative among the nations, the Republican wave now carrying the party to victory may lessen.

These Republicans in the Senate, not now committed, should therefore avoid being hurried into embarrassing commitment by the Knox resolution and should wait until the treaty is presented and until they can, after a full discussion, not in anger, but after a calm, courageous, self-restrained consideration of their responsibility to this country, the world, and to their party, decide what the situation demands of them. The plea that they, by voting for the resolution, may induce the conference to repudiate Mr. Wilson and accept their informal suggestions as to separation of the league from the treaty, is of course without the slightest weight.

MAY ONLY ENCOURAGE HUNS.

The conference will certainly not change the treaty now perfected after such great labor and difficulty. The only possible effect of the resolution on the other side, therefore, may be to hearten the Germans in delaying or refusing signature. Certainly the Republican Senators do not seek such a result and do not care to be made responsible for it by their countrymen.

On this side, if the treaty should be amended or rejected on its merits, the Senators should have the courage to vote their convictions. The temporary embarrassment to the country involved in such action can not be charged to them if their reasons are good and their motives are high and clear of partisanship or personal feelings. The embarrassment should and will subject their reasons and motives to severe and careful scrutiny. Meantime the Republicans of the Senate should not pass the Knox resolution. The reasons for not doing so are clear, and they will be clearer as the inexorable order of events proceeds.

SOLDIERS' INSURANCE PAYMENTS.

Mr. ROBINSON. I offer a Senate resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I think it will require only a moment or two to dispose of the matter. The resolution will procure for the Senate the facts respecting the matter referred to by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and give us the viewpoint of the Secretary of the Treasury, both as to the authority of law for the alleged action and the justification of the same.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 88) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate whether he has approved a contract or contracts for converted Government insurance held by men in the military forces of the United States under which beneficiaries may receive lump-sum payments instead of annuity payments extending over periods of 20 years, and, if so, under what authority of law such action is taken.

Also, that he furnish the Senate with the form of said contract, if any, with such further information concerning the subject as he may deem pertinent.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask that section 21 of the act of June 25, 1918, be inserted in the RECORD in connection with the resolution, and I call attention to the language printed in italics—italics mine—as affording probably a legal basis for the contract said to have been authorized. It is desirable that the Senate be informed fully regarding this subject, for it is clear from the statements made a few moments ago by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that those who originally sponsored the act are not in sympathy with the proposed contracts.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 21. That section 402 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 402. That the director, subject to the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall promptly determine upon and publish the full and exact terms and conditions of such contract of insurance. The insurance shall be payable only to a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, and also during total and permanent disability to the injured person, or to any or all of them. The insurance shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments. *Provisions for maturity at certain ages, for continuous installments during the life of the insured or beneficiaries, or both, for cash, loan, paid up and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable, may be provided for in the contract of insurance, or from time to time by regulations.* All calculations shall be based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 3½ per cent per annum, except that no deduction shall be made for continuous installments during the life of the insured in case his total and permanent disability continues more than 240 months. Subject to regulations, the insured shall at all times have the right to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries of such insurance without the consent of such beneficiary or beneficiaries, but only within the classes herein provided. If no beneficiary within the permitted class be designated by the insured, either in his lifetime or by his last will and testament, or if the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, the insurance shall be payable to such person or persons within the permitted class of beneficiaries as would under the laws of the State of the residence of the insured be entitled to his personal property in case of intestacy. If no such person survive the insured, then there shall be paid to the estate of the insured an amount equal to the reserve value, if any, of the insurance at the time of his death, calculated on the basis of the American Experience Table of Mortality and 3½ per cent interest in full of all obligations under the contract of insurance."

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill No. 18. I understand the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] desires to address the Senate; but I should like to have the bill before the Senate, and then the Senator from Texas can proceed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD obtained the floor.

Mr. KENYON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gerry	McCormick	Pomerene
Beckham	Gronna	McCumber	Robinson
Borah	Hale	McKellar	Sheppard
Calder	Harding	McLean	Simmons
Capper	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Henderson	Moses	Smoot
Colt	Hitchcock	Myers	Spencer
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Stanley
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Swanson
Dial	Kendrick	Norris	Thomas
Edge	Kenyon	Nugent	Trammell
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Fall	King	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Knox	Phipps	Warren
Fletcher	La Follette	Pittman	Watson
France	Lenroot	Poindexter	Williams

Mr. KING. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are detained on official business.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] are detained on important public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRONNA in the chair). Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to preface this discussion of the league of nations by presenting certain facts which I believe to be of vital significance.

First. Woodrow Wilson and those associated with him in framing the league have recognized from the outset the limitations of the treaty-making power of the United States.

Second. The league has been constructed with scrupulous regard for the integrity of our Constitution and the preservation of all its functions.

Third. American participation in the league will always remain within the control of Congress to such a degree that the American people must see to it that our national legislators, both our Representatives and Senators, as well as our Presidents, are held under specific promise to make that participation effective and enthusiastic.

Fourth. While the power to negotiate a treaty rests with the President and the Senate, all legislation needed to make and keep a treaty operative must come from Congress. The power to make a treaty effective is coextensive with the power to negotiate it. Without the former power the latter would be use-

less. The House of Representatives, therefore, is as essential to the operation and observation of most treaties as the Senate or the President, because most treaties require legislation of some sort to make them effective. Furthermore, Congress may directly abrogate or indirectly nullify the provisions of a treaty, acts of Congress and treaties being on an equal footing as laws of the land. Congress may do this by formal abrogation, or by legislation conflicting with the treaty, or where the treaty is not self-executing by failure to enact the legislation necessary to carry it into effect, or by a declaration of war, which of itself abrogates or suspends existing treaties with the enemy. The league of nations will come into being as the result of a treaty, and Congress will continue to exercise, so far as the United States is concerned, the same power over the league provisions requiring legislative action under our Constitution as over all treaty provisions calling for such action. If a treaty provision or a league provision calls for money or credit on the part of the United States, these must be furnished, if at all, by act of Congress. Our Constitution provides that Congress alone may appropriate money from the Treasury or borrow money on the credit of the United States. And the same is true as to the declaration of war, the use of the armed forces of the United States on land or sea, the levy of taxes and imposts, the control of naturalization, and the other powers specifically vested by the Constitution in Congress. It will be seen, therefore, that while the President and the Senate constitute the treaty-making power, the President, the Senate, and the House, by virtue of their combined legislative function, constitute the treaty-preserving and the treaty-abrogating power. I repeat, therefore, that the American people must maintain an unceasing watchfulness over all individuals composing the various elements of the legislative function if the part of the United States in the league of nations is to be active, faithful, and efficient.

Let me say at this point that it ought to be a matter of pride to every American that our President, Woodrow Wilson, by virtue of his character, courage, ability, vision, by virtue of his course as the head of this Republic throughout the great conflict, by virtue of his definitions of the cause and purpose of the world upheaval, has become the chief spokesman of the aspirations of mankind for a lasting peace. When hostilities ceased with the armistice of November 11, 1918, and the duty of arranging a permanent peace loomed before the victors, so commanding a figure had Woodrow Wilson become, not only as the President of the Republic that had contributed so materially to the final result, but also as the proponent of terms of settlement including a league of nations which had met with almost universal approval, that his presence during the peace negotiations was regarded as imperative by all the allied leaders. He determined, therefore, to challenge precedent and for the first time in history an American President appeared on foreign soil to aid in the settlement of the economic and political destinies of the earth.

The peace conference assembled at Paris on January 18, 1919, with nations represented whose combined populations exceeded twelve hundred millions. Practically the first constructive work of the conference was the appointment of a committee to prepare a plan for a league of nations. The resolution for the creation of this committee was unanimously adopted. The resolution stated that the creation of a league of nations to promote international obligations and to provide safeguards against war was essential to the maintenance of the world settlement which the conference had met to make—that the league should be an integral part of the general treaty of peace and should be open to every civilized nation that could be relied on to promote its objects.

I desire here to emphasize the fact that the first act of the peace conference—an act representing the unanimous decision of the nations that had banded together for the preservation of the civilization of the world—was to declare that the league of nations was essential to the maintenance of the peace of the world; that it was essential to the permanent disposition of the problems growing out of the war, and was, therefore, an inseparable part of the treaty of peace. Consequently the Knox resolution, which calls for the separation of the league of nations from the treaty of peace, is a repudiation of the combined judgment of the civilized world. If passed, it would place the United States in an attitude of opposition to the treaty in its present form. It would be an encouragement to Germany to reject the treaty, as was so well explained by ex-President Taft in the article read by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] a few moments ago.

The speech of President Wilson in behalf of the resolution threw additional light on the province of the league. He pointed out that the many complicated questions arising from the war could not be successfully settled by the decisions of the present conference, that readjustments would be necessary from time to time, and that permanent processes of settlement should be established. He said further that the people of the world should not again be subjected to a strain and burden like that of the last four years, that it should be placed beyond the power of a military faction in any country to involve the world in war, that the old conditions of aggression and force should be ended, and that the nations of the world should act together for the peace, the justice, and the liberty of mankind. He contended that a league of nations should be formed not only to solve the problems connected with the war, but to make secure and permanent the peace of the world.

The committee was then appointed to prepare and submit a plan for the contemplated league of nations. It consisted of delegates from 14 nations, those from the United States being President Wilson and Edward M. House, of Texas. In view of the fact that Mr. House has been made the subject of partisan criticism on the floor of the Senate, I deem it proper to refer to him at greater length. He is one of the most remarkable men of the time. Never having held public station before, he has rendered services of extraordinary value to his State, his country, and the world. His father was one of the leading citizens of the Texas Republic, having been chosen to represent the young nation in a financial capacity abroad. The son, Edward, was educated overseas. From early manhood he evinced a deep interest in the public affairs of Texas. He helped to bring forward some of its ablest leaders. He spent long periods of study and travel in foreign countries obtaining a fund of knowledge which he now finds of distinct advantage. Turning his attention to national affairs he was one of the first to be impressed with the candidacy of Woodrow Wilson for President, and became one of his most devoted and active supporters. A friendship followed between Wilson and House that has ripened and deepened with the stirring years that have marked the death of an old world, the birth of a new, amid the thunders of the bloodiest conflict of the ages. Edward M. House has been intrusted by the President with missions of as much importance as ever fell to human hands, missions which he performed with quiet but consummate success. And be it said to the credit of Woodrow Wilson that when he came to appoint the delegates to Paris he gave this unassuming yet all-efficient private citizen a place at the council table of the nations where the fate of the earth was to be decided. Of the other members of the American delegation—Lansing, the profound and cultured diplomat; White, the distinguished Republican, the noted student of international law, exceptionally qualified by experience and ability to represent this Nation at Paris——

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just a moment. Of Bliss, the warrior statesman, possessing a store of practical wisdom and a capacity for action that have made his counsels of unmeasured benefit, it is unnecessary to speak further at this time. Let it be sufficient to say that the entire delegation has won a high and permanent place both in American and in world history.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. I wondered if the Senator would repeat his characterization of Mr. White.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I said he was a distinguished Republican.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator adduce authorities in support of that allegation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. He was appointed by a Republican President as ambassador to one of the principal nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. He was appointed by a Democratic President as secretary of legation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not so understand. He was first appointed by Arthur, if I am not mistaken, and afterwards recalled by Cleveland. He was appointed to several ambassadorships by Republican Presidents, appointed, according to my information, as a Republican. It is my understanding that he is a Republican.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I admit that Mr. White was at one time a very distinguished member of the former, but now defunct, Progressive Party.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. If I may also suggest, Mr. White was at one time referred to by President Roosevelt as the ablest man in the American Diplomatic Service.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee on the league of nations was in session at various intervals from February 4 to February 13.

Many differences developed. The debates were long and earnest and at times it looked as if all could not reach common ground. On February 14 President Wilson, on behalf of the committee, presented to the conference a plan for a league of nations which had finally received the committee's unanimous approval. This plan was acclaimed throughout the world as an instrument of enduring peace. Only in the United States did there break out violent opposition, led by a small group of men, most of whom are in the Senate, who claimed that American membership in the league meant the surrender of American sovereignty to the control of foreign powers; that the league gave other countries an unfair proportion of voting power; that it imperiled the Monroe doctrine; that it would compel us to administer the affairs of other lands in a way contrary to our will, our interests, and our duties; and that it did many other things too monstrous to mention.

Let us now proceed with an examination of the proposed league. The instrument describing it is officially designated as "The covenant of the league of nations."

Its original members are to be, first, the nations named in the annex to the covenant who sign the treaty of peace, the covenant being a part of said treaty, to wit, United States of America, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, British Empire, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Serbia, Siam, Uruguay; second, such other nations named in the annex who accede to the covenant not later than two months before it becomes effective, to wit, Argentine Republic, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela.

Any fully self-governing State, Dominion, or colony not named in the annex may be admitted to the league by a vote of two-thirds of the assembly, one of the two constituent bodies of the league, on the giving of guaranties of a sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and on the acceptance of the regulations of the league regarding its military and naval forces and armaments.

Any member may withdraw from the league after two years' notice, provided it has fulfilled all its international obligations and all its obligations under the covenant at the time of its withdrawal.

The league is to operate through two separate and distinct organizations called, respectively, the assembly and the council.

All members of the league are members of the assembly, each member having one vote and not more than three representatives. Under the terms and limitations of the covenant, the assembly may deal with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

The council is to consist originally of nine members. The United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan are to be permanent members. The four other members are to be selected by the assembly. The council, with the approval of a majority of the assembly, may increase the number of its permanent members or the number of additional members to be chosen by the assembly. Each member of the council has one vote and may not have more than one representative. Under the terms and limitations of the covenant, the council may deal with any matter within the sphere of the league or affecting the peace of the world.

Any member of the league who is not a member of the council shall be accorded a representative to sit as a member of the council during the consideration of matters especially affecting the interests of such member.

Unless expressly provided otherwise in the covenant, decisions at any meeting of the assembly or the council must be by unanimous vote of all members represented at the meeting. This is certainly a sufficient safeguard against the domination of either body by Great Britain and her colonies, a domination which the opponents of the league have urged would occur. It is equally a safeguard against domination by any particular country or group of countries.

All matters of procedure and the appointment of committees of investigation in both assembly and council shall be decided by a majority vote of members represented. The first meetings of both assembly and council are to be summoned by the President of the United States—a remarkable tribute to our country.

The seat of the league is established by the covenant at Geneva, but the council may at any time decide that it shall be established elsewhere.

All positions under the league are to be open equally to men and women.

The nations forming the league agree to recognize the principle that the maintenance of peace will require the reduction of armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations. The council, taking into consideration the geographical situation and the circumstances of each nation, is to formulate plans for the reduction of armaments for the consideration of the several nations. These plans are to be revised and reconsidered every 10 years. If the limitation of armament suggested by the council should be adopted by a nation, it is agreed that the nation shall not exceed that limitation without the concurrence of the council. It is thus left to the voluntary action of a member nation as to whether it will comply with the recommendations of the council for reduction of armament. If the nation decides to comply, it is morally obligated not to exceed the limit recommended by the council unless the council consents. It would be difficult to find anything violative of a nation's sovereignty or of justice and fairness in this arrangement. The United States and Great Britain agreed in 1817 not to increase the number of armed ships on the Great Lakes, and for more than 100 years Congress has respected the obligation without disparagement to the national sovereignty.

The members of the league agree that the private manufacture of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections, and the council is directed to advise how the evil effects attendant on such manufactures can be prevented, due regard being had for member nations not able to make the munitions and implements essential to their safety. This stipulation confers a purely advisory function.

The members of the league agree that there shall be full and frank interchange of information as to the scale of their armaments, their military and naval programs, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes. Surely there can be no objection to this obligation, and surely no legislative body desirous of promoting peace could fail to make it effective in every way.

A permanent commission is authorized to advise the league on the execution of the provisions relating to disarmament and on military and naval questions generally. Here again the function conferred is an advisory one.

The member nations agree to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of each other, and in case of such aggression or the threat or danger thereof the executive council is to advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled. This puts on the nations signing the covenant an obligation for mutual resistance to aggression, but it confers no powers on the league. It pledges the individual nations to assist each other in opposing invasion, but clothes the council with the function only of advising as to how most effectively to act. If the nations are to make a genuine attempt to reduce the burdens of enormous armaments and to render wars more difficult, especially wars of conquest, it is hard to see how they can make any progress unless they stand by one another against military aggression.

Any nation with predatory ambitions would hesitate a long time before invading the territory of other nations if it knew that so many of the civilized countries would make common resistance in some form. So I submit that this obligation, while it will not make war impossible, will prove to be a powerful deterrent of war and an effective guaranty of world peace. It leaves the choice of means and the time of action to the various nations themselves, and places no affirmative power in the hands of the league. So we see that in another of its most fundamental provisions the league endeavors in no way to override the sovereignty of the individual nation. Furthermore, the agreement to protect member nations against external aggression puts an international Monroe doctrine around every nation that joins the league. By virtue of the Monroe doctrine the United States guarantees the independence and territorial integrity of certain countries on this hemisphere. These countries on joining the league will find the civilized world behind the United States in the matter of this guaranty. Moreover, Woodrow Wilson has secured the adoption of an article in the covenant specifically recognizing and approving the Monroe doctrine. This is article 21, and it reads as follows:

> Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.

It has been argued that this mutual guaranty would preserve the existing political organizations of the world and would in this way constitute a barrier against changes which might be demanded by progress and development. A closer view will show that this guaranty has no reference to the internal structure of nations and empires, but is aimed only at aggression from the outside.

Any war or threat of war anywhere in the world is pronounced a matter of concern to the league, and the league will take such action within the terms of the covenant as it may consider essential to the peace of mankind. A meeting of the council may be called at the request of any member of the league to consider such an emergency. Any member may draw the attention of the council or assembly to any circumstances affecting international relations which threaten to disturb either the peace or the good understanding between nations on which peace depends. Here again no powers are conveyed to the league, the member nations having the right to take such steps as their respective governments deem advisable in view of the league's recommendations.

We now come to the provisions of the league relating to arbitration and the settlement of disputes. First, the member nations obligate themselves in the event of disputes likely to lead to a rupture not to resort to war without previously submitting the questions involved to arbitration or to inquiry by the council. The council may refer the matter to the assembly, and so may any party to the dispute within 14 days after its submission to the council. If a dispute is submitted to arbitration, the parties may select any tribunal on which they may agree or have heretofore agreed, or may utilize an international court to be established by the league to hear such cases as the parties may decide to lay before it, and to give advisory opinions on questions referred to it by the council or by the assembly. The members of the league agree to abide in good faith by arbitration awards. If there should be any failure to abide by or carry out the award of an arbitration tribunal, it is made the duty of the council to suggest steps for its execution. It will be seen that arbitration is not compulsory, but optional, and that under these provisions the spirit of existing treaties between nations for arbitration of controversies may be fully observed.

Second. The parties to a dispute which has been submitted to arbitration or to either body of the league agree not to resort to war within three months after the award by arbitration or a recommendation resulting from an investigation by the council or assembly. The arbitrators must act within a reasonable time and the council or assembly, if the matter has been referred to either, within six months. This provision gives opportunity for reason to resume its sway, for angry passions to subside, for the moral force of world opinion to operate, for the exercise of persuasion on the contending countries.

Third. The parties at issue agree not to go to war at all with a member of the league which complies with an arbitration award, or if the dispute shall have been referred to the council, with the unanimous recommendation of the members of the council other than the parties to the dispute, or, if the controversy shall have been referred to the assembly, with the recommendation of that body having the approval of all its members who are also members of the council and of a majority of the other members, exclusive in each case of the members who are parties to the dispute. If such recommendations can not be had in either the council or the assembly, the members of the league reserve the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute is claimed by either party to relate to matters solely within its domestic jurisdiction and the council or assembly, as the case may be, so finds, no recommendation is to be made as to settlement.

If any member of the league resorts to war in disregard of these obligations, namely, to submit in the manner heretofore described to arbitration or to inquiry, or to refrain from war until three months after the arbitration award or the report of the result of the inquiry, or to refrain altogether from war against a nation whose contention wins the decision of the council or the assembly or of the arbitrators, such member is deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league. These other members undertake to subject the offending nation to a severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their citizens and those of the covenant-breaking nation, as well as the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the citizens of the covenant-breaking nation and those of any other nation, whether a member of the league or not. The council is to recommend what military or naval force the members of the league shall severally contribute to effect the purposes of the league. The members will then take such further action as they may individually deem advisable.

The members of the league agree to support one another to such extent as they may individually consider proper in the financial and economic measures taken against the covenant-breaking nation and in resisting any special measures against one of their number by said nation.

Reviewing the provisions of the league covenant for the settlement of controversies we see that they comprise a machinery admirably adapted to the end in view. The organized public opinion of the civilized world is brought to bear on international disputes, an opinion which no nation can ever afford to antagonize. If a nation persists, however, in ignoring the processes established by civilization for the maintenance of peace, it will face such penalties as the nations of the league in their own separate and individual judgment deem proper.

If either or both of the disputing parties are not members of the league they shall be invited to become such for the purpose of settlement under the terms applicable to league members. If they refuse, the council may take such action, within the scope of its functions, and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and settle the dispute. If a nation thus refusing makes war against a member of the league, it shall be subjected to the penalties visited by the league on a member nation which goes to war in violation of the covenant's rules regarding arbitration and inquiry.

Every treaty or international engagement made hereafter by any member nation shall forthwith be registered with the secretary general and published by him as soon as possible, and no such treaty or engagement shall be binding until so registered. This ends secret diplomacy—a fruitful source of trouble and dissension among the nations.

The assembly may from time to time advise members of the league to reconsider treaties that have become inapplicable and to consider international conditions endangering or liable to endanger world peace.

All obligations or understandings now existing among member nations inconsistent with the terms of the covenant are abrogated, and the member nations agree that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with these terms.

Colonies, territories, areas relieved as a result of the war from the sovereignty heretofore governing them and not able to stand alone are to be intrusted to the tutelage and superintendence of members of the league, called for such purpose "mandatories." The well-being and development of the liberated peoples are declared a sacred trust of civilization, and their wishes are to be a principal consideration in the selection of a mandatory power. The degree of authority to be exercised by a mandatory nation must either be previously agreed upon by the members of the league or explicitly defined in each case by the council. The mandatory nation is to make an annual report to the league, and a mandatory commission is to be established for the purpose of receiving and examining annual reports as well as of advising the council on all matters relating to the observance of mandates. Thus every safeguard is thrown about the administration of the affairs of the peoples who have been freed by the war but who are not yet in position to look after themselves. It is not imperative that any nation shall accept a mandate; this is a matter to be decided by each nation for itself.

Subject to and in accordance with present and future provisions of international conventions the members of the league agree (a) that they will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children in their own countries and in all countries with which they have commercial and industrial relations, establishing the necessary international organizations for the latter purpose; (b) that they will undertake to secure just treatment of the natives inhabiting territories under their control; (c) that they will intrust the league with general supervision over the execution of agreements looking to the repression of the slave traffic, the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs; (d) that they will intrust the league with general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of the traffic is necessary; (e) that they will provide freedom of communication, transit, and equitable treatment for the commerce of all league members, special regard being had for the regions devastated during the war; and (f) that they will endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease. The league thus places itself in position to cooperate with the various international societies and organizations dealing with the subjects specified, many of which bodies have already become important factors in the progress of the world.

And, Mr. President, in thus supporting the operations of all these great international organizations, the league would justify its existence if it accomplished nothing else.

International bureaus already established by general treaties, if the parties consent, and all future international bureaus established by member nations are to be placed under the direction of the league.

The members of the league agree to aid in the establishment of national Red Cross organizations which have as purposes "the improvement of health, the prevention of disease, and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world."

The last article of the league covenant provides that amendments can not become effective unless ratified by each nation represented in the council and by a majority of those represented in the assembly. Thus no change can be made in the covenant unless the United States gives its consent. This is further proof of the fact that no one country or group of countries may control the league, and thus endanger the sovereignty and independence of the United States or any other member.

The last article further provides that no member of the league is bound by the adoption of an amendment if it signifies its intention not to be bound, and that in such case it ceases to be a member of the league.

Viewing the covenant of the league of nations as a whole, it may well be characterized as the most effective instrument for the maintenance of peace and the prevention of war the heart and brain of man have yet produced. It has not attempted the impossible; it is based on a clear recognition of the fact that we have not yet reached that stage where war may be entirely suppressed. It makes war remote and improbable, however, by organizing the public opinion and the moral force of civilization in one great international unit, pledged to the peaceful settlement of international controversies.

We are told that the United States should not enter into an arrangement of this kind because our geographical situation and our inherent strength make us independent of foreign broils, and they say this with 80,000 American graves in foreign soil bearing tragic testimony to the effect of a European situation on this Republic.

They tell us that if we subscribe to this covenant we do so as a matter of favor to other nations; that they need us, but we do not need them. I tell you that there was never a time when it was more necessary for the civilized nations to stand together for the peace and liberty of the world than now. It is either this or the piling of armaments on armaments until the people's backs are broken from the strain.

The covenant offers the firmest barrier against war humanity has yet known. It builds fresher and stronger foundations for the civilization and progress of mankind. It is the mightiest advance toward a higher existence and a better day since the cry of the angels in the skies of Bethlehem for peace on earth, good will to men.

Mr. President, it remained for two of the smaller nations of the earth to give mankind an example worthy of universal emulation. In 1900 Chile and Argentina were at the point of war. In an appeal of uplifting eloquence on Easter Sunday Bishop Benavente, of Argentina, directed the angry peoples to the teachings of the Galilean, and urged that a statue of Christ be erected on the frontier connecting the two countries. The response was immediate. The dispute was submitted to arbitration, with Edward of England as arbiter. His decision was promptly accepted, and the effect was wonderful. The tides of passion fell. Arsenals were converted into schools. Funds intended for battleships were employed in the beneficent enterprises of peace. In commemoration of the triumph of reason over force a statue of Christ was erected on the mutual boundary line which traverses the crest of the Andes. The statue was made in part of melted cannon. Thus the implements of battle were dismantled and molded into the features of the everlasting Prince of Peace.

With one hand supporting the cross, the other pointing to the heavens, stands the Christ of the Andes, on the mountains that divide the lands where peace and love once vanquished war. On the pedestal the following legend is inscribed: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble to dust than Chileans and Argentinians break the peace which at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer, they have sworn to maintain." God hasten the day when every people of the globe shall subscribe to a similar sentiment at the feet of a similar figure erected at the seat of a league of nations consecrated to eternal peace.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I desire between now and 2 o'clock to occupy the time of the Senate very briefly in reference to the league of nations. I will occupy not more than 25 minutes, if I am not disturbed.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. Would the Senator object if I should suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McKellar	Sherman
Borah	Harrison	McNary	Simmons
Capper	Henderson	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smith, Md.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Smoot
Curtis	Kellogg	Norris	Spencer
Dial	Kendrick	Nugent	Stanley
Edge	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Phelan	Swanson
Fletcher	King	Phipps	Thomas
France	Kirby	Pittman	Trammell
Gerry	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Hale	Lenroot	Robinson	Warren
Harding	McCormick	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, what I shall submit is purely on my own responsibility. I do not, I know, assume to represent the political party with which I am affiliated. I do not know even whether I represent my own constituency in my own State. I am only following what to me appears to be a line of duty. Probably most of my associates do not agree with me on this feature of the subject as it is applicable to the league of nations. I have not communicated in an official way with the advisory committee on this side of the chamber; I would not know how to communicate with it if I wished. I do not know anything of their meetings, their purposes, or the general objects they have in view in matters of a political character. If I were privileged to do so, it would be improper for me to submit to their consideration any of the reasons that I now might allege. It is solely a matter undertaken on my own responsibility, therefore. It is not done precipitately; it has been approached with deliberation, founded upon a long investigation of the very much condensed matter that I shall present. I have put it in the smallest possible compass so that it might be read with the least consumption of time. It is a feature of the league of nations, Mr. President, that in my judgment ought not to be omitted in the discussion of that momentous subject. The controversy which undoubtedly will rage in this chamber for some time and in the country for a much longer time would be incomplete, according to my lights, if I did not submit this chapter or subchapter in the current discussion of that subject.

I have no personal feeling in the matter, Mr. President. I am a member of no church, I regret to say. So far as the two great divisions of the Christian church are involved, I have relatives in both branches, both in the Protestant and in the original Christian church known as the Catholic—blood relatives in both those great divisions of religious thought in the Caucasian race. I have many more sincere personal friends who are Catholics. I have everything to risk or lose and nothing to gain. If I did not comment on the ecclesiastical power, now latent but existent, in the league of nations, I would regard myself as derelict in my duty in presenting my own convictions on this subject. If I look aside from my own conceptions of my duty in the uncharted sea of controversy, from what source shall I derive guidance, from what place will I obtain light?

Mr. President, this is not a political question. I can not go to my party for guidance; I can read no platform; I can consult no leader; I can not go to the church, because it is greater than any creed or man-created organism, great even as those mighty ecclesiastical organizations of the world are. If those bodies had been competent to save, then when we cried out in our day of agony they would have availed us. I can go only to my Creator or to my country, to whose Constitution and laws, to whose traditions and institutions of free government, and to whose sheltering care for my ancestors and myself I owe all that I have in this world and all that I expect in the few years left to me on this earth.

I am animated by no desire for anything further in this life. I have had preferment beyond my deserts and far beyond my expectations when I entered public life. I have no ambition, but I do owe to my country the last calm reflections that I shall make upon public questions in this Chamber, the best that I have in whatever erring, faltering judgment my Creator has given me; and that, with the blessings of Providence, if my health shall endure, I shall give. I expect no return; I only expect to give to that country to which I owe this duty the

best that I have, whatever it may be, much or little, humble or exalted. I shall have criticism. I shall bear it. I shall be maligned. I shall endure it. I shall be misunderstood. I shall correct it. I shall be deserted by friends. I am accustomed to it. I expect only to perform my duty as I see it. I repeat, I ask no return; I have no selfish motives in any decision I have made in this Chamber; I have no ambition for political preferment; I care only to be a citizen of my country. To that country I owe the supreme allegiance of an American. I expect, according to my lights, wherever my footsteps may lead in the journey remaining, guided by those lights, to give the best of my understanding and service in this crisis of our national life. Therefore, animated by this purpose only, I have somewhat reluctantly come to the conclusion, against the advice of many personal friends, that I owe to this country of mine the supreme duty of saying, within a limited time here, what I have committed to paper in order that I may be understood and possibly the better read, if any shall do me that credit.

ECCLESIASTICAL POWER IN THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

From the beginning of the Christian era differences have constantly arisen on the separation of secular and spiritual authority. In a ruder age no doubt some reasons existed for a union of ecclesiastical power with the civil. The sword and the church could survive against the barbarism of the middle ages when Christendom was assailed, only by forgetting those differences.

In later days the union of church and state has universally fallen under the ban in the more civilized countries of the world. When the church exercised temporal power it was difficult to preserve the rights of conscience. Toleration and a complete severance of temporal from papal power as well as all other ecclesiastical organizations became indispensable requirements. Our Government is founded on the complete divorce of civil and spiritual affairs.

The darkest chapter in the Caucasian race is religious persecution. The cruelty and oppression practiced in an earlier day by the devout believers in many creeds stain human history. Freedom of worship and exemption from restrictions imposed by civil government are a necessary result of universal toleration and the separation of church and state. It was a doctrine of slow growth. It is a permanent cornerstone, however, of justice. It is not now material nor proper to criticize or attempt to place the blame for earlier persecutions. All were in a greater or less measure guilty, as shown both by history and by the documentary evidence preserved in many quarters of the globe. Persecution has not been a sole characteristic of any one church, but of many of the great churches or the great religious beliefs of the earth. It is the perverted sentiment of a debased and erring humanity that has made such a chapter to be read by the sons of men. Therefore, Mr. President, all have been in a greater or less measure guilty. Even Protestants have persecuted. I can tell the truth about them all. The dust of martyrs has gone from the stake to be scattered to the four quarters of the earth by others than practiced it in the Inquisition. Let us tell the truth about them all to-day, in the hope that we may never relapse in any quarter of the civilized globe into that unhappy state again. What we are now concerned in is to preserve absolute freedom of conscience and actual separation of ecclesiastical from civil power, universal toleration of every religious faith not inconsistent with or subversive of the public peace or welfare and private right.

From an early age the occupants of the Vatican have believed and still believe in the inherent right of papal authority to administer civil government. I know how old this controversy is and how bitterly assertions have been made and denied. I know, too, Mr. President, the aspersions that may be the lot of those who touch these vital subjects. I would rather tell the truth now than attempt to tell it when it is too late. It is with the utmost regret I fail to find recorded in the course of papal claims of later days any renunciation or disavowal of the doctrine. So far as a layman can discover the Vatican still believes it ought, and would if the power permitted, assume to administer ecclesiastical and civil government as its joint, exclusive, and paramount power. The divorce of the spiritual affairs of mankind from the temporal has never met with the approbation of papal authority. I have searched the records in the libraries, in all the avenues of information accessible, and I find no renunciation of that ancient doctrine; but, on the contrary, I believe it to be a part of the indispensable belief of that authority to the present hour. The overwhelming verdict of modern times is opposed to that combination of powers. History has not yet faded from the memories of the human race. The separation, however, will endure only so long as the people of the world, or its several nations, shall be able by public opinion to continue their governments under such separation. I believe a very large majority of the population of our country now favor the continuance of this separation without regard to distinctions of creed. It must be admitted, however, that the influences and control of papal authority are much stronger and more absolute over those who accept the head of that organization as infallible and sacred than among the great Protestant divisions of the Christian church. In the event of a definite exercise of power by the Vatican over the members of its church how far it would sway their conduct if it were sought to resume the exercise of temporal authority as a part of the spiritual jurisdiction is uncertain.

This uncertainty becomes of grave concern in examining the league of nations. I am not of that happy variety that care nothing for history. I am compelled by my habits of thought to admit its value in the affairs of men. It has become the fashion now to deride and ignore its salutary lessons. The historian is the newspaper man of the centuries. We are living in a new era. It is said the old régime has passed away and a new order is upon us. It is assumed that human nature, the elemental laws that govern both in and about us, the ambitions, and passions of our species are no longer existent. Unhappily for this mirage of skygazers no changes have occurred in the elemental nature of ourselves, both for good and evil, and in the laws of the physical world. So long as our Creator leaves us under these mundane limitations and disabilities we must studiously heed the voice of human experience. Yesterday is the schoolmaster of to-day, and both to-day and yesterday often point with unerring accuracy to the affairs of to-morrow. Of the great powers of the earth this Republic is yet a veritable infant. We are in the kindergarten stage of our development in the family of nations—143 years old the 4th day of next July.

When the Chaldeans, who began history, who traced the laws of nature by their shepherds in the hills of Asia, expired before the conquering legions of the Assyrians, that nation with its Babylonian successor had survived 1,100 years against its public enemies. When the Assyrians perished, beginning with the destruction of the hosts of Sennacherib, Assyria had held the reins of power for 1,000 years. The Medes and the Babylonians and the Persians came in turn, the Phœnicians, the Greeks, and the Romans. To-day, England of modern nations has the longest continuous uninterrupted reign of civilized dominion there is left of modern nations on the earth. She is 1,000 years old since the days of King Alfred, and we are 143 years old, and are going about in the plenitude of our pride, prating of what we will do in the world of nations. We, I repeat, are in the kindergarten stage of our development, and all that gives us stability apart from the American character we are forgetting we have borrowed from Holland and from Great Britain, from our ancestors across the sea, modified it and put it into practice here, adapted it to our wants—our ancestors showed genius in the adaptation and framing from the material of the ages—and still we think we can control and mold laws more unchangeable than those of the Medes and the Persians. Let us rather, in humiliation and meekness of soul, gaze upon the mighty wrecks where the domed and pillared capitals of empire lie in the obscuring mold of centuries and are forgotten except by the student and the statesman who reflect upon the melancholy end of those who perished long before we assumed to govern the world. We can no more ignore proper precautions with impunity and survive than the forgotten races of history whose temples and altars are covered with the drifting dust of centuries. Our paper charters and laws signify nothing against the willful impulses or disposition to error among the living of any given generation. The league of nations will be no stronger than the self-restraint and the sense of justice of the individual member nations. The influences collected in or set in operation by that charter for good or evil must be interpreted and weighed in their probable abuses or perversions.

The original members of the league of nations are the United States of America, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, British Empire—Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, India—China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Serbia, Siam, and Uruguay. Of these original 32 member nations, signatories to the proposed league, 28 are Christian nations and 4 are of other faiths. Of these 28 Christian nations, 17 are Catholic nations, either a majority or an overwhelming preponderance of the population being of that religious faith, and 11 are Protestant. In some of them, a minority, it is true, the support of the Catholic religion is enforced by the State, with certain resulting civil disabilities for others. The greater part, however, have secured universal toleration of conscience by

law, organic or statutory. I have read with many hours of time, running through a long period, beginning last winter, the religious history of these nations. I sum it up in this short paper.

The Catholic members of the league are Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Uruguay, and Czecho-Slovakia. The 17 nations will be represented in the league, in all human probability, by Catholic delegates. No criticism of itself could be made of this, nor ought. That church represents in its membership either a majority or almost an entirety of the several populations. The sway over those people and their implicit faith in the infallibility of the head of this great religious organization is supreme. It is one of the greatest ecclesiastical powers the world has ever known. Its influence upon the modern world is but faintly appreciated by those outside of its spiritual jurisdiction. It is a power for good. I cheerfully bear witness to its support of stable government, and, above all, its steady opposition to a socialistic state, disorder, and Bolshevism in its various forms and manifestations. I believe it one of the greatest agencies in the world to meet those sinister influences. Disintegrating socialism and its exponents recognize the solid rock of Roman Catholicism as a barrier in their way. The sanctity of the family relation, the elemental rights of life and property, and the necessity of stable government have no sturdier support among the churches of the modern world.

If it were not for the belief of the Vatican in the wisdom of its temporal supremacy in the same government that safeguards life and property, as well as ecclesiastical and civil liberty, there could be none of this criticism I make of the league. The head of the church proclaims and teaches his infallibility. It is traditional and historic. The two doctrines exerted in their full effect on the original 17 Christian nations of that faith in the league give to that church its complete dominion by actual votes. It might be exercised to the end of time justly and in moderation. The separation of church and state might continue. Universal toleration might still be the great guaranteed right of all. The peril lies in the claim of papal power never abjured, never disavowed. There is always danger in great power in one hand coupled with such a belief. The temptation to enforce that belief might break down every barrier built up by centuries of struggle and sacrifice. Shall the United States commit itself to the mercy of a power from which our ancestors delivered us? Shall we risk entangling ourselves and our posterity in the toils we have escaped through their wisdom and the warnings they left to guide us in the duties and perils of our generation? The covenant of the league of nations bears within its folds a reactionary power more fatal and insidious than a Prussian helmet, more dangerous than future war!

The 13 States invited to accede to the covenant of the league of nations are: Argentine Republic, Chile, Columbia, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. All are Christian races, with the single exception of Persia, which is Mohammedan, with a slight mixture of other faiths. Of the 12 invited Christian States, 7 are Catholic, viz, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Paraguay, Salvador, Spain, and Venezuela. Of the original signatory nations with the invited nations, 40 out of a total of 45 are Christian populations. Five of the 45 nations are non-Christian. China's faith is Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism; other faiths, both Christian and otherwise, are tolerated. Hedjaz is almost entirely Mohammedan. Japan gives religious freedom, the State supporting none; Buddhism and Shintoism are the prevailing faiths. Siam worships at the shrine of Buddhism, with education chiefly in the hand of the priests of that religion. Persia, as already stated, is Mohammedan.

Seventeen of the original and seven of the invited nations are Catholic. Therefore, 24 of the 40 equal votes of the Christian nations, members of the league, are spiritually dominated by the Vatican. If the question of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical or the civil power arises, I believe it a matter of profound apprehension that one man at the head of a great religious organization controls, if he follows his own present as well as traditional convictions, or seeks to control the conduct of the delegates of the 24 member nations. And this power is proposed to govern the world! In these circumstances may we not well hesitate in voting the United States into the league when it becomes practically impossible for us ever to withdraw? The difficulties to be raised if we seek to leave the league can be raised by the smallest and most insignificant of the member States. There is scarcely one that could not present some valid reason satisfactory to it why we have not discharged our international obligations or performed all our obligations under the covenant.

Would Colombia ever permit us to leave the league of nations until we had settled her indemnity for the Panama expenditure? Never; and if she is a member she has an absolute veto upon our withdrawal, and she would exercise it.

The Vatican is a most earnest advocate of the covenant of the league of nations. With 24 out of 40 members of that league under his spiritual sway, to convince him would require no extended argument aside from the alleged merit of the document. It is well known that the Vatican was prior to the war the closest adviser of the late Emperor of Austria, Francis Joseph. That monarch seldom acted in his governmental capacity without first consulting and obtaining the approval of the papal power of Rome. It will be recalled that during the war when the Central Powers began to suffer reverses suggested mediation came from the Vatican. It was understood at the time to be inspired by Austrian solicitations. If mediation had taken place then, in the light of what is now occurring, we know it would have left Austria with her territory intact and Germany secure in the greater part of her conquest and plunder, with no exacted or paid indemnity.

I have only to refer to the papal message of August 1, 1917, published in the press of that day. It, by its suggested terms made on the instigation of the Austrian authorities, would have left the Central Powers in possession of their plunder, with no atonement for their crimes against humanity. There was more than mere suspicion in this unfortunate clandestine relation, because in the treaty of London, in article 15, it is expressly provided that the Pope and his representatives are positively to be excluded from the future peace conference.

I read from that treaty. In the treaty known as the London treaty, a secret treaty of concern in the Fiume incident and the settlement of the Trentino and the Italian irridenta country, dated April 26 to May 9, 1915, section 15 reads as follows:

> France, England, and Russia obligate themselves to support Italy in her desire for nonadmittance of the Holy See to any kind of diplomatic steps for the purpose of the conclusion of peace or the regulation of questions arising from the present war.

Section 15 was a guaranty against this clandestine relation that existed between the papal power and Francis Joseph. It is well known why section 15 was inserted in the secret treaty. Whatever may be the relation now, those were the relations at that time. Italy feared the relations between Austria and the Vatican in her domestic temporal affairs. It is well understood that the controversy between the temporal Government of Italy and the papal power dates from the time when their spiritual and civil jurisdictions were severed in Italy and the two were made distinct in all the Italian territory.

March 16, 1919, President Wilson conferred with the Vatican at Rome. I refer now to that interview, inserted by myself in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 23d of May, 1919, on page 139. It was published among other papers, and all the metropolitan papers carried it. In the New York World of March 17, 1919, the papal authority said, among other things, referring to the league:

> President Wilson put the matter so clearly that my doubts began to melt, and before our interview closed I agreed with him on the main lines of his plan. The President struck me as being more interested in his league of nations than in fixing the problems of the newly created States.

This is either a miraculous conversion or the deep traditional wisdom of the Holy See, which? The great pontifical dignitary gives no random interviews. Neither can we believe both the President's visit and the interview were not for a preconceived purpose. It reveals, too, our absent President as making the league of nations the paramount purpose of his presence at the peace table. Boundaries of newly created States, millions of people, their rights, their wrongs unrequited for weary years, even peace itself, were bartered for votes for the league. Small wonder the "14 points" were abandoned in the frenzied rush. If the Hun had not been invoking them constantly, they would have sunk from sight long ago.

The controversy over Fiume and the resulting troubles recall the belief among many Italians that the Vatican is not in sympathy with the civil government of Italy on this subject.

I have many communications from well-informed Italians in this country who know the history of their native land. They are of that faith. They accept the spiritual authority of papal power. They do not, because they are Americans in their belief, accept his supremacy on matters of civil authority.

It is fair to infer that the Pope cordially approves of President Wilson's stand against Orlando and the Italian civil authorities. Our good President's appeal to the people of Italy over the head of Orlando and his official associates may have been made with due deliberation and foreknowledge. The morning press reports carries the news of the overthrow of the Orlando ministry by the vote of a want of confidence in the Chamber of Italian Deputies. There is a most remarkable continuity in the sequence of events from the Vatican's first efforts toward mediation to the Fiume controversy. While the evidence is cir-

cumstantial, it all tends to connect President Wilson with influences unfriendly to the temporal power of Italy and inimical to the future welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask instead of reading at length that certain documents relating to the subject, a communication already referred to from the papal authority, an article from the Masonic Chronicle of June 7, 1919, and from the same authority of March 17, 1919, be printed at length in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TEXT OF THE POPE'S NOTE TO THE BELLIGERENT POWERS SUGGESTING BASIS FOR PEACE.

[By the Associated Press.]

LONDON, *August 16, 1917.*

The foreign office has issued the French text of the letter from the Pope to the King, inclosing a copy of his appeal to the heads of the belligerent peoples. The Pope's appeal is accompanied by the following letter from Cardinal Gasparri, papal secretary of state:

"Your majesty, the holy father, anxious to do everything he can in order to put an end to the conflict which for the last three years has ravaged the civilized world, has decided to submit to the leaders of the belligerent peoples concrete peace proposals exposed in a document which I have the honor to attach to this letter. May God grant that the words of his holiness will this time produce the desired effect for the good of the whole of humanity.

COPY FOR PRESIDENT WILSON.

"The holy see, not having diplomatic relations with the French Government or with the Government of Italy or the United States, I very respectfully beg your majesty to be good enough to have handed a copy of his holiness's appeal to the President of the French Republic, to his Majesty the King of Italy, and to the President of the United States. I also beg to add 12 other copies, which I request your majesty to be good enough to hand to the leaders of the nations friendly to the Allies, with the exception, however, of Russia, Belgium, and Brazil, to whom the document has been sent direct.

"In expressing to your majesty my sincere thanks for this extreme kindness, I am happy to take the opportunity to offer you the homage of sentiment, a very profound respect with which I have the honor to sign myself your majesty's very humble and devoted servant.

"GASPARRI."

TEXT OF POPE'S APPEAL.

The appeal follows:

"To the leaders of the belligerent peoples:

"Since the beginning of our pontificate, the horrors of a terrible war having been let loose on Europe, we have in view, above everything, three things to preserve: Perfect impartiality toward all belligerents, as is suitable for Him who is the common Father and who loves all His children with equal affection. Continually to attempt to do all the good possible, and that without exception of person, without distinction of nationality or religion, as is dictated to us by the universal law of charity which the supreme spiritual charge has confided to us with Christ. Finally, as our pacific mission also requires, to omit nothing as long as it was in our power which might contribute to hasten the end of this calamity by trying to lead people and their leaders to more moderate resolution to hasten a serene deliberation of a peace just and durable.

"Whoever has followed our work during those three painful years which have just passed has been able easily to recognize that if we have always remained faithful to our resolve of absolute impartiality and to our attitude of benevolence, we have not ceased to exhort the peoples and the belligerent brothers again to become brethren, although publicity has not been given to all that we have done to attain this very noble aim.

EARLY APPEAL NOT HEARD.

"Toward the end of the first year of the war we addressed to the nations in conflict most lovely exhortations, and more, we indicated the part to be followed to arrive at a stable and honorable place for all. Unfortunately, our appeal was not heard and the war continued desperately for another two years with all its horrors. It became even more cruel and extended over the earth, over the sea, and in the air, and one saw desolation and death descend upon the cities without defense, upon peaceful villages, and on their innocent population, and now no one can imagine how the sufferings of all would be increased and aggravated if other months or, worse still, other years are about to be added to this sanguinary triennium.

"Is this civilized world to be nothing more than a field of death? And Europe, so glorious and so flourishing, is it going, as if stricken by a universal madness, to run to the abyss and to lend its hand to its own suicide?

"In such a terrible situation and in the presence of a menace so serious we, who have no particular political aim, do not listen to suggestions or to the interests of any of the belligerent parties, but are solely compelled by a sentiment of our supreme duty as the common father of the faithful, by the solicitation of our children, who implore our intervention and our pacifying work.

"Through the voice even of humanity and of reason we once more emit the cry of peace, and we renew a pressing appeal to those who hold in their hands the destinies of nations. But, in order no longer to speak in general terms, as the circumstances had counseled us in the past, we now wish to make a more concrete and practical proposal and to invite the governments of the belligerents to come to an agreement upon the following points, which seem to be a basis of a just and durable peace, leaving to them the task of analyzing and completing them.

DISARMAMENT OF NATIONS.

"First of all, the fundamental points must be that the material force of arms be substituted by the moral force of right, from which shall arise a fair agreement by all for the simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments according to the rules and guarantees to be established, in a measure necessary and sufficient for the maintenance of public order in each State. Then in the substitution for armies the institution of arbitration, with its high pacifying function, according to the rules to be laid down and the penalties to be imposed on a State which would refuse either to submit a national question to arbitration or to accept its decision.

"Once the supremacy of right has thus been established all obstacles to the means of communication of the peoples would disappear by assuring, by rules to be fixed later, the true liberty and community of the seas, which would contribute to lessen the numerous causes of conflict and would also open to all new sources of prosperity and progress.

"As to the damages to be repaired and as to the war expenses we see no other means of solving the question than by submitting as a general principle the complete and reciprocal condonation which would be justified moreover by the immense benefit to be derived from disarmament, so much so that no one will understand the continuation of a similar carnage solely for reasons of an economic order.

"If for certain cases there exist particular reasons they would be deliberated upon with justice and equity, but these pacific agreements with the immense advantages to be derived from them are not possible without a reciprocal restitution of the territory at present occupied.

COMPLETE EVACUATION OF BELGIUM.

"Consequently on the part of Germany the complete evacuation of Belgium, with the guarantee of her full political, military, and economic independence toward it.

"The evacuation of French territory. On the part of other belligerent parties similar restitution of the German colonies.

"As regards the territorial questions, as, for example, those which have arisen between Italy and Austria and between Germany and France, there is reason to hope that in consideration of the immense advantages of a durable peace with disarmament, the parties in conflict would wish to examine them with a conciliatory disposition, taking into consideration, as we have said formerly, the aspirations of the peoples and the special interests and of the general welfare of the great human society.

"The same spirit of equity and justice ought to be followed in the examination of other territorial and political questions, notably those relative to Armenia and the Balkan States and territories making a part of the ancient Kingdom of Poland, whose noble and historical traditions and sufferings which it has endured, especially during the present war, ought to conciliate the sympathies of nations.

"Such are the principal bases whereupon we believe the future reorganization of the peoples ought to be built. They are of a nature to render impossible the return of similar conflicts and to prepare a solution of the economic question so important for the future and for the material well-being of all belligerent States.

"Therefore, in presenting to you, who direct at this hour the destinies of the belligerent nations, we are animated to see them accepted and to see thus the conclusion at an early date of the terrible struggle which more and more appears a useless massacre.

"The whole world recognizes that the honor of the armies of both sides is safe. Incline your ears, therefore, to our prayer. Accept the fraternal invitation which we send you in the name of the Divine Redeemer, the Prince of Peace. Reflect on your very grave responsibility before God and before man.

"On your decision depend the repose and the joy of innumerable families, the life of thousands of young people; in a word, the happiness of a people for whom it is your absolute duty to obtain their welfare.

"May the Lord inspire your decision in conformity to His very holy will. May God grant that while meriting the applause of your contemporaries you will also obtain in the future generations a splendid name of pacificators.

"As for us, closely united in prayer and in penitence with all those faithful souls which sigh for peace, we implore for you the light and counsel of the Divine Spirit.

(Signed) "BENEDICT.

"At the Vatican, August 1."

[From the Masonic Chronicle.]

THE POPE AND THE KAISER.

Additional evidence that the Pope and the Kaiser had a complete understanding before the war and that the Pope threw his influence in favor of Germany is constantly being provided by the Germans and also by the Pope's adherents.

A dispatch printed in the daily newspapers and sent out by the Associated Press shows clearly the friendly attitude of the present German statesmen toward the Pope. It reads:

"VERSAILLES, *May 11.*

"The Pope should be a member of the league of nations, Germany will contend in a series of objections and suggestions concerning the covenant as adopted by the peace conference.

"By what manner of reasoning the Holy Father is to receive the status of a nation is as yet unrevealed, but presumably the Germans mean he should be a member of the executive council or hold some high official place in the league."

This would indicate that the Germans still believe in autocracy, and that there is a strong desire on their part to convince the Pope they appreciate favors at the hands of the Vatican during the war. It also proves that Gen. Pershing was right when he said "the Vatican was altogether too friendly with Germany."

The Pope responds by demanding a modification of the peace treaty, as evidenced by this dispatch:

"ROME, *May 31.*

"The Corriere d'Italia, unofficial organ of the Vatican, referring to the reported opposition the peace treaty has aroused in every country, demanded to-day that it be revised immediately 'in the name of humanity.'"

The above juicy morsels, coupled with the Pope's peace proposal, wherein he advised the Allies to surrender to the Kaiser, and the Kaiser's recent "spasm," charging the Masons with being responsible for the war, should point out the duty of every American citizen and especially every Mason.

It should be remembered that in the past the Vatican, or Pope, controlled and directed many kings and rulers of Europe, the most cruel and bloodthirsty on earth. The Pope and the Roman Catholic Church have always meddled in the politics of Europe, and, in fact, in state affairs in all sections of the world. It has been an established policy of that church to place its votaries in public office, thereby enabling it to control the destinies of unfortunate peoples. Monarchs have invited the Pope to assist them in ruling their people, and the Pope has always complied to the detriment of the people. This condition has existed in many countries of Europe for hundreds of years, and for this reason the Roman Catholic Church has been accused of being a political rather than a religious institution.

The founders of the Republic of the United States wisely proclaimed in favor of religious liberty and absolute separation of church and state.

These sound principles of government have enabled peoples of different religious beliefs to dwell together in harmony.

Believing it possesses sufficient strength, the Roman Catholic Church is now attempting to control or rule these United States. Its faithful adherents occupy many of the most important public offices, and in every case these Roman Catholic officeholders carry their religion into politics.

No one objects to the Roman Catholic Church as a religious institution, but the time has come when it must remove itself from state affairs. It is opposed to free speech, free schools, and a free press. It is ruled by an autocracy. It may continue to meddle in the politics of Europe, but a continuation of its present policy will end in disaster. The Pope's friend, the Kaiser, will be in luck to escape with his life. Let the Pope take heed and attend strictly to his religious knitting.

[Reprinted from the New York Evening Post.]

FULL TEXTS OF SECRET TREATIES AS REVEALED AT PETROGRAD—THE SENSATIONAL "SECRET DIPLOMACY" DISCLOSURES MADE BY TROTSKI WHEN THE BOLSHEVIKI CAME INTO POSSESSION OF THE RUSSIAN ARCHIVES.

If there is one man who has profited by the publication of the secret documents given out by the Russians and just printed in full by the Evening Post, it is Woodrow Wilson. Trotski had, of course, no such special purpose in mind. He merely wanted to strike at all secret diplomacy, to show how the allies were secretly at the same old game of planning how to redistribute the world, according to their own tastes and desires, agreeing privately among themselves as to the spoils of victory. Recognizing how great the mischief this sort of thing has done in the past, wishing to help on a democratic peace, and to force everything into the open. Trotski opened up the archives. By doing so he let out the very best evidence of the wisdom and statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson in putting as his first clause in his peace conditions of January 8, 1918, this demand:

"Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

Behind him on that plank should stand every American who is loyal to democracy and desires a better world, and the Evening Post rejoices that its good luck in being able to obtain in this country the full text of the first batch of these documents—there are more to come—has made possible its thus serving the President and the country's underlying cause.—Oswald Garrison Villard, writing in the Saturday Magazine of the New York Evening Post, February 2, 1918.

FULL TEXTS OF SECRET TREATIES AS REVEALED AT PETROGRAD.

FIRST INSTALLMENT.

The documents given in the first installment are:

1. Trotski's preface to the publication of the secret treaties announcing that "the government of workers and peasants abolishes secret diplomacy."

2. Secret telegram from Terestchenko, Russian foreign minister, September 24, 1917, to the Russian ambassador in Paris, concerning the willingness of the then Russian Government to publish the treaties concluded before the war.

3. The treaty by which Italy entered the war April 26, 1915.

4. Report of Gen. Polivanoff regarding causes of Roumania's entry into the war November 20, 1916.

5. Confidential memorandum, source not indicated, of offers to Greece for her aid to Serbia.

6. Agreement with regard to the division of Turkey February 21, 1917.

In his address before Congress on January 8, defining the war aims of the United States, President Wilson stated as his first condition of a durable peace:

"Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

The demand for the publication of the secret treaties between Russia and her Allies was brought forward soon after the overthrow of the Czar's Government by the extremist socialist factions and was opposed to the last by the earlier coalition cabinets, by Kerensky, and by his minister of foreign affairs, Terestchenko. The Bolsheviki uprising against Kerensky broke out on November 7 of last year. Leon Trotski lost no time in taking possession of the archives of the foreign office at Petrograd, and with characteristic energy the publication of the secret documents was begun November 23.

Following is the text of Leon Trotski's preface on secret diplomacy, issued at the time of the first revelation of the documents:

SECRET DIPLOMACY.

In commencing the publication of secret diplomatic documents in the field of foreign policies of Czarism and of the bourgeois-coalition governments for the first seven months of the revolution we are fulfilling the obligation which we assumed when we were the opposition party. Secret diplomacy is a necessary weapon in the hands of a propertied minority, which is forced to deceive the majority in order to subject it to its own interests. Imperialism, with its world-wide plans of plunder and rapacious treaties and agreements, brought the system of secret diplomacy to its very highest development. The struggle with the imperialism that has bled white and ruined the peoples of Europe connotes at the same time the conflict against capitalistic diplomacy, which has many reasons to fear the light of day. The Russian people and with it the peoples of Europe and of the whole world must learn the documentary evidence of those plans hatched in secret by the financiers and industrialists jointly with their parliamentary and diplomatic agents. For the right to this evidence the people of Europe have paid with countless sacrifices and utter economic ruin.

The abolition of secret diplomacy is the foremost condition of honest, popular, truly democratic external policy. To bring about such a state of affairs is the purpose of the Soviet government. Therefore, in openly proposing an immediate armistice to all belligerent nations and their governments, we at the same time publish such treaties and agreements which have lost all their binding force on the Russian workers, soldiers, and peasants, who have taken the power of government into their own hands.

The bourgeois politicians and scribblers of Austro-Hungary and Germany may attempt to make use of the published documents in order to present in a favorable light the diplomatic efforts of the Central Empires. But any attempt in this direction will be doomed to complete and sorry failure. And this for two reasons: Firstly, we intend soon to present before the judgment of public opinion the secret documents which characterize quite sharply the diplomacy of the Central Empires; and, secondly—and this is of greater importance—the methods of secret diplomacy are just as international as imperialistic rapaciousness itself. When the German proletariat through revolutionary means will find access to the secret vaults of its government chancellories, it will extract therefrom documents in no wise inferior to those which we are about to publish. It remains only to be hoped that this event will take place as soon as possible.

The government of workers and peasants abolishes secret diplomacy, with its intrigues, lies, and cipher codes. We have nothing to conceal. Our program formulates the ardent desires of millions of workers, peasants, and soldiers. We want the speediest peace based on honest cohabitation and cooperation of peoples. We want the speediest overthrow of the domination of capital. Revealing to the whole world the work of the ruling classes as it finds its expression in the secret documents of diplomacy, we address ourselves to the workers with that call which constitutes the unchangeable basis of our external policy, "Proletarians of all countries, unite."

The people's commissary of foreign affairs,

L. TROTSKI.

Following is the text of a secret telegram from Terestchenko to the chargé d'affaires in Paris concerning the willingness of the then Russian Government (Sept. 24, 1917) to publish treaties concluded before the war.

RUSSIA'S READINESS TO PUBLISH THE TREATIES.

[Secret telegram from the Russian foreign minister to the chargé d'affaires in Paris, communicated also to London and Rome, Sept. 24, 1917, No. 4225.]

With reference to your Nos. 947 and 952. The assurances made to you by Ribot (then French foreign minister) on the occasion of his declaration in the chamber regarding the eastern frontiers of France are unfortunately not altogether straightforward. The question of linking this agreement with the agreement regarding Constantinople and the Straits was raised neither in the exchange of notes with Paléologue (then French ambassador in Petrograd) nor in my verbal declaration to Noulens (the present ambassador). Noulens proposed to me the publication of the treaties concluded before the war; that is, really the Russian military conventions. To this I remarked that such a publication of a treaty which is generally known would be completely misunderstood by public opinion and would only give rise to demands for the publication of the agreements which had been concluded during the war. The publication of these, and especially of the Roumanian and Italian treaties, is regarded by our allies as undesirable. In any case we have no intention of putting difficulties in the way of France or of placing Ribot in a still more painful position. In order, then, to avoid in the future such misunderstandings as have already twice arisen owing to his statements in the chamber, I request you to intimate officially to the French Government that on the part of Russia no obstacles will be placed in the way of publishing all agreements published before or during the war, in the event of the other Allies who are parties to them consenting. Regarding the question of Asia Minor agreements, I will communicate to you my views in a special supplementary telegram.

(Signed) TERESCHENKO.

The following agreement among the powers of the Entente dates back to the first year of the war and the régime of the Czar. Signed on April 26–May 9, it preceded by just a fortnight the entrance of Italy into the war.

THE ITALIAN AGREEMENT.

The Italian ambassador, Marquis Imperiali, under instructions of his Government, has the honor to deliver to the minister of foreign affairs, Sir E. Grey, the French ambassador (in London), and the Russian ambassador (in London), Count Benckendorf, the following memorandum:

ARTICLE 1. Between the general staffs of France, Great Britain, Russia, and Italy must forthwith be concluded a military agreement. This agreement shall define the minimum military forces which Russia must move against Austria-Hungary in the event the latter should concentrate all her forces against Italy and Russia against Germany. In an equitable fashion the agreement shall regulate the questions of armistice in so far as these relate to the commanding staffs of the army.

ART. 2. On her side Italy obligates herself, with all the forces at her command, to enter into the campaign in combination with France, Russia, and Great Britain against all of the Governments at war with them.

ART. 3. The naval forces of France and Great Britain will actively and fully cooperate with Italy until the Austrian fleet is completely destroyed or until the conclusion of peace. Between France, Italy, and Great Britain shall be signed forthwith a military naval agreement.

ART. 4. Under the imminent treaty of peace Italy must receive: The district of Trentino; the entire southern Tyrol to its natural geographic boundary, the River Brenner; the city and suburbs of Trieste, Goritzia, and Gradisca, all of Istria to Quarnero, including Volosca, and the Istrian islands of Cherso and Lussino, and also the smaller islands of Plavnik, Unia, Canidole, Palazzuolo, San Pietro dei Nembi, Azinello, Grutzo, together with the neighboring islands.

ART. 5. In the same manner Italy is to receive the Province of Dalmatia in its present form, with the inclusion within its limits on the north of Lissariki and Trebino, and on the south of all lands to a line drawn at Cape Planca to the east along the watershed in such a manner that in the Italian domains shall be included all the valleys along the rivers flowing into Sebiniko, such as Chicollo, Kerka, and Butisnitza, with all their tributaries. In the same way Italy is to receive all the islands located to the north and west of the shores of Dalmatia, beginning with the islands of Premua, Selva, Ulbo, Skerd, Maoñ, Pago, and Puntadura, and farther to the north, and to Meled on the south, with inclusion therein of the islands of St. Andrew, Buzzi, Lissa, Lessino, Tercola, Curzola, Kaisa, and Lagosta, with all the islands and bluffs belonging to them, as well as Palagozza, but without the islands of great and little Zirona, Bua, Satti, Brazza.

ART. 6. Italy shall receive in full right Vallon, the islands of Sasseno, and a territory sufficiently extensive to safeguard them in a military way, approximately between the River Voyuss on the north and the east, and to the boundaries of the Schimar district to the south.

ART. 7. On receiving Trentino and Istria in accordance with article 4, of Dalmatia and the Adriatic Islands in accordance with article 5, and the Bay of Vallon, Italy is obligated in the event of the formation in Albania of a small autonomous neutralized State, not to oppose the possible desire of France, Great Britain, and Russia to redistribute among Montenegro, Serbia, and Greece of the northern and southern districts of Albania. The southern shore of Albania from the boundary of the Italian district of Vallona to the Cape of Stilos is subject to neutralization.

Italy shall have the right to conduct the foreign relations of "Albania." In any event, Italy obligates herself to leave certain territory sufficiently extensive for Albania, in order that the boundaries of the latter are contiguous on the west from Lake Ochrida to the boundaries of Greece and Serbia.

ART. 8. Italy is to receive in full right all the islands now occupied by her at Dodekez.

ART. 9. France, Great Britain, and Russia in principle recognize the interests of Italy in preserving the political balance in the Mediterranean Sea, and her right to receive on the division of Turkey an equal share with them in the basin of the Mediterranean, and more specifically in that part of it contiguous to the Province of Adalia, where Italy had already obtained special rights and has developed certain interests vouchsafed to her by the Italo-British agreement. The zone subject to transfer to the sovereignty of Italy will be more specifically defined in due time, and in correspondence with the vital interests of France and Great Britain. Likewise the interests of Italy must be taken into consideration, even in the event the territorial inviolability of Asiatic Turkey shall be sustained by the powers for a further period of time, and if only redistribution of spheres of influence is to take place. Should France, Great Britain, and Russia in the course of the present war occupy certain districts of Asiatic Turkey, the entire district adjacent to Adalia, and herewith more specifically defined, shall remain with Italy, which reserves for itself the right to occupy the same.

ART. 10. In Libya all the rights and privileges which prior to this date have been acquired by the Sultan on the basis of the treaty of Lazansk are recognized as belonging to Italy.

ART. 11. Italy shall receive such share of the military contribution as shall correspond to the measure of sacrifice and effort made by her.

ART. 12. Italy joins in a declaration made by France, England, and Russia as to leaving Arabia and sacred Mohammedan places in control of an independent Mohammedan power.

ART. 13. In the event of expansion of French and English colonial domains in Africa at the expense of Germany, France and Great Britain recognize in principle the Italian right to demand for herself certain compensations in the sense of expansions of her lands in Erithria, Somaliland, in Libya, and colonial districts lying on the boundary, with the colonies of France and England.

ART. 14. England obligates herself to assist Italy immediately to negotiate on the London market on advantageous terms of a loan in a sum not less than 50,000,000 pounds sterling.

ART. 15. France, England, and Russia obligate themselves to support Italy in her desire for nonadmittance of the Holy See to any kind of diplomatic steps for the purpose of the conclusion of peace or the regulation of questions arising from the present war.

ART. 16. This treaty must be kept secret. As to Italy joining in the declaration of September 5, 1914, only said declaration shall be made public immediately after the declaration of the war by or against Italy.

Taking into consideration the present memorandum, the representatives of France, Great Britain, and Russia, having been duly empowered for this purpose, agreed with the representative of Italy, who in his turn was duly empowered by his Government in the premises, as follows: France, Great Britain, and Russia expressed their complete agreement with the present memorandum presented to them by the Italian Government. With regard to articles 1, 2, and 3 of this memorandum relating to the cooperation of the military and naval operations of all four powers, Italy declares that she will enter actively at the very earliest opportunity and, at all events, not later than one month after the signing of the present document by the contracting parties. The undersigned have set their hands and seals at London in four copies the 26th day of April, 1915.

SIR EDWARD GREY,
CAMBON,
MARQUIS IMPERIALI,
COUNT BENCKENDORF.

Significant in the following memorandum addressed to the Russian authorities is the policy of double-dealing which it suggests with regard to Roumania, which had entered the war on the side of the Allies and had met with disaster. Gen. Polivanoff, the writer of the report, evidently finds consolation for Roumania's misfortunes in the reflection that in case of victory Roumania would have attained a degree of prestige and military influence detrimental to Russia.

RUSSIAN POLICY TOWARD ROUMANIA.

[Report of Gen. Polivanov (No. 240) regarding the causes of Roumania's entry and recent events on the Roumanian front, Nov. 7–20, 1916.]

Since the outbreak of the European war Roumania had officially adopted a neutral attitude, which very frequently and noticeably inclined now to one, now to the other side, according to the course of military operations. This was based upon two main calculations, the wish not to arrive too late for the partition of Austria-Hungary and the endeavor to earn as much as possible at the expense of the belligerents. Our successes in Galicia and Bukovina in 1914 and early 1915, the capture of Lemberg and Przemysl, and the appearance of our advance guard beyond the Carpathians brought the question of Roumanian intervention to a head. At the end of May of the same year our retreat from Galicia and Poland took place, and Bukovina was abandoned, and the feelings of leading circles in Roumania correspondingly changed. The negotiations for intervention came of their own accord to a standstill.

At the end of 1915 and early in 1916, after the destruction of Serbia and Bulgaria's intervention, Roumanian policy leaned very noticeably toward the side of our enemies. At that time the Roumanian Government concluded a whole series of very advantageous commercial agreements with Austria-Hungary and Germany. This circumstance forced our military, financial, and commercial authorities to show great caution in the question of the export from Russia to Roumania of war material and various other supplies, such as might fall into the hands of our enemies. In consequence of the brilliant offensive of Gen. Brusilov in the spring and summer of 1916, Roumanian neutrality leaned once more to the side of the Entente Powers, and there arose the possibility of renewing the interrupted negotiations for Roumanian intervention. It is to be observed that from the first the chief of staff, for military reasons, held the neutrality of Roumania to be more advantageous for us than her active intervention in the war. Later on Gen. Alexeiev adopted the point of view of the Allies, who looked upon Roumania's entry as a decisive blow for Austria-Hungary, and as the nearing of the war's end.

In August, 1916, a military and political agreement was signed with Roumania, which assigned to her such accessions of territory (Bukowina and all Transylvania) as quite obviously did not correspond to the measure of Roumania's share of military operations, since she had undertaken only to declare war on Austria-Hungary and had confined herself to operations in Transylvania.

The events which followed showed how greatly our Allies were mistaken and how they overvalued Roumania's entry. Under the impression of the catastrophe currents arose in Roumania itself which opposed a continuance of the war and made the early conclusion of peace, even of a separate peace, their aim. The misfortune which overcame Roumania is the natural result of the complete lack of military preparation under the two-sided policy of Bratianu. Roumania's easy victories in 1913 and her diplomatic success after the Balkan wars contributed materially to both society and Government exaggerating their own importance. Politically and militarily, the Roumanians greatly overrated themselves and are now undergoing a bitter disappointment.

From the standpoint of Russian interests we must be guided by the following considerations in judging the present situation in Roumania. If things had developed in such a way that the military and political agreement of 1916 with Roumania had been fully realized, then a very strong State would have arisen in the Balkans, consisting of Moldavia, Wallachia, the Dobrudja (i. e., the present Roumania), and of Transylvania, the Banat, and Bukowina, acquisitions under the treaty of 1916, with a population of about 13,000,000. In the future this State could hardly have been friendly disposed toward Russia, and would scarcely have abandoned the design of realizing its national dreams in Bessarabia and the Balkans [sic]. Consequently the collapse of Roumania's plans as a great power is not particularly opposed to Russia's interests. This circumstance must be exploited by us in order to strengthen for as long as possible those compulsory ties which link Russia with Roumania. Our successes on the Roumanian front are for us of extraordinary importance, as the only possibility of deciding once for all in the sense we desire the question of Constantinople and the Straits. The events now occurring in Roumania have altered to their very foundation the conditions of the treaty of 1916. Instead of the comparatively modest military support which Russia was pledged to provide in the Dobrudja, she had to assign the defense of Roumanian territory on all sides almost exclusively to Russian troops. This military aid on the part of Russia has now assumed such dimensions that the promise of territorial compensations to Roumania prescribed in the treaty in return for her entry into the war must undoubtedly be submitted to revision.

(Signed) POLIVANOV.

The following confidential memorandum, the exact source of which is not indicated, concerns the offers by the ministers of Russia, England, and France to the Greek Government in Athens of territory in South Albania and Asia Minor in return for immediate Greek aid to Serbia.

OFFERS TO GREECE.

[Confidential memorandum, exact source not indicated.]

Offer of South Albania: On November 22, 1914, the ministers of Russia, England, and France declared to the Greek Government in Athens that Greece would receive the southern portion of Albania, with the exception of Valona, in the event of her immediate entry in aid of Serbia. For immediate entry Venizelos demanded a sure guaranty from Roumania against an attack of Bulgaria upon Greece. This guaranty was not given by Roumania. Consequently Greece gave no help to Serbia and the offer lapsed.

Offer of territory in Asia Minor: On January 12, 1915, the British minister in Athens, on instructions from his Government, informed Venizelos that if Greece at the moment of a fresh attack upon Serbia came to the latter's aid, the Entente Powers would recognize to Greece important territorial acquisitions on the coast of Asia Minor. On January 15, 1915, the Greek ministers in Petrograd, Paris, and London handed in the answer of the Greek Government to the English proposal, containing a whole series of conditions. The negotiations begun on January 20 regarding Greek wishes in respect of Asia Minor were held up by negotiations regarding Bulgaria's entry, and were interrupted by the designation of Venizelos on February 21, 1915. On March 9, 1915, the Greek foreign minister, Zographos, handed to the ministers at Athens a note in which the cabinet expressed the wish to resume the negotiations interrupted by the departure of Venizelos. On March 30, in answer to this, the Entente ministers expressed the readiness of the Russian, British, and French Governments to guarantee the Vilayet of Aduin to Greece in the event of her entering against Turkey. They resumed the negotiations, adding verbally that the offer would lapse unless Greece without delay declared her readiness to intervene. In the reply note the Gounaris cabinet on April 1 declared its willingness to enter at once, if the Entente Powers would be ready to commence military operations against Turkey jointly with the Greek troops. Intervention was made dependent on a formal guaranty of Greece's territorial integrity, with the inclusion of North Epirus and the islands during the whole war and for a definite period after it. The territorial acquisitions of Greece in Asia Minor and elsewhere were to be the subject of subsequent deliberation. The negotiations were not renewed during that month, and on May 1 the foreign minister declared that the Entente Powers obviously did not wish to guarantee Greece's integrity and that the Gounaris cabinet had decided to preserve its neutrality still further.

Information with regard to the division of Turkish territory in Asia Minor is contained in the following memorandum of an agreement entered into in the spring of 1916 as result of negotiations taking place in London and Petrograd between the British, French, and Russian Governments. The document has no signature, but is certified as being true to the original.

THE DIVISION OF TURKEY.

Information on the question of Asia Minor, February 21, 1917.

As a result of negotiations taking place in the spring of 1916 in London and Petrograd, the British, French, and Russian Governments came to an agreement with regard to future distribution of their zones of influence and territorial acquisitions in Asiatic Turkey, and also with regard to organization within the limits of Arabia of an independent Arabian government or confederation of Arabian governments.

In general this agreement is substantially as follows:

Russia acquires regions of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, Bitlis, and also the territory of South Kurdestan, along the line of Muscha Sert Ibn Omar—Amali Amalia, Persian boundary. The farthest point of Russian acquisition on the shore of the Black Sea is to be a point west of Trebizond, subject to future determination.

France is to receive the coast strip of Syria, Addansk district, and territory bounded on the south by a line running, Ajutab-Mardin to the future Russian boundary and on the north by a line Ala-Daga—Kosanya-ak-Daga—Ildiz-Daga—Zara—Ogim—Kharput.

Great Britain acquires southern part of Mesopotamia, with Bagdad, and reserves for herself in Syria the ports of Harpha and Akka.

By agreement between France and England the territory in the zones between French and English territories shall be formed into a confederation of Arabian governments, or an independent Arabian government, the zones of influence over which is herewith defined.

Alexandro is declared a free port.

With the aim of conserving the religious interests of the allied powers, Palestine, with the sacred places, is to be separated from Turkish territory, and is to be subject to a special régime by agreement between Russia, France, and England.

As a general condition, the contracting powers mutually obligate themselves to recognize the respective concessions and prerogatives existing prior to the war in the territories acquired by them.

They agree to assume a proportionate share of the Ottoman debt equivalent to their respective acquisitions.

True to original.

—

SECOND INSTALLMENT.

The second installment concerns the important agreements entered into with regard to territorial readjustments on the Franco-German frontiers, and at Constantinople, and the Straits. A further document deals with information that a Swedish diplomatic pouch is to be opened at Madrid. The translations of these documents from the files of the Russian foreign office are from the first Russian texts known to have reached this country.

The documents given are:

1. Telegrams from Sazonoff, Russian foreign minister, on joint agreements for territorial readjustments and on forcing German trade out of China. Dated February 24, 1916.

2. French annexation plans in Western Germany as communicated in an imperial audience at Petrograd by M. Doumergue. January 30, 1917.

3. Note from the Russian minister of foreign affairs restating French annexation plans in Western Germany and pledging Russia's support.

4. Telegram from the Russian ambassador at Paris on the agreement on exchange of annexations, March 11, 1917.

5. Agreement as to annexation by Russia of Constantinople, the Straits, etc., March 4, 1915.

6. Telegram of Sazonoff, March 18, 1915, concerning Russian annexation of Constantinople and the Straits.

7. Telegram of Sazonoff to the Russian ambassador in London restating agreements with regard to Constantinople and Persia.

8. Telegram to the Russian ambassador at Stockholm on the information that it is proposed to open the Swedish pouch at Madrid.

In the following telegram from the Russian Foreign Minister Sazonoff we find the first mention of allied plans regarding territorial readjustments at the expense of the Teuton powers in case of victory. To Great Britain and France is conceded the right of determining the western boundary of Germany, in return for a free hand for Russia with the eastern boundary of the Teuton countries. The importance of forcing German trade out of China in conjunction with Japan is emphasized.

PROGRAM OF SAZONOFF.

[Secret telegram to the ambassador in Paris, Feb. 24, 1916. No. 948. Refer to my telegram 6063 of 1915.]

At the coming conference you might be guided by the following general principles:

Political agreements entered into among the Allies during the war should remain unalterable and are not subject to revision. This refers to our agreement with France and England about Constantinople and the Straits, Syria, and Asia Minor, and also to the London agreement with Italy. All propositions as to future boundaries as to Central Europe are at this moment premature, but at the same time it is to be remembered that we are ready to grant to France and England complete freedom in fixing the limitations of the western German boundary, depending that the Allies in their turn will grant to us freedom in fixing our boundaries with Germany and Austria. It is important to insist on the exclusion of the Polish question as a subject matter for international discussion and on elimination of all attempts to place the future of Poland under the guaranty and control of the powers. With regard to Scandinavian Governments it is important to make an effort to hold Sweden back from taking a hostile step, and at the same time to decide in time upon measures to win Norway over to our side in the event war with Sweden can not be avoided. To Roumania all political benefits have already been offered to induce it to take up arms, and therefore to look in this field for new decoys is altogether useless.

The question of forcing Germans out of Chinese market is of great importance, but as its solution is impossible without the cooperation of Japan, it is preferable to submit it for discussion at an economic conference, at which Japan will be represented. This does not exclude the desirability of exchanging ideas on this subject between Russia, France, and England through diplomatic channels.

(Signed) SAZONOFF.

Nearly a year after the preceding agreement we find the Russian Foreign Office dealing in greater detail with French annexation plans in western Germany.

DEMANDS FOR ANNEXATION BY FRENCH BOURGEOISIE.

[Secret telegram to the Ambassador in Paris. Petrograd, Jan. 30, 1917. No. 507. Copy in London.]

Secret. At an Imperial audience M. Doumergue transmitted to the Emperor the desire of France to insure for herself at the termination of the war the return of Alsace and Lorraine, and of a certain position in the valley of the River Saar, and also to attain the political separation from Germany of her beyond the Rhine Provinces and their organization on a different basis, so that in the future the River Rhine should be a secure strategic boundary against German invasion. Doumergue expressed the hope that the Imperial Government would not decline to formulate at once its assent to these propositions. His Imperial Majesty, in principle, assented to this, in consequence of which I requested Doumergue, after getting in touch with his Government, to communicate to me a proposed agreement which could be formulated by means of exchange of notes between the French Ambassador and myself. Meeting in this manner the wishes of our ally, I consider it my duty to call attention to the point of view of the Imperial Government expressed in the telegram February 2, 1916, No. 948, to the effect that "in leaving France and England full freedom in the determination of western boundaries of Germany, we assume that in their turn the Allies will grant us equal freedom to fix our boundary limitations with Germany and Austria-Hungary."

On that account the forthcoming exchange of notes on the question raised by Doumergue gives us the basis for asking the French Government at the same time to confirm to us its agreement to leave to Russia freedom of action in the matter of determining her future western boundaries. Specific data on this question will be communicated by us to the Parisian cabinet. Moreover, we deem it necessary to bespeak the consent of France on the exchange at the end of the war of easements in the Aland Islands. Please explain to Briand to the above effect and telegraph as to results.

(Signed) POKROFSKY.

The question of annexations in western Germany is restated concretely in the following note, dated only two days later than the preceding dispatch:

COPY OF A NOTE FROM THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FEBRUARY 1–14, 1917, NO. 28, TO THE FRENCH AMBASSADOR IN PETROGRAD.

In your note of this date your Excellency was good enough to communicate to the Imperial Government that the Government of the Republic intended to include among the terms of peace which will be offered to Germany the following demands and guaranties of territorial character:

(1) Alsace and Lorraine to be returned to France.

(2) The boundaries will be extended at least to the limits of the former principality of Lorraine, and will be fixed under the direction of the French Government. At the same time strategic demands must be taken into consideration, so as to include within the French territory the whole of the industrial iron basin of Lorraine and the whole of the industrial coal basin of the Valley of the Saar.

(3) Other territories located on the left bank of the Rhine, and not included in the composition of the German Empire, will be completely separated from Germany, and shall be freed from all political and economic dependence on her.

(4) The territory on the left bank of the Rhine not included in the composition of French territory shall form an autonomous and neutral government, and shall be occupied by French armies until such time as the enemy Governments completely fulfill all the conditions and guaranties mentioned in the treaty of peace.

Your excellency stated that the Government of the Republic shall be happy to have the opportunity of counting upon the support of the Imperial Government in order to bring its intentions to accomplishment. In accordance with the order of his Imperial Majesty, my august sovereign, I have the honor to communicate in this note, in the name of the Russian Government, to your excellency that the Government of the Republic may count on the support of the Imperial Government to bring to fulfillment of its aforementioned intentions. Be so good, etc.

In the following concise restatement of the agreements between France and Russia concerning territorial readjustments there is the additional dramatic interest that at the moment the telegram was dispatched from the Russian embassy at Paris revolution was in full swing at Petrograd, and the Imperial Government carrying with it, as events showed, the entire elaborate structure of secret agreements made public by Trotzky, though the abdication of Nicholas II did not come till three days later.

EXCHANGE OF ANNEXATIONS.

[Secret telegram of Parisian ambassador, Feb. 26 (Mar. 11, 1917). No. 168. My answer to telegram No. 167.]

No. 2. The Government of the French Republic wishing to confirm the importance and meaning of treaties entered into with the Russian Government in 1915, as to object of regulating at the end of the present war the status of Constantinople and the Straits, in accordance with Russian wishes; and wishing to preserve for its allies all guaranties with regard to military and commercial relations necessary for the economic development and safety of the Empire recognizes the complete freedom of Russia to determine her western boundaries.

(Signed) ISVOLSKY.

In the three appended documents are contained the dispositions of the Allies for the settlement of the question of Constantinople and the Dardanelles. These are, perhaps, the least secret of the documents made public by Trotski, in the sense that their context had been a matter of fairly common knowledge from the beginning.

AGREEMENT AS TO CONSTANTINOPLE AND THE STRAITS.

[Second political division. Information.]

On the 19th of February (Mar. 4, 1915) the [Russian] minister of foreign affairs handed a memorandum to the French and British ambassadors in which was defined the position as to annexation to Russia of the following territories as the result of the present war: The city of Constantinople; the western shores of the Bosphorus, Marmora Sea, and the Dardanelles; Southern Frigia, to the line of Enos-Media; the shores of Asia Minor, between Bosphorus, the river Samarra, and a point of Ismid Gulf to be subsequently defined; the islands of Marmora Sea and the islands of Imbros and Tenedos. The special rights of England and France within the limits of aforesaid territories to remain undisturbed.

The French as well as the English Governments expressed their assent to the fulfillment of our desires in the event of a successful termination of the war and the satisfaction of a series of demands of France and England within the limits of the Ottoman Empire, as well as in other places. These demands, in so far as they refer to Turkey, are substantially as follows:

The recognition of Constantinople as a free port for the transit of merchandise not coming from or going to Russia, and the freedom of passage through the Straits of merchant ships.

The recognition of English and French rights in Asiatic Turkey, subject to specific definition in a special agreement between France, England, and Russia.

The preservation of sacred Mohammedan places and of Arabia under an independent Mohammedan rule.

The inclusion within the English sphere of influence of the Persian neutral zone created by the treaty of 1907 between England and Russia.

In recognizing these claims as in general subject to satisfaction the Russian Government nevertheless made certain reservations:

With respect to formulation of our wishes in connection with sacred Mohammedan places it is necessary to define now whether these places will remain under the administration of Turkey, with the retention by the Sultan of the title of Caliph, or is it the intention to create new and independent governments. In our opinion it would be desirable to separate the Caliphate from Turkey. At all events, the freedom of pilgrimage is to be insured.

In agreeing to the inclusion of the neutral zone of Persia within the English sphere of influence the Russian Government considers it only just to state that the region of the cities Iphsagan, Jezda shall be confirmed to Russia, as well as a strip of the neutral zone which cuts in the shape of a wedge between Russian and Afghan boundaries and reaching the boundary itself at Zulphogar shall be included within the Russian sphere of influence.

The Russian Government also considers desirable at the same time to reach the solution of the question as to the territory of northern Afghanistan contiguous to Russia, in line with its wishes expressed in the negotiations of 1914.

After the entrance of Italy into the war our wishes were communicated to the Italian Government which expressed its assent on its own behalf on condition that, in the event of successful termination of the war, the Italian claims in general, and specifically in the East be satisfied, and on recognition by Italy within the limits of territories ceded by us of identical rights as possessed by England and France.

THE QUESTION OF CONSTANTINOPLE AND THE STRAITS.

(Secret telegram of the minister of foreign affairs to the French ambassador in Paris. Mar. 5 (Mar. 18), 1915. No. 1226.)

On the 23d of February (March 8) the French ambassador, in the name of his Government, stated to me that France is ready to take the most friendly attitude toward the realization of our desires, stated in my telegram to you, No. 937, in connection with the Straits and Constantinople, for which I have instructed you to express to Delcasse my appreciation. In his conversations with you, Delcasse, even before, repeatedly expressed his assurances that we may depend on the sympathy of France, and only referred to the necessity of clarifying England's attitude, from which side he feared objections, before giving us more concrete assurances to the aforesaid effect.

Lately, the British Government expressed in writing its complete agreement to the annexation of Constantinople and the Straits to Russia, within limitations indicated by us, reserving therein only for itself a guarantee of her own economic interests, and also a similar benevolent attitude on our side to the political aims of England in other spheres. For me personally the assurance of Delcasse, in whom I have the deepest confidence, is quite sufficient, but for the Imperial Government more specific declarations are desirable as to the agreement of France to the complete fulfillment of our desires, similar to that made by the Government by Great Britain.

SAZONOFF.

(Secret telegram of the minister of foreign affairs to the ambassador in London.)

Referring to the memorandum of the British Embassy here of the 12th of March, be kind enough to express to Grey the deep appreciation of the Imperial Government for the full and final agreement of Great Britain to the solution of the question of the Straits and Constantinople, in accordance with wishes of Russia. The Imperial Government fully appreciates the feelings of the Government of Great Britain and is positive that sincere recognition of mutual interests will forever assure the solid friendship existing between Russia and Great Britain. Having given its promise with regard to conditions for commerce in the Straits and Constantinople, the Imperial Government sees no objection to the confirmation of its agreement to the following arrangement: (1) Freedom of transit through Constantinople of merchandise coming from or intended for Russia. (2) Freedom of passage through the Straits of merchant ships.

In order to make the undertaking of breaking through the Dardanelles easier for the Allies, the Imperial Government is ready to assist in attracting to this undertaking on a reasonable basis of other governments, the cooperation of which in the opinion of France and Great Britain is useful.

The Imperial Government fully shares the opinion of the Government of Great Britain that sacred Mohammedan places must in the future remain under independent Mohammedan rule. It is desirable to clear up now, however, whether it is the intention to leave these places under the rule of Turkey and conserve in the Sultan of Turkey of the title of caliph, or whether it is proposed to create new independent governments—for only in one or the other event will the Imperial Government be in position to formulate its wishes. As for itself, the Imperial Government would consider it extremely desirable to separate the caliphate from Turkey. The freedom of pilgrimage must, of course, be fully guaranteed.

The Imperial Government confirms its agreement to the inclusion in the sphere of English influence of the neutral zone of Persia. It, however, deems it just to state that the regions constituting the cities of Isphagan and Gezda, forming with the latter one complete whole, shall be confirmed to Russia, because of the Russian interests established there.

The neutral zone now cuts in a wedge-like shape between the boundaries of Russia and Afghanistan and comes close to the Russian boundary near Zulphagar. Because of that it will be necessary to place part of that wedge within the Russian sphere of influence.

Of material importance for the Imperial Government is the question of the building of railroads in the neutral zone, which question calls for further friendly elucidation. In the future the Imperial Government expects recognition in it of full freedom of action in the sphere of influence allotted to it, with the reservation for it specially, of prior right of develeopment within such sphere for its finuancial and economic enterprises.

Finally, the Imperial Government deems desirable a simultaneous solution of the question of Afghanistan territory contiguous to it, in the sense of the wishes expressed by the imperial ministry in previous negotiations of the past year.

(Signed) SAZONOFF.

The chief interest of the following brief dispatch is in confirmation of the vulnerability as well as susceptibility of the Swedish diplomatic mail bags:

(Secret telegram to the ambassador in Stockholm, Oct. 15–28, 1917. No. 629.)

With regard to matters in Madrid, I was informed that it has been proposed unexpectedly and by a mistake to open the Swedish pouch. In view of the circumstances communicated in telegram No. 628, and the readiness of the new minister to meet us on that question, I earnestly ask you to take all measures so that that which has been predicted by Solovieff shall not take place. Taking into consideration the painful vanity of the Swedes, we would be taking the risk of rousing the opposition of the new cabinet even more than of the old, and would at once lose whatever benefits the change of government now being accomplished may have assured us of.

(Signed) GULKEVICH.

THIRD INSTALLMENT.

Corroboration of the fact that an international group of bankers from the Allied and Central Powers had a conference in Berne in September, 1917, in an endeavor to arrive at an agreement for ending the war is contained in the secret documents revealed by the third installment. Two dispatches deal with this topic, one outlining the policy of Germany toward Russia in a prophetic manner, emphasizing the Teuton wish for separatism in Russia so that Germany might deal more effectively with the smaller nationalities in arranging commercial treaties.

A second group of dispatches, of especial interest to the United States, deals with the attitude of the allied powers toward Russia's new government in October last. Expressions of gratitude were sent to Mr. Lansing because the ambassador of the United States had not taken part in certain representations made to the Russian Government in Petrograd, by the ambassadors of Italy, Great Britain, and France.

A further dispatch deals with the proposed Stockholm conference for peace, and finally a group of significant messages from Tereschenko afford a graphic picture of Russia's internal problems in the months before the Bolshevik government overthrew Kerensky.

One of the puzzles of the international situation during the period preceding the fall of Kerensky was the sudden appearance of anxiety at Petrograd lest the western allies make peace at the expense of Russia. In view of the fact that the situation was usually regarded from the opposite angle—namely, the possibility of a separate peace by Russia at the expense of the western allies—this fear of betrayal by Russia had no plausible explanation until the appearance of rumors of a meeting of financiers from both belligerent camps in Switzerland for the purpose of talking peace. The following two telegrams offer a reason for the apprehension felt at Petrograd:

NEGOTIATIONS OF FINANCIERS AS TO PEACE AT THE EXPENSE OF RUSSIA.

[Decoded Sept. 14, 1917.]

(Secret telegram of the chargé d'affaires in Berne, Sept. 4–17, 1917. No. 707.)

In the local press there slipped through information that certain financiers of both the enemy camps lately had extensive conferences in Switzerland. The make-up and aims of the conference are being kept strictly secret. The certain participants were: Jacques Stern, from the Netherland Bank of Paris; Tuchman, from the Paris branch of the Lloyd Bank; Fürstenberg, director of the German Discont Gesellschaft, also a director of the Deutsche Bank and a director of the Austrian Austro Bank. Although the English denied that they participated in the consultations, however on the 2d of September, Head Director Bell, of the Lloyd Bank, arrived here from London under the pretext of establishing a branch in Switzerland. According to rumors as a basis of agreement were discussed: Return of Alsace-Lorraine to France and satisfaction for Italy. Nothing definite was established with regard to Russia, only propositions were expressed that the Central Powers could receive certain compensations in the East. The German participants in the negotiations especially insisted on the cession to Germany of the Baltic region and on the independence of Finland.

(Signed) ONU,
Russian Chargé d'Affaires at Berne.

GERMAN POLICY IN RUSSIA.

(Secret telegram of the Russian chargé d'affaires at Berne, Oct. 17, 1917. No. 815.)

An influential Anglo-Jewish financier, who took part at the conference mentioned, stated that Germany's aim was to promote separatism in Russia so far as possible, so as to split her up into small States. For Germany it will be easy to conclude commercial treaties with weaker States (Lithuania, Courland, etc.). The maintenance of Russia's unity is equivalent to leaving her in the economic sphere of the Allies, which would be above all advantageous to America. For England the Russian market is not of special interest, because England is more occupied with her colonies and sea trade. Hence, for England, the splitting up of Russia into several small States seems acceptable, all the more so because in the event of Russia being weakened England would secure a free hand in Asia. In a dismembered Russia German industry and trade will find work for a long time to come. America's competition with Germany in the Russian market will be even more advantageous for England than the predominance of the influence of one or other of the two powers. From the words of my informant it may be concluded that it was just these proposals which were the foundation for an exchange of views with the Germans at the conference in August and September. It can certainly be assumed that with the English, French, and German branches of the international financial clique a political agreement also has been concluded in this sense. There is not any proof of the Allied diplomats having taken part; it is out of the question that Mme. Andrus could have taken part; but in order to divert attention various devices may have been resorted to, in which they may have had their share.

In the subsequent telegrams we pass from the sphere of international relations proper to internal conditions in Russia, though here, too, we find traces of the international situation affecting Russia's internal problems. The first of these dispatches deals with the breakdown of the Kornilloff uprising and its consequences in an enhancement of Bolshevik influence. It ends nevertheless with the assertion by Tereschenko of the Kerensky government's intention to proceed with the rehabilitation of the army.

SECRET TELEGRAM TO THE AMBASSADORS IN PARIS, LONDON, TOKYO, WASHINGTON, AND STOCKHOLM.

The uprising of Gen. Korniloff has been completely liquidated. Everything passed without bloodshed, as the troops sent against Petrograd refused to go against the provisional government and declared their allegiance to it. Korniloff agreed to surrender himself to Gen. Alexieff. The generals taking part in the rebellion will strand trial. It is becoming clear that mutual misunderstanding and misconception played an important rôle in the whole matter, due to the participation of various unsuccessful and suspicious mediators, between the staff and the provisional government. In this the group surrounding Korniloff was especially to blame. At the present time there reigns complete quiet and order, except for certain disturbances among the Cossacks on the Don, caused by Gen. Kaledine, which can not have important consequences. A new government has been organized. Kerensky remains presiding minister and has been designated commander in chief, which was necessary to quiet down democratic elements and soldiers. Chief of Staff Alexieff will, in fact, conduct operations. A number of army appointments are being made, showing that it is the intention of the Government to create order within the army.

The constitution of the Government will also respond to the needs of the moment, as is indicated by the appointment of Gen. Verkhofsky as minister of war and of Admiral Verderevsky as minister of marine. Changes will take place in the rest of the make-up. Chernoff, certain cadets, and Nekrasoff have gone altogether. Cadet Kishkin and several representatives of manufacturers will enter. I handed in my resignation with the other ministers, but the question as to my return to the ministry has not as yet been decided. The problem before the new Government is to avert all disturbances, conflicts, and disorders in the army which may arise because of lack of confidence in the commanding staff. The most energetic measures will be taken to bring

this about. At the same time that Petrograd and Moscow have been declared under martial law all measures have been adopted to restore order in the rear of the army. At the present time, in connection with the Korniloff matter, Bolsheviki have been greatly strengthened, and demand that persons arrested on the 5th of July be released. However, the position of the Government has been greatly improved after its victory, which gives reason to reckon on most energetic conflict with Bolshevism. In general, it may be considered that the sad events of recent days, because of their rapid solution, have not weakened us for the struggle with the external enemy, but proved the unity of feeling and the general desire to concentrate on this struggle without being diverted by internal disputes and conflicts. No matter what attempts may be made in the future by the Left or the Right to disturb the political course adopted by the Government, you may be assured that they will be met by the combined resistance within the country. The Government will persevere firmly and under all circumstances in the continuance of the war, and with restored energy will labor to revivify and rebuild the army.

Sent August 31. No. 4059. Code.

(Signed) TERESCHENKO.

A prime weakness in Kerensky's position, and one which his Bolshevik opponents exploited to the utmost, was the charge that the Allies were interested in the restoration of Russian order only in so far as it might bring back the Russian Army as a factor in the war. Representations made to the Kerensky government by the English, French, and Italian ambassadors on the 9th of October were regarded even by the Kerensky government as tending to confirm this charge. The "painful impression" so created is conveyed in the following six dispatches, in the second of which the Kerensky government expresses its appreciation of the conduct of the American ambassador at Petrograd in abstaining from the joint effort to exercise pressure on Russia.

—

SECRET TELEGRAM TO THE AMBASSADOR IN WASHINGTON.

26TH OF SEPTEMBER (OCT. 9), 1917.

No. 4559.

The English, French, and Italian ambassadors were received to-day by the presiding minister, and in the name of their Governments communicated to him as to the necessity of taking measures for rehabilitating our army's capacity for war. This step could not but create upon the provisional government a painful impression, the more so as the efforts of the provisional government, for the inflexible continuation of the conflict with the common enemy, are well known to the Allies. I ask you to communicate to Lansing in strict confidence, how highly the provisional government appreciates the abstention of the American ambassador from participating in the aforementioned united step.

TERESCHENKO.

—

"A PAINFUL IMPRESSION."

[Secret telegram to the Russian ambassador in Washington, Oct. 11, 1917.]

The démarche of the three ambassadors made a painful impression upon us, both by reason of its contents and of its form. Our allies know very well the extraordinary efforts made by the provisional government to restore the fighting efficiency of the army. Neither military misfortunes nor internal disorders nor the gigantic material difficulties availed to break Russia's unbending determination to carry on the war against the common foe until the end. Under such circumstances we must ask ourselves, with astonishment, what opinion could impel our allies to such a step, and what practical result they expect from it? Please communicate to the foreign minister the contents of this telegram and convey to him my urgent request that he should represent the démarche of the Allies as the result of previous negotiations—in view of the dangerous excitement of our public opinion.

TERESCHENKO.

—

No. 4461.

The presiding minister in his reply to the three ambassadors remarked that the provisional government will take measures to avoid such interpretation of their step as in the public opinion of the country might create irritation against the Allies. He pointed out at the same time that the present difficult position of Russia was to a considerable degree conditioned by the heritage from the old régime, the governments of which in their time met with trust and assistance abroad, perhaps not corresponding to their merits. He also called attention to the dangerous results that would follow the hesitation of the Allies in the matter of supplying our army with military material, and that the results of such hesitation affect the front two or three months after they have taken place. As to the war, A. F. Kerensky stated that in Russia it is always looked upon as an international concern, and because of that he considers it unnecessary to emphasize the sacrifices suffered by the Russian people.

The imperialism of the central powers presents the greatest danger for Russia, and the war upon it must be conducted in close unity with the Allies. Russia, having suffered more than others from the war, can not bring it to an end without assuring her territorial inviolability and independence, and would continue the war no matter what may be the strain on all the other nations. With regard to measures for the restoration of the army's capacity for war, the presiding minister pointed out that this problem is taking up the entire attention of the Government, and that to-day's voyage to the general staff of the ministers of war and foreign affairs was called forth precisely by the necessity for working out a program corresponding to the need. In conclusion A. F. Kerensky replied to the general charge of the ambassadors that Russia is still a great power. (No. 3 follows.)

TERESCHENKO.

—

SECRET TELEGRAM TO THE RUSSIAN AMBASSADORS IN PARIS AND LONDON.

No. 4303. SEPTEMBER 17–30, 1917.

With regard to conversations with the allied ambassadors here and more especially with the most outspoken one of them, the American ambassador, I have come to the conclusion that among our Allies in one of the latest conferences in Paris or London an agreement has evidently been reached with regard to distribution among them of those spheres in which they must materially cooperate with us in the continuation of the war. For example, the Americans, it seems, took upon themselves the problem of equipping for us of the railroad transport. This question is of tremendous importance to us, as it is, in fact, the technical and material problems which under present conditions are assuming a menacing character in the sense of our ability to actually carry on the war to its conclusion. I might be ready in view of that to meet the Allies by taking the initiative in a proposition for a more active than heretofore participation on their part in the organization of our industry and transports, if on their side would be shown a readiness to that effect. I ask you to carefully feel out the situation as to the foundation in this direction and to communicate your conclusion.

TERESCHENKO.

—

SECRET TELEGRAM TO THE CHARGÉ D' AFFAIRES IN LONDON, COMMUNICATED TO REPRESENTATIVES IN PARIS AND ROME.

No. 4797. OCTOBER 16–29, 1917.

Referring to your telegram No. 365, with regard to your conversation with Balfour I consider it necessary to confirm that, in our opinion, the forthcoming conference of the Allies must have for its problem the appraisement of the general situation and the establishment of complete solidarity of the Allies in their views with regard to the same. At the same time the conference must determine the means for further conduct of the war and the mutual assistance which the Allies must give to each other. With regard to the participation at the conference of a person enjoying the confidence of our democracy, it is necessary to keep in mind that such person will enter into the make up of the Russian Government delegation in whose name only its head shall speak officially.

TERESCHENKO,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"RUSSIA IS STILL A GREAT POWER."

(Mr. Kerensky and the entente ambassadors.)

[Secret telegram from the foreign minister of the provisional government to the Russian ambassadors in Paris, London, and Rome, Oct. 9, 1917.]

The French, British, and Italian ambassadors expressed the wish to be received by the premier. They made to him a statement emphasizing that recent events gave rise to fears as to Russia's powers of resistance and her capacity to continue the war. In this connection public opinion in the allied countries may demand from their governments details regarding the material help given to Russia. In order to make it possible for the allied governments to calm public feelings and instill fresh confidence, it was incumbent on the Russian Government to show by deeds its determination to use every means for restoring discipline and imparting a real war spirit to the army. Finally, the allied governments express the hope that the Russian Government will fulfill the task and thus assure itself of its allies' support.

The minister in his reply to the three ambassadors emphasized that the government was taking steps in this direction, and that this step of the ambassadors was calculated to arouse great resentment generally, and made clear his astonishment at such a step. He also pointed out that the present difficult position of Russia was to an important degree connected with the legacy taken over from the old régime, whose government had in its day claimed abroad a support and a confidence quite out of keeping with its merits. The minister also drew their attention to the dangerous effects which were bound to follow any restriction by the Allies of the supply of necessities to the army. These effects show themselves after two or three months, and then can no longer be made good.

As regards the war, Kerensky emphasized that in Russia it was still regarded as a universal national affair, and that he therefore considered it unnecessary to lay special stress on the sacrifices made by Russia. The imperialism of the central powers was the greatest danger for Russia, and the struggle against this imperialism must be conducted in close accord with the Allies. Russia, who has suffered more than all others from the war, can not end it without seeing her State interests and her independence assured. She will continue the struggle and do all that is possible to make the army capable of resisting. As regards restoring its fighting powers, the premier pointed out that this task was the subject of the Government's attention, and that during his visit to the front speeches were made regarding the need of working out a program in this connection. Finally, Kerensky, in view of the collective manner of the ambassador's démarche, pointed out that Russia is still a great power.

TERESCHENKO.

—

Great hopes were based by the Kerensky government upon the preliminary parliament, which, as a matter of fact, the moderates succeeded in controlling, but which was simultaneously repudiated by the Bolsheviki. With the breakdown of the preliminary parliament, events moved rapidly toward the final collapse of the Kerensky régime.

SECRET TELEGRAM OF MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO THE REPRESENTATIVES IN PARIS, LONDON, ROME, WASHINGTON, TOKYO, AND STOCKHOLM.

PETROGRAD, *October 9 (22), 1917.*

No. 4636.

Yesterday the preparliament was opened. The first session passed tediously, with the exception of the scandal created by the Bolsheviki, who left the session, announcing that in such an institution they do not care to participate. It became clear that the representatives of the unsocialistic groups, together with the Moderate Mensheviki-Socialists and Social-Revolutionists, constitute a considerable majority, which will be in position to support the Government. The Bolsheviki are preparing for the forthcoming congress on October 30 of the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, in which they expect to have a majority. A very strong campaign is now being waged in democratic circles on the question of the Parisian conference. At the same time, it is important to note that on the question of peace there is no unity even in the parties or the left. For instance, the instruction given to Skobileff by the central executive committee of the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies meets with severe criticism among socialists themselves. Against the candidacy of Skobileff appear with caustic articles the papers Novaya Zhizn and the Bolshevist Rabochiy Put. At the same time we can not but note a peculiar patriotism and even a warlike spirit exhibited at the present time by some of the extreme elements. Their basic frame of mind in this connection is due to the conviction that when we will propose a program of democratic peace desired by the socialists the German imperialists may not accept it, and then it will become necessary to fight for defense. This idea is vaguely expressed in the press of the extreme Left and has lately found an echo among the sailors. The latter, in their appeals in connection with the failure in the Bay of Riga, aim to emphasize the heroism of the fleet in its conflict with the external enemy, contrasting it with the insufficient steadfastness of the land armies. At the same time it is emphasized that the war is not only against the Germans, but against exploiters in general to create a universal revolution. This point of view is directed against bourgeoisie and the Government, which are being accused by the Bolsheviki in that they gave up Riga and

are ready to give up Petrograd in order to finish with the revolution. The news of the intention of the Government to evacuate Petrograd is especially exciting the circles of the extreme Left, which threatened to prevent it by force. It is not necessary, however, to attribute an exaggerated meaning to these signs of Jacobinism, but, after all, their positive meaning lies in the awakening patriotism of the dark masses, which the internationalists must take into cognizance.

TERESCHENKO.

This dispatch from Tereschenko further traces the rise of Bolshevik influence as a result of the Korniloff affair, but takes, nevertheless, an optimistic view of the possibilities of a coalition of all the moderate parties.

398.

SECRET TELEGRAM TO THE AMBASSADORS IN PARIS, LONDON, ROME, WASHINGTON, TOKYO, AND STOCKHOLM, SEPTEMBER 26 (OCT. 9), 1917.

No. 4438.

After lengthy negotiations between the representatives of the democratic conference on the one hand and the cadets and manufacturers on the other, there was formed a coalition cabinet, the constitution of which has been communicated to you. As the fundamental character of these negotiations it is to be noted that the great spirit of concession on the part of the leaders of democracy who recognize that the transfer of power into the hands of Socialists would at this time be very unprofitable for them. However, the importance of these concessions is minimized in that comparative modern socialist leaders have to a great degree lost control of the masses which tend to extreme directions and can be only held in check with great difficulty. In connection with this may also be recognized a split in the democratic circles. The more moderate government elements of all parties are tending to group themselves about representatives legally chosen by means of the universal suffrage of Zemstvo and city local self-governments.

The participation in this movement of cooperatives gives it great significance, as behind it stands organized peasantry. On the other hand, Bolshevistic and anarchistic tendencies are gradually gaining ascendency in the soviet of soldier and workers' deputies, which has taken place altogether in Petrograd and is also taking place in other cities. Such soviets of workers and soldiers' deputies placed themselves in a state of opposition and disobedience to the Government, but on the other hand are losing influence in extensive circles of the population. Very important will be the rôle played by the preparliament, which, until the constituent assembly, must act for the national Government. Although there will be a socialist majority in its constitution, it is positive that in combination with representatives of liberal parties, moderate socialists will be able to resist Bolshevism. It should also be remembered that the country will listen to the voice of moderate groups, whose patriotic declarations can not remain without influence. As to the program of the Government, it comes down to three important points—to raise the military capacity of the army; to preserve elementary order in the country; to fight economic disorganization. Yesterday a general railroad strike was commenced. Against it measures have been taken partly in the way of satisfaction of the demands of the railroad workers and partly in the form of repressive measures. The strike can hardly develop, as it does not meet with sympathy. It is not spreading at the front.

(Signed) TERESCHENKO.

Writing after the fall of Riga, Tereschenko is still confident that something like military discipline can be reestablished, and that the condition of virtual armistice which had set in with the revolution and been interrupted during the brief offensive of July could be done away with.

TO THE AMBASSADORS IN PARIS, LONDON, WASHINGTON, TOKYO, AND MINISTER IN STOCKHOLM.

The capture of Riga has created a profound impression within the country and has considerably intensified the sobering process which has been noted before. The question of the army's capacity for war agitates everybody, and there is noticeable in democratic organizations a turn in the direction of patriotism and a realization of the approaching danger. A proof of this is found in the last session of the soviet of labor delegates and the organizaions of the Petrograd garrison. The manifesto to the army and the population issued by them contains in it the appeal to sacrifice everything for the defense of the fatherland.

The attitude of the Government in regard to the danger of German advance is becoming firmer and more definite. A series of measures for the defense of Petrograd and the establishment of order in it and its environs are nearing a stage of realization. Petrograd is being energetically relieved of unnecessary institutions and inhabitants as this is vital in order to facilitate the food supply of the city. While not foreseeing immediate danger to the capitol the Government is yet ready to assist in decreasing the population for economic reasons and for the establishment of order. The matter of unloading (merchandise) has been placed in the hands of the minister of postal communications, Nikitin, with special powers, he being a very energetic organizer. As to the military program, cooperation of the staff and the war ministry is completely arranged for. I can not but note that the news arriving here from the allied countries, and especially the newspaper articles with regard to the latest military events on our front, have created in patriotically attuned circles a very depressing impression.

At a time when every effort is being made here to strengthen the decision to continue the war at any cost, and when a general attitude is being evolved in the spirit of complete cooperation with the Allies, public opinion of the latter refuses, it seems, to place confidence in us. This creates here great perplexity, especially as in spite of our defeats our June offensive and the counteroffensive of the enemy have compelled the Germans to concentrate on our front even larger forces than at any former time. The aim of the Kerensky government to stop at any cost the actual condition of armistice, which in the spring permitted the transfer of enemy forces from our front to the French front, has been completely attained. In view of this, it is here considered as desirable to react on the public opinion of allied countries and to explain this situation, emphasizing that here exist, neither in Government nor in other responsible circles, not excluding those democratically inclined, no doubts or hesitations with regard to the future direction of our policies as to the continuation through every means of the war in full accord with the Allies.

TERESCHENKO.

This brief dispatch dealing with the activities of Branting, leader of the Swedish Socialists, shows that in Russia Branting's activities in behalf of the Stockholm conference were not at all regarded as a maneuver in favor of a German peace.

SECRET TELEGRAM OF THE AMBASSADOR AT STOCKHOLM, AUGUST 5–18, 1917.

NO. 445.

Personally.

Branting, who at first was very low-spirited because of the situation created through the refusal of the Allies to grant passports to socialists, is gradually beginning to quiet down. Yesterday, in a strictly private and confidential conversation, he expressed himself in the following manner, which I am transcribing verbally as it was stated to me: "If Kerensky does not repudiate the idea of a conference, let him declare that at the present time he deems it inadvisable. Holland-Scandinavian committee will be obliged to submit."

If you consider it necessary to make use of these data, I earnestly ask you to keep their source secret, and not to compromise Branting and not to deprive of a valuable source of information.

Z. GULKEVICH,
Ambassador at Stockholm.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, nothing was further from my intention than to address the Senate this morning, but in view of the observations that have been made by my more or less learned friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], I feel that some reply would not be out of season. I listened with all my faculties to the Senator's speech but was unable to tell precisely what he was talking about, but he furnished to the Senate and to the American people the remarkable phenomena of a man being foggy and windy at one and the same time.

The Senator from Illinois, for whom I have an affection, says that the league to secure peace, if adopted, will become a deadly instrument of oppression, and that Pope Benedict or some succeeding Pope may subject not only the American people but the civilization of the entire earth to monstrous tyrannies by reason of the fact that a number of so-called Catholic nations desire to have no further warfare by entering the league of nations. Of course, Mr. President, Belgium seems anxious to become a member of the league of nations, if formed, and a large percentage of her people are of Catholic faith; but a large number of the heroic people of Belgium are Protestants, firm in their religious belief, and they desire to enter the league. It can not be astounding that a country like Belgium, which fought Prussianism with a valor beyond the range of eulogy, would be glad to enter a league where a repetition of the outrages perpetrated upon her would be well-nigh impossible.

It is amusing to see the opponents of the league changing their ground and racing about like a tortured animal on a hot surface. When the league was first proposed the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], for whom also I have great affection, delivered a speech that, like a red and fiery comet, literally set the sky afire. He convinced men whose reason had temporarily slipped that the kings of the earth would surely dominate this league, and with that coruscating language and rhetoric for which he is so justly famous he pictured kingly power destroying free republics. All over our broad land men in their homes and at their firesides were disturbed and said if it be true that kingly power is to be resumed, we would better instruct our representatives not to vote for the league. But the argument soon went to pieces, as kings grew scarcer and kingdoms fell apart. So the kings departed, but not the shoutings.

Then, again, we were told that Great Britain was to have six votes in the league, and all those who want to get votes began to "twist the lion's tail." That is an American prerogative we all have on the Fourth of July. Who here has not twisted the lion's tail when seeking for votes? I delight to do it. I am invited to do it every Fourth of July, and I think I am going to continue to do it for some time to come. Great Britain with six votes! Ah, Great Britain was going to dominate the league.

The coon-skin cap and powderhorn that our fathers so much revered and that as heirlooms are handed down would become a reproach. Lexington, Putnam, and Light Horse Harry Lee, and John Hancock were to be forgotten; and again the British Empire, with its monstrous tyranny, was to dominate this country, for we are to have one vote and Great Britain six.

But after we had come from under this spell of bewitching oratory and had read the cold print we found Great Britain had one vote in the council, which is the controlling functionary of the league, and that Canada, as it should have, and Australia, as it should have, have a right to be heard in the assembly. So the king argument and Great Britain argument faded.

Then when public sentiment for this league to secure peace began to grow and prosper, as it did, when the farmers in their homes and men in their workshops who had lost their sons and saw their Representatives in Congress voting countless millions to pay the expense of the war began sending telegrams to the Senators urging that something be done to put an end to war, in desperation the remarkable eloquence of my friend from Missouri conjured up another specter and told the South that the Negroes were going to dominate the league, and that the brutalities and infamies which the colored race had perpetrated upon the defenseless white people of the South would again soon

be resumed, and that no white man or his family would be safe in the South if we tried to bring about peace in the world by a league of nations.

The argument that the Negro was to dominate the league did catch a few persons, but they were so relatively few that even the Senator from Missouri, I think, has abandoned the fear that we are going to be under the Negro's domination. We finally saw that Haiti, Santo Domingo, Liberia, et id omne genus were not going to destroy the Anglo-Saxon civilization of the world.

Very well. Still again came the mind, heart, and soul of the American people, saying, "We are tired of warfare; we are tired of having our women go down into the shadow of the valley of death to bring forth sons to be buried nameless in a battle trench; we demand that you, Democrats and Republicans alike, make some honest, constructive effort to bring peace to the world, if possible."

But once more we were told that Bolshevistic Russia would dominate the league, that the league was endeavoring to erect a superstate, to be imposed upon us. But that argument soon withered and collapsed. We have had appeals to partisan politics, appeals to prejudice, appeals not to reason but appeals to prejudice, special pleadings.

Then, my friend from Illinois has now, in his destitution of argument against the league of nations, gazed into the future and read some of the past, and finds that Pope Benedict and succeeding popes are artfully and with cunning skill weaving a web around the world so that the Vatican shall dominate the league and make the world Catholic.

Mr. President, I am ashamed of my friend, the Senator from Illinois. I have more than affection for him. He is a man of ability, and it is to be regretted that he will give vent to such puerile statements. No sensible, no thoughtful, man believes that any church would dare attempt to dominate the world. Such attempt would be an absurd, a monstrous, thing.

If there be one question upon which all the churches of the world are united, it is the question that we should do some sensible thing to try to stop warfare in the future, if it be possible. Nobody who indulges the luxury of thinking believes that the Catholic hierarchy or any other hierarchy is going to attempt to dominate the earth. I do not apprehend any danger of church domination. I am sure I would be, if not the first, I should be one of the first men to bound to the front here and elsewhere and physically fight against any church of any sort that would attempt to dominate the world politically or by force of arms or by cunning.

A man's religion is between himself and his God. No matter what religion he has, and whether he shall have any religion at all, is for him to determine. That is the beauty and the glory of this Republic—freedom to worship in accordance with the way a man sees fit. I am tired of appeals to religious prejudice. They do not become statesmen; they do not become the enlightened period in which we are now living.

So I shall not be surprised if some league opponent shall soon say that the Mormon Church, Episcopal Church, the Church of Christian Scientist, or some other church is about to dominate the world through this league of nations. Such arguments fall of their own inherent weakness. I urge upon Senators in the discussion of this great question, this question which is surpassingly important, to let it be a Homeric contest, let patriotism speak, let logic and the power of thought speak, and not prejudice of any kind, either political or religious prejudice. Let us, as becomes this great war Senate and this reconstruction Senate, debate these problems in such a way that when posterity reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the succeeding years they will be proud that in the interest of civilization there was such a Senate. When they read the arguments to the effect, first, that kings were to dominate the league of nations, then Great Britain was going to dominate, and then Negroes were going to dominate the league, then Bolshevism was going to dominate the league, and then Pope Benedict or some other pope was going to dominate the league, will they feel proud of the Senate of our times? Such arguments are not in keeping with the great high plane of elevated thought that must solve this question.

So, Mr. President, I believe that the various Protestant churches, the Catholic Church, the Jews, the Mormons, and other religious denominations are not seeking to dominate the bodies and the property of men; they are seeking moral victories rather. Their great conflicts are not for material gain or for the exploitation of their neighbors. These great denominations are not attempting to enslave mankind; they are the pioneers of civilization, and for many painful centuries have been slowly advancing, holding high the torches of reason, lighting up with gladsome rays the dark places of the earth, where brutality, ferocity, and stupidity hold sway.

Before the Christian era the kindly lights of human sympathy, the advances in domesticity, and the intelligent organization of force held at bay malice, greed, murder, and blood lust; but even with these splendid influences humanity's forward march was slow and discouraging, until at last came the elevating influences and optimistic teachings of the Christian religion, which has comforted, elevated, and purified countless millions of human hearts.

Without the influence of the churches of the world civilization would perish within 90 days; it is the churches of all the various denominations that have raised man from his condition as a caveman and brought him forward as an enlightened human being who wants to make the world habitable, wants to make life, as we go through it, a pleasant journey, instead of a fanged and horrid thing. So when you begin to make the argument that the churches are about to attempt to enslave mankind and to overthrow civilization through a league of nations, it seems to me the very bottom of a deep pit of destitution of argument has been reached.

Mr. SHERMAN rose.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me first say that I did not have any opportunity for preparation on this question, and if I say aught that seems to offend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], I shall cheerfully apologize, for I believe that LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN is a man who has a good heart, and before he allowed himself to see all these specters and visions, he had a good head, but where Woodrow Wilson and those who are trying to form this league to secure peace have used caution, the Senator from Illinois has used only caustic; and in these days caustic does not get us anywhere. The time has arrived not for vitriol but for vigor. By vigor I mean vigorous consciences that inspire men so that they are not afraid to stand up in the public forum and say what they believe to be correct.

Mr. McCUMBER rose.

Mr. ASHURST. I see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] arises. I heard his speech supporting the league, and I read his speech again last night. I commend it to the citizenship of this Nation. Some one year ago in debate I said that, if the Republican Party was destitute of a candidate for the Presidency, they could go further and fare worse, and they probably will, than to nominate the Senator from North Dakota. His speech in the Senate—not because he happened to agree with me—in support of the league of nations demonstrates that he is a man of statesmanship, of scholarship, of courage, and of ability, and I believe, when the American people shall have read his speech and shall have learned, as he has so well said, that never was there an instrument so shamefully misquoted as is the covenant for a league of nations, the swelling tide of popular opinion will rush forward in support of the league, even in greater measure than it is doing to-day.

In the life of a Government, as in the life of a man, sometimes there comes a crisis so deep and so terrible that in any attempt to visualize it words seem weak, if not contemptible, and we have now reached that exact point in the proposal to form a league of nations

I impugn the motive of no Senator. I question the vote of no Senator. He is responsible to the American people for his vote on this all-important question. More than that, he is answerable to that grim monitor called conscience, a monitor within his breast which slumbers not nor sleeps, but which with persistent and uncanny vitality gives no peace nor rest to him who disregards her unmistakable and infallible warnings.

It is utterly stupid to apply the epithet "traitor" or other opprobrious terms to those who are in favor of a league of nations. A large proportion of the patriotic citizenry of our country believe that the constitution of the proposed league of nations is a document as noble in idealism as our Declaration of Independence and as practical and as workable as our Federal Constitution, and these persons believe that in the world's day of trouble the league of nations points the way at least to a tolerable security. No man ever convinced another by abuse. Only logical arguments, generous and exalted public speech, should find a place in our annals during such a posture of affairs as that now before us. Likewise, the opponents of the league of nations ought to be exempt from vilification and abuse; many of the opponents of the league are men of patriotism and high character, and we must not forget that a large number of persons who now oppose the league were once earnest in its advocacy; and in referring to the fact that some of the opponents of the league were once its champions, I must, of course, exempt and except the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. They have always been opposed to any league at any time. During the

past few months, in opposition to any league, they have swept along like fiery comets with a zeal and an eloquence that can not be described by any other word than "great."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMOOT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I am obliged to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting of a committee, or I should not now seek to interrupt the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator from Arizona is entitled to the thanks of the Senate and of the country for the criticism which he has just presented to some phases of the discussion upon the league of nations. I interrupt him, therefore, merely to add that, if the religious question in any phase is to be introduced into the discussion and the determination of this great treaty, or any part of it, it will prove most unfortunate not only to America but to the world.

Mr. ASHURST. I think the Senator from Colorado is correct about that.

Mr. THOMAS. In this country Protestants and Catholics, Mormons and Dissenters, Jews and Gentiles, white men, black men, and red men were a unit in defending the institutions of the country and in battling against the ambitions of the greatest Protestant country in Europe outside of Great Britain. Catholics in those countries which were opposed to Germany were as loyal as were Protestants; Protestants in those countries which were fighting were as loyal as were Catholics. Mohammedans, Buddhists, Brahmins, and the believers in every form of religion mingled with those who have no religion at all, and are mutually responsible for this victory, as they were similarly responsible for instituting the war through the agency of those Governments of which they were citizens or subjects.

More wars have occurred and more lives have been lost through the development of religious fanaticism than from all other causes combined. The religious problem must not, under any circumstances, be a factor in the consideration and disposal of this mighty question.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it is I who owe the thanks, and I am glad that the Senator from Colorado interrupted me, his interruption will probably prove to be the most illuminating part of my speech.

Here I now leave the questions of British domination of the league, Negro domination, and Vatican domination with which we have been regaled and pass on to other subjects with the simple statement that I believe the churches of the earth will be and should be content to win victories in the moral field, in the religious field, and will attempt no conquest of land or persons, but will appeal through that beautiful and noble temple—conscience—which, though invisible to mortal eyes, is the only temple through which churches should or will attempt to appeal.

Now a word about the peace treaty and the peace conference, since I am on my feet.

When Wilson started for the Paris conference his enemies, indeed some of his friends, shifted their tongues to the starboard side of their faces, and with gestures like undertakers signaling to pallbearers filled the circumambient atmosphere with gloomy predictions that Wilson would soon be enmeshed and entangled in the web which the scheming politicians and exquisite diplomatists of Europe would adroitly weave about him. But in all the heavy tasks confronting that polylingual assemblage in Versailles, Woodrow Wilson was the delegate of distinction, ability, and authority, and I am grateful as an American citizen that no act nor word of his in any way disfigured or marred the high objects for which the Paris conference assembled.

Those persons who last December feared lest the shrewd representatives of other powers would outwit Woodrow Wilson at the peace conference have seen their fears evaporate.

Those who believed that Wilson's large idealism and scholarship equipped him for luminous expression and euphonious phrases, but not for solid concrete work, have seen Woodrow Wilson solve the most intricate and complex problems ever presented to any assemblage of men in recorded history.

Master of eloquent speech, Wilson has proved himself successful in the realm of "the arduous greatness of things done."

Wilson was the dominating force in drafting the treaty which arraigns Germany before the bar of civilization—a treaty which pronounces judgment on the wickedness of Prussian militarism; a treaty which teaches Germany that the pillager pollutes himself, that the thief robs himself, and that the murderer inflicts upon himself deeper wounds than those which kill his victim; a treaty which teaches Germany that behind every Prussian Junker, silent but with uplifted blade, stands the shadow of retribution and justice.

If Germany complains of the terms as being harsh, let her think for a moment of her treaty of Bucharest, where she ground to a pulp Roumania's bleeding body. Let her think of Serbia. Let her remember her extortions from the Ukraine, the Baltic Provinces, and her treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

We seem to be in danger of forgetting why America entered into the war. So let me here restate the reasons for our taking part in that vast enterprise.

We entered the war to protect, vindicate, and uphold certain vital American rights—very vital rights—rights likewise possessed by every other independent State, great or small—rights that must be respected and preserved or the independent State is reduced to a dependency or to a condition of vassalage.

Secondly, we entered the war to assist civilization in its volcanic contest to survive the most desperate assault organized force ever made upon it.

These are the things for which America fought. These principles we widely proclaimed to the world from time to time during the progress of the war, and we can not now fail or refuse to follow our own teachings to their logical conclusion.

To fail to sustain the league of nations would mean that we not only abandon our dead in France, but abandon also the cause for which they died.

We are required to assist in the liquidation of the war. It would doubtless be to many persons a profitable plan if we would simply withdraw to the seclusion, ease, comfort, and riches of our own shores. But such can not be, for in taking part in the war we gave reasons so noble that we made a high place for America as the unselfish, altruistic, and disinterested Nation; and, as has been wittily said, we are now in that posture which confronts many a Christian, where he must either lower the tone of his preaching or live a noble life.

The practical question which confronts us is, Are the allied powers who have won the Great War simply to patch up a mere temporary armed truce, or shall international justice and moral courage be employed to prevent unnecessary wars?

Is the world to drop back into its former attitude of laissez faire and let matters drift haphazardly along? If so, the martyrs and heroes of this war suffered in vain.

Must those nations that wish to live orderly, useful, and noble lives forever be imperiled and harassed by a sword of Damocles suspended over them? Whether we like it or not, we must either face a league of nations or face constant warfare.

Christianity, civilization, justice, and the orderly protection of human society over and over again have narrowly escaped extinction during the past 20 centuries. Surely there is not a Senator here who would pretend to be oblivious to the bitterness, hate, and resentment the Great War has engendered?

Why, therefore, may not the forces of morality, justice, and freedom organize for their own safety and for their own perpetuation? Shall we transmit to posterity safety or peril? Is civilization to be nakedly exposed to the constant menace of annihilation, while ignorance, barbarism, and ferocity are given a free hand at organization?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, has the Senator asked not to be interrupted?

Mr. ASHURST. No; I would yield to my friend from Missouri at any time.

Mr. REED. I do not rise for the purpose of getting into any controversy, but merely for the purpose of understanding clearly the Senator's statement. The Senator has just used the expression that we must either have a league of peace or we must yield to inveterate warfare. There has not been a great war since the Napoleonic wars closed 100 years ago; there have been a large number of small wars, and there have been four or five wars of considerable magnitude. At this time, with Germany prostrate, with Austria dismembered, and with Russia practically paralyzed, why does it follow that we must have a league of peace or else face incessant and inveterate warfare?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I am going to reach that.

Mr. REED. I should like to get the Senator's views on that question.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish the Senator to hear me. The Senator is a scholar and a historian, and I will reach that point later. I want especially to appeal to him on that question.

I was saying that, in my judgment, we must face some sort of a league or face inveterate warfare of the most severe kind. The question is, as I see it, Shall we with passivity allow the material and moral horrors, the blood, "the climbing fire, lean

famine, and quartering steel" of world wars to fall again upon the world?

On armistice day, when soldiers of liberty by the millions were able once more to breathe air free from gas and shell smoke, they wiped the blood and sweat and mud from their eyes, looked out upon a war-swept landscape, and demanded not money, not ease nor comfort, not even food, but they did demand that the civilization they had saved should construct some proper bulwark to protect itself from another assault such as the one their valor had just repulsed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator unduly, but I have heard a good many men undertake to talk for the American soldier and tell what he thought and what he demanded. The sentence that the Senator has just uttered is very beautiful in its language, but I wish to know who has the right to say that the American soldier has demanded anything except that the Germans should have a sound licking and that he should get back home?

Mr. ASHURST. I can not speak for the American soldier; I am not so presumptuous as to attempt to do that; but I have talked with, I presume, 500 of them—I was careful in the conversations I had—and I believe that the whole number of 500 said they did not want to go to another war, although they were willing to go if it became necessary.

Mr. REED. Did the Senator find any of them who wanted to agree to police Europe and to go back there again for that purpose?

Mr. ASHURST. Police Europe!

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I say this lovingly, but I wish we could talk about this question without any selfishness entering into it. Policing Europe! Fight for other people! I am very tired of such talk. Fight for other people! Whoever saw a warrior or a knight-errant fight for himself?

Mr. President, on Jackson Square, in front of the White House, are four bronze statues. On one corner stands the statue of Baron von Stueben. Did he fight for himself? He fought for liberty for other people. On another corner stands the statue of Rochambeau. Did he fight for himself? No; he fought for other men's liberty. Across the corner still farther stands the statue of Lafayette. Did he leave a loving and beautiful wife, a comfortable home, and opulence and ease to fight for himself? Did he fight for himself? No; he fought for the liberty of other men. On the fourth corner stands the statue of Kosciuszko. Did he fight for himself? No; he fought for other men. Let me commend these illustrious heroes to those who fear we are going to fight for other people.

Down on the Mall is a great cairn of stone, 555 feet high, stately, beautiful, and inspiring. No name is written on it, but it stands perpetually in honor of him who was "first in war and first in peace." There is not carved on that monument, in letters of insulting, degrading brass, "F. F. H."—fought for himself—but that monument lifts its head from its everlasting base to the sky because Washington fought for the liberty of other men. We do not erect statues to men who fight for themselves. So I say to you, when you tell me the league of nations requires men to fight for other people, I say it does not but what if it does? Are we not the knight-errant among the nations of the earth? Who else more than America should enlighten the world? Is noblesse oblige gone from the earth? Is the Senator answered now? Is that sufficient? Let us hear no more about fighting for other men. I would not fight a minute for myself. Well, I did, once or twice, and I am ashamed of it to this day; but the poor and weak fights I tried to make for the rights of those who could not speak for themselves are the efforts upon which I look with satisfaction. George Washington, sitting on the banks of the Potomac, with his vast estates and a thousand employees and slaves, the wealthiest man in the Colonies, did he fight for himself? He required no assistance from anybody; he left his home and his devoted wife, he left the plantation that is to-day so restful to the eye, not to fight for himself but to fight for generations yet unborn.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator asks me if I am answered. I reply that I am not answered. He made the assertion that the American soldier wiped the blood from his eyes and then demanded—in substance this was his statement—that the league of nations should be enacted. I asked him who had the right to make that assertion for the American soldier. He replied that he did not undertake to speak for him, but that he had talked to some 500 of them, who had expressed the desire that there should be peace, and so forth, in the world. I asked him then if he had heard any of these 500 say they wanted to go back and police Europe. The Senator then entered upon a rhapsody which was very well and happily put, but which, I complain, is not an answer. I still ask, Did any one of the 500 men say that he wanted to go back and police Europe? We can leave out of the question now what Rochambeau fought for and what Washington fought for——

Mr. ASHURST. Let me ask the Senator if Washington fought for himself?

Mr. REED. Oh——

Mr. ASHURST. I will ask the Senator to answer that question.

Mr. REED. Let the Senator answer my question, and then I will answer his.

Mr. ASHURST. I will answer the Senator if he will answer my question.

Mr. REED. Then let the Senator answer me this qeustion: Did any of the 500 soldiers to whom he has referred say they wanted to go back and police Europe?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir; there were a half dozen of them who said they wanted to go back and "lick" England.

Mr. REED. Very well; so much for the league of peace and for brotherly love. Thus doth the sweet flower blossom. Now I will answer the Senator as to the others. I will begin where the Senator left off, at Washington. Washington did not fight for himself; he fought for his country, and when he had succeeded, with the help of other patriots, in establishing here a free and independent Government, he declared to all posterity that this Nation should attend to its own business, that it should not entangle itself in the affairs of Europe; and, against the insistence of many enthusiasts, he refused to allow our country to commit itself to the cause of France, although Lafayette had been recently here.

Mr. ASHURST. Just a moment. Let me answer that. Washington refused to commit himself because Lafayette was imprisoned by the very powers that were appealing to Washington.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; he refused to allow any interference, not upon that ground but upon the ground that every nation must have regard for its own welfare and must not chase foolish sentiments and must not be a knight-errant, but must be a sensible, wise, prudent people, remaining at home, attending to their own affairs. Every word Washington ever uttered was in consonance with that thought. The appeal to Washington is an appeal against the Senator.

As for the other gentlemen who came here to fight for various reasons, I would not take from their loving memory a single particle of that affection that America has showered upon them. But it is one thing for a man to volunteer his own service and imperil his own life voluntarily, as thousands of our American boys did when they went and joined the English and Canadian Armies, and it is quite another thing for a legislature to vote a contract that will compel the death of millions of people who have nothing to say about making that contract.

If the Senator wanted to be a knight-errant—and I speak it with all the kindness in the world; I know nobody more likely than the Senator to conceive it to be a high duty and privilege to go and make war in the cause of something he thought was right, even though there was no selfish purpose—if he wanted to do that, he would have the right to do it. But has he the right to make a contract that involves that kind of service for 110,000,000 people, and to follow it with a draft law that compels the boys to leave their homes, and the mothers to yield their sons, to die as knight-errants in a cause that is not theirs?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I entered the Chamber while this colloquy was going on, and I listened to the inquiry of the Senator from Missouri, addressed to the Senator from Arizona, as to whether any one of the returning soldiers expressed a desire to go back to Europe to police Europe.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am really curious to know from the Senator from Missouri why any returning soldier should entertain the idea of going back to police Europe. What does the Senator mean by "policing Europe"?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a triangular controversy generally leads us far afield, but I can answer the Senator as to what I mean by policing Europe, and he is entirely too capable a man not to know what I mean.

Before the United States entered this war, as a sovereign nation, existing here within her own borders, she owed no obligation to interfere in any of the quarrels or wars of European or Asiatic States. That had been her traditional policy. The only obligation she owed was to defend herself, and, of course, the general obligation that every nation owes to be a decent nation in the world. The proposition now is that we shall enter into a compact by which a governing body is to be set up in Europe. It is to be composed of one representative from each of some 32 States which are named, and one representative from each of other States that may hereafter be admitted, and we have heard of it somewhat frequently as a league of nations. Carved out of this assembly is a body of nine, known as the council. These bodies have various powers, the exact nature of which has been more or less discussed upon the floor of the Senate; and in those powers I find the authority, in substance and effect, to command the United States to send her armies and her navies, at the direction of that central governing body, for the purpose of maintaining the peace, as they are pleased to call it, of the world, or for the purpose of making war on a State that in the opinion of this governing body has trespassed against its rules and regulations.

But without stopping to discuss that at this time—a theme that I intend to discuss at length——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator has already done so.

Mr. REED. I have discussed it, and under the old form, the old league, made a case that nobody has answered. But I am content for the present, when I speak about going back to police Europe, to call attention to article 10 of the league, which expressly recites that the high contracting parties bind themselves to preserve against external attack the domains of every member of the league, and to preserve the present established government of those countries. The Senator from Montana may or may not call that an agreement to police, but, as I understand the English language, if we adopt article 10, and if Roumania is a member of this league——

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I want to observe that I am in the attitude of the man who was pardoned out of the Arizona penitentiary—I was not allowed to finish my sentence. I yield, however.

Mr. REED. Let me finish mine. The Senator had taken his seat, I knew, only temporarily.

If Roumania should be attacked by Bulgaria or by Turkey or by Poland or by any other nation, the minute an armed soldier stepped across her border it would be our duty to be there and arrest that offender—arrest him with the force of our arms. I call that a contract of policement. If you want to use an uglier term, it is a contract for bloody and deadly war.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad to have the matter clarified, because I had an idea that "policing" referred to quite a different line of activity. I apprehend that the cities of Switzerland, and the cities of Italy, and the cities of Germany, and the cities of Roumania will have their own police force just the same as they have had in the past; and, therefore, I thought it rather strange to expect that a returning soldier would indicate that he desired or did not desire to return to police Europe. But let me remark, Mr. President, that if on next Monday the Germans take the same attitude with respect to this treaty that is taken by the Senator from Missouri, we shall then, undoubtedly, be engaged in the disagreeable task of policing not only all of Germany, but a goodly portion of the remainder of Europe besides.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator let me answer that?

Mr. ASHURST. Why, certainly.

Mr. REED. Of course the Senator from Montana understood me to refer, when I spoke of "policing," to arresting men for bootlegging?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did not; but the Senator wants the returning soldier to understand that that is his meaning of the word "policing."

Mr. REED. No; I asked the Senator from Arizona a question, using the word "policing." I am sorry if it did not meet with the approval of the Senator from Montana as a term.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Excuse me; I would not object to the Senator doing that, but the question he asked was whether any of these returning soldiers expressed a desire to go back for the purpose of policing Europe.

Mr. REED. Yes; and the Senator from Arizona understood me to mean just what I have said, for he said: "Yes; I have heard four or five of them say they wanted to go back and police Europe."

Mr. ASHURST. No, no.

Mr. KING. To go back and "lick" England.

Mr. REED. To go back and lick England.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; that is what I said.

Mr. REED. That was the answer. He understood that I was talking about nations fighting. He was not in that dark and shadowy intellectual land which led him to stumble into the ditch of misconception, and think I was talking of bootleggers or of niggers playing crap in an alley. He knew what I meant.

Mr. ASHURST. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator will let me finish, I will yield to him at any time.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. What committee amendment, amending the bill, is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment before the Senate is the second committee amendment on page 5.

Mr. KENYON. I want to plead with my good friend from Arizona. I do not want to have him shorten his speech unnecessarily; but here is a great bill that has been before the Senate for a couple of weeks, and has been laid aside for appropriation measures. If it can not be passed by to-morrow night, the Senator knows well that the appropriation bills will be here next week, and that is practically the end of this bill. Now, I do want to plead that within some reasonable time the debate concerning the league of nations this afternoon be ended. The Senator can go ahead with his speech, but he yields to these interruptions, which amount to speeches, and we have now had three hours of the league of nations. We ought to have three hours of work. It seems to me it would be a fair division if we should divide the afternoon into three hours for the league of nations and three hours for the real work of the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the request of my friend from Iowa is to me a command.

Mr. KENYON. No; I do not mean it as a command to the Senator; but I urge the Senator to make his speech and not allow interruptions of from 15 to 20 minutes to take up his time. I am anxious, and many others are, to go ahead and finish this bill if we can. We will have from the 1st of July to the 1st of next July to debate the league of nations, if necessary.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I reply by saying that any request, on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere, by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, always appeals to me; but it is a singular circumstance that while other Senators have bombarded the air for hours against the league, and nobody requested that they stop, the moment we begin to talk in behalf of the league we are appealed to to stop talking. I want to say to my friend from Iowa that his feet are on the unriven rock. He is in charge of a great bill. It ought to be a law before the 1st of July; and his request to me will have consideration. I got into this debate by accident. I had no more intention of addressing the Senate to-day than I have of walking right out now into that cloakroom; but my friend from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] made some observations which I felt should be replied to.

Let me now go back, and I want the Senator from Missouri——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt long enough to apologize for having taken his time?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator does not need to apologize.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator ought to finish his speech.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am going to invoke the rule if the Senator gives up the floor for speeches within his speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will proceed.

Mr. ASHURST. All right. Now, this was what I was saying when I was interrupted: I did not have an opportunity to finish my sentence. I am sorry the Senator from Missouri has gone out of the Chamber, but let me repeat the question, so that, when it is heard in its entirety, Senators can see whether such a colloquy would be justifiable as the one that ensued.

I said this:

> On armistice day, when soldiers of liberty by the millions were able once more to breathe air free from gas and shell smoke, they wiped the blood and sweat and mud from their eyes, looked out upon a war-swept landscape, and demanded not money, not ease, nor comfort, not even food, but they did demand that the civilization they had saved should construct some proper bulwark to protect itself from another assault such as the one their valor had just repulsed.

That was the question I asked; my statement was that when these gallant soldiers rested for a moment, and drew one breath of healing air, they asked the statesmanship of the world to use its genius and its courage to prevent a repetition of this very thing; and that is what drew the fire of my great friend from Missouri.

What shall the answer be? Shall we reply that we are so bankrupt of statesmanship, so sterile of practical judgment as to be utterly unable to care for and conserve what our soldiers

died for? Shall civilization make the shameful admission that it is so destitute of genius, originality, and initiative that it can construct nothing to prevent the spread of another world war? Shall we say to these soldiers we do not believe in taking measures to prevent the outbreak of great conflagrations, we will let you put out the fires after they have begun to rage with fury. In my judgment that sort of statesmanship does not appeal to the soldier.

My friend from Missouri asked me the question as to where the great wars of the future are going to come from, and he has left the Chamber. I will now tell him where the great wars of the future are going to come from, if he will come into the Chamber.

Livid fires of malice and revenge that will smolder for 300 years have been lighted by this war, and those fires at some unguarded moment will flare up and place in deadly peril, indeed probably destroy, civilization unless civilization is organized and ready to control those fires. The world is confronted now not so much with the task of bringing a higher civilization, but with the task rather of seeing to it that the tolerable civilization we already have is not entirely annihilated.

Are Senators so blind that they see no sinister portent to us and to the other enlightened nations from the destructive hordes that are now sweeping out of Russia? And I need not remind Senators that the Bolsheviki barbarians now rampant in Russia are gushing from the same great fountain whence in ancient times belched also the Tartars, Mongolians, Huns, and Turks that threatened and imperiled Christianity.

When the Senator from Missouri asks me where the great wars of the future are coming from I reply that surely Senators can not be oblivious to the fact that all Germany is filled with a desperate thirst for revenge. The speech of Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau at Versailles on May 7, "Lusitania day," furnishes evidence all too eloquent, and whether Germany signs the treaty or not she will turn her face to the eastward, and that means that German efficiency and Russian mystery and fatalism will combine and will have en bloc 250,000,000 of people who will proceed forthwith to prepare for another world war and try to recover advantages which Germany believes she should possess.

Germany came to the peace conference, not in sackcloth and ashes, not repentant, but bold, indeed arrogant, if not insulting. The speech of Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau upon analysis may be divided into three distinct parts; one part was addressed to the peace conference, another part to the German people, and still another to the future.

Jenghiz Khan was born with his fist clenched over a clot of coagulated blood resembling a red stone.

After overrunning all of the country from the China Sea to the Dnieper River, he returned to his home.

At the city of Herat he massacred 1,600,000 persons in one week.

Starting westward again in 1127, he terrified all Europe. Five planets coming in conjunction, superstitious fear overcame him, and he died.

The Turks are in Europe to-day as a consequence of their ancestors having been driven from their original home in northern Asia by Jenghiz Khan.

From that mysterious fountain there may again gush millions of men filled with an insane desire to overrun the world.

What is the cry to-day in Germany? "We shall awake Barbarossa"—a brutal and stupid emperor, who lived hundreds of years ago, and whom, with their mythology, they believe they can rouse to their defense in a day of great peril. That is the cry in Germany to-day: "We will raise Barbarossa again from his sleep."

Do you know what those words mean? If you do not, read your German that you learned in school, and see what it means—"We are going to wake Barbarossa"—and then tell me whether or not the German is defeated in spirit. His powerful arm of military conquest may be broken, but he, with his resiliency, will rebound eastward, and coalesce with the Russians, and we, naked, unprepared, must face that; and we, Senators of a great Republic, sit around on these benches and see no danger from the situation!

Now, I am going to read from a magazine, The American Monthly—it was once The Fatherland!—edited by Mr. George Sylvester Viereck. I just happened to pick it up the other day. It is published, I suppose, in the city of New York. The article is headed, "To sign or not to sign," and he says, referring to *Lusitania* day, May 7, when Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau made this "eloquent" speech in which he appealed to generations yet to come:

Clemenceau seeks his refuge in legal technicalities. Such a course may be effective in a police court. All such snarls are swept aside by the tribunal of history.

Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau spoke in eloquent accents. He despised legal evasions. He did not seek refuge in rhetoric. He spoke from the depths of his heart. The big four were visibly affected by his speech, the first breath of manhood in an atmosphere of diplomatic finesse.

George Sylvester Viereck, the spokesman for the pro-German element of our country, says that Von Brockdorff-Rantzau was the great man on that occasion and Woodrow Wilson, Clemenceau, Orlando, and Lloyd-George did not amount to anything; that they were practicing diplomatic finesse.

This magazine is printed in the United States!

What else did Mr. Viereck say? This is the issue of June, 1919. He said:

The soul of Germany, chastened by suffering, refined by fire, sublimated by self-analysis, spoke through Brockdorff-Rantzau.

That is true.

Germany does not speak through the mouth of Maximilian Harden.

Now, let me interpolate. Who is Maximilian Harden? He is the man who is opposed to militarism, one of the few men who is courageous enough to say that Germany was wrong in this conflict. But George Sylvester Viereck says Von Brockdorff-Rantzau is the man who speaks for the soul of Germany.

Brockdorff-Rantzau spoke for the new Germany. We know that it is a new, idealistic Germany, for the old régime would never have surrendered its army and its navy, its forts and its soil, its prisoners and spoils.

Further, he says:

The treaty of Brest-Litovsk—

That was the treaty where Russia was betrayed, and where only the statesmanship of Wilson and of Lloyd-George prevented our allies from falling into the pit, and which brought forth the much-abused 14 points from Woodrow Wilson. This editor says:

The treaty of Brest-Litovsk was Jeffersonian in its democracy compared with the treaty of Paris.

Further, and this is the man who speaks for all the pro-Germans of the United States and for the Germans in Germany—page 102, June issue, 1919:

Henceforth the dream of every German will be consecrated to a greater Germany. French occupation of the Saar Valley will be a daily reminder of "revanche."

Revenge!

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for just a question?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Did I understand the Senator to say that George Sylvester Viereck spoke for all the Germans of the United States?

Mr. ASHURST. No. I might have said that, but I do not mean that. I mean he speaks for all those persons who believed the German cause was right and believe it should have prevailed and who hope it may yet prevail. In my State, and doubtless in other States, there are many men and women born in Germany who fought in this war, who bought Liberty bonds, who proved themselves to be good Americans.

Mr. KING. May I just add that I think the Senator's last statement is absolutely correct. George Sylvester Viereck stands for the unregenerated German. He is not an American; he never was; he never can be. He is disloyal to this country; he always was since he has been here. But, thank God, he speaks but for a small section of the German-Americans of the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, Mr. President; that is true. He speaks for very few in the United States, but, indeed, what he says is shared by the people who made up the German Empire, and here is what he says:

Henceforth the dream of every German will be consecrated to a greater Germany. French occupation of the Saar Valley will be a daily reminder of revanche.

No penitence, no remorse, unrepentant.

I quote again:

French occupation of the Saar Valley will be a daily reminder of revanche.

Here it is. I am astounded I did not see it before:

We shall wake Barbarossa from his sleep.
Every German in the world will become an Irredentist.

Not every German in Germany, but every German in the world would become an Irredentist.

The soul of Germany will be stirred to its depth until German Tyrol, German Bohemia, the Baltic Provinces, Alsace-Lorraine, West Prussia, Schleswig, Austria, in short, Germania irredenta, is restored to the Fatherland.

One more word from Mr. Viereck:

No nation, no matter how small, can consent to economic or political tutelage. Neither the new Germany nor the old will submit to the abrogation of its sovereignty. The confiscation of its ships and its colonies, and its one-sided disarmament proposed will lead to a rebirth of militarism. The Allies may imagine that they can render Germany permanently impotent with many minute restrictions, but the mind of man can devise no strategem that the mind of man can not circumvent.

Germany accepted the principle of self-determination in good faith, but its application by the Allies makes a mockery of President Wilson's professions. In every quarter of the globe they are sowing the seed of contention. No European equilibrium is possible with Alsace-Lorraine, Schleswig, Silesia, German Bohemia, German Tyrol, German Poland, and the Saar Valley under foreign domination.

In other words, Germany serves notice on you now that as long as Alsace-Lorraine and other Provinces are turned away from Germany or under any other sovereignty there will be no peace so far as Germany is concerned.

We are appealed to from time to time as to what Washington said. No man has read with profounder veneration the works of Washington and his speeches and of his statesmanship more than I have. There is no man here who has a greater conception of Washington's true grandeur than have I. But the gentlemen who tell us what Washington would have done and what Jefferson would have done, I presume, will never again use the telephone. I presume they never will again use an electric light because Washington never used an electric light. I presume they will never send a telegraphic dispatch; they will never go upon a railroad car, never witness a flying machine because Washington did not. I reply that statemanship is a progressive science. Statesmanship keeps pace with the times as they march, and the alleged statesmanship that remains in a procrustean bed of fixity is a statesmanship that will not build states or secure their liberties after they are built.

We are willing to be guided by and to live and die by the fundamental principles taught by Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and Franklin, and their mighty comrades, but how vast the difference between Washington's day and ours! In Washington's day you could take a buckboard or a packet boat and in a few months you could probably reach Charleston from New York. You could cross the waves of the Atlantic in eight weeks at that time. Washington's advice was good then, and it is good now, to avoid entangling alliances. The league of nations is the very thing that is going to give us a chart by which we can sail and avoid entangling alliances. It will again bring forward and galvanize into life international law so that we shall have a chart by which to steer and a rudder that will send us in the right direction. So much as to Washington's times.

In 1819 a steamer crossed the ocean and Europe and America were brought closer together. Then the great pulsating cable that was to send its messages of love, commerce, and tragedy to all parts of Europe from our country was laid, and we seemed nearer Europe. Statesmen in England read at their breakfast table what took place in America the day before. We read in our morning papers what took place in Europe the day before. We were still closer to Europe, and the world was growing smaller. All the progressive sciences were at work to make the world grow smaller. The mighty hosts of civilization went west in great caravans and built up the Pacific States, and the world still grew smaller. Then steamships crossed the ocean in a few days, and the world grew smaller still, and finally the cavalry of the clouds flamed forth and gave a very tournament effect to the Great War.

Thus came the nervous and temperamental airplanes with bombs under their wings, began to drop their bombs upon our enemies, and our enemies began to bombard our lines with this new method of warfare of which Washington and his mighty comrades had never dreamed. We were nearer yet to Europe. Then a gallant American made an attempt to sail across the ocean in an aeroplane, and he met with a measurable degree of success. Hawker and Grieve boldly attempted to make a trip across the whole Atlantic Ocean at one sweep, and they nearly succeeded. It was a dramatic thing, a brave thing. It will be prosaic and usual in 20 years. Then before the month had passed into eternity two more brave men not only attempted to fly but did fly across the bounding billows of the Atlantic in 16 hours and a few minutes, and Europe was still closer to us.

I tell you, Mr. President, this German efficiency, with its terrible German cry of "Revanche," this cry that "We shall awake Barbarossa," when 70,000,000 people talk like that and when 190,000,000, yea, 200,000,000 people in Russia, fatalists, all, coalesce, and it is only 16 hours across the Atlantic, do you tell me that we are in no danger whatever. Scientists are now making gas bombs so deadly that one bomb dropped upon a city will destroy the life of every person in that city. They are developing, if you will pardon the expression, ability in chemistry, that I think is diabolically ingenious. Chemists now can make a gas so deadly that the German gas smells like perfume in comparison with it, and yet do you tell me we should stand here oblivious to all these dangers and that our sons must go forth nakedly exposed to all these dangers, and we are either too stupid or too cowardly to take effective measures looking toward the perpetuation of our own life as a Nation?

So, Mr. President, it becomes the duty of the civilization of the world—it should be the duty of statesmen, to see to it that some league is made whereby we can control the manufacture of these diabolical engines and these poisons of such a character, these engines of such hideousness that they are alleged to have the powers of Lucifer himself. It is our duty to be prepared to save the civilization, to see that we shall aid other nations to bring about disarmament. It is our duty to do that, and if we fail to do that, we, this war Senate, fail in the performance of the greatest duty ever imposed upon the American Senate, the greatest duty ever imposed upon any assemblage of men in recorded history.

I have no disposition to quarrel with those persons who are opposed to a league of nations. I respect them, but I am not of them. They think that when the armistice was signed Mars fell silent, but let me remind them that Mars is red instead of dead. They think now that Germany has been defeated, this earth will henceforth be a beautiful temple within which are walled peace, contentment, and plenty; a temple within which strife and war are blackballed, and from which all crime, vice, cupidity, hate, envy, rage, and revenge are banished till time itself shall be no more. They are, I am sorry to say, sadly mistaken. I wish they were not mistaken, but practical men know that evil things will continually assail man on this mundane sphere—that envy, deceit, cruelty, foaming revenge, land hunger, bigotry, cupidity, greed, lust for world power, and kindred evil passions inveterately attack the human race and must be combated not surrendered to.

Mr. SHERMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. KENYON. I rise to a privileged question.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KENYON. No; I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry first.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator yield five minutes to me?

Mr. KENYON. The Senator has the floor. Will the Senator agree that the time he spends on this question he will not spend on the bill that is the unfinished business.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; the time I take now will be charged up against my time on Senate bill 18.

Mr. KENYON. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, this is three times the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] has prostrated himself in parliamentary sackcloth and ashes over my misdemeanors. He has on several occasions been so abased and humiliated by my behavior that he has wallowed in grief and been unable to refrain from expressing earnestly his horror at the violence done to his standards of conduct.

If I understood the Senator correctly, and I bear now with him to correct my quotation if I did not hear aright, he said that he was "ashamed of the Senator from Illinois." I have grown so accustomed to those manifestations of his sovereign displeasure that it does not grate upon my sensibilities or awake even a vestige of repentance. I know the Senator is the Chesterfield in charge of senatorial behavior and is the Beau Brummel of forensic taste. I have learned long ago never to expect to take the floor upon any matter of current concern without lacerating his sensibilities. I can not help it if I express myself in the vernacular that goes through the fastidious array of proprieties that hedges him about.

The Senator upon all three occasions, now, counting this evening, has animadverted at considerable length upon my aboriginal, barbaric conduct in this Chamber. I regret that he has, upon such occasions, been moved to these cries of anguish from a tortured parliamentary soul, but I have no guarantees for my future behavior. I know that the Senator is the form and substance of proper conduct on this floor, and I know that I render myself largely an outlaw from polite society in the Senate by not heeding his timely observations. I have learned to look upon him as a sturdy exemplar of all that is chaste and altogether lovely in legislative life. If I might be permitted in the five minutes that I wish to occupy in this matter, Mr. President, I would quote from the great English bard, to describe this watchful guardian of senatorial dignity and propriety:

> See, what a grace was seated on this brow;
> Hyperion's curls; the front of Jove himself;
> An eye like Mars, to threaten and command;
> A station like the herald Mercury,
> New-lighted on a heaven-kissing hill;
> A combination and a form indeed,
> Where every god did seem to set his seal,
> To give the world assurance of a man.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMOOT in the chair). The Secretary will report the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 5——

Mr. KENYON. I ask that that amendment may go over until the other amendments are agreed to.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask whether any of the committee amendments have been agreed to?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

The SECRETARY. The amendment on page 1, line 4, where the word "occupation" was stricken out and the word "industry" was inserted, was agreed to. On page 2, line 2, "1919" was changed to "1920"; in line 3, "1920" was changed to "1921"; in line 17, "1921" was changed to "1922"; and changes were made in lines 15, 16, and 17 in the years. An amendment has been made to the committee amendment on page 4, line 25, after the word "appropriations," and the period. The committee proposes to insert the following amendment as amended:

In any State the legislature of which does not meet between the dates of the passage of this act and December 31, 1920, if the governor of that State shall accept the provisions of this act, such State shall be entitled to the benefits of this act until the legislature of such State meets in due course and has been in session 60 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. KENYON. It has been suggested to me that a number of State legislatures will be in special session and under many constitutions the governor may limit the work to be done by the special session. Hence, I think a further amendment should be made to the amendment by inserting after the word "meet," in line 1, the words "in regular session."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "meet," in line 1, insert "in regular session," so as to read:

In regular session between the dates of the passage of this act and December 31, 1920.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. There is a committee amendment, on page 5, line 11, to strike out "and" and insert a semicolon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 13, after the words "civil employment," the committee proposes to insert "and to cooperate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, with such public and private agencies as it may deem advisable."

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Iowa explain what the committee had in view when this amendment was written into the pending bill?

Mr. KENYON. I will explain to the Senator the purpose. If an organization such as the Knights of Columbus, the Young Men's Christian Association, the American Federation of Labor, or the Jewish Welfare Board should raise funds for a scholarship they could cooperate with this board. That is the object. I think it is a very worthy purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of one passed over.

Mr. KING. I understand there is an amendment, on page 1, line 4, striking out the word "occupations" and inserting the word "industry," and in the next line, line 5, inserting certain words.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that the one in line 5 has gone over until the other amendments are acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that all the committee amendments have been agreed to, with the exception of one amendment that was passed over. The Chair understands, however, that the Senator from Iowa has certain amendments which are committee amendments to offer at this time.

Mr. KENYON. I offer the amendment, on page 2, I suggested yesterday, limiting the time of this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 4, strike out the word "annually" before the word "thereafter," and after the word "thereafter" insert "for a period of five years."

Mr. POMERENE. How will the text read?

The SECRETARY. So as to read:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and thereafter for a period of five years, the sum of $1,000,000.

Mr. KENYON. There should as a part of the amendment be inserted the word "annually" after the figures "$1,000,000," in line 5, so as to read:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and thereafter for a period of five years, the sum of $1,000,000 annually.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. KING. I understood the Senator from Iowa yesterday, and also the Senator from Georgia, to suggest that this bill should be in operation for five years only, including the appropriation carried by the measure. As I understand the amendment, it would continue it for a period of seven years.

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator is justified in reaching that conclusion. I did say that, but I do not want to be in accord with the Senator's statement that it was my idea that it should end in five years. I think it will never end; but I was willing that the time should be limited to five years. I will do that now by changing "five" to "three." That will make five years for the whole period. Will the Secretary make that change?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has a right to perfect the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Strike out "five" and insert "three" before the word "years," so as to read:

For a period of three years the sum of $1,000,000 annually.

Mr. KENYON. I want to get that right. It should read this way, Mr. Secretary:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and thereafter for a period of three years, the sum of $1,000,000 annually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the way the Secretary read it.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. I have another amendment to offer. On page 6, line 15, after the word "not" and before the word "direct," I move to insert "within one year from the time of said appeal," so as to read:

And if the Congress shall not within one year from the time of said appeal direct such sum to be paid it shall be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. At the bottom of page 7, after line 24, I move to insert:

A full report of all expenses under this section, including names of all employees and salaries paid, traveling expenses, and other expenses incurred by each and every employee or by members of the board, shall be submitted annually to Congress by the board.

Mr. KING. May I make an inquiry of the Senator from Iowa? Does not the Senator from Iowa offer an amendment that will limit the compensation that is paid to those who are employed under this act?

Mr. KENYON. I have no objection to such an amendment, and I supposed some one would offer the amendment. It is a reasonable amendment, and, as far as I am concerned, I shall not object to it.

Mr. KING. The Senator appreciates the fact that it is difficult at this stage of the proceedings to offer an amendment that will be suitable and will take into account the multifarious duties to be performed by the agency hereby created, having in view the fact that some of the employees of necessity are paid a much higher compensation than others; but we are confronted daily with evidences of the mistakes which have been made by Congress during the past few years when we discover that men are receiving as much as $15,000 and $20,000 out of lump-sum appropriations as annual compensation. Cabinet officers receive very much less than many men are receiving now who are employed in some of the bureaus and new agencies that have been created during the war. I understand that one official who is now operating under an act which is very much like this—the vocational rehabilitation act—is receiving $10,000, and a large number of men are receiving $4,000 and some higher than that amount. Indeed, the salaries which are paid under the vocational act, I think, are entirely too high and entirely disproportionate to the salaries paid in other useful and important public positions. If no limitation is placed here, I have not any doubt in the world but what there will be a repetition of the mistakes, to use a very mild term, which, I think, have been made by this vocational board with respect to the salaries it has been paying in the past and is paying now. I think there ought to be a limitation placed upon these lump-sum appropriations.

While I have the floor, if I may be pardoned and it will save me from directing the attention of the Senator later to it, there is another matter to which I wish to call his attention. I find in the bill $200,000 yearly will be paid to those who have the administration of the act. For the first year $750,000 is appropriated, and out of that $200,000 will go for salaries to the same men who are already receiving, some of them, $10,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. To whom does he refer?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. KING. As to the $10,000?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. I believe, and I will say to the Senator from Georgia if he will agree to it, that I think there should be a reduction in the amount of $200,000, and the board are willing to try to get along with less. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] intended to offer an amendment cutting it in two, but that would cut it down too much. I had intended to offer an amendment cutting it to $100,000 for the year 1919–20, $150,000 for the year 1920–21, and $200,000 thereafter.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator intend that $200,000 shall be paid out of an entire appropriation of a million dollars for salaries alone and administrative purposes?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, no. The Senator does not comprehend the act when he places that construction on it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say, first, that I think the junior Senator from Utah is mistaken about any $10,000 salaries being paid out of the appropriation for the vocational rehabilitation of wounded soldiers.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I did not refer to that act, but to the educational board.

Mr. KENYON. I think the director's salary is $10,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think it very possible that Dr. Prosser's salary is that sum, for I understand he was making $12,000 a year in other employment before he came to the Vocational Board.

Mr. KENYON. His salary is $10,000, but he is worth a great deal more.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. He was making, as I have stated, several thousand dollars—certainly $2,000—more than that, but he gave that work up to devote himself to this service. He only agreed, however, to stay a limited length of time, planning to return to other work, in which he will make a larger sum, as soon as this is thoroughly under way.

Mr. KENYON. The members of the board only receive $5,000 each.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The members of the board receive but $5,000, and they are paid less than the members of any of the other boards in Washington. That is due to the fact that, with one exception, they are men of means, who are deeply interested in this work and are willing to contribute a large part of their time to the work without considering compensation.

I wish to say just a word or two further about the work that is to be done by the Federal board through the use of this fund. The experts will go to the States and teach how the instructions should be conducted. They are educators; they have gathered together a number of the brightest men in the United States from educational institutions, who are specializing, and who have specialized on the rehabilitation of the physically defective. I believe that a number of the men whom they have associated with them have come to them for this temporary service of a couple of years, giving up places that paid more than they receive from the board. I think there are several who draw a salary of $5,000 a year and several who draw $3,000 and perhaps $3,500; but instead of being men, so far as I can learn, who are getting more pay here than they got before, they are men who can command salaries of that character in the educational institutions of the country.

This fund is to provide a class of experts who will help carry to the educational institutions of the States the specialized knowledge which is so essential to advance the work throughout the land.

Mr. President, in a short time the majority of the men who are engaged in the soldier rehabilitating work will cease to be employed. The bulk of the men to whom the Senator has referred, and who, I think, have been unjustly criticized in the speech from which the Senator read, were engaged in the first part of the work, preparing the plans, studying out the system, and starting it. Inside of a few months there were thousands of soldiers under their direction, the number running up to large figures in a few months.

Now, while I am on my feet I should like to ask to print a number of letters in the RECORD, not stopping to read them, from various organizations and educators in the United States, urging the extension of vocational training to the injured generally. These letters came to me when the bill was before the Senate a year and a half ago for the vocational rehabilitation of injured soldiers. At that time I turned down the request to press this provision; but, as I have before stated, I undertook to bring it before the Senate again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia to print in the RECORD the letters now presented by him will be agreed to.

The letters referred to are as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Oakland, Calif., May 8, 1918.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It is with great satisfaction that I read of the noble work you are doing in your efforts in fathering the bill for the reeducation of war cripples. I wish you could be induced to have the bill amended to provide also for the reeducation of industrial cripples. Thousands of victims of industrial accidents are every year cruelly thrown upon the human junk heap to remain a burden to society until, from inactivity, they have rotted in their graves.

Such reeducation as you are contemplating for the war cripples is equally valuable for the industrial cripples, and will prove as much a blessing to the country as will the reeducation of the crippled soldiers and sailors.

I trust you will not let this opportunity to render the country, for years out of time, a service of incalculable value—amend the bill to provide for industrial cripples.

Very respectfully, yours,

CHAS. L. JACOBS,
Director.

—

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, April 24, 1918.

Senator HOKE SMITH.
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This commission has just received and carefully considered Senate bill 4284, introduced by you on April 8.

We heartily favor the measure you have proposed but strongly feel that its scope should be so broadened as to permit the cooperation of States willing to cooperate with the Federal Government, to the end that the inestimable benefits proposed to be conferred by this legislation may be shared to the extent of the capacities of the several institutions by all who require such ministrations, without regard to how they are injured.

In the administration of the workmen's compensation, insurance, and safety act of California for nearly seven years this commission has been sensible of the lack of adequate treatment for getting injured members back into commission. Surgeons tell their patients to exercise such injured members, well knowing that they will not do it adequately, and for the reason that it hurts, but if they do not do it the penalty will be ankylosed wrists or ankles or elbows or shoulders and a crippled condition for life.

It has been found, as you know, by the experience of the countries at war that real work in shops adjacent to orthopedic hospitals goes very far toward remedying this difficulty. By reason of numbers of patients the surgeon and his assistants are able to get teamwork out of the men, and when led by teachers who themselves were injured and rose superior to their injuries the influence for good becomes inestimable.

In our judgment, in the light of our experience, there should be no break in the work of reeducation from the beginning of occupational therapy, even while bolstered up in bed in the hospital, and continued throughout the hospital experience and convalescence outside of the hospital, on to the reeducation and rehabilitation of the injured person industrially and his placement somewhere where he can make a self-respecting livelihood by the time his compensation payments expire.

We in California greatly need an orthopedic hospital, with shops attached, and a home of recovery for the care of those suffering from neurasthenia, and we see no way of securing such institutions except through cooperation with the Federal Government, such institutions in California to be made available for the injured soldiers of Nevada, Arizona, and perhaps of Utah, in addition to those that would be returned to California when no longer able to serve in the ranks.

We are quite sure that the Legislature of California would cooperate with alacrity with the Federal Government in achieving these ends, and then, when in the course of time the war ends, as it some time must, the institutions thus established would be maintained in perpetuity for the care and treatment of such cripples as may develop in the Army and Navy and in the nonmilitary employments of the Federal Government, in collaboration with representatives of those who are injured in industrial life or by private accident.

Therefore we shall regard it as a great step in advance if the bill in your charge can be modified as suggested by a committee, which has no doubt before this submitted proposed amendments for your consideration.

We feel, however, that, in view of the fact that injuries take place in all walks of life, in agriculture and among rural populations as well as urban, that any contribution which the Federal Government may make to the States for the maintenance of such institutions should be apportioned with regard to the population of such State, rather than with regard to their respective urban populations; some States having many injuries to deal with are largely urban, while others are largely rural and agricultural, and any State money that is used for such a purpose should be on condition that the benefits may be accessible to all who require such benefits to the extent that they can be made available without regard to race, condition, or place of residence.

Trusting that you may see your way clear to further this broadening of the measure in your charge, we are,

Very cordially, yours,

A. J. PILLSBURY,
WILL J. FRENCH,
MEYER LISSNER,
Commissioners.

—

Whereas our European Allies have in their vast necessity found it advisable to undertake a systematic rehabilitation of crippled soldiers through occupational therapeutics, followed by reeducation; and

Whereas there are more people crippled in industry than there will be in our armies if all the men now in service enter the field, if their experience corresponds to that of the Allies; and

Whereas a bill has recently been introduced in Congress which, if passed, will provide occupational therapeutic hospitals and auxiliary workshops for rehabilitation of crippled soldiers and sailors and will provide reeducation with compensation for services during rehabilitation: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved by the Medical Society of the State of California in its forty-seventh annual meeting, held at Del Monte, April 16, 17, and 18, 1918, That the necessities of the industrially injured require and war-

rant that the scope of the above-referred-to legislation be broadened to permit of provisions for rehabilitation and training of those who have been incapacitated by industrial injury or by personal injury.

Whereas the exigencies arising out of the World War have intensely stimulated effort in orthopedic and other forms of surgery; and
Whereas the nations now at war have sedulously undertaken to rehabilitate crippled soldiers through occupational therapy followed by reeducation; and
Whereas there are more persons crippled in industry and by personal injury than in war; and
Whereas a bill has lately been introduced into Congress providing for the establishment of orthopedic hospitals with auxiliary workshops, to be utilized in treatment of crippled soldiers and sailors by occupational therapy, thus opening the way for subsequent reeducation and rehabilitation of earning capacity, even for the seriously injured: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved by the California State Conference of Social Agencies at its tenth annual meeting, held at Santa Barbara, Calif., April 16–19, 1918, That the occasion requires and the necessities warrant that the scope of such legislation be so broadened as to permit any State so desiring to cooperate with the Federal Government in establishing and maintaining such hospitals and reeducational institutions as may be found needful, upon condition that their benefits may be shared by all who require them, however they may have received their injuries, whether in war, in industry, or by personal injury.

Unanimously adopted April 19, 1918.

—

DENVER, COLO, *April 26, 1918.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This commission has noted with interest the bill introduced into the Senate by you and known as Senate bill 4284, and known as a vocational rehabilitation bill for soldiers and sailors.

This commission desires to urge upon you the proposed amendment to this bill which provides for the inclusion within the terms of the act for the vocational rehabilitation of victims of industry. The proposed amendments, copies of which have doubtless reached you, we feel are in harmony with the Smith-Hughes Act, which established the Federal bill for vocational education, and we feel that said board is the best suited and would be the best equipped to administer relief to industrial cripples, cooperating with the several States in the establishment of such curative hospitals and shops as are necessary upon a fifty-fifty basis.

Very truly, yours,

THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF COLORADO.
By WALTER E. SCHWED, *Secretary.*

—

THE CHOATE SCHOOL,
WALLINGFORD, CONN., *May 3, 1918.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I want to add my plea to many others in support of the bill (S. 4284) for reeducating war cripples under direction of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and I want to urge an amendment which will permit industrial cripples to regain their economic usefulness through this same system. For the good and for the happiness of the brave and unfortunate men themselves, and for the advantage of the help these men will be in the great labor need, I beg that time and thought be given to these humane and economic measures.

Faithfully, yours,

GEORGE C. ST. JOHN.

—

THE ASSOCIATED CHARITIES OF NEW LONDON,
New London, Conn., April 26, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I respectfully urge the importance, from the standpoint of those of us who are engaged in social work and have an opportunity to observe the tremendous waste resulting from the crippling of men engaged in industry, that all possible be done to amend the vocational rehabilitation bill (S. 4284) so that it will include the same provision for industrial cripples that it does for the soldiers and sailors.

Very truly, yours, MALCOLM S. NICHOLS,
General Secretary.

—

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Dover, Del., May 11, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the meeting of the State board of education yesterday Senate bill 4284, which you recently introduced and which has been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, I beg to say that an amendment to the bill providing for the rehabilitation of working men disabled in industry was discussed, and the board instructed its secretary to inform you that it is heartily in favor of such an amendment to Senate bill 4284. In the State of Delaware there are vital industries engaged in manufacturing war materials, and that the State board of education is of the opinion that a man injured in building a ship for the United States Government at the present time should be put on an equal footing with the soldier who may be wounded in battle, as both men are serving to the best of their ability in the interests of their country.

Trusting that you may be willing to advocate such an amendment to Senate bill 4284, I am,

Very truly, yours, A. R. SPAID,
Secretary.

—

THE FLORIDA ANTI-TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION,
Jacksonville, Fla., April 26, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH, *Senator,*
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our attention has been called to Senate bill 4284 providing for vocational rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors.

Has it occurred to you how important it is that this sort of service be extended to civilians injured through industrial accident and otherwise? I believe that slight amendment of the bill would enable this very great service to be extended to such cripples. If this can be done, you will have made a remarkable contribution to meeting the problems of our country and we should be very grateful for such an amendment.

Yours, sincerely,

HOMER W. BORST,
Executive Secretary.

—

CHICAGO, *April 17, 1918.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Industrial Commission of Illinois is in receipt of a communication from the Industrial Commission of New York, inclosing copy of a letter they have sent you, urging you that Senate bill No. 4284, introduced by you, providing for the rehabilitation of injured soldiers, be amended so that injured workmen may have the advantages thus afforded, and asking us to join with them in writing you to the same effect.

I am authorized by the Industrial Commission of Illinois to say to you that we heartily approve of the recommendation made by the New York commission. Everyone engaged in the administration of workmen's compensation acts realizes that this is one of the most important things to be accomplished, not only for humanitarian reasons, but as an economic proposition. Many a man is injured in industry in such a way as to unfit him for the work for which he has been trained. He knows nothing else, nor is he able unaided to acquire any other training. To throw this man on his own resources is not only inhuman but uneconomic. He can be so trained in the usual case that he will be a hundred per cent man in some other line of work.

The Illinois Industrial Commission, therefore, strongly urges you to follow the recommendation made by the New York commission.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES S. ANDRUS,
Chairman Illinois Industrial Commission.

—

SPRINGFIELD, *April 22, 1918.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Department of Labor of the State of Illinois is desirous of indorsing a letter of April 10, sent you by Secretary W. S. Coffey of the New York State Industrial Commission.

While soldiers crippled in the Army of the United States are being treated that they may return to industrial service, it will be a wise and most fair measure to extend the same consideration to industrial cripples.

The movement has our most hearty indorsement.

Yours, most cordially,

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
By BARNEY COHEN, *Director.*

—

BOISE, IDAHO, *May 17, 1918.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The Industrial Accident Board of the State of Idaho is advised that you have introduced a bill, No. 4284, copy of which we have received, to provide for vocational rehabilitation of soldiers crippled while in the service of our country.

We desire to say to you that we are earnestly in favor of such legislation, not only because of its economic value but because of the effect it will have on the peace of mind of any of our unfortunate boys by reason of again making them really independent and useful citizens, and for the further reason that it is certainly nothing more than our Government owes them and is right beyond question of doubt.

We are also advised that there is a movement on foot to have the provisions of the law enlarged to include industrial cripples and laying a part of the cost on the individual States.

As our work brings us into close touch with the havoc wrought by industry, we feel we are perhaps fairly competent to speak on such matters and we do not hesitate to indorse this latter movement also with almost the same degree of enthusiasm as we do the first. The whole spirit of such legislation is justice, and it would be a shame to build up such a magnificent undertaking only to see it abandoned in a few years when there could be such splendid service rendered by its perpetuation.

We trust you will look with favor upon this suggestion, which we know finds encouragement almost everywhere.

Believe us to be,

Very truly, yours, INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT BOARD,
By E. F. CATON, *Commissioner.*

—

LOUISVILLE FEDERATION OF SOCIAL AGENCIES,
Louisville, Ky., May 13, 1918.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Louisville Federation of Social Agencies, including 26 of the charitable and philanthropic societies of Louisville, I wish to recommend for your favorable action Senate bill 4284, for reeducating war cripples under direction of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. I hope you will be able also to be influential in the passage of the amendment which will permit industrial cripples to regain their economic usefulness through this same system.

Yours, very truly,

ELWOOD STREET, *Director.*

—

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *April 16, 1918.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This department learns with much concern that you have introduced a bill, Senate No. 4284, to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to industrial service of soldiers crippled while in the armies of the United States. We fully approve of the wise and far-seeing measure, which we know will be of the greatest value both prior to and during the reconstruction period. At the same time, we wish to urge upon you an amendment to Senate bill No. 4284 providing the same consideration for industrial cripples; that is, wage earners injured in the mines, mills, and factories of various States.

In our administration of the employers' liability compensation act of Louisiana we have had repeatedly upon our minds the necessity of the rehabilitation and reeducation of injured wage earners, of the great value to these wage earners and society in general if industrial cripples are so provided for through artificial limbs and education in their use, or, in case of loss of eyesight or such other condition as will not permit of reconstruction, reeducation in work that these maimed industrial soldiers will be able to perform. We believe that this movement can be

safely and logically associated with the bill that you have sponsored in the United States Senate. Furthermore, we are convinced that such provision will be a cause for satisfaction and commendation to the great industrial army so necessary in the work of winning the war.

We shall ask other industrial commissions and accident boards to join with us in this appeal.

Sincerely, yours,

F. E. WOOD,
Commissioner of Labor of Louisiana.

—

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT BOARD,
Boston, April 25, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Industrial Accident Board of the State of Massachusetts has learned of the bill which has been introduced by you into the United States Senate providing for the rehabilitation of crippled soldiers and sailors returning from the war. A copy of that bill has reached us; and later there was received a copy of the proposed amendment thereto, whereby the facilities which the bill contemplates shall be provided to soldiers and sailors may also be provided to those industrially injured. We here in Massachusetts would be very glad to see legislation along the lines suggested by the amendment adopted, provided that this work is definitely under the control of the industrial accident or compensation boards of the several States.

The medical department of our commission has done more or less work with reference to the rehabilitation of industrially injured along the lines open to that department. Our insurance companies are also doing much work and spending considerable sums of money along the same lines. But, up to the present time, we have not entered into any work involving the education of those industrially injured outside of industry itself. We propose, however, to undertake something of the sort, and the proposed legislation—I refer, of course, to the amendment—would be extremely desirable from our standpoint in aiding us in doing this very thing.

The arguments in favor of it are many. I have no doubt they are as familiar to you as they are to us; and they will undoubtedly be presented before the committee which hears the matter more fully and intelligently than I could hope to set them forth in this letter. I therefore will add nothing further than to say that our commission would be very glad to see the proposed legislation as amended enacted into law.

Very truly, yours,

WM. W. KENNARD, *Chairman.*

—

BOSTON PROVIDENT ASSOCIATION,
Boston, May 2, 1918.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

In re proposed amendment to S. 4284.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of a large number of people in Boston who are deeply interested in the project of vocational reeducation, and especially that phase of it which would deal with men injured and handicapped in industry, I beg to express the earnest hope that your excellent measure may be amended by the addition of sections 8, 9, 10, and 11, as proposed.

These sections are intended, as I understand it, to provide for Federal and State cooperation in the undertaking of reclaiming for industry those who are crippled by accident. The organization which I represent deals with and attempts to aid large numbers of persons in this category, and in the process of this undertaking we have occasion to feel the very great need of wresting from our war-time experience this great boon to the injured man.

Respectfully, yours,

WM. H. PEAR.

—

LANSING, *April 19, 1918.*

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The labor department of the State of Michigan recently learned that you have introduced a bill (S. 4284) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to industrial service of soldiers crippled while in the armies of the United States.

I wish at this time to respectfully inform you that this department fully approves of this wise and far-seeing measure, which, we believe, will be of the greatest value, both prior to and during the reconstruction period.

I further respectfully urge upon you an amendment to Senate bill No. 4284 providing the same consideration for industrial cripples; that is, wage earners injured in the mines, mills, and factories of the various States of the Union.

If you can see your way clear to attach this amendment you will, I believe, confer a very lasting benefit upon the United States as a whole.

Trusting that this may meet with your approval, I remain,

Very respectfully,

R. H. FLETCHER,
Commissioner of Labor.

—

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF SOCIAL AGENCIES,
Minneapolis, May 15, 1918.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: On May 1, at the meeting of the Central Council of Social Agencies, which is a body composed of delegates from the organizations listed on the reverse side of this letterhead, a motion was unanimously adopted instructing the president and secretary to urge that you do all in your power to further the proposed amendment to the vocational rehabilitation bill (S. 4284) so as to permit its benefits to extend to industrial cripples as well as to those who have been handicapped through the war.

Every year a vast number of men are being compelled to lead lives of enforced idleness as a result of industrial accidents. For their sake, and for the sake of our communities, they should be given an opportunity to again become self-supporting, self-respecting citizens, as well as economically useful. It is a problem which touches the work of every social agency and can be adequately solved only through such a national movement as is provided for in the vocational rehabilitation bill.

Will you not do all in your power to further its passage with the amendment mentioned?

Sincerely, yours,

A. J. TODD, *Chairman.*
OTTO W. DAVIS, *Secretary.*

ST. LOUIS PROVIDENT ASSOCIATION,
St. Louis, April 22, 1918.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to urge you as strongly as I can to add an amendment to your bill No. 4284 that will provide for the vocational rehabilitation of the victims of industry. It can be combined with the other; each will supplement the other.

It is seriously needed.

Respectfully,

C. M. HUBBARD,
General Manager.

—

STATE OF MONTANA,
INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT BOARD,
Helena, April 20, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Care Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Industrial Commission of the State of New York has just called our attention to the measure that you have introduced, known as Senate bill 4284, which contemplates providing for vocational rehabilitation and thus the return to industrial service of soldiers crippled while in the service of the Government.

We congratulate you upon your farsightedness as well as your humanitarianism in thus early in the proposition taking steps to provide for an eventuality that will undoubtedly be with us in the course of the next few months.

It would be wise, in our opinion, if you could at the same time, through the medium of your bill, provide for the same consideration for industrial cripples, represented by wage earners accidentally injured in the course of their occupation in the mines, mills, and factories of the country.

Our experience in the administration of the workmen's compensation law in the State has brought forcibly to our attention the necessity of rehabilitation of injured wage earners to the extent that they at least may be able to contribute something to society from their labor instead of constituting a perpetual burden upon same. We know of no good reason why industrial cripples should not be provided with artificial limbs and educated in the use of same, with the result that in a short time they would be able to change their dependent position to one of constructive endeavor, to at least a limited extent.

We trust that you will feel disposed to give this matter consideration.

Thanking you for your attention to the proposition, we remain,

Very truly, yours,

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT BOARD,
A. E. SPRIGGS, *Chairman.*

—

THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,
Newark, N. J., April 22, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I have very carefully read the bill introduced by you into the Senate under date April 8 "to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes."

After reading this bill, I can not but most heartily indorse the proposed amendment thereto, which I understand has the approval of the American Federation of Labor, the National Red Cross, the National Chamber of Commerce, etc. I have for many years been deeply interested in all matters relating to industrial accidents and their prevention, but of the many problems connected therewith perhaps the most perplexing has been the rehabilitation of the injured for the kind of work suitable to their condition of permanent impairment. Only a few days ago a blind man came in to see me, for the ostensible purpose of soliciting subscriptions to the Blindman's Magazine. He frankly conceded that his efforts were merely the seeking of charity in disguise, but he said, "What is there for me to do?" This man is typical of a large number of men and women who are maimed or permanently impaired in consequence of industrial accidents more or less inherent in the employment. They at present have, as a rule, no alternative but to seek charity or become otherwise a burden upon society. An organized effort in their behalf is absolutely necessary. I therefore trust that you will give the proposed amendment to your bill favorable consideration. I am sure that your action in this respect would have the most hearty approval of all who have seriously concerned themselves with the rehabilitation of the injured in consequence of the casualties of everyday life, just as it will be our duty in the future to effectively provide for the maimed and injured as a consequence of the war.

With the assurance of my sincere personal regard, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

F. L. HOFFMAN.

P. S.—By a curious coincidence the attached letter was replied to following the dictation of my letter to you.

—

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND PRINTING,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Raleigh, April 13, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I notice that you have introduced a bill to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to industrial service of soldiers crippled while in the armies of the United States. Your interest in the future welfare of our disabled heroes is most commendable, and I sincerely hope Congress may look with favor upon this wise and far-seeing measure, which would prove of the greatest value, both prior to and during the reconstruction period. And while you are considering the vital subject of humanitarianism for our soldiers, why not add an amendment to your bill providing the same consideration for industrial cripples—that is, wage earners injured in the mines, mills, and factories of the various States?

During my career as a public official I have often been impressed with the need for the rehabilitation and reeducation of injured wage earners. What a blessing it would be to these wage earners and society generally if industrial cripples were provided by law with artificial limbs and given thorough instructions relative to their use. Or, in case of loss of eyesight and other ailments that might not permit of reconstruction, let them be reeducated in work that they may be able to perform, similar to that you would provide for the maimed industrial soldiers.

Far be it from me to intentionally offer any suggestion that might place an impediment in the way of any effort for the relief of our dis-

abled soldiers; but I believe the disabled wage earner can be safely and logically associated with your splendid effort, and I want to assure you that such a course would be a cause for general rejoicing to the great industrial army so necessary for the continued operation of industrial plants in the work of winning the war.

Hoping these suggestions may be received in the spirit they are given, and with high personal regards, I am,

Yours, very truly,

M. L. SHIPMAN, *Commissioner.*

SYRACUSE PRINTING PRESSMEN'S UNION,
Syracuse, N. Y., May 31, 1919.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am instructed by my organization to write you commending you for introducing the bill, S. 4284, as it certainly is a grand thing. I was also asked to request you to amend the bill to include disabled workers on the industrial field.

Hoping you may see fit to grant our request, I beg to remain,

Yours, respectfully,

FRANK D. BUGBY,
Secretary Treasurer.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Schenectady, N. Y., May 27, 1919.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the regular meeting District No. 33, held Saturday, May 25, our lodge went on record commending yourself and the Hon. WILLIAM J. SEARS for the introduction of the bill, S. 4284, to rehabilitate and reeducate maimed and crippled soldiers, and ask that you insert the following amendment to include disabled workers on the industrial field as well as those in our vast Army.

Very truly, yours,

J. G. BUTLER,
Recording Secretary, District No. 33,
International Association of Machinists.

AMALGAMATED ASSOCIATION OF STREET AND
ELECTRIC RAILWAY EMPLOYEES OF AMERICA,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 29, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

I am writing you at this time in behalf of our organization, representing 2,500 members, commending you for the introduction of bill (S. 4284) to rehabilitate and reeducate maimed and crippled soldiers.

As organized workers and defenders of our country, either in the fighting line, workshop, or construction work, striving to uphold our country's reputation as the most model industrial democracy on the face of the globe, we appeal to you and request that the bill be amended in order to include disabled workers on the industrial field.

Thanking you in advance, I beg to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

VINCENT TUERO,
Financial Secretary, Division 523.

THE NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Utica, N. Y., April 20, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The officers of the New York State Federation of Labor learn with satisfaction of the introduction of a bill in the Congress which has for its object the rehabilitation and reeducation of maimed and crippled soldiers as they return to their native land after struggling for the establishment of true democracy throughout the world by wiping out autocracy as typified by the present Central European Powers. This act on your part in presenting the subject to the national lawmakers is marked by the highest patriotic and humanitarian spirit, and the wage earners of New York State hope and trust that your bill may be enacted into law and no expense be spared by the National Government to take care of the boys who went "over there" and returned maimed and crippled and give them opportunity to sustain themselves in their future life without recourse to charity. We owe much to our soldiers who are so valiantly striving in our behalf.

The thought comes to us that there is another class of soldiers who are doing wonderful work in another line, that is, on the industrial field. These workers are being maimed and crippled by the thousands every year. Is it too much to ask you to incorporate in your measure a provision to provide for rehabilitating and reeducating these workers so they may be able to take care of themselves after recovering from the wounds made by machinery? Many of them are never able to take their former places in the workshop again. But they must live and they detest charity.

We would be pleased to have an expression of your opinion on this matter.

With best wishes for the success of your proposition and assuring you of our unanimous and energetic support, I am, for our executive council,

Respectfully, yours,

E. A. BATES,
Secretary-Treasurer New York State Federation of Labor.

THE SOCIAL WELFARE LEAGUE OF READING, PA.,
Reading, Pa., May 3, 1918.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing you as a body interested in the welfare of men disabled through industrial accident to urge that you exert your influence to amend the vocational rehabilitation bill (S. 4284), now in committee, to cover industrial cripples.

Trusting that you appreciate the importance of this act to the soldiers of our industrial army and that you will use every effort to have the amendment effected, we remain,

Yours, very truly,

RACHAEL J. D. BRADSHAW,
General Secretary.

THE ASSOCIATED CHARITIES,
Pittsburgh, May 10, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I desire to express my commendation of the vocational rehabilitation bill for disabled soldiers and sailors (S. 4284), as introduced in the Senate by yourself. May I respectfully urge that the bill be amended so that the victims of industry may come within its scope?

Sincerely,

JOHN YATES,
General Secretary.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., May 4, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am very much interested in the passage of bill S. 4284, furthered by yourself and Hon. WILLIAM J. SEARS, for reeducating war cripples under the direction of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

I sincerely hope that you can see your way clear to add an amendment to this bill to permit industrial cripples to regain their economic usefulness through this same system. Once the vocational schools are equipped to take care of the war cripples they can easily take care of the industrial cripples, because the problem of securing work after an injury is alike to both and neither will interfere with the other. The war cripples and the industrial cripples should both be given as great an opportunity as possible to rehabilitate themselves for future usefulness in life, and I believe a great deal of good can be accomplished along this line.

I am inclosing herewith a blue-print chart showing the activities of the industrial commission. If you are interested in the work of any particular department and will advise me to that effect, I shall be glad to send you literature pertaining thereto.

Very truly, yours,

G. P. HAMBRECHT,
Chairman Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] expressed the belief that I was in error with respect to the statement made concerning the salaries paid. I read from the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, part 2, taken quite recently. I read from page 1236. Mr. Prosser is on the stand. Mr. BYRNES of the House said:

I notice that you have in your report quite a large number of high-salaried employees. For instance, I notice that you have 20 at $4,000, 25 at $3,500, and 32 at $3,000.

Mr. PROSSER. Yes, sir.

I might say, in passing, that this is not all that the board spends. The board receives a large contribution from the Treasury to administer the soldiers' vocational educational training provisions, as I am advised, and it was receiving a very large sum, of course, under the vocational measure which first passed Congress. Mr. BYRNES proceeds:

You have one at $10,000; one at $5,000, and one at $7,000.

Mr. Prosser says:

The $10,000 is for the director, I suppose, my salary being split between the two acts—the vocational educational act and the vocational rehabilitation act.

So Mr. Prosser gets $10,000; some other individual gets $7,000; another gets $5,000; 20 receive $4,000; 25 receive $3,500; 32 receive $3,000; and so on. He further states:

Dr. Chandler, who was superintendent of public schools of Richmond, Va., is paid $7,000.

I find this statement from a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, the leader of the majority in the House, Mr. MONDELL, on page 4332 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 24, 1919, in challenging attention to the high salaries which are paid to officials of this bureau. I might add, Mr. President, as I indicated a few moments ago, that many of these new bureaus, agencies, and commissions, particularly where there are no limitations placed by Congress in the act creating these organizations, are drawing salaries very much in excess of those paid in the departments and the established bureaus of the Government. But to proceed with the statement of Mr. MONDELL. Some claim had been made that these men were civil-service employees, and Representative MONDELL uses this language in reply to that:

I know that these appointments were made in a way under the civil-service law; in other words, this board prepared the questions, laid down the rules, fixed the inquiries, and, of course, the folks who passed that kind of an examination were in the main people who had been selected by the board. Of course, they went through civil-service forms, but it was a sham. There is no doubt about that.

Then he proceeds to say:

I simply want to call the attention of the House to what has been done under the claim and pretense of doing something for the soldier. When this board came before our committee they had 157 soldiers under their charge. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is interested. They had 157 soldiers under their charge, and they had at the same time 344 employees, every one of whom was receiving a goodly salary. One of them was receiving $10,000, 1 was receiving $7,000, 1 was receiving $5,000, 20 were receiving $4,000 a year, 28 were receiving $3,500 a year, over 62 were receiving more than $3,000, and 49 were receiving from $2,500 to $3,400.

This committee has had a good many cases of scandalous misuse of public funds brought to its attention, but never a case as indefensible as this.

This board was organized to do a good work, and went forth apparently with the principal purpose to give employment at high salaries to everyone they could find who would take employment.

Then, on the following page, this is found:

The salary list was so indefensible that the committee felt it was necessary to limit it, but I am calling attention to the fact that the $4,000,000 appropriation which was asked—and I would like to have the

attention of the gentleman who offered the amendment—the $4,000,000 estimate includes $2,745,000 for salaries and incidental administrative expenses. Now, if the gentleman wants to make provision for the soldiers by providing that kind of a pay roll, well and good.

Mr. President, this is the same board that is receiving $200,000 per annum, as I am advised, as compensation and for salaries and for administrative purposes out of the very small appropriation made to the States for vocational rehabilitation work. Then they asked for nearly $3,000,000 out of the $4,000,000 they asked to be appropriated for soldiers' educational rehabilitation work for compensation and for administrative purposes. Then in this bill now being considered, which calls for an appropriation of $500,000 for the first year, there is a demand for $200,000 for annual salaries. By the way, the first year ends June 30, 1919—in a few days.

Mr. KENYON. It is to end in 1920. That has been changed, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I was not so advised. The sum of $500,000 is appropriated under this bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and out of that $500,000, as I read this bill, $200,000 are to be appropriated to the same board for salaries—this board that receives $200,000 for their services in connection with the rehabilitation act, and which asked for $2,750,000 for compensation and administrative purposes out of an appropriation of $4,000,000, which was asked for the aid of the soldiers.

I wonder at the moderation of the language of the Representative from Wyoming when he was addressing himself to this subject in the House. He used the words "scandalous misappropriation and abuse of the public funds." I think if any such salaries are being paid, and if any such compensation is demanded as was demanded in the case of the soldiers' vocational bill and is demanded here, there ought to be some condemnation visited upon the heads of the vocational board. I think their demands are indefensible. Three hundred and forty-four employees, as Mr. MONDELL said, are drawing salaries up to $10,000 a year, and at the time when they had that number of employees 157 soldiers were receiving consideration at their hands.

Here is an appropriation of $500,000, and out of this $500,000, $200,000 is asked as compensation and for administration purposes. Let me see if I am correct in that statement, as I do not wish to make any statement not founded upon the facts before us.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I said a few moments ago that, in my judgment, the amount provided was too high, and I have relied on the Senator from South Dakota, who told me that he would offer an amendment to reduce it; but if he does not do so, I shall offer an amendment reducing the amount the first year to $100,000 and for the subsequent years to $150,000.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator from Iowa, whose reputation is that of an economist, a man who desires to conserve the public funds, if he thinks that this board, which has already received a large fund under prior bills for work analogous to this—indeed, this perhaps complements or supplements that work—ought to receive out of this rather small fund $100,000 the first year and $150,000 in subsequent years? It seems to me that it is entirely too large, that it is unfair to the States, and unfair to the work which it is supposed this fund will be devoted to when it is provided that such a large part of it shall go as compensation.

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator is in error in saying that this amount is to be paid out of the $500,000 appropriation. It is in addition to that. Now, I wish to say to the Senator——

Mr. KING. That does not change the argument which I have been attempting to make, but effects it only in degree.

Mr. KENYON. It does not change the argument, but it changes the proportion. As the Senator knows, I have agreed with the efforts he has made in the direction of economy; I have been a good deal of a crank on that subject. These high salaries, except in certain instances, ought not to be paid, and I should be glad if some fair limitation could be imposed; but for a man like Dr. Prosser $10,000 is not a high salary. Sometimes the very highest-priced men are the ones to whom the smallest salaries are paid, but it is a question of getting the work efficiently done.

The board have done a tremendous work. I know they have had a very hard time getting along on the $200,000 appropriation; and I think possibly some people had it in mind that by giving them another $200,000 they could not only carry on this work but would be enabled better to carry on the other work. We can not do that, however, because Congress has limited the amount.

The Senator must bear in mind that if this work is a success—and I firmly believe that it will be—it is going to require different lines of work than they have carried on. For instance, they will have to have expert industrial surgeons, who can study the hospital and its relation to the man who is to be given the vocational training; they will have to have various kinds of studies of that character.

Take the problem of consumption; they will have to go into that, ascertain what are the safe occupations for men who have been afflicted with that disease, and under what circumstances they can go back to work. Then they will have to have experts in the trade fields. That is an entirely new field, and it is going to be a very large field for them to work. They will also have to go into the hygiene question. So I do not believe that $100,000 will be sufficient. It may be that it would be during the first year while they are getting started, but after that, the second and third years will probably involve the heavy part of the work, and, if we limit the amount to $150,000, we are holding them right down to the least amount that will enable them to carry on the work. If the Senator would offer a fair amendment limiting the salaries, that might be well. I think if there were two men paid, say, $5,000 a year and four or five paid not to exceed $4,000 a year, and the remainder not exceeding $2,000 or $2,500 a year, the board might be able to get along.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him there?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. The administrative machinery, as I think the Senator will concede, is already in existence. There are more than 344 employees in just one branch of the vocational board, as I understand the statement of Representative MONDELL. They have their building; they have their clerks and all of the necessary instrumentalities with which to put this act into operation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But if the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KING. I do not know whether the Senator from Iowa has the floor or I have it.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator asked me a question, and I tried to answer it.

Mr. KING. If I have the floor, I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in a short time the majority of the men who are engaged in the soldier rehabilitation work will cease to be employed. The bulk of the men to whom the Senator has referred, and who, I think, have been unjustly criticized in the speech from which the Senator read, were engaged in the first part of the work, preparing the plans, studying out the system, and starting it. Inside of a few months there were thousands of soldiers under their direction, the number running up to large figures in a few months.

The individual soldiers who were injured were being studied at every point in which they were located throughout the United States. They were classified and advised and aided in taking up lines of preparation through which it was believed they could overcome their physical infirmities. It was unjust, I think, to the board to mention the first number of men who had been engaged in the work and the number of men who had been put actually into position, for those connected with the board were studying all the injured in the hospitals, in the camps, and in various lines.

Now, let me go back just a moment to the work of the vocational board prior to the commencement of the rehabilitation work. It is true that the director receives $10,000 a year, but I have been advised he was making more than that, possibly $12,000, which he gave up to engage in this work. It was not a case of finding a man who needed a job and giving him a high salary, but it was a case of finding the right man and inducing him to take up this work at less than he was making before. I do not know about the $7,000 man; I do not know as to that salary; but I know that the vocational board selected a number of the ablest students of vocational education in the United States and brought them together to be able to each state the best combined thought and experience of the leaders in the work from all the States.

What the Senator calls "administration" would be misunderstood if there were not an explanation given. It does not mean the administration of the office here through secretaries and clerks and work of that kind, but the men who receive $5,000 are, as I have stated, selected from the ablest vocational training institutions in the United States and sent to the various States to take up the problem of helping them work out systems of vocational education. Some of the very best work accomplished through this money has been brought about through those men

who went to the States and helped work out their local problems from city to city and from town to town. I know in my own State we had been stumbling along trying to do some vocational training work in our public schools. We had one great institution, the Georgia State College of Technology, and we had been trying to introduce vocational education elsewhere, but had made little progress. However, since the Vocational Board sent its experts down to us to help start off the work it has been given an impetus that it might not have gathered if we had worked away 20 years by ourselves.

The Vocational Board took the whole country into their vision; they picked the ablest and best men that had been tried out in the country, and furnished their combined experience first at one place and then at another and then at another, gathering teachers together and explaining how the work could be conducted. What they did for us through the use of this fund was not here at Washington, running an establishment, but throughout the country, helping organize and giving vitality and strength everywhere to vocational training. For my State I acknowledge the great debt we owe to them for what they have given us. I had been on the board of education in Atlanta for a number of years, perhaps most of the time for a period of 25 years, and I had tried to introduce vocational training two or three times without much success. Dr. Prosser and his assistants have, I think, made more progress in two years than we had made in 10 before. So it is not fair, it is not just to look upon this expenditure as a mere overhead administrative expenditure. It is for the employment of experts to work out plans and go throughout the country to help the local organizations get in shape to do effective work.

I think $5,000 is a good salary for almost any of these employees as salaries for teachers go, but I think the board has a number of men who are not excessively paid at that rate and who came from institutions that paid them at least that amount. I know that the chairman of the board, Mr. Monroe, had for several years devoted much of his time patriotically to the problem of preparation by special training for the struggle of life. He was a graduate of the great Massachusetts Institute of Technology; had made a success in his own private business; had accumulated property; retired, I think, from active business, and had for several years been devoting himself to the study of the problem of how to help stimulate better preparedness for the boys and girls, the young men and young women, in various lines of industry throughout the United States, especially in his own State, in order that he might serve his fellow man. I believe a great blessing has come to this country through the work of the vocational board. I helped work out the bill under which the work is being conducted; I helped pass it; and no one can take away from me the personal gratification I have derived on account of helping to do that work, helping to start an agency that is serving my fellow man, helping to furnish an opportunity to prepare our boys and girls to become better capable of meeting life's struggles, to become capable of greater accomplishments, and of doing more in the opportunities that open to them. I know good is being accomplished by the contribution of our Nation to vocational training. When we help a boy or a girl to prepare for life, to do more and better work, we are relieving many of the problems that confront us; we are helping to relieve them; and in my judgment this board has been a benediction, and its work is a blessing.

What I wanted was to press the proposition that these are not ordinary overhead charges; these are not the ordinary administrative works. The salaries are to picked men of greatest skill who are working out plans for vocational training from the combined knowledge of our entire country and who furnish their knowledge to the agencies of the States that they may work out with greater success the local problems; and I do not believe there is a man employed by the board who is overpaid.

Mr. KING addressed the Senate. After having spoken for half an hour he said:

Does the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] desire to continue this evening?

Mr. KENYON. Yes. The Senator's remarks are very interesting.

Mr. KING. How long does the Senator desire to continue?

Mr. KENYON. Is not the Senator from Utah ready to vote?

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to have a vote on the bill to-night.

Mr. KING. I do not think we will vote to-night, unless the Senator would desire to run very late. I can conclude my observation to-morrow in perhaps an hour.

Mr. KENYON. I think that is what the Senator said the other day.

Mr. KING. But the Senator did not give me the opportunity. He has been so interested in the league of nations and other matters that I did not have the opportunity.

Mr. KENYON. If the bill is not passed to-morrow, the Senator knows the situation. If the bill is not to be passed, well and good. I simply would like to have it come to a vote.

Mr. KING. I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that I have no disposition to prevent a vote to-morrow, and will be glad——

Mr. KENYON. Would the Senator have any objection to unanimous consent to vote upon the bill and all amendments by 3 o'clock to-morrow?

Mr. KING. I would not have the slightest objection to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote to-morrow.

Mr. KENYON. I am afraid it would be impossible to get unanimous consent for that purpose this evening.

Mr. KING. I think I can assure the Senator that there will be no difficulty in getting the bill through to-morrow.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator says he will not consume over an hour in discussion to-morrow?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator further guarantee that there will be no speeches upon the league of nations to-morrow?

Mr. KING. The Senator knows how important that subject is. I will guarantee that I shall not speak on that subject.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator let us finish the amendment to-night?

Mr. KING. I have no objection at all. I will suspend with that understanding, but before we adjourn I will ask the Senator from Iowa if he will not prepare an amendment, after consultation with those who are most interested in the bill, with respect to the limitation of compensation?

Mr. KENYON. I shall try to do that.

Mr. KING. I prefer that they shall be consulted, because their judgment would be far better than mine.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand it is the purpose of the Senator from Iowa to have the pending amendment adopted this evening and then adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow, when the bill will be taken up for final passage?

Mr. KENYON. With the understanding that there will be no speeches on the league of nations. Let us get through with these amendments to-night and then adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Iowa give notice that if the bill does not pass to-morrow by 6 o'clock we will hold a night session?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; I shall ask for a night session.

Mr. KING. I will join in the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] proposes to amend, on page 7, line 24, after the word "expenses," by inserting:

A full report of all expenses under this section, including names of all employees and salaries paid them, traveling expenses, and other expenses incurred by each and every employee and by members of the board, shall be submitted annually to Congress by the board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is, on page 1, line 5, after the word "otherwise"——

Mr. KENYON. May I be permitted to dispose of this other amendment first? On page 7, line 7, I move to strike out the numerals "$200,000," and, on line 8, to strike out the word "annually" and substitute for the part stricken out the following:

One hundred thousand dollars for the years 1919 and 1920 and $150,000 annually thereafter for a period of four years.

I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 7, strike out "$200,000," and, in line 8, strike out the word "annually" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

One hundred thousand dollars for the years 1919 and 1920——

Mr. SMOOT. It should read "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," and then there will be no question about what year is meant.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; I will ask the Secretary to make that modification.

The SECRETARY. Insert the following:

One hundred thousand dollars for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and $150,000 annually thereafter for a period of four years.

Mr. KING. This board is now receiving $200,000 under the vocational act?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KING. It is receiving a very large sum under the soldiers' vocational act, and, in addition, will receive this sum?

Mr. KENYON. I do not think the sum they will receive under the soldiers' act is very large.

Mr. KING. I feel sure the Senator is in error.

Mr. KENYON. I may be in error, but I am certain this is the smallest amount they can get along with. I have talked straight to them—that we wanted this appropriation cut to the bone.

Mr. KING. I shall not offer an amendment now, but I shall move to reconsider to-morrow if I do not receive any different information from that which I now have. I ask the Senator from Iowa to confer with the board in the meantime and ascertain exactly what they are now receiving from the two sources and the number of employees who are now in the bureau and in attendance in the execution of each of the acts.

Mr. KENYON. I will have that information for the Senator to-morrow.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the next amendment.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "otherwise," to insert, "and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think if we are going to have a vocational rehabilitation law it ought to apply to everybody without making the beneficiaries swear that they are paupers. The effect of this will be that perhaps the man who needs it the worst will feel in his soul that he ought not to be compelled to go and state that he has not sufficient means to provide for his own rehabilitation. It seems to me that the limitation is altogether wrong in principle. If we are going into this question for the rehabilitation of our soldiers, it should not make a particle of difference whether the man can give it himself or whether he is unable to do it. The man who can do it without distressing himself and has plenty of means to do it no doubt will receive the assistance from some other source, perhaps personal in its character, but when a man is called upon to go with other soldiers and can not go there and be rehabilitated without taking an oath that he is unable to do it, I think it is calling upon him to do something that he should not be required to do.

Mr. KING. Is not my colleague making a mistake when he assumes that it applies to soldiers? This bill does not apply to soldiers.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware that it does apply more particularly to soldiers. The soldiers are those who are most affected, and they form the great number who will be cared for under the provisions of the bill at the present time.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, as I understood the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], his idea of the bill is that it has no application to soldiers. They are cared for under an act which we passed at the last session of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. To a certain extent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is true that this bill applies to all who are injured. If the act confined to soldiers did not take care of them, they could come under this act also.

Mr. SMOOT. And there are 4,000 of them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are more than that already who are under the charge of the Vocational Board.

Mr. SMOOT. But I say there are now 4,000 soldiers who have to be taken care of. I spoke of them, of course, not with any idea of carrying the thought that there is no one else to be taken care of. But I do not care whether it is a man in everyday life or not, if we are going to undertake to do anything for the man, he should not be compelled to come and swear that he has no means to do it for himself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will pardon me, when we take taxes from the people for educational purposes, for special instruction or special lines generally, as we are doing now for the injured, ought not any man or boy who is injured to be entitled to that benefit?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to discuss the question now. All I ask is that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. So do I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no further committee amendment. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I have one amendment to offer. I move that there be a new section, numbered section No. 2, defining the term "personal disabillity" and also "rehabilitation."

Mr. KENYON. Where will the Senator have that inserted?

Mr. SMOOT. As section 2 of the bill, and then change the numbers of the other sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section, to be known as section 2, on page 4, after line 2, to read as follows:

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of this act the term "persons disabled" shall be construed to mean any person who by reason of a physical defect or infirmity, whether congenital or acquired by accident, injury, or disease, is or may be expected to be totally or partially incapacitated for remunerative occupation. The term "rehabilitation" shall be construed to mean the rendering of a person disabled fit to engage in a remunerative occupation.

Mr. KENYON. I have no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, June 21, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *June 20, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We rejoice, our Father in heaven, with exceeding great joy, for the inherent qualities Thou hast woven into the soul of man, which are ever pushing him upward and onward to a larger life and purer civilization; that the most dishonest man admires honesty in another; that the most impure admires purity in another; and the most consummate liar admires truth in his brother; that sin is its own condemnation and righteousness its own reward.

Inspire us day by day to truth, justice, and righteousness, that we may be worthy of the world's Great Exemplar; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Agricultural Department, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the House has agreed to a repeal of the daylight-saving law. I think the form in which the House agreed to that provision is better than the form in which it was agreed to in the Senate. While I suppose the House conferees will agree to some provision on the proposition I am entirely satisfied that it should go to conference, but there should be some expression on the subject on the part of the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will first report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill carries 91 amendments. It is customary to send bills to conference. It has been suggested that it might be well to agree to the amendment with an amendment. After all, it might endanger the passage of the bill, and it was thought best to refer it to conference in order that it might be ironed out there and reported back to the House. I take it the conferees will insist upon the amendment as passed by the House if it is agreed to in any way whatever.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is entirely satisfactory to me. I assume it will be agreed to in that form, in view of the action taken by the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me about three minutes?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman know the exact amount of the Senate increases over the total of the House bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. Four million three hundred and eighty thousand nine hundred dollars.

Mr. MONDELL. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] appreciates and that the House conferees appreciate the attitude of the House in regard to matters of increases on

appropriation bills. I am sure the gentleman has a lively recollection of the attitude of the House on this bill. It was somewhat critical. A majority of the Members of the House seemed to feel that the Committee on Agriculture had been, to put it mildly, quite liberal in its treatment of the department and of its various and divers agencies. I am sure that the conferees will have that attitude and view of the House in mind while in conference. My own hope is that the conferees on the part of the House may find, after careful examination of the Senate amendments, that the majority of them can be dispensed with. There may be some amendments that are essential, and I am sure no one desires to curtail any work that is vital. We are all, however, interested in keeping the appropriations down, so far as we can without real injury to important public services. I am sure the conferees on the part of the House will have all those things in mind.

Mr. HAUGEN. With the four days of experience that we had here on the floor, I think they will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how these gentlemen get the floor?

The SPEAKER. It is all by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asked unanimous consent to send the Agricultural bill to conference. Objection being reserved, he is explaining why it should be sent. Any objection will end it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that after the four days' experience on the floor I think I can assure the gentleman that the conferees fully appreciate the sentiment of the House, and it will be the purpose of the conferees to carry out that sentiment, which, as I understand it, is that there shall be some retrenchment and desire for economy.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I trust that there is no one anywhere who has the idea that because we are near the 1st of July and all anxious to have this bill passed therefore the House may agree to any sort of an amendment in order to secure the passage of the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa if I understood him correctly when he stated that it was the disposition of himself personally as one of the conferees that he would permit the daylight-saving repeal to be put on the Agricultural appropriation bill as a rider in the form in which it passed the House in a separate bill, and that he would not eliminate that and trust to the Senate passing the measure which passed the House?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman did not correctly understand me. I said that if the conferees agreed to incorporate it in the bill they would undoubtedly prefer the amendment as passed by the House.

Mr. WALSH. So that it is not the gentleman's idea that it should be properly left as a part of the Agricultural bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is a matter that has to be ironed out in conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced the following as conferees on the part of the House: Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. LEVER.

FRESH-WATER PEARL-BUTTON INDUSTRY.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the fresh-water pearl-button industry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the fresh-water pearl-button industry. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question that the privileges of the House have been invaded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN]; and the question of violation of privilege I raise is this: On yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts addressed the House during the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, and before he began his address he secured leave, on page 1404 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as reported, as follows:

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise, extend, and correct my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Now, in this extension of remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts has printed seven articles by Mr. William Hard that were published in recent issues of the New Republic. These articles cover about nine closely printed pages of the RECORD, and are vicious and, I think, unwarranted attacks on the Postmaster General.

I have no objection to the gentleman from Massachusetts extending his own remarks. While I did not agree with him in his intemperate attack on the Postmaster General, still I recognize his right to make whatever criticisms he sees fit that are within the rules of the House, and I should not have objected to any extension of his own remarks along these lines, though, of course, I would not have approved them. But he did not secure leave from the House to print these seven different articles from the New Republic, and I submit that it is a violation of the privileges of the House to have so printed such articles. [Applause.] And therefore I offer a privileged resolution to eliminate them from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution offered by Mr. BLACK:

"*Resolved*, That whereas it appears from the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, June 19, 1919, that Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, of Massachusetts, addressed the House during general debate on the sundry civil appropriation bill and was granted leave to revise, extend, and correct his remarks; and whereas under such grant he has caused to be published seven printed articles from the New Republic written by William Hard, covering about nine closely printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said articles attacking the official acts of the Postmaster General, A. S. Burleson:

"*Resolved*, That the publications of said articles are without sanction of the House and in contravention of the special order granting to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] leave to revise, extend, and correct his remarks, and that said articles be expunged from the RECORD and the Public Printer be directed to omit them from the public RECORD and be prohibited from issuing any copy or copies thereof in pamphlet or other form from the columns of the daily RECORD."

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Texas on what ground it is privileged?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming makes the point of order that the resolution is not privileged. On what ground does the gentleman from Texas claim that it is privileged?

Mr. BLACK. That the leave of the House so to "revise, extend, and correct my remarks" does not cover or include the printing of seven long, different articles by Mr. William Hard that have recently been published in the New Republic.

Upon that point I can cite to the Chair numerous precedents. In section 904 of the House Manual and Digest these precedents are cited: First, "Where a Member gets leave to insert one matter he may not print another," volume 5, 7001, of Hinds' Precedents. Second, "Where a Member abused a leave to print on the last day of a session, the House at the next session condemned the abuse and declared the matter not a legitimate part of the official debates," volume 5, 7017, of Hinds' Precedents. Again, "An abuse of the leave to print gives rise to a question of privilege," volume 5, 7005, 7008, and 7011, of Hinds' Precedents. Next, "A resolution to expunge from the RECORD in such a case is offered as of privilege," volume 5, 7012, of Hinds' Precedents. And further, "An inquiry by the House as to an alleged abuse of the leave to print does not necessarily entitle the Member implicated to the floor on a question of personal privilege," volume 5, 7012.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that when a Member asks unanimous consent to "revise, extend, and correct my remarks" he does not put the House on notice that in that extension and that correction he is going to print seven long articles that cover nine long, closely printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If the gentleman from Massachusetts in his request to extend his remarks had said to the House, "I ask unanimous consent to print seven articles by Mr. William Hard that make an attack on the Postmaster General," I dare say that there are plenty of Members in this House who would have objected to the extension of remarks of that kind. But he did not put us on any notice of that kind, but simply asked the privilege of the House "to extend, revise, and correct my remarks." And I submit that those remarks of Mr. William Hard, although they may have the indorsement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, are not his remarks, and I do not think that these articles have the indorsement of this House. I think the resolution is privileged, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend for a moment? If it is agreeable to the gentleman, the Chair would like to make a suggestion. This is a rather important question. The Chair offhand was under the impression that a Member who obtains the right to extend his remarks in the RECORD may print not only his remarks but extracts which he chooses to append thereto, unless he is limited, as is often done, by somebody objecting to any extraneous matter, but the Chair would like to

examine the authorities, so that we may be sure that a proper precedent is set. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Texas if he is willing to let this matter go over until to-morrow?

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Does the Chair indicate by that remark that he does not desire to have anybody discuss the point?

The SPEAKER. Oh, it can be discussed to-morrow.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I should like to say something right now, for a very few moments. [Laughter.] I realize the position of the Chair, and do not want for the shadow of a moment to embarrass him. I do not intend to take very much time, because it is not necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the suggestion of the Chair will prevail, and that the whole matter will go over until to-morrow. I do not see that any harm can come to anybody from that course.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I will yield to the suggestion of the Chair.

TUNNEL UNDER HUDSON RIVER.

Mr. RAMSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 409, and that the same be immediately considered. I desire to make a statement showing the importance of this bill. It will take only a few moments for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RAMSEY] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table S. 409, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

Mr. RAMSEY. May I have the privilege of having the bill remain upon the Speaker's table, so that I can make a request for its consideration either to-day or to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. That does not require the consent of the House.

Mr. RAMSEY. I should like to make a little statement, because the matter is of a great deal of importance to these communities. The Legislatures of New York and New Jersey have passed appropriations for this tunnel, and they want to begin operations on the first day of July. It will cost about $15,000,000. No expenditure of the Federal Government is involved, but there is a constitutional provision that before States can enter into a contract they must have the consent of Congress.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. I should like to know who has the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is not entitled to address the House at this time.

MEMBERS' CLERKS.

Mr. IRELAND. I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the disposal of the bill which the House is considering, and such business as may be on the Speaker's table, and not to interfere with conference reports, House joint resolution 104, having to do with the clerk hire of Members of the House, be made the next order of business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Accounts, asks unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the sundry civil bill, and not to interfere with business on the Speaker's table or conference reports, House joint resolution 104 relative to Members' clerks be in order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 409. An act to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed, on June 5, 1919, bill of the following title:

H. R. 2329. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

FOOD ADMINISTRATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which, without the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed, and the message and documents referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 21 of the act of Congress approved August 10, 1917, under which the Food Administration was created, I transmit herewith the annual report of the United States Food Administration for the year ending December 31, 1918.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
20 June, 1919.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN.

For expenses of the Alien Property Custodian authorized by the act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, including personal and other services and rental of quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $4, traveling expenses, printing and binding, law books, books of reference and periodicals, supplies and equipment, and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $800,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman if the Alien Property Custodian has filed the report of expenditures required by the act creating this official; and also if the committee has the reports that were called for in the hearings on the deficiency bill and which the hearings show were to be submitted later?

Mr. GOOD. The Alien Property Custodian, under date of February 26, 1919, made a report, and I suppose it was in pursuance of the requirement of the act. The extent to which it gives details of his transactions I am not advised, for I have not had the time to examine it. The reports called for by the committee in the hearings on the deficiency bill were compiled by the Alien Property Custodian, and they are here. They are contained in two large volumes, and the compilation required a great deal of work. They came in after the hearings were printed and the bill had been disposed of. They are in the rooms of the committee, and anyone who wishes can examine them if they desire to do so.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state from an examination whether the reports contain the fees paid to counsel and what the total expenditure for that purpose was?

Mr. GOOD. There are no footings in the report. It gives the fees that were paid out of the trust funds. What we were inquiring about at that time was whether they were paying large attorney fees and other expenses out of the trust estates and charging them to the trust. This report gives every corporation whose property was taken over, the name of the attorney who has been appointed to represent the trust, and where the amount of the fee has been fixed that is given. In most of the cases I observe they have selected counsel, and "no compensation paid to date" is the notation at the bottom. In some of the cases very large fees, it seems to me, unusual fees, exorbitant fees, were allowed. Of course, I say that without knowledge of the details; but I have knowledge of one case where a fee of $15,000 was allowed to a person who recently resigned as judge of a court. I have not had time to digest these entire reports.

Mr. WALSH. How much has the Alien Property Custodian turned over to the Treasury Department for the sale of alien property which is under the law held in the Treasury awaiting disposition by Congress? While the gentleman is looking that up, let me ask if he can tell me how many more properties the Alien Property Custodian has that he expects to dispose of, and how long the transactions will continue after the peace treaty is signed?

The time of Mr. WALSH having expired, he was given two minutes more by unanimous consent.

Mr. GOOD. When the Alien Property Custodian was before the committee in February he stated that he had sold property to the extent of approximately $30,000,000. When he was before the committee two weeks ago he stated that he had already received about 40,000 reports of enemy property, and trust estates and the active trusts on the books number 35,000; that the value carried on the books at the present time was approxi-

mately $600,000,000. I understand that as soon as the President shall have proclaimed that the treaty of peace has been signed and approved, the Alien Property Custodian's functions, so far as taking over additional property, cease. Then the only problem is to preserve the property and dispose of it as either the treaty of peace or the law shall direct.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in response to what the gentleman from Iowa has said I want to say a few words. The gentleman from Iowa stated that the statement filed by the custodian shows that at least in one case an exorbitant fee has been paid, a fee of $15,000. He then stated that he did not have the opportunity to examine it to find out the details of the case. I respectfully submit that if he has not had the opportunity to examine the details, nor to ascertain the character or the amount of work performed, he should refrain from expressing any judgment as to whether or not the fee charged the estate was exorbitant.

Manifestly it would be unfair to take an isolated case out of all the trusts taken over by the custodian and intimate there has been extravagance. There are two volumes here, and the gentleman selects the case showing the largest fee and disregards the hundreds of cases where little or no compensation was paid.

The gentleman has before him a full statement of the amount thus far spent in administering every trust. There were more than 26,000 trusts, and the value of the property belonging to enemy persons administered by the Alien Property Custodian is approximately $800,000,000.

I have glanced over the report, and the only case where I recall that a fee of that size has been paid is the Bayer case, where it was shown that through the efforts of counsel $1,000,000 of income taxes fraudulently kept out of the Treasury by the enemy alien was recovered and turned into the Treasury. Counsel through his efforts, covering a long period, unearthed and recovered for the Treasury a million dollars, and a fee of $15,000 is not exorbitant; it is not as high as would be paid by a private corporation. Let me say that fee was paid, not out of the Treasury, but out of the funds of the German-owned corporation, the alien-enemy fund.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentleman if a full statement of the activities of the organization under discussion has been filed with the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. The committee asked the custodian to file a statement showing the expenditures to counsel for administering the various trusts taken.

Mr. JUUL. Pardon me, but is that filed with the committee?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Let me answer the question. That money, the gentleman will understand, is paid out of the enemy trust fund and not out of the Treasury of the United States. It is charged against the German-owned corporation.

Mr. JUUL. I understand; but I want to ask the gentleman if such a statement is filed with the Committee on Appropriations, and has the committee a report that Members of the House may have access to?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It was filed with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am satisfied he will allow any Member to see it. I learned that it was filed and secured a copy, which I have here, and no fair judgment can be arrived at unless a man considers the whole list. If you pick out one isolated case, it will not be just to the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the list filed with the committee simply states in the vast majority of cases that no counsel fees had been paid to date.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; and manifestly he could not say that they have been paid if they have not.

Mr. WALSH. That does not preclude the Alien Property Custodian from paying fees in the future upon the basis of this fee referred to.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It does not preclude the custodian from paying in any case a fair compensation for the service rendered. In many cases only nominal fees were charged, and in many cases no fee was paid at all.

Mr. WALSH. The larger the fees paid, of course, the less money is turned into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Government.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman can not argue that, because the larger the fee paid the less money is left to the trust fund.

Mr. WALSH. That is to be disposed of by Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Congress must enact legislation to say how it shall be disposed of—whether it shall be returned to the enemy owners or held pending the settlement of claims of Americans against German interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I said that I have not had time to examine this report, and if the gentleman from South Carolina will consult with his colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], he will know that we have been sitting up until midnight every night in the preparation of this bill. These reports came in after we started that work. What attracted my attention in looking through the report was that Mr. J. Harry Covington, who resigned a position as one of the judges of the District of Columbia Supreme Court sometime ago, where he worked hard and received a salary of $6,500 a year, was appointed attorney for the Kalle Color & Chemical Co., manufacturers of dyes in New York, and the statement is made that no compensation was paid to date, but on looking a little further I found that he was also attorney for the Bayer Co., manufacturer of colors, and I read from the report the fact that for the entire legal services of the Bayer Co., the Synthetic Patents Co., and the William Crowell Color Co., Judge Covington received a fee of $15,000, and that Frank L. Crocker received a fee of $10,000, or a total of $25,000. It seems to me that inasmuch as an able attorney, who has been occupying a position on the bench here in the District at a salary of $6,500 a year, could within a short time take down from one concern a fee of $15,000, it was at least a matter that was open to investigation. That is all that I meant to say with regard to the matter.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I know the gentleman wishes to be fair. He says that he has not had time to investigate the report, but states the amount of this fee, without stating anything as to the services rendered. I ask permission to extend my remarks by putting into the RECORD what the Alien Custodian has stated in this report as to the case the gentleman has referred to. He states that the Bayer Co. required constant legal service, that doubtful bonus contracts with some German employees were legally avoided, with a saving of about $40,000. Proceedings before the Federal Trade Commission to use its patents were successfully defended, and validity of title established to patents worth more than $500,000; that counsel by his services saved $1,000,000, forcing the German alien owners of this property to turn over that amount in taxes, running back as far as 1913. That service was rendered, and it makes no difference whether it was rendered by a man who served on the bench until a short time ago or who at one time served as a Member of this House. Service in this House and service upon the bench does not disqualify a man to practice at the bar.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I refuse to yield. Service in this House and upon the bench does not necessarily brand a man as incompetent, as some men would seem to assume. That does not mean that he did not render valuable service, because the record shows that he did, and when he saved $1,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States and $500,000, so far as the patent question was concerned, and $40,000 in bonus contracts, I think that the fee when compared with fees paid for like service was reasonable, and every successful lawyer in this country will think so. While the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] receives but $7,500 to-day, he certainly does not mean to argue that that fact should preclude him from earning larger fees if he returns to the practice of law. The question is whether the service was rendered. No man can challenge that.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the motion to strike out. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if this enormous amount of income taxes was not all under investigation by the Internal Revenue Department?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no information as to that. If it was, and they had not uncovered it, and counsel did, he did more than the Revenue Department, and it furnishes additional reasons why he was entitled to this fee.

Mr. WALSH. The logic of the gentleman from Tennessee——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of South Carolina.

Mr. WALSH. Of South Carolina; I beg the gentleman's pardon——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is granted this time.

Mr. WALSH. Also that of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I hope he will grant it.

Mr. WALSH. I should say upon the logic of the gentleman that whenever the attorney for the Internal Revenue Department uncovers a large amount of income taxes that has not here-

tofore been paid that he would be justified in coming up here and asking that his salary be increased upon the basis of a legal fee, but the gentleman, I think, will find that this matter was under investigation by the Internal Revenue Department and that it was only because the property got into the hands of the Alien Property Custodian that the settlement of it was hastened.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not follow the gentleman. Mr. Covington is not an employee of any department and is not asking for an increase of compensation. He is an attorney, practicing law, and was employed to represent this trust estate and was paid for his services. The gentleman says the Revenue Department uncovered this $1,000,000, but the positive statement of the custodian is that Mr. Covington uncovered it and brought about its return to the Treasury. I have no information that the Revenue Department was investigating this matter at all.

Mr. WALSH. And the gentleman contends that this enormous manufacturing concern, which had made some dyes and manufactured aspirin, I think, has been permitted to go on and continue its business in this country since 1913 with simply no attention whatever from the Internal Revenue Department?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no information as to their activities. This company was endeavoring to defraud the Treasury, and that is not confined, I presume, to any one company or any one State. I think it is to the credit of counsel that it was unearthed and $1,000,000 was placed in the Treasury of the United States.

If it was not so lengthy, I would ask to insert the entire statement in which the custodian lists every trust in which compensation has been paid to attorneys or directors. It shows innumerable cases where eminent counsel served without any compensation at all and many others where the compensation was only nominal. He has been managing the greatest trust business in the world, and there is nothing in his administration that he is not entirely willing to place before Congress. Taking this statement as a whole it shows an economical administration of which the custodian is justly proud.

The statement made by the custodian as to the Bayer Co. follows:

THE BAYER CO.

(Manufacture of colors.)

Address, 117 Hudson Street, New York City.
Capital stock, $750,000; $525,000 common authorized; $525,000 common issued; $225,000 preferred, issued.
Enemy interest, 100 per cent.
Number of directors, 9.
Report numbers, 7165–7167.
Trust number, 6781.
Depositary, Franklin Trust Co., New York City.
Directors appointed to represent A. P. C. stock: (1) Nicholas F. Brady, 54 Wall Street, New York City; (2) G. H. Carnahan, 120 Broadway, New York City; (3) George C. Haigh, American Exchange National Bank, New York City; (4) Frederick B. Lynch, 8–10 Bridge Street, New York City; (5) Hon. M. H. Glynn, Albany, N. Y.; (6) E. J. Lynett, Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa.; (7) J. Ramsay Speer, Trappe, Md.; (8) Charles B. MacDonald, 71 Broadway, New York City.
Elected attorney and counsel: J. Harry Covington, Washington, D. C., and Frank L. Crocker, 5 Nassau Street, New York City. Statement attached.
Date of sale: December 12, 1918.
Purchaser: Sterling Products Co., Wheeling, W. Va.; Grasselli Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
Purchase price: $5,310,000.

The Bayer Co., of New York, was the largest and most powerful German-owned dye and drug manufacturing concern in America at the outbreak of the war. Carl Dulsberg, the chief of the war-trade board of Germany, was the owner of one-third of the stock, and the company was largely used for the distribution of German propaganda funds in America. It was most cleverly organized, the Synthetic Patents Co. having been brought into existence as a holding company for the plant and patents of the Bayer Co. so as to conceal the profits and evade taxation. The higher officials of the Bayer Co. were nearly all unnaturalized German citizens, and the entire capital stock was voluntarily reported as enemy property within two or three months after the passage of the "trading with the enemy act." It became apparent, however, that this voluntary surrender was simply in line with German cunning, and that to unravel the complicated affairs of the company would involve able managers under the guidance of highly competent lawyers.

The directors selected for the Bayer Co. were Nicholas F. Brady, 54 Wall Street, New York City; G. H. Carnahan, 120 Broadway, New York City; George C. Haigh, American Exchange National Bank, New York City; Frederick B. Lynch, 8 Bridge Street, New York City; E. J. Lynett, Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa.; J. Ramsay Speer, Trappe, Md.; Charles B. MacDonald, 71 Broadway, New York City.

J. Harry Covington, formerly chief justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, was requested to become chief counsel and Frank L. Crocker, of New York, became his associate.

It was soon developed that just before the voluntary surrender the Germans in control had organized the Williams & Crowell Color Co. with money fraudulently diverted from the Bayer Co., and to this new company it was intended to transfer the valuable business of the Bayer Co. This subsidiary was seized, reorganized by the counsel, and upward of $300,000 of money and property was recovered for the Bayer treasury.

The Bayer Co., in fact, required constant legal services. Doubtful bonus contracts with some of its German employees were legally avoided with a saving of about $40,000: proceedings before the Federal Trade Commission to use its patents were successfully defended, and validity of title established to patents worth more than $500,000; examination of legal effect of depreciation charges, profit-sharing payments, and royalties resulted in uncovering and paying to the United States Treasury over $1,000,000 income taxes running back to 1913, which had been systematically concealed.

About the end of 1918 the company and its affiliated concerns had been completely straightened out, and a plan of sale of the property to American purchasers was developed. The capital stock of the Bayer Co., of the Synthetic Patents Co., and of the Williams & Crowell Color Co., as an asset of the Bayer Co., together with 1,200 drug and dye patents held by the Synthetic Patents Co. and certain contracts and contract rights between these companies, Bayer & Co., of Germany, and Dulsberg and his German associates, individually, for the payment of shares of earnings intended to further the evasion of taxes, were offered at public sale, title was prepared and put on file for public examination by Judge Covington, of counsel. The property brought $5,310,000, with the purchaser agreeing to pay the more than $1,000,000 of concealed back taxes and also the taxes for the year 1918, amounting to more than $500,000. The real price, therefore, was about $7,000,000, and after the details of transfer had been arranged by counsel, possession of the property was given to the purchasers on February 1, 1919.

For the entire legal services to the Bayer Co., Synthetic Patents Co., and Williams & Crowell Color Co., Judge Covington received a fee of $15,000 and Frank L. Crocker received a fee of $10,000, or a total of $25,000.

In connection with the very large number of valuable patents (1,200) figuring in this case, critical examination of the letters patent and the Patent Office records thereof had to be made, and other technical questions relating to such patents required the services of patent specialists. Emery, Booth, Janney & Varney, of New York and Chicago, were paid $4,000 for these services.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 shall apply to employees of the office of the Alien Property Custodian on the same terms as the said section applies to employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOARD OF MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION.

For commissioner, $7,500; assistant commissioner, $5,000; necessary and proper expenses incurred in connection with any arbitration or with the carrying on of the work of mediation and conciliation, including rent in the District of Columbia, traveling, and other necessary expenses of members or employees of boards of arbitration, furniture, office fixtures and supplies, books of reference and periodicals, salaries, traveling expenses, and other necessary expenses of members or employees of the Board of Mediation and Conciliation, to be approved by the chairman of said board, $32,040; in all, $44,540.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 36, line 19, after the sum "$44,540," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That no part of this money shall be expended until, as a condition precedent to considering any question of dispute, such board shall require the parties to the controversy to agree in writing that they in good faith will abide by the decision of said board."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that it is not a limitation but is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order for two minutes?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. That is all I want. Mr. Chairman, I do not see the use of spending thousands of dollars every year on this Board of Mediation and Conciliation unless it is going to accomplish some result, at least, for the benefit of the people of this country. Hundreds of cases are submitted to this board where the parties when they submit them have no intention whatever of abiding by the action of the board in case the decision goes against them. Out of the 6,000 strikes that occurred during war times, from the time the war was declared, on April 6, 1917, until the armistice was signed, on November 11, 1918, many of those 6,000 cases of controversy were submitted to this board, and after the decision of the board the parties paid no attention whatever to the decision, but went ahead with their strikes, to the detriment and injury of the people of this country. Why spend thousands of dollars on such a board unless the decision of the board means something after they give a hearing and after they render their decision? I know that the matter goes out on a point of order, if the chairman insists upon it. But if the chairman does not make the point of order, this proposed wholesome provision will become law. I know that we are deprived of the opportunity of making this Board of Mediation and Conciliation worth something to the country if the chairman knocks the proposed amendment out on a point of order, and I sincerely hope that he will not renew his point of order but will let us vote upon the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS.

For expenses made necessary by the act approved May 17, 1910, entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," including the purchase of periodicals, maps, and books of reference, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the commission by the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, who shall be the secretary and shall act as the executive officer of said commission, $10,500.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make that motion for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman of the committee what sort of beneficial aid this commission is rendering. What are they doing?

Mr. GOOD. The Commission of Fine Arts, under the law, passes upon the plans and specifications and types of structures that the Government proposes to build here in the city of Washington. The commission has been in existence since 1910, and I think it is the judgment of people, who are competent to pass judgment upon the general scheme of improvement for a city so far as buildings are concerned, that this commission had done a great work. They serve without compensation, and, as I stated, have been in existence for a number of years——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This item is for the purpose——

Mr. GOOD. It was created in 1910.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What expenses are provided for in a general way? I do not desire to take up much of the time of the committee or the chairman.

Mr. GOOD. They get no salary. The commissioners receive their actual traveling expenses. There is only $10,500 carried, and that covers incidental expenses in passing upon plans, clerk hire, and matters of that kind.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Is it not true that buildings that have been constructed recently in Washington have been taken from this commission by a recommendation of the department?

Mr. GOOD. The temporary buildings were not submitted to them.

Mr. DOWELL. Did not the Secretary of the Treasury recently in the erection of a large building here in the city recommend that it be taken, and was it not taken, from this commission, and was not a special architect provided for in the legislation for that purpose?

Mr. GOOD. We made appropriations of money and authorized that building, and gave the Secretary of the Treasury the right to employ outside architects.

Mr. DOWELL. It was taken entirely from this commission?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know whether they passed on it or not.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. My impression is that the work of this commission is purely advisory. They have not done any of the real architectural work. It is a board that has to be consulted.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DOWELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1378. An act to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the navigable waters of the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. POMERENE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

For expenses of experimental work and investigations undertaken by the Council of National Defense, by the advisory commission, or subordinate bodies; for the employment of a director, secretary, chief clerk, and other expert, clerical, and other assistance; equipment and supplies, including law books, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; subsistence and travel, including the expenses of members of the advisory commission, or subordinate bodies or other employees going to and attending meetings of the advisory commission or subordinate bodies; and printing and binding done at the Government Printing Office, the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1919 is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman for some information. As I understand, the estimate asked for was $50,000, in addition to the unexpended balance, and that the unexpended balance is $84,000. Is that correct?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. HICKS. Just exactly what do they propose using that $84,000 for, now that the war is over? Is it for the preservation of records, or what is the purpose?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that this is one of the items, again, that there was no controversy about. It passed the House before, except that it carried $50,000 and no reappropriation. We have simply reappropriated the unexpended balance. To what extent the Council of National Defense will function, I do not know. There are six members of the Cabinet who are members of that council. And while they asked for $260,000 and had an appropriation of about $400,000 for the current year, the committee felt that when the war was over the activities of the Council of National Defense would not be very great, and that the $84,000 that was on hand would give them all the money that was necessary.

Mr. HICKS. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that is even a larger amount of money than they should use.

Mr. GOOD. Maybe that is true.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that the former bill repealed and covered into the Treasury the unexpended balance and appropriated $50,000. This bill authorizes the expenditure of the unexpended balance of $84,000.

Mr. HICKS. I merely wanted to say that now the war is over, $84,000 is a large sum for this purpose.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of directing attention to what this Council of National Defense is contemplating doing.

The Secretary of War appeared before the Appropriations Committee on June 13, and stated that there were 7 miles of bookcases, containing the records of the draft board, scattered throughout the country. He said:

We have stables fitted up at the Washington Barracks for those records. They are putting in hard floors and fitting up the stables for the filing of the records. The accumulation of records here is absolutely beyond the imagination of anybody. It is a penal offense for me to tear one up, no matter how unimportant it is.

Now, I can not quite see, under the law creating the Council of National Defense, what authority it has over the draft records, which the Secretary states are scattered throughout the country. I am a little bit surprised that the Secretary should make that statement, because I think if he will make investigation he will find that these draft records, or practically 90 per cent of them, if not more, are here in Washington, scattered about in a number of different buildings, piled up in many cases 6 or 8 feet high, and in some buildings that are nothing but tinder boxes, with insecure construction, as I am advised that in some of them the doors are so loose that the rain blows in upon the records.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I suggest to the gentleman that that is the fault of Congress in that Congress has not provided a proper building for the storage of these records.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know under what authority of law those draft records were sent to Washington?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They were sent here under the order of the Provost Marshal General under direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. WALSH. Under what authority did the Secretary have those records sent to Washington?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are a part of the War Department records. Does the gentleman think that those records ought to be destroyed?

Mr. WALSH. Of course not. The gentleman knows there is no such insinuation or implication.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I desire to ask the gentleman this question: If they are not in Washington, where on earth would they be stored?

Mr. WALSH. Well, most of the States of the Union have a National Guard and an adjutant general. These records relate to the inhabitants of the States, and I think a careful reading of the draft law will disclose that there is no authority for piling them up here in the city of Washington.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. These records constitute a history, to a certain extent, of the members of the National Army. The States have nothing to do with the National Army. The records were prepared under the control of the War Department and the Federal Government, and I submit that here is the only place that they should be stored.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman knows that the States had a great deal to do with the raising of the National Army. The point I am making is this, that those records are so valuable they should not be stored indiscriminately in buildings where they are subject to the weather and where they will continue to be in danger from fire.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is just the point.

Mr. WALSH. And the gentleman knows that the department has buildings under its jurisdiction now where these records might well be placed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is just the point, that these records ought not to be indiscriminately stored throughout the various States of the Union. They ought to be brought here.

Mr. WALSH. They have been brought here.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And Congress should provide a place where they can be safely kept.

Mr. WALSH. Those records are here. They are not scattered throughout the country except, as I think, in one State. They are here in Washington.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. And they are piled up here like a lot of miscellaneous freight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that having been chairman of the district exemption board of middle Tennessee, I am somewhat familiar with the character, importance, and situation of these records. All of these local boards and district boards simply had temporary quarters. They were instructed to keep all of these records and to properly pack them and send them to the Secretary of War in Washington.

In reply to the suggestion that they should be retained in the States, I submit that they are very important Federal records and will be very important for all time to come, or at least for many generations, in ascertaining facts about these various men with respect to pension claims and claim for compensation and allotments and in order to correctly determine the status of each of these men.

Now, as is well known, a great deal of trouble and confusion and expense arose out of the fact that sufficient records of the soldiers of the Civil War were not kept, and as a consequence the Government was very frequently imposed upon. These records contain not only the claims for exemptions of the different men and the action thereon by the local and district boards, but statements of each of the registrants as to his physical condition and upon various other questions; and they contain certificates of the physical examinations made by the physicians of the local board and, in case of appeal, by the appeal boards. I submit that those are highly important for future reference, both as a protection to the Government and the individual; and they are of much value from a military and historical standpoint.

Now, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], these records have all been sent here in cases and boxes and stored in various different buildings, because they had no other place for them. I consider it equally as important that all these records should not only be kept here but should be properly sorted and systematized and indexed, to the end that all public officials and other citizens may have proper access to their contents.

Just the other day I received an inquiry from a citizen of my State desiring to know something about the record, as shown by these exemption records, of a certain registrant. I made inquiry of the War Department and was told that while they had all these records it was as yet inaccessible; that the records were all stored; and that it would possibly take several weeks and much expense to find this record. The official to whom I made application further stated that they hoped to be able to properly systematize and index all these records. I think that this is properly a work for the Federal Government and that these records belong to the Federal Government, aside from the fact that the different States have no facilities or quarters for the storage of same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, in opposition to the pro forma amendment I want to say that this discussion reveals a situation about our public records that, I think, invites an observation on the fact that our Government is the only government of any consequence in the world that does not have a hall of records, a national archives building—a matter that has been discussed in this House for years and years.

Just before the Great War a commission was appointed on this subject, and on that commission were Speaker CLARK, Vice President MARSHALL, and one other—I think it was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House—who were to select a site for such a hall of records. The war disorganized everything, and I presume that on that account the matter has been allowed to pass by. In speaking recently with our honored ex-Speaker he told me that they had waited for a call of the commission by the Vice President. I can understand why there is no active interest in it now.

But, members of this committee, if you would take a trip through this city and investigate the situation of our public records and note how they are located, how they are scattered, and in what hopeless condition they are, so that any day might see a total loss of them, either by water or by fire, I am sure that every Member here would urge that we lose no time in establishing a hall of records, fireproof, in which we could classify and index and place in safety the most valuable documents that the country to-day possesses. If you go to the Treasury Building, you will find the attic under the roof stuck full of most valuable records. A few years ago you might find under the sunken yard of the Treasury Building important and valuable records put in this or that pigeonhole, and if you were to go into the Patent Office you would find the records put back in dark places and in halls and mixed in with the steam pipes. We had a photograph taken of a bunch of records that had been taken out and put upon a table where the moisture had so crumpled them that they were in a state of decay, and they were especially valuable records.

Therefore I call upon the House to urge again the building of a hall of records at some appropriate place here, fireproof, and that immediate steps be taken to transfer these valuable documents to one place so that they can be utilized.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. DALLINGER. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if it would not be a good plan to take that land that Poli's Theater stands on, a square, with four other squares, which have been purchased for that purpose?

Mr. FESS. I am in favor of starting at once a building that can be added to from time to time as the necessities of the Government may suggest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. This is the only country in the world—and I have made an investigation of the subject—that does not have a national archives building, and here in this city are these documents, evidences of the activities of the Government, the value of which can not be estimated, and they are in danger of fire and water and other elements that destroy. Our Government ought to take this step immediately and put them in shape for preservation.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GOOD. I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I hope the gentleman will withhold that motion until he has explained this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation provided by "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, including medical, surgical, and hospital services, and supplies provided by section 9, and the transportation and burial expenses provided by sections 9 and 11, $1,000,000, to be available immediately and to remain available until expended.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the department reported to the Committee on Appropriations that this service

would be out of money on the 16th of June; and while this bill will not become a law until about the 30th of June, it will permit them to pay the expenses of claims that have been incurred this year. Otherwise, if the point of order is made against the words "to be available immediately," it will be necessary to have a deficiency appropriation for the expenses of the department from the 16th of June to and including the 30th of June. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist on the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order on the words "to be immediately available and."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, $1,100,000, of which sum there may be expended not exceeding $50,000 in the employment of counsel, not exceeding $3,000 for necessary books, reports, and periodicals, not exceeding $1,500 for printing other than that done at the Government Printing Office, not exceeding $100 in the open market for the purchase of office furniture similar in class or kind to that listed in the general supply schedule, and not exceeding $70,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee why it is necessary to appropriate $70,000 for the rent of buildings for the Interstate Commerce Commission when the Interstate Commerce Commission Building has been completed only two years?

Mr. GOOD. The Government does not own that building, and this is for the rent of it.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. This is for the rent of the Interstate Commerce Building?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Is the rent $70,000?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. That must be the specified rent.

Mr. GOOD. I think that is the only building they occupy, and this item is for the rent of that building, based upon a lease that has been in existence ever since the Interstate Commerce Commission occupied the building.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Who owns the building?

Mr. GOOD. The Interstate Commerce Commission has a lease on the building at Eighteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. There are 11 stories and a basement. The annual rental as stated in the estimates is $72,058.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Who owns the building?

Mr. GOOD. The owner's name does not appear.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Is it owned by a private person?

Mr. GOOD. Either an individual or a corporation. It is not a Government-owned building. The Government has nothing to do with it except to occupy it and pay the rent.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. It has made a contract then for a number of years?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; at a low rental. The rate is 36.3 cents per square foot of floor space. There are 198,506 square feet of floor space in the building.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Was the building erected for the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. GOOD. I think it was erected for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep informed regarding and to enforce compliance with acts to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads; the act requiring common carriers to make reports of accidents and authorizing investigations thereof; and to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and test block-signal and train-control systems and appliances intended to promote the safety of railway operation, as authorized by the joint resolution approved June 30, 1906, and the provision of the sundry civil act approved May 27, 1908, including the employment of inspectors, and per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, $313,600.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee why this item was increased so materially over the provision of last year, being some $63,000 more. Has the governmental operation of railroads brought about this increase?

Mr. GOOD. That was increased to supply the service provided for in an act of Congress passed last year to the extent of $53,600, and there was a deficiency carried in the deficiency bill.

Mr. HICKS. Can the gentleman state for what purpose the money is to be utilized? The item mentions block-signal systems and all that. Is that because we have installed new devices?

Mr. GOOD. That is to pay the inspectors provided for in that act.

Mr. HICKS. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and including not exceeding $15,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, $2,500,000.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the committee if he can tell me how much money has been expended in the effort to procure a valuation of the property of common carriers?

Mr. GOOD. By the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The amount is considerable. They have had to date $15,800,492, and this item carries $2,500,000.

Mr. KREIDER. Is the gentleman informed as to what per cent of their work is completed? How far have they progressed?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] to answer that question.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I believe Judge Prouty, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, stated that the field work might be concluded by January, 1921, but that it might take another year to extend the units of cost to the elements of valuation fixed by the board.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For scientific research, technical investigations, and special reports in the field of aeronautics, including the necessary laboratory and technical assistants; traveling expenses of members and employees; office supplies, printing, and other miscellaneous expenses, including technical periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of research laboratory and wind tunnel, and construction of additional buildings necessary in connection therewith; not to exceed $1,500 for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; personal services in the field and in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for clerical, drafting, watchmen, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $43,000; in all, $175,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to get some information on this item. I would like to ask if any additional hearings were held on this appropriation at the last session?

Mr. GOOD. No; in framing this bill the committee accepted the hearings and the judgment of the former committee; we had no additional information on the subject.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is not able to state whether the tunnel has been built?

Mr. GOOD. It has not been built, because the other appropriation failed. My recollection is that they have a small tunnel; but the amount carried here is for a large tunnel to permit of more extensive experiments.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the figures "$175,000," line 11, page 44, and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 11, strike out "$175,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no information on the item. A great deal of experimental work is carried on by the Army and the Navy, and the purpose of getting the advisory committee originally was to confer with the Bureau of Standards and other bureaus on tests of cable and materials, and so forth. Now we are beyond that stage. I will admit that a committee of this kind is necessary, but as the service is at present constituted, without any system of cooperation or coordination, this money is simply squandered. I do not know of any present good it can do, and inasmuch as both services are in a transitory period and there is to be a general reorganization, I think we might as well save $125,000 on this item, and I urge the acceptance of my amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, both the Army and the Navy are engaged in experimental work in regard to air service. This commission was established in order that there might be no duplication in experiments. They estimated for $325,000 for the next year. The committee that made up the former bill thought

they could get along with $175,000—$25,000 less than they had for the current year.

I want to say to the gentleman from New York that I think some of the money we are expending for experiments of this kind in a laboratory separate and distinct from the Army and the Navy is money very well spent, and that it is saving a great deal of money that would otherwise be spent if the Army and the Navy could have a free hand in experiments.

Instead of building one wind tunnel to carry on the experiments for aeronautics, you would have a big wind tunnel for the Army and another for the Navy and be duplicating the very thing we are trying to centralize in the service. I am as anxious as the gentleman to cut down this bill, but I think it would be poor economy to try to cut down in one of the experimental provisions that is presided over by men of the standing of Dr. Stratton, who is a member of the board, and Admiral Taylor and other members.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to say to the gentleman that I quite agree with what he says. This committee does not carry on any experiments. Dr. Stratton and Admiral Taylor are in office regardless of this item. They may meet and confer on the theory and policy of doing their work. If the committee carries on any experimental work, $175,000 would not pay for one-half of an experiment.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is mistaken; they have a laboratory near Langley Field and are carrying on experimental work in that laboratory.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But that does not cost any money; that is being carried on by the Army or the Navy, as the case may be.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman can point out any experiments carried on by the Government that does not cost any money——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I mean that it does not cost any money out of this appropriation; they are provided for in the Army and Navy appropriations.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will pardon me, if the gentleman from New York will look at page 103 of the hearings, he will find that this covers supplies and equipments and maintenance and operation. They came before the committee and asked for $325,000 for study and work and the field laboratory, and the committee of the last House thought it wise and proper to give them the amount of $175,000 as carried here. If the gentleman will look at page 102 of the hearings he will find that it is for coordination of experimental work, and they also furnish industries of the country with the result of these experiments.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I agree as to the utility of the work, but I do not see where the money goes. We have a Bureau of Standards, we have a military aviation and a naval aviation, and we have material in both branches. Why appropriate $175,000?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will look at the hearings, he will find that $60,000 is for supplies, meaning by that fuel, oil, gasoline, and material used in construction. The hearings on page 102 show the items that they need this money for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchasing, requisitioning, or otherwise acquiring plants, material, charters, or ships now constructed or in the course of construction, and the expediting of construction of ships thus under construction, and for the cost of construction of ships, within the limit of cost authorized by law, $276,000,000; and the unexpended balances of the appropriations for the housing of shipyard employees and their families, the taking over of certain transportation systems and the transportation of shipyard and plant employees, the purchase of ships under construction or to be constructed in shipyards in foreign countries, and the operation of ships, contained in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $150,000,000 for the purchase of ships contained in the deficiency appropriation act approved October 6, 1917, are reappropriated and made available to meet obligations already incurred within the purposes of the appropriation herein made.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this to ask the chairman why it is necessary in this bill to provide the identical wording of the bill we passed a year ago in reference to the requisitioning of ships and the acquiring of plants, etc. Here are our shipyards running at full blast. We do not propose, I hope, to commandeer any more shipyards or plants and, therefore, why the necessity of providing that it can be done?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, that has been necessary because there have been quite a number of requisitioned ships that have not been paid for, quite a number of ships that were purchased from foreign owners, not completed and not paid for. Take the matter of housing, for instance. It is 98 per cent completed and it has to be wound up.

Mr. HICKS. That is not requisitioning ships.

Mr. GOOD. Because of the fact that those things have not been completed, it is necessary to carry some appropriation for the completion of them and a settlement of matters, and we have carried the language just the same as it was carried before and within the limit of cost, and I think properly so.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Will the chairman inform me how many ships there are now being constructed in foreign countries? I supposed that we had enough shipyards here.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will turn to page 545 of the hearings, he will find the description there of the progress of Japanese and Chinese contracts—steel ships—as of May 24, 1919. The total tonnage amounts to 245,864.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Did our Government contract with the Japanese Government direct or with individuals in Japan?

Mr. GOOD. As far as Japan is concerned, the statement does not give the name of the person or company that is constructing the ships, and as far as China is concerned, the contracts seem to have been entered into with the Kiagnan Dock & Engine Co.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The President of the Hog Island Shipyards informed me that the Government is chartering ships that it has constructed for $2,000 a day. I want to know whether the committee took into consideration the money received from the chartering of ships and the selling or ships built by the Government?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. He also told me they were selling ships as fast as they could be constructed at $210 a ton.

Mr. GOOD. We are relying upon their receiving out of operation of ships as much as $60,000,000 during the next year, which may be used in the construction program. We carry a much smaller sum here than they estimated for the construction of ships, and yet, by carrying that smaller sum we have also given them authority to use certain unexpended balances.

In one case an unexpended balance amounts to $118,000,000, out of the appropriation for the purchase of ships, where only $31,000,000 was expended. That money has been reappropriated. There is no use of making the appropriation again. We figure that they could use out of their receipts from operation $60,000,000 for the next year. We also figure that they will have a large sum available from the ships they are selling, which may be used in paying for ships that are under contract and for work in Government yards.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The president of the Shipping Board said that probably our Government would be building ships for foreign nations for the next 10 years, as we could build them more cheaply and more quickly. I have been authentically advised that the British Government would not build ships unless they sailed under the British flag.

Mr. GOOD. I should hate to see the program carried out where the Government would be in the shipbuilding business for the next 10 years. I think it is more probable that we shall sell our shipyards and let private concerns in the United States carry on the shipbuilding program; but, of course, at the present time they have a great many——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not believe that, under the language in lines 23 and 24 on page 45, the Shipping Board would still have the power to requisition the plants or ships, just the same as we intended they should have during the war?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose that is so. They have that power now. That power was given to the President, and we have not by the bill attempted to limit that nor to repeal that provision, in so far as requisitioned ships have not been settled for, and money is necessary, and we have to carry the provision to give them the money for requisitioning ships.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will permit, is it not possible, if we were to strike out all of the language in line 23, up to and including the word "or" in line 24, and insert the word "for"—"for ships under construction and process of construction," and so forth—that you would have the right, then, under that language to pay for any ships or plants or any of the properties that might have been requisitioned heretofore, but at the same time you would safeguard the Treasury against

any further requisitioning; and would not that be a wise thing, in the judgment of the chairman?

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not think so. This power was granted to the President to continue during the war and for six months after the proclamation of peace. They are not now requisitioning any ships; they have not of late requisitioned any ships; they do not intend to requisition any ships.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I am certain of that, because we have got too many ships. Now, the problem of the Shipping Board is to sell the ships and I think the Shipping Board is clearly alive to the situation that Congress intends that they shall dispose of that class of ships where they have too many of a given type and the quicker those ships are converted into private ownership where that can be done without loss the better, and I think that is their policy and will continue to be their policy. I do not believe that the Shipping Board or the President would permit the continuation of the requisitioning of ships. While I do not have the figures before me, the gentleman will notice in line 2, page 46, that all of this appropriation is within the limit of cost as authorized by law. Now, the $515,000,000 was for the requisitioning of ships, and my recollection is that $415,000,000 of that has been appropriated.

Mr. McKENZIE. Well, Mr. Chairman, on the statement of the gentleman of the committee that he has an abiding faith in the wisdom of this board not to involve the Government in any further expenditures along this particular line, I will refrain from offering an amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that obligations are out already for the full $515,000,000.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. At the beginning of the paragraph it reads:

The authorization of $2,884,000,000 for the construction of ships is reduced by the sum of $120,000,000.

How much of that authorization has been used, if the gentleman is informed?

Mr. GOOD. So far as the authorization is concerned, contracts have been let for all except $220,000,000 worth of ships, but the fact is that when the armistice was signed contracts up to the entire authorization had been let, but after the armistice was signed there were cancellations to a point so that at the present time the contracts outstanding and the work in progress in the yards are $220,000,000 less than the total authorization.

Mr. KREIDER. Is the gentleman prepared to say how many of these ships or what proportion have been received or finished and whether the money received for the sale of ships and for the leasing of ships is covered into the Treasury or retained as a revolving fund?

Mr. GOOD. The money that is received by the Shipping Board is used by the corporation. The money of the corporation does not go into the Treasury of the United States at all, but goes into the treasury of the corporation like in the case of any private corporation, although their stock, as the gentleman knows, is owned by the Government, so their receipts from the sale of ships or from the sale of houses or anything of that kind, or in the operation of ships, goes into the treasury of the Shipping Board, Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. KREIDER. Is this revolving fund to be continued to be used for that purpose?

Mr. GOOD. Until it is covered back into the Treasury of the United States by law.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KREIDER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. The chairman of the committee referred to proceeds from the sale of ships. Does the gentleman know whether the Shipping Board has the authority to announce the policy of the merchant marine as to whether the Government should operate ships or build or whether they without further authority can sell those ships or can lease them?

Mr. KREIDER. Well, as I understand from the chairman of the committee, this fund is now placed in the hands of this corporation, and they can sell ships and cover the money into their own treasury, lease ships and cover the money into their own treasury, build more ships, and keep on with this fund indefinitely. That is as I understand it.

Mr. GOOD. The provisions of law in that regard reads as follows:

That all money turned over the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation may be expended as other moneys of said corporation are now expended. All ships constructed, purchased, or requisitioned under authority therein or heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States shall be managed, operated, and disposed of as the President may direct.

Mr. FESS. There is no authority there for the sale of these ships.

Mr. GOOD. There is another provision authorizing the sale of ships in another act. This provision here regarding the disposal of ships refers to the provision in the former act as to the authority to sell, so I think there is no question but what the President has the power to sell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the last pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, in view of the statement of Mr. Hurley, frequently quoted in the press—that the policy of the Government should be the sale of these ships; that the Government should not enter upon a policy of governmental operation; I want the chairman to make that specific—whether without further legislation on the part of Congress the Shipping Board is free to enter upon that sort of policy and dispose of in the market ships that they have built or that they have commandeered—hardly commandeered, because those would have to be turned back?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman under the law as it now stands they have the right—and, I think, are properly exercising the right—to sell these ships. They have sold about $51,000,000 worth of ships. They are selling them from around $200 to $225 a ton, and so far they have been selling ships for practically all they cost; and it was stated before the committee by everybody who appeared before the committee that they have a great many of these fabricated ships of one type, and that it is not a well-balanced fleet because of that fact. And that it is necessary, in order to compete with the ships of other countries or other concerns, that this fleet should be augmented by larger and faster vessels, and that we ought to dispose of a great many of these standard, fabricated ships. Now, they have been selling those, and I think have sold about $51,000,000 worth.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, I have noted, as have other Members, that the cost of the building of the ships has been so much greater because of the war cost than our competitors have built them for that it has been suggested that a certain proportion—say, 75 per cent—should be written off as due to the war. Would the Shipping Board have the right to do that? Would they have a right to fix the price without any authority from Congress?

Mr. GOOD. I think they have the power to fix the price and sell the ships.

Mr. KREIDER. I would like to know what portion of this $2,284,000,000 has been paid over? I would like to know how many more taxes we have got to lay so that these people can operate? The Treasury is now overdrawn.

Mr. GOOD. I could give it to the gentleman in just a moment. The appropriations heretofore made aggregate $1,938,000,000 for ships. Now, that is in addition to the appropriation of $276,000,000 carried in the bill and is also in addition to any of these balances that were appropriated for some other purpose. I am now referring only to the appropriation for the acquisition of these particular ships, and if I am mistaken in that regard I will correct it.

Mr. KREIDER. It will be about $800,000,000 more?

Mr. GOOD. In addition to that they have $415,000,000 for requisitioned ships and $150,000,000 for purchasing ships and $75,000,000 for acquisition of foreign ships.

Mr. KREIDER. I desire to say that if one-tenth of the reports concerning the management and operation of the Shipping Board are true, then Congress should without delay take measures to stop the waste that is going on and which compels us to levy these taxes on the people of the country.

Mr. GOOD. I am for the elimination of waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No contracts for ship construction to be entered into shall provide that the compensation of the contractor shall be the cost of construction plus a percentage thereof for profit, or plus a fixed fee for profit.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. HICKS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] is recognized.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to ask the chairman, if I may, a question. I know he is a reservoir of all information and knowledge, and I will therefore take another chance shot at him.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there is a bill which has been passed by the Senate, and which will be brought before this House either to-day or to-morrow, in reference to authorizing the shipyards of this country to take contracts for for-

eign account in building bottoms. Up to the present time, as I understand, under both law and regulations, our shipyards have been prevented from taking foreign contracts, although they have been offered them at profitable terms.

A few weeks ago I was on the Pacific coast, and they have there, as you all know, along the Columbia River and on Puget Sound, a great many shipyards capable of producing not only wooden and concrete ships, but fine steel ships. I was told by some of those shipyard owners that, whereas the Government contracts would expire some time this fall and whereas they had been offered contracts for ships for foreign account, they were not allowed to take those contracts, and when they asked the Shipping Board why they were told it was against the policy of the Government. Now, the point with me is: Why did our Government or why did the Shipping Board prevent those shipyards, in which American capital is invested, in which American labor is employed, from taking contracts which would keep that capital employed and that labor at work? It seemed to me a shortsighted policy when I first learned of it, and I still think so. It strikes me as rather remarkable that it is necessary to put a bill through branches of Congress to compel the Shipping Board to do now what would seem to me in good common judgment they should have done weeks or months ago. And I would like to ask, if I may, why it was the Shipping Board did not allow those shipyards to take those contracts when they could have been taken to the extent of millions of dollars?

Mr. GOOD. In answer to the gentleman, I will only say, all I know about the matter is that a bill has been introduced and passed in the Senate that would open up our shipyards for the purpose of building ships for foreign account. Now, I do not know just exactly what the attitude of the Shipping Board is with regard to that, or the reasons for their attitude, rather, unless it be that they have so many ships themselves to sell and can make spot delivery that they would prefer until some of those ships are disposed of not to create a surplus of ships in the market. I do not know whether that is a reason or not, but I anticipate that that may be one of the reasons for it.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. HICKS. I will.

Mr. ELSTON. I think it is true that there is a law against domestic shipyards taking foreign contracts, but the Emergency Fleet Corporation of the Shipping Board, under the assumption of some power, or probably by direct authority, promulgated a rule that all shipping contracts for construction should be lodged with the Shipping Board for allocation to different domestic yards, and they have permitted those contracts to accumulate in the Shipping Board before they would apportion them to various yards at all. I understand there is a sort of reservoir of contracts there that have not been allocated at all, because the Shipping Board has felt they could not permit local shipyards to engage in that kind of work when Government work was in progress there. I believe this bill that has passed the Senate is merely to take away from the Shipping Board any power to make any such rule, so that the shipyards can make ships as they will.

Mr. HICKS. I want to thank the gentleman from California as well as the gentleman from Iowa. I knew I was probably asking the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] a little more than I should, because he can not be expected to know about all of these technical subjects as to shipping, but I think his explanation is probably somewhere near the mark. It is interesting anyway.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The paragraph that has just been read relates to awards for ship construction and seems to provide that no contract shall be entered into hereafter providing for construction on the cost-plus-profits plan. Does this mean the elimination of the 10 per cent cost-plus contract?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; any per cent. Contracts would have to be let on the open-bid basis at a lump sum.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the committee have any hearings on the question of 10 per cent plus contracts?

Mr. GOOD. Not at this time, but in the past the committee had considerable hearings on the subject, and at this time we had them put in the hearings a list of the contracts to show the ships that were being built in that way. It is the judgment of the committee that all ships constructed under such contracts cost the Government a good deal more than ships constructed in any other way.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Those contracts, of course, were entered into during the war and were very hastily made, although I think very carefully drawn in some instances, and apparently enabled the contractor to get through and spend as much as he pleased for material and for labor while he was going on with the contract. He suffered no loss, and in certain instances certain taxes incurred by him were included. The system was very much criticized, as the gentleman will recall, although it was very widespread. Having that in mind, I wanted to inquire whether the adoption of this paragraph would mean a return to advertised bids and proposals to do shipwork hereafter?

Mr. GOOD. That is the law, and if they follow the law that is what it means.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the passage of this paragraph of four lines will be notice to the Shipping Board that hereafter no cost-plus contracts can be entered into, and that the ordinary peace-time procedure of advertising for proposals for ship construction will have to be resorted to?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and it will also be notice to the shipbuilders that if they get contracts of that kind they will have a hard time in getting the money from Congress to pay for them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It means that they must have their own equipment and look after their own profits, and that there will be no more of the alleged favoritism that has been charged up to cost-plus contracts.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think the Shipping Board has entered into any cost-plus contracts since the armistice was signed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some of the very earliest contracts that were subjected to criticism were made by the Shipping Board. I am inclined to think—and those present will correct me if I am not correct—that the only contracts made on the cost-plus basis were made by the Shipping Board, and that the Army followed the precedent set to some extent, and that gave rise to the criticism we heard about cantonments and other structural work, which was due to the fact that these original forms of contract provided that the contractor could buy what he pleased and pay what he pleased and still have 10 per cent profit over all. I think they were generally adopted throughout the war.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is entirely correct. Such contracts have been made, but those contracts were made during the war, in the early part of the war, for reasons with which the gentleman is entirely familiar.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But they are still in operation.

Mr. GOOD. They are not making any new contracts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are not making any more contracts of that kind, and do not propose to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is what I desired to have understood and emphasized, if it is a fact; that, from the passage of this bill on, no more of these cost-plus, guaranteed-profit contracts will be granted by the Government. That is the fact?

Mr. GOOD. The last contract of that kind was made with the New York Shipbuilding Corporation, of Camden, N. J., and was dated October 18, 1918. Another dated on the same day was that of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. That was the last cost-plus contract.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is the end of it, if this bill passes?

Mr. GOOD. I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "for observation of the total eclipse of the sun of June 8, 1918, etc.," is reappropriated and made available immediately for observation of the total eclipse of the sun of May 28, 1919, visible in Bolivia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "and made available immediately."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order on the words "and made available immediately." The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withhold that, because that observation has been made and the expense incurred, and it has been paid out of the Smithsonian fund and reimbursed from the trust fund. It really is not a large appropriation, and it should be made at this time.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, it will be available immediately, I guess, by the time this law passes. I make a point of order on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balance of the allotment of $5,000,000, made from the appropriation for the national security and defense for the fiscal year 1919 to the War Trade Board for the United States Russian Bureau (Inc.), shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the passage of this act. All records and property of such organization shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby empowered and directed to wind up the affairs of the said bureau.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee rose.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. I move to strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, on page 50.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: On page 50, strike out all of lines 3 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a provision affecting the unexpended balance of the $5,000,000 that was appropriated or allotted from the national security and defense fund by the President to the War Trade Board for the United States Russian Bureau, Incorporated. The countries of Great Britain, France, Japan, and the United States, by an interallied council, have agreed to finance the Trans-Siberian Railway Co. to the extent of $20,000,000. That contract has already been entered into, and the President, we learned after we put this matter in the bill, had withdrawn, or had issued an order withdrawing, the $5,000,000 from the Russian Bureau, Incorporated, that he had allotted to that corporation, and had directed that it be turned over to the Secretary of State to carry out the provisions of that contract.

I do not know what the contract is in its terms. I understand in a general way that this railroad is owned by the Russian Government. I assume that they have thrown around it all the safeguards necessary so as to assure the return of the loan. But this much has happened: They have already paid $1,000,000 out of this fund in accordance with that contract. We have got that investment there now. The other countries have put up their investment each of a million dollars. While I feel, and feel quite strongly, that matters of this kind should have come before Congress and an appropriation asked for that purpose, and that we should have been fully advised, yet we are brought face to face with the fact that during the war we did appropriate vast sums of money for national security and defense and placed in the hands of the President $150,000,000 to be expended in his discretion.

This contract has been made. If the agreement had not been made and the question was before us, I am frank to say that I would not be for it; but the agreement has already been made and $1,000,000 has been expended, and I can see how the Government might be very seriously embarrassed if the contract was not carried out. I talked with the vice chairman of the board, and afterwards received a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, which can be read if desired, explaining this whole transaction. The vice chairman of the War Trade Board, who is acting chairman of the board, is a business man of wide experience. He advises me that every safeguard has been thrown about the investment, and that he has no doubt that the money will be returned to the Government eventually.

That is the situation. If we had known these facts, we would not have put the provision in the bill originally; and, inasmuch as it is in the bill and the condition is as I have explained, I really felt that it was my duty to move to strike it out, in order that the President, and especially the Government of the United States, may not be embarrassed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Iowa will not prevail. The more money this Government or any other government spends in Russia apparently the worse conditions get there. Now, it seems to me, it is time that we cease pouring our money into Russia, $5,000,000 at a clip. The President has turned over to the Russian Bureau of the State Department, according to the hearings on page 390, $5,000,000 out of the emergency fund. Out of that fund they have loaned $1,000,000 for the construction or maintenance of some kind of railroad there—the Trans-Siberian Railroad—and we are given the comforting assurance by the representative of the State Department that this is a mere loan of $1,000,000, and that it will be turned back to the Treasury of the United States, and that the evidences of the indebtedness will be deposited with the Treasury.

In view of the situation that has developed since the signing of the armistice, it seems to me it is time that the United States began to conserve some of its resources. We spent millions of dollars in Russia in loans made before the revolution, before the government there which it was sought to establish went to pieces, and I do not believe the most sanguine Member of the House expects that this Government will ever be repaid for the loans that we have made. Neither do I think there is any immediate possibility that the Government will receive back the $1,000,000 we put there that has gone into this railroad. Nobody knows how much the associated governments have contributed. At least the statement in the hearings conveys no information upon that point. Neither does the chairman of the committee set it forth. It appears that under some authority of law, which probably was expressed in most general terms, the President has seen fit to make available of the funds which were placed at his disposal for emergency purposes $5,000,000 to the Russian Bureau of the State Department, and of that sum we have become investors to the tune of $1,000,000 in the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Uncle Sam has money enough tied up in railroads in his own country to-day without dipping into the Federal Treasury to the tune of a million dollars and investing it in a railroad in the country of Russia, where probably to-morrow some of the disciples of Lenin and Trotski will destroy the roadbed and destroy the equipment of the railroad, and then those who are so considerate of these poor people will send an ambassador to the capitals of the nations throughout the world and seek contributions of millions of dollars more.

I submit that this motion, which seeks to strike out the language covering back into the Treasury $5,000,000 heretofore available for the War Trade Board, should not be adopted, particularly in view of the fact that in the very second paragraph of the bill the President has transferred the activities of the War Trade Board to the Department of State, and of the unexpended balance the sum of $200,000 is made available for the State Department to carry on the activities of that board.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. What will be the disposition of the unexpended balance of $5,000,000 if it is retained by the State Department?

Mr. WALSH. One million dollars of it has already been loaned to the great railroad financiers in Russia, and the other $4,000,000, I submit, would be available for the same purpose.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman know whether that is the purpose of the State Department?

Mr. WALSH. We have only the statement of the chairman of the committee, as supplemented by a statement in the hearings by the Solicitor of the State Department, that there was a loan of $1,000,000 made to the railroad in Siberia in order to keep the Trans-Siberian Railroad in operation. It was a loan to them; and, apparently, $1,000,000 is not sufficient, and it is going to require the balance of the $5,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the letter written by the Assistant Secretary of State may be read at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington.

DEAR MR. GOOD: Mr. Woolley, of the War Trade Board, has just explained that you have informed him that the sundry civil act, which is about to be presented to the House, contains a provision which requires the return to the general funds of the Treasury of the unexpended portion of the $5,000,000 allotted by the President from the appropriation for national security and defense to the War Trade Board for the improvement of the economic conditions in Russia, and which the War Trade Board propose to return to that appropriation, so that it may be utilized for the furtherance of the interallied plan for the maintenance of the Siberian railways.

The inclusion of such a provision in the pending bill will make it absolutely impossible for this Government to fulfill a solemn and unequivocal obligation which has been made by the Department of State to our associates in the war. Upon the assumption that the President's fund would remain available until June 30, 1919, as prescribed by Congress, we have assured the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Japan that this Government would be prepared, in order to meet an immediate emergency which will not suffer delay, to advance to the Siberian railways at once part of its pro rata portion of a fund of $20,000,000, which has been determined by the interallied committee in Siberia to be absolutely essential to prevent the collapse of transportation facilities in that country. The above-mentioned funds, which are about to be returned by the War Trade Board to the appropriation for national security and defense, are the only funds now available for the fulfillment of this solemn international obligation, and should Congress direct the return of these moneys to the general funds of the Treasury, this Government will find itself in a most embarrassing position, and in effect will be compelled to repudiate an obligation delivered in all good faith to the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Japan.

Aside from the matter of international good faith referred to above, the failure at this critical time of the interallied plan for rendering assistance to the Siberian railways will have the most serious and far-reaching consequences. The success of the present forces of law and order in Siberia which are successfully opposing Bolshevism is wholly dependent upon the maintenance of transportation facilities, and a failure at this time to maintain the Chinese Eastern and Trans-Siberian Railways would materially lessen the prospect for the return of order in those portions of Russia which are now so successfully resisting the further advance of anarchy. Unless we are assured of the success of the interallied plan to rehabilitate these railways there is scant likelihood that conditions in Siberia will return to normal at any time in the near future, and this, of course, will make it impossible for American commercial interests to engage in trade with that country, which promises, if the interallied plans are carried out, to offer abundant opportunities for the advancement of the export and import trade of the United States.

In conclusion, I should emphasize that the present plan does not in any wise contemplate a donation to the Russian railways. The proposal is merely to make a loan to the Russian railways, which will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States with interest as soon as the economic life of Russia can be reconstituted. Furthermore, these

funds will be disbursed under the supervision of our own representative, Mr. John F. Stevens, who is now in charge of the operation of these railways.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will appreciate the importance of the success of our plan, which has been adopted with the firm conviction that the benefits to accrue to the United States will exceed in value many times over the amount of money involved.

The effect of our program is such that I am convinced that the use to which this money is to be put is entirely germane to the purposes intended by the act from which it is derived, as the restoration of normal conditions in Russia and the opposition to the tide of Bolshevism is an integral part of our program of national defense, and this is the very purpose for which these funds were appropriated by the Congress.

Allow me to add that as soon as the department can ascertain from the interallied committee the definite plan for financing railways, which is now in course of preparation, it is its intention to present the whole matter to Congress for its approval and such appropriation as may be deemed appropriate. In the interim, the collapse of the undertaking, which is so vital an element in the restoration of Russia, would be prevented by using for that purpose the remainder of the fund described in the foregoing.

I am, my dear Mr. GOOD, very sincerely, yours,

WILLIAM PHILLIPS.

The Hon. JAMES W. GOOD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a repetition of the old, old story that we have heard so many times since this war commenced, that if we do not approve of the action now proposed it will embarrass the President of the United States; that it will embarrass the administration; that it will embarrass our country. That is the story that was told at the time that the President of the United States, without any warrant or authority of law, expended over $4,000,000 in the purchase of the Arlington Hotel site. That is the same story that came to us at the time we were asked to appropriate $100,000,000 for the purpose of reestablishing Mr. Hoover in Europe in charge of the interallied food-control operation.

We are now told that it would be very embarrassing to this administration if this clause were permitted to remain in this measure. I would like to know when is the time coming when the Congress of the United States will begin to function, as it is its duty to function, and to resume the appropriating of public money. I have always understood that it is the duty of Congress to appropriate money for certain expenditures after having been given the facts for which those expenditures are asked. I say that the President of the United States exceeded his authority granted under the provisions that put this large sum of money in his hands in the first instance.

We are now told that the President of the United States has obligated this country in the sum of $5,000,000 in the Siberian Railroad project, and that he did it since he went to Paris; he did it since this war was closed, for he announced from this rostrum that the war was closed. He did it not as a war measure, but did it, if you please, in utter violation of the law that gave him this money to be used as a war emergency fund.

You will understand from the letter just read by the Clerk that this is not a loan to the Russian Government. It is not a loan to any government; it is a loan to a corporation—a loan, if you please, to the Siberian Railroad Co. What right has the President of the United States to take any amount of money out of the United States Treasury, unless by warrant given him by Congress, and loan it to any corporation? He can not justify it on the ground that it is making a loan to the Russian Government, for it is no such thing.

It has already been said, or offered as a suggestion, and is stated in the letter that has just been read, that it was necessary, because the interallied governments thought it would bring order out of chaos in Russia; that it would operate to put down Bolshevism, now rampant over there.

I wish to say that the President of the United States could have prevented activities in many other ways that would have been of some avail in putting down Bolshevistic activities. It would at least have produced some moral effect if he had not given Bolshevists public and private audiences since he has been in Paris. It would have had some effect if he had not appointed these men to public places. It would have had some effect and been of some avail if he had not appointed Mr. Herron to a public position.

I wish to call the attention to what Herron says when referring to his benefactor, Mr. Wilson, in a book he has written extolling him. I read:

Prof. George D. Herron, disciple of free love and herder of affinities, continues ardent in his admiration of President Wilson, whom he evidently regards as a kindred soul. In his latest work he says of the President:

"He is revolutionary beyond anything his words reveal, beyond anything his contemporaries have discerned. As contrasted with America's President the parliamentary leaders of German socialism are medieval reactionaries."

In this connection it must be remembered that Prof. Herron is speaking of the President in a laudatory way. He himself is opposed to all existing institutions, and he is hailing the President as one of his own kidney. Apparently there is only this difference between them: President Wilson went to Europe voluntarily and despite public protest, whereas Herron fled there as a result of public protest against his immoral and outrageous conduct.

And yet they tell us that the President of the United States is justified in this unauthorized act in taking $5,000,000 and loaning it to a corporation, or to the Siberian Railroad; that he is doing it for the purpose of putting down Bolshevism, when he has been doing much on this side and the other side to spread the socialistic and Bolshevistic spirit that has been gaining ground so rapidly throughout the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 25 minutes, the time to be occupied by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want more than 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time for debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 25 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I may want more than 5 minutes, but I will not ask for over 7 or 8.

Mr. GOOD. I am giving the other side of the aisle 20 minutes, against 5 on this side.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Ten minutes have already been consumed. There have been statements made that I think this side is entitled to answer, and I think the gentleman should be more liberal of his time.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, why can not this go on for a while? I suggest that it run for a little while before the request is made.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 25 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were 43 ayes and 33 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it seems to have been demonstrated during the last few months that no question affecting the President of the United States can come up on this floor or at the other end of the Capitol that some Members on the other side, on account of their great intemperate and unreasonable prejudice against him, can not refrain from making an attack upon him.

Now, I am not going to consume any of the time at my disposal in undertaking to answer anything that may have been said which does not have reference to this particular appropriation. The President holds a place in the affections and confidence of the people which all of their unjustifiable attacks can not destroy.

The fact is that at the last term Congress, without a dissenting vote on either side of the aisle, appropriated $100,000,000 for the use of the President in our national defense. The President was given full authority to use that sum in any way he saw fit for our national defense.

I am not prepared to say that it may not appear that some of these funds may possibly have been spent in a way that some gentlemen on the floor would not have spent it. The President would have been a superman if he had spent all of that $100,000,000, under the circumstances under which he has been laboring, without meeting criticism here and there. But I do say that if the facts are that he has only used unwisely the small amount referred to by the gentleman from Indiana out of that great sum, then I submit that the President of the United States has done much more than we could have expected from him under the circumstances.

What are the facts in reference to this. I say that the commitment made by the President of the United States, acting through the War Trade Board, was justified and authorized under the authority given him in the use of this fund. The War Trade Board made a thorough investigation of all the facts, and came to the conclusion and so reported to the President of the United States that the best thing that could be done to put down Bolshevism in Russia and secure the everlasting gratitude of 97 per cent of the citizens of Siberia was to furnish them with those things they so badly need, in order to provide them with the actual necessities of life. And the other great powers took the same view.

They need shoes, they need tin plate, they need clothing, foodstuffs, and many other necessaries of life, and these necessities

were not given to them but were to be sold to them. This Government was to get full return for all the supplies furnished to them. After that agreement had been reached, it appeared that the transportation facilities in Siberia had broken down. There was no way to get these supplies to the Russians in Siberia, and it became necessary for somebody to finance the Siberian Railroad in order to provide proper transportation. Thereupon $1,000,000 was loaned to this railroad. It was loaned on good security. It will come back in due time. I wish to call the attention of this House to the fact that all of that money is being expended by an American, Mr. John Stevens, who was selected by the Governments and placed in charge of that railroad, and is now acting.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Does the gentleman know anything what these securities are?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The securities are upon the railroad, upon its equipment, its roadbed, its stock, and on property belonging to it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Does the gentleman know how much the railroad was bonded for before we furnished this loan?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not; but I am informed by Mr. Woolley, the acting chairman of the War Trade Board, who, as the gentleman from Iowa has said, is a business man of wide experience and splendid reputation, that these securities are abundantly able to take care of the loan. I can not yield further unless I can get an extension. Later on it appeared that the railroad would need more money, and four great powers—Japan, England, France, and this country—entered into solemn agreement with——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited, and the Chair understood that five minutes was to be given to each of five gentlemen. If any one of those gentlemen wishes to waive his time——

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, when the motion was made I called attention to the fact that the agreement had not been made, and we are now on a limitation of time, without reference to who is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is a matter by which the Chair is obligated in honor to recognize those who were named in the proposed agreement.

Mr. DOWELL. The Chair will remember there was objection to the request, and anyone had a right to make that objection. The Chair must now recognize those who are entitled to the floor without reference to the proposed agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has agreed to yield his time to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, these four powers—Japan, Great Britain, France, and this country—have entered into this agreement to loan, not to give, to this railroad $20,000,000, and our proportion of that amount is $5,000,000. Our country has been committed to it, committed to it as a matter of national defense. Gentlemen may stand here and criticise the President, if they choose, for entering into that commitment, but the fact remains that the commitment has been made and this very sum has been obligated in this way. In addition to that, Japan has already paid up its $5,000,000, and I understand that Great Britain is in the act of putting up its $5,000,000, and France will do the same thing. Yet, gentlemen would have us in this bill seek to take away from the President of the United States the only fund that he has to carry out the obligation made by this Government in this respect and keep faith with the other countries. What does Mr. Woolley say with reference to this investment? He says that by building this railroad, by putting it in good condition, it will mean $150,000,000 of trade to this country alone. Gentlemen who stand here and who undertake to break this agreement made by your President and mine are in the attitude of denying to United States manufacturers of agricultural implements and of shoes and of all of the other things that they need in Siberia the benefit of this great amount of trade, and as I say to you, that while what we furnish them may not be paid for in money, because they have not the money, they have the platinum, they have the flax, and other products, which they can exchange for what they receive from us.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know how much of Great Britain's contribution of $5,000,000 is taken from the money that we have already loaned to Great Britain?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If it is taken from the money that we have loaned to Great Britain, then Great Britain, of course, is obligated to return it to this country, and is paying us the interest on that money.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman states that Great Britain is paying us interest. Has Great Britain ever paid any interest on the loans that we have made to her?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know what amount of interest Great Britain has paid, but that does not concern this question. The fact remains that Great Britain borrowed the money to which the gentleman refers from the United States, and I dare say that the gentleman will not say that Great Britain is not entirely responsible for the obligation it gave to this Government, and will not keep faith with this Government, as this Congress is being asked to keep faith with Japan and Great Britain and France in making this money available.

Mr. JUUL rose.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not yield any more. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] said that he thought that the President should have come before Congress and secured permission to make this agreement. I wish to say to the gentleman from Iowa that the President was not required to come before Congress, because if there ever was a question of national defense, considered so, not only by this country but by the other three great powers, this is one of them, and I submit that the delays incident to coming before Congress, which as a matter of fact was not in session at that time, would have defeated the whole purpose of this allotment and commitment which has been made by the President.

I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa will prevail. [Applause.]

Under leave obtained I append herewith the following memoranda which was handed me after I concluded my remarks:

1. The maintenance and rehabilitation of the Trans-Siberian Railways have been undertaken as a joint allied project.

2. The Secretary of State has given a definite assurance to our associates in the war that this Government will contribute its pro rata share to the interallied plan of financing the Russian railways which is essential to continue their operation. They can not continue unless funds are immediately available. In view of the necessity for immediate action, the President directed the dissolution of the Russian bureau, whose capital was derived from the appropriation for national security and defense, and reallotted the unexpended capital to fulfill this Government's obligation to pay our share of the moneys to be advanced under the above-mentioned plan. These were the only funds available for such purpose, and if this appropriation is not continued available until June 30, 1919, as originally provided in the act creating it, there will be no means of fulfilling the solemn international obligations made to our associates in the war.

3. The allotment in question is an entirely proper use of the moneys appropriated for national security and defense. The present conditions in Russia, the activities of Bolshevism, even at the present date, constitute a menace to the United States and indeed to the entire civilized world. Ninety-seven per cent of the population in Siberia are at heart anti-Bolshevik and they are successfully opposing Bolshevism. Their economic existence and their ability to continue such opposition is dependent entirely upon the receipt of foodstuffs, shoes, clothing, agricultural implements, and other commodities for which they are dependent upon outside sources. The Trans-Siberian Railway is the only means for the transportation and distribution of these supplies and, unless this railway is enabled to function to the very highest degree of efficiency possible, the people of Siberia will lack the foodstuffs and other supplies necessary for the continuance of their economic life, their ability to oppose Bolshevism will be seriously lessened, and we will be playing directly into the hands of the forces of anarchy by failing to maintain the conditions which are vital to the maintenance of the present régime of law and order in Siberia.

This Government will secure more than a full return for the use of this money. In the first place, it should be clearly borne in mind that this money is not to be spent. It is to be loaned and repaid to the United States with interest as soon as Russian economic life is reconstituted. In the second place, unless the Russian railways are maintained and every effort made to foster the rehabilitation of Russian industry and commerce, it will be years and years before Russia again becomes a market for the foreign trade of the United States. The closing of the Russian markets has been a serious blow to our foreign commerce, and every dollar spent to restore orderly conditions and the resumption of commercial activity in that country will be a tenfold gain to the commerce of the United States. It will reopen one of the great world markets to the manufacturers and producers of the United States. The money presently involved is negligible in comparison with the benefits which will accrue to the United States as a result of the proposed loan to the Siberian railways.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the legal attitude in which we find ourselves. This money has been given to the President as a con-

tingent fund. It can be expended for any purpose for which the President may see fit and proper to spend it. He might spend it for things which you might think to be foolish; he might spend it for things which would not be indorsed by anybody. Congress gives this fund without strings and without limitation or proviso. The President of the United States, of course, is responsible to the Congress for the manner in which he expends the money. He can be called upon to tell how and for what purpose he expended it. He will then willingly and fully account for it. What could you do if the President should to-morrow draw this money out of the Treasury? You would be absolutely helpless if the warrant were drawn now before this bill should pass and the money should be paid. But it is charged that it is not a war measure. Acting Secretary Polk—and I shall ask permission at the proper time to put his letter in the RECORD—said Mr. John F. Stevens, before the war closed and during the Kerensky government, when we were endeavoring to give to those people who were friendly to the Entente, our people, aid and assistance, and we agreed to send the $100,000,000 worth of food to the Kerensky government, which was succeeded by the Kolchak government; that we would furnish the supplies, but that as incident to that it was absolutely essential and necessary that we should have transportation, and this is but a consummation of the matter we had commenced to take over a year ago before the close of the war. Now, we can not, I take it, as the Congress, put ourselves in the attitude of repudiating a position which we have taken, after having given to the President of the United States the right to use this money according to his own conscience, to use this money in a confidential manner.

The reason for giving to the President this fund is the same as that for having given such funds to a President in the past during a war that he might use it instantly, use it for purposes which it would not be wise for the enemy to know, would not be wise for the public generally to know. Now, if the President abuses that confidence, if the President has used it for an improper purpose, then criticism can be made of him, because he is responsible to this Congress and responsible to the American people for the money——

A MEMBER. Can he get the money back?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; he will get the money back. But will gentlemen on the floor of the House put themselves in the attitude before the American people of repudiating the action of the President, repudiating the action of those people representing us in Russia, and say we are going to take the authority away from him without knowing the facts? Congress says, "We ought to know all the facts." On the contrary, I say Congress ought to know all the facts before it repudiates its own Government. When it gives to the President hundreds of millions of dollars in a lump sum to be used as he thinks the interest of the country demands, and he uses $5,000,000, we have no right to take back the money unless we know of some wrongdoing. Before we take it back we ought to know what we are doing.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. We want the facts, and can the gentleman state whether or not this railroad is a Government owned and operated railroad or whether it is a railroad owned by a private corporation?

Mr. SISSON. I have absolutely no information, and from my point of view I do not believe that for the purpose of this legislation at this time it is necessary for the Congress to know, in view of the fact that it has pledged this amount of money which is now in the Treasury; and if the President, acting upon authority given him, acts in an improper manner his responsibility is to his conscience and to the Congress, because as Gen. Washington stated in the very beginning of this Government, when Congress sought to make him tell how he spent certain contingent funds given him, he denied the right of Congress, after vesting him with the right to use it, to know the nature of the expenditures at the time, and it has been so considered from that time to this, and no President—no Federalist, no Whig, no Democratic, no Republican President—has ever been denied the right to spend a contingent fund in time of war according to his own judgment when it was given to him for that very purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I understood the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] yielded me his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has one minute remaining. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for one minute.

Mr. SISSON. Now, gentlemen of this House, assume this responsibility, a very severe responsibility——

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to object to the gentleman going on; I am perfectly willing for him to go on by unanimous consent, but I submit it is not right to proceed under a cession of time from some one else under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this is quite a different proposition, and the Chair rules that this is the same as time allowed in general debate on this proposition.

Mr. DOWELL. But, Mr. Chairman, the allotment was made on a motion to limit the time to a certain number of minutes, and certainly under that the Chair is not able to grant one person more than five minutes under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi to proceed for one minute.

Mr. SISSON. One is not able to say much in one minute, but I do want to say that on the facts stated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the facts which are given by the State Department—and those are the only facts we have, and they are sufficient—but I say without hesitation that if we had absolutely no information at this time that this Congress could not afford in this critical moment to take from the President of the United States this authority, in view of the fact that these negotiations have been going on for all these years. We should not leave the President in the embarrassing attitude—no, not the President but ourselves—yea, together with the other fact, that the food for which we spent the $100,000,000 might not reach the proper destination. Therefore, if I were a Republican and were seeking political advantage, I would certainly give the President that power you have already vested him with by a unanimous vote, and then if he did not use that power with wisdom and discretion you could hold him responsible for it before the American people. I am sure the committee will take this view and strike this item out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print the letter of Acting Secretary Polk on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1919.

Hon. J. P. BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: I have your letter of June 19, 1919, in which you inquire for the facts regarding the agreement this Government has entered into for the restoration of traffic on the Siberian railways and the necessity of the President's having certain funds to carry out the obligations of this Government in the above-mentioned agreement.

In February, 1919, by direction of the President, this department accepted on behalf of the Government of the United States a plan proposed by the Japanese Government for the supervision of the Chinese Eastern and Trans-Siberian railways. A summary of the plan was at once given to the press. The plan proposed that the general supervision of the railways, in that part of Siberia in which the Allies have been operating, shall be exercised by a special interallied committee consisting of representatives from each allied power having military forces in Siberia, including Russia, and the chairman of which shall be a Russian. Under the control of the interallied committee two boards are operating:

First. A technical board, consisting of railway experts, whose duties shall be to administer the technical and economic management of the railways.

Second. A military transportation board for the purpose of coordinating military transportation.

The interallied committee referred to above is now working out a plan for covering such financial arrangements as the seriously impaired condition of the railways require. Strikes are threatened all along the line because the men have not received their pay; Bolsheviks, with the aid of enemy prisoners of war, last summer blew up numerous bridges; repair shops have not been functioning, owing to lack of money and equipment. The representative of the United States on the interallied committee is Mr. Charles H. Smith; the president of the technical board is Mr. John F. Stevens. These two gentlemen have reported that the interallied committee require at once $20,000,000 gold credit as an emergency fund to tide over the situation until a definite financial plan, which is now in course of preparation, can be formulated. They have further reported that $4,000,000 in cash is needed immediately in order to prevent the total collapse of the undertaking.

This Government has informed the Governments of Japan, Great Britain, and France that it is prepared to advance its quota at once and to take such measures as may be necessary to tide over the present emergency until it is definitely ascertained just what financial obligation each Government concerned in the plan will be called upon to assume. Furthermore, the United States, in the same way as other governments concerned, has undertaken to maintain such American officials and railway experts as may be necessary to obtain the results desired. At present the American officials and railway engineers who are concerned in this arrangement include Mr. John F. Stevens and Mr. Charles H. Smith, together with the organization of American railway engineers known as the Russian Railway Service Corps.

If the President is unable to secure at once—and there has already been more delay than was safe—funds necessary to meet this emergency, the reports we have show that our international agreement to attempt to restore the railways will be altogether discredited. I need scarcely say that without the assistance of this Government and the American experts, who figure so largely in the undertaking, the plan will collapse.

The Siberian railways are vital to any attempt to assist the people in Siberia. The wear and tear of four years of war has been followed by depredations and disorders on the part of the Bolsheviki, who last year were receiving important assistance from enemy prisoners of war whom they had released from confinement. The consequence is that railway traffic has almost stopped. Without aid from the associated Governments it will collapse entirely. The result would make it absolutely impracticable to ship those supplies which are so urgently needed by the population, and in addition to render that support to the authorities at Omsk which has just been promised by the President and by the prime ministers of France, Great Britain, Italy, and Japan. Without immediate measures to restore normal economic conditions in Siberia chaos will ensue, which will not only result in additional privations and misery for the population but will also deprive Americans of the opportunities they wish to create in business.

This Government has an international obligation to take part in the restoration of the railways in Siberia. This undertaking is vital for the welfare of the population. I believe no other means so effective could have been devised. I am confident that this effort of the Government is one which the people in this country will heartily approve and support. Consequently I hope Congress will prevent this Government from being discredited in its relations with its associates and in the estimation of the Russian people.

Let me add that our effort in Siberia is a war measure which had its inception when this Government arranged to put the services of Mr. John F. Stevens and the Russian Railway Service Corps at the disposition of the provisional Government of Russia, then headed by Mr. Kerensky in the fall of 1917. Subsequent developments in Siberia, culminating with the attacks of the Bolsheviki and enemy prisoners of war upon Czech and Russian troops, called for some international undertaking to restore the normal economic life of the people and make it possible for them to settle their own affairs. The plan effected in February, 1919, represents the conclusion of negotiations begun last summer, and constitutes an obligation to fulfill a responsibility which we assumed before the signing of the armistice. Negotiations for the signing of peace appear to be approaching a conclusion; conditions in Siberia, however, continue to require the aid of the Allies. The authorities now established there repudiated the Brest-Litovsk treaty, and are to-day holding in confinement German and Austrian soldiers as prisoners of war.

There seems to me no possible question of this Government's obligations in the matter, or of the propriety of the President in this instance using such funds as may be still at his disposal.

I am, my dear Mr. Buchanan,
Very sincerely, yours, FRANK L. POLK.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to inform this committee that if the information read here a moment ago, contained in the letter of the Assistant Secretary of State, had been before the subcommittee on this bill this paragraph would never have appeared in the bill; and I do not believe that there is a member of the Committee on Appropriations who will challenge that statement. Unfortunately, our committee did not get the information until this paragraph got into the bill. We did try to strike it out in full committee, but there was objection. But I want to applaud the manliness and the fairness of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of this committee, when he now sees the light and rises here and asks the committee to strike this paragraph from the bill.

Now, what does it mean, anyway? It is all right for my very able and worthy colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to make light of the Russian people, but he forgets that if the Russian people had not been in the great World War in the first year of it—1914—in all human probability Germany would now be in complete control of Europe and, mayhap, of this great country. We must not forget their contribution in the early hours of the World War, and which is not yet ended, may I say to my good friend from Indiana [Mr. WOOD]. And what does it mean, even if Congress should pass this provision turning back $5,000,000? Do you suppose that the President would ever allow you to get away with it? Why, to-morrow he could draw on the Treasury for this $5,000,000 and keep his compact as a representative of this Government with the other allied Governments. And it is a waste of time and a waste of money, because time spent by Congress means the spending of money to discuss keeping such a provision as this in this bill.

The sundry civil bill will not pass Congress for a couple of weeks, at least; and if a Republican majority is going to be unpatriotic enough to take that money away from the President and not only repudiate him but repudiate a contract entered into by this Government—because he was not only acting as the President of the United States when he entered into this contract with the allied Governments but he was acting as the representative of the Government, and every contract must be executed by some representative—I say that it will be not only a repudiation of the President of the American people but a repudiation of a contract of the American people. And I do not believe there is a single fair, honest Member of this House on the Republican side of the aisle but that will follow the Republican chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who asks that this paragraph be stricken from the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ] is recognized.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, it appears from the gentleman's argument that if a Member on this side of the House does not vote as the gentleman wishes and as he has indicated, then that such dissenting Member has convicted himself of being unfair to the President and as in favor of the repudiation of national obligations. I submit that the disposition of the question in no way concerns the honor of our President, nor does it involve in any sense the integrity or honor of the Government of the United States.

My understanding of the proposition is that if Congress authorizes the expenditure of this vast sum, such action will be tantamount to a committal of the United States Government to the scheme—not temporary, but permanent in character—of financing and rehabilitating that celebrated single-track, blacksnake railroad, the trans-Siberian—a road about 6,000 miles long, extending from Vladivostok to Petrograd, a distance as great as from New York to San Francisco and back again.

If you paid attention—which I know you did—to the reading of the letter of the Assistant Secretary of State, placed in the RECORD, you doubtless observed that its tenor and effect was that the sum of $1,000,000, already advanced by the President, constituted the first or initial contribution, and that four additional millions are to be only so much more, and that after a while the plan will be to further provide a permanent system for the financing of the trans-Siberian and other railroads of Russia.

The administration, in operating its American railroads, has sunk nearly a billion dollars, and in operating the Russian railroads is seeking to commit us to a plan for the permanent financing of these roads, and that may mean the further loss to our Government of millions, if not billions, of dollars.

Permit me to say that if I thought that the payment of this huge sum of $5,000,000 would bring the American soldiers home from Siberia and elsewhere in the Russias before the rigors of another winter set in, I would gladly vote to contribute that sum. [Applause.] The American people are staggering and groaning under a great burden of taxation. They have been patient and long-suffering, but they will not always chide, neither will they withhold their anger forever. The President will be here in a few days, at least so we hope, and when he comes if he can then show us that there is embodied in the proposition an international question that affects the honor or the integrity of our country and the American people, let him do so; let him take us into his confidence and we will not betray him.

But a disclosure of the facts should be made in order that we may judge of the situation. To Congress has been delegated the power to appropriate money, and Congress should be the judge of the propriety of every such appropriation. The American people ought to be informed of the terms and conditions of the contract and as to the ultimate amount of the expenditures to be made, in order that they may be advised concerning the far-reaching consequences of the plan. Let us know how far afield the President, by the terms of the contract, has gone, and then we will be able to act in wisdom and with knowledge and understanding.

That we have squandered money in a great many ways can not be denied, for we have seen waste and extravagance on every hand, and now, to send more money to Russia for the use of the Siberian railroads, can only end in further loss to the Government. We sent these Russians 5,000 railway locomotives, and many of them, I have been told, lie rusting at the port and along the right of way. I submit that it is now high time to call a halt. To continue sending these millions of dollars to the Siberian railroads is like unto pouring water in a rat hole. [Applause.]

The facts germane to the issue now before us seem to be that Congress, at a previous session, appropriated $150,000,000, and placed the same in the hands of the President as a contingent fund. That as to the disposition of a fund of this character the Executive is the sole judge and has plenary power, I admit, but I deny his right to use the fund as a consideration for the execution of a contract that will bind the Government to heavy collateral, contingent, and consequential obligations. The President subsequently transferred of that fund $5,000,000 to the War Trade Board, whose affairs are now in the hands of the Secretary of State.

According to an interallied plan of Great Britain, France, Italy, and the United States an agreement is said to have been made between these governments whereby it was stipulated that

the powers named would advance to the trans-Siberian and one other railroad in Siberia the sum of $20,000,000. Thereupon of the sum of $5,000,000 originally transferred from the contingent fund to the War Trade Board, $1,000,000 thereof was advanced to the Siberian railways with some kind of an understanding that the United States would advance an additional sum of $4,000,000. It is said that the main object sought to be accomplished was and is to keep the Siberian railroads in operation. In the letter of the Assistant Secretary of State, addressed to the chairman of our committee, it is said that "unless we are assured of the success of the interallied plan to rehabilitate these railroads there is scant likelihood that conditions in Siberia will return to normal at any time in the future." And further on in the letter the Assistant Secretary says:

In conclusion, I should emphasize that the present plan does not in any wise contemplate a donation to the Russian railways. The proposal is merely to make a loan to the Russian railways, which will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States with interest, as soon as the economic life of Russia can be reconstructed. Furthermore, these funds will be disbursed under the supervision of our own representative, Mr. John F. Stevens, who is now in charge of the operation of these railways.

From the foregoing excerpts, it is revealed that there is now on foot a plan to "rehabilitate" the Russian railways. And furthermore, that the money heretofore or hereafter advanced is not to be returned to the United States until the economic life of Russia shall have been reconstructed. And, it is further indicated that the funds are being disbursed under the supervision of the representative of the United States Government now in charge of the Russian railways. The truth, therefore, is that our Government is not only operating the railroads of the United States but, acting in conjunction with certain foreign powers, is operating the railroads of Russia. The Assistant Secretary frankly discloses the startling fact that the money already paid, to wit, the sum of $1,000,000, and the further installment of $4,000,000, loaned without security and, as I think, without authority, are not all that is to be contributed by our Government. The letter proceeds thus:

Allow me to add that as soon as the department can ascertain from the interallied committee the definite plan for financing railways, which is now in course of preparation, it is the intention to present the whole matter to Congress for its approval, and such appropriation as may be deemed proper.

Therefore, it clearly appears that we are being led into this vast scheme by a process of induction, insidious in form. First, by an agreement made between our Government and the other three Governments, to advance $20,000,000, of which our share was to be one-fourth, or $5,000,000. Secondly, that $1,000,000 of this has already been paid, and thirdly, that the roads, to all intents and purposes, are being operated by our Government and the other powers, substantially in the manner and to the extent, and, perhaps, with like effect, as our Government is now operating the railways of the United States.

If this Congress shall by its action recognize the validity of the agreement which was thus entered into by allowing the expenditure of $4,000,000 in behalf of that cause, then we will thereby ratify that agreement and irrevocably commit our Government to whatever undertaking has been set on foot.

While the Assistant Secretary says that as soon as the department can ascertain from "the interallied committee" what the plan for financing the Russian railroads is, which plan is now in course of preparation, then it is the intention of that department to submit the matter to Congress. When that plan is submitted to Congress will it not then be urged that objection comes too late; that on account of the delay we can not demur; that to refuse to fulfill the agreement and approve the plan would amount to a repudiation of the President and of a national obligation, and that any Member who does not vote to sustain such agreement and plan is unfair to the President and is a repudiation?

How many of the American people have knowledge of the fact that we are engaged in operating the Russian railroads, one of which is by far the longest in the world? The news comes as a great surprise to me, as I know it does to you.

If our representatives in Russia in handling the railroads there meet with no greater success than has attended the efforts of those operating the American railroads on Government account, then we may be assured that the foreign project will not be favored with great success.

I can readily see why many of my colleagues may hesitate to say "no" when we are confronted with the appealing protest of the Secretary, who warns us of the ominous consequences that may follow our refusal to ratify the President's action—not only the loss of $1,000,000 already invested, but national honor as well, they say, will be jeopardized. But, Mr. Chairman, I was sent here by a constituency that demand—and justly demand, as I think—that retrenchment should begin and that extravagant demands upon the Treasury must be met by a stern refusal upon our part and that wherever possible appropriations should be severely pruned with an intelligent but courageous hand. Acting under these convictions, I shall vote "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. May we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without oujection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 92, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including as a part thereof this memorandum on the subject.

Mr. WALSH. Is that the memorandum that was read?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it is a different memorandum.

Mr. WALSH. Is it in the hearings?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. It was handed to me since, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.: For remodeling paint shop, providing necessary machinery, and converting it into a woodworking shop, $20,000.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 51, line 19, after the word "For," strike out "remodeling" and the words "providing necessary machinery, and converting it into a woodworking shop, $20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, the situation at the Watertown Arsenal illustrates the trouble that a committee gets into when it simply copies a bill which went through at the last session.

Now, I realize that the Committee on Appropriations, in order to get its bills into the House and through the House and Senate before the 1st of July, was not able to hold extensive hearings upon all the items; but I think that I can explain this particular matter to the chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations, so that they can see that it would be unwise to leave these items affecting the Watertown Arsenal the way they were in the last bill and the way they are in this bill. I have in my hand a letter from the office of the Chief of Ordnance similar in tenor to a letter recently received by me from the commandant of the Watertown Arsenal, one paragraph of which I desire to read:

Upon the preparation of the revised estimates for the consideration of the Sixty-sixth Congress, the commanding officer at the Watertown Arsenal requested the amount of $20,000 for remodeling the paint shop and converting it into a woodworking shop be withdrawn, as the necessity of the same had disappeared, and in place of the same $25,000 be appropriated for a new paint shop.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that paragraph that I have just read refers to this particular amendment that I have just offered. In other words, the situation has entirely changed since the original estimate was made before the committee at the last session. The necessity for a woodworking shop with expensive machinery no longer exists, but there is a necessity for the expenditure of $25,000 for a new, fireproof, up-to-date paint shop. The Government has expended an enormous amount of money on the Watertown Arsenal. I doubt if the plant there could be duplicated for $50,000,000. Twelve new buildings were erected during the war, and the paint shop is the same old paint shop that they had during the War of 1812, and it is not fireproof. They have been getting along the best they could. Now, with the additional buildings that have been constructed and the additional work that is required, it is absolutely essential that they have a paint shop that is adequate to the needs and somewhere near fireproof. The amendment which I have offered only increases the appropriation by $5,000; that is, the committee gave

the arsenal $20,000 in the bill at the last session of Congress, and they have simply copied the item in this bill, and I simply suggest striking out the words providing for the making over of the old paint shop into a woodworking shop, so that the item will read as amended, "For paint shop, $25,000." I trust with this explanation the committee will be willing to accept this amendment and not oppose it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, that program that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] has suggested would lead to the rankest kind of extravagance. Last year all that the War Department asked—and everybody knows that it always asks for more than it expects to get—all that it asked for the paint ship was $6,000, and now the gentleman comes in and wants to appropriate for the paint shop, that they do not need, $25,000, when nobody except the gentleman from Massachusetts has ever suggested to anybody that they needed a paint shop at all.

The War Department came before the committee and said, "We do not need this paint shop, and we want to remodel it into a woodworking shop, and we want $20,000 for that purpose." Now the gentleman comes—and this is the first time the committee has heard of it—without any estimate from the War Department, and wants $25,000 of cool cash for a paint shop that the War Department says it does not want.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For bar-stock storage shed with necessary facilities, $50,000.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 51, line 22, after the word "facilities," strike out "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$76,000."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to state that no opportunity was given by the Committee on Appropriations in this Congress for the revised estimates to be submitted. I have a letter to that effect from the commandant of the Watertown Arsenal and also one from the office of the Chief of Ordnance. There was no opportunity given for the presentation of the present needs of this arsenal. The item of $6,000 in last year's estimates to which the gentleman from Iowa refers was for a temporary paint shop to be used while the old paint shop was being made over into a woodworking shop and until a new permanent paint shop could be provided.

Now, there is an absolute need for the amount that I suggested in the amendment which has just been defeated, and there is a still greater need for the amount asked for in this second amendment, which I have just proposed. At the last session the lowest bid for this bar-stock storage shed that could be obtained was $63,000, and the Ordnance Bureau, which was given a hearing at that time—and I had the opportunity, through the courtesy of the chairman of the committee, to be present—stated that fact to the committee, and yet the committee arbitrarily cut it down to $50,000.

Now, there is no place in which to keep materials in that arsenal. They are dumped right out on the ground—iron, steel, and other raw materials necessary for the work in that arsenal. We ordinarily have snow in that section of the country during a good part of the winter, and when the employees need anything in the way of material they frequently are obliged to have a lot of workmen sent out to shovel off the snow, and then hunt for what they want instead of having, as any well-ordered private business establishment would have, a storage house and yard, where all these materials can be kept in an orderly manner and obtained when needed.

Now, since that $63,000 estimate or bid was obtained, the cost of materials and of labor has risen to such an extent that $76,000 is the lowest possible price that that storage shed can be erected for.

Therefore I have made the motion that the amount be made $76,000. The committee simply copied the item from the last bill, making it $50,000, when even at that time $63,000 was the smallest amount that it could be built for. What is the use of putting an item into this bill for the construction of a building which the committee, by its own action, has thus admitted the necessity for, and appropriating only $50,000 when the building can not be built for less than $76,000? You might just as well leave out the item altogether.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is perfect folly for the United States Government to invest large sums of money in navy yards and arsenals if it is not going to make them efficient—if we as representatives of the people are unwilling to spend the money necessary to allow them to do effective work. The amount mentioned in my amendment is simply the amount which is necessary to erect this shed. It is of no use to keep in here the item of $50,000, because the building can not be built for that amount and the committee knows it. It is simply camouflage, and I trust my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if the statement of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] is true, that the estimates for this construction were $76,000 instead of the $50,000 carried in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that he is perfectly aware of the statute requiring the manner in which estimates shall be submitted. The chairman of no committee can prevent any officer of the Government from submitting an estimate in the manner provided by law, and, so far as I know, the Committee on Appropriations has not asked any executive officer not to submit estimates. We have had a great many estimates on this bill since the bill failed in the last Congress, and gave as extensive hearings as our time permitted. As to this item no estimate was submitted as required by law, and no one appeared before the committee asking a hearing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to strike out the last two words. I want to say just a word on this matter along the line of what has been said by my distinguished colleague [Mr. DALLINGER]. In this morning's paper I find a report of the conditions in the country, and, among other things, it tells the changes that have come about in the purchasing price of the dollar. I think these facts should be recognized by the committee and the House when they are dealing with these problems. When I was mayor of Boston, I had quite an experience, because the city council at various times refused to give the mayor money enough to make improvements based upon the engineers' estimates, and the result was invariably that the city lost money, and there was, in addition to that, a lot of time wasted and public interests were neglected. Now, this is what this morning's paper says:

What has been the decrease in the value of the dollar since the beginning of the European war? According to a "History of prices during the war—international price comparison," a pamphlet prepared in cooperation by the Department of Commerce and the War Industries Board, the price of 150 commodities chosen advanced in the United States from 100 in August, 1914, to 207.

There is an increase of 100 per cent. I read in the paper that 1,300,000 men, mostly laborers and mechanics, are to leave this country, and there is hardly a day's paper which does not tell of strikes calling for increases of wages; and they are to be given. Under these circumstances, I repeat, what common sense is there in wasting time appropriating money for improvements when it is obvious that they can not be made for the money appropriated? Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the Members who are responsible for the reporting of these bills will give this question of increased prices the consideration which it deserves.

Mr. GOOD. Let us have a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civilian employees: For interment, or of preparation and transportation to their homes or to such national cemeteries as may be designated by proper authority, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, of the remains of officers, cadets, United States Military Academy, including acting assistant surgeons and enlisted men in active service; interment, or of preparation and transportation to their homes, of the remains of civil employees of the Army in the employ of the War Department who die abroad, in Alaska, in the Canal Zone, or on Army transports, or who die while on duty in the field or at military posts within the limits of the United States; interment of military prisoners who die at military posts; for the interment and shipment to their homes of remains of enlisted men who are discharged in hospitals in the United States and continue as inmates of said hospitals to the date of their death, and for interment of prisoners of war and interned alien enemies who die at prison camps in the United States; removal of remains from abandoned posts to permanent military posts or national cemeteries, including the remains of Federal soldiers, sailors, or marines, interred in fields or abandoned private and city cemeteries; and in any case where the expenses of burial or shipment of the remains of officers or enlisted men of the Army who die on the active list are borne by individuals, where such expenses would have been lawful claims against the Government, reimbursement to such individuals may be made of the amount allowed by the Government for such services out of this sum, but no reimbursement shall be made of such expenses incurred prior to July 1, 1910, $8,451,000: *Provided*, That during the continuance of the present war the above provision shall be applicable in cases of officers and enlisted men on the retired list of the Army who have died or may hereafter die while on active duty by proper assignment.

Mr. HULINGS. I move to strike out the last word, in order that I may have an opportunity to ask the chairman of the committee whether this paragraph provides for the burial expenses

of Red Cross nurses, Knights of Columbus, Young Men's Christian Association, and other persons similarly employed on the other side?

Mr. GOOD. A large part of the $8,451,000 is for bringing home the remains of men in the military service. It does not apply to persons not in the military service.

Mr. HULINGS. Then I move to insert after the semicolon, in line 20, page 55, the words "Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, Knights of Columbus, Salvation Army, or members of the Jewish Relief Society employed as nurses in the military service."

Mr. GOOD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HULINGS. We ought to provide for the burial and bringing home of these nurses.

Mr. SISSON. Has the amendment been reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has not been reported; but the gentleman has the floor.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield until the amendment is reported, so that we may see what he is talking about?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULINGS: Page 55, line 20, after the word "service," insert "Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, Knights of Columbus, Salvation Army, or members of the Jewish Relief Society employed as nurses in the military service."

Mr. GOOD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, you will notice that in line 21 it provides for the interment or preparation and transportation to their homes of the remains of civil employees of the Army in the employ of the War Department who die abroad. This simply provides for the same attention being given to the remains of those who did the splendid work over there. I understand some of these societies by appointment of Gen. Pershing undertook certain military work. You can hardly ever hear an Army man who returns from over there but that speaks in the highest praise, especially, of the Salvation Army nurses who have ministered to them oftentimes at the very front. I think this does not include civil employees, and it is a very proper place to introduce it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, where the remains of civil employees are brought back they are the civil employees of the Government of the United States. The remains of the persons referred to in the gentleman's amendment are not employees of the Government of the United States, but are employees of the Young Men's Christian Association, the Jewish Relief Society, the Knights of Columbus, and so forth. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is not germane and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. HULINGS. I want to say that I understand the Red Cross and the Young Men's Christian Association were specifically employed by Gen. Pershing to do certain work.

Mr. GOOD. If they are, they will come under the provisions of the law.

Mr. HULINGS. I think the people were employed by the societies and in a very much larger sense by the people of the United States, and I think proper attention and respect should be shown to their remains.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For care, protection, and maintenance of Confederate Stockade Cemetery, Johnstons Island, in Sandusky Bay, Ohio, $250.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 57, line 5, by striking out the figures "$250" and inserting in lieu thereof "$350."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For ordinary care of Franklin Park, $1,500.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I would like to know how many appropriations are made of this kind outside of the District of Columbia bill. We are appropriating $7,500,000 for the District of Columbia, and in this bill numerous other appropriations.

Mr. GOOD. The District bill I do not think carries an appropriation for property of the United States. This is the property of the United States, and the appropriation is for its maintenance, and those appropriations have always been carried in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. JUUL. This is an additional appropriation in the District of Columbia bill?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. Does the gentleman know how much is carried in this bill in addition to what is carried in the District of Columbia bill?

Mr. GOOD. There is about $400,000 carried in this bill, of which the District pays one-half, and these items, as I say, have always been carried in the sundry civil bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

To provide for the increased cost in park maintenance, $25,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question about this item. This item is not carried in the current law, is it?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; for the same amount.

Mr. SISSON. Was it an item that went into the current law?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; at the same figures; it has been carried for two years. This year it was carried at $25,000 and the prior year $15,000, and it was to take care simply of the increase in wages.

Mr. SISSON. It carries the increases that they have had for the last two years?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extension of the bathhouse at the Tidal Basin bathing beach, $10,000.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the gentleman tell us how much of an extension that will be at the Tidal Basin?

Mr. GOOD. That will add 50 per cent to the bathhouse facilities on the men's side. They asked for $20,000, which would have doubled the men's bathhouse facilities. There is quite a demand for an increase of bathhouse facilities, and the committee felt that it was altogether likely that they did not need double the capacity, but would need as much as 50 per cent. It adds 265 lockers to the bath facilities.

Mr. VAILE. I want to say that I was down there the other day and there were 343 young men in line waiting to get at the ticket window, and more than 50 girls. I asked a young man how long it would take to get to the window and he said an hour and a half, and there was not more than one-third of them then in line.

Mr. GOOD. I will say that this appropriation would not enable them to construct locker facilities for this year. It is not proposed to do it and they say they can not do it.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why all these minor appropriations carried in the sundry civil bill are not carried where they properly belong, in the District of Columbia bill, or why all the items in the District of Columbia bill are not carried in this bill. Here we are appropriating for the District of Columbia in two bills in the city of Washington.

Mr. GOOD. This is not the property of the city of Washington. While it is located in the city of Washington it is the property of the United States, and the appropriations are to take care of the United States property. In such cases those items are always carried in the sundry civil bill and not in the District of Columbia bill.

The District has nothing to do with this bathhouse. Of course it does pay one-half of the expense, but it is the property of the United States.

Mr. JUUL. That is exactly as it is with other items.

Mr. GOOD. It pays half the item, and they contribute one-half of the $400,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those items to which I have not made objection, but it strikes me that this item ought to be carried either in the District of Columbia appropriation bill or that the District ought to pay for it wholly out of its revenue, as the playgrounds and other activities of that kind are paid for. At least it ought to be paid for under the present law, if we can not get the half-and-half principle abolished.

Mr. GOOD. It is paid for under the present half-and-half policy.

Mr. SISSON. I do not see any provision for that.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look on page 63 he will find on line 13 that one-half of the foregoing items are paid for in that way.

Mr. SISSON. That is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Building where Abraham Lincoln died: For painting and miscellaneous repairs, $200.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this paragraph for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question. Has this appropriation been carried before in the sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. GOOD. This appropriation, I am advised, has been carried for a great many years in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. MAPES. Upon what theory? It is a private enterprise, is it not?

Mr. GOOD. The Government owns the building, and it is upon the theory that this is to preserve the building.

Mr. MAPES. My understanding is that the Government does not own the building, and that it is owned by a private individual and used for the purpose of making revenue, and that everyone is charged for entering the building.

Mr. GOOD. My understanding is that the Government owns the building, but it is operated or maintained in a way by a private individual, who takes care of the exhibit and charges a fee for persons who view the exhibit there, but that the property is the property of the Government.

Mr. MAPES. I did not know that it was.

Mr. GOOD. That is my information.

Mr. MAPES. The owner of what is inside the building, the Lincoln relics, and so on, is an individual.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I think they are owned by the person who has them on exhibition, but the Government owns the property.

Mr. MAPES. Is the building rented to that individual?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think so; I think the individual is permitted to occupy the building and exhibit these relics to the public who come to see them. He pays no rent.

Mr. MAPES. Would it not be better for the Government to own the whole institution and cease the charge made to the public?

Mr. GOOD. It would seem that relics of that kind ought to be in the National Museum, where everybody could see them without cost. It is a very slight item and has been carried for a good many years.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that my understanding is that they do not make a fixed charge at this place, but that it is voluntary in its character.

Mr. BEGG. Oh, no; the charge is 25 cents.

Mr. MAPES. I think the gentleman will find that it is a fixed charge of 25 cents.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lincoln Memorial: For commencing construction of the Lincoln Memorial reflecting pool, $200,000, to be available until expended.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph commencing on line 13 and ending on line 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The point of order is that there is no law authorizing that appropriation; that it is entirely new legislation and not in response to any statute of the United States. If the Chair desires to hear the act in respect to the Lincoln Memorial read, I have it here before me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks he understands the act.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Permit me to state, Mr. Chairman, that I am governed by no narrow spirit in this matter. I believe that a reflecting pool down there, such as that depicted in the hearings, will be an eyesore instead of a beauty spot. It is proposed to maintain it through seepage, for moss to grow in and frogs to croak in. It would be more beautiful ornamented with roses or grass. Do not consider me as not wanting to render to Abraham Lincoln all of his merits. I admire greatness, whether I agree with its views or not. I hope that his fame will be as eternal as the stars that light his grave.

Mr. GOOD. Mr Chairman, this is a part of the general scheme of park improvements. It is not a part of the memorial itself. It is simply a part of the landscaping scheme in proximity to the monument itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does this appropriation go beyond the limit of cost fixed for the Lincoln Memorial?

Mr. GOOD. It goes beyond the limit of cost fixed for the Lincoln Memorial itself, but it is not a part of the Lincoln Memorial. It is a part of the landscaping adjacent to the Lincoln Memorial. What is proposed to be done is this: It is proposed to create in the park leading up to the Lincoln Memorial a pool about 160 feet wide and 2,000 feet long. It is proposed to take the earth from this place and move it up around the base of the Lincoln Memorial, where they need it. Under the law they are authorized to get dirt to fill in around the base of the memorial, and all this is a proposition to dig out a pool and take the dirt from it and fill in around the memorial. It would be just as much in order as to construct a road through the park, and you can construct a road through a park without authorization for expenditures. It is not offered as a part of the Lincoln Memorial at all. The Lincoln Memorial was constructed on certain plans and specifications, and this is not a part of the plan, but is a part of the general scheme of landscaping in the park. It is spoken of as the Lincoln Memorial reflecting pool, because it is so close to the Lincoln Memorial that the water which fills the pool will reflect the image of the memorial itself.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, if it is no part of the Lincoln Memorial, why do they call it that? It is called that in the very act itself. Here is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations seeking to repudiate his own work and his own name. Now, in addition to that, what authority of law have we on an appropriation bill to pass legislation to construct a reflecting lake for anything? I have investigated so far as I could all the laws upon the statute books relative to the care of parks, and I can not find any law which authorizes this Congress, in an appropriation bill, to provide for the construction of a lake or a reflecting pool, so it is subject to the point of order, whether viewed from the Lincoln Memorial standpoint or whether viewed from the park standpoint.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, surely no Member of the House will contend it would be out of order for the superintendent of a park to elevate or terrace 1,000 or 2,000 feet of the park. If there was waste material and he wants to terrace some part of the park to the extent of 2 or 3 feet, why surely no one would say he had not the right to do that. If he states that he wants to use part of the material over in another part of the park and as a result of the use of that material he makes a reflecting pool, why surely that is in order under the general care of a park.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order against the words "to be available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks, regardless of whether the paragraph is subject to the point of order or not on the question of developing the park, that the language "to be available until expended" would make it subject to the point of order, and hence sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph after line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, after line 12, insert the following language:

"For commencing construction of a reflecting pool in West Potomac Park, $200,000."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on it.

The CHAIRMAN. As the appropriation is in pursuance of a work in progress, namely, the development of park work, the Chair thinks this amendment would not be subject to the point of order. It is in the nature of a work in progress of developing the park, and the Chair would hold the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Chair has ruled the amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

One-half of which sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GOOD. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized on this amendment. Now, gentlemen, I want the committee to know something about the history of this matter. I am not going to weary the committee by reading at any great length from the debate. When this matter first came before the Congress it was thoroughly debated, and $2,000,000 was granted by the Congress with the absolute assurance that that $2,000,000 would complete the Lincoln Memorial. Notwithstanding, this amendment is now offered as a park improvement; you all know that under the guise of that amendment it is a pool to be made as a reflecting pool, according to the testimony, for the Lincoln Memorial. Now, first I call attention to the fact that in asking for the $200,000 gentlemen are not absolutely candid with the House, because they say that perhaps as this pool will take the water in through seepage, and if it does the $200,000 will be ample; if not, they may have to concrete the bottom and take water from the city and ask at least $500,000 more if they do. What I would like to see done by this Government in modern times is some memorial or monument of this kind completed within the amount appropriated and Congress treated fairly.

But unfortunately this does not happen. Some Congressman who is unwilling to debate the merits of the proposition will raise a sectional issue or will accuse some one of lack of patriotism if they do not vote the additional sum asked for. Or else will contend that any sum of money, however great, will be voted by him to commemorate the memory of this great hero, no matter

who he is. In this way, in this case, at this time, I doubt not that you will hear men on the floor of the House contend that they will cheerfully vote any sum of money to build a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, but endeavor to leave the impression that every man who does not vote for this additional $200,000 does not want to build a memorial to Abraham Lincoln. If this does not occur, it will be contended that opposition to this $200,000 means that you do not want to complete this great memorial. All of this is not argument. And, indeed, it is not fair to the Congress or to the people. The Congress voted $2,000,000 to erect to the memory of Abraham Lincoln a memorial that would command the respect and admiration of civilized men the world over. It was agreed at the time that the appropriation was originally granted that $2,000,000 was too vast a sum to be expended for this purpose. It was truthfully contended at the time that nowhere on earth could any such sum be rivaled as the amount that Congress was then asked to appropriate. Nevertheless, Congress did vote this vast sum, but the Members that cast their votes for the amount at the time had the definite, positive, absolute, and certain assurance that the $2,000,000 would fully complete the memorial and all the grounds thereto, and that no additional sum would have to be asked.

During the debate on February 15, 1916, Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, stated that "it was intended that this sum should provide a completed memorial, and the act was so determined and construed that when the memorial was completed everything should have been provided that was essential. When the bill that passed the House on February 7, 1911, was under consideration, Mr. McCall, who had charge of that bill, stated that he would construe it as meaning that the commission was to provide for a memorial of a very imposing character and that we might contemplate providing plans for a memorial that would cost $2,000,000, grounds, site, and all other accessories. The site was furnished by the Government, in addition to the $2,000,000. So that the amount available for the memorial was not encroached upon by expenditure for a site." So you see, gentlemen of the House, that in selecting a site on ground belonging to the Federal Government the commission saved the purchase of the site and the entire $2,000,000 went into the memorial. When the plans and specifications were prepared, and after various discussions in the commission and sundry changes, they finally agreed upon a plan, and that plan provided for a completed memorial within the $2,000,000. This memorial plan was presented to the Committee on Appropriations, and connected with the plan was a picture as the building would look when completed. And so, gentlemen of the House, in the debate on February 15 the Members of Congress felt that they had not been treated fairly, for the commission ought to have, after all these assurances and all the discussions in reference to the matter, had this memorial completed within the $2,000,000. But, no; the people who were making the plans and enjoying the fruits of the contract and drawing the salaries had no idea of letting the Congress off with this $2,000,000. It looked to Members of Congress then as if it was deliberately planned to leave the memorial in such shape that Congress would be compelled to grant the additional large sum.

They knew that by conjuring with the great name of Lincoln they would be able to get any additional sum that they might ask for. I do not believe that all of the commissioners—perhaps none of them—realized exactly what was being done, but when this matter did come up in the House on the 15th of February there was quite a good deal of discussion, and the feeling was rather high, because those Members who were connected with the Appropriations Committee realized that they had been deceived. At the time this great sum of money was first allowed there was no objection to the memorial to Abraham Lincoln from any quarter of the country. The only discussion was as to the amount. This sum was so vast that many Members of Congress did have opposition, not to the memorial, but to the amount expended. So that the assurance was doubly sure by all those who had charge of the bill that this $2,000,000 was to make a completed job, and when they asked for this additional $594,000, many Members of Congress, especially Mr. Fitzgerald, the chairman of the committee, and Mr. GILLETT, the present Speaker of the House, were very strong in their statements in reference to the manner in which the engineers and architects had dealt with Congress.

I am certain, gentlemen of the committee, that if they had not had behind them the great shades of Abraham Lincoln they would not have dared to ignore the manifest and unquestioned wish, desire, and determination of Congress, as expressed in the original debate, which granted the $2,000,000. And when this matter of the additional $594,000 was being testified to in the committee, and, as I remember, the Committee on Appropriations in the House declined to grant the additional $594,000, Gen. Harts, when he was before the committee, testified that even at that time the memorial could be completed within the appropriation. That was at the time when Gen. Harts, who was the engineer in charge of the Capitol Building and Grounds, testified, as I say, before the committee that the Lincoln Memorial could be completed as per plans and specifications within the $2,000,000.

I have not time to give all the details. I wish I could; and no one, in my judgment, would feel that Congress had been treated fairly.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, the discussion on this floor will be conducted by those who are advocating this additional sum for the purpose of convincing the gentlemen of the committee and the people of the country that those of us who do not feel that this appropriation should be made at this time are the ones not acting in good faith. Indeed, it is painful to me to see how men will declaim on Abraham Lincoln and use his great name to put over a scheme like this. The whole record connected with this memorial in deliberately planning to spend more than $2,000,000 does not do credit to those who planned the whole project. Those who had charge of the work evidently deceived the commissioners. I do not know whether it was the architect, the contractor, or the Fine Arts Commission. But I do know that Mr. CANNON, who was Speaker at the time the original $2,000,000 was appropriated, was made a member of the commission by virtue of the fact that he was Speaker, and then afterwards when Mr. CLARK became the next Speaker they were both on this commission.

Both of these gentlemen insisted that the Lincoln Monument should be completed within the limit of cost, but the Fine Arts Commission and the other members of the commission insisted that certain material, about which there was quite a long controversy, should be used instead of material which was nearer and cheaper and could be had less freight rate, so that it could not be completed within the limit of cost. A reference to the RECORD shows that Mr. CANNON stated upon the floor of the House, and so did Mr. CLARK, that they were in favor of completing this Lincoln Memorial within the limit of cost, but they were voted down by the other commissioners. Now, they first asked for $900,000 additional, but that was not looked upon with favor, and they reduced it to $594,000, I believe. Now, after quite a controversy about being betrayed in that manner, Mr. Fitzgerald, then chairman of the committee, said after this magnificent sum had been appropriated, a sum never appropriated before by any nation on earth to build a marvelously beautiful memorial to this great and good man, to this man who really does not need a memorial for the perpetuation of his memory but may need a memorial to call the attention of those who come after him to his virtues, in his name they came to get five hundred and odd-thousand dollars additional for the purpose of making a change in the whole plan, and Congress was then assured that this would complete the memorial, would complete the grounds, and the debate at that time showed—because I have it all before me—the chairman of the committee, Mr. Fitzgerald, insisted that that should be done.

The five hundred thousand and odd dollars was seriously opposed by Mr. GILLETT, now the Speaker of the House. Mr. Fitzgerald insisted, in view of the testimony of Gen. Harts, in view of the report of the commission, that under the then plan the Lincoln Memorial could be completed; but notwithstanding that fact, the five hundred thousand and odd dollars was given; and in the debate with Mr. Slayden, Mr. GILLETT, Mr. CANNON, and many other Members taking part, among many other things Mr. GILLETT said:

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe, as I am sure everyone else does, most heartily to the beautiful tribute which was paid by our leader to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, but I deny that a vote upon this question is any test of either a man's patriotism or of his admiration and reverence of that great man.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will if I can get a little time.

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman opposed to this appropriation?

Mr. SISSON. I am; yes. I hope I have made myself clear on that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. It is a matter of importance and there is some history connected with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. GILLETT further said:

I yield to no man in my respect for his memory, but I feel it my duty to vote against this proposition. [Applause.] I do not think anyone pretends that the memorials we build to our national heroes are at all commensurate with their services for us. I do not think anyone

pretends that the amount of money we vote for a memorial measures at all our gratitude. No money could measure that. We only decide what is a fair, liberal amount to build a memorial. If $2,000,000 had not been thought enough, I would gladly have voted originally for any additional amount, but when Congress has once fixed it I do not want any executive authority to try to increase it. Congress decided that $2,000,000 would build a beautiful and fitting tribute to one of our greatest Presidents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had every reason to expect—at least, I expected—when this commission was appointed, consisting of some of the most distinguished citizens of this country, that for once, for once the executive body would carry out the will of Congress. We are constantly criticizing here—I believe the Appropriations Committee feel it more than others—but we are constantly criticizing the executive tendency not to abide by the will of Congress in appropriations. When an appropriation is passed for some object the executive departments always seem to be striving to exceed the appropriations, striving to make some plan by which they can come before us and compel us to further what they desire. It is not peculiar to this or any administration. I believe the most flagrant instance of it in Washington is our present Agricultural Department Building. It is an executive tendency, and Congress always is enraged by it, as we have the right to be. When this commission was appointed I thought at last we had a commission that would conform to the will of Congress. I appreciate what our distinguished ex-Speaker said, and I appreciate the delicacy of his position. I venture to say that if he had had the running of that commission a beautiful and satisfactory memorial would have been built, with all of its accessories, within the $2,000,000. Some of my most intimate friends are upon this commission, and yet I am mortified by their conduct. I think from the beginning it was obvious from what our ex-Speaker said that there was an expectation that they would come before us for an increased appropriation. Now, they ought to have done one of two things. They ought, as he said, to have cut the garment according to the cloth, or they ought originally to have come back to Congress and said that they could not construct such a memorial as we wished for that money and they wanted more, and undoubtedly Congress would have given more, if necessary; but for them to go on and commit us to a plan and then come back and claim that they can not complete it within the appropriation is most censurable.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts, the present Speaker of the House, that Congress is not treated fairly; that Congress, having appointed the commission, and two commissioners having seats in the House at that time, were insisting that the memorial should be completed within the appropriation, but that, notwithstanding that fact, they changed the plan by tearing down certain steps and having the ground moved up around the memorial. You know how high it is built. If you saw the picture that was presented here at that time, you would remember there was a provision for certain marble steps. They decided that the marble steps would be entirely too high, and so they proposed to make a hill. I asked somebody now, "Will you go down to the memorial now and tell anyone where the $594,000 has gone?" It looks to me about in the same condition it was in when they asked for the $594,000. Of course, there has been some work. Take it from me, that when they place this pool there you are going to be called upon to appropriate $500,000 more. And I am unwilling that this great national hero, I am unwilling that this great man whose name everybody throughout the world reveres, should be made the means and should be used as the tool to get this $200,000, when the testimony shows conclusively that you will not be able to build this pool for $200,000 if there is not sufficient seepage to fill it full, and that you will have to put a concrete bottom in it, and that you will have to arrange pumps, and you will have to buy water from the city to keep it full. This will be a constant heavy expense. Just think, all this in addition to the two million five hundred and ninety-four thousand already appropriated when by every code of honor and decency this monument should have been completed within the $2,000,000 as promised and pledged.

So, gentlemen of the committee, I do think there ought to be a let-up to these monuments built to our great and our mighty dead, and one ought to be completed and the commission taken off the pay roll. If you read these debates you will find that Congress was given assurance that this sum would complete it. But some years have elapsed since that, and Members have died and the House changed so that the majority are now new Members.

Now, to make this in order here now it is necessary to change the very language and change the very purpose for which you are appropriating the money. And yet when you do it you are making an appropriation for park improvement when the language carried in the bill, that was stricken out on a point of order, shows that it was a necessary and integral part of the Lincoln Memorial, and that but for the Lincoln Memorial no pool would have been thought of. So it is a part of the parking system now, but you still call upon the name of Lincoln to justify it.

I ask this committee, in view of the fact that we have appropriated $594,000, with no statement to show how much they have used, with no one able to show how much is on hand and for what it has been spent, and with these commissioners getting a salary of $7,500 a year each, should we grant this appropriation? For, if we do, how long will they want to continue it? In God's name, let us have one memorial completed somewhere near the amount originally appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, it is a rather peculiar proceeding to witness the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], who a few moments ago rose to defend the action of the President in making available $5,000,000 for fear that to withhold that money might embarrass him, speak now in opposition to an amendment carrying $200,000 to make and complete a memorial which has been appropriated for and which is nearing completion to "the great emancipator."

Mr. Chairman, since that memorial was begun the land in that vicinity has been utilized for some buildings which were thought necessary in order to house the War and Navy Departments, and it has developed in completing them that to construct a pool in that vicinity, known as a reflecting pool, would add much to the beauty of the memorial which we have provided. Yet the gentleman from Mississippi is unwilling that the plan of the Art Commission, recommended by the official having charge of the parks, should be carried out, even though the cost is but $200,000; and yet at the same time he is willing on the mere pretext that we might embarrass the present Chief Executive, that we should make available $5,000,000 to help finance a "streak of rust" across the plains of Siberia.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I submit that even if the amount were twice that proposed by the commission we ought not to hesitate even at this date to take action to make that memorial more beautiful and more attractive, even if in so doing, perhaps, we recall to the hearts and minds of the American people that we had another great President at another crisis in the Nation's history.

The gentleman has read some remarks made by a former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations which, of course, were appropriate and timely at the time; but conditions have changed since then, and I do not believe, if it were left to a vote, that the American people, including those in the gentleman's own section, would oppose even in the midst of all this profligate expenditure of money—these extravagant appropriations which have been necessary and for which we are responsible and must bear our share—a single objection to the further development and beautification of this park, so that it may be indeed one of the true beauty spots of the Nation's Capital. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I was a member and am still a member of the commission to construct the Lincoln Memorial. Ex-Speaker CLARK was and still is a member of that commission. Ex-President Taft is the chairman, as I recollect it. Some of the members have died, including former Senator Cullom and former Senator Blackburn, since the commission was organized and since the memorial was authorized. Two million dollars, according to my recollection, was the limit of cost.

There was a contest as to where the memorial should be located. Two of us—I think ex-Speaker CLARK and myself—wanted to locate it somewhere near the Soldier's Home on the axis overlooking the Capitol; but other members of the commission were against it, and the architect was dead against it, and a majority of the commission located it in Potomac Park.

Now, Potomac Park is a park authorized by law. The roads were built, and many of the trees were planted. But the memorial was located there, and after it was located there, the limit of cost having been fixed, there came up a question of the kind of marble that should be used in the construction of that building. There was competition amongst contractors. Some bid on Georgia marble, some bid on Tennessee marble, and there was a bid on Colorado marble, and the question was put to the commission to determine what marble should be chosen. As I recollect it, I think ex-Speaker CLARK and myself were in favor of the Georgia marble, but the Art Commission, as it turned out, reported that the Colorado marble was the finest marble on earth for such a purpose, durable and capable of withstanding the effects of storm and the efforts of nature to discolor it. It was contended that there was no other such marble on earth. My recollection is that that marble, transported as it was from away out at the jumping-off place in Colorado, added $400,000 or $500,000 to the expense of the memorial.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman is right about it. It required about $150,000 additional freight expense.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. I am speaking of the expense incident to the marble. But I have become somewhat reconciled, since I have seen the marble, to that expenditure. Anyhow, the Fine Arts Commission, which advised the Lincoln Memorial Commission, as well as a majority of the commission itself, concluded to select the Colorado marble, and that made necessary the additional expenditure, which was appropriated for.

Potomac Park belongs to the Government. The fee belongs to the United States. I was under the impression that Potomac Park was improved at the expense of the United States Treasury alone, but I am informed by one who is better advised than I am that the improvement and maintenance of the park are at the joint expense of the United States Government and the District of Columbia on the half-and-half principle, although the Government owns the park in fee simple. But it does not make much difference about that, because the District will not have to put up its half of this expenditure, though it has more than enough money in the Treasury if that were needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to have about five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. When I first landed in Washington as a Member of Congress the Washington Monument stood not half completed. The patriotic ladies who raised the fund to buy Mount Vernon also had charge of the Washington Monument. It stood for years and years incomplete. I recollect very well that in 1876 John Sherman, in the Senate, offered an amendment appropriating the money to complete that monument. It was on the Fourth of July. There was a session on that day, as we thought that was a good way to celebrate it. Congress appropriated the money necessary to complete the Washington Monument. I have always been glad of it. When completed it was found to be so heavy that it was necessary to do some engineering to strengthen the foundation. I do not recollect exactly what the expense was, but I think it was something like $200,000. But, anyway, it was effectively strengthened, as I think, against earthquake and storm and wind and time, and I believe it will stand as a great monument through the latest generations. [Applause.]

Now, this pool is not a part of the Lincoln Memorial project. It was never estimated for, although I think when I had the honor in a former Congress to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations a proposition was presented, while they were developing this park and planting trees in it and making roads, to make a pool similar to this through the center. But as the Treasury was somewhat hard up at that time my recollection is that I opposed it.

Now the location of the Lincoln Memorial, the foundation going down 50 or 60 feet to the hard rock, makes it secure, and it was concluded to make a hill upon which the memorial should rest. I think that was proper, because the memorial ought to be lifted up somewhat. We did not want it to be dwarfed by the Washington Monument, not far off. We wanted it to be in harmony with the Washington Monument, and greater in size, at least laterally; and all who have looked at it, I am sure, are quite satisfied with what has been done. There was a hill, as I recollect, constructed from dirt. In the main, the dirt was contributed by excavations, dumping places, and cellars, incident to the development of the city, and it cost but little. My recollection is that it practically cost nothing. But now it is necessary to have additional dirt placed around there, and that dirt is to be obtained as the dirt was obtained from which the hill was made, but it can not be done anywhere in the near future, because it would take time to obtain it from the ordinary dumping grounds, and by excavating this pool a great amount of additional dirt can be obtained. Therefore this pool some time or other should be built, in my judgment, because if you take the dirt from the pool, together with what you would obtain otherwise, it could be obtained without expense. Now, if you are to complete the memorial in any reasonable time you have got to buy the dirt and haul it in. Then, if this pool should be constructed in the future—and I believe it will be constructed and ought to be constructed, following the landscape gardeners and experts and the Fine Arts Commission—you will have to dispose of the dirt that is excavated, and will have to haul it away. Upon the whole, I have made up my mind that I will vote for this appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, for one, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] will not be agreed to; and then I hope that the appropriation of $200,000 will be made.

Ever since we have had before us this proposition to build this memorial to Abraham Lincoln we have had a controversy every time anything in connection with it has come before the House, and the controversy has been about the money involved. I remember after the first appropriation had been authorized a very serious attempt was made here to divert it from the construction of a beautiful memorial to the very sordid purpose of building a highway. Fortunately that was voted down. We authorized the $2,000,000. Then in the course of time it came before the House again. The Fine Arts Commission had suggested that there ought to be a different quality of marble than that which had first been suggested, because it would make the memorial more beautiful. That cost some $225,000 extra, as I recall, and that raised a controversy. I was in favor of that. I did not think we could make the memorial too beautiful.

Then came the appropriation of $500,000 additional, and that was controverted. Now we are asked to put this reflecting basin there, which will contribute still further to the beauty of this memorial, and it is proposed to require the people of the District of Columbia to pay half of it. Why, Mr. Chairman, the people of this world, in all the ages to come, in accents new and nations yet unborn, as long as men love liberty, will be erecting memorials and paying tributes to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. Down in my district one small county a few days ago determined to erect a memorial to cost half a million dollars to the memory of the boys who went from that county to fight against Germany. That is just one small county. Yet it is said that the people of these United States, 100,000,000 of them, inspired by the teachings and the example and the character of Abraham Lincoln to spread the light of liberty throughout the world, are unable to appropriate $3,000,000 to build a beautiful memorial and to improve the surroundings so as to make it perfect. And now, when we are called upon to finish out the plan as originally proposed, to make this reflecting basin, which, I well remember, was a part of the original plan, when we are called upon to give the finishing touch to what we hope will be one of the beauty spots of the world, when it is proposed to spend $200,000 or $300,000, or whatever is necessary to complete it, it is suggested, not that the people of all this Nation should bear the burden equally—I should say share the privilege equally—but that the people of the District of Columbia should be called upon to pay half of it. Why, as time goes on and liberty grows and men are happier under its beneficent light, in my opinion this will be a spot to which the peoples of the earth who have come to know liberty and to love it will repair for inspiration, and it ought to be as beautiful in design as it is in purpose. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. I ask that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 12 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, it seems that some of the gentlemen on the floor of the House are trying to put us who are fighting this appropriation in a false attitude. No man is more eager than I am to see built a monument to perpetuate the name of Abraham Lincoln as long as grass grows and water runs. The question is whether this so-called reflecting lake is an improvement or a detriment to it. Let us see what the facts show. There are to be two lakes, one 2,000 feet long and 160 feet wide, and a smaller lake, 200 feet long and 160 feet wide. How deep? From a foot and a half to two feet. What sort of water? Seep water. Let me tell you something. This whole tract used to be a mere seepage from the Potomac River. They hauled dirt there and filled it up. They now propose to take away the same dirt with which they made the fill, dig it down to the seepage, and make a reflecting lake.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will yield, most of that dirt on the Potomac River there was saturated with water that ebbs and flows from the river.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It matters not. They propose to take the same dirt out, dig it down to the original seepage, and then you will have a stagnant pool of seep water under the false name of a reflecting lake. How much more beautiful it would be to have the green verdure of nature to adorn that memorial. How much more beautiful it would be to have roses and the grass and the beautiful trees and vines, which would be more useful and imposing.

Let us see. The Lincoln Memorial has already cost the Government $2,594,000. In addition to this, the cost of the reflecting pool is to be $200,000, in the first instance. If they get it below the seepage-water level, they say it will not be necessary to put a cement foundation to hold the water. If it is not waterproof, if they have to put a waterproof foundation in, it will cost $300,000 more, making $500,000, or a total cost for the memorial and pool of $3,094,000.

Now, right here I am going to make a prediction. If you gentlemen vote to put these lakes there and put them there, in future years a future Congress will vote to fill them up and plant the surrounding grounds in flowers, evergreens, and grass.

Another proposition: Ought you to make an improvement unless it is first submitted to the Lincoln Memorial Commission and have their careful consideration and approval? This has not been submitted to them.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It has been talked about; it was not a part of the memorial, but the landscape was advised by the Fine Arts Commission. In fact, the Fine Arts Commission is advising us all the while.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, yes, it has been talked about; but heaven has been talked about, and so has hell. [Laughter.] What evidence have we that the Fine Arts Commission approve it? Col. Ridley said that they approved it; but did the committee summon them and find out whether they approved it, or whether there was any difference of opinion about it? Gentlemen, in the erection of this monument to one of the greatest men who ever adorned the pages of American history you propose to make a mosquito pond and call it a reflecting pool. If you do that, the responsibility is yours and not mine.

Now, on this amendment just a word. Every park in the District is conducted under the half-and-half plan. Whether you adopt the amendment I care not. If you want to make an exception and put in this reflecting pool, you will exercise your judgment, but it will be an eyesore instead of a beauty spot around the monument. I beg of you to let the Lincoln Memorial Commission and Fine Arts Commission join in some plan to adorn it and then let Congress carry it out, that this monument to Lincoln may be a landmark in the annals of fame. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, every word of objection to the passage of this appropriation comes from this side of the aisle. I do not want the House to think that I as a Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations am in sympathy with the few Democrats on that committee who have opposed this appropriation, and I hope that my tongue will cleave to the roof of my mouth if I ever utter a word of objection to the voting of any sum of money to beautify any monument to the greatest President this country ever had. [Applause.]

My friend from Texas has lost his vocation. He ought to have been an engineer or an artist. The gentlemen who drew up these plans are paid for this sort of work. They have devoted not only the best that was in them to get a proper kind of plan, but they have the patriotism and the love of Lincoln's memory to inspire them in their work, and for one I prefer to yield to their judgment rather than to the judgment of the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

I want the Democratic Members on this side of the House, when they vote on this proposition, to remember that whenever Lincoln's name is brought up here and this memorial is mentioned, opposition always comes from certain gentlemen on this side of the aisle, and I say that it hurts the Democratic Party.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. No.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Well, the gentleman ought not to make statements——

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman has no right to interrupt me.

Mr. RAGSDALE. They are untrue.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is guilty of an infraction of the rules of this committee. Now, I yield.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I want to call the gentleman's attention——

Mr. GALLIVAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman has made a statement, and I would like to have him know if he does not——

Mr. GALLIVAN. I yielded for a question.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am going to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I yielded for a question.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Does the gentleman know that when this bill was last up for consideration I made a speech in favor of an appropriation for it, while Congressman Fitzgerald, of New York, a Democrat from the North, fought it, and not a Member from the South?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I recall with great pleasure the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE], and I was one of those who applauded him, because he was one of the few who spoke for Lincoln's name; but if he will recall, I followed Fitzgerald, of New York, and I opposed the position which he took in opposing that extra appropriation for this memorial. But the gentleman must remember that Mr. Fitzgerald, of New York, was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and ex officio he was the watch dog of the Treasury. He was not animated by that kind of opposition which, I am sorry to say, I fear—I fear is embedded in the hearts of some of those who constantly rise in Congress when the memorial to Abraham Lincoln comes before us for consideration. I hope that my colleagues on the Democratic side will be careful in their votes for this proposition, and, for God's sake, do not let us get in any worse with the American people than we are now by the action of a few of our number. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this reflecting pool will be a success or the failure that is anticipated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN]. I do know that we have one of the greatest landscape architects in the United States on this commission, and it is his opinion, and I understand the opinion of the Fine Arts Commission, that it would greatly add to the beauty of this memorial. I grant the fact that this pool would not be necessary were it not for the Lincoln Memorial, but I am inclined to follow the recommendations of the Fine Arts Commission.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GOOD. I want to say this: If we are to build the pool that is to reflect the monument of Abraham Lincoln, then for God's sake let us not invite some one else to help us pay for it. Let us pay for it willingly out of the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time has expired under the agreement.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, unless some of us can have a chance to speak for the Democratic side, I object.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I will always object when the gentleman wants a half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, let us love one another.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk again reported the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. I have not the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa before me, but if I can see it for a moment I think I can state what my amendment is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk again reported the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "commence" and insert the word "the," so that the amendment will read "for the construction," and I want to be heard on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "commence" and insert the word "the."

Mr. SISSON. How will it read with that stricken out?

The CLERK (reading): "For the construction."

Mr. SISSON. That is all right. I ask to be heard on that amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Debate is closed.

Mr. SISSON. But I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. SISSON. But not upon this particular phase of this amendment.

Mr. GOOD. There was an agreement, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi——

Mr. SISSON. Of course, but anything can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman understands that we desire to put this bill through this week, and there is an agreement on this——

Mr. SISSON. I want to say to the gentleman that during the progress of this debate I have taken up but very little time.

Mr. GOOD. I know that; the gentleman has been helping the committee.

Mr. SISSON. And if the gentleman can find anybody who will help it more than I will, I would like to find who he is; but I do want to call the attention of this committee to this particular matter.

Mr. GOOD. I think the committee understands it.

Mr. SISSON. I want to call the attention of the committee to it specially, and I ask that I may proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, this $200,000 was appropriated with the distinct understanding that this is for the completion of these lakes. I have no objection to the memorial to Mr. Lincoln. I know Mr. GILLETT, the Speaker of this House, had no objection to a memorial to Mr. Lincoln when he made the speech against the $500,000 increase, a very strong one. I know that men who do not believe in extravagant appropriations for this purpose are just as great admirers of this great commoner as any other. I know also that if that great commoner were here himself he would speak for the American people and for the taxpayers and say, "For God's sake, do not use my name to perpetuate the salaries of men to build to me a monument; but if it is going to be a monument, it shall be builded and completed just as Congress intended and you must use my name in this manner." [Applause.]

Yet that is exactly what is being done here now. No man can ever say that Lincoln himself ever did such a thing. Yet men say that Members of the South alone speak against this appropriation—say this when only a moment before the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] spoke for the amendment, and in the presence and hearing of the gentleman making that statement.

As this amendment is now drawn it is no part of the Lincoln Memorial, but a part of the parking system. Oh, gentlemen of the committee, do not commit the outrageous extravagance in the name of Lincoln. How you Republicans like to conjure with the name of Lincoln to cover up your extravagances! You proclaim economy with your voice and not in your legislation. No man who has spoken for this appropriation has discussed the merits of the question. You who have spoken for it talk as if the $200,000 were all that is involved. You fail to tell of the $2,000,000 originally appropriated. You will not let the country know how this thing was juggled so that those who draw salaries and reap profits got the $594,000 additional. Then, to show these same people an excuse to spend more than $200,000 in addition to the $2,594,000, the amendment offered provides "For the commencement of," and so forth. Do you not know that this is only a license to spend much more? They will begin to dig the lake, and before the lake is half completed they will come back for $500,000 more, and there is no end of the thing. Strike out the word "commence" and make the amendment read "For the construction."

Be fair about it. Do not, in the name of Lincoln, do this unwarranted thing and try to justify it by demagogy. Do not cry sectionalism. God knows the Civil War is over. The country is united. The South does her part and she always will. This sling by northern Democrats is now worse than by the Republicans. For God's sake, do not play politics with the South in this way. Why, Lincoln was a southern man. How bad is your case when to justify this appropriation you must resort to such tactics. You elected Mr. GILLETT Speaker, a man of learning and patriotism and Representative from Massachusetts for more than 26 years and as good a Republican as there is in this House, and he opposed, as I have shown you, the additional $594,000 in 1916. So did John Fitzgerald, of New York, chairman of the Appropriations Committee at the time. Then why should the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] and myself be censured and our motives impugned? It is not becoming in the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. Chairman, if we want to appropriate money so that we can control the appropriations, you must adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation of $5,000 made in the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, for unveiling and dedicating the memorial to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including erecting and taking down reviewing stands and putting the grounds in sightly condition, is made available for said purposes during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order that I may ask the chairman a question. I am a member of the Library Committee in this new Congress, and as a member I would like to know what progress we are making toward the completion of this monument down here to Gen. Grant?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman the sculptor employed to model the figures which are to go on the monument has been very sick for a number of years and progress has been very slow and it was because of his very extreme illness. That is the situation and that is the reason of the delay.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have that explanation for this reason: I have heard that the inactivity on the part of those charged with that completion is due to a lack of interest on the ground that it has been badly placed. I have heard that criticism often, that the location of the monument was a mistake, and I have labored under the suspicion that probably it has been allowed just to drift because no interest was taken in it. That would certainly be unfair and inexcusable, and I am glad to have the chairman state that it is due to circumstances not within our control.

Mr. GOOD. That is as I understand it.

Mr. FESS. So that we may expect it to be completed in time?

Mr. GOOD. I hope so and in the very near future.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

State and Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors: For continuing aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled volunteer soldiers, in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, including all classes of soldiers admissible to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, $900,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be apportioned to any State or Territorial home that maintains a bar or canteen where intoxicating liquors are sold: *Provided further*, That for any sum or sums collected in any manner from inmates of such State or Territorial homes to be used for the support of said homes a like amount shall be deducted from the aid herein provided for, but this proviso shall not apply to any State or Territorial home into which the wives or widows of soldiers are admitted and maintained.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the comma, after the word "for," in line 22, page 79, and inserting a period, and then striking out lines 23, 24, and 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Page 79, line 22, strike out the comma after the word "for," insert a period, and strike out the balance of the paragraph.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to place the soldiers in the State or Territorial homes upon the same basis with the soldiers that are living in national homes. We have in the State of Indiana a State home that admits the wives and widows of old soldiers. It is the practice now in that State, and has been for some time, to take all the pensions away from the soldier or the soldier's widow who is there, except a very few dollars. The result is that it produces naturally discontent and great dissatisfaction, and especially now when the cost of everything is as high as it is, and when these soldiers and their widows are growing older they want delicacies that can not be had in the soldiers' home, and ofttimes when they are sick they want things that can not be provided from the table.

It seems to me now that while these old folks are growing less in number, this discrimination should not be had. I believe that while a pension is primarily granted for the relief and help financially of the soldiers and soldiers' widows, it is likewise given to them as a badge of honor. I do not believe that it becomes this Congress or the State through its action to take any portion of this money from the old soldier or the widow of the old soldier. I hope, therefore, that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I understand this provision has been carried in the law for 10, 12, of 15 years. It is a general provision; and it is one that has been a part of the law for a long time.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No. I expect that there are some other soldiers' homes in the United States where soldiers' wives and widows are admitted, although I do not recall, but there is one at La Fayette, Ind., and some years ago complaint was had from the old soldiers there because of the fact that the pensions were taken away from them, and Congress enacted at that time, I am informed, a law prohibiting the taking away of any portion of their pensions.

Mr. GOOD. My understanding is that if the gentleman strikes out only the language and does not amend the statute, he is going to create a hardship on those persons in the homes where wives and widows are not admitted.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Not at all. If you read the rest of this act, you will find it provides that no sum of money shall be taken away from them, or, if there is any sum taken away from them by the homes, except in State and Territorial homes, it shall be taken from the amount that is given them by the United States Government, except it says:

But this proviso shall not apply to any State or Territorial home in which the wives or widows of soldiers are admitted and maintained.

You take and strike out the language included in the amendment, and it will then read:

That for any sum or sums collected in any manner from inmates of such State or Territorial homes to be used for the support of said homes, a like amount shall be deducted from the aid herein provided for.

It will put the State and Territorial homes upon the same basis exactly that these national and other homes are now occupying.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will look at the latter provision there, in lines 23, 24, and 25, it says the deduction shall not apply to State or Territorial homes in which the wives or widows of soldiers are admitted and maintained.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. What is the proviso? The proviso is that there shall not be taken away from the inmates of these homes any sum. If we do, it shall be deducted from the sum given them by the Congress, except this proviso, which forbids their taking it away from other inmates, shall not apply to the State and Territorial homes where wives and widows are admitted. In other words, it discriminates in favor of every home except those that admit soldiers' wives or their widows, and that is not right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Lincoln Memorial in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Lincoln Memorial. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses of land offices: For clerk hire, rent, and other incidental expenses of the district land offices, including the exchange of typewriters; per diem, in lieu of subsistence, of clerks detailed to examine the books and management of district land offices and to assist in the operation of said offices, and in the opening of new land offices and reservations, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for actual necessary traveling expenses of said clerks, including necessary sleeping-car fares: *Provided*, That no expenses chargeable to the Government shall be incurred by registers and receivers in the conduct of local land offices except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, $350,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph on page 82, line 9, to correct the spelling of the word "advice."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURVEYING THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Four surveys and resurveys of public lands, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $675,000: *Provided*, That in expending this appropriation preference shall be given, first, in favor of surveying townships occupied in whole or in part by actual settlers and of lands granted to the States by the act approved February 22, 1889, and the acts approved July 3 and July 10, 1890, and to survey under such other acts as provide for land grants to the several States and Territories, and such indemnity lands as the several States and Territories may be entitled to in lieu of lands granted them for educational and other purposes which may have been sold or included in some reservation or otherwise disposed of, except railroad land grants, and other surveys shall include lands adapted to agriculture and lands deemed advisable to survey on account of availability for irrigation or dry farming, lands subject to disposition under mineral land laws where survey thereof is not otherwise provided for, lines of reservations, and lands within boundaries of forest reservations, and including such retracements and re-marking of State boundaries as shall be found necessary in order to close the public land lines thereon. The surveys and resurveys provided for in this appropriation to be made by such competent surveyors as the Secretary of the Interior may select, at such compensation, not exceeding $200 per month each, as he may prescribe, except in Alaska, where a compensation not exceeding $300 per month each may be allowed such surveyors, except that the Secretary of the Interior may appoint not to exceed one supervisor of surveys, whose compensation shall not exceed $300 per month, and not to exceed 10 surveyors who may be employed in a supervisory capacity, whose compensation shall not exceed $250 per month each, and such per diem in lieu of subsistence, not exceeding $3.50, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and actual necessary expenses for transportation, including necessary sleeping-car fares, said per diem and traveling expenses to be allowed to all surveyors employed hereunder and to such clerks who are competent surveyors who may be detailed to make surveys, resurveys, or examinations of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, and inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, and for making, by such competent surveyors, fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States: *Provided further*, That the sum of not exceeding 10 per cent of the amount hereby appropriated may be expended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purchase of metal or other equally durable monuments to be used for public-land survey corners wherever practicable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $10,000 of this appropriation may be expended for salaries of employees of the field surveying service temporarily detailed to the General Land Office.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 88, line 11, after the word "Office," in line 11, insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation may be used for the survey, classification, and sale of the lands and timber of the so-called Oregon & California Railroad lands and the Coos Bay wagon road lands."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment at the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], who is unable to be here because of the necessity of performing his duties with the Committee on Ways and Means, which is now holding hearings.

The General Land Office has been engaged in classifying these lands in order to sell them and to dispose of the timber. The force of the office is now organized, and this can be done much more cheaply by the force engaged in this work than if it were to be undertaken at a time when the office did not have these employees available for the purpose. The gentleman from Oregon advises me that there is a considerable demand for the lands and for the timber, and that as the lands are reclassified the Treasury will receive a very large amount from them as they may be disposed of, but unless they are classified nothing can be done with the lands in order to make them available for this purpose. He also advises me that there is considerable demand on the part of soldiers in that region who are interested in the projects for the purpose of making homes.

Now, this does not increase the appropriation, but merely makes a portion of the lump sum available for this purpose. I trust that there will be no serious objection on the part of the committee to setting aside a portion or part of this sum as indicated.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection to that, inasmuch as it is left optional with the officer to use or deny any part of it in his discretion.

Mr. WALSH. It is optional.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For geologic surveys in the various portions of the United States, $347,073.50.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman if this appropriation for the Geological Survey of $347,000 is sufficient to enable them to do all the work they have in contemplation?

My reason for asking this question is that I get a great many letters asking for surveys of counties in Texas which are prospective oil counties and in many instances are established oil counties, and the answer I get when I call upon the bureau usually is that the appropriation is insufficient for them to make an investigation of those counties.

Mr. GOOD. Since I have been in Congress that is about the answer that I have had whenever I make a request for certain work. I think that is about the answer that the various other bureaus give—that they do not have the money.

But I will say that in this case this item was passed upon by the committee that heard the testimony in the last Congress. We adopted just the amount which was contained in this bill when it was up for consideration before, and it is the same amount that was carried this year. The committee did not cut the amount at all, but gave the same amount. As a usual thing all of these services ask for more money than they actually expect to get, and the cut here was only from $400,000 to $347,000.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would just like to suggest this to the gentleman. A great deal of new territory is being discovered and developed, and while the Geological Survey could not be expected to survey all of the counties, yet it seems to me in a

new field that is being developed and discovered there should be an appropriation sufficient to enable them to do the work in those sections. The bureau advises that with the same appropriations that they have had for some years they will not be able to go into new fields.

Mr. GOOD. They will finish an old field some time, and then they will move into a new field. But I will say to the gentleman that if this amount were $500,000 and a Member of Congress went to the officer having this work in charge or the allotting of new work, in all likelihood he would say there was not a sufficient appropriation to do the work.

That is their customary excuse. They plan their work and the fields in which they will operate, and Members of Congress are not able to get very many changes in those plans. That has been my observation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. One further question. Was an additional amount asked along this line by the bureau in submitting estimates to the committee?

Mr. GOOD. The original estimate was $400,000, and since the action of Congress there has been no complaint from the department with regard to the amount that was allotted, so far as the committee knows.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to strike out the last two words. I am in receipt of a letter which I desire to read for the information of the House. It is very short:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1919.

Hon. JAMES P. BUCHANAN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: In reply to your telephone inquiry as to the reason for the hostile feeling of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GALLIVAN, toward the Postal Service, and particularly toward the Postmaster General, I beg leave to direct your attention to the fact that upon my recommendation the pneumatic-tube service has been discontinued.

For years this useless appliance was an incubus on the Postal Service, occasioning waste of millions of dollars of postal revenue. Every postal expert now agrees that the prediction of the late Mr. Justice Moody, made when he was a Member of the House and at the time this bankrupt commercial concern was unloaded on the department, that it would "ultimately prove a stain on the Postal Service," has been thoroughly verified. Representative Moody then stated that a prominent Member of Congress, pending the adoption of this tube service by the Government, had been offered as a gift stock in this concern, and that the scheme to fasten it on the Postal Service had been "conceived in sin and born in iniquity."

As stated above, on my recommendation this stain on the Postal Service was removed by the last Congress. If you will now turn to page 1579 of the RECORD of the last Congress, under date of January 15, 1917, and run your finger down the second column, on the eleventh line you will find the real reason of Representative GALLIVAN'S resentment and rage.

I feel honored by the disapprobation of such a man. I would not ask you to waste your time in making a reply to any statement he might make.

Sincerely, yours, A. S. BURLESON.

The Clerk read as follows:

For chemical and physical researches relating to the geology of the United States, including researches with a view of determining geological conditions favorable to the presence of deposits of potash salts, $40,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee what proportion of the $40,000, if he knows, will be devoted to the potash investigation? It says for chemical and physical researches relating to geology, including the item of potash.

Mr. GOOD. The committee that reported out this bill did not have any hearings on this item. It was not contested. But I am advised that at the time of the hearing on the former bill it was estimated that about $20,000 would be used for potash work.

Mr. FESS. How long has this item been carried? Is it new?

Mr. GOOD. I understand this item has been carried for a number of years. It is not a new item.

Mr. FESS. Are we making any progress in the discovery of the potash salts? Are we increasing very largely our known resources?

Mr. GOOD. I think they have made some progress. Mr. Smith, of this service, stated when he was before the committee in February:

At the time that clause was put in the appropriation was increased $20,000, and it has been the policy to use about $20,000 for the potash work. During the present year it includes the field tests of brines, some investigation of the Red Beds of New Mexico, and the work of the Southwestern States on the nitrates, largely at the request of War Department, some special examination in Nevada, and then some work which is now under way in cooperation with the State of New Jersey on the greensands of New Jersey, which have a high potash content and were utilized in fertilizers years ago and are now used in conjunction with some of the by-product work, cement, etc. We are also examining some of the potash slate in Georgia and the leucite rock in Arkansas, somewhat similar to the leucite rock in Wyoming, and there seems to be one place where the earlier work of the Survey is now being utilized as the basis for some large-scale development work, and the geologist in charge visited these developments in Wyoming to confirm the earlier estimates of potash-bearing rock.

Mr. FESS. I would say to my friend that there was a gentleman in the office to-day who stated to me that there are now being brought into the country elements that can be sold at $1.50 a unit, and that what we have can not be sold short of $2.50 a unit, and he is considerably concerned about our ability to produce. I think the Ways and Means Committee, which is holding hearings at this time, has the matter under consideration, and my question was, Are we making any progress in the discovery of these deposits?

Mr. GOOD. I think not. I think the progress has been quite slow.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inquiries and investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, with a view to economic development and conserving resources through the prevention of waste; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting the industry, including equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel, and subsistence, $100,000.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARRISH: Page 92, line 13, strike out "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be closed in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I believe that the increase of this item is of very great importance at this particular time. I am aware of the fact that the sundry civil bill passed at the last session did not include the $50,000 additional item. But since that time conditions have arisen to justify, and not only justify but demand, the increase of the appropriation this amount. One of those conditions is that Mr. Requa, who had charge of the Oil and Gas Division of the Fuel Administration, has discontinued his work and the additional work is placed on the Bureau of Mines, and especially that part which relates to the conservation and development of petroleum and natural-gas industries.

In Texas we get very little, if any, assistance from the Bureau of Mines. We have a large oil district, one that has become the greatest oil district in the United States. For example, in north central Texas, we now have a daily production of 190,000 barrels, and that production is increasing at the rate of 10,000 barrels per week. But we do not get the benefit of the mature thought and scientific study that the Bureau of Mines should give our district. We have called upon the department to assist us and give us the best and most scientific methods of development and conservation, but they tell us that they have begun the work in other fields, and they can not take on Texas, Louisiana, Illinois, and other fields without more money.

The only way Texas can get any assistance from the Bureau of Mines is for Congress to give us this additional appropriation. Mr. Manning, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, Secretary Lane, and Secretary Glass have all concurred in recommending this increased item of $50,000.

What is the purpose of it and what is the necessity? It is in order that we may conserve the natural products of this Nation. For example, the report that was made on December 10, 1918, by Mr. W. Champlin Robinson, Director of the Bureau of Oil Conservation, shows that $835,000,000 of petroleum was wasted in exploitation in 1917, and in the same report he says that $1,200,000,000 worth of natural gas was likewise wasted in the same year.

What does that mean? It means that we must begin to carefully study and conserve the natural resources of oil and gas or in a short time we are going to find the country without them.

The United States Geological Survey makes the report that natural resources are now 40 per cent exhausted, and if that is true then we ought to begin to take care of the 60 per cent yet remaining in the ground. If we do not do that we shall find the country face to face with a great fuel shortage, and unless a substitute for petroleum can be found many industries will be forced out of business. We are building up a merchant marine on the theory that oil is the fuel that will best stand the test. Every farmer in this country is now being fast thrown upon this industry in order to get the power to pull the plow. They are using the tractors, and the oil goes into the machinery of every

American industry and every family; every home in the United States is to-day touched by this industry, and we are all interested to see that it is properly conserved, and the way to do it is to apply scientific methods of conservation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARRISH. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. GOOD. The time is all disposed of.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will yield two minutes of my three minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. PARRISH. One example of efficiency is illustrated in the Cushing field of Oklahoma. Experts persuaded two operators to apply corrective measures to their methods of production, and by the application of such corrective methods these two men increased their production 3,000 barrels a day, representing a property value increase of $3,000,000. That is only one illustration.

In my country they are drilling three or four wells on a town-lot block. They are not employing scientific methods of conservation. They need scientific instruction. I call upon you, gentlemen, to give us this item in order that we may be instructed in scientific methods of the production of oil and gas, such as we are applying it in all other industries important to the American people. I hope you will give us this item, and I ask it, not to take your time, but because the department is calling for it, and we can not have the assistance unless we get the appropriation. I ask the Members to vote with me on this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, a reference to the letter sent by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, on May 21, 1919, will refute any imputation that a local interest solely inspires the offering of an amendment for an increase of $50,000 in this item. This is the amount recommended by the Secretary upon sound economic principles. It is a well-known fact, as stated by him, that the consumption of petroleum is increasing far more rapidly than is its domestic production. It is being used now in all of the various branches of our industries in civil life, and is a very necessary commodity in time of war. The letter shows that the total wastage in the exploitation of oil and natural gas in the United States for the year 1917 amounted to $2,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I not have time for just one sentence, to call attention to the fact that the adoption of this amendment will effect the conservation of helium, the noncombustible gas, most essential in the use of dirigibles; and if only as a matter of protection, as a sort of prophylactic remedy, the $50,000 used in this item would yield great returns in the saving of human life.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, in rising to support this amendment I want to assure you that I do not do so in any way in criticism of the Appropriations Committee, but on the other hand, I want to take this occasion to congratulate the chairman of that committee and each of the members of it for the industrious and honest way in which they have handled their work on this bill. I feel that the members of the committee, the Members of Congress, and in fact the people generally have not given enough consideration and weight to this paragraph, which is in fact a very important one to the people of the entire country. This matter is not one of local interest. It is not one of interest to the local industry alone, but is of interest to the entire people of the country. The history of the oil and gas business shows that we have not in the past given enough attention to the question of getting from oil its full proportion of products. Like the electric business, oil is in its infancy. A few years ago, before researches by this department and other scientists had been made, we got from oil only a minimum amount of gasoline. Through the scientific researches of this department and others we are to-day getting what is considered a maximum amount of gasoline out of the oil, but even though we have succeeded in that, from a scientific point of view no doubt the industry is still in its infancy and that by proper research more gasoline and other by-products may be extracted from it, to the benefit of the people of the entire country. Consequently, in the interests of the people, nothing should be done that would stop the work provided for in the first sentence of the paragraph which is for the treatment and utilization of petroleum and natural gas.

On the other hand, there are two important matters in this paragraph. The other is a provision for the economic development and conserving of the resources through the prevention of waste. The amount suggested in the bill might have been sufficient when the reports and hearings were had upon it, but I call attention to the fact that to-day in the State of Texas they are drilling for oil in 112 counties, and in the State of Oklahoma 33 counties are producing oil and the drills are running in every county in that State. What does it mean? It means that each well is a different problem in itself. New sands must be handled, studied, and scientific methods suggested, in order to conserve and bring from them the highest degree of production of the articles so much in demand by the American public, and I fear that if you do not give us the $50,000 additional, either the research work or the work for the conservation of the product must be stopped. It is absolutely essential that the oil industry be given the most thorough consideration and assistance. In the case of the Cushing (Okla.) pool, gas enough went to waste which if utilized would have made gasoline enough to run this country for many months through lack of knowledge of how to utilize it. But since through the work of this department and other agencies a process has been developed whereby what was formerly waste gas is utilized and to-day millions of gallons of gasoline are being produced from it, this being one of the results brought about by just such items as this. This is but one illustration. Many more showing beneficial results of a scientific study of the oil and gas industry could be cited, but I have not the time. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment will prevail and that this Congress will come to realize the great importance of the oil and gas industry and in all cases will lend to it the encouragement to which it is entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HOWARD was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is only one thought I want to suggest. This oil in Texas and Oklahoma and the gas there that is going to waste do not belong to the people of Oklahoma or the people of Texas when you look at it from the standpoint of the great economic interests of the country. That is your oil down there; it is your gas that runs your industries. I understand it is conceded the Treasury Department says that there is a tremendous waste in that field and that they are unable to do corrective work or to make the suggestions required by reason of the limitations upon the amount of money which they may expend. Now, everybody knows that there is a tremendous development in that country. We ask $50,000, and I submit to the judgment of the House that, if this work ought to be done at all, there is every reason why it ought to be done in that field, where a large number of inexperienced operators are wasting the oil that is to run your machines wherever you may be and the gas that is to develop your industry, whatever that may be. That is the only thought I have to submit, and I hope that we will not consider this from the standpoint of local or sectional interest, but will look at it from the standpoint of the general national necessity of conserving the great national resources of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think no one can complain because this service was not liberally provided for. The only estimate was for $100,000, and the former committee gave them every penny that was estimated for. It was said to the committee that if they cement the wells that each of the inspectors who would do the cementing could save to the people who owned the wells $300,000 a year. If that is the case, why do not those men who own the wells get the inspectors there at their own expense and do their own cementing? It was not until May of this year they asked for an increase in this appropriation. The gentleman says that the people of Oklahoma and the people of Texas do not own this oil.

If they will release all their ownership in it, I will find them plenty of men who will go in there and take those wells and do the cementing and not ask the Government for a single penny. We have been very liberal in this matter. This is all they had last year. This is all they thought of asking for next year until the 22d day of May, and even then the only reason——

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I would like to yield, but I have only two minutes.

The only reason assigned us why they did not make the estimate before was because they expected the Fuel Administration to do this work. Why, it was known that the Fuel Administration would go out of business as early, at least, as the 11th day of last November. And yet it was not suggested to anybody that this work would lag or that the appropriation was insufficient until the 22d day of May. I think we have been very liberal, and I am sorry we can not feel that the appropriation should be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. GOOD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 30, nays 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for the enforcement of the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act, with the exception of the sum of $15,000 which may be used for expenses incident to concluding the work under said act.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do so for the purpose of asking some information in regard to that last item that we have just put in the bill.

One of the gentlemen from Texas, I think it was Mr. PARRISH, made the remark that this new gas, helium, would come under a proviso of this kind, and as helium is now being developed in certain large quantities on a commercial basis, and as that gas is used largely in the Army and Navy dirigible work, it seems to me this proviso is well thought of. And that is the reason I voted for it. I would like to ask one of these gentlemen from Texas, if he is able to answer it, how this affects this helium gas, practically, and what has been done? As I understand it, we have a plant at Fort Worth, Tex., owned jointly by the Army and Navy, for which we appropriated about $5,000,000 this year, for the production of that gas, and that the Government is producing it at the rate of $80 to $100 per 1,000 cubic foot.

Mr. PARRISH. Yes, sir; about $100 per 1,000 cubic foot.

Mr. HICKS. I would like to have the gentleman give us some information in regard to it.

Mr. PARRISH. If the gentleman will yield, I would say in regard to this that I live about 14 miles from where the helium gas is produced. About six years ago, or perhaps a little longer, before the scientific methods that now prevail were discovered, one of these wells producing helium gas shot wild in the air for something like 75 days at the rate of 20,000,000 cubic feet per day. At the present time, while there has not been much direct work done by the bureau in this territory, yet at the same time the scientific methods that have been discovered have enabled us to stop a gas well running wild inside of 12 hours. Not only that, an oil well occasionally gets on fire, and in times past it would burn until we could work out some way or another to get it out—perhaps after it had burned several days—but now we can extinguish one inside of 10 hours at the longest, and thus save the oil that would have been otherwise destroyed.

Helium gas, this lighter-than-air, noncombustible gas, is produced at Petrolia, and is piped to Fort Worth and there extracted at the plant to which the gentleman from New York refers, and large quantities of it are in the field yet. But, as I said a moment ago, scientific study and methods need to be adopted in order to continue the services to the highest efficiency. Of course, the gentlemen all know that it is lighter than air and noncombustible and you can shoot into it without harm to the occupants of a machine, whereas with the crude gas the machine would shoot into flames and destroy everyone within it. This shows the importance of proper conservation of this gas. It means the saving of human life.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, my colleague has stated about all I desired to say in this regard, except I want to add that my advices from Fort Worth, where this helium plant is located, are that satisfactory progress is being made in the refining of the gas that is produced at Petrolia. This is an industry which is needed in times of peace and war. Helium tends to afford, in peace, safety from accident; in war, safety from attack. Both in peace and war, therefore, many lives will be saved because of the use of it.

Mr. HICKS. I understand that by the washing process the gas is not injured for other purposes; in fact, it is made better, even though you extract this helium out of it?

Mr. LANHAM. My understanding is that the gentleman is correct in his opinion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Government fuel yards: For the purchase and transportation of fuel; storing and handling of fuel in yards; maintenance and operation of yards and equipment, including motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for inspectors, purchase of equipment, rentals, and all other expenses requisite for and incident thereto, including personal services in the District of Columbia, the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for these purposes for the fiscal year 1919 is reappropriated and made available for such purposes for the fiscal year 1920, and of such sum not exceeding $500 shall be available to settle claims for damages caused to private property by motor vehicles used in delivering fuel: *Provided*, That all moneys received from the sale of fuel during the fiscal year 1920 shall be credited to this appropriation and be available for the purposes of this paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. What is the authority for these motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for inspectors of Government fuel yards in the District of Columbia? There is no authority for that paragraph carried in the law.

Mr. GOOD. We have authority here, I think, for purchasing motor trucks. They bought some motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles out of the appropriation for last year, but this is for maintenance of the motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles. Under the item of equipment, in line 21, they are permitted to buy a motor truck. That is part of the equipment; but the motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle can not be bought without specific authority, and they do have that in this provision.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think under the original law they would have that authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts make the point of order on the whole paragraph or on the proviso?

Mr. WALSH. The motor-propelled vehicles come in two paragraphs. I will make a point of order on the whole paragraph unless I can get some information. Do these vehicles run around and suffer that amount of damage every year, or is it necessary to provide specially for these contingencies?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman will remember how necessary it was to provide fuel yards in the city. They deliver fuel all over the city. They have to have a large number of trucks. They are delivering coal at the rate of a thousand tons a day, so that the gentleman can see that it is necessary to maintain quite an equipment. That is what this is for.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the reservation of the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1920 there shall be covered into the appropriation established from time to time under the act approved March 12, 1914, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," the proceeds of the sale of material utilized for temporary work and structures in connection with the operations under said act, as well as the sales of all other condemned property which has been purchased or constructed under the provisions thereof, also any moneys refunded in connection with the construction and operations under said act, and a report hereunder shall be made to Congress at the beginning of its next session.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I do so in order to ask the chairman of the committee what progress we are making in the railroad building under the original authorization?

Mr. GOOD. The amount carried in this appropriation provides for all of the authorization of $35,000,000.

Mr. FESS. This finishes it?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. It is estimated that it will take about $10,000,000 more to finish the road, and the Secretary of the Interior was desirous of having this bill carry more than the amount we carry. But the committee was of opinion that we could not carry more than was authorized, however important it might be to have additional funds to complete the road.

Mr. FESS. From the representation of the Secretary of the Interior is the committee satisfied that our effort in undertaking this enterprise was a good one?

Mr. GOOD. So far as the present committee is concerned, I will say to the gentleman, that we had no hearings on that phase of the project at all. We only considered in a very limited sense the question of giving some additional money in the last deficiency bill in order that they might keep their force there. Those were the only questions inquired into. As to whether or not the money has been economically spent, I will say to the gentleman that the present committee has not gone into the matter at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.: For administration, protection, maintenance, improvement, and development, including not exceeding $2,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of a motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicle for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, $25,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HICKS. I do so merely for the purpose of saying a word or two in regard to the Director of National Parks, Mr. Mather, of Chicago, a gentleman of the highest character. He is giving his time and his services without any idea of adequate compensation for them. He is going into his own pocket every year to the extent of many thousands of dollars to make this service more efficient. He is a gentleman who goes back and forth over this country for the single purpose of making the national parks more easily accessible to the people of this country, and he is a man whose character and whose service, in my judgment, entitle him to the thanks of this Government and the people of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.: For protection and improvement, $10,000.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, those of us who are familiar with the Rocky Mountain National Park think this appropriation is not nearly sufficient, but we are not asking for any greater appropriation at this time. That is in order to keep faith with certain agreements and understandings which, I am told, were made by the Colorado delegation with the Appropriations Committee. But I do not want to let this opportunity pass without calling attention to the fact that the Rocky Mountain National Park is by no means a local institution. As stated by the very distinguished director of the national park service, to whom the eloquent and fitting tribute was so justly paid a moment ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS], this national park is visited by over 100,000 people every year. I think the director of the national park service understated the number. I think he should have stated that over 100,000 cars visit the part of the park which is accessible by roads. More people visit that park every year than visit all the other national parks combined, not excluding the Yellowstone National Park. You see cars there from Florida and Kansas and every State in the Union. If it were not essential to keep faith on this matter, we would now ask for a larger appropriation, feeling that this Switzerland of America, this great national playground, should be developed. And I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to this matter because at a later session of this Congress we shall ask for a larger appropriation and ask your support for it. [Applause.]

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. With reference to the statement made by my colleague [Mr. VAILE], I agree with everything he has said concerning the necessity for a larger appropriation for the Rocky Mountain National Park. He has not overstated its importance among our other national parks. There were 134,000 actual entries into this park last year, as shown by the records kept at the entrance of the park. It is not as accessible to the people as it should be, and it needs quite an appropriation in order that it may be made so that this asset now belonging to the people of the United States should be properly developed. When this park was created, in 1915, there was opposition to its creation, and in order to meet that opposition promises were made to this House that no appropriation exceeding $10,000 should be made without the authorization of Congress. Recognizing that that appropriation was inadequate, I attempted on two or three different occasions to get that inhibition removed. I was constantly met with the reminder of the promise that had been made and could not succeed until last year, during the closing days of the Sixty-fifth Congress, when I succeeded in allaying the objections that had been offered by a guaranty that no additional appropriation would be asked for this year, on account of war conditions. Notwithstanding that, I see that the National Park Service asked the Committee on Appropriations for $60,000, but they did not insist on it when they ascertained that this guaranty had been made when the former inhibition was removed during the closing days of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Now, I feel that we should keep absolute faith with this Congress in that respect, and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to that agreement, properly appropriated only $10,000; but at the same time I want to insist that the Government will be very shortsighted if it does not in the future make very liberal appropriations to develop that park and make it accessible to the people in a way commensurate with the magnificent scenery that is contained therein.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may pass over the paragraphs with reference to St. Elizabeth Hospital on pages 111 and 112. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is away, and he wants to offer some amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to pass over the paragraphs with reference to St. Elizabeth Hospital. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, ice and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than $1,500 shall be used for normal instruction, $76,437.75.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that paragraph on the ground that there is no legislation authorizing the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I think it is true that there is no legislation authorizing it, but I hope the gentleman will not press the point of order. It has been carried for a long time.

Mr. RAGSDALE. That does not make it right.

Mr. GOOD. There is a whole lot of charity in this bill.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am going to make a point of order on this because it is not carried legally.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa concede the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I understand there is no statute authority for this service, and it has frequently gone out on a point of order, but has been put in in the other body and later agreed to in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For tools, materials, fuel, wages of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, $20,000.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, $1,500.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, $10,000.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Medical department: For part cost of needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, $7,000.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, biological, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the science hall, including cases and shelving, $2,000.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, including necessary labor to care for and operate the same, $5,000; in all, $121,937.75.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I make the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and compensation of the surgeon in chief, not to exceed $3,000, and for all other professional and other services that may be required and expressly approved by the Secretary of the Interior, $33,360. A detailed statement of the expenditure of this sum shall be submitted to Congress.

For subsistence, fuel and light, clothing, bedding, forage, medicine, medical and surgical supplies, surgical instruments, electric lights, repairs, furniture, motor-propelled ambulance, and other absolutely necessary expenses, $47,000; in all, $80,360.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 1378. An act to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the navigable waters of Newark Bay in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WIRE-CONTROL BILL.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 120, for the repeal of the telephone and telegraph act, be laid before the House and the House insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the bill S. 120, the wire-control bill, be taken from the Speaker's table, laid before the House, and the House insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked for. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. ESCH, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. SIMS.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that next Wednesday morning, after the reading of the Journal, I be permitted to address the House for one hour on military operations in France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are trying to get the appropriation bills through I do not believe that any unanimous consents should be granted for a purpose of that kind, and I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table to-morrow I be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman as I have said to 25 Members that I could not agree to stand aside for the small bills nor for remarks upon any subject, and I shall be compelled to object, because we must get through with the sundry civil bill to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. REED of West Virginia, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence, for three days, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, June 21, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Bureau of Navigation of that department for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting tentative draft of bill governing levying of Panama Canal tolls (H. Doc. No. 126); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to amend the explosives act of October 6, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 127); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter acknowledging receipt of House resolution No. 78, which requests certain information concerning employees of the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 6319) for the purchase of site and the erection thereon of a public building at Albemarle, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6320) for the erection of a public building at Lenoir, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JEFFERIS: A bill (H. R. 6321) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to school district No. 43, Washington County, Nebr., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage and ammunition for same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 6322) granting a national charter to organize and maintain subordinate chapters of the Phi Beta Sororities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6323) for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 6324) authorizing the Postmaster General to make rules and regulations for the forwarding and return of mail matter of the second, third, and fourth classes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 6325) making provisions for the construction of a canal across the State of New Jersey to connect the Delaware River with New York Harbor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6326) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bay St. Louis, Hancock County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Collins, Covington County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6328) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pascagoula, Jackson County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Columbia, Marion County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6330) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Birmingham, Ala., a German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6331) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bessemer, Ala., a German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 6332) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenwich, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6333) to provide for the construction of a ship canal from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario for the improvement of navigation, to prevent the pollution of international waters in the Niagara River, and for the development of water power; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6334) donating two captured cannons or field guns and carriages to the city of Kentland, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6335) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6336) authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to conduct the collection and disposal of city refuse; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 6337) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Galeton, Pa., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 6338) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Due West, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 6339) to allow persons entitled to compensation under the act of October 6, 1917, as amended, for certain disabilities to elect between rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 6340) authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of peanuts and peanut products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 6341) making appropriation for payment of balances due by readjustment of sala-

ries of postmasters under existing law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEBSTER: A bill (H. R. 6342) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, at the town of Usk, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6343) providing for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6344) providing for the purchase of a site for a new post-office building at Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6345) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Robeson, State of North Carolina, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6346) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of New Hanover, State of North Carolina, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6347) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Brunswick, State of North Carolina, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Cumberland, State of North Carolina, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6349) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Harnett, State of North Carolina, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6350) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Bladen, State of North Carolina, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6351) donating a captured German cannon or field gun, with carriage and projectiles, to the county of Columbus, State of North Carolina, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 6352) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lackawanna, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6353) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Aurora, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 6354) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cities of Brockton and Quincy, Mass., each one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6355) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to that part of the city of Boston known as Hyde Park, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6356) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following towns in the State of Massachusetts one German cannon or fieldpiece: Dedham, Randolph, and Stoughton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6357) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following towns in the State of Massachusetts one German cannon or fieldpiece: East Bridgewater, West Bridgewater, and Whitman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following towns in the State of Massachusetts one German cannon or fieldpiece: Easton, Norwood, and Canton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following towns in the State of Massachusetts one German cannon or fieldpiece: Milton, Rockland, Weymouth, and Westwood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following towns in the State of Massachusetts one German cannon or fieldpiece: Avon, Braintree, and Holbrook; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the following towns in the State of Massachusetts one German cannon or fieldpiece: Abington, Foxboro, and Sharon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 6362) to construct a suitable building for the use of the United States court at Gainesville, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6363) for the relief of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6364) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the ninth congressional district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6365) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Toccoa, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6366) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Canton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6367) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Buford, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6368) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Lawrenceville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6369) authorizing the erection of a post-office building in Jefferson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6370) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Commerce, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 6371) to encourage home ownership and to stimulate the building and buying of homes, to create a standard form of investment based on building-association mortgages, to create Government depositories and financial agents for the United States, to furnish a market for Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6372) providing for the transfer of certain lands within the limits of the Fort Taylor United States Military Reservation from the jurisdiction of the War Department to the Navy Department for development as a submarine base; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6373) to amend an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 6374) to amend paragraph 220 of the act approved October 3, 1913, entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6375) for the relief of Kentucky drafted men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6376) to amend section 2 of the act approved September 8, 1916, relating to pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 126) requesting the Acting Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives charges of British atrocities in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 127) to print for the use of the House 100,000 copies of the speech of Hon. F. C. HICKS on the American flag; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BLANTON: Resolution (H. Res. 128) requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information regarding the Mooney case; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 127) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAILE: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) requiring scientific study of values and relative values by the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CARTER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 13) authorizing the printing and binding of the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, upon the acceptance of the statue of Sequoyah, presented by the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the Federal home-loan bills now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENDALL: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, urging appropriation of funds for the operation of the Frankford Arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6377) for the relief of Faxon, Horton & Gallagher; Long Bros.' Grocery Co.; A. Rieger; Rothenberg & Schloss; Ryley, Wilson & Co.; and Van Noy News Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 6378) granting an increase of pension to Harvey M. D. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6379) granting a pension to Julia Waters Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) to advance Richard Drace White in the active lists of commanders and temporary captains in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 6381) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. George Rodgers Clark at Clarkville, in the county of Clark, in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 6382) granting a pension to Cosam Julian Bartlett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 6383) granting an increase of pension to William F. Gilluly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) granting a pension to John W. Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6385) granting a pension to Marion E. Strunk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6386) granting a pension to Nancy B. Rich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6387) granting a pension to N. J. Stonecipher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6388) granting a pension to Oma Durham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) granting a pension to Mary S. Maxwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6390) granting a pension to S. P. McReynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6391) granting an increase of pension to David Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFERIS: A bill (H. R. 6393) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Speie, alias Lewis Spady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6394) granting a pension to George J. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) granting an increase of pension to William H. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6396) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. H. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 6398) granting a pension to Martha J. Hilliard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 6399) granting a pension to Elizabeth Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 6400) for the relief of Theresa Scherer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6401) granting a pension to Aurora C. B. Kinnie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6402) for the relief of Revilow N. Spohn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6403) granting a pension to Eugenie Schottmueller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6404) granting a pension to Marie Schneider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6405) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gaskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6406) granting an increase of pension to Maria Louise Richardson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 6407) for the relief of Michael MacGarvey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6408) granting a pension to Mary Kirk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 6409) granting an increase of pension to John J. Curry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 6410) authorizing the city of Boulder, Colo., to purchase certain public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6411) granting a pension to Katherine G. Manning; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6412) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 6413) for the relief of Clara Kane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Herman W. Schallert; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6415) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of milk producers shipping into Milwaukee, Wis., urging enactment of law to amend Federal antitrust laws so as to permit collective sales of farm products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, New York City, requesting repeal of sales taxes on motor cars, trucks, parts, and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lincoln Parish branch of League to Enforce Peace, advocating a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Civil Service Reform League, urging appropriation of $75,000 for reclassification and regrading of the service in the District; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Slovak Calvinistic Presbyterian Union of the United States at Youngstown, Ohio, expressing gratitude and appreciation to the President and entire Nation for liberating Czechoslovakia and other small nations from oppression and tyranny of 1,000 years; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of First Baptist Church of Agawam; members of Ballard Vale Lodge, No. 105, International Order of Good Templars, Ballard Vale; National Division, Sons of Temperance of North America; and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, National, against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Detroit Branch, No. 1, National Association of Letter Carriers, for an immediate increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, asking for an increase in salary for school-teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of United States Jewery at Share Tefela congregation, protesting against the massacres and persecutions of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of several thousand citizens of Springfield, Mass., against tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Vineland, N. J., in re atrocities visited upon the Jews of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: Petition of persons at Kansas City and other points, urging the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINSON: Petition of citizens of Goldsboro and other cities of North Carolina, asking repeal of tax on soda water and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. Petition of York County Automobile Dealers' Association, protesting against the present high tax on the automobile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce (Inc.), New York City, requesting repeal of sales taxes on motor cars, trucks, parts, and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of The Bronx Board of Trade, against national prohibition as prohibiting manufacture and sale of beers and light wines in food-control bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARSS: Petition of citizens of Duluth, Minn., for the repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of St. Matthews Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Clark County, Wis.; citizens of Vernon County, Wis.; and officers and teachers in Tunnel City Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, earnestly protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of milk producers of Milwaukee, Wis., representing 3,000 men, urging that a law be enacted to amend the Federal antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: Petition of the Nebraska State Association of Commercial Clubs, requesting legislation favorable to the development of water power; to the Committee on Water Power.

Also, petition of citizens of Pender, Nebr., against the repeal of war prohibition and petition to enact legislation to enforce the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of First Presbyterian Church of Springfield, Ohio, for enforcement of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Christian Endeavor Society, First Lutheran Church, Bellefontaine, Ohio, protesting against modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 250 members of the Church of the Brethern, New Carlisle, Ohio, protesting against modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the American Hampshire Sheep Association, urging retention of zone advances on advertising pages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of St. Brendan Society, Historic Hall, Roxbury, Mass., and citizens of Boston, to reject any league of nations which does not afford fullest safeguard to American rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Jugo-Slav organization of South Wilmington, Ill., concerning the Jugo-Slav-Italo situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Sycamore (Ill.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of citizens of Sikeston, Mo., urging repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Caruthersville, Mo., urging repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: Petition of W. K. Willborn and 126 other old soldiers of the soldiers' home, Beauvoir, Harrison County, Miss., asking to be pensioned; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Petition of the Ordway Equity Exchange, Ordway, S. Dak., asking that 2 cents each month be added to price of wheat up to June 1, 1920, as carrying charge to avoid blockade of wheat, and to make unnecessary the permit system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of certain Jugo-Slavic residents of Grays Landing, Fayette County, Pa., protesting against the allotment to Italy of all former Austrian Provinces of Istria, Gorizia-Gradiska, part of Carniola, and parts of Dalmatian coast and some islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Resolution of the San Diego County Federated Trades and Labor Council, San Diego, Calif., protesting action of Legislature of the State of California on prohibition and urging subject referred to a referendum vote of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Izer Davis Co., manufacturing confectioners, of San Diego, Calif., against 5 per cent tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Freja Lodge, No. 17, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Hartford, Conn., against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, representing 5,000 women, protesting against the repeal of any part of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Resolution adopted by Carpenters' Local No. 910, of Gloucester, Mass., favoring the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Ericsson Manufacturing Co., Buffalo, N. Y., against tax on automobiles and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of W. S. Cooper and many other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream in the present revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Fred J. Seames, Buffalo, N. Y., relating to naval appointments, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of Sheffield, Ala., for back pay for work rendered at nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George C. Lehmann, for the purchase of the Curtiss Elmwood Avenue plant for the aircraft production at Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Spencer Lens Co., Buffalo, N. Y., relating to taxes on chemical glassware and optical glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Buffalo, Depew, Lackawanna, and other towns in New York, protesting against tax on soda water, soft drinks, and ice cream and asking for repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Danbury, Conn., opposing the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, A. C. Terry, secretary, protesting against the Poindexter bill, S. 313, and urging that section 4, interstate-commerce act, should be left in hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Columbia Steel & Drafting Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Poindexter bill, S. 313, and urging that section 4, interstate-commerce act, should be left in hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, requesting and urging that ample funds be immediately appropriated for the operation of the Frankford Arsenal and to keep at least 2,400 men continuously employed at said arsenal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition of S. Y. Thornton and other citizens of Cooper County, Mo., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Springfield Garden, Long Island, for full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Young L. Park, representative of United States Asiatic Society, relating to Korean questions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Woodhaven Benevolent Society, Woodhaven, Long Island, against the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, New York City, indorsing the general plan of league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Religious Society of Friends, in New York City, against passage of a bill for universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Hecla Iron Works, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring H. R. 2370; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a petition of Rotary Club of Buffalo, N. Y., requesting the establishment of a National Conservatory of Music in Washington, D. C., with branches in California, Illinois, and New York; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of Moores Mills Lodge, Good Templars, Moores Mills, N. Y., asking for full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from Associated Dairymen of California, indorsing legislation to clarify the existing law governing agricultural associations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter from California White & Sugar Pine Manufacturers' Association, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against Senate bill 36, providing for the transfer of the national forests from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ed. Wupperman, of Cortina Academy, New York, protesting against prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of Mrs. Mary D. Bradford, La Maude Yule, Marie Keating, G. N. Tremper, Mrs. H. M. McKenzie, and 137 other teachers and citizens of the city of Kenosha, Wis., requesting legislation for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and petitioning that war-time prohibition be not repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Pasadena Federation, California, against repeal of prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SCHALL: Petition of Frank Gilmore and sundry citizens of Onamia, Minn., to repeal taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of sundry voters of the Seventeenth district of Illinois for the repeal of the so-called "stamp tax"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Punxsutawney, Pa., favoring repeal of section 904 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of employees of electrical concerns of Philadelphia protesting against repeal of daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *June 21, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou dost hold the nations in the hollow of Thy hand. Thou dost order the pathway of men in their individual lives and in their national life. Thou dost create the conditions under which we live out our lives. Thy law must govern the final issue. The waving grain waitest upon Thy will for its maturity and rich harvest. The beasts of the field receive from Thy hand their daily supplies. It is ours to live out our lives in the sphere of human responsibility under the guidance and grace of God, whose will governs us. Give us that guidance this day that we may discharge faithfully and well the duties that are upon us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 36).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the sum of $129,820 required by the War Department for the fiscal year 1920, for improvement and care of public grounds in the District of Columbia, $30,000, and Ordnance reservation civilian schools, $99,820, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America extending the right of suffrage to women, which will be placed on the files of the United States Senate.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that being advised of the inability of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to serve as a member of the committee of conference on the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, the Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ESCH, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. SIMS, managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a petition of Slovan Society, No. 3, Z. S. Z., of Pueblo, Colo., praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oakland, Corning, Sabetha, Sitka, Floral, Topeka, Newton, Culver, Ford, Harveyville, Haviland, Coldwater, Phillipsburg, Haverhill, Pretty Prairie, and Nortonville, all in the State of Kansas, and of sundry citizens of Heavner, Okla., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Berwick, Mapleton, and Otisfield, all in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Flint, Wayne, Northville, and Onaway, and of sundry citizens of Otsego and Montgomery Counties, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a memorial of the Pastors' Association of Barry County, Mich., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Wheeler and Shepherd, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a memorial of the St. Joseph's Society, of Grand Rapids, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Young Women's Christian Association of Jackson, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation placing women in the Industry Service of the Department of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented petitions of Local Branch No. 7, Post Office Clerks' Association, of St. Louis, Mo.; of Local Branch No. 44, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Wilmington, Del.; and of sundry rural mail carriers of Howard County, Ind., praying for the readjustment of salaries of postal clerks, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Federated Shop Crafts and Employees of the Michigan Central Railway, of Jackson, Mich., praying that early consideration be given the national wage question, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a memorial of the Common Council of St. Ignace, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Howell, Mich., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a memorial of sundry members of the medical profession of Williamston, Mich., remonstrating against further restrictions in the use of alcohol for medicinal purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Traverse City, Mich., praying that an appropriation be made for the deepening of the St. Lawrence River and the Welland Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1410, Patrons of Husbandry, of Skandia, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Bannister, Saginaw, Wayne, Bark River, Chesaning, and Burr Oak, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Federated Trades and Labor Council of San Diego County, Calif., praying that the question of national prohibition be decided by a referendum, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 24) thereon.

In connection with the submission of this report, I desire to give notice that following the final disposition of the bill in charge of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] I shall ask the Senate to take up the Army appropriation bill and make it the unfinished business, and, if there is a reasonable period of time left during this afternoon, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KING. I do not think the Senator should ask the Senate to consider the bill this afternoon. It has not been printed; at least, if it has been, we have had no opportunity to examine it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand the feeling of the Senator from Utah on that point. The bill will be printed and in the hands of Senators by 2 o'clock or 2.30 this afternoon, and I had it in mind at that time in case of objection to the consideration of the bill page by page, commencing at the beginning, to ask the Senate to consider the items to which objection would not be raised, in order that some progress might be made this afternoon, because I will state to the Senator from Utah my motive in urging this apparent haste is the fact that June 30 is staring us in the face and it is urgent that this bill shall be passed at an early date. I shall certainly not attempt to impose upon the Senate this afternoon the consideration of items which might give rise to serious discussion and debate.

Mr. KING. I am inclined to think that the Senator will not make any progress by asking for the consideration of the bill this afternoon. I have no doubt that after opportunity has been afforded Senators to become familiar with the bill it will result in their omitting to propound many questions which otherwise would be propounded and in the end will make for the more speedy passage of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Utah would not object to the bill being laid before the Senate at the proper time and made the unfinished business?

Mr. KING. Not the slightest.

Mr. CURTIS. So it would then have the right of way.

Mr. KING. And I shall not object to the course suggested by the Senator from New York, but I merely suggest that I do not think he will make any speed by pursuing that course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from New York, of course, shall consult with other Senators as well as members of the committee, to judge of the temper of the Senate at that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PERDIDO RIVER BRIDGE, ALABAMA.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 1362) to authorize Hiram I. Sage, a citizen of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Perdido River at Nunez Ferry, and I submit a report (No. 30) thereon. I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let us hear what the bill is first.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendments were, on line 5, after the word "bridge," to insert the words "and approaches thereto"; in the same line, at the end of the line, after the words "Perdido River," to insert "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation"; and, in line 7, after the word "at," at the center of the line, to insert the words "or near"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That Hiram I. Sage, of Baldwin County, Ala., his heirs and assigns, be, and he is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Perdido River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in section 22, township 6 south, range 6 east, in Baldwin County, Ala., at or near the point known as Nunez Ferry, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize Hiram I. Sage, a citizen of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Perdido River at or near Nunez Ferry."

ST. JOHN RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 530) for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada, and I submit a report (No. 28) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the State of Maine and the Dominion of Canada, jointly, of a bridge to be erected across the St. John River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided*, That the construction of said bridge shall not be commenced until the consent of the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada for the erection of the structure shall have been obtained.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendments, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 1711) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., and I submit a report (No. 29) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the bridge authorized by the act of Congress approved July 17, 1914, to be built across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., are hereby extended three years and six years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BRIDGES.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 241) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, and I submit a report (No. 26) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, and State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, and State of Pennsylvania, at or in prolongation of Exeter Street, as the same is now established and used in the respective municipalities, to replace the present structure erected at the same location in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable water," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 240) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa., and I submit a report (No. 25) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River at a point suitable to the interest of navigation from Main Street, in the village of Mocanaqua, township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, and State of Pennsylvania, to Main Street, in the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, and the State of Pennsylvania, as the same is now established and used in the respective municipalities, to replace the present structure erected at the same location, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable water," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 242) to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the town-

ship of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, and I submit a report (No. 27) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, at or in prolongation of Church Street, in the village of Wapwallopen, township of Conyingham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 2182) to establish game sanctuaries in national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 2183) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2184) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hartland, Me., one German cannon or field-piece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2185) granting a pension to Daniel H. Anker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2186) granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2187) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain lands in the State of Utah to Cyrena E. Young;

A bill (S. 2188) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133);

A bill (S. 2189) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska; and

A bill (S. 2190) to authorize the consolidation of Government lands and of privately owned lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2191) to amend section 8 of the act approved February 28, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2192) granting a pension to Olive R. Grow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2193) donating a captured cannon and unloaded projectiles to the city of Whiting, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 2194) granting a pension to John D. Ball (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2195) granting a pension to Frank H. Seay (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWBERRY (for Mr. TOWNSEND):

A bill (S. 2196) for the adjudication and determination of claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents or otherwise; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2197) granting an increase of pension to Annie Manchester (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment providing that the $10,000 for the construction of a steel bridge and approaches across the Santa Clara River, on the Shivwitz Indian Reservation, in the State of Utah, and the $5,000 for construction of a wagon road through that reservation, appropriated by the Indian appropriation act of June 30, 1919, be reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment providing that retired officers of the Army and Navy who were called into and had active service during the period of the war may be detailed to duty with the Public Health Service, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that retired officers of the Army may wear the uniform and insignia of rank and organization which they held when retired, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. STERLING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, Senate bill 18.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 18) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. KENYON. Before the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] commences his address, I agreed last evening with him that I would offer an amendment this morning relating to salaries. I have talked it over with members of the board, and pursuant to their view and likewise that of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], I offer the following amendment, to be inserted at the end of section 5, page 7.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, at the end of section 5, after an amendment already agreed to at that point, insert:

No salary shall be paid out of the fund provided in this section in excess of the following amounts: $5,000 to not exceeding one person; $4,000 to not exceeding three persons; $3,500 to not exceeding five persons; and not over $3,000 to any other employee per annum.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out the numerals "$3,000," in the last line of the amendment, and to insert "$2,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I do not think the Senator ought to offer that amendment. If you will make it $2,500 I am not going to raise much objection to it, though I really think that it would cripple the service. But it may teach economy, and if we can teach any economy it is a good thing. However, $2,000 is too low, and we can not get the men to do the work at that figure. That is all of it.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator agree to a limitation as to the number of employees to be paid $2,500?

Mr. KENYON. I can not do that. I do not know how many they will need. I think we have got to rely somewhat on the honesty and good sense of these men. If we can not do that we had better abandon the whole thing.

Mr. KING. That has not been a safe standard to apply to the public service and public bureaus and executive agencies in the past. We relied upon the patriotism and honesty of those in charge of the special bureaus and agencies, particularly those created during the war, and hoped that because we were at war, because so much was needed for the prosecution of the war, economy and a spirit of justice would characterize their conduct and would govern them in fixing the number of em-

ployees and the amount of compensation paid to each. But unfortunately our experience has demonstrated conclusively that there was a dispositon to increase the number of employees in many of the departments, bureaus, and governmental commissions, boards, and agencies, to a number entirely disproportionate to the amount of service required and to pay them compensation far beyond what the service performed was worth. We are confronted every day with the salary lists paid in many of these bureaus and executive agencies, and are shocked at the vast sums paid for administrative purposes, and the large salaries paid to employees, and the enormous number of persons employed in executive branches of the Government.

The Shipping Board is one of the flagrant offenders, and persons employed by it and in the Emergency Fleet Corporation receive from $10,000 to $25,000 per annum. There are many other agencies that have exhibited a sordidness that calls for condemnation. We supposed that when these large appropriations were made we thought that during the war at least there would be some disposition to practice economy, but the more confidence reposed in these executive branches the stronger was the disposition apparently to betray the confidence which the legislative branch reposed in them.

I am not willing, regardless of the high character of those who will have charge of the administration of this fund, to permit them to employ as many persons as they please at such compensation as they please to execute the provisions of this act. The record of this board, as shown by the hearings in the House, gives no assurance that it will practice economy or act with financial prudence.

I called attention yesterday to the statement made by the leader of the majority in the House where an appropriation of $4,000,000 was asked for and nearly $3,000,000 were requested for the administration of the fund. There has been too much prodigality during the past few years in the expenditure of public funds, and during the war the expenses of some of the governmental agencies have been wasteful in the extreme. I repeat it is unsafe and, indeed, a dangerous practice to appropriate lump sums to executive authority to be expended for salaries and administrative purposes without placing limitations and clear restrictions.

Mr. President, in view of the suggestion of the Senator, though I do so reluctantly, I will consent to a modification of my motion to amend so that it will read "$2,500" instead of "$2,000," but then, when it shall have been agreed to, I shall offer an amendment limiting the number of employees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Utah to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. KING. I modify the amendment so that it will read "$2,500."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out "$3,000" in the last instance and insert "$2,500."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in examining the amendment closely——

Mr. KENYON. I suggest to the Senator to let the amendment to the amendment be adopted, and then he can offer his substitute.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask my colleague to withdraw his amendment to the amendment for the present, and then I should like to offer a substitute, because it is worded better I think.

Mr. KING. I will temporarily withdraw my amendment to the amendment and see what my colleague offers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to substitute the following, because I think it clarifies the language of the amendment offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the words "following amount" strike out and insert, so that it will read:

No salaries shall be paid out of the fund provided in this section in excess of the following amounts: At the rate of $5,000 per annum to not more than one person; at the rate of $4,000 per annum each to not more than four persons; at the rate of $3,500 per annum each to not more than five persons; and no other employee shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of $2,500 per annum.

Mr. KENYON. That means practically the same thing, though perhaps it is better worded. I do not know whether it is or not. I am willing that that substitute shall be adopted in place of my amendment.

Mr. KING. I move, as an amendment to the amendment, that where the word "four" is used relating to the number of employees at $4,000 each, "four" be stricken out and the word "two" inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am not going to keep on arguing this matter. I have said to the Senate and to the junior Senator from Utah that these were the figures as to the numbers that Dr. Prosser, who is at the head of the present board, declared he needed and could not get along without. I asked him to put the proposition at the very lowest—that is, four; and these will be expert men; some of them will be surgeons who are needed in camps to do the work. Now, if the Senate wants to cripple the work without the Senator producing any figures or any reason to support his proposition, it may go ahead and do it. I am not going to spend any more time arguing the matter.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there is, of course, no disposition to cripple any work which the Government properly should undertake. The same argument which the Senator from Iowa has just made is always made when efforts are submitted in the Senate or in the House or elsewhere looking to curtail the expenses of the executive departments of the Government. It is my experience that executive officers usually ask for more than they should have and more than is necessary for the efficient administration of the duties which devolve upon them. I wish that were not the case; but I submit that the experience of the Senator from Iowa and the information which we daily receive now must convince him of the fact that the demands of the executive departments for salaries and for employees are often without merit. Their recommendations are often the outgrowth of the extension of authority and governmental activity into fields which they are not authorized to enter.

The Appropriations Committee is deluged with letters, statements, and reports of various bureaus, agencies, and employees of the Government appealing for increased compensation. Many of these claims are in behalf of the higher-paid officials. There seems to be little thought for the taxpayer and little consideration for efficiency and economy. All persons who come in contact with governmental agencies are convinced of the waste and inefficiency in the handling of national concerns. There is too much machinery, there are too many employees, there is too much red tape. There is no head, no one who is responsible, no rigorous work done, no sense of personal responsibility as in private service.

Why, Mr. President, soon after we entered the war the trains that came to Washington were loaded day and night with thousands and tens of thousands of men and women who came here seeking service in various executive departments of the Government. We were promised that as soon as the war was over most of these men and women would be separated from the service and would return to their homes. The armistice was signed in November last; the process of demobilization not only of the Army but in the executive departments of the Government began. We were led to believe that there would be a very great reduction in the number of employees, and yet at the present time the aggregate number of employees in all of these departments and executive branches is only 8,000 less than there were at the peak during the war.

Mr. President, when these bureaus and departments and agencies become fastened upon the Government they remain; and when the number of employees is increased even for a temporary purpose, they usually remain. My colleague [Mr. SMOOT] invited my attention last evening to an advertisement of one of the departments that has, I think, thirty or forty thousand employees—I do not pretend to state the exact number—in which the statement is made that 1,000 additional stenographers are required. I do not know how many more employees are demanded in the various other branches of the service in that bureau.

Mr. President, when a governmental agency is created, immediately those in authority seek to extend their hand of power and to draw to that department fields of activity which were never conceived to be within the purpose of such agency. The ambitions of the officials and bureaus lead to the extension of their power, and soon they have assumed such immense proportions that some expert or scientist or faddist within it conceives the idea of dividing the bureau or agency or department or instrumentality into a number of other bureaus or agencies or instrumentalities, giving the new creations additional power, and extending their authority and multiplying the number of office-holders who are to operate within such newly created organizations, and so on ad infinitum. Cellular growth manifested and developed in the biological world finds a strong competitor in

the bureaucratic organism. One cell develops others, which in time break off and others are formed.

Mr. President, of course these officials—and they are not different from other governmental officials—will insist upon larger compensation and more employees for service under their direction. I stated yesterday that the board referred to in the bill under consideration is already in existence, it has already administrative machinery, it is already drawing from two funds of the Government $400,000 or more per annum for the employees who are in that service. This bill when it was introduced called for an appropriation of $500,000 for the first year, and to expend this amount $200,000 was asked for.

Mr. President, I am getting tired of many appeals made by some officials for additional compensation and higher salaries, and I am getting tired of the constant demand for an increased number of employees. Why do not some of these men, if they are dissatisfied with the service, resign? You do not find many resigning, but you do find them importuning the Government to keep them on. Senators almost daily are visited by employees of the Government urging that they aid them to retain their positions.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Did not the Senate provide an extra clerk for each Senator a short time ago?

Mr. KING. I understand that that was done.

Mr. KENYON. And did not the Senate increase the salaries of their clerks and secretaries a short time ago?

Mr. KING. I understand that that was done.

Mr. KENYON. If we are going to begin on this policy of the Senator from Utah, we had better begin at home, had we not?

Mr. KING. I agree most heartily with my distinguished friend, and I shall join with my friend in any recommendation that will make for economy; that will save to the taxpayers of our country, for it seems that everybody is represented here except the taxpayers.

Mr. KENYON. Did the Senator from Utah vote for the bill providing an additional clerk for each Senator?

Mr. KING. I do not recall that the proposition came as a separate bill. If it had done so, I should have voted against it.

Mr. KENYON. If Senators really need clerks to do their work, does not the Senator think it may make for efficiency to have a sufficient number of clerks?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. Is not that equally true in the case of the other departments of the Government?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. Then does it not all get back to the one question of the honesty of the people who are managing the different varieties of work of the Government? If we can not have honest people who will take care of the public funds as they would of private funds, it is an unfortunate situation, but it is an indictment against our whole Government.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator, in view of his long experience here, if he thinks that the large number of employees in the Federal service is required?

Mr. KENYON. I do not. I think they could be decreased one-third, if not one-half.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think if there were honesty and efficiency and that loyalty and devotion to the public service that ought to characterize public officials, whether they are clerks or whether they occupy higher positions, that the administration of the affairs of the Government would cost hundreds of millions of dollars less than it is now costing the Government?

Mr. KENYON. I do; but I think Senators would be in a better position to preach economy if they did not have an extra clerk voted to themselves, and a free barber shop and a marble bathroom maintained at public expense. I think that those who live in glass houses had better pull down the blinds.

Mr. KING. Well, Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator means by his last statement.

Mr. KENYON. I mean that it is easy to preach economy to everybody else and every other department of the Government, but we have a hard time when we come to apply it right here to ourselves. We do not do it; that is all.

Mr. KING. I think, perhaps, there may be something in the indictment which the Senator makes against his colleagues here that in fixing the number of clerks allowed Senators and in provisions made for the maintenance——

Mr. KENYON. I do not want the Senator to say I am indicting my colleagues because of their clerks. I say there is efficiency and sense in having enough clerks to do our work, but the same thing applies to other departments of the Government.

Mr. KING. And yet, as I understand the Senator, he believes that, if there was loyalty and efficiency upon the part of the employees of the Government, at least one-third of the number could be dispensed with.

Mr. KENYON. I believe that. I think the whole trouble, however, is that we do not regard public funds and the protection of public funds and economies in connection with public funds as we would private funds. I think a public dollar ought to be made go as far as a private dollar, but I know it does not.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think when men are handling funds of others, whether they be public funds or funds which come to them in a fiduciary capacity, that they ought to handle them with greater care and with more scrupulous regard to their proper utilization than if they were handling their own funds?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. KING. I am sure the Senator will not complain or criticize me because I am calling attention to what I conceive to be extravagances in departments of the Government. Our Government is not very much different from other Governments in this regard. Men in the service of Governments which are democracies have the same weaknesses as are possessed by individuals employed under other forms of government; but it has been said repeatedly upon the floor of the Senate and in the House by men who have made investigation that the cost of running the Government was entirely too great; that there was not that regard for the public funds which should characterize public officials. I am not the only one who has intimated that such is the case. A distinguished Republican Senator, after a very careful examination, after years of contact with the public service, declared upon the floor of the Senate that at least $300,000,000 could be saved annually if there were a proper administration of the affairs of the Government, and that statement was made at a time when the expenses of the Government were very inconsiderable, measured by the annual expenses of the Government at the present time.

I am objecting, Mr. President, to these lump-sum appropriations. There has not been a Senator to whose attention the subject has been called but has said that it was a mistake to make lump-sum appropriations. I am not going to call attention by name to the numerous agencies created during the war, but some of them have been investigated, and Senators have had occasion to inquire into the salaries and the number of employees in many of these bureaus, and I have yet to find a single Senator who has approved of the policy of lump-sum appropriations and leaving to the honesty of those administering the funds the discretion and authority to fix such salaries as they pleased and hire such employees as they pleased. Experience has shown the necessity of limitations; and I shall insist in this bill, as I shall insist with respect to other bills and as I have insisted in the past, that limitations be placed upon the number of employees and upon the amount of compensation paid.

I think that it is unjust to the thousands of persons in the public service, who have been so employed for years under fixed compensation, in grades where their salaries are limited, and who are performing work just as important as and in some instances more important than that which is required under many of these new bureaus and agencies, and yet whose compensation is only one-half and in some instances less than one-half of that which is paid to employees who have been provided for in many of the new instrumentalities and executive agencies. I think that is unjust; it makes for inefficiency and discontent.

One employee of the Government who visited me a few weeks ago invited my attention to the fact that he had been in the Government service for 15 years. His work was of an important character, and he was receiving $2,500 per annum. And yet we have created a large number of bureaus and executive agencies during the past two years without fixing the compensation or placing any limitation upon the number of employees, so that hundreds, if not thousands, of men have been employed who are paid sums far in excess of the amount paid to the employee to whom I have just referred, although the services which they are performing are no more important than the service which he is rendering. This sort of legislation makes for discontent and for complaint. Men in the civil service who have been working under the Government for years, when they see these new agencies created and the employees therein given higher salaries, feel that they are dealt with unjustly. They will come to Congress and clamor for an increase in their salaries, and there is no reason why their appeal should not be responded to. It is unjust and it is unfair to create additional bureaus and agencies and governmental executive instrumentalities and not grade the employees in those departments and agencies and bureaus and

provide for them the same compensation that is given to those who have been in the Government service for years, where the service performed is of a like character or similar character.

Mr. President, we want efficiency, of course; but we have discovered that efficiency does not always come from lump-sum appropriations or high salaries. Indeed, I think that many of these new agencies, with their high salaries, their lump-sum appropriations, without limitation upon the number of employees, have shown us a chapter of inefficiency far greater than can be found written in the departments that have been in existence for years, and where the employees are limited by existing law as to the compensation which they shall receive.

The Senator says that he has consulted with Dr. Prosser, and that the amendment which he has offered is all that Dr. Prosser can concede. Perhaps I have not stated that accurately; but, at any rate, we are told that the bill could not be properly administered with any less appropriation than that indicated and with less compensation for the employees than that stated in the amendment. I started out by saying that the same appeals are made by all of the executive officers: "We must have so much. We can do with no less." "We must have so many employees. We can do with no less." "We must pay so much. We can do with no less." The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I have no doubt, has discovered in his investigations that in many of those departments where there was no limitation, where lump sums were appropriated, there was waste and extravagance that calls for severe censure to be administered to some who were connected with the expenditure of those sums. I am only asking for uniformity, asking for the adoption of some rule, some standard, not to leave it to some departments to pay very much larger salaries than other departments where the work is similar or of no greater importance.

Therefore I ask for a vote upon the amendment which I have suggested.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate not so directly to the pending amendment as to a statement made on yesterday that in February the Federal Board for Vocational Education had engaged in the soldiers' rehabilitation work 300 employees, when only 150 soldiers were actually assigned to training.

Yesterday I referred to this statement and explained that it was entirely misleading unless accompanied by additional information, and, in a general way, I answered this unjust criticism. Now, I wish to go somewhat more into exact facts.

By the 1st of March there were registered and under the study of the employees of the Board for Vocational Education over 30,000 disabled soldiers. The 300 employees were not giving their time to the 150 injured soldiers who were receiving exclusive training. There were over 30,000 injured soldiers who were receiving the careful study and service of these employees; 1,215 injured soldiers—injured men not found to require exclusive training—had been located in employments by the Vocational Board. Places had been found for them where, despite their physical injuries, they were capable of taking up lines of work where they could progress in capacity as the work itself was done. These figures were entirely omitted; they were not embraced in the statement of the 150 who were receiving exclusive training. The 150 had been assigned to schools where they were receiving training for work into which they subsequently were to enter. The total number of soldiers at that time assigned to occupations or schools was 1,365. The 30,000 not assigned were receiving care and study by the 1st of March.

There had been established trying-out stations for the injured soldiers. At these stations the injured soldiers were studied and experimentations were being made as to their physical capacity and their mental aptitude for different lines of work.

Canada spent $10,000,000 in erecting places for retraining her injured soldiers. Under the policy we have pursued nothing of the kind took place. We spent, in connection with our receiving stations and trying-out stations and preliminary training, about $100,000; but four hundred and odd institutions in the United States have been located to which these soldiers who are receiving exclusive training are assigned, and the expense of establishing plants has been entirely obviated in the United States. One hundred and twenty different lines of occupation have been studied out which the disabled in various degrees are able to follow, for which they can be prepared, and into those lines they were being directed.

There are now 4,200 assigned to exclusive study in the different schools and in most varied lines of occupation. Over 10,000 injured soldiers, in addition to those in schools, have been placed in varying lines of occupation. After many of them had tried out their capacity in a measure in these trying-out stations, after they had been studied by physicians, 10,000 places have been found where they have gone to work, and where their continued progress is not through exclusive vocational training but by occupation in the work they are doing.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. KING. I have been advised by a number of people—one or two who have, it is alleged, been placed by this Vocational Board—that those placements would have been effectuated just the same without this board, very much the same as one person wrote me with respect to the Federal Employment Service, which claimed to have placed a large number in a certain town. He told me that those persons would have been placed without the Federal Employment Service and that they were actually placed by private individuals, but they reported through the Federal Employment Service because of the requisition by the latter that that should be done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have no doubt that a portion of them would have found their places without the assistance of the board. I do not claim that it was exclusively the work of the board, but I do claim that the employees of the board have had a part, and a most valuable part, in helping to work out the problem of employment for a large portion of these 10,000 injured soldiers.

Six thousand cases, in addition to the 4,200 now in exclusive study, have been graded and assigned, and will shortly take up their exclusive preparation in schools for vocational education. Twenty-five thousand more, it is estimated, out of those registered with the Vocational Board will be found capable and be placed, not exclusively by the board—I do not claim that; I want to be perfectly fair—but their study and their work and their help has contributed, in many instances entirely, to the fact that numbers of the 10,000 are placed and engaged in service where they can grow and improve in capacity.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Complaints have been made to me in regard to this service, or, rather, criticisms of this service. One of the critics called to my attention a fact with which apparently he was familiar—that some individual who had met with some little accident to his finger was sought out at considerable expense by this Vocational Board, or some of its representatives, and aid extended to him, and the board claims this person as one who had been, under this board, placed and rehabilitated by it. If that is the case, does the Senator think that that is the jurisdiction of the board or within the functions of the board?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I would rather have an occasional happening of help to an injured soldier that he did not need than the neglect of any where they did need it. I am glad that we have reached a board engaged in handling soldiers against which the criticism is that they are trying to do too much for the wounded soldiers rather than too little.

Now, with regard to this force of employees: Vast numbers of letters of inquiry have come to them. I am glad that this is a force that has answered the inquiries and that we have not the complaint that the inquiries have piled up on them neglected.

I wish to show the present status of their work, which is: Four thousand two hundred in exclusive training schools or exclusive student work; 10,000 assigned to occupations; 6,000 more ready for exclusive student work; a registration with the Vocational Board of over 100,000 whom they are trying out and helping to classify; and an almost certainty that the student body proper will reach about 15,000, while those assigned to useful and improving work will reach about 35,000. There are 59,000 men to-day in the hospitals still to be registered and to be the subject of further study.

I felt, Mr. President, that it was only fair that we should see the case, not from the standpoint of 300 employees and 150 soldiers assigned to work, but that we should see it as it really was—over 30,000 registered with the board March 1 and being studied, and since that time over 100,000 registered; 4,200 in schools; 6,000 more ready for exclusive student work; 10,000 assigned to employment, 1,215 placed in occupations in February when the 150 assigned to exclusive student work alone were mentioned. A recognition of the fact that earnest, faithful, devoted work is being done to carry out the responsibilities we placed upon them is due to the Federal Board for Vocational Education. We should feel pride and find joy from the service they are rendering, and not seek to belittle the loving work of our Nation for the injured soldier.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, in this discussion I wanted to ask the Senator from Georgia how much money was appropriated in the soldiers' vocational rehabilitation bill for the

managing Federal board or for the organization of its working force?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My recollection is that it was something like $200,000.

Mr. KIRBY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have not thought of it for some time, and I may be mistaken.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Congressman MONDELL, as I recall the hearing to which I called attention yesterday, and the speech which he made in the House, stated that $4,000,000 was asked for by the board and $2,750,000 was asked for by the board for compensation. Whether or not that amount was actually appropriated, I am unable to state.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That bill has not come to us yet.

Mr. KING. I am speaking with respect to the last year's appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No such bill as that has passed the Senate or come to us. The bill that I presented, and the one that was passed, carried, my recollection is, $200,000 for these charges.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, when the soldiers' vocational rehabilitation bill was before the Senate I favored its passage, and I do not know sufficiently about its operation to say whether or not it has been or is being carried out successfully. At that time I offered an amendment to that bill proposing to allow those injured in industrial employment who were not able to follow their former vocations to take the benefit of the free training that was provided therein for the soldiers. I said: "If you are going to create this sort of a school or these schools and train the injured soldier, you might as well train the injured citizen, the man who is unable to follow his old employment. The Government has as much interest in the training of one as it has in the training of the other."

The amendment was objected to and opposed by the Senator from Georgia on the ground, he said, that we would be unable to take care of all the wounded soldiers and all the men injured in industrial and civilian employment. Now the committee comes here with this bill, proposing to take care of those who are injured in industrial and civil life.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The objection was that we were not prepared to do that. We had not developed specialists and studied the question so as to handle it. My suggestion was and my promise was at that time that we give the board the time to develop experts and get started with the soldiers, and that I would bring in the measure suggested by the Senator as soon as the board said they had made sufficient progress with their first responsibility to broaden it out as the Senator from Arkansas thought it ought to be broadened out.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I am in entire accord with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] on the proposition of the necessity for the vocational training of the injured soldier as well as the injured civilian. We are in entire accord on the proposition that the Government is interested in having this done, that these men may not become public charges, that they may continue to contribute to the production of wealth and the promotion of the public welfare. The matter that I want to discuss is this: If we have organized a school to train the disabled soldier, if it has become effective in the particular field, and has done the things that have been suggested here, why is it necessary now to give this board $200,000 more to get another force to take care of men injured in industry, who are injured in like manner as our soldiers are injured? It is well enough to have the law; it is well also to have a provision that the States shall help take care of the condition, but why should $200,000 more be given to a board that is already organized and that has already made regulations, that has already made all sorts of plans for the rehabilitation of men injured in war? Why can they not, with that information and force, go ahead and carry out the provisions of this act without $200,000 more for overhead expenses and management? That is the point I want to discuss and inquire about.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. KING. In addition to the $200,000 to which the Senator just referred, which they have under the soldiers' vocational act, they receive at least $200,000 per annum under a prior act.

Mr. KIRBY. That is what has caused me some little pause in the matter. The State boards are required, when the State shall have put up its amount of money, to submit plans for the rehabilitation of these men. All sorts of plans are provided for. They must submit the plans to the Federal board for its approval. They can not be carried out or executed without the approval of the Federal board. If this Federal board is already organized, if it is operating and efficient, then when the State boards must make their plans and submit them to the Federal board for approval, why should it have $200,000 more for another organization when it has already an office force which it seems is efficient and sufficient to take care of the condition that it was created to look after? I would like to ask the chairman of the committee about that matter.

Mr. KENYON. I know the Senator wants to be accurate, but apparently he does not know that an amendment was adopted cutting the amount to $100,000 the first year and $150,000 for the succeeding year.

Mr. KIRBY. That is, section 5 has been so amended?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. KIRBY. That helps some.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would like to make a suggestion to the Senator. The appropriation for the soldiers will expire in a couple of years. We propose to continue the work. The theory was to prepare this work and go right on with it after the soldier work stops to a large extent.

Mr. KIRBY. The theory is all right and the practice would be, but necessarily this board——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are shaping our appropriations with that end in view.

Mr. KIRBY. I could not understand the necessity for an additional $150,000 a year for office expenditures and office force of the Federal board when the State board must submit all the plans for rehabilitation of the injured civilians and when it necessarily has already had to develop all the plans for the rehabilitation of the soldiers. When it has developed all these plans and put them into operation now, as I understand it, why will it require so much more office force to take care of the number of men who are injured in civil life?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to say to the Senator——

Mr. KIRBY. How many men is it supposed this bill will reach and benefit if it becomes a law?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are in the United States certainly over 500,000 who to-day could be the subject of study and suggestion and State vocational training. If the Senator will allow me, this money that has been expended on the soldier has not been expended for office force. In various parts of the United States, in various localities and various camps, there are expert physicians, expert vocational trainers, who together have, as I stated a little while ago, what they call trying-out stations, in which they have brought in the wounded soldiers and tested their physical condition and helped them there, not in the office here, but helped them there, work out the problem as to what line of occupation they can best follow, and they have helped place over 10,000 of them in occupation after testing out their capacity and helping them to determine their capacity. Nothing like the sum has been spent here in office work. It has been spent away from here, where the soldiers were, to a large extent.

I just throw out that idea, because I know the Senator from Arkansas has been interested in this class of work very much, and it was with real hesitation that I failed to support his motion to add the injured generally before, but I was urged by friends of the measure to give them a little time and not to have the 500,000, at least, of injured generally applying for suggestion and advice when the soldiers were about to come back on them in such large numbers.

Mr. KIRBY. This bill provides, in section 5, that—

> For the purpose of making studies, investigations, and reports regarding the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their placements in suitable or gainful occupations, and for the administrative expenses of said board incident to performing the duties imposed by this act, including salaries of such assistants, expert, clerk, and other employees, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, as the board may deem necessary, actual traveling and other necessary expenses—

And so forth.

I understand the other bill provided for all that, for the making of plans, for the making of surveys, for the carrying out generally the provisions of the act, and for an office force that was sufficient to take care of the conditions that might be developed. That being true, the same sort of plan ought to rehabilitate one man that will rehabilitate another, whether he got his leg shot off on the battle field or cut off in a sawmill or in a cottonseed crusher. If there is necessity for this much-increased office force to make these plans or to agree upon these plans or to make these surveys, I would be glad, so far as I am concerned, to support it; but it seems to me there ought to be some necessity shown for this additional $150,000 a year for increased office force and expenditures here in Washington.

Mr. DIAL. By the same board.

Mr. KIRBY. Yes, by the same board, and when the State boards are required to make all these plans and suggestions and submit them to the Federal board in the first instance for ap-

proval before they are to be carried out or executed. If there can be some more light thrown on that particular phase of the question, I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, there will probably not be a record vote on this bill, and therefore I desire to say a word in order to give my hearty approval to the general principle of the bill. This measure has been opposed largely because it is suggested that the subject should be taken up primarily by the States. I think there is a good deal of force in that suggestion, but at the same time I am convinced that it is a matter not only of State importance but of nation-wide importance.

As a Congress we have concerned ourselves with education along other lines, particularly in the disposition of our public lands, and I can see no sound reason why we should not, to a limited degree at least, encourage the vocational rehabilitation of our disabled citizens, no matter by what cause. I indulge the hope that in the future the States will awaken to the necessity of taking up this subject and dealing with it alone without Federal aid, but I feel that I would be derelict in my duty, knowing the situation as I do, if I did not encourage the States by offering Federal aid now.

In the early years of my professional life I used to see many men leave the court room who had been seriously injured in some factory or mine nonsuited, perhaps, because their injuries were the result of unavoidable accident or because they had been guilty of contributory negligence, or because the injury was the result of negligence by a fellow servant, and they were left helpless, to be cared for by the charities of the country. It seemed to me that society owed them something, and I am glad to know that in my State, as in many of the States, they have adopted workmen's compensation laws to care for them. But while those laws provide a certain compensation for injuries, they do not help the injured man to restore himself to a place of usefulness in the community. Many of these men, of course, can not be rehabilitated so as to care for themselves, either in whole or in part, but many of them can be, and it is for them that we are now having a care. If I had one man who was to be the object of beneficial legislation either in the way of giving him a living or in the way of helping him to make a living for himself, I would prefer to resort to the latter method. In other words, I believe that we are doing a greater service by helping a man to help himself than by giving him a living, and if for no other reason because it restores his self-respect, his independence, and opens the door of hope for the future.

Just the other day I heard Gen. J. M. T. Finney, the great Baltimore surgeon, who was at the head of the surgical department of the American Expeditionary Forces in France, discuss conditions in the hospitals in France. He said that out of the thousands and tens of thousands of soldiers who lay there wounded he never heard one of them ask the question, "Am I going to die?" But the thought that was uppermost in the mind of the sufferer was this, "How soon can I get out of here?" "Am I going to be permanently crippled?" In other words, he was hoping that notwithstanding his wounds he might be restored to a state of usefulness to himself and to his community. And now I dare say if that thought was with the wounded soldiers, so it must be with those who are wounded in the industries of our country. It seems to me that when we adopt legislation of this kind we are opening the door of opportunity to those who are maimed and who may yet be instruments of usefulness for themselves, their families, and their communities. For these reasons, very briefly stated, I hope this legislation will pass.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smoot
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Spencer
Cummins	Kellogg	Norris	Sterling
Curtis	Kendrick	Nugent	Sutherland
Dial	Kenyon	Overman	Swanson
Fletcher	Keyes	Page	Thomas
France	King	Phelan	Trammell
Gerry	Kirby	Phipps	Wadsworth
Hale	Lodge	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Harding	McCormick	Pomerene	Warren
Harris	McCumber	Sheppard	
Harrison	McKellar	Sherman	

Mr. GERRY. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are necessarily detained on important public business.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thought that amendment was accepted by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment we are to vote upon now is to strike out the word "four" and insert the word "two" before the word "persons."

Mr. KENYON. I think there was a misapprehension about it.

Mr. KING. As I understand it, the Senator from Iowa accepted the other amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. I had no objection to the other amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then this amendment strikes out the $4,000 and reduces it to $2,000?

Mr. KING. No; it strikes out the number of employees who receive $4,000 and reduces them to two. I ask that the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment in order that the Senate may fully understand it.

The SECRETARY. The amendment of Mr. KENYON, as modified, is to insert:

No salaries shall be paid out of the fund provided in this section in excess of the following amounts: At the rate of $5,000 per annum, to not more than one person; at the rate of $4,000 per annum each, to not more than four persons.

Mr. KING proposes to strike out the word "four," before the word "persons," and to insert the word "two."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa will remember that we were told of the necessity for those four employees—one, at least, a physician and the others highly expert men. We were satisfied that they were right, and that they could not get otherwise the character of service needed. I hope the Senator from Utah will not insist on the amendment.

Mr. KING. Let me make an inquiry. Will the Senator from Iowa indicate the character of employees that are to be secured under this provision?

Mr. KENYON. Those four, as I understand, are rather in the nature of expert surgeons. It may be that some of them are to be experts in the trade field. I suggested the other day that this is going to involve the work of getting men into the trades; it is going to involve the question of the study of consumption and of other occupational diseases. They are experts. I can not tell now what was to be the character of the four employees, but I know that some of them were to be surgeons.

Mr. KING. While the Senator from Iowa is on the floor, if he will permit another inquiry, I desire to call his attention to the fact that the next provision, as I recall, asks for five clerks. What are they?

Mr. KENYON. Those are regional agents, who go out in the different regions of the country, to be continually traveling to do the work of the board.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think, in view of the provisions of the bill that the States themselves must prepare plans in collaboration with the Federal Government, that those regional agents are necessary?

Mr. KENYON. The director, in whom I have great confidence, says they are. I accept his judgment about that matter. He knows more than I do about it. I also talked with the Senator from Georgia, and with him this morning I cut down every one that was not absolutely essential. The director was advised of the feeling of the Senate, and especially of the feeling of the junior Senator from Utah, and we were ourselves anxious to reduce the number to the minimum. That is all I can say about it. If it is not satisfactory, let the number be cut down.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We thought we had brought it down to the minimum. The only place about which we had an issue was to the $3,000 and the $2,500 employees. We thought $2,500 was better than $3,000, and the director thought that $3,000 was necessary; but we got him a little uncertain, and it was determined to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Utah and reduce the $3,000 class to $2,500.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think I see the temper of the Senate. While I do not agree with the statements just made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], while I believe this board has been ex-

travagant and that this bill provides for continued extravagance, I will not press the amendment; but I offer the following amendment——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah withdraws the amendment that he proposed, and the Secretary will state the additional amendment.

Mr. KING. At the close of the bill I move to insert:

Provided, That no person receiving a compensation of less than $3,500 per annum shall receive in excess of the amount of compensation paid in the regular departments of the Government for like or similar services.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we can accept that amendment.

Mr. KENYON. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, are amendments now in order as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Amendments are now in order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the word "otherwise," and to insert the words "in any legitimate occupation," so that if amended it will read:

That in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or in any legitimate occupation and their return to civil employment——

Mr. KENYON. Under the amendment the language will read "industry or in any legitimate occupation"?

Mr. KING. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMOOT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in the absence of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], who is necessarily absent on public business, but who will return shortly, and who, I understand, favors this amendment as well as myself. I offer the amendment, as the supporters of the bill probably know, in order to eliminate what I call the underserving, not necessarily undeserving because of misfortune or any congenital disability, but because of a lack of merit in any of the affairs of life.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have in mind a young boy whose parents and family abandoned him, and who was literally shoved on the streets of one of the cities of my State. He shines shoes and does any little thing that he can to make a livelihood for himself. He has a leg that has withered away, and gets around on the streets in the most distressing fashion. He is a pitiable spectacle. He was not injured in industry, but had some kind of disease that withered his leg away. He has naturally a very bright mind, and, if he were rehabilitated under this proposed law, he would make a useful citizen and would become much happier. If the Senator's amendment is adopted, that young man—and, by the way, I have not seen him in a number of years and do not know whether he is still on the streets of my city—and every other young man similarly situated would be eliminated from this rehabilitation work. It seems to me that this bill should apply to young men in that situation who are so unfortunate as to lose their limbs and who need rehabilitation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the case presented by the Senator from Tennessee is an extreme case, but there is no reason why the comparatively few extreme cases of that kind ought not to be taken care of by the State of Tennessee or other States. I do not think the Government ought to invade the province of private charity that belongs to a State, or the province of rehabilitation, if it be given the more agreeable sound, for, after all, charity is all it is. You may conceal it by any euphonious language you please, but nevertheless it is the extension, through the taxpayers of the community or of the country at large, of the help that otherwise every person must give himself. That belongs——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. Pardon me for just a moment—that belongs to the States and not to the General Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Taking the case I have mentioned, if the Government, through cooperation with the States—and this is a cooperative measure entirely; they both join together under it—if, through the cooperation of the two Governments, a boy situated as the one to whom I have referred could be rehabilitated and put in a position where he could make a good, honest living for himself, where he could always be in employment that would render him happier and make a good citizen of him, instead of its being charity, would not the two Governments, the National Government and the State government, be amply repaid in thus building up its citizenship?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is so infinitesimal when it is applied to the General Government, Mr. President, that it almost ceases to be a factor to be considered in legislation. Primarily it is the duty of the States to take care of those extreme cases. The meritorious one cited by the Senator from Tennessee appeals very strongly to one's sympathy, but the States can take care of those instances. The larger the population, it may be assumed, the more numerous those cases will become, but at the same time the more numerous become the facilities and the resources of the State in order to furnish the necessary care. There is one unchangeable condition that always follows these misfortunes. The Senator from Tennessee says that the young man so afflicted has a very capable mind. If that is so, either through his family, through local influence, or through the State, at least that mind will be utilized and developed. I say candidly, Mr. President, that I never have—and I think I have the average sympathy for misfortune—that overflowing sympathy for a man, for instance, who has lost his leg and is around on the street corner at some place asking alms that I might be expected to have by the professional humanitarians to whom I alluded a day or so ago. Generally the person of merit who has some claim upon the sympathy of the public or the community or the State, when he meets with a misfortune, can best be cared for and reach that sympathy and that kindly help in the community where he has suffered the misfortune, if he is the right kind of a character. There is hardly an exception to that. Generally the person who is found among strangers displaying his misfortune and seeking help from those who never knew him before, prior to the time he received the injury was of the type that could not get help because he did not deserve it.

Let me give you an illustration that is drawn not from the records of the platform gentleman who is going about on a salary appealing to the sympathies of the humane, but from actual conditions that face everybody who applies charity practically. In a certain town of considerable size in the West there appeared one day on the streets asking alms a man who walked with one wooden leg and a pair of crutches. The other leg was absent. A paper was carried by him and presented to the charitably inclined reciting that he had only the necessary means to buy one wooden leg, and the passer-by was solicited to contribute funds in order that he might buy another wooden leg. Of course it was a case that would appeal to all who were disposed to help the unfortunate. He raised over $100 by actual count in the course of a single day in that city of 25,000 or 30,000 population. Two days afterwards he appeared over 150 miles away with the same pair of crutches and the same one wooden leg and the same one stump, but he had a different statement with which to solicit alms. In the first place referred to he stated he had lost his leg in a freight yard, he having rendered service under the freight depot master. In the second town it was stated that he lost his leg in a sawmill because of an unfortunate fall in front of a circular saw.

These statements came to the attention of the charitably inclined. It happened that a traveling man was in city No. 2, who remembered the circumstances, having contributed a $5 bill himself for the relief of the unfortunate in the first city referred to, in order to help him secure another wooden leg. Having a fairly good memory, he found that there was a different statement about how the accident occurred. It was brought to my attention. Ordinarily I would not feel disposed to make any trouble, and that is the reason why I like to sift measures that are intended to relieve these cases.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENYON. If the committee will accept the Senator's amendment, would he be willing, then, to postpone his address to some other time?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is a fair offer for a compromise.

Mr. KENYON. We are trying to get the bill in good condition——

Mr. SHERMAN. If I can get what I want in this particular exploit, I do not know but that I ought to yield.

Mr. KENYON. I was laboring under the impression that yesterday, when we gave way to the Senator, there was some kind of an agreement, a little shadowy perhaps, that the Senator would make his remarks at that time and not to-day, so that we might get through the bill to-day.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have a good deal coming yet, on which I will credit the five minutes I took yesterday. I will credit that to my occupancy of the floor now, if the Senator so desires.

Mr. KENYON. Be that as it may, I will say to the Senator that those members of the committee who are here are willing to accept his amendment, if by so doing further discussion of the question can be avoided.

Mr. SHERMAN. The acceptance of the amendment is the end of controversy, and it would, of course, be entirely superfluous for me to proceed in that event.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is agreed to.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge to a slight oversight in the amendment adopted on page 2, under which a term of three years following the year 1922 is provided for. That would give a total life of six years to the bill. That language should be changed, I suggest, to read two years, so as to make the life of the appropriation five years in all.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think that is true. We have had considerable trouble in getting it correctly arranged. The object is to make it extend over a period of five years. We specify three years after the year 1922, which should be amended, as the Senator suggests, so as to make it a period of two years after 1922. I ask unanimous consent that that change be made—strike out the word "three" and insert the word "two."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to?

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out "three" and insert "two," so that it will read——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to have that read, because I do not catch the effect of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. So that the entire paragraph will read, starting on line 10 with the word "and":

> And in returning vocationally rehabilitated persons to civil employment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of $750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and thereafter for a period of two years——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is all right.

Mr. KENYON. It makes it all right.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether he thinks it wise and proper to fix the compensation for a period in excess of one year?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, yes, Mr. President. I think it is unwise to limit it to five years, but on account of the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations not to have these appropriations running year by year, I have consented to this arrangement. It would be perfect nonsense to limit it to one year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That would not start the work at all.

Mr. KENYON. They could not get started. We might as well quit and let them go.

Mr. KING. The point I have in mind is this: The Senator knows that in many of the departments—in fact, all, so far as I know—and in many of the agencies and bureaus the compensation is provided annually in an appropriation bill; and I see no reason why this compensation should not be provided for in some general appropriation bill, the same as compensation is provided for other agencies and bureaus of the Government.

Mr. KENYON. It is perfectly apparent to me why it can not; but I am not going to be drawn into a discussion that merely prolongs the passage of this bill by discussing that question.

Mr. KING. Of course, I can not induce the Senator to talk if he does not want to.

Mr. KENYON. No; the Senator can not induce me to talk. Of course, the Senator can talk himself if he desires.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator another question, then. Does not the Senator think that when this is put into operation, and the States have inaugurated the machinery which the bill calls for, the expense will be less on the part of the parent board than it is when the organization is first started?

Mr. KENYON. I have the feeling that after four or five years there will be practically no expense to the Federal Government. When it is once started the magnificent results of this work will be so apparent that the States will carry it on and appropriate more money, just as they have for vocational training, and it will become entirely a State matter.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt but that the States will carry on this work, because they are doing it in some States now, and all undoubtedly will do so.

Mr. KENYON. I think only in one State now.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is in error.

Mr. KENYON. I think New Jersey is the only State that has passed a bill for the purpose of carrying on this work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, on page 5, lines 13, 14, and 15, I move to strike out the words "and to cooperate." They are in italics, in a committee amendment. I assume that that amendment has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Chair will say to the Senator from Illinois that that amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move, then, to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois moves to reconsider the vote whereby the committee amendment found on page 5, lines 13, 14, and 15, was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. On that motion I desire to be heard.

Mr. President, I make this motion to reconsider in order to move not to concur in this committee amendment, which is in the following language:

> And to cooperate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, with such public and private agencies as it may deem advisable.

"It" referring to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, in line 6, the first line of section 3, from which this amendment is quoted.

I now wish to resume my story of the one-legged constituent, which I was inopportunely prevented from completing by the Senator from Iowa accepting my amendment. I would regard the history of public charity as being incomplete if I did not supply this to the RECORD.

After the investigation was begun—and it is applicable to striking out this amendment, as I shall show soon—it was discovered that before he received the injury complained of he never was worth anything; that he was a tramp; that while engaged in beating his transportation upon a freight train he fell off, under the wheels, and lost both of his legs; that he had no claim upon the railroad company, and none whatever upon the community that had the honor of being his place of residence. He could arouse charitable impulses much better among strangers. Therefore he went abroad, not only for his health but for the benefit of his pocketbook. We looked him up, and found by actual computation where we located the scene of his endeavors that he had collected more than $5,000 for the purpose of purchasing one wooden leg. Now, I always have my troubles in satisfying my scruples when an unfortunate is found soliciting charity many hundreds of miles from home or from the place where the accident occurred. Usually, if he possesses merit in his misfortune those in the neighborhood where he is known, or where the misfortune occurred, are the quickest to respond to their sympathetic impulses to give him relief, and when I find them going abroad, generally it is because there is some good reason why they ought not to have the relief.

This particular amendment has the effect of putting the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation in communication with all the public and private charitable agencies of the States. It goes further and connects them with every private charity that may be founded in any State in the Union. In effect, it creates the board created by a former act, and recognized in this act as a visitor of the charity. It makes a Federal authority one of the visitors to apply the charity, because, in the case of a private charity founded by the beneficence of some testator or somebody in his lifetime who presents a fund to trustees for the purpose of perpetuating some great private charity, it puts in communication with that charity to profoundly affect the administration of the charity a Federal visitor. This board will exercise visitorial powers upon the charity founded by private means or the charity will not receive the favorable mention of the Federal authorities. In other words, it will be discriminated against; and while no legal right

of visitation is given, yet in fact this opens to Federal visitation every private charity created in the United States, in addition to opening the charities of the different States. A more mischievous or harmful provision could not be inserted in any measure. It is putting under the thumb of Federal inspectors the charitable impulses of the whole American people. No testator writing his will, with this provision in the act, will feel free to request his lawyer to write in it the founding of any great eleemosynary institution. The charitable, the penal or semipenal, the reformatory, and the educational charities that constitute the best of the impulses of the human race, and the best of the great charities that have been founded by private means, will be put under the ban of Federal inspectors. That is what this means, and that is why that amendment has been offered. I doubt very much whether the committee itself, in considering this amendment, or whether the Senate has fully measured the scope of its application.

As far as private eleemosynary funds are concerned in the foundation of great charities, I wish them to remain as they ought to be, private, not to be interferred with by the laws of the land, unless they are contrary to the public welfare or in some manner impair the public morals. When this is avoided they ought to be beyond even the moral influence of Federal officers.

Think of the number of private charities! In my own State some of the most beneficent I have ever known were created, some by the possessor of large means in his lifetime, some by devise or bequest in wills. Let me give one as an illustration—the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund in Chicago, of which Sherman C. Kingsley was for many years, and, I believe, is yet, so far as I know, the directing agency. It is a power for good; and still this great beneficent charity, in which no hand of political influence, no governmental authority, has ever interferred, must be put under the ban of some $1,500 or $2,000 a year Government inspector, who would go out, claim the right to examine its books, observe the beneficiaries of the charity, how they had conducted their affairs, and because that inspection was denied an injurious report could be made to the board at Washington, and official destruction of much of their influence must follow.

That can be done. That may not be the purpose, but everything must be measured by the extent of the abuse of the power. There is many a thing that was not foreseen at the time some blanket power was vested in somebody. Afterwards, when in actual operation the abuse of the power became manifest, it was no answer to say that that was not in the contemplation of the Senate or the House or the State legislature at the time it passed it. The power is there; and in this particular amendment the power exists to abuse the private charities of the country or the State charities. Their name is legion. The first great public charity in this country was established by Stephen Girard, in Philadelphia. After some litigation that great foundation was sustained. Following that charity, with the increase of population and of private fortunes and the understanding that money sometimes can be better used in that way than in any other and that an heir at law can not be made rich merely by leaving him money, but that the greatest thing is to leave him capable of taking care of himself and with a proper character; with that idea these charities have increased, both among the living and the charities made by the last wills and testaments of many possessors of large fortunes. Instead of discouraging them, I think we ought to encourage them. Instead of putting them where they may be possibly brought under the influence, moral or otherwise, of the Federal authority, we ought to keep them sedulously away from all such authority.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the motion to reconsider will prevail; and, if it does, I shall move not to concur in the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Illinois is to reconsider the vote whereby the committee amendment on page 5 of the bill, lines 13 to 15, was adopted.

On a division, the motion to reconsider was rejected.

[Mr. KING resumed and concluded the speech begun by him yesterday. See Appendix.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, are amendments still in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the bill is in the Senate and still open to amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, after line 16, it is proposed to add the following:

Provided, That no discrimination shall be made or permitted for or against any person or persons who are entitled to the benefits of this act because of membership or nonmembership in any industrial, fraternal, or private organization of any kind, under a penalty of $200 for every violation hereof.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, as far as it is within my power as chairman of the committee, I accept that amendment; at least, I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with amendments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to proceed very far with this bill this evening? As I stated a few moments ago, I feel, of course, the importance of early action upon this bill, yet some of us would like to read it. We can not make any objection intelligently without having read it, even if we were disposed to do so, nor can we propound any question intelligently without having read it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is not my desire to press the bill this evening. The bill has now been made the unfinished business, and upon the adjournment of the Senate and reconvening on Monday, at 2 o'clock it will be taken up by the Senate in due order. I desire, however, to say that the time is so short for the consideration of this bill prior to June 30, the end of the fiscal year, that, commencing with Monday, unless the Senate otherwise determines by its vote, I shall keep the bill before the Senate until it is finally disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill has had its first reading?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The formal reading of the bill has been dispensed with, and it will be read for amendment, and the committee amendments will be first considered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I say, I shall not press the bill this afternoon.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before we separate for our observance of the Sabbath, I wish to call attention to a publication which I am sure will assist us in the patriotic observance of the returning Sabbath day. It is a message which we ought all to contemplate; and I know of no better time for its consideration than late in the evening upon Saturday, as we are about to have a day of rest. It will have an uplifting and exhilarating influence, no doubt:

Eminent Republicans urge Senators to cease partisan fight on league of nations. Appeal addressed to WADSWORTH and CALDER by former Cabinet members, bankers, financiers, and judges says party should not be placed in hostile attitude toward project for averting preventable war and calls for action so peace may be concluded.

* * * * * * *

Twenty-eight Republicans of national and even international prominence, all residents of this city, men whose word in other years has had great weight in the councils of the Republican Party, have formally petitioned the Senate of the United States to abandon the partisan fight on the league of nations and ratify the peace treaty speedily and without amendment.

Peculiarly enough, this appears in the New York World:

The petition was drawn up by George W. Wickersham, former United States Attorney General—

Now a law partner of Henry W. Taft—

nearly a month ago, when the dilatory tactics of certain elements of the Republican representation in Washington, which culminated in the Knox resolution, began to give those who have the welfare of the Republican Party at heart serious concern. The petition is brief and to the point.

TEXT OF APPEAL TO SENATORS NOT TO DELAY THE CONCLUSION OF PEACE.

To Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, jr., Hon. WILLIAM CALDER,
United States Senators.

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned, regularly enrolled Republicans of the State of New York, respectfully urge that political partisanship should have no place in the consideration on its merits of the constitution

of the proposed league of nations. The Republican Party, which has done so much to promote the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, can not justly be placed in an attitude of hostility to the project adopted by the conference at Paris for the extension of principle to all the associated nations for the purpose of averting all preventable wars.

"Preventable" is good.

The undersigned urge that the treaty containing the peace covenant be promptly ratified by the Senate without attempting to embarrass it by amendment, thus delaying the conclusion of peace and the establishment of a great agency for its future preservation.

This seems to bear date of the 21st of June, 1919. That is to say, that is the paper in which it appears. So we are urged to ratify the treaty without delay, even before the treaty has been signed by Germany or transmitted to the Senate!

The first signature is that of George W. Wickersham, at one time Attorney General of the United States, under President Taft. The second signature is that of Henry W. Taft, brother of the ex-President and law partner of Mr. Wickersham. The other names are given here as fac simile signatures, and I ask to have them inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Signatures to appeal in behalf of the league: Geo. W. Wickersham, Henry W. Taft, Herbert Parsons, Charles H. Strong, Alfred E. Marling, Edward W. Harris, Charles S. Whitman, Paul D. Cravath, William C. Breed, Lauren Carroll, Wm. L. Ransom, Sam A. Lewisohn, William Chilvers, Adolph Lewisohn, Charles D. Hilles, Charles D. Norton, Arthur Curtiss James, Theodore E. Burton, H. G. Ward, Wm. H. Wadhams, Mary G. Hay, Homer Folks, Lewis H. Pounds, Wm. Jay Schieffelin, Wm. Fellowes Morgan, Darwin P. Kingsley, Wm. D. Baldwin, Oscar S. Straus,

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I call particular attention to the author of the petition. I wish to diagnose the processes by which he arrived at his conclusion that the Senate of the United States should hasten to ratify this treaty.

Mr. Wickersham went abroad a few months ago, and after he returned he made a full written confession as to his conversion and his sudden change of mind. That statement was published in the New York World of March 23, 1919. It opens by saying:

Before I went abroad last December I was decidedly opposed to our country's becoming involved in any entangling alliance with the nations of Europe. This attitude I felt was true Americanism.

Mr. Wickersham, it seems, had lived in this country for 60 years. He is a gentleman of experience and great learning; he had enjoyed unusual advantages; and yet at the end of his sixtieth year he was opposed to the Republic entering into any entangling alliances with foreign powers. For 60 years he entertained the view that that was true Americanism. He accepted the doctrine of Washington and of Jefferson and of Jackson and of Lincoln; he had kept the faith. But he went abroad, and herein seems to have been his great advantage over the Father of our Country, who wrote in the Farewell Address against entangling alliances. As both men were men of equal worth and patriotism, and as both lived faithfully to the creed of nonentangling alliances for over 60 years, we must conclude that there is something in knowledge gained by travel which transcends all other earthly knowledge.

At the time Washington wrote his Farewell Address we were in the midst of the Napoleonic Wars. Europe had been tortured and decimated to an extent much greater and extending over a wider area of territory than that covered by the world conflict at this time. That war included Switzerland and Norway and Sweden and Spain and Egypt. But at the time Washington wrote his Farewell Address the entire civilized world was threatened with the domination of what William Pitt called an armed system, represented by the Napoleonic genius of the day. Washington, notwithstanding the condition in which Europe then found itself, and notwithstanding the world-wide desire for peace, notwithstanding the fact that Europe seemed to be in turmoil and chaos, was of the opinion nevertheless that it was better for civilization, better for human liberty, better for free institutions, and better for this Republic that we maintain a position of independence and divorce ourselves then and thenceforward forever from the European system. But Washington did not have the advantage of travel.

The plain fact is—

Says Mr. Wickersham—

that this proposal for a league of nations is one that can not be thought out completely in America.

The plain fact is, says the Attorney General, that this conception of a league of nations is one that can not be understood or comprehended until you have transplanted yourselves from American environments and American atmosphere and accepted a relationship with another system with which the American system has always been at war. I agree with the general. No man can ever agree to this scheme until he has by some process or other diluted his Americanism. He must by some process, travel or otherwise, get an un-American view. He must come under the subtle and denationalizing influence of foreign ideas, foreign theories, foreign policies, or by other methods not necessary to mention, unlearn his Americanism. General Wickersham is right.

The American system, Mr. President, is founded upon the theory of liberty. The European system is founded upon the theory of force——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. And that distinction is just as marked to-day as it was in the days of Washington and as it has been for a hundred years. The contest in this situation now is whether we shall still continue to abide by the American system founded and conceived in liberty or whether we will accept the European system founded upon force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has stated that the European system is no different from the American system than it was in the days of Washington. Does he not think there has been a great change in the method of governing Great Britain, under which the people of Great Britain have taken the power of government into their own hands? Has there not been a great change in France, where the French Republic has been established, equally self-governing with the system in the United States? Has there not been a great change in Italy, where Italy has become a constitutional monarchy?

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator heard from Italy within the last 15 minutes?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator will not contend that the King has any longer power in Italy as he formerly had, but it is the King's cabinet, and the King's cabinet changes in Italy when public opinion changes. Does the Senator seriously contend that the European system now is the same as the European system was in the days of Washington, before responsible democratic governments were installed in those countries?

Mr. BORAH. There have been, of course, advances in England toward democratic government; there has been an advance in France toward democratic government; but outside of those two powers there is no place in Europe to-day in which the European system is any more akin to the American system than it was a hundred and odd years ago. Indeed, Mr. President, the European system is more distinctly European, more thoroughly founded upon force in the other parts of Europe, except in those nations which I have named, than in the days of Washington's Presidency.

But, Mr. President, we are not aligning ourselves alone with England and France. Does the Senator from Nebraska contend that the Mikado is any less an absolute and divine ruler than he was 50 years ago or a hundred years ago?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is an enormous gulf extending between the Japan of 50 years ago and the Japan of the present day.

Mr. BORAH. In Italy——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will permit me to answer his question, in the last 25 years there has been an enormous change in the progress made in Japan toward self-government, which is almost as complete already as our own. The Mikado's Government falls whenever public opinion in Japan changes. Does not the Senator know that the electorate in Japan during the last 10 years has been doubled, and the issue there will soon be advanced again, under which they will have universal suffrage in Japan as we have it in the United States? Has the Senator been blind to the enormous progress of self-government in Japan, under which the Mikado of Japan is becoming rapidly like the King of Great Britain?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Nebraska is as wide from the facts as General Wickersham was before he went to Europe. [Laughter.] The Mikado to-day reigns by the same authority—that is, divine command—and is obeyed for the same reason, because he receives his authority from on high, as 100 years ago. There is not a particle of change in that respect in the Japanese Government now and a hundred years ago. The latest book which has been written upon that subject, Democracy in the East, will disclose to the Senator from Nebraska that he is speaking of a government in Japan that does not exist.

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and free institutions do not exist in Japan to-day any more than they did in Russia under the Czar.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are not talking about that. We are talking about the power of the Mikado.

Mr. BORAH. I am speaking of that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I challenge the Senator's statement, and I declare to him that within 10 years the electorate of Japan has been doubled, that there is rapidly approaching the successful conclusion of universal suffrage in Japan, and that in Japan the government changes more frequently than in the United States, and that it changes in response to popular sentiment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the constitution of Japan was given to the people of Japan by the Mikado, and any change in the constitution of Japan must be made by the Mikado. It is transmitted from above below. The people of Japan can not change a single line of that constitution, neither can they exercise any power without the consent of him who rules by divine authority. There is no more freedom of institutions or freedom of speech in Japan now than there was in the days of Washington. If the Senator will investigate the last statements made with reference to the authority of the Mikado, he will find he is greatly in error as to his power.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator——

Mr. BORAH. But, Mr. President, I do not care to be drawn any more into the Japanese proposition. I want to give my attention to other gentlemen.

Mr. Wickersham said:

> I had no dramatic conversion. There was no single experience, no sudden burst of light which sent me back, like Saul of Tarsus, to preach a different gospel. But on the ground, face to face with the facts instead of at home engrossed in historic doctrines, it was impossible not to see that America is already enmeshed in a world situation from which she can not withdraw.
>
> In the atmosphere of Europe these facts take on a different meaning. I had hardly set foot in England before I was forced to realize as I had not done before what this situation meant to almost everyone in Europe.

Mr. President, I beg of Mr. Wickersham that he give to those of us who have not had an opportunity to travel and get the atmospheric influence of Europe, and the benefit of it, a little time to consider a treaty which involves the whole future of the American Republic. I beg Mr. Wickersham, who lived in this country for 60 years and said he was an adherent of the position which I now hold, and which many other Republicans now hold, that we should not enter into entangling alliances, to give us an opportunity to examine it in all its details and to work out, if we can, its effect upon the future of our people and of the Republic. We are groping as he groped in his now rejected Americanism for so many years. His sudden conversion makes him, like all new converts, impatient and intolerant, but will he not be patient with those who have not yet been to Damascus?

If we had had the opportunity which he has had to have experienced what he must have experienced in Europe, we might be able to see the matter more readily and more hastily. But I desire to say to Mr. Wickersham and to those who signed with him, having only such light as an American citizen can have, and only such atmospheric influences as we acquire here in America, having never visited Buckingham Palace or Versailles nor felt the enlightening and uplifting power which seems to have so wonderfully served Mr. Wickersham, that we propose to settle this matter upon the American basis and upon the American theory of thinking and reading before we vote.

A world league—

And I call particular attention to this—

> is for the moment a dream. A defensive alliance to protect the peace of the world is the only practical plan at present. * * * Civilization must be preserved by the alliance of the powers—

Naming them—

> Great Britain, Italy, France, and Japan—

Under the scheme of the league of nations.

Mr. President, that is a very important sentence for us to consider. Mr. Wickersham has made a very remarkable statement. A league of nations, he says, is a dream. The only thing that we can have is an alliance, which the President said we should never take and never accept, with three or four great powers under the camouflage or the name or designation of a league of nations, and that is precisely, as we view it, what this is.

Shall America—

He says—

> refuse to join this world alliance to protect the peace terms she has dictated and prevent anarchy and war because some lawyers believe it may in some particular conflict with the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. President, it is not the lawyers who are interested in the Monroe doctrine; it is not simply the professional men who are interested in preserving the American traditional policy; it is the people as a whole, the Nation as an entirety, that is interested in preserving the Monroe doctrine. It is a striking proposal that the gentleman who has been for 60 years a believer in the Monroe doctrine should almost overnight come to the conclusion that it is simply a technical defense interposed by a technical profession.

A great deal has been said in the last few days with reference to making this a partisan issue or a partisan question. At the risk of trespassing upon the time and patience of my colleagues again for a few moments, I want to say just a word and finally conclude what I have to say upon this question.

Mr. Taft called attention, in an article which was inserted in the RECORD yesterday, to the proposition that all politics should cease at the water's edge. I agree with that perfectly. If this was merely the writing of a treaty between the United States and Germany or the war powers of Europe, if it dealt with no other question than that of settling our troubles with a foreign power, I would say that there could be no possible division. It would still be a party question, but all parties would agree, and that would take it out of politics.

But, Mr. President, this is not the settlement of a treaty. It deals with matters of domestic concern to the American people. It deals with the question of our Government. It reaches down and gets hold of the things which touch the men and women throughout the entire land in their individual lives and in their individual homes. Is the Monroe doctrine a question between ourselves and some foreign power or is it a domestic question? Do politics stop at the water's edge with reference to the Monroe doctrine? Yes; but on this side of the water. There ought not to be any division between parties as to the preservation of the Monroe doctrine. It is a domestic question, an American question, exclusively a domestic question, and exclusively an American question.

And so with the multitude of other things involved in this treaty and the league of nations; it is not a mere settlement of the disturbances of war or the conflicts which arise out of wars, but it is a question which reaches down and takes hold of our domestic concerns. We all know that there is no possible way to keep this out of polities. It is simply inconceivable that it should stay out of politics. Why? Because the American people have no way under heaven of expressing themselves except through their political organizations. We settle all our problems in that way. All political parties may sometimes agree; but, nevertheless, through parties we act.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. If I understood the Senator correctly, his view is that there is no way to keep this out of politics. Was that the view at the time of those who signed the round robin?

Mr. BORAH. I can only speak for myself. The Senator from Ohio will not have to hunt for the tracks of the Senator from Idaho. There has never been an hour since this was proposed, and long before Mr. Wilson declared for a league—there has never been an instant when I would not have denounced my party if it refused to say upon which side of this question it takes a stand.

Mr. POMERENE. One of the things that most delight me with the Senator from Idaho is that we never have to hunt for his tracks.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not ask my Republican brethren who differ with me to accept my view on this question. I am tolerant. But I ask them to take a stand. Mr. Hays says this is an American question. It is an American question, but there are two sides to the question. On which side does he stand? There are two sides to the proposition. Both sides can not be right; one side must be for the interest of our people, the other side must be to their detriment. All I ask Mr. Hays to do, as he has presumed to speak for the party, is to say on which side lies the interest or the future welfare of the American people. I object to the repudiated doctrine of being neutral, even in thought.

Upon one side it is said hangs the future peace of the world and that we can afford to surrender our sovereignty, or a part of it, to surrender a portion of our independence in order to get the benefits which they claim will come, to wit, the peace of the world. Very well. If the majority of the Republican Party believe that that is true let them so write it in the bond and take their stand. On the other hand, if it transpires that this is not the peace of the world, but that it is pawning the brain and the brawn and the manhood of America for all the future wars of Europe; if it transpires that instead of standing by the American system, conceived in liberty, we are to go back to the European system, founded upon force; if it transpires that it is a surrender of the dearest rights ever purchased by human blood, a forfeiture of the most sacred privileges ever bought by human

sacrifice, will the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, refuse to take a stand? I say it will not. It will take a stand, and that stand will be for America.

It is an American question. It involves all there is to America, in my judgment. While I do not complain of men who see it in a different light, I do complain of those who do not see at all for fear that expediency in a future hour may challenge their wisdom for having acted at this time.

Mr. President, I have been a Republican all my life. I expect to remain a Republican, but I would trample upon the platform which indorsed this treacherous scheme and I would spurn the platform which was silent upon the subject. My country, as I see it in this hour, is in peril. I may be mistaken, but the only means I have of measuring my own conduct is the light which comes from within; and to tell me that I should surrender my convictions or modify my views on this question for the sake of party does not mean anything to me at all. Sir, the Republican Party was born in order to maintain the American Union. If I read the signs of the times aright, the same fight is on now.

What would have been thought of the men of 1860 if they had said this is an American question; we must not take sides upon the proposition. Ah, Mr. President, let me say to those men who sit here in the atmosphere of Washington that there may be a majority of the Republican Party who do not want them to take sides. Such men as Mr. Taft and Mr. Wickersham and Mr. Henry Taft and Mr. Straus and a few international bankers may not want the party to take a position. Why? Because they know the Democratic Party is thoroughly organized and that in every precinct of the United States its organization is fighting for the league of nations. They know if they can sterilize and stop the action of the Republican Party, just that much is gained for the success of the league. Therefore, interested not as Republicans but as advocates of the league, they do not want the Republican Party to take a position. I want it to take a position, and I venture now to prophesy that it will take a position.

Mr. President, I was starting to say when interrupted by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] that the people have no way to express themselves except through a political organization. That is the only means under free government that they have of making their wishes known. They must express themselves through political organizations or not at all. If the Democratic Party is supporting the league of nations, and the Republican Party takes no stand, and there are three or four or five million people in the United States who are earnestly opposed to the league of nations, who think that it is a surrender of their rights as American citizens, how are they going to express themselves? They must either do it through a political organization or consent to be disfranchised and to have no voice at all. I therefore desire to see my own party voice that sentiment; but if it does not voice that sentiment there will be a means found by which to voice it.

The international bankers may monopolize pretty nearly everyone else in the United States, but they can not monopolize the right to form a political party, and if the Democratic Party and the Republican Party have passed under the grip and control of the international bankers of New York who are financing the League to Enforce Peace and sending out the hundreds and thousands of speakers and flooding the land with propaganda in favor of this league of nations, if both the parties have passed under their control, there will be another party which will represent the American people. I repeat I am not making threats. I am stating a plain, thoroughly well-established principle of politics in a free government. This fight against the league will go on, and it will have to go on through some political organization. Mr. Hays nor no other man can commit the Republican Party to neutrality, to indecent expediency, to absolute inaction. It belongs to the rank and file, and they will determine what the course will be.

So far as I am concerned it makes no difference to me in my individual action what the Republican Party does. I shall now and at all times oppose this scheme. But I can not reconcile myself to the policy of those who stand here in the midst of the greatest contest in history of our Government and cover their inaction by the statement that it is an American question. Of course it is an American question; but I repeat, upon which side is to be found America's true interest? Let us line up as we believe our country's honor and our people's happiness demand; but in the name of common honor, of manly upright citizenship, let us scorn the cowardice of neutrals.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think the remarks made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] indicate that he is laboring under the delusion that there is no method of ascertaining the sentiment among his Republican fellow citizens except through a party organization. I want to call his attention to a few incidents that have happened of late which show, in my opinion, the trend of Republican public opinion in favor of the league of nations.

I venture the assertion that every test of public opinion heretofore made has shown an overwhelming sentiment of the American people in favor of the ratification of the league of nations. For instance, a certain newspaper vote was taken under the auspices of 16 newspapers, headed by the New York Globe, a month or more ago. The number of votes polled was 141,000. That indicated that 141,000 people took the trouble to cut out from the newspapers the ballots therein printed, cast their vote upon it, and send it to the newspaper from which they had cut the clipping. That vote showed 107,644 for the league, and it showed 33,407 against the league.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska if that vote was not taken on a slip for a league or against a league, and not for or against the league? The clipping I saw had it that way.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suppose it was for the league, but I am not personally advised.

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. KENYON. I think it was for a league.

Mr. BORAH. The one I saw was for a league.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was certainly taken after the constitution of the league of nations had been published in this country.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; the first league.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was the only league the people knew anything about, and that league was not as strong in public opinion as is the revised constitution. So if there has been any change it has been in favor of the league.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator from Nebraska and Mr. Taft and these other gentlemen were for the first league because it was perfect, and they are for the second because it has been greatly improved.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not intend to have the Senator divert me from my purpose in a few minutes to lay before him the fact that every test of public opinion so far taken in the United States reveals the fact that here is an overwhelming sentiment, Republican as well as Democratic, in favor of the league. I venture the prediction now that if the Senator proposes to belong to a party which will declare against the league he will have to leave the Republican Party and organize a new one.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Nebraska does not discourage the Senator from Idaho at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. BORAH. So far as I am concerned, if there were only two, and I know of two, we would have a party of our own.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not doubt it.

Mr. BORAH. And we would be an American party; we would represent American principles.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I admire the Senator for his stalwart courage.

Mr. BORAH. We would not surrender American institutions to the domination of a foreign power.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I am only pointing out to the Senator the hopeless situation he is in in the Republican Party.

Mr. BORAH. Not at all. One with God on his side is a majority.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the partnership of God Almighty with any human being was probably dissolved when William Hohenzollern went out of business, and I would not advise the Senator to attempt to revive it.

Mr. BORAH. I think there is a successor to William Hohenzollern, whose name I do not care to mention.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the next test that I know of that was taken was by the Literary Digest, of New York City, which polled 1,377 editors—Republican, Democratic, and independent. The vote of those editors was 718 for the league, 181 against it, and 478 conditional—an overwhelming majority for the league, to say nothing of those who added certain conditions under which they would accept it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I wish the Senator would wait until I finish this. I will yield later.

The circulation of the newspapers, tested in this way, as reported by the Newspaper Gazetteer, showed a total circulation of 21,000,000. The vote for the league represented a total circulation of 9,886,449; the vote against the league represented a total circulation of 4,326,882; and the conditional vote for the league was 6,792,461.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator infer from that last statement that all the people who read the newspapers vote as the editors believe?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, Mr. President, I am sure the Senator would not put any such inference as that in my mouth. I am only showing the fact, which is undenied, that every test heretofore made of public opinion anywhere has shown an overwhelming majority for the league, and I am giving instances.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, what was the Senator's purpose in reciting the number of people who read the papers whose editors were in favor of the league and the number of the people who read the papers whose editors were opposed to the league if he did not mean to infer, at least, that the people followed the editors?

Mr. BORAH. He wanted to show how much patience the readers have.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It tended to show the importance of the newspapers of the country as exponents of public opinion.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he took any pains to analyze the detailed information contained in the newspaper vote to which he has just referred?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I did to some extent.

Mr. MOSES. I do not know how accurately or closely the Senator had made that analysis, but the sole newspaper quoted from my State was a Democratic newspaper of none too large circulation, the motto of whose management always has been declared to be "Anything that Wilson is for is good enough for us."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This questionnaire was sent out by the Literary Digest practically to all newspapers, and if the Republican newspapers opposed to the league did not take interest enough in it to express their opinions it was possibly because they were in the condition of the men whom the Senator from Idaho is denouncing. I do not know why it was that the opposition newspapers did not respond, if they did not. They had the opportunity to do so. Many who responded are Republican.

Another poll which has been very recently taken was at Yale University by the Yale News, after announcing that it was going to take it and after inviting the representative men of the country to make arguments for and arguments against the league; and after that preparation the vote showed a total of 816 for the league and 286 against the league. The student body and the faculty were equally overwhelming for the league.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCORMICK. Is that the university of which Mr. Taft was a quondam professor?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not want to answer any unnecessary question. It is a university which stands among the very first universities of the country. If the Senator from Illinois can produce the vote of another university of equal standing in the country that does not show a similar result, I should like to see it.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. NEW. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska what result a poll of the country taken in the early fall of 1896 would have shown the sentiment of the country to be on the free silver question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We took a poll about that time, as I recall.

Mr. NEW. We also took one later.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; we took one in November.

Mr. NEW. Then, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that at that time the Republican press of the section of the country in which I live was pretty largely advocating the free silver theories of Mr. Bryan. The Chicago Inter Ocean, for instance, which had the largest weekly circulation of any newspaper in that region, not only persistently and consistently advocated free silver, but it circulated books—I remember one, "Coin's Financial School," which was circulated in very great numbers all over the State of Indiana—influencing the voters, of course, for free silver.

Then, I would add that a poll in Indiana taken in September, 60 days prior to the election of 1896, showed a very substantial majority for free silver; but the election in November, after the matter had been discussed and the people had had an opportunity to find out what was really behind it, resulted in a Republican victory and a gold standard victory in the State of Indiana of something like 20,000 votes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, I do not intend to fight the campaign of 1896 over again. I did enough fighting at that time to last me for the rest of my life; but I want to say to the Senator from Indiana, in the attempt to injure my feelings by a reference to what he calls the "free-silver vagaries of that year," he is also likely to give personal offense to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and I trust he will spare his feelings, if not mine.

Mr. BORAH. I trust my support of Mr. Bryan has not caused the Senator to feel any enmity toward me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I love the Senator from Idaho.

The American Federation of Labor, representing the most intelligent labor interests of this country, overwhelmingly at their session yesterday indorsed the league of nations, and I have in my office other such evidence, and at a later date I may produce that evidence of the state of public opinion in the United States.

However, I want to refer now to some of the Republican newspapers of the country that are supporting the league of nations and antagonizing the Knox resolution.

In San Francisco, Calif., the Chronicle and the Bulletin, independent Republican newspapers; in Los Angeles the Times, the greatest Republican paper, possibly, upon the Pacific coast; in Colorado the News, of Denver; In Waterbury, Conn., the American, a Republican paper; in Chicago the Post, a Republican paper, and the News, independent, but generally Republican—possibly the greatest paper in Chicago; in Indiana the Star, an independent Republican paper published at Indianapolis; in Iowa the Des Moines Register, the leading Republican paper in the State, the Capital, which is an evening paper, also Republican, and the News, an independent paper; in Davenport the Times, a Republican paper; in Kansas the Topeka Capital, edited by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Journal, also a Republican paper; in Wichita the Eagle, an independent Republican paper; in Emporia the Gazette, edited by William Allen White——

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator say that the Wichita Eagle is an independent Republican paper?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I said it——

Mr. BORAH. If that is the Senator's idea of an independent Republican paper, it is not worth while for him to call any more.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I said it with some hesitation, because it is edited by Mr. Victor Murdock, who was a Republican Representative and served with me for many years in the House of Representatives. He afterwards became a Progressive Republican, somewhat like the Senator from Idaho, but still, as I understand, ranks as a Republican. He certainly is not qualified to vote the Democratic ticket.

In Louisville, Ky., the Herald, a Republican paper——

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Did not Mr. Murdock hold a position under the Democratic administration?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, there are a number of Republicans who held positions under the Democratic administration.

Mr. FALL. I agree to that. Is not that a qualification to vote the Democratic ticket?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; not necessarily.

Mr. FALL. It may not be compulsory, but it is a qualification.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that there has been a good deal of complaint on the Democratic side—not necessarily from me, but from my associates—because of the large number of Republicans who have been recognized in responsible positions under this administration.

Mr. FALL. Was it not because of the large number of Democrats or Republicans holding positions under the Democratic administration who opposed Democratic policies?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will submit this list, and then I shall answer any questions.

In Louisville, Ky., the Herald, a Republican paper; in Maryland, at Baltimore, the American, a Republican paper; in Massachusetts, at Boston, the Herald, an independent Republican paper; the Record, a Republican paper; the Globe, an independent paper; in Springfield, the Springfield Republican, now classified as an independent paper, and the Union, a Republican paper; in Minnesota, at St. Paul, the News, an independent paper, and the Pioneer Press, a Republican paper; in Missouri, the Globe-Democrat, at St. Louis, a Republican paper; Kansas City, the Post, an independent paper; in Nebraska, at Omaha, the Omaha Bee, the old standpat Republican paper, and the News, the Pro-

gressive Republican paper; in Lincoln, the Journal—the old Journal—and the progressive News, both Republican papers, being all of the Republican papers of the State of Nebraska of State-wide circulation.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has all the newspapers practically on his side, it seems?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not said that. Of course, I do not know what the Senator infers.

Mr. BORAH. It looks very discouraging, I assure the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Now, the Senator having public sentiment on his side and the newspapers on his side, will the Senator agree with the Senators upon this side who desire to pass a measure for a popular vote upon this matter?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, there is a method by which this question can be brought into the election.

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Republicans defeat this treaty, it will be thrown into the next election, and then the Senator will discover what the public opinion of the United States is.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose we do not defeat it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am trying to save the Republican Party from such a disaster; I am trying to show to my Republican brethren, and particularly to the Senator from Idaho, that when he declares that some party must oppose the league of nations he can not induce the Republican Party to do it unless he flies in the face of expressed Republican opinion all over the country.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, that does not make a particle of difference to me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not suppose it does.

Mr. BORAH. No; not a particle. Now, I come back to the question, Will the Senator join with the Senator from Idaho and other Senators in preparing and passing a law which will provide for a plebiscite on this question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No, sir; I will not join in anything of that kind. We have faith that the Republicans in the Senate of the United States are going to vote to ratify this treaty. We believe there are enough independent Republicans upon the other side of the Chamber not to play party politics; we believe that there are Republicans upon the other side of the Chamber who are going to stand by the independent Republican sentiment of this country which favors the league; we believe that Senators over there who declared to their constituents that they are in favor of a league of this sort are going to vote for it when the time comes, and that there will be no necessity of going to the people; but, if it should become necessary to go to the people, there will be a way to accomplish that.

Mr. BORAH. Let us assume, for the sake of the argument, that there are some of that kind of Senators upon this side who are going to vote for the league; but let us assume also what I was trying to show awhile ago, that the people have some rights in this matter.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Why not give them a chance to vote on it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am showing to the Senator that wherever they have expressed their opinion, it has been for the league.

Mr. BORAH. With all due respect to the newspapers, I would rather have the people in the election booths vote on the question in order to size up public opinion. Will not the Senator agree that the only way we can have an accurate determination of the public sentiment of this country is by popular vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like very much to encourage my friend in the formation of his new party, but I can not cooperate with him in assisting him to do it. We are going to ratify the league of nations, and we are going to do it by Republican votes on the Senator's side of the Chamber.

Mr. BORAH. That may be true.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And if the Senator wants to appeal to the people, he will have to do it in his own way.

Mr. BORAH. Then, as I understand the Senator, representing Senators on the other side of the Chamber in favor of the league of nations, he says that he will not cooperate with the Senators upon this side to get a popular vote upon this question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, we have not had any proposition of that sort offered to us as yet.

Mr. BORAH. Well, will the Senator——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We believe that the crying need of the hour is peace; we believe that the crying need of the hour is an institution to preserve peace; we believe that those needs can only be satisfied by ratifying this treaty promptly; and we believe it can be and will be ratified at this session.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And according to constitutional methods.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; according to constitutional methods. The Constitution comes into good play when you want protection.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Idaho has just referred to the question that I was going to ask. Is the Senator from Idaho convinced that there is any authority under the Constitution whereby this Congress can pass a law providing for a referendum on a question of this kind?

Mr. BORAH. I have not any doubt at all that we could pass a law and take an accurate survey of public opinion. I do not contend, of course, that we could pass a law the vote under which would be legal or binding upon the Senate, but we could know the expressed view of the people of the country.

Mr. POMERENE. But there could be no law whereby an honest vote upon this subject could be obtained if somebody was inclined to stuff the ballot boxes.

Mr. BORAH. No; the ballot boxes could be absolutely protected; there is no question about that. Now, let me ask the Senator from Nebraska what is his idea? The President says he is coming back here and going to the country and going to submit this question to the people. If that is true, ought not the people have an opportunity to record their views after they have heard the President?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know whether the President said that or not. I can not affirm that. I do not know what the President is going to do. I have no more communication with him than has the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; but ex-President Taft has been going over the country for the purpose of gauging public sentiment, and how are we to know what public sentiment is if we do not give the people an opportunity to vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator is curious, let him start out and see what kind of audiences he will get.

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to advertise my audiences.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator asks me why ex-President Taft has done it, I respond that he has done it because he is confident; he is not afraid to speak to the American people; he has influenced public opinion; he is leading public opinion. If the Senator from Idaho can lead public opinion, let him go out and try it.

Mr. BORAH. I did go out, and I had a very good time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will go again.

Mr. BORAH. I did not have any complaint at all of my audiences or the response. Of course, I did not have some of the conveniences of a special car and some of the company which surrounds the ex-President, but I got along very well. I am entirely content with what I believe public opinion to be, and I say that those who are advocating the league do not dare to submit this question to a popular vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, unless the Senator desires the floor longer, I will finish this list and take my seat.

In New York City the Commercial, which is a great independent paper, devoted to the business interests of the country, is supporting the league; the Post, an independent paper, is also supporting it; the Globe, an independent paper, or, more particularly, a Republican paper, is giving it its support; and so is the Mail. In Buffalo the News, a Republican paper, is supporting it. In Ohio, at Columbus, the State Journal and the Dispatch, both Republican papers, are supporting it; in Cincinnati the Times-Star, a Republican paper, and the Enquirer, a great independent paper, are supporting it. In Oregon the Portland Oregonian, the leading Republican paper in that part of the country, is supporting it, and so, in Salem, Oreg., is the Journal, an independent paper. In Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, the Public Ledger, a Republican paper, is supporting it, and the Saturday Evening Post, the paper of the largest circulation in the United States, I presume, is giving it strong, vigorous, and effective support. In Tennessee, at Nashville, the Banner, which is an independent paper, is supporting it. In Washington, at Spokane, the Republican Spokesman-Review is supporting it.

Mr. President, this is a list which I have hastily prepared during the last two days, but it shows, to my mind, just as everything else shows, that there is a tremendous Republican support not only among the rank and file of the people of the United States, but among the intellectual leaders of the Republican party all over the country, in favor of the ratification of the league of nations. So, I say to the Senator that, if he proposes to put his party on record against the league of nations or leave his party, he will leave the party.

LOAN OF AIRCRAFT MATERIAL.

Mr. WADSWORTH obtained the floor.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Indiana to make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, by the courtesy of the Senator from New York, who temporarily yields, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 38, which, I think, will occasion no debate. If it does, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is Senate joint resolution No. 38?

Mr. NEW. I was about to state. It gives the War Department the right and authority to loan to colleges conducting scientific departments aircraft motors and aircraft parts for use in their courses of instruction. The department has the machines and the material requested, but lacks the authority to loan it. I have had requests from the College of the City of New York, from Harvard University, and from one or two other institutions for the enactment of legislation permitting the loan of this material.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand that this privilege is limited to colleges and universities alone?

Mr. NEW. To colleges and universities conducting scientific departments where the study of aeronautics is made a specialty.

Mr. POMERENE. Is there any objection to extending that privilege to the high schools of the country?

Mr. NEW. I think there would be, because I think that would make too large a number.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, some time ago I had a request of that kind from one of the high schools in Ohio, although I do not now recall what one it was. I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of the joint resolution so far as the colleges and universities are concerned, and I can see how there might be some objection to extending the privilege very generally; but at the same time it does seem to me that if these motors and other mechanical equipment of the War Department could be used for educational purposes they ought to be so used.

Mr. NEW. I think, Mr. President, that there probably would not be a sufficient number to extend this privilege to the high schools and similar educational institutions, but for colleges conducting scientific research along the lines of aeronautical engineering there would be an ample supply.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana for the present consideration of the joint resolution named by him?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) authorizing the loan of aircraft material to educational institutions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the joint resolution be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to loan to educational institutions which maintain scientific departments, motors, aeroplanes and parts thereof, and aeroplane equipment.

SEC. 2. That the said motors, aeroplanes and parts thereof, and aeroplane equipment are to be loaned for educational purposes only, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. The title to said property shall remain in and with the Government of the United States, and the loan of the property may be terminated by the Secretary of War whenever the best interests of the public service so demand.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *June 21, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, we would seek Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer, that we may come within the circle of Thy holy influence and be tractable to Thy spirit, that we may thus be the better prepared for the complicated duties before us.

Hear us and thus guide, uphold, and sustain us in the right, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the following-named gentlemen to the following-named committees, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN moves the election of Hon. R. WALTON MOORE, of Virginia, as a member of the following-named committees: Revision of the Laws and Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

The election of Hon. JAMES O'CONNOR, of Louisiana, as a member of the following-named committees: Claims and Elections No. 3.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the gentlemen named be elected members of the committees named.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House resolution 85, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 85.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to send forthwith to the House of Representatives the number of commissioned officers of the Army who upon the date of May 31, 1919, are on duty in the District of Columbia, and how many of them are holding commissions of a higher grade than that to which they are entitled in the Regular Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the word "directed" and insert the word "requested."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Army," insert "and what official work they are now performing."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. This resolution is not privileged. A report has been made upon it by the committee.

The SPEAKER. It is a resolution of inquiry.

Mr. GARNER. But after a committee has reported upon it it is no longer privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GARNER. I beg to differ with the Chair, according to the rulings heretofore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] called my attention to that once, and I disillusioned myself with reference to the rule. However, I merely want to get a ruling of the Chair upon it at this time.

The SPEAKER. In Hinds' Precedents, section 1770, a similar resolution was brought up as a question of privilege, and was allowed.

Mr. GARNER. What Congress was that?

The SPEAKER. May 13, 1878.

Mr. GARNER. I am not going to object to the resolution. I merely called the attention of the Chair to the fact that heretofore the ruling has been that where a privileged resolution is considered by a committee and is reported to the House and placed on the calendar it ceases to be a privileged resolution. If the Chair desires to look it up and place his own ruling in the Journal, I would be very glad to have it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad subsequently to look up the matter. At present the Chair thinks that it is privileged, and so rules.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to raise any objection to this, but the words "if not incompatible with the public interest" ought to be in the resolution and in all resolutons of this character. Of course, this is such a small matter and amounts to so little anyway that I shall not insist upon it now, but I give notice that that is the right way to word one of these resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DYER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution which I introduced yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas calls up a resolution which he offered yesterday as a matter of privilege, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution offered by Mr. BLACK:

"*Resolved*, That whereas it appears from the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, June 19, 1919, that Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, of Massachusetts, addressed the House during general debate on the sundry civil appropriation bill and was granted leave to revise,

extend, and correct his remarks; and whereas under such grant he has caused to be published seven printed articles from the New Republic written by William Hard, covering about nine closely printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said articles attacking the official acts of the Postmaster General, A. S. Burleson:

"*Resolved*, That the publications of said articles are without sanction of the House and in contravention of the special order granting to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] leave to revise, extend, and correct his remarks, and that said articles be expunged from the RECORD and the Public Printer be directed to omit them from the public RECORD and be prohibited from issuing any copy or copies thereof in pamphlet or other form from the columns of the daily RECORD."

The SPEAKER. A question of order was raised that this was not privileged. The Chair has examined the precedents and thinks that the rule is very well settled, and some of the old cases are very entertaining. According to the precedents this is a privileged resolution, but the Chair also is glad to find it laid down by Mr. Speaker Carlisle in a case which has been followed ever since, that the question whether the matter alleged is a violation of the rules of the House is a matter not for the Speaker to decide but for the House to decide. The resolution is now before the House, and it is for the House to decide whether the matter inserted violates the rules of the House and should be expunged.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Under the rules of the House, as the mover of this resolution, it is my understanding that I would have the privilege of one hour's debate, at the end of which time I would have the right to move the previous question. I want to know if I would be permitted during that time to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] a portion of that time, and then still have the right to move the previous question within the hour?

The SPEAKER. Oh, certainly. If the gentleman yields for debate, he does not lose control of the floor.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Would the gentleman have any objection to letting this matter go over until Monday? We are concluding the sundry civil appropriation bill, which is the last of the great supply bills, and if the matter could go over until Monday, we could dispose of the sundry civil appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking this over alone last night, and I read my own speech over two or three times. I think I did as perfect a job as was necessary, without extending my remarks; it needs no reenforcement; and I ask unanimous consent that the extension of my remarks in the speech I made be eliminated from the RECORD. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] asks unanimous consent that the extension of his remarks in the RECORD be expunged. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. The extension.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, that the extension of his remarks be expunged from the RECORD; and also will not the gentleman ask this be not sent out?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Why, certainly.

Mr. BLACK. And that the language of the resolution be agreed to.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I think it is already printed in about 60,000 copies, and that is enough.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. GALLIVAN. Too late.

Mr. BLACK. I want it stated that the substance of the resolution be unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on the unanimous consent asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there was so much confusion, I did not catch what the gentleman from Massachusetts said. Did he state——

The SPEAKER. He asked unanimous consent to strike out all the matter published except his own remarks.

Mr. WINGO. I understood him to make the statement that so many thousands of copies of this had already been printed. Is that true?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I suppose the ordinary number of copies has been printed for the use of the House.

Mr. WINGO. There have been no special copies printed?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have not ordered any; no.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object if the gentleman will couple with it that the Public Printer be prohibited from printing this.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have already stated I was desirous of having that done, and I am requesting unanimous consent that any further copies will not bear this extension.

The SPEAKER. That it will not be printed as frankable matter. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6176.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6176, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

McNeil Island (Wash.) Penitentiary: For the construction complete of the following buildings: New dining room, kitchen, and bakery, $60,000; new hospital, $20,000; residence for the warden and residence for the deputy warden, $10,000; cottages for guards and employees, $12,000; in all, $102,000 to be available immediately and to remain available until expended, and to be expended so as to give the maximum amount of employment to the inmates of said penitentiary.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "to be available immediately," in line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MAGEE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 1706. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Snake River about 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 425. An act to establish the Zion National Park in the State of Utah; and

S. 796. An act for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects.

The message also announced that Mr. LA FOLLETTE was excused on his request from further service as a conferee on the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, and Mr. POINDEXTER was appointed in his place.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Detection and prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; the investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, clerks, referees, and trustees of the United States courts and the Territorial courts, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the official papers, records, and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney General at any time; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice or the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General; hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, including not to exceed $140,000 for necessary employees at the seat of government, and including a director of the bureau of investigation at not exceeding $7,500 per annum, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General; in all, $1,400,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. What authority is there for appointing a director of the Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. GOOD. To that extent I suppose the paragraph is subject to a point of order. The Attorney General came before the committee and pointed out the spread of crime throughout the United States and the need for its suppression. He has appointed William J. Flynn to occupy this position. Mr. Flynn is a man of large family, a man of more than a national

reputation, being one of the best men in the world to search out criminals and cause their arrest. You can not get that kind of a man for $4,000 a year, the amount that is allowed for the present position.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. He has only recently been engaged in this work?

Mr. GOOD. He has recently been engaged in this work.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know whether or not it is a fact, as has been alleged in the public press, that the Department of Justice curtailed its activities in searching out this propaganda against the Government and of these activities of people who are interested in the overturn of our Government and the establishment of a soviet form of government, so called, along in April of the current year, and shortly after the cessation of these activities we were confronted with the activities of these people on May Day in sending bombs through the mails?

Mr. GOOD. Well, I did not know the Department of Justice had in any way relaxed its activities in bringing these offenders to trial.

Mr. WALSH. Well, that was not my question. Of course, they can not bring them to trial——

Mr. GOOD. Well, in searching them out and causing their arrest, I did not know that there has been any lessening of its activities in ascertaining where crimes had been committed. This year they had $2,350,000. Now, for the next fiscal year they ask for $2,000,000, first in the original estimate $1,500,000 and $500,000 in a supplemental estimate, and the committee has given them $1,400,000, which is $950,000 less than the appropriation of this year.

Mr. WALSH. This additional $500,000 is to be used for apprehending these people and wiping out this red propaganda, as it is called in the press?

Mr. GOOD. It is to be used for two purposes. First, to detect crime, and secondly to prosecute crime. Mr. Garvan, who was formerly with Mr. Jerome, of New York, as his assistant, has been employed to prosecute the crimes, and Mr. Flynn has been employed at the head of this service to detect crime, and the statement of the Attorney General was quite full, and in that he spoke of the spread of Bolshevism in the United States, and that it was necessary to detect all classes of criminals.

He says in his statement:

> Of course, what we are very much concerned about, Mr. Chairman, particularly, is the situation in the country with reference to what we might call ultraradicals or Bolshevists or class-war agitators, and the possible outbreak of trouble in various parts of the country growing out of that agitation. What has happened in the past you are, of course, familiar with.

And then he goes on and details the sending of bombs through the mails, and attempts of that kind to take human life. Our understanding was that this increased appropriation was largely asked for to detect crime and to prevent the spread of Bolshevism.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know, if he will yield further, whether or not——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I still further reserve the point of order.

Does the gentleman know whether or not it is a fact that the recent raid upon the Bolshevist headquarters in New York, where papers and documents and other incriminating evidence were obtained, was participated in in any way by the Department of Justice?

Mr. GOOD. No; I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. WALSH. And does the gentleman know, or was the Attorney General asked, whether or not the charge that has been made in the public press—and I quote from a clipping taken from the Pioneer Press, dated Washington, D. C., May 2—is true or not, in effect, as follows:

> The Department of Justice ceased its activities against the Reds in New York nearly a month ago, it is reported, and over the protests of the department's chief officer in that city. By some it is felt that the department's laxity in keeping tab on these extreme radicals made it possible for them to attempt a bomb outrage on such a large scale.

Now, was any inquiry made of the Attorney General along lines which would develop whether they had ceased their activities or let up on them in any way in New York, where recently these Red headquarters have been raided?

Mr. GOOD. The committee had no information with regard to that matter, and therefore did not make any inquiry. We had no knowledge that anything of that kind had been done.

Mr. WALSH. And Attorney General Palmer felt that an additional half million of dollars would be sufficient to conduct his activities, provided Mr. Flynn were engaged as the head of this bureau of investigation?

Mr. GOOD. Well, of course, he asked more than a half million of dollars. The last bill carried $900,000 and this bill increases it by $500,000.

Mr. WALSH. I say half a million additional.

Mr. GOOD. He wanted still more than that. He wanted $1,500,000 in addition, and it was carried in the bill that failed to pass, and he did ask for this half a million additional over his former estimate for this purpose.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the record of the gentleman named, Mr. Flynn, who for years, I understand, was in charge of the Secret Service branch in the Treasury Department, and in view of the statement of the gentleman that he is to be put in charge of this work of wiping out these people and stamping them from this country, we may well give them this extra half million dollars, but I was interested to know whether or not the committee made any inquiry with reference to the rather serious charge in the press that they ceased their activities in New York, and that shortly thereafter this outbreak occurred, and that it is now attempted to reestablish their work there and put it in charge of Mr. Flynn, than whom I am willing to concede there is no better man in the United States qualified to carry on this very important work in these very serious times.

Mr. GOOD. If the committee had any intimation that they had ceased their activities in New York or elsewhere along this line, we certainly would have made some investigation, but we did not know anything about the report which the gentleman has read.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do so for the purpose of answering the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I wish to say to the gentleman, and to the gentlemen of the House, that there has been no curtailment of the activities of the Department of Justice in searching out anarchists or Bolshevists or carrying out any of the provisions of this section for the detection of crime generally.

The Attorney General stated that for more than two months he had been earnestly and actively endeavoring to reorganize this service, with the view of suppressing these anarchists who are undertaking to terrorize the Government and the people generally. He made this statement in the committee:

> I have been working on these plans for two months. It is not an easy job to reorganize an institution like this. I had the acceptance of Mr. Garvan, and two days before this bomb explosion, on June 2, I had Mr. Flynn's acceptance, so I knew what our plans were and that they were going to be put through, because Mr. Flynn's acceptance is not contingent upon this appropriation being carried in this way.

The statement was that he would have had the right under the appropriation as made to pay Mr. Flynn a salary of $7,500. But the Attorney General's idea was to make him director of this investigation, and not to put a $7,500 man under a $4,000 Chief of the Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Palmer further stated that he had been making efforts for some time to secure the assistance of Mr. Francis P. Garvan, of New York City, a man who made a reputation when for more than nine years he served as assistant district attorney under Mr. William T. Jerome at the time the latter was prosecuting attorney of New York City, a man who, he stated, had more general knowledge of crime over the country in general than any man within his acquaintance. Mr. Garvan did not want to accept the position of Assistant Attorney General, but having been appealed to by the Attorney General to come to his assistance in this hour, he finally agreed to accept the position as Assistant Attorney General, and will be appointed; and then they agreed that it was——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Just a moment.

Then they agreed that it was best to select some man who had a reputation throughout the country as an investigating expert, whose very name would guarantee not only to the people of this country, but those who are committing these acts, that the Government was going to the fullest limit in order to suppress them and put them out of business and where they belong.

And they finally got Mr. Flynn to accept this position, provided they would pay him the sum of $7,500. He has, as the Attorney General stated, quite a number of children, and he could not afford to work for the Government at a salary of less than that amount.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the Francis P. Garvan who is referred to as having accepted this position the same Mr. Francis P. Garvan who is also Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed that he is. But I will say that Mr. Garvan made a national reputation while he was assistant district attorney in New York under Mr. Jerome,

the prosecuting attorney in New York. He prepared and tried many of those very important cases with which we are familiar, including the Molineaux case, as I am informed, and the Nan Patterson case, and others which I do not at present recall. I am sure that everyone who is familiar with Mr. Garvan's qualifications and attainments along this line will agree that the Attorney General has picked the very best man he could have selected as Assistant Attorney General to prosecute this particular work in the apprehension of these criminals, and if the funds necessary for the purpose are given he will suppress these terrorists, punish those who have been engaged in these crimes, either as principals or accessories, and prevent a repetition of such acts as have recently occurred in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the statement that Mr. Francis P. Garvan has been selected by the Attorney General to assist Mr. Flynn in the prosecution of these cases is intensely interesting, if the Mr. Francis P. Garvan referred to is the same Mr. Francis P. Garvan who is the successor of the Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, because it reveals some of the inner workings of the departmental system that now prevails in the city of Washington.

If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is correct, that we are going to catch these reds, these bomb throwers, through the instrumentality of Mr. Flynn, and of Mr. Garvan selected for that work because he is a great New York criminal lawyer, notwithstanding he is still Alien Property Custodian, how are we going to do it if we give Mr. Garvan two or three jobs at one time when the bomb throwers are still busy? The millions we have heretofore appropriated to catch them do not seem to avail.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, I have just stated that Mr. Garvan has finally agreed to accept the position of Assistant Attorney General for the purpose of carrying on this work, and that necessarily carries with it his resignation as Alien Property Custodian, because he can not fill both offices and draw pay for both at one and the same time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know whether Mr. Garvan intends to give his sole time to the service of his country in catching or attempting to catch these bomb throwers, for whose apprehension we have appropriated millions, but who have not yet been caught?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He undoubtedly does, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I will ask the gentleman why the same Mr. Francis P. Garvan, the distinguished criminal lawyer of New York, has recently been elected to and has accepted the presidency of the Chemical Foundation (Inc.), which has taken over all the German patents in the United States for the manufacture of dyestuffs through an arrangement with the Alien Property Custodian, Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, now the Attorney General of the United States, under an order of the President?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. When was that election held, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Ways and Means has been giving devoted attention during the last three or four days to the matter of a duty upon dyestuffs, and it has developed the fact that the Alien Property Custodian, Mr. Palmer, now Attorney General, and charged with the apprehension of bomb throwers, selected Mr. Francis P. Garvan to be president of the new organization, and arranged through an Executive order for the transfer of certain German patents on file in the United States Patent Office to a corporation known as the Chemical Foundation (Inc.), with capital stock of $500,000, of which corporation Mr. Francis P. Garvan has been elected president, although he is still Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. When was that election held?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, and I am asking the Members of the House, how are we ever going to apprehend these bomb throwers, although we appropriated a million dollars last year to catch them and are now asked for an appropriation of $1,400,000 to catch them, if Mr. Flynn, instead of devoting his time to that work, devotes a large part of his time to the writing of sensational magazine and newspaper articles concerning the brilliant activities of his service, and if Mr. Francis P. Garvan, who is at present Alien Property Custodian, is also president of the Chemical Foundation (Inc.), capitalized at $500,000 for the purpose of engaging in the manufacture of dyestuffs in the United States?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. When was the election of Mr. Garvan as president of this corporation held, I again ask the gentleman?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not tell the exact date, but it was within the last few months. There is not any question about it. Mr. Francis P. Garvan, the successor of Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer as Alien Property Custodian, said Mr. Palmer being now the Attorney General of the United States, is now the president of the Chemical Foundation (Inc.), which, because of certain information it has obtained, due to the seizure of German patents and German papers, proposes to control the dyestuff industry in the United States. It may be a proper transaction, but it seems to me that if ever there was a case of doubling up offices and concentrating several functions in the hands of a single individual, this is a flagrant case. If ever there was a time when the Attorney General and his assistants should devote their time to the apprehension of bomb throwers and other anarchistic criminals for the sake of the peace and welfare of this country this is the time, and these men should not be permitted to devote themselves to outside services and draw outside salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, let us see if we can not agree as to the time. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments close in 15 minutes, the time to be given to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment pending. A point of order was pending.

Mr. WALSH. I withdrew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Within what time does the gentleman from Iowa desire to limit debate?

Mr. GOOD. Fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is requested that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I desire to call the attention of the House to a very peculiar situation now strangely existing in our Government. We spent a huge sum last year, and now we are called upon to spend $1,400,000 more to hunt out and detect anarchists, men who are fighting not only the laws of our country but also the Government of the United States.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not right now; just a moment. I have on my desk communications signed by prominent citizens of this country charging that within the last two years the Department of Labor has sent to California Mr. John B. Densmore, who is a purported nephew of Secretary Wilson and the present Director General of the United States Employment Service of this Government, not to enforce the law but to hunt up evidence to help the anarchist, Thomas J. Mooney, to escape justice and punishment in this country. Those charges have never yet been denied by the Secretary of Labor, although he is thoroughly familiar with same. It was only last week that the newspapers of this country brought to the attention of the people of the United States the intelligence, from the same platform and upon the same program with Mrs. Rene Mooney, the wife of Thomas J. Mooney, that the Secretary of Labor, Hon. William B. Wilson, in a speech in Atlantic City last week, intimated that he was yet spending the money of this Government hunting up evidence to get a new trial for this convicted anarchist—a new trial, when Thomas J. Mooney, who in months past edited two anarchistic papers in this country preaching anarchy against the Government of the United States, has been convicted by the courts, and his conviction affirmed by the courts of last resort. Evidence for a new trial! I ask my lawyer friends what good would evidence do now to a convicted criminal serving out his sentence in the penitentiary? We are asked to appropriate for one department of the Government $1,400,000 to hunt out and detect anarchists, and yet at the very same time, by his own admission through the newspapers, at Atlantic City, we are confronted with the strange situation that a Cabinet officer, if you please, is still spending the money of this country trying to get an anarchist loose who is now serving punishment in the penitentiary.

What good is it going to do to detect his brother anarchists, if after they have been detected, arrested, tried by juries of their peers and convicted, and sentenced to the penitentiary, and their cases affirmed by appellate courts, we find a department of this Government still spending the money of the Government trying to get them out? Under what authority of law did Secretary Wilson send John B. Densmore to California? Who gave him the right to assume and attempt to execute the functions of the Department of Justice? Why should he interfere with the administration of law and public justice in the State of California? Under what authority of law is Sec-

retary Wilson "now devoting much time" to the Mooney case, as at Atlantic City he is reported to have said he is doing?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Has the gentleman the publication to which he refers as containing the statement of the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, if my good friend from Texas had read the papers last week he would have seen the statement, undenied by the Secretary of Labor, to the effect that he is still hunting evidence on behalf of Thomas J. Mooney.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want my colleague to take up all my time.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman kindly put in the RECORD the exact statement of the Secretary of Labor, so that the Secretary's position may stand with the gentleman's speech?

Mr. BLANTON. If there is no objection on the part of the House I will publish the newspaper comment which purports to give the statement of the Secretary of Labor. Now, I say it is not denied that he stated at Atlantic City——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I shall have to object to putting in newspaper comments, but I want the gentleman to put in the Secretary's statement.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say this in answer to my good colleague from Texas, that when a newspaper tells a lie on you or me—insignificant Members of the House of Representatives—it may not be so necessary for us to call it down, as our acts do not so vitally affect our Government, but when the newspapers of the country spread broadcast a purported statement from a member of the Cabinet, concerning the policy of this Government with respect to anarchists, it is the duty of that Cabinet officer, if it is not true, to deny it, and let the newspapers so inform the people, and the Secretary of Labor has never yet denied the newspaper reports that appeared in all the daily papers of the country.

To show how widely circulated was Secretary Wilson's speech made in Atlantic City on Friday, June 13, I insert from the Daily Oregonian, published at Portland, Oreg., Saturday, June 14, 1919, the following excerpt:

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *June 13.*

Secretary of Labor Wilson, speaking before the convention of the American Federation of Labor to-day, urged organized labor to refuse to support the nation-wide strike which has been proposed as a protest against the conviction of Thomas J. Mooney. Mr. Wilson told the delegates that the Government was investigating the claim that new evidence justified a new trial, and that he was devoting much time to the case.

The Secretary declared that so far the Government's inquiry had shown that the judge and jury before whom Mooney was tried had conducted themselves properly and that on the evidence the jury had to convict.

Note the statement that "he—Secretary Wilson—was devoting much time to the case."

Note the following large, black-typed headlines appearing the same day in the Free Press of Detroit, Mich.:

WILSON HINTS AT A NEW TRIAL IN MOONEY CASE—CABINET MAN TELLS LABOR CONVENTION EVIDENCE IS BEING INVESTIGATED.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *June 13.*

Secretary of Labor Wilson, speaking before the convention of the American Federation of Labor to-day, urged organized labor to refuse to support the nation-wide strike which has been proposed as a protest against the conviction of Thomas J. Mooney. Mr. Wilson told the delegates the Government was investigating the claim that new evidence justified a new trial and that he himself was devoting much time to the case.

Now notice the following excerpt from the Chronicle, published in San Francisco, Calif.:

UNITED STATES SIFTING EVIDENCE IN STEP TO SECURE NEW TRIAL, SAYS SECRETARY OF LABOR.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *June 13.*

Secretary of Labor Wilson, addressing the convention of the American Federation of Labor to-day, * * * said the Government was investigating the evidence in the case in connection with the movement for a new trial for Mooney.

I will call your special attention to the following excerpts received from Mr. Francis R. Welsh:

[Telephones, Bell "Lombard 2404," Keystone "Main 3460." Cable address "Ralston." Francis Ralston Welsh—Investment Bonds—109–111 South Fourth Street.]

PHILADELPHIA, *May 2, 1919.*

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Abilene, Tex.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed is a clipping from a newspaper showing the final victory of the Bache-Denman interests over the United Mine Workers and their verdict for $625,000 recovered against the union. The union's crimes in this case included murder, arson, dynamiting, and the driving away of miners from the plant by rifle fire. They also fired on the wives and children of fleeing miners. They raided Frogtown and it was confessed that they did this in order to say the Bache-Denman people did it and frame up a case against them as an excuse for the union's crime. The whole story is typical. Eleven union miners confessed to their crimes and their fines were paid and they were rewarded by the union, putting a premium upon other crime. The mild-mannered Debs came out with a vile screed in the United Mine Workers' Journal approving the action of the murderers and encouraging them to further crime. When President White of the United Mine Workers of America was put upon the stand he confessed that at no time during his entire connection with the union had he ever known of any disciplinary action having been taken by any officer of the national organization against any national officer or employee or member of the union or against any district or local officer or employee or against any district or local branch, on account of violence or injury to life or property in labor disputes, and that he knew of no instance in which the union had given publicity in the Journal or otherwise to any notice to the members that they would be subjected to any discipline by the union if they participated in such violence.

Gompers and Morrison issued a circular in the McNamara case in order to excite the workmen and make them contribute to the Gompers-Morrison private pocket fund, that was as vile and mendacious a document as ever was issued. They agreed to give to each contributor to the fund a full account of what was done with the money, and it was to be used for the McNamaras' defense. The McNamaras confessed. Gompers blamed them for confessing, but not for their crimes. The fund could not be used for their defense after their confession, but no account was ever given of it and none of it was returned. It was simply a huge graft game.

Again thanking you for the good work you are doing, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

F. R. WELSH.

Mr. F. R. Welsh embraced in his communication the following excerpts from the report of the San Francisco grand jury, to wit:

John B. Densmore, the nephew of Secretary of Labor Wilson, was sent to San Francisco, at large expense to the United States, apparently to play into the hands of the anarchists and disloyalists and to injure District Attorney Fickert for doing his duty in prosecuting criminals.

REPORT OF THE GRAND JURY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE INVESTIGATION OF THE REPORT OF J. B. DENSMORE.

Hon. GEORGE E. CROTHERS,
Presiding Judge Superior Court, San Francisco, Calif.

SIR: Since November 22, 1918, the date of its publication in the San Francisco Call, the grand jury of the city and county of San Francisco has had under investigation the charges of municipal corruption contained in the report of John B. Densmore, Director General United States Employment Service, to the Secretary of Labor, Hon. William B. Wilson.

These charges primarily concerned the office of the district attorney of the city and county of San Francisco, Mr. Charles M. Fickert, and the attorney general of the State of California was requested by the then presiding judge of the superior court, Hon. Edmund P. Mogan; by the governor of the State of California, Hon. W. D. Stephens; and by the grand jury of the city and county of San Francisco to assist in the investigation.

The attorney general, Hon. U. S. Webb, appeared in person before the grand jury and named Mr. E. B. Power, assistant attorney general, to conduct the investigation. At the outset Mr. Webb and Mr. Power informed the grand jury that the investigation would both, by law and of necessity, be confined to the determination of the alleged misconduct and alleged malfeasance in the office of Mr. Fickert. Through the many weeks of our work, therefore, the sole question before the grand jury has been the determination of the truth or falsity of these charges, in so far as they concern the district attorney and the conduct of his office.

It was to be expected that as these charges had been made in a published report by an official of the United States Government, that the grand jury would be assisted in its investigation by such official and by those of his subordinates who might have been employed in procuring the evidence upon which the report was based. The contrary proved the case. Mr. Densmore departed and refused to answer either the subpœna of the grand jury or the request of the foreman that he return to San Francisco for the purpose of assisting in the investigation. Appeals to the Secretary of Labor that he instruct Mr. Densmore to return to San Francisco, by the Hon. W. D. Stephens, governor of the State of California; Hon. James Rolph, jr., mayor of San Francisco; Hon. Edmund P. Mogan, the then presiding judge of the superior court; and the foreman of the grand jury, William H. McCarthy, proved equally unavailing, despite the assurance given by the Secretary of Labor in a wire to the governor of the State, under date of November 27, 1918:

"I am instructing Mr. Densmore to put into your hands a complete copy of his report to me, and I am also instructing him to place himself entirely at your disposal."

To this the governor replied, in part, under date of December 2, 1918:

"Therefore, the proffered presence here of Densmore is necessary, and I request that you direct him to report forthwith to the attorney general of this State, who will guide the matter in all further legal developments."

Mr. Arnold, in a communication dated December 23, 1918, stated that he was directed by the Secretary of Labor "to state that he will not at this time direct either Mr. Densmore or his assistants, Messrs. McCarty and Parsons, to return to San Francisco."

For 32 days, therefore, the grand jury had been led to believe that the author of the charges and his assistants would appear. In the meantime every other available agency of investigation was employed.

Mr. Densmore's assistant, William Armstrong, declined to testify on the ground that he might incriminate himself.

Our investigations lead us to believe that the report is at least inaccurate in many important details. Conversations, or purported conversations, have apparently been distorted and garbled. Facts have been misstated and circumstances misconstrued. The grand jury of the city and county of San Francisco therefore begs to report that it can find no evidence tending to show either misconduct in office or malfeasance in office or the commission of any crime on the part of the district attorney or any of his assistants.

The grand jury desires to make it plain that this investigation was not undertaken either for the purpose of whitewashing or mud slinging. Its sole desire was to get the facts. The accuracy of the report can be determined by its reference to certain members of the grand jury. This is one of the reasons given by the Secretary of Labor for his refusal to

allow Mr. Densmore to come to San Francisco. Mr. Densmore's inference, as well as the subsequent reasoning of the Secretary of Labor, was based on a gross misstatement of facts. However, the life of this grand jury will terminate shortly. A new grand jury will be impaneled by a new presiding judge. It may be that Mr. Wilson will waive his other two reasons and, before the new body, permit Mr. Densmore and his assistants to prove the correctness or admit the falsity of their charges.

The Densmore report remains an unconfirmed and unsubstantiated document. There is no evidence to show by whom or when or how the information was secured. The reason of Mr. Densmore's visit to San Francisco, as well as its object, has not been disclosed. Just what his instructions may have been, who authorized the investigation, and who approved the expense incident thereto are equally in doubt. The only apparent facts are that, with or without the knowledge of his superiors, the report, filled with uncorroborated and unproven charges, embodying entirely irrelevant matters, quoting and exhibiting the salacious details of one of the so-called Baker Street cases, was given publicity. That the author immediately fled and failed not alone to respond to the service of the State courts, but to service of the United States courts as well, and since the publication of the report has been protected in his position and encouraged in his silence by the head of the Department of Labor.

It is to be regretted that any official of the United States Government would be permitted to come to San Francisco or any other city and give publicity to a report reflecting not alone on its officials but upon the morality and integrity of the community and then deliberately fail to assist in substantiating the charges and refuse to support them.

It is even more regrettable that the same official, without reprimand or censure, could be permitted to evade the service of a subpœna and, when outside of the jurisdiction of the courts of California, could give expression to the statement made by John B. Densmore in the Oregon Journal of November 25, 1918, reflecting on the good name of San Francisco and of the State of California. This interview is reported as follows:

"A man has no chance if they start out to get him in San Francisco. They can jostle a man off the street, kill him, and have a dozen witnesses to testify that he pulled a gun and started the fight. It is worse than New York ever was. I have been in practically every city in the United States, and its conditions are worse than any of them."

Such statement is as unjust and as unfair as it is untrue and un-American.

It is most regrettable that the Secretary of Labor would lend himself to such a proceeding and not alone repudiate his promise to Gov. William D. Stephens to place Densmore and his assistants at his disposal in the investigation, but through the Department of Justice assist in deliberately blocking it. Through his efforts the United States district attorney was directed by the Attorney General of the United States to appear in court and offer in defense of her client the plea that Mr. Densmore's operator—William Armstrong, an employee of the Department of Labor and Justice—could not answer any questions pertaining to the Densmore report, on the ground that he might incriminate himself. Most investigating bodies are assisted in their deliberations by the Government. This grand jury has found itself in the peculiar position of being opposed and hampered and blocked in its efforts by officials of the Government, and more particularly by the very officials who made and gave publicity to the charges.

The grand jury wishes to express its appreciation of the services rendered by Assistant Attorney General E. B. Power, and of his careful, impartial, and conscientious assistance. The grand jury is also indebted to the governor of the State, Hon. W. D. Stephens; the attorney general of the State, Hon. U. S. Webb; the mayor of San Francisco, Hon. James Rolph, jr.; the presiding judge of the superior court, Hon. Edmund P. Mogan; and Chief of Police D. A. White for their aid and help.

And over his own signature I now give you the rest of Mr. F. R. Welsh's communication with regard to the Thomas J. Mooney case, and the activities of the Department of Labor and of Mr. John B. Densmore, Director General of the United States Employment Service, with regard thereto, as follows, to wit:

Undoubtedly the greatest peril from which our country suffers to-day is that of Bolshevism.

One of the most astonishing things is the shameless effrontery with which disloyalty has been fostered and disloyalists shielded and rewarded by some of the very officials whose patriotic duty it was to do exactly the reverse. In this connection a brief study of the Mooney case is of much interest.

Mooney was a professional anarchist. There was no concealment about this. He helped to found and to support two anarchist papers—first The Revolt and afterwards The Blast. One of the contributors to the former paper in 1912 was Lenin, at the head of the Russian Bolsheviki, while Trotski was also a friend of Mooney's and visited him in prison before he went to Russia. It is worthy of note, too, that Karl Liebknecht, the former leader of the German Bolsheviki, was a friend of Mooney's, and it was at his instance, when he was in San Francisco in 1911, that the Mooney group founded a school to teach anarchy to children called "The Young Socialist," in which Mrs. Mooney (then Mrs. Hermann) was a teacher.

The Revolt was an extra radical anarchist paper, while The Blast was gotten up to preach anarchy and work against preparedness in a way to delight the hearts of every traitor and pro-German. Among contributors to these papers were the anarchists William D. Haywood and Eugene V. Debs. Alexander Berkman was not only a contributor but was editor of The Blast. Mooney himself was a delegate to the Socialists' convention at Stockholm in 1910, and in 1907 traveled all over Europe visiting socialists in different countries. He toured the country on the "red special" with Eugene V. Debs, and, though he had never studied law, ran for superior court judge and sheriff on the Socialist ticket. He was a member of the molders' union of the American Federation of Labor, of the Industrial Workers of the World, of the Syndicalist League, of a German anarchist society connected with the Industrial Workers of the World, of the International Workers' Defense League, founded by Industrial Workers of the World and reds from other organizations, and of other red societies. He preached revolution and the overthrow of our Government and our civil and religious institutions. He was constantly preaching anarchy to his friends and appealing to the reds and his favorite signature was "Yours, for the revolution."

We find him working in support of the McNamara murderers, both before and after they confessed; Caplan and Schmidt, comurderers with the McNamaras; Ford and Suhr, who murdered a district attorney and a deputy sheriff; Joe Hillstrom, an Industrial Worker of the World, who committed the brutal murder of a storekeeper and his son; and other criminals. His associates were anarchists and reds in the American Federation of Labor, the Industrial Workers of the World, and other organizations. He was one of the founders of the International Workers' Defense League, which was gotten up for the purpose of helping anarchists to commit crime with impunity. We also find him mysteriously influential with politicians in high places. He was looked at askance by the better labor element in and outside of unions.

Among the anarchists and disloyalists with whom he associated were Alexander Berkman, Emma Goldman, William D. Haywood, Eugene V. Debs, Mother Jones, Fremont Older, Anton Johannsen, Edward D. Nolan, J. Edward Morgan, Robert Minor, N. Lenin, Leon Trotski, Karl Liebknecht, and a host of others, including a number who are now in jail for murder or for disloyal offenses against the United States.

He wrote letters threatening the assassination of Gov. Spry, of Utah, if he did not pardon the murderer Joe Hillstrom, and Gov. Johnson, of California, if he did not pardon the murderers Ford and Suhr. He and his fellow anarchists were especially down on chambers of commerce because they represented patriotic sentiment, and on judges, district attorneys, soldiers, sailors, and police because they enforced the law, as well as on priests and clergymen because they preach morality. They sneered at respectability.

These anarchists, socialists, and I. W. W.'s have spent millions for propaganda, have founded Ferrer schools, where anarchy and disloyalty are taught, and have disciples in all the principal cities of this country as well as in many cities of Europe. In a recent raid made by the Federal authorities, on evidence brought to light by District Attorney Fickert, of San Francisco, there was found a large quantity of bombs, phosphorus to be used by the I. W. W. for destroying crops and barns and starting forest fires, and anthrax germs for infecting and killing cattle. Two of the I. W. W. arrested confessed to their crimes and said that their paymasters were Thomas J. Mooney and Anton Johannsen.

Johannsen, an I. W. W., has been touring the country in support of Mooney, lecturing to such dupes among the labor unions and the reds as he can find, and saying that the Mooney case is a frame up on the part of the wicked capitalists and incidentally getting these dupes to subscribe to the Mooney defense fund, which subscriptions go into the pockets of these anarchist agitators who give a vague account of what they do with part of them, but never any full and explicit statement of all their receipts. It is a profitable business for the agitators. Johannsen, a well-known anarchist and I. W. W., was indicted with Ryan in Indianapolis for transporting dynamite unlawfully. He is under indictment in the Federal courts for complicity in the dynamiting of the Llewelyn Iron Works and the Los Angeles Times Building with the McNamaras; is a friend of Caplan and Schmidt, now serving a life sentence for dynamiting the Times Building, and who stayed at his house at the time they were purchasing dynamite, and was a delegate from the I. W. W. to attend the trial of the criminal and disloyalist William D. Haywood, the I. W. W. leader. In spite of protests by Federal officials and while attending the trial of Haywood as an I. W. W. delegate, Johannsen was appointed as United States mediator of munition strikes by the Department of Labor, of which Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson is the head.

This appointment would seem almost incredible were it not one of a number of similar things that have happened; and in this connection it is well to remember that William B. Wilson was secretary of the United Mine Workers, is known throughout the anthracite coal regions as a good anarchist, and was locked up with his pals by the sheriff at Frostburg, Md., for the good of the community. One of the appointees of Secretary of Labor Wilson was Frank P. Walsh, who was one of the packed Colorado strike commission and chairman of the committee on Industrial Relations.

We find Frank P. Walsh as a friend of these men and appointed by them as one of a committee to use his influence at Washington in their favor. We further find him as a friend of Alexander Berkman, the notorious anarchist and disloyalist, to whom Berkman appeals to use his influence to help the murderers and disloyalists Mooney and Billings, and offers to let him control their defense. Berkman writes him: "We are in desperate straits out here. Five human beings are going to hang unless we can do something different from what we have done in the past. There is nobody in the San Francisco bar who can understand this situation himself, let alone explain it in the foul atmosphere of a court. I have to join with the boys in jail in saying that I see no way on earth to save their lives except Frank P. Walsh. I asked McNutt (the murderers' counsel) to wire you, because I wanted you to see that there will be none of the petty confusion of quarrels among counsel if you come. I now assure you that any controversy will be settled as you see fit. McNutt would have to go if he could not get along with you. With you promised to us we could, I suppose, get more delay. I could sleep better to-night if I thought you would come." In response to that appeal we find George P. West, United States investigator under Walsh, an old supporter of the McNamaras and other Reds, and whose articles in Fremont Older's paper deceived the public about the Times Building dynamiting, sent out to California to help the Mooney gang at the cost of the United States. We find from Berkman's private correspondence that he paid West $300, with a statement that West's name was not to be made known as the recipient of the money. We find a letter from West to the anarchist Berkeman, who was convicted of attempting to murder H. C. Frick, stating that when he went to the Pacific coast as a so-called investigator labor men were opposed to Mooney and believed that he should hang for his crimes, and thought him certainly guilty, but that he, West, had set about changing their views, and had been more or less successful. From the same letter we learn that anarchist Berkman was to have an advance copy of West's official report, which was to be issued just before the Mooney trial at the proper dramatic moment to have a maximum effect on public sentiment, jurors, and witnesses, and then we find it published by the Industrial Relations Committee as an official document of the United States, thus making our Government appear as a supporter of the anarchists and disloyalists who were plotting against it.

Arnold has now been sent to San Francisco by Secretary of Labor Wilson to supersede a man who, I am told, was a careful and conscientious investigator. In a letter to a New York lawyer he assures him he will use his influence with the Department of Justice to help the head of the I. W. W.'s under indictment at Sacramento for arson and other crimes to escape the "humiliation of a trial."

After District Attorney Fickert had shown himself to be a fearless prosecutor who stood out against all threats and cajolery and had refused to play into the hands of the anarchists, John D. Densmore was sent out by his uncle, Secretary of Labor Wilson, apparently for the purpose of playing the anarchists' game. Densmore was in former

years a supporter of the McNamara murderers and agitator on their behalf. His relations with various reds were close. He went out at the expense of the United States and is said to have had in his employ some 30 detectives, including some of the men employed by the friends of anarchist Mooney. Densmore himself had been associated with the Mooney defense, but the people were supposed to swallow his so-called investigation as an impartial affair. He and his gang tapped the wires between the district attorney's office and the United States Naval Intelligence office, the Army Intelligence office, and United States marshal's office, and stole various documents and gave the information so obtained to reds and disloyalists who were subjects of investigation and prosecution by United States and State authorities. Then choosing the Call, edited by an anarchist named Fremont Older, who is a friend of the reds and had publicly entertained Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, he published a scurrilous attack upon District Attorney Fickert and tried to bolster this up by stating that certain people were authority for certain statements. Some of these people have appeared before the grand jury and stated that they never made the statements Densmore attributed to them. Then after Densmore was subpœnaed as a witness in the United States court and was wanted by the grand jury, he fled the State and, in spite of all efforts on the part of the governor and the district attorney to get him back, he is still a fugitive from justice in California. Yet Secretary of Labor Wilson puts this nephew of his forward to represent the people of the United States! A witness before the grand jury testified that Fremont Older, an anarchist and supporter of Mooney and other reds, had sent a representative to the witness to say that if District Attorney Fickert would join the Sinn Feiner Judge Griffin in asking for a new trial for Mooney the scurrilous Densmore report would not be made public, but otherwise they would continue after District Attorney Fickert until they "got" him.

We find that Judge Franklin Griffin, trial judge in the Mooney case, even while running for office, took part in a union-labor demonstration against a candidate for another office. During the trial he was very friendly with Bourke Cockran, the Tammany orator and counsel for Mooney. Immediately after the trial he made a speech, in which he publicly admitted that he was a Sinn Feiner and considered Sir Roger Casement one of the great men of the war. After this, when the radical element among union-labor men (in opposition to much of the conservative element who believe that Mooney should hang) started agitation for a new trial, we find Judge Griffin advocating a new trial for Mooney and expressing doubt as to the credibility of some of the witnesses, and this in spite of the fact that the evidence was so overwhelming that the jury, on which there were two union-labor men, convicted Mooney on the first ballot, and that the foreman of the jury, William R. MacNevin, stated on the day of the verdict and before the political agitation about the witnesses, that "the jurors felt that the structure of the evidence produced by the prosecution was so strong that they could not conscientiously follow their oaths as jurors and recommend life imprisonment. You ask me if it was the evidence of Frank C. Oxman, the chief witness of the prosecution, that convinced the jurors of the guilt of Mooney. It was not this alone. It was the whole case that convinced us. We felt that the volume of evidence introduced was overwhelming, and that we had no alternative but to agree on a verdict of guilt.

"John McDonald, the waiter, impressed us by his testimony. So did Mrs. Edeau and her daughter, the Oakland dressmaker. We felt that all these people could not be mistaken in their identification of Mooney, Mrs. Mooney, Warren K. Billings, and the man with the scraggly moustache as the persons they saw in the jitney of Israel Weinberg just before the explosion at Steuart and Market Streets. One of these might be mistaken, but all of them couldn't be." The letter written by Judge Griffin to the governor was regarded by the latter as a political contribution rather than a judicial one, and he did not permit it to influence his decision. The whole matter was thrashed out again before the supreme court of the State, and the questions of the credibility of the witnesses and everything that the defense could think of were injected into the case. After a careful review of the case, the supreme court decided that Mooney had been justly and properly convicted. One paragraph from the decision is "From the record before us it appears that the defendant was confronted by testimony from many sources which fully supports the verdict found by the jury. He was defended with great ability in the superior court, and he was similarly represented in this court. We can not find that he was deprived of any right, statutory or constitutional, or that any material error of law was committed calling for a reversal of the judgment or an abrogation of the order denying his motion for a new trial."

Mooney's friends from the first stated that they would not rely on a court of justice for his acquittal, and at once started a propaganda in his defense long before the trial, sending threatening letters to the district attorney and, after the jury was drawn, to the jurors, and later to witnesses.

There are in this country many papers published solely for the purpose of agitating for the overthrow of our Government and our civil and religious institutions. There is a get-together movement among reds and Bolsheviki of all shades. It is thought that the American Federation of Labor and the I. W. W. are constantly at war, but we find the red element in the former fraternizing with the latter, and at times members of both organizations, as was Mooney. We find officials of our Government playing into the hands of the radicals and apparently at times much more anxious to serve them than to serve their country. We find a campaign of ruthless mendacity being carried on to deceive and influence people whose motives are patriotic and respectable. We find thousands of men traveling round the country, living on what contributions they can get from their dupes and preaching anarchy and Bolshevism, and last but by no means least, we find the public with little real appreciation of what is going on, unaroused and, as usual, waiting until the worst has happened before taking action.

Is it not our duty to our country to make this situation known to everyone and to arouse the public as fully as possible? Should we not preach about it incessantly and get others to do likewise, and strive to influence not only those who agree with us but also those who, through apathy or partisan feeling, are disinclined to acknowledge this condition and recognize the truth?

F. R. WELSH.

Gentlemen of the Congress, I do not know whether the above charges made by Mr. Welsh are true or not. I am informed that Mr. Welsh is a prominent business man of Philadelphia, and that he is a substantial man of property. He advises me that he has sent a copy of the above both to Secretary Wilson and to our Department of Justice. If his charges are not true, he ought to be criminally prosecuted for libel, and the parties against whom he has preferred charges ought to punish him in the damage courts of the country in a big civil judgment for libel. On the other hand, if his charges are true, there is something radically wrong with our Department of Labor, and proper investigations should be made and proper changes take place. If Mr. John B. Densmore is guilty of the charges preferred by Mr. Welsh, he has no business being in charge of our United States Employment Service, especially when Auditor Burroughs, in the United States Shipping Board, has charged him with wasting and misapplying millions of dollars of the people's money.

Again I ask, what is the use of spending millions of money hunting out and detecting anarchists if another department of the Government is spending its time and money in assisting a convicted anarchist to escape just punishment?

It is due the country for Secretary Wilson to answer the charges made by Mr. Welsh and tell us whether same are true or false and exactly what connection his department and Mr. John B. Densmore have had with the Thomas J. Mooney case, and also to tell us whether the newspapers correctly quoted him when they said that he stated at Atlantic City "that he was devoting much time to the case," and if he is doing this he should tell us upon what authority of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. May I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets very much that under the agreement it can not be permitted.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. May I ask the gentleman to give me half a minute?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will if I can. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised the question that Mr. Garvan is president of some private corporation. I know nothing as to the facts relative to his business engagements, but I submit that there are doubtless many Members of Congress who are interested in private business who may possibly hold some official positions at the head of some private business, but they are here attending to their duties. The facts are that Mr. Garvan has only recently been persuaded—I use the word advisedly—he has been persuaded, under the very great insistence of the Attorney General, to take charge of this particular work, and only consented after the Attorney General had called his attention to its importance and because, as the Attorney General said, he had touched his passion. Mr. Garvan is a man of large means who, as the Attorney General said, wanted no Government position, but finally agreed to take the position of Assistant Attorney General for the purpose of taking charge of the efforts to suppress anarchy in this country.

Now, I want to read for the benefit of the House just what the Attorney General had to say upon the subject, which is a better answer than I could possibly make to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said. The Attorney General says:

I have been able to persuade Francis P. Garvan, of New York, to accept the position of Assistant Attorney General in charge of all investigation work in the department. Mr. Garvan, in my judgment, is without a superior in the business of the detection of crime in a great, broad way. He was for nine years the chief assistant to William T. Jerome, when he was district attorney of New York. He was the head of the homicide division of that office, and in the days when Jerome was a great district attorney and trying a great many cases of immense importance Garvan was the big man in the office. He prepared for trial and tried the Molineux case, the Patrick case, the Nan Patterson case, and all of the other sensational murder trials conducted in New York at that time. He knows the police of every city in America. He knows the lower East Side of New York. He knows the criminal classes and they know him, and they have the most holy and healthy respect for his powers. I know him, too, because I put him in charge when I took the position of Alien Property Custodian of our bureau of investigation there, and it was due to Mr. Garvan's great ability, great organizing ability, and great ability as a crime detector himself, that we were enabled to uncover the camouflage which had been placed over the enemy-owned properties in this country in hundreds and hundreds of cases. We owe to him, more than to any other individual, the credit for digging out the enemy property in this country. So I say I know him.

Now, Mr. Garvan does not come within the class of persons who can not afford to work for $4,000 a year. Mr. Garvan does not have any desire to hold a Government job of any kind or character. He is a man of very large means, but as he said, I touched him on his passion, and he agreed, because it was his passion to engage in this work during the emergency, and he has consented to become an Assistant Attorney General in charge of all this business of investigating crime and of all other investigations in the United States. But he insisted, and I am sure he is absolutely right, that he should have under him as the chief of the Bureau of Investigation some man whom the criminal classes of the country would likewise respect, who had had great experience in detective work; in other words, a very much bigger man than you can ordinarily hope to get for $4,000. He and I together finally persuaded Mr. William J. Flynn, who was for many years chief of the Secret Service in the Treasury Department, and has since that time been chief of the Secret Service and the Rail-

road Police under the Federal Railroad Administration, and who is, I think, recognized by the country generally as probably the leading organizing detective of America, to head the Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Flynn, however, can not take any place for $4,000 a year, because, as he told me, he has half a dozen little Flynns, and he has been working for the Government so long that he has not laid anything by, and on that account I have put in this estimate a provision to allow the employment of a director of the Bureau of Investigation at not to exceed $7,500 per year.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to detract from the ability and distinction of Mr. Garvan, to whom the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has been referring, although I do not think he ought to claim any great credit for that gentleman's skill and ability in the Nan Patterson case, which I think the gentleman will recall did not result in a conviction. I do desire, however, to read a letter which was sent by the chairman of the board of trustees of the American Defense Society of New York to the governors of several States under date of April 29, 1919. Chairman Davison of that society sent this letter to the governor of Iowa:

Hon. W. L. HARDING, *Governor,*
Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR SIR: The American Defense Society very respectfully places before you a copy of a recent act of the State of New Hampshire aimed against those seeking to overthrow this Government and the Government of the several States by violence.

You undoubtedly appreciate the situation created and the impetus afforded the forces of disorder by the decision of the Federal Government that its department for the enforcement of law can not take any cognizance of these matters.

The whole matter of suppressing open attempts to overthrow freedom and our national institution has been thereby relegated to the State authorities. The situation in view of the world unrest and the steady growth of syndicalism, radical socialism, and similar movements having for their object the destruction of the social fabric calls for careful, intelligent, and earnest consideration and action.

With the utmost confidence we place these matters before you for your official consideration.

I will highly esteem an expression of your views, however informal.

Very truly, yours,

CHAIRMAN BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it will be disclosed on investigation that the recent raid made in New York on the World Tower Building, whereby a large force of policemen and other officers of the law raided these quarters, was due to none of Mr. Garvan's assistance, nor was that raid under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, according to the press reports, and it might lend some color to the charge in the letter sent out by the American Defense Society. That is no reason, however, why this appropriation should not be increased. If necessary, it ought to be doubled, because the time has come when the Federal Government can not afford to neglect to attend to these matters.

The gentleman stated yesterday that Mr. Covington was to be credited for uncovering this tremendous amount of money where one corporation had been escaping paying the income tax. To-day he transfers that credit, or, perhaps, spreads it out, so that it will cover Mr. Garvan's case.

I submit that the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], with reference to Mr. Garvan's activity as Alien Property Custodian, and the results that were reached, make it unnecessary for Mr. Garvan or the distinguished Attorney General to worry about not being able to take a $4,000 job. But we may not be surprised at the charge made by the American Defense Society that the Department of Justice had felt that it was not within its province to interfere in stamping out the activities of the Reds, particularly when we reflect that one of the chosen advisers to the Executive of this Nation, the most important responsibility ever placed on a Chief Executive, is the Reverend—God save the mark—George D. Herron, whom he has delegated to go and consult the Bolsheviks of Russia, a man whose views would put some of the socialists of this country to blush for shame, and who would make them appear as conservatives and reactionaries. And yet he is in the counsel of the great representative of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks and extend them by incorporating the newspaper clippings I referred to, and also the statement concerning the activity of the Labor Department in behalf of Thomas J. Mooney.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I object.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. On line 16, page 117, strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,350,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 117, line 16, strike out "$1,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,350,000."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that all debate has been closed on amendments.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inspection of prisons and prisoners: For the inspection of United States prisons and prisoners, and for the collection, classification, and preservation of criminal identification records and their exchange with the officials of State and other institutions, including salary of the assistant superintendent of prisons, $2,500, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, $11,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item relates to the inspection of prisons and prisoners, some of which might apply to the services of the Attorney General if he would start these detectives of his under the $1,400,000 appropriation just passed on the trail of the men who are throwing bombs, rather than have the men so employed and paid for by the Government engaged in other lines of business, and some unquestionably for their own profit.

My contention is that all of these appropriations would be more effective if our administrative officers were a little more attentive to their duty. To me the most amazing thing on earth is that in a great country like this, with a population of 110,000,000 people, it is impossible to trace out the men who issued or printed the circulars handed out by the Reds, or to find the man or men who make bombs, one of whom, now in eternity, placed a bomb at the very front doorstep of the Attorney General of the United States.

Is there any lack of interest on the part of Congress? Have we failed to make an appropriation sufficient to enable the Attorney General and the Treasury Department, through its Secret Service or any other agency of the Government, to go forward and trace out these crimes? I think no criticism can be laid at the door of Congress in that regard. We have done everything that these public officials of ours have asked us to do to enable them to ferret out wrongdoers, and yet from month to month and from May day to May day, even up to the very door of the palace of justice itself, these bombs continue to be thrown, and this despite the wonderful detective ingenuity of William J. Flynn and Francis P. Garvan, the distinguished New York lawyer, who is Alien Property Custodian and president of the Chemical Foundation. The criminal still stalks about. It must be owing to some cause or other. It may be due to the fact that men who have the ability of Francis P. Garvan, whom the gentleman from Tennessee extols for his detective ability and who evidently has got very close to the Attorney General of the United States, are so preoccupied or so engaged in other lines of business, or it may be that William J. Flynn, the great detective, was so busy writing stories of the "Eagle's Eye" as to be unable to give the necessary attention to this matter.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman wants to be fair?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I want to be fair.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I thought the gentleman understood that Mr. Garvan and Mr. Flynn have only recently been employed to undertake this work.

As a matter of fact, they have not been in charge for more than two or three weeks, if that long, and I am sure the gentleman's criticism of those gentlemen for failing to stop these outrages——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much money was given to the Department of Justice last year for this purpose?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My impression is that it was $2,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; it was $1,000,000, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am very glad to be corrected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Which, I would say, would be sufficient for the detective agencies to go around and find out who printed that circular found at the Palmer residence, and who made the bomb that was exploded there.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I say that that amount ought to be doubled for the next year under the present conditions, and if I had my way this bill would have carried at least $600,000 more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose it had been doubled and the gentlemen who received the money as salary and compensation for traveling around the country making these investigations had been engaged in other business, would they have caught these crooks?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would say to the gentleman that he has no proof that Mr. Garvan is engaged in any other

business at this time. I submit that he can be president of a private corporation and not interfere with his duties as Assistant Attorney General. The Attorney General states that he is giving all of his time and proposes to give all of his time to this particular work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I submit that we have it out of the mouth of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that this same Mr. Garvan, who is supposed to seek out these crooks, is at the present time the Alien Property Custodian of the United States, and I rose to say that I have discovered in a perfectly legitimate way, by sitting over there listening to gentlemen on the dyestuffs inquiry, that this same Mr. Garvan, this great criminal lawyer from New York City, who has been selected to ferret out the crooks and get these bomb throwers, who is also the Alien Property Custodian, succeeding Mr. Palmer, the Attorney General, who was formerly Alien Property Custodian, has also been elected president of the Chemical Foundation (Inc.).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to see if we can not agree on the time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GOOD. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the extension of time for three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, we are getting tired of this.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, you are always getting tired of it when we are burning the fires under you, and I propose to keep at it until you know the truth. We will push it down your throats. I want to show you who Mr. Garvan is. I want to show you what the Chemical Foundation is. I want to show you some very peculiar methods that have obtained in the Alien Property Custodian's office under the present Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is the gentleman in good humor enough to answer a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When the gentleman withdraws his objection to my reasonable request I shall go along under the five-minute rule and conclude what I have to say, but the gentleman said that he was getting tired of it, meaning me. Of course, it will take him a long time to throw me over that way.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. No objection was made to the extension for three minutes on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Objection was made to the limit of time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was recognized for three minutes and has the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Chemical Foundation (Inc.), according to Mr. Palmer, Attorney General of the United States, former Alien Property Custodian, succeeded by Mr. Garvan——

The CHAIRMAN. Under unanimous consent debate has been closed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was I not granted three minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. But consent was granted to close debate. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Traveling and miscellaneous expenses: For traveling and other miscellaneous and emergency expenses, including advances made by the disbursing clerk, authorized and approved by the Attorney General, to be expended at his discretion, the provisions of section 3648, Revised Statutes, to the contrary notwithstanding, $7,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item relates to traveling and miscellaneous expenses. Therefore, it relates to the subject that I desire to discuss. The expenses of Mr. William J. Flynn and Mr. Francis P. Garvan, the distinguished criminal lawyer from New York, and others who engage in this important detective work, naturally have to be paid, and it is one of the things that I am bringing to the attention of the House. If they get pay for traveling over the country searching out bomb throwers and do not find them, they may keep on traveling at the expense of the Government just as long as we make appropriations for that purpose. But what I wanted to say, and I address myself now particularly to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], for whom I have a keen admiration when he is normal, is the relationship of Francis P. Garvan to the Chemical Foundation (Inc.). What is that? It is a new thing. We have learned of it during the last few weeks. Here is what it is. A corporation founded by certain very prominent gentlemen in New York, some of them very large financiers, with whom Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, as Alien Property Custodian, had come in contact while he was performing the duties of his office, in whom he appears to have every confidence, to take over 4,500 patents, which Mr. Palmer and Mr. Garvan, the distinguished criminal lawyer from New York, the successor of Mr. Palmer as Alien Property Custodian, found on file in the Patent Office of the United States, and which they seized on the ground that they belonged to certain German patentees and, therefore, were alien property.

There was the basis for an organization. Certain rich patents to make dyestuffs in the United States if anybody wanted to use them. Seize these patents, although they were protected by the laws of the United States, put them in the hands of a private corporation and somebody would not only protect the industries of the United States, fix the price of dyestuffs in the United States possibly, but they would make use of the German patents and make money—yes, make money. Who were these who formed this corporation? Here are the men on the board of trustees: Otto Bannard. A dye maker? No. President of the New York Trust Co. Cleveland H. Dodge—and you on this side remember Cleveland H. Dodge, surely you do on the other side. If some of you do not, some do remember the speech of Mr. RODENBERG on this floor in reference to the lifting of an embargo on arms sent into Mexico when we were apparently friendly to that country. Mr. Dodge was also one of the largest contributors to the Democratic campaign fund to elect Mr. Wilson President of the United States. He is the second man on this list. Not a dyer, but a business man, and you will find his name on much of the philanthropic literature coming here to encourage relief for the Armenians and other oppressed peoples of the world. George L. Ingraham. A dyer? No. Late presiding justice of the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court. Ralph Stone. A dyer? No. President of the Detroit Trust Co. Benjamin Griswold. A dyer? No. He is of Brown & Sons, Baltimore. "These gentlemen have been serving as the advisory sales committee of the Alien Property Custodian for over a year." I am quoting from the book of the Chemical Foundation (Inc.). "They represent the highest standard of American patriotism and disinterestedness. Long lives of manifested ability, long lives of unselfish service to their country, guarantee the character of the Chemical Foundation." Now, having seized these 4,500 German patents they may be able to control the dyestuff industries in the United States. This company is capitalized at $500,000—$400,000 for 6 per cent preferred stock and $100,000 common stock, also limiting dividends to 6 per cent; so evidently they are to make money somewhere, no matter how philanthropic and patriotic the corporation may be. Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, Alien Property Custodian, having advised with these men up to the point where he seized these German patents by an Executive order of the President—there being no advertisement—sold these German patents which he had seized as Alien Property Custodian to the Chemical Foundation (Inc.), and that having been done and these distinguished and philanthropic gentlemen, having gotten possession of these patents, conscious of their worth, I assume, looked about for a president for their corporation, and, with the approval of Attorney General Palmer, former Alien Property Custodian, succeeded by Mr. Francis P. Garvan, they elected Mr. Francis P. Garvan president, and he is president to-day. That is the story. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we can agree upon some time as to this debate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has stated he is anxious to dispose of this bill to-day. I have been somewhat surprised; I know, of course, there is a disposition on the part of many gentlemen on that side, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, not to miss an opportunity to make a partisan speech. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This, however, does not——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We were told most of these gentlemen were Republicans——

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that debate——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I shall desire some little time.

Mr. GOOD. I am going to give the gentleman some time. I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded—how much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may want five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question. The gentleman says he is anxious to finish this sundry civil bill. Does not the gentleman think if we had less of these speeches on that side of the House we could get through much sooner?

Mr. GOOD. There have been quite a number on the other side. [Applause on the Republican side.] I can not control that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the request I made some time ago in reference to extension of remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing certain papers that he referred to in a former request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as to the matter to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] referred in an effort, apparently, to be sensational, I take it that no subject that has been up in the House for months has been given wider publicity than this phase of the activities of the Alien Property Custodian's office. Before the Ways and Means Committee during the past few days extensive hearings have been given to the manufacturers of dyestuffs and to the consumers of dyestuffs. In connection with this hearing Mr. Joseph H. Choate, who was connected with the Bureau of Chemical Investigation in the Alien Property Custodian's Office, spoke for some three or four hours, during which time he discussed in the most minute manner every phase of this matter to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania now undertakes to refer in a sensational way. There is nothing whatever unusual about the facts or about the transaction. In fact, the widest publicity had been given to it prior to this hearing.

The publication there called the History of the Chemical Foundation had been put out by understanding of the dye manufacturers of the country, and I think the principal dye consumers of the country, in which it is undertaken to set out every detail of this matter to which the gentleman now refers. I shall expect to get into the RECORD the statement of Mr. Choate, fully setting forth additional facts in answer to quesions propounded to him during this hearing. The principal fact, Mr. Chairman, was that the Alien Property Custodian's office, in accordance with its duty, was seizing certain alien-enemy-owned property, and, under authority of law, selling it to the highest bidder. They were given authority to do this by both Houses of Congress. They seized some 5,000 patents which had been taken out by German dye producers in order to prevent our American manufacturers from producing those dyes in this country. Rather than to sell at auction this entire block of patents to one dye manufacturing concern in this country, every person connected with the principal dye business agreed that these patents should be distributed in blocks to different dye manufacturers, in order that no monopolistic conditions could arise, and in order that the fullest benefit of these patents might accrue to all dye manufacturers and all dye consumers in this country. The only way they could effect this was by organizing a purely trustee corporation. The small amount of money that was put up there carried a condition to the effect that nothing except a return of the equivalent of 6 per cent interest could be received back, and the directors were especially selected from men who had no interest in the dye-manufacturing or dye-consuming interests in this country, in order that they would be absolutely impartial in administering this trust.

They were selected without any thought of politics, without any thought of selfishness, without any thought of any improper or unsound business transactions or business policy. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is the first gentleman, so far as I have heard, who has undertaken to distort this transaction, this policy, into one carrying with it some ulterior or questionable purpose. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to consume the time of the committee, but I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, very earnestly insisted that this bill should be passed at an early moment, and I know he is sincere in that desire and in his efforts in that direction. The majority leader has also stated that it was exceedingly important to pass this bill at the earliest possible moment. So far as I am concerned, and I think it may be said of others on this side, we have endeavored as far as we could to assist the gentleman from Iowa in expediting the passage of this bill, and I regret very much that there are gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, a few of them, who undertake to retard the passage of this legislation, which it is so important should pass the Senate in order that it become a law at the beginning of the fiscal year, by taking time to endeavor to make political capital out of matters wholly foreign to this bill.

I have no information as to the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means. My colleague from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] has very fully referred to that. But I do want to say something in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who has made a veiled attack upon the Attorney General and also upon Mr. Garvan.

No gentleman has said that Mr. Garvan is not all that the Attorney General has said he is. No gentleman has questioned his ability, no gentleman has questioned his training or his qualifications, or has denied the fact that he is, as the Attorney General says, in his opinion, the greatest crime investigator now in the United States and the man who, in his opinion, is best fitted to carry out the duties of this office, both on account of his ability and his qualifications and also his high character and standing throughout the country.

He has not taken charge of the position of Assistant Attorney General, but he has consented, as I said a while ago, to accept the position of Assistant Attorney General so long as it becomes necessary to make these investigations. But he has not actually qualified, and he is not now in the position, but when he does accept it and becomes an Assistant Attorney General he will no longer be Alien Property Custodian. Now, that is all there is to it.

As I have said, the fact that he may be president of some private corporation does not in any sense disqualify him to perform the duties of Assistant Attorney General. And, as the Attorney General himself has stated, it will not prevent his giving his entire time and attention to those duties when he assumes the position of Assistant Attorney General. The Attorney General has organized this bureau for the purpose of actively and vigorously prosecuting these anarchists who are bringing terror in certain sections of this country, and I regret that a gentleman upon the floor of this House has taken advantage of the fact that he is making that earnest, sincere effort in order to put down anarchy and terrorism to attempt to make political capital out of matters wholly foreign to the item under discussion.

I repeat that the Attorney General in the appointment of Mr. Garvan, and in their joint selection of Mr. Flynn, has chosen the best men available in this country for that particular work, and editorials in leading newspapers all over this country have commented favorably upon his action. It has struck terror into the hearts of the criminals of this country, because they know that men are at the head of that bureau who will see that the laws of this country are upheld and that the people and their property are protected. I regret that this appropriation does not carry more. I believe that all of us would like to see the fullest possible amount appropriated, but I know that if the Attorney General has not sufficient money to carry on this work he will only have to come back to Congress and get it. I want to see the alien anarchists in this country deported across the water; I want to see our immigration laws so amended that no characters of that kind can get entrance into this country in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not want to make a political speech, but I want to say that there are some things that I believe I ought to call to the attention of this House. I sincerely hope and trust that Attorney General Palmer will conduct these investigations and prosecutions through whatever organization he may select and will give us good results.

But I want to direct your attention to this fact, that we are reaping the crop the seed of which we have sown. I want to direct your attention to the fact that certain organizations, one of them known as the I. W. W., and other anarchistic societies, during the progress of the Great War, now ended, not only threatened to destroy but actually attempted to destroy the food products of this country, the food that was needed to feed

our boys when they were in the trenches abroad, the boys who, through our legislation, were drafted from their homes. Those same people threatened and attempted to blow up railroads. They threatened and attempted to destroy our mines, the product of which was used in the manufacture of the things absolutely needed for the prosecution of the war. They attempted also to destroy the lumber that was needed for the building of ships and the manufacture of airplanes. And they did all that at a time when we were in war and at a time when none of us knew exactly what the outcome would be.

Yet I have not heard that any of those people were convicted as traitors to this country, which their acts proved them to be. Is it possible that the millions of dollars that we have given to the Attorney General's Department for the prosecution of crime have been expended without results and that the Department of Justice has winked at these things and allowed them to go on, thereby encouraging this anarchism? And is it possible that only when an attempt is made upon their own lives do they rise up now and say that this evil thing has got to be stamped out, although when the activities of these criminals were directed against the boys in the trenches and were a factor, and intended to be a factor, against our winning the war these crimes against the country were winked at?

I do not make the charge that there was any winking at them; but, in my judgment, every one of those men were traitors and should have been lined up before a firing squad next morning and disposed of summarily. But I have heard of no such action being taken.

In this connection I want to call your attention to the hold-up, if you please, in the manufacture of munitions of war, which was carried on, to a certain extent at least, with the connivance or with the oversight of our officials who were appointed to detect crimes and criminals when they entered our munition plants. The only thing which seems to have been necessary to secure employment in those plants was a card from the labor unions of this country, and it is a fact that can be proven that 60 per cent of those workmen who entered the munition plants were not citizens of the United States. They held us up in the manufacture of munitions and caused the faulty manufacture of munitions of war and other things needed for the prosecution of the war. We appropriated millions of dollars for the suppression of crime. In my judgment there is no greater crime than to be a traitor to the country in time of war, and I think it is abundantly proven that we had such traitors in this country; and yet it seems that our Attorney General was unable, with all the machinery at his command, with all the money at his command, to detect and punish those men. Some people are now seeking to throw aspersions upon the labor organizations simply because these anarchists and traitors happened to be members of these unions. It was the duty of the Department of Justice to ascertain who those men were and to weed them out and punish them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. Not now. I sincerely hope and trust that Attorney General Palmer, in whom I have the utmost confidence, will succeed in stamping out this evil from the country. But, oh, how much better it would have been had his predecessor in office succeeded in putting out the fire when it first started! Had he done so, we would not now find ourselves in the condition we are in. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, including not exceeding $15,000 for salaries of necessary employees at the seat of government, $100,000: *Provided, however,* That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided, further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] suggested that he would put in the RECORD——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I must make the point of order that we have now passed the question of the detection of crime.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I submit that I desire to discuss the paragraph in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph relates to the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and it is just possible that the association to which I shall refer may come within its provisions. The Chemical Foundation (Inc.) would probably constitute an organization very close to the antitrust laws when it gets into active operation, and I am sure that when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] hears what the Attorney General himself said about it he may be assured that the Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, had some doubt in his own mind on that subject.

I quote from the Attorney General of the United States with reference to the formation of the Chemical Foundation (Inc.), an association which might possibly come within the purview of the few lines of this paragraph which is now before the committee. The Attorney General suggested that after these German patents had been seized——

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. On what page is the gentleman reading?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Page 48 of what is known as "The Chemical Foundation (Inc.)," which appears to be a report by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer. He said:

The suggestion for the formation of this corporation met with instantaneous and enthusiastic approval, and as a result the Chemical Foundation (Inc.) was formed.

Then the Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, formerly Alien Property Custodian, who is succeeded now by Mr. Francis P. Garvan, said:

The voting stock is to be placed in a voting trust.

I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to this, as to its pertinency. Voting trust!

The voting stock is to be placed in a voting trust of which the trustees are to be five gentlemen who for months have been acting as the sales committee which passes upon sales made by my department; that is to say, George L. Ingraham (former presiding justice of the Appellate Division, First Department, New York Supreme Court); Otto T. Bannard (president New York Trust Co.); Cleveland H. Dodge; B. Howell Griswold, jr. (senior partner of Brown Bros., bankers, Philadelphia); Ralph Stone (president Detroit Trust Co.), and the charter is so framed that under the patents nonexclusive licenses only can be granted on equal terms to all proper applicants, and must be granted to the United States free of cost.

The company is capitalized at $500,000, of which $400,000 is to be 6 per cent cumulative preferred stock and $100,000 common stock, also limited to 6 per cent dividends. The first president of the Chemical Foundation (Inc.)—

This is a Delaware corporation, by the way—

will be Francis P. Garvan, of the New York bar, to whose clear vision and indefatigable industry I am chiefly indebted in the working out of this plan.

By Executive order, obtained under the provisions of the act, I have sold to this company for the sum of $250,000 approximately 4,500 patents; the remaining $250,000 has been provided for working capital, so that the company may be able to commence immediately and prosecute with the utmost vigor infringement proceedings whenever the first German attempt shall hereafter be made to import into this country. The charter of the corporation provides that surplus income is to be used for the retirement of the preferred stock and thereafter for the advancement of chemical and allied science and industry. The price thus paid was necessarily determined somewhat arbitrarily; the great majority of the patents were presumably valueless. The value of the remainder was entirely problematical and impossible to estimate. Substantially the entire industry having combined for the purpose of this purchase, it would have been impossible on public sale to find as a bidder any legitimate manufacturer. No other bidder could, therefore, have been found on public sale except some speculative individual, who might have bought them for purposes practically amounting to commercial blackmail. The combination was not objectionable to public policy, since it was so organized that any genuine American, whether a stockholder of the company or not, could secure the benefits of the patents on fair and equal terms.

You will observe from this statement of Mr. Palmer that a part of Mr. Garvan's work as president of this corporation will be "to commence immediately and prosecute with the utmost vigor infringement proceedings." This is certainly a pretty large independent job for a public official who is to devote his detective capabilities to the search for bomb throwers. You will also note, and I call this to the attention of the gentleman of Iowa, that Mr. Palmer raises the question of "public policy," and urges, no matter what others may think of it, that "the combination was not objectionable."

Now, can there be any doubt about the Attorney General's participation in this? Am I making a veiled attack on him in taking him at his own words? The Attorney General says that he was instrumental in the selection of Mr. Garvan, to whose "indefatigable industry he is indebted for the working out of this plan."

The Attorney General tells the whole story himself, and it is most interesting. I repeat these important lines already quoted, so you may fully appreciate their significance:

By Executive order, obtained under the provisions of the act, I have sold to this company for the sum of $250,000 approximately 4,500 patents. The remaining $250,000 has been provided for working capital, so that the company may be able to commence immediately and prosecute with the utmost vigor infringement proceedings whenever the first German attempt shall hereafter be made to import into this country.

Now, the gentleman says I am making a veiled attack on the Attorney General, and he prays that we will not delay the passage of this bill, because if we continue this kind of discussion we may say some things that are political. I am just calling the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Attorney General and Mr. Francis P. Garvan devised this Chemical Foundation (Inc.), and that they turned over to this corporation of their own creation these valuable German patents.

As to the pertinency of the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], I want to say that if Mr. Attorney General Palmer and Mr. Francis P. Garvan, the distinguished prosecutor from New York, intend to devote their time to the prosecution of infringement proceedings with regard to German patents, they may not catch up with some of these bomb throwers for whose detection we are making large appropriations. I assume we have a right to ask that the appropriations we make for this purpose produce results, and that bomb throwing in this country may be stamped out. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I ask that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman from South Carolina is going to speak, I would like to have three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Then I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply for the purpose of correcting an impression which I am satisfied the gentleman from Pennsylvania is anxious to create. When he continually refers to this corporation as having secured these valuable patents, he fails to state to the House that this corporation was organized at the suggestion of the Alien Property Custodian for the purpose of developing the dye industry in this country, for the purpose of protecting this industry, an object which the gentleman from Pennsylvania daily asserts he is anxious to accomplish. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania never has stated that which is true, that Mr. Francis P. Garvan has no moneyed interest in it, and as president of this corporation does not receive a single cent from it. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will tell the gentleman very frankly. I called up the custodian's office. He was out of the city, and his secretary told me that I could state the fact that Mr. Garvan does not receive one dollar as president of the corporation which the gentleman from Pennsylvania continually refers to; and the gentleman from Iowa knows that when Mr. Garvan served as head of the investigation bureau of the custodian's office he did not receive any salary for the services rendered in that position. Yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks to put him in the position of using knowledge acquired in the Alien Property Custodian's office for the purpose of organizing this corporation for his own benefit, when the fact is that it was organized for the benefit of American interests, for the development of the dye industry of this country, and he is serving as president of that corporation without any compensation at all. The gentleman has no fear that Mr. Garvan when he takes charge of this work will fail to make good. His fear is that Mr. Garvan will make good, because he knows that the Attorney General has selected the proper man for the purpose, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania places partisanship above patriotism, and he proves that that is true when he stands here to-day and moves to reduce the amount that is appropriated for the detection of bomb-throwing criminals. [Applause.] The gentleman can not say that he has any other purpose in it, for he knows that this fund is used not only for the purpose of detecting violations of all other criminal statutes but that $500,000 was added for the specific purpose of enabling the Attorney General to carry out his plan to prosecute the I. W. W. and the radicals and the bomb throwers in this country, and he, by his motion, sought to reduce the amount for that purpose by the sum of $50,000 and to that extent handicap the work of the department. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman wishes to state the matter correctly, he will state that for the purpose of getting five minutes on this subject I moved to strike out $50,000 and then withdrew the motion.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman seeks to defend that motion. In other words, he moved to strike out $50,000 to be used for the purpose of detecting bomb throwers in this country in order to have five minutes in which to indulge in political debate on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is correct in saying that I made the motion to get five minutes' time, because the time was limited, and I want to get the facts in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman is one of the most expensive luxuries the country has ever had in this House. [Laughter.] But when it comes to deducting $50,000 from the fund for the prosecution of anarchists in order that he may speak for five minutes that is exceeding the limit. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the members of this House have not already found out that some of the most expensive men that we have had in the service of the Government are those who have been serving at a dollar a year, it is time that they did understand it. [Applause.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] consumed five minutes' time, but he did not take time enough to tell this House all the facts in this case. I want to tell the House a few more facts, and then it can consider whether this matter ought to be investigated further. I am making no charges against anybody here. I simply want to lay a few of these facts before you, and then see whether they are not worthy of further consideration. Here were some men who were employed in the office of the Alien Property Custodian, working for the Government; in fact, trustees for the Government, supposed to be working in the interest of the Government and not in their own interests.

They found out in the course of this work for the Government that included in this alien property were a number of expensive and valuable patents under which great profits might be made by the owners. They found that out by reason of their confidential employment by the Government. After they ascertained this they proceeded to organize a company called the Chemical Foundation, and one man was chosen president who was employed by the alien custodian, and another from the same organization, who was attorney for the custodian, was made attorney for the chemical company. They also created a board of directors from those who had charge of the sales for the alien custodian, and then these gentlemen who had charge of the sales proceeded to sell all of these valuable patents to the company which they themselves controlled for the sum of $250,000, at private sale, so that no one else could put in competitive bids.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I have only three minutes. A situation arises which needs further investigation. It seems a little surprising that these gentlemen who are engaged to prosecute the trusts appear to be the head of and a part of what may be the greatest trust ever organized in this country. These gentlemen can issue licenses to whom they choose. It is true that they say that no exclusive license shall be issued to any person, but that licenses shall be issued to any person who can show 100 per cent Americanism and competency, but the latter is to be determined by these gentlemen who are the sole judges and there is no appeal from their judgment. You have here a prospect of the greatest trust ever created, apparently organized in the interest of the large manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KREIDER, by unanimous consent, was given leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous expenditures in the discretion of the Attorney General, fuel, forage, hay, light, water, stationery, fuel for generating steam, heating apparatus, burning bricks and lime; forage for issue to public animals, and hay and straw for bedding; not exceeding $500 for maintenance and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; blank books, blank forms, typewriting supplies, pencils, and memorandum books for guards, books for use in chapel, paper, envelopes, and postage stamps for issue to prisoners; labor and materials for repairing steam-heating plant, electric plant, and water circulation, and drainage; labor and materials for construction and repair of buildings; general supplies, machinery, and tools for use on farm and in shops, brickyard, quarry, limekiln, laundry, bathrooms, printing office, photograph gallery, stables, policing buildings and grounds; purchase of cows, horses, mules, wagons, harness, veterinary supplies, lubricating oils, office furniture, stoves, blankets, bedding, iron bunks, paints and oils, library books, newspapers and periodicals, and electrical supplies; payment of water supply, telegrams, telephone service, notarial and veterinary services; advertising in newspapers; fees to consulting physicians called to determine mental conditions of supposed insane prisoners, and for other services in cases of emergency; pay of extra guards or employees when deemed necessary by the Attorney General: *Provided*, That live stock may be exchanged or traded when authorized by the Attorney General, $150,000.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not possible some time in the near future to consolidate all these expenses for motor vehicles? We have in almost every bill and every paragraph an item for

motor-driven vehicles. I want to suggest that in the near future it ought to be possible to centralize all of this motor business in some institution from which the vehicles could be sent and accounts kept. There is not a place in any bill where a man can gather whether the amount allowed for a motor vehicle is $600 or $150. Does not the gentleman think there should be a central department where these vehicles could be issued to the different departments and one account kept for vehicles, gasoline, and everything of that sort?

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman mean in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JUUL. I mean for the whole Nation.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know that that would be practicable, but I think it perhaps could be established in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JUUL. Every department and every branch of a department wants to get an item into the appropriation bill for a motor-driven passenger vehicle.

Mr. GOOD. These are used by the service for which the appropriation is being made. Of course, in this item only $500 of this appropriation is to be expended.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman does not care to express an opinion on the idea that I have advanced?

Mr. GOOD. I think we are expending more money than we ought to expend for motor-driven passenger vehicles. There is no question about that, and we have to work out some economy some way, some time. But the gentleman can understand that the committee having this matter in charge would not have jurisdiction of a statute that would accomplish the result that the gentleman speaks of. Something ought to be done to make it more businesslike. Of course, some departments need motor-driven vehicles, and they need them badly. I know in some instances the right to use them is abused, and I should be glad to bring about an economy that would stop that abuse.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lighthouse vessels: For salaries and wages of officers and crews of light vessels and lighthouse tenders, including temporary employment when necessary, $1,400,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman what has become of the appropriation in the last sundry civil bill whereby three lighthouse vessels were to be allowed out of the quota of the vessels of the Shipping Board?

Mr. GOOD. The sundry civil bill that failed to become a law carried a provision that three vessels should be constructed and turned over by the Emergency Fleet Corporation. Mr. Redfield came before the committee and explained that these vessels that they required were vessels with a large deck space but a small cargo-carrying space, whereas the vessels constructed by the Emergency Fleet Corporation had a large cargo-carrying space and a small deck space, which would not be available for them at all.

We took up with the Emergency Fleet Corporation the matter of changing the design and the reshaping of plates so as to make the vessels available, and they said it was impossible at this time. The committee went somewhat into the testimony, but because of the very high prices of material and labor at this time, and the desire and necessity of getting the bill through, we did not hold further hearings on the matter, thinking the vessels already in commission perhaps would be sufficient until we could bring up another bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In that connection I would say that I have read the Secretary's statement, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in my remarks. It is comparatively brief.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

VESSELS.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, there is an item carried in this bill for a certain kind of craft that you desire in the Lighthouse Service, and the item provides that you shall get these boats from the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. I understand you to say that that can not be done.

Secretary REDFIELD. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Secretary REDFIELD. I trust I shall not be misunderstood as being rude when I smile, but I have found it very difficult to make a comparison of this matter which would be correct. The paragraph in the sundry civil bill as it passed the last House is precisely like giving a man a bass viol when he asked for a violin. They are alike in the respect that they both have strings, and that is all. In this respect, the vessels which we are asked to take are like those we asked for in the respect that they both float, and that is all. The vessels offered us are five times too big. They are deep draft instead of shallow draft; they have large cargo space and small deck space, and we require small cargo space and large deck room. They have twice the power required and they take three times the crew required. I can not imagine anything more improvident than to ask us to take a vessel which costs four times as much to run in place of a vessel one-third or one-fifth the size.

Mr. VARE. Did you furnish the Emergency Fleet Corporation with the specifications as to the kind of vessel you wanted?

Secretary REDFIELD. We did, of course. We have taken it up very carefully with the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. MAGEE. Were these vessels which have been offered to you by the Emergency Fleet Corporation presumed to have been built as a result of specifications you submitted to them?

Secretary REDFIELD. No, sir. We asked for three lighthouse tenders and two lightships, as I recall, or possibly for three, and the committee afforded us a very careful hearing, and to our great astonishment this item appeared in the sundry civil bill requesting the Emergency Fleet Corporation to transfer to us any vessel they had under construction for doing this work. We could not use them. We could not put them in use for a single day, and if we did they would cost us at least three times as much to run. I sent to the chairman of the committee some photographs which will show the situation at a glance. A merchant steamer anchored as a lightship in a heavy gale of wind might last, perhaps, 24 hours. A lightship must stay there for many, many years. She is built for the job.

The CHAIRMAN. You are speaking now about the deficiency bill?

Secretary REDFIELD. Yes, sir. We have obtained bids twice and have been unable to get a vessel for that amount of money, but for this small additional sum which the committee has heretofore approved we can buy at once a vessel better than the one we purposed building. There was no reason, I think, for throwing it out. I can not understand why it was thrown out, and will be very glad indeed if the committee can cause it to be restored.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Furthermore, I gathered the impression, before I read the Secretary's statement, from an informal conversation with the chairman, that possibly these vessels were not needed at all. I found nothing to that effect in the Secretary's statement. Perhaps I misunderstood the chairman the other day when I was talking personally with him about this matter. The gentleman jokingly said to me, "Why, they do not need those vessels anyway."

Mr. GOOD. I was jokingly speaking when I said that, because I did not know just exactly what the needs of the service were, and as the gentleman knows, from reading the hearings, we did not go into that matter because we were so pressed for time.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I understood the situation, and I wanted to correct any false impression I might have obtained from the gentleman's jocularity.

Mr. GOOD. I did not mean to give such an impression.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, including maintenance, repair, or operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn vehicles for use in field work, including extra compensation at not to exceed $1 per day for each station to employees of the Lighthouse Service while observing tides or currents, and including compensation, not otherwise appropriated for, of persons employed in the field work, and commutation to officers of the field force while on field duty, at a rate not exceeding $2.50 per day each, to be expended in accordance with the regulations relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and under the following heads:

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question with reference to the item on page 135, line 11:

Including extra compensation at not to exceed $1 per day for each station to employees of the Lighthouse Service while observing tides or currents.

Just exactly what is the purpose of that extra compensation? They are receiving, I assume, their regular compensation, and then they are getting this dollar a day extra for this special work. Does the special work demand the extra compensation?

Mr. GOOD. That is mainly to be paid to employees when they are off duty. The survey has no right to their time upon such occasions. They are then permitted to pay them this dollar a day for making these observations. It, perhaps, is cheaper to have it done in that way than to hire additional help for much more.

Mr. HICKS. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that this is extra compensation for overtime.

Mr. GOOD. Much of it is.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WOOD of Indiana having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.;

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne,

State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada; and

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For objects not hereinbefore named that may be deemed urgent, including the preparation or purchase of plans and specifications of vessels and the employment of such hull draftsmen in the field and office as may be necessary for the same; the reimbursement, under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, of officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies furnished for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities and to shipwrecked persons temporarily provided for by them, not to exceed a total of $550; actual necessary expenses of officers of the field force temporarily ordered to the office in the District of Columbia for consultation with the superintendent, and not exceeding $500 for the expenses of the attendance of the American delegates at the meetings of the International Research Council, $4,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I notice they are authorizing some delegates to attend meetings of the International Research Council, where heretofore they have been attending meetings of the International Geodetic Association. What authority is there for broadening this, and is this research council a subcommittee of the league of nations?

Mr. GOOD. The name was formerly the International Geodetic Association.

Mr. WALSH. It is the same body, is it?

Mr. GOOD. It will not be exactly the same body. A number of members of this organization were German citizens. The Department of Commerce has asked for this new name, which is the name that the association will hereafter take, and it will be officered by Americans to some extent.

Mr. WALSH. The Coast and Geodetic Survey?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; the International Research Council. It is to be hoped that the Coast and Geodetic Survey will be controlled by Americans. Permit me to read the letter of Col. Jones, which will explain the matter:

Due to the German prominent part in the International Geodetic Association, this name will be changed by mutual agreement with our allies who have been members of the International Geodetic Association. They have now decided to call it the International Research Council.

That is the only reason that the name was changed in the bill.

Mr. WALSH. That is, those who are left after they have extracted the German influence?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vessels: For repairs and maintenance of the complement of vessels, including traveling expenses of persons inspecting the repairs, and exclusive of engineer's supplies and other ship chandlery, $56,000.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. How many vessels does the Coast and Geodetic Survey require? This speaks of "vessels."

Mr. GOOD. I can not state to the gentleman how many they have now. The gentleman will recall that during the war a great many of their vessels were transferred to the Navy. Whether they have all been transferred back I can not say.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Originally does the gentleman know how many were required to take care of the service?

Mr. GOOD. There were quite a number of vessels in the Coast and Geodetic Survey service.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. This item provides also for the inclusion of traveling expenses of persons inspecting the repairs.

Mr. GOOD. This is a maintenance item entirely.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Where do people have to travel from to inspect these repairs? It seems rather extraordinary that these vessels should be maintained and then that traveling expenses should be allowed for inspectors.

Mr. GOOD. Inspectors have to travel from place to place and from port to port where these vessels are stationed in order to inspect them.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to know how many vessels they have.

Mr. GOOD. They have 12 or 15 large vessels, and I find from the testimony that they expected to get 7 of their vessels back from the Navy in the near future. Just how many will be in service next year I can not tell.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I can not tell the number of vessels they have in the service, but in a conversation with Col. Jones in the last few weeks he stated to me that they did not have a sufficient number of vessels, but they hoped that we would give them more coast vessels in the Pacific. He stated that unless we provide better service there we are liable to lose more boats than they have.

The most dangerous part of our coast is in the Alaskan and northern Pacific waters. We do not have sufficient boats for that service, and these ships are needed for that purpose.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. And the necessity is growing more and more every year?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Woods Hole (Mass.) Station: Superintendent, $1,500; machinist, $960; two fish-culturists, at $900 each; three firemen, at $600 each; four apprentice fish-culturists, at $600 each; in all, $8,460.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We all know, Mr. Chairman, that Woods Hole, Mass., is located in a most advantageous place, and we also know that Woods Hole is represented by a most able man in Congress, but I would like to ask why it is that Woods Hole gets $8,460, which is in excess of nearly every other station that this Government is supporting, and I would like to know why we have to spend that much money in that particular place in excess of the other places?

Mr. GOOD. This is a lobster station, the others being simply fish stations. This is the only explanation. [Laughter.]

Mr. HICKS. That is a very good explanation, and I withdraw my motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Steamer *Phalarope:* Master, $1,500; engineer, $1,200; fireman, $780; two seamen at $810 each; cook, $870; in all, $5,970.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just for the purpose of asking the gentleman in reference to the services performed by these various steamers. There is not anything in the bill to indicate what they are doing, and I would like to know what we are voting this money for.

Mr. GOOD. These steamers go back and forth between these fish stations on the rivers and on the coasts and are performing the services of taking up fish and matters of that kind. They are doing very good work, I guess.

Mr. JUUL. I thank the gentleman; that is what I wanted to know.

Mr. GOOD. And the appropriation has been carried for a number of years.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For officers and crew of vessel for Alaska fisheries service, $26,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman why there should be such a large appropriation in this particular item which seems to be out of proportion to the previous appropriation. For instance, this year it is $26,000.

Mr. GOOD. Well, this is a very large vessel, and it plies between Seattle and Alaska, and the expenses of operation necessarily are much larger than the others.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it strictly on Government business and in the interest of the Government business? Does it ply strictly on Government business and in the interest of Government business?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; to the Alaska fisheries and to the Pribilof Seal Islands, in which the Government is interested.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wytheville (Va.) Fish Hatchery: For general improvements to the water supply, including the purchase of a right of way for pipe line, and right to construct dam and reservoir, $5,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. What is this improvement? They want to purchase a right of way to construct a dam. How extensive is this work?

Mr. GOOD. It is for an increase in the water supply. Dr. Smith, when he appeared before the committee in February, said in regard to this item:

That is an old station which was acquired in 1896 from the State of Virginia. We have been operating it for a number of years. The original appropriation was only $10,000. At present it is necessary to install a new pipe line from the stream that is one of the sources of water supply for the reason that the present line, made a number of years ago, is broken, leaking, and unequal to the pressure, and is liable to leave us at any time without a proper supply of water. The intake is not on the Government property, and it is necessary that that be acquired by purchase.

They ask $10,000 for this, and we have carried $5,000, thinking they could make arrangements there without the acquisition of land, and repair the pipe line so as to carry the water to the station.

Mr. WALSH. They ask to purchase land?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And you have framed it so they can only purchase the right of way for this line?

Mr. GOOD. That is all.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distribution cars: The appropriation of $55,000 in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918 for the purchase or construction of two steel cars for the distribution of useful food fishes is continued and made available during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to make some inquiry in reference to these cars. I do not see that item in the bill of last year. Am I mistaken in that?

Mr. GOOD. It was not in the bill of last year, but it was in the fiscal year of 1918, year before last.

Mr. HICKS. Let me ask the chairman just what these cars are used for. It says, "for the distribution of useful food fishes." Does this mean that young fish are taken from one station to another?

Mr. GOOD. These fish are taken from the hatcheries and distributed throughout the country in these cars, and they are distributed in streams where it is desirable to augment the supply of fish.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BABKA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I notice in the estimate presented to the committee by the Secretary there was an item of $15,000 for the demonstration and imparting of knowledge and instruction in the proper cooking of fish. I was wondering the reason why this item had not been provided for in this appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that we did not go into that very carefully, for this reason: About a year ago the Department of Commerce did undertake to instruct the canners in the matter of canning grayfish, and the canners up at Boston and Gloucester followed their instructions.

Mr. WALSH. Dogfish.

Mr. GOOD. Is that the same as dogfish?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. And these canners invested a considerable amount of money in the canning of grayfish and putting it on the market at a low price, and, lo and behold, this year the Secretary of Commerce comes back with an estimate first of $45,000, and before this committee of $60,000, to pay the damages sustained by the canners who had canned these dogfish in accordance with the instructions of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BABKA. That was a different plan. Did anything develop in the hearings before the committee that this particular work did not have the result he claimed?

Mr. GOOD. It was all in the instructions as to canning of fish, and until the department is better advised as to proper instructions as to cooking fish, we thought it advisable to give no further appropriations along this line.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enforcement of the laws regulating immigration of aliens into the United States, including the contract-labor laws; cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner General of Immigration; salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed to enforce said laws, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914; enforcement of the provisions of the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," and acts amendatory thereof; necessary supplies, including exchange of typewriting machines, alterations, and repairs, and for all other expenses authorized by said act; preventing the unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States, by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto; expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expenses of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation; refunding of head tax and maintenance bills upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that collection was made through error of Government officers; all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, $2,450,000: *Provided*, That the purchase, use, maintenance, and operation of horses and motor vehicles required in the enforcement of the immigration and Chinese exclusion laws outside of the District of Columbia may be contracted for and the cost thereof paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of those laws, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe: *Provided further*, That not more than $12,000 of the sum appropriated herein may be expended in the purchase and maintenance of such motor vehicles.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 153, line 17, strike out "$2,450,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,440,000: *Provided*, That the salary of the commissioner of immigration for the port of New York, stationed at Ellis Island, New York Harbor, shall be fixed for the fiscal year 1920, at $2,500."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe my amendment is subject to a point of order. It retrenches expenditure.

The purpose of my amendment, gentlemen, is to reduce the salary of the commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island, who now draws a salary of $6,500, and who is very rarely at his station, unless he goes there for the purpose of defending a detained anarchist. I have his record, and find that from the 1st of January, 1918, to about the 1st of June, 1918, Mr. Howe was at Ellis Island three or four times. From June, 1918, to about October of that year his attendance amounted to 10 per cent. In October of 1918 Mr. Howe went to Europe, not on any official business, as far as I can ascertain, and returned to this country in March of this year.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What does the gentleman want to pay him any salary for at all, if he does not attend to his duty?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will tell the gentleman why. It is because if I cut it out entirely he may remain in office and collect his full salary, of $6,500. That is what I had in mind when I reduced it to this amount.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have fixed laws in this country on the question of immigration, and whether Mr. Howe believes in the laws or not, it is his sworn duty to enforce them. He is entitled to his personal opinions and to express them, but he must administer the law as he finds it. I want to call the attention of the House—and a great deal was said to-day about anarchists—to the provision in the immigration law pertaining to anarchists.

We are able to take care of the anarchists in New York City by our municipal police, but after we get these anarchists and turn them over to the immigration office at Ellis Island we find that the immigration commissioner, instead of deporting them according to law, acts as their counsel.

Now, I will give you one case, that of Andrea Ciafolo, warrant No. 54379/400. This alien was arrested by the police of the city of New York and turned over to the immigration office. The law on the question provides, after setting forth the classes of aliens that shall be excluded:

Anarchists or persons who believe in or agitate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials.

That is the law. Let me read you the testimony of Mr. Ciafolo:

Q. Do you believe in organized government?—A. I do not believe in government, because the nation does not need a government.

Q. Do you mean by the right of free criticism the right to advocate by force or violence the overthrow of government or the assassination of government officials?—A. I have explained before that when government does not satisfy the necessity of the people they have a right to change it by any means they desire; whatever they think best.

In reply to a question as to what he would substitute for government, he answered "Spontaneous organizations."

Q. Do you believe in the overthrow by force or violence of organized government?—A. I believe that when the government is not able to satisfy people they have a right to change, and it makes no difference what means they use to do so.

Q. Do you consider it a part of the anarchistic belief to be in opposition to all organized government?—A. The anarchist does not believe in any form of government.

Q. This is the anarchy you believe in, is it not?—A. For myself, I believe that I do not need any sort of government, because I can guide myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Now, Mr. Chairman, on that testimony, disregarding the papers found on this anarchist, but on his

own testimony, the inspector who heard the case recommended the deportation of the alien, and this is what Commissioner Howe wrote to the department. After referring to the case, he says, under date of May 22, 1919:

> This is another of those cases in which it seems to me there ought to be more evidence or a different kind of evidence to support the warrant. The alien does not admit that he is an anarchist. He has not advocated or taught anarchy, but had simply studied it for his own education. He does say that he does not believe in government, and if all the people were of his intelligence and education they would not require a government. Instead of organized government he would substitute spontaneous organization. His definition of anarchy is unconditional liberty of a man to criticize any form of government, whether political, economic, or religious. He says the people have a right to change government by any means they desire.

So the commissioner, quoting the testimony where this man admitted that according to his belief people had the right to overthrow government in any way they desired, recommended that the warrant be dismissed and that the alien be liberated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In just one minute.

I want to state for the RECORD that the department did not follow the recommendation of the commissioner, and the alien has been ordered deported.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman believe that this commissioner, Mr. Howe, will be one of the first persons dismissed from office by the President of the United States when he returns to this country?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the President will remove this man, but if the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] can give us that assurance I am willing to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would say to the gentleman that this is entirely a nonpolitical matter. Probably 75 per cent of the citizens of the United States want to have this man removed, and want to have these anarchistic aliens deported. I am confident the present commissioner of immigration at New York will be dismissed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I feel quite certain that Mr. Howe will not be dismissed.

On another occasion Inspector McKee, in charge of detained aliens, refused to turn over certain literature that was sent to these anarchists by outside friends. When Mr. Howe ordered him, in writing, to deliver that literature, and when Mr. McKee again refused, Commissioner Howe took that literature himself to the detained anarchists. In that batch of anarchistic literature were copies of the Rebel Worker, the Red Dawn, the Truth About the I. W. W., the New Solidarity, I. W. W. Songs, and the Seattle Union Record. So that we have the commissioner of immigration, when he is not traveling around in Europe, or lecturing, or amusing himself somewhere—I do not know what he does with his time—making a special trip to Ellis Island for the purpose of delivering this kind of literature to detained aliens who were awaiting deportation under charges of being anarchists and engaged in some movement to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Gentlemen, the only way we have of rebuking this official, the only way we have of expressing our minds and showing that such actions do not meet with our approval, is to cut his salary. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the things which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has called to the attention of the House can be justified for one minute. Notwithstanding that, I believe that the gentleman from New York has not reached the matter in the proper way. If we adopt his amendment, I do not care if they get the very best man in the United States to act as commissioner of immigration, he could not receive the salary that a man should have in that capacity.

Now, if the gentleman would offer an amendment to the effect that no part of this appropriation could be used to pay the salary of this man as commissioner, I would have no objection to it. If what the gentleman from New York has said is true, that man ought to be removed, and ought to have been removed before. [Applause.] I am not going to defend that sort of thing; but I do say we ought to maintain the salary of that position, so that a good man who will attend to his duties and enforce the law can be had, if the present incumbent is not a fit man. I have no knowledge with regard to it. I take the word of the gentleman from New York with regard to what has taken place over there, but I do ask him not to cripple the service, so that we can not have anybody there at all who is competent to do this work. It is a very important work.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out the proviso and inserting "no part of the appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of Frederick C. Howe, present commissioner of immigration at the port of New York," leaving the amount as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Modify the amendment by striking out the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That no part of the appropriation herein made shall be used to pay the salary of Frederick C. Howe, commissioner of immigration at the port of New York."

Mr. VAILE. The amount would remain at $2,450,000, would it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, few men differ about the condition of affairs which prevails at Ellis Island. We are appropriating $600,000 here for the deportation of anarchists. We appropriated this morning $500,000 to help the Attorney General find these men who are opposed to our form of government and to our laws. It is useless to have a Commissioner of Immigration at New York away from his post of duty. He presided as chairman over what proved to be the largest Russian meeting held in Madison Square Garden a few weeks ago. It is true that he was away several months from Ellis Island traveling in Europe, and the Department of Labor states it is not responsible for his retention. About 10 days ago there was quite a scene at the Department of Labor, at which Mr. Howe was one of the parties, and the others were the gentlemen in charge of the Department of Labor. His appointment is made by the President, and while there were some criticisms of his administration about two or three years ago, I had hoped that the changes suggested at that time would be the end of it.

Mr. Howe is what is commonly known as "a radical," and his writings and leanings are that way. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, which has had Mr. Howe's matters before it for a number of years, has always felt that it was not the province of the committee to determine who should be in charge at Ellis Island or what views he should have. During the last fiscal year only 20 anarchists were deported from the United States, at an expenditure of practically $600,000. Now, these anarchists and others who do not believe in our form of government are gathered up, for instance, at Seattle, and sent to Ellis Island, and then, lo and behold, at Ellis Island they are given better treatment than is given to honest, worthy immigrants when they arrive here and pay their increased head tax.

Although I am not sure that the method that is adopted here is the ideal method, yet it seems to me, from the expression of views I have heard in this House, it is perfectly apparent that when a prominent Federal officer does not realize the temper of the country we should give notice in some way, directly or indirectly, to all employees who have leanings against our form of government and its institutions that we do not propose to tolerate it any longer. [Applause.] You can not expect men in the employ of the Government not to be asking a lot of questions when they were never more dissatisfied than they are now. The reason for it is that they have not got a chief to go to to make their complaints. As I am the New York member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I get complaints every week, and while the department down here tries in every possible way to eliminate the complaints and bring peace and harmony over there, the fact is it does not exist. So for that reason I hope that the expression of opinion of the chairman of the Immigration Committee may come true. If it does not and there is no improvement, I think it will be up to the House to take some action, and for the managers on the part of the House to appear before the Senate in proper form and ask the Senate to take the necessary constitutional action with reference to this appointee. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I have two minutes?

Mr. GOOD. I think I only used about three minutes, and I will yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know, of course, anything about the facts that have been stated by the gentlemen from New York. Of course, I do not question the truth of any statements they have made with reference to this particular official.

Mr. SIEGEL. If the gentleman will take the time after the House adjourns to look up the reports of that New York soviet meeting, he will find all the facts he needs.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not denying any facts stated by the gentleman or his colleague. I am willing to give full credence to them as far as that is concerned; but I submit that this is not the way to go about removing this official at Ellis

Island. If he is what the gentleman has said, of course he ought not to hold the position that he holds; but there is a proper way to go about it. This House ought not to undertake to try a man on the charges that have been made here upon the floor without giving him a hearing and at least giving him an opportunity to present the facts in his own defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not the doing of that in an irregular way making him a first-class revolutionary martyr, probably just what he wants?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Can it not be done better by the President of the United States?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I hope the House will go about this in an orderly way and vote down this amendment, and let charges be preferred against this man and if sustained let him be removed in a legal way. Certainly this House without any investigation ought not to take this action.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAGUARDIA) there were—ayes 18, noes 44.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of Labor, of examiners, interpreters, clerks, and stenographers, for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Bureau of Naturalization, provided for by the act approved June 29, 1906, as amended by the act approved March 4, 1913 (Stat. L., vol. 37, p. 736), and May 9, 1918 (Stat. L., vol. 40, pp. 542 to 548, inclusive), including not to exceed $50,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official stations, including street car fare on official business at official stations, together with per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for such per diem together with actual necessary traveling expenses of officers and employees of the Bureau of Naturalization in Washington while absent on official duty outside of the District of Columbia; telegrams, verifications of legal papers, telephone service in offices outside of the District of Columbia; not to exceed $5,300 for rent of offices outside of the District of Columbia where suitable quarters can not be obtained in public buildings; carrying into effect section 13 of the act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat., p. 600), as amended by the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 765), and in accordance with the provisions of the sundry civil act of June 12, 1917; and for mileage and fees to witnesses subpœnaed on behalf of the United States, the expenditures from this appropriation shall be made in the manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, $450,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the compensation of assistants to clerks of United States courts.

Mr. GARRETT. I reserve a point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order on the proviso.

Mr. McKEOWN. I desire to ask the chairman a question as to the total amount that has been appropriated for this department in the former bill, as well as any change in the amount.

Mr. GOOD. The amount carried in the current law is $275,000. The amount carried in the bill that failed was $350,000. There was $400,000 appropriated in a special act for the Naturalization Service. Now, unquestionably the work that the service has been called upon to do has been very largely increased during the past two years. It was stated before the committee that the number of persons who are applying for naturalizaion has increased to a very large extent, and the estimate as I recall it was for $675,000, and that later was modified to $800,000. Now, of course, it is impossible to say just how much of this will be expended. A great deal will depend upon whether or not the applications for citizenship increase during the year as much as they have increased during the present year.

Mr. McKEOWN. I did not rise for the purpose of criticizing it. I desire to compliment the committee for increasing the amount, because heretofore the department has been embarrassed in not having enough agents to investigate particular cases as they should be investigated at this time.

Mr. GOOD. That was the purpose of the increase.

Mr. GARRETT. I should like to ask the gentleman about the proviso beginning in line 14 on page 155.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that he will recall that during the last Congress we amended the law respecting the pay of clerks of courts which had provided theretofore that they could take their pay from the receipts of the office. They were paid out of the fees. Next year they will be paid salaries fixed by the Attorney General, as well as all the clerks in the offices of the United States courts.

Mr. GARRETT. And that is true of the assistants as well as the clerks?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Now, these clerks also perform duties for the Naturalization Service, and inasmuch as the salaries fixed by the Attorney General include all the services of the clerks, whether the clerical work in the offices of the clerks of the court or with regard to naturalization, it was suggested, in order to prevent their being paid twice for the same service, that this proviso should be carried.

Mr. GARRETT. The proviso does not affect the clerks. It affects the assistants to clerks.

Mr. GOOD. What I have said of the clerks is true of the assistants. Their salaries are fixed by the Attorney General and are paid at a rate intended to cover all their services, both as assistant clerks of courts and as the assistants in doing the work required in the Naturalization Service.

Mr. GARRETT. Where does the fund come from with which the clerks' assistants are paid?

Mr. GOOD. In line 12 on page 123 of the bill there is carried $800,000 for this service. They estimated for $900,000, but they were not quite sure as to what these salaries would amount to. In fact, they had not yet been put into effect and will not be until the 1st of next month.

Mr. GARRETT. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIEGEL: Page 155, line 3, after the word "exceed," strike out "$5,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,000."

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for this increase arises on account of conditions in New York and Boston. It does not increase the total appropriation. It gives the Naturalization Bureau the amount expended last year, which was $6,600, instead of $5,300 allowed in this bill. This is absolutely essential for the room that they have in New York in order to accommodate the applicants and their witnesses for examination. There is only a difference of $1,700 to take care of the office space in New York and Boston. In New York City and the adjacent territory in New Jersey, with a population of 10,000,000, they can not do the work in a less space.

Mr. GOOD. I know nothing about it. This is the amount that was in the former bill; and while they asked for more, the judgment of the gentlemen who made up the former bill and the judgment of the House was that the amount ought to be sufficient to cover the rent. I have no knowledge in regard to it, but if it is too small it will be enlarged before it becomes a law, I have no doubt. The difficulty with these appropriations is that in too many of them the amount is placed at too large a sum instead of cutting it down.

Mr. SIEGEL. I know this place in New York at 5 Beekman Street. I have seen these long lines of men running out into the hall. They have not sufficient room. They should not be required to stand out in the hall and on the stairs. As I said, they spent $6,600 last year. They took $1,300 from the $400,000 special appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. They only had $5,300 last year.

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes; but they used in addition to that $1,300 from the $400,000 appropriation, making $6,600 that they spent for rent. We have not a proper Federal building in New York that they could get space in, as in other cities.

Mr. GOOD. It is the opinion of Congress that they ought to get quarters so that they would not expend more than $5,300.

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman must remember that this covers the whole State of New York up as far as Albany. You are asked for an appropriation of only $1,700 to benefit a population of ten or eleven millions of people. I am not asking for an increase of the total appropriation. I ask only that they be given a chance to retain the same quarters they have now, and in justice and fairness to the bureau and those who come there it should be granted.

Mr. GOOD. I am not so much interested in the quarters as I am in having the rent kept down. That was the amount carried in the last bill, and it is an intimation to the department that they should keep the quarters within the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. I ask that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I am one of the very few Members in the House, on account of being on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, who has taken the time to watch these proceedings by which the applicants are naturalized. After they make their application in court it is essential that they go to the place where the Naturalization Bureau is located and be examined as to their fitness to be admitted to citizenship. Every applicant and his two witnesses has to go there. They had over 335,000 applications in this country during the last year. It is not a case where we ask for a larger amount of money. The same conditions prevail in Boston, where they have not sufficient room and where the people have to line up and stand outside in order to await their turn to be examined. I will insert in the RECORD the full number of applications, and so forth. It is quite a long story. I ask the

chairman to consent to this amendment. I do not think we should be put in the position of crushing out the small space they now have, for you can not get another room in New York sufficiently large for this amount of rent money. As I have several times stated, I am not asking that the total amount be increased.

Mr. GOOD. I will say that I know nothing personally about it. They had that amount last year, but it seems that they spent $6,600. If the gentleman knows, as a matter of fact, personally, and is satisfied that this is not an increase of rent——

Mr. SIEGEL. It is simply to keep the same space.

Mr. GOOD. I am not inclined to oppose the amendment. Mr. Chairman, the report shows that—

The Bureau of Naturalization of the Department of Labor has for five years been securing the organization by the public schools of classes, both night and day, for the instruction of adult foreigners in English and citizenship responsibilities. Primarily this has been for foreigners who are candidates for citizenship. It is now in contact with 3,277 cities, towns, and small communities in every State in the Union and Alaska and Hawaii. The superintendents of schools have pledged the organization of classes in 2,193 places and already tens of thousands of classes are in the process of organization, while in approximately 1,084 places classes will be organized in the coming year according to present reports from the school authorities in those places. These places represent the places of residence of the foreign population of the country and a large percentage of the native illiterates. While these classes were originally organized for the foreign born, they are now being attended in ever increasing numbers by native Americans.

This work has been specifically authorized by the act of Congress of May 9, 1918, which carried an appropriation of $400,000, and was prior to that time inaugurated under the general authority in the act of June 29, 1906, giving charge of all matters concerning the naturalization of aliens to the Bureau of Naturalization.

The machinery has therefore been established between the Federal Government, working through the Bureau of Naturalization and the public schools of the entire country with which to deal with the whole problem of illiteracy, not only among the foreign born but with the native adult illiterates as well.

The cost of the Federal administration in all its phases is borne by the naturalization fees collected from the candidates for citizenship and deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

A Federal textbook has been published and is distributed free to the foreign born who are candidates for citizenship attending these public school classes, and certificates of graduation are being presented by the public schools in conjunction with the Bureau of Naturalization to such foreigners. Motion pictures carrying the message of loyalty to our Government and visualizing its activities are distributed and are shown to these foreigners and illiterate Americans. Industrial, labor, racial, educational, religious, patriotic, commercial, and other organizations are working with the public schools and the Federal Government in this Americanizing undertaking.

Approximately from 15,000 to 20,000 school-teachers and officers of the public schools are engaged in this work in conjunction with the Federal Government, and hundreds of thousands of foreigners who heretofore were unable to do so are now having educational facilities and are learning of the institutions of the United States Government. This support of the Federal Government is responsible for the present organization and development of these classes in probably 80 per cent of the communities referred to where adults were never before taught.

This work constitutes now by far the largest responsibility of the Bureau of Naturalization and has necessitated the creation by the Secretary of Labor of the position of director of citizenship and the placing of that officer in direct supervision of this work.

The report shows further:

"B."

Foreign born applying for citizenship through the Bureau of Naturalization.

Years.	Incoming immigrants.	Declarations filed.	Petitions filed.	Total candidates.	Total applying for citizenship, including derivative citizens.
1907	1,285,349	[1] 73,723	.....	.....	.....
1908	782,870	137,229	.....	.....	.....
1909	751,786	145,794	.....	.....	.....
1910	1,041,570	167,226	.....	.....	.....
1911	878,587	186,157	.....	.....	.....
1912	838,172	169,142	.....	.....	.....
1913	1,197,392	181,632	.....	.....	.....
1914	1,218,480	214,016	.....	.....	.....
1915	326,700	245,815	.....	.....	.....
1916	298,826	207,935	.....	.....	.....
1917	295,403	438,748	132,320	571,068	1,142,136
1918	110,618	335,069	[2] 151,449	486,518	973,036
1919:					
10 months	.....	311,505	155,485	467,390	934,780
2 months [3]	.....	62,381	31,097	93,478	186,956
1 year [3]	.....	374,286	186,582	560,868	1,121,736

[1] Nine months only.
[2] Represents petitions on which certificates issued during the fiscal year.
[3] Estimated.

Years of experience and counts repeatedly made show an average of 1.125 of citizens derive citizenship through the petitioner. This has been treated as only one derivative in this statement.

That this bureau is trying to meet the situation is shown by the following extract:

To illustrate further the increase in the filing of naturalization papers: "In Detroit recently it grew so rapidly that it was necessary for aliens to stand in line outside of the clerk's office as early as 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning in order to secure a number when the office opened at 9 o'clock. Those who received numbers were told to return at specified times during the day to secure their papers. Many who stood in line for hours, however, were turned away. Even the forms became exhausted, and because of inability on the part of the bureau to fill the requisitions more expeditiously the Board of Commerce of Detroit printed for the clerk 50,000 facts forms for declaration of intention. As a temporary partial relief an examiner was specially assigned to Detroit to explain to representatives of 62 industrial plants in Detroit ways whereby they could assist their alien employees in preparing their facts for declaration and the duplicate and triplicate declarations in the plants, which represented approximately 25,000 nondeclarant employees.

"In Chicago a similar situation has been presented recently where there has been an increase in the number of declarations filed of approximately 360 per cent over a similar period in each of the years 1913 to 1916, with no indication whatever that this increased demand will discontinue. The declarants came so fast in Chicago that it was necessary for the different clerks of courts to turn away sometimes as many as a hundred or more a day. The aid rendered by industrial plants in preparing in the plants for their foreign-born employees facts forms for declarations and duplicate and triplicate declarations has been tremendous, but is far from sufficient to relieve this demand upon the clerks of courts."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

Mr. WALSH. Will the remarks be the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to insert two pages, giving the number of people arriving and the number of applications, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS.

To enable the Secretary of Labor to continue the investigation touching women in industry, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, $40,000.

To enable the Secretary of Labor to maintain in the District of Columbia an organization to act as a central clearing house for cooperation with the States and the political subdivisions thereof in the furnishing of information and the rendering of assistance in the employment of wage earners throughout the United States, including a director at $5,000 per annum, an assistant director at $4,000 per annum, 4 chiefs of divisions at $3,000 each per annum, and such other personal services at rates of compensation not exceeding $1,800 each per annum as may be necessary, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, $200,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph, beginning on line 21, page 155, and ending on line 7, page 156.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve it for three minutes.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, my information on this subject is limited to listening to 25 or 30 speeches made by the gentleman from Texas. I am so impressed with the subject and have had so many letters from constituents and friends at home concerning this department of the Government, that I want to talk a little about it and make some inquiries.

I have heard the gentleman from Texas say that he believed in this department of our Government and that he would favor and support such a department as a permanent one under certain restrictions and conditions. This propaganda has permeated the minds of people in my district to such an extent that they are asking me to support a permanent bureau of this kind.

The distinguished gentleman also on numerous occasions furnished a record statement from reliable and well-informed people as to the mismanagement of this department under the present head and as to the misappropriation and misuse and extravagant use of the funds appropriated. As I understand it, they ask for $200,000 to maintain the department in which over $4,000,000 was wasted last year. This is a little like the Ellis Island proposition, and as a new Member I get lost. I am frank to say I was convinced from the letters written by the gentleman at Ellis Island and signed by him that he was unfit for the position he was holding, and I would have no hesitancy in voting to remove him.

I am convinced by matters introduced into the RECORD by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that the man at the head of this department is mismanaging the department and is unfit to spend the money appropriated. Still, that hardly justifies us in doing away with the department of the Government. I am somewhat handicapped in my relations with the distinguished gentleman now residing in Paris, who, I understand, is coming home soon, and therefore I can not appeal to

him, and I do not know that I can rely upon his removing these inefficient and improper officers at the head of his departments. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has often told us of his intimate relations with the President, and he has assured us that the President would do almost anything he asked him to do, and I am going to suggest that we go ahead and appropriate this $200,000——

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am sure that the gentleman does not want to misquote me.

Mr. TINCHER. I do not mean that he said exactly that, but I draw that inference from his statements.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish I were that close to the President. Unfortunately I am not.

Mr. TINCHER. I am not very close to him. As I understand it, he issued certain publications in which he did not advise my coming here. [Laughter.] And I am not personally acquainted with the gentleman; but I do hope that some man on the Democratic side of the House who is close to that gentleman will meet him when he arrives in the United States and prevail upon him to stop in Washington long enough to remove a few of these corrupt officers before he starts his campaign of 1920. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] But I would hate to see the several departments of our Government crippled——

Mr. GALLIVAN rose.

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, yes; I hope he will comply with the gentleman's wishes and remove Mr. Burleson, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Oh, let the gentleman reserve it for a moment.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is that I am right and he is wrong. I told the truth about the man that I attacked. He reads what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] puts into the RECORD and is persuaded that the head of this Employment Service is an unfit man. May I say to my friend from Kansas—and I believe he is an honest man and wants to be fair—that no campaign of misrepresentation has ever been more successfully waged than has been the campaign waged against John B. Densmore.

He is as fine, as clean, as capable, as honest an American citizen as there is in this Capitol or outside of it, and I will not sit here quietly when a new Member comes here and announces that in his judgment this faithful official, who has worked until midnight year in and year out for this Government, ought to be removed because of certain articles that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has inserted into the RECORD. If I have done nothing else than to put a doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] that his opinion about Mr. Densmore is wrong, I shall be happy.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the ground that there is no legislation for this.

The CHAIRMAN. To what language does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. To the language beginning on page 155, line 21, with the word "to," and ending on page 156, line 7, with the figures "$200,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel, oil, and cotton waste, and advertising for the power plant which furnishes heat and light for the Capitol and congressional buildings, $150,000. This and the two foregoing appropriations shall be expended by the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds under the supervision and direction of the commission in control of the House Office Building, appointed under the act approved March 4, 1907, and without reference to section 4 of the act approved June 17, 1910, concerning purchases for executive departments.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of making an inquiry of my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, with reference to a portion of this paragraph. I observe in the first line that this appropriation is not only for the purpose of buying fuel, oil, and waste, but also advertising the power plant. I understood, of course, that this administration believes in advertising and that it is always advertising; that the various departments and a great many of the different agencies see fit to advertise the value of the services which they are rendering the public, and in particular has this been the case with the Department of Labor, or with this bureau of that department which has attempted to find situations for those who are out of work. It has been advertising to such an extent that it has often sent out telegrams and messages invoking the aid of various clubs, organizations, and individuals in its support. The Secretary of the Interior also has been advertising, sending out communications to the soldiers and telling them of the great benefits they will obtain from a project which he has in mind, which he assumes is going to be very soon put into effect by Congress. But why advertise the power plant? I do not understand what is meant by that. That is a rather new line of advertising. I have been accustomed to all of the others for a long time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is advertising for the things which are necessary for the power plant. This whole matter, as the gentleman knows, is under the House Office Building Commission, and under the law it is necessary for them to advertise for supplies.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I suspect that this advertising was entirely proper, because it had passed the examination of my colleague, and that it was probably of the nature of which he speaks. I do think very serious objections should be made to the departments' advertising, however, as they have conducted it in the past in an attempt to influence legislation, and to get some pet scheme they have before the House and carry it through in that sort of way. They are not paid for that. They are paid to act in the way of carrying out legislation that we enact.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman understand that this attempt, by press propaganda and other means throughout the country at large, to influence legislation is paid for out of the private purses of these gentlemen, or is it in some way charged off to expenditures for the Government and paid out of a Government fund?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think these gentlemen are so patriotic as to pay for it out of their own pockets. It is apparently paid for out of the public funds.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is exactly what I wanted to get at, and my own inclination led me to suspect such a thing. Does the gentleman have any idea what authority they have for paying public money out for propaganda to influence legislation?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They certainly have none, and in one particular instance I stated under the Secretary of the Interior—I say the Secretary of the Interior; some under official; I do not know whether the Secretary of the Interior knows anything about it or not—some official of his department has sent out return postal cards with a return frank for anybody to use and make reply. Now, there is no authority of law for anything of that kind.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. I am very much interested in the reference which the gentleman makes to the advertising in the Interior Department.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. The question is an interesting one. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from his observation if that advertising has not been operating successfully with the leader of his party on the floor of the House?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, whether it has been successful with the leader of the party or not depends upon the conclusion that he might draw. Now, the gentleman from Wyoming himself, if he saw fit, might do such advertising at his own expense, but this project, as I understand, is for some petty scheme of the Interior Department.

Mr. GARRETT. I was really asking about the effect of the advertising which has been done by the Interior Department upon the leader of the gentleman's party.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I am not concerned about a matter that I am not concerned with.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit me to suggest, having such great confidence in the judgment of the leader of our side, I am inclined to think he has come to his opinion in spite of the Secretary of the Interior's approval of it rather than because of it. I rather think the gentleman from Wyoming came to the conclusion sometime before the Secretary of the Interior did and started the movement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I can not say about that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, while I was temporarily and unavoidably out of the Chamber the item at the bottom of page 155 and top of page 156, relative to the United States Employment Service, went out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Of course, that would have occurred had I been here just the same, so that my absence has made no difference in the procedure. I simply refer to the

fact that I was absent because I had intended to make a very brief statement in regard to that item when it was reached. I avail myself of the opportunity to do so now. My opinion is that it is not only very important that the item be in the bill when it becomes a law, but my personal opinion is that the appropriation should be larger than that recommended by the committee. There has been a very great deal of criticism of the Federal Employment Service. I do not know just how much of that criticism has been justified by the facts. There has certainly been some basis for it or there would not have been such a volume of criticism. Nevertheless, the service has undoubtedly done some good—a very considerable amount of good, in my opinion—and I think it would be very unfortunate to have it discontinued at this time. I do not approve the plans and purposes of some of creating a great governmental employment service costing many millions of dollars annually. I do not believe that would be wise; but I am convinced the Federal Government ought to undertake a work which goes as far, at least, as is contemplated under the language that went out of the bill. I think that we should go further than that and at least do that character of employment work that is interstate in its nature. The State employment agencies necessarily busy themselves with matters of State employment, or employment within the State, and we all know that in our country the demand for labor, the demand for mechanics, comes from widely separated districts. The field for supplying the demand for labor and mechanics is not bounded by State lines. There is a certain amount and class of work that should be done by the Federal Government. I am not prepared to say how much we should spend on an employment service, but I am very certain that we should not only do what is contemplated by the provision that went out on a point of order, but that we should extend the work further in order to at least cooperate fully and completely with the States, and in that connection do a class of interstate work which the States can not or will not do. I trust that when this bill becomes a law it will carry a sum sufficient for the Employment Service, at least along the lines I have suggested. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is no motion before the House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in opposition to the motion made by the gentleman from Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Wyoming in the regret he has expressed that this provision in the bill went out under the point of order. I had hoped, in its modified form, that the gentleman from Texas would have consented that the provision be passed without making the point of order he has just made to similar provisions in other bills heretofore considered. I also am in accord with the gentleman from Wyoming in the statement that he made to the effect that this provision in itself is not sufficient. It has been my position and the position of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], that this service should be extended so that work could also be done in the States. For my part, while I very cheerfully supported the provision which went out under the point of order and I believe it should have been adopted, I do not think it went far enough, because I do not think a clearing house here in the city of Washington for the purpose of securing information and disseminating it through the States would be as effective as it would be if this Employment Service could have agencies in the various States for the purpose of calling upon employers and also receiving requests from those who desire employment. I think this service is exceedingly essential, particularly at this time, in the interest of the returning soldiers and sailors who need positions. I had hoped that the gentleman from Wyoming, as the majority leader of his party, now in control of this House, would bring in a rule for the purpose of making this provision in order and permitting the Congress to make an appropriation to take care of this service, as I think it ought to be taken care of.

Mr. SIMS. I just wanted to state what the gentleman stated, that the rule would put the objection all behind and make the item effective. And there is no trouble about getting a rule if there is any sincerity in wanting to get this legislation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Precisely; and I am sorry, indeed, that there does not seem to be any disposition on the part of gentlemen on the other side to bring in a rule in order to permit the House to act on some of these propositions.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in conducting this bill I have attempted to do so without any sort of partisanship at all. I have tried my best to keep down every semblance of it in this matter, and so far as I am concerned there has not been an item put in the bill or an item kept out of the bill in the spirit of partisanship.

It ill becomes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to leave the impression that his remark would attempt to leave, that because of partisanship we brought in a provision in the bill that we did not attempt to put through—that it was pure bunk.

Now, I want to say to the gentleman that the objection came from his own side of the House and not from this side.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is kicking before he is spurred. I did not accuse the gentleman of any insincerity, but I repeat, if the gentlemen upon that side want a vote on this proposition, they have it in their power to bring in a rule in this House and permit the House to pass on it.

Mr. GOOD. So far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to have a rule; but I want to say to the gentleman that the President, who has been in Paris for the past three or four months, refused to call Congress together until only a few weeks of this fiscal year remained, and this committee has been working night and day in order to put through the appropriations so that the Government might function after the 1st day of July. It may be all right, and would be all right, to bring in a rule here if we had the time. But here is a bill carrying hundreds of millions of dollars that has to become a law, if possible, before the 1st day of July, and yet the gentleman would cast aspersions upon this side because it does not bring in a rule to make in order a provision that would have been in order if nobody had made an objection to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman has known all the time that this was subject to a point of order if anybody made it.

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why did you not have the Rules Committee all cocked and primed to bring a rule in here?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Missouri knows full well how long it takes to bring in a rule and have it adopted. And I will ask the gentleman this question: Why his party when he was Speaker of the House, did not bring in a rule to make this same provision in order? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You can get your Rules Committee together in 10 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Why did you not get your Rules Committee together?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was Speaker of the House and was not running things on the floor of the House.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman was the leader—the Speaker of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was Speaker of the House.

Mr. GOOD. And the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was a member of the Committee on Appropriations then, and he was as mum as could be, and never asked anybody for a rule, and never offered any amendment on the floor of the House to make this provision in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You are acting just exactly like a boy who is making faces at another boy, and then the other one turns around and makes a face at him. You are trying to justify your negligence because somebody else, according to your own idea, was negligent, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was making remarks simply to bring politics into this thing.

Mr. GOOD. It was brought in on that side of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The speech of the gentleman from Iowa was skillfully camouflaged political harangue.

Mr. GOOD. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman from Missouri. My speech was only intended to put a stop to the practice here of calling attention to this side of the House as playing politics by bringing in a provision that was subject to a point of order without asking for a rule. I will say to the gentleman that there are no less than a hundred items in this bill that are subject to a point of order, and it was never my intention for one single minute to bring in a rule to make them in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You had best bring in a rule and get along better.

Mr. GOOD. We have gotten along pretty well, I think.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word.

This went out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Texas. The matter of employment service is one that ought to be taken care of by the States, and I think it is taken care of by the States that need it. I have a clipping here showing the bills that were passed by the Illinois Legislature, and which will

become laws on the 1st of July under our constitution. Upon this exact matter there were four employment services in Chicago, liberally paid for, before this session of the legislature, and now there is an increase of one. There is an increase of eight throughout the State, so that every city of 25,000 inhabitants will have an employment agency. Illinois is the third State, but first in agriculture and third in manufactures. The city of Chicago is the second manufacturing city in the Union. And I expect Missouri has employment services.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course it has.

Mr. CANNON. "Of course it has," says the gentleman, because Missouri has grown to be not only a great agricultural State, but also a great manufacturing State. In God's name, do not you think that the respective States, under the present conditions, needing this service will have it, as Missouri has it, as Illinois has it, as New York has it, paid for from the State treasury? Then you will have home rule. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I want five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Of course it is not in order anyway.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Some reference was made to what happened in the subcommittee, and as I am a member of the subcommittee I want to be heard on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present. No; I will withdraw the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations for the Capitol power plant hereafter may be expended under the supervision of the House Office Building Commission without reference to that portion of the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 concerning the purchase of fuel for governmental services.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve it.

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve it for a couple of minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not make the point of order. Mr. Woods, the Superintendent of the Capitol, advises us that because he is forced to purchase fuel from the Government fuel yard it is costing him more than he can buy it for in the market. If Mr. Woods had authority to go into the market, there would be competition here between large consumers of fuel. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. We were assured when we established this fuel yard that we were going to reduce the cost of fuel and reduce the expenses of the Government. Here is one branch of the Government saying it can go out and get coal a great deal cheaper than by buying it at the Government fuel yard. It seems to me we had better discontinue this yard or have an investigation and see what is the matter with it.

Mr. GOOD. This does not do away with the yard. It permits Mr. Woods to buy fuel outside, and if he can buy it cheaper outside there will be some reason why this fuel yard should either go out of business or improve its methods. It will be a good thing to have competition. If it is ascertained that Mr. Woods can buy his coal at 10 or 15 cents a ton cheaper than the fuel yard can furnish it, certainly he should be permitted to do it, and the fuel yard officials should then be asked to explain why it is that it costs more to buy coal from them than it costs outside.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. Under this paragraph would Mr. Woods have the right to buy at a higher price than is charged by the fuel yard?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is there any limitation here as to what he shall pay?

Mr. GOOD. The House Office Building Commission, which is composed of Members of the House, supervises this matter, and I am sure they can be trusted with it, and I am assured that Mr. Woods would not buy a pound of coal outside the fuel yard unless he can do it more cheaply outside than he can buy it from the fuel yard.

Mr. McKENZIE. Have you that language in there?

Mr. GOOD. It is so understood.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries: For an additional amount to enable the commission to complete the reclassification of salaries in accordance with the requirements of section 9 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, $25,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I make it.

Mr. GOOD. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. WALSH. That there is no authorization of law for appropriating any additional amount to enable the commission to complete its work.

Mr. GOOD. It is continuing a work in progress.

Mr. WALSH. It is a continuation of work provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, and they should report.

Mr. GOOD. They can not complete their work with the appropriation already made. This is a work undertaken, begun under the authority carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act to commence it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the provision in the legislative act authorizing the reclassification of salaries fixed a limit on the expenditure?

Mr. GOOD. It did not. It carried an appropriation of $25,000 and did not fix a limit, and therefore it is in order to appropriate any sum necessary to complete that work up to the time required for them to report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the logic of the last statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would permit this commission to continue its work for the next 25 years.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, certainly it would. When we passed the legislative and judicial appropriation act that act carried a paragraph creating this commission. That act was for a certain fiscal year. Now, they are seeking to drag out the life of that commission for the next fiscal year and ask us to give them $25,000 additional. The amount provided in that act was to be expended under the authority of that act. That act did not authorize any additional amount. The presumption was when that act was passed that that sum would complete their work. The appropriation then made was presumed to be sufficient. This is the old story of a commission, being appointed to do a certain amount of work, dragging on into the next year and coming in and attempting to get some more money.

Now, it seems to me that, considering the temporary authority of that act authorizing the appointment of this joint commission in that particular bill, this paragraph seeking to appropriate an additional amount is out of order. It is an additional amount to enable the commission to complete the reclassification of salaries in accordance with a provision of the legislative act creating the commission. It does not come within that classification where you can provide in a subsequent bill for a continuing work, like the construction of a levee or a public building or the dredging of a river or harbor. This is a commission.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. GOOD. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the language of the act:

Said commission shall submit its report and recommendation as early as possible, and in any event by the second Monday of January, 1920.

Then it provides for the salaries of the commission, and there is an appropriation of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of expenses authorized to be incurred.

Now, the commission can not continue indefinitely, as the gentleman has suggested. The commission dies on the first Monday of January, 1920. It must make its report to Congress by that time, and I take it that the appropriation of the necessary funds to enable it to make its investigation up to that time is authorized under that act.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The paragraph that the gentleman has read from that act would have been subject to a point of order if anybody had cared to make it at the time, would it not?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but it is the law now.

Mr. WALSH. It is the law now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to be heard a moment, if the Chair will hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I call attention to the provision of the act that—

The commission shall consist of three Senators, who are now Members of the Congress, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Representatives, who are now Members of the Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker. * * * Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

In other words, if an appointed Senator dies or resigns, the President of the Senate appoints another Senator to take his place. If an appointed Representative dies, or if he resigns, the Speaker of the House appoints another Representative in Congress to take his place. These three Senators and these three Representatives were not expected to draw $625 a month, because they would be already drawing $625 a month from the Congress, and when this provision was made in the bill we new Members—I am speaking now for myself—made no point of order against it, because we believed that the three Senators and the three Representatives would not be any expense whatever to the Government; that the three Members of the House would not be drawing $1,875 a month, as the ex-House Members of this commission are doing at this time. While it is true that this bill was approved March 1——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I will get to my point in just a moment. It was understood by Congress that the commission would not cost much money, because this further provision was in the bill:

The heads of the various governmental services and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall furnish office space and equipment, detail officers and employees, furnish data and information, and make investigations whenever requested by the commission in connection with the purposes of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear why the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. For this reason: The gentleman from Massachusetts has called attention to the fact that if a point of order had been made at the time that it was a legislative rider upon an appropriation bill, the point of order would have been good; and until it is shown that there is a necessity for this appropriation of more money to carry on this commission a point of order is good, because it is new legislation carrying on, at a very large expense, a commission which was not intended by Congress at the time it was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that section 9 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, providing for a joint commisson on reclassification of salaries, limiting the life of the commission to the second Monday in January, 1920, and fixing their compensation at $625 a month and appropriating $25,000 for the expenses of the commission incurred in the work which they are authorized and directed by the act to perform, justifies the exercise of power by the House in making further appropriations to pay whatever expenses may be incurred from time to time in the performance of the work for which this commission was authorized, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, to strike out the paragraph beginning with line 24, on page 158, and ending with line 3 on page 159.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to strike out the paragraph beginning with line 24, on page 158, and ending with line 3, on page 159.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this law provides that each department of the Government shall furnish to this commission certain clerks and other facilities for transacting their business. With the proper expenditure of $25,000 which we have already appropriated, I do not see any necessity for appropriating one single other dollar. Improper estimates have been made concerning the resolutions passed the other day. The Secretary of War has sent to the Speaker of the House an estimate that it will cost $30,000 in expenses for the War Department to have answered the supplemental questionnaire which was intended to be answered by the employees of the War Department here in Washington, as submitted in House resolution No. 74 the other day. In estimates the Secretary of the Treasury wants $375 for printing the questionnaire and some of the other departments want as much as $300 for printing. I have a statement from the Public Printer of this Government stating that upon such substantial paper as this colored writing paper [exhibiting sample from the Government Printing Office], which is a thick, heavy paper, the Government Printing Office can furnish 100,000 copies of the proposed supplemental questionnaire for only $189.38.

Yet the Treasurer, with only 32,000 employees affected, asserts it will cost his department $375 to do that printing, when, as a matter of fact, it will cost only about $60, and the Secretary of War asks for $30,000 for getting the information, when the legislative intendment concerning this resolution, as shown in the record, is that these questions shall be answered by the clerks here in Washington only, to whom the original questionnaire was already directed by this commission, which original questionnaire was answered in less than three days after delivery to them. Now, if our departments can make incorrect estimates concerning expenses, I am here to say that if our good Secretary of War would use the clerks he now has who are idle in the department he can answer his questionnaire with the nominal expenditure of not over $150. I cite our good Secretary of War to Mr. Robert L. Foote, who is at work in the Attorney General's department, who besides his salary has made within the last few weeks as high as $240 a week selling stock in Texas oil companies, and selling much of it during office hours, acting under orders of some officers of that department to appear before them in their offices to negotiate for oil stock during office hours. Last year, in addition to his salary, Mr. Foote earned and collected nearly $1,000 for keeping a set of books for a private institution here in Washington. If our good Secretary of War will investigate the idle clerks in his department, and if he will call on the Government Printing Office for proper estimates, he will find out that in less than 48 hours he can get an answer to every questionnaire from every one of the employees which this resolution intended should answer it, at a cost of not over $150 total for his department.

I can not believe that our departments would conspire to find unreasonable excuses for not obeying the order of Congress, especially when the first five of these resolutions were passed by the House by acclamation, without even a division being demanded, and the last resolution passed was passed by an overwhelming vote, including that of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, Democratic leader; Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, Democratic leader in the Sixty-fifth Congress; and by numerous other Democratic Members. Why can not we adopt the method pursued by the Civil Service Commission? I have more respect and high regard for our efficient Civil Service Commission than I ever had before.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not yet. I want to say that the Civil Service Commission, instead of coming in with an estimate of $30,000 for expenses, notified me that on their mimeograph they are having some clerks mimeograph the questionnaires and are going to have them answered without its costing the Government one single dollar. That is the kind of department I admire—that will use economy with respect to Government business.

What the Civil Service Commission can do with its very limited clerical facilities, certainly and as well should the other departments of the Government likewise be able to do, with their thousands of clerks, many idling time away each day. All of the departments have their own mimeograph and multigraph machines and ample operators to handle them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 158, strike out the paragraph beginning on line 24 and ending on line 3, page 159.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas should not prevail. The joint commission on reclassification of salaries have undertaken this work in a big way and are trying the best they can to arrive at a reclassification that they can submit to Congress that will have a scientific basis for fixing the salaries of the 104,000 employees in the District of Columbia. No extensive work along scientific lines has been attempted by the Government for a great number of years. I think we should give this commission this amount of money. I was not present when they appeared before the committee, but I was impressed with the idea that they would need more than the $25,000 originally appropriated, and I think perhaps that they will need more money than we are appropriating here; but at least they will need all of this amount.

To stop their work now by adopting this amendment would be a waste of the $25,000 already appropriated and leave us where we have been for several years without a scientific basis on which to grade the salaries of the Government employees. The employees are entitled to some consideration, and Congress wants to know what is a fair wage for them. That was the intention when the provision was carried in the last legisla-

tive bill. We want to put it upon some basis of fixing salaries other than favoritism and things of that kind that have heretofore prevailed. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Texas will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON of Virginia: Page 159, after line 3, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For allowance to ZEBULON WEAVER, contestee in the contested-election case of Britt against Weaver, Sixty-fifth Congress, for expenses incurred by him in that case and actually paid out and ascertained by Election Committee No. 3, $2,000."

Mr. GOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia if this claim has been audited?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Yes; it has.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman has personally examined it?

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I have.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this matter was presented to the committee in the hearings on the general deficiency bill, but because of the fact that there was no certificate, as required by the committee, we did not include it. The committee was satisfied that the amount was correct, but it did not comply with the rules of the committee, and that was the reason that it was not included, and the committee has no objection to its being put in here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The paragraph of the deficiency appropriation act approved July 8, 1918, which increased the compensation of certain employees of the Government Printing Office during the period of the war and for six months after the proclamation of peace, shall continue in effect until June 30, 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the purpose of extending these salaries?

Mr. GOOD. The paragraph was carried to prevent a reduction in the pay of the employees in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. WALSH. Is it an announcement of the policy that all the Government salaries increased on account of the war are to be indefinitely continued?

Mr. GOOD. No; but conditions have not changed very much since the signing of the armistice; the high cost of living is about the same now as it was then, and until conditions become somewhat normal it was thought that the same provision carried before, practically by unanimous consent, should be carried now.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing and binding for Congress, including the proceedings and debates, $2,292,276. Printing and binding for Congress chargeable to this appropriation, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the reason for this increase in the cost from $1,852,000 in the current law to $2,292,000 for printing and binding for Congress.

Mr. GOOD. This is intended for the long session of Congress, the other being an appropriation for the short session of Congress. It has always carried a larger sum for the long session than for the short session.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman at hand the amount for the last so-called long session?

Mr. GOOD. In 1918, for the fiscal year ending June 30, the amount was $1,907,252, and since that time the cost has very materially increased, and the additional amount carried in this bill is to pay the additional costs of printing and binding.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the fact that the complexion of the House has changed politically this increase may be required.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the State Department, $40,000.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday we heard read here a communication from the State Department that led us to believe that the $5,000,000 item that was stricken out at that time was used by the President of the United States out of his war emergency fund after he went over to Paris, and invested in this Siberian Railroad proposition, and that the State Department was not apprised of the fact at the time, but that any interference on our part now would be embarrassing to the country and the administration, leading us to believe that the President, without any previous correspondence or understanding with the State Department, took the action that he did at that time. I think it is proper at this moment to call the attention of the House to the fact that as early as January 21, 1919, Mr. Polk, then the Acting Secretary of State and now the Acting Secretary of State, sent the following telegram to Mr. Lansing, who at that time was abroad, as he is now abroad, in which he said:

(Green and cipher.)

WASHINGTON, *January 24, 1919.*

(Ammission, Paris. 391. Jan. 24, 3 p. m. Very confidential.)

For the SECRETARY OF STATE: Referring to my answer to 376, January 21, regarding Siberian Railway plans, I take the libery of calling your attention to the political situation here. Critical spirit to-day is being clearly manifested in regard to Russia.

1. By attack on War Trade Board Russian Bureau.

2. By attacks on personal conduct of Ambassador Francis. LAGUARDIA apparently got his information from Consul Winship, now at Welland, and Lieut. Commander Crolley, formerly at St. Petersburg, and now naval attaché at Madrid.

3. By Senator JOHNSON'S continually attacking administration policy of keeping troops in Russia and Siberia.

There is no question but the Republicans are trying to force an extra session and leading Democrats seem to feel that the extra session should be considered inevitable. If successful, Republicans, resenting control of various committees, will make attacks on every phase of policy of administration in Russia.

We are committed now to a proposition for the operation of the Siberian Railway, and I wish to lay stress on the fact that money must be supplied in large sums in order to carry through this plan. In view of the attitude of Congress on the food bill, I should give up the possibility of seeking money through appropriation. The Russian ambassador has no funds and has already exhausted sums set aside for maintaining Siberian Railway corps.

I am taking the liberty of stating the case so that the President or yourself may have all the facts before you before he commits himself to supplying money for this purpose from his private fund. I have not consulted Japanese ambassador, and for this reason would like to have your views as soon as possible.

POLK.

So it appears now that the Department of State was advising the President of the United States that he should not ask the Congress of the United States for an appropriation of this character, so that he knew at the time, through the Secretary of State, the attitude of the American Congress and the attitude of the American people in respect to diverting money that was given to him for war purposes as an emergency fund during the time of war and investing it in this Siberian railroad.

There is some ground for suspicion at least that all of this money is not being used for the highest utilitarian purposes, as the letter we heard yesterday would have us believe, that it is not all being used for the purpose of destroying and putting down Bolshevism——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is well-grounded belief that the soldiers of this country who are being kept in Siberia are being kept there for no other purpose than that of guarding this railroad, and that they are doing this for the reason that there is private investment of capital of private citizens of the United States in that road, and that is the actuating reason that is keeping our soldier boys over there. There is good ground for the belief that this $5,000,000, diverted, if you please, as I believe, unlawfully from the President's war emergency fund, has been put into that railroad for no other purpose than to protect the private interests of private citizens of the United States.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know just when our Government decided to loan money to the Siberian Railroad. The matter was not gone into in committee and investigated because it was not expected that it would come up. I do know that we have loaned, as the gentleman does, $1,000,000, taking security for it, as we have been informed by Mr. Woolley, the acting chairman of the War Trade Board. Just when they made the agreement with Japan, Great Britain, and France to loan $20,000,000, the four countries contributing each one-fourth of that amount, I do not know, but I do know this, and I took occasion yesterday to call attention to it, that the War Trade Board for some time——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do know that the War Trade Board has for some time been making an investigation as to the advisability of doing something to help finance that railroad, and that after very thorough investigation they reported to the President of the United States, so I am informed, that it was a proper thing to do. Just who made the arrangements with Japan, Great Britain, and France I do not know, but the fact is that the arrangement was made. The point made on this side was that it was a question purely of national defense, and I think the papers placed in the RECORD yesterday will show that; that it was an absolute commitment on the part of this Government, and that as a matter of good faith, international good faith, with our Allies, we should live up to it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding what the gentleman has said, and I thank him for the information that he has imparted, I maintain and believe that this Congress will deny the right of the State Department or the President of the United States to commit this country to any policy with reference to the building of railroads in foreign countries. I deny the right of the President of the United States or of the State Department to commit us to the building of a railroad in any foreign country. The Congress of the United States alone can do this, and then only within certain constitutional limitations. The President of the United States had no more right and the State Department had no more right to commit us to the building of a railroad in Siberia than they would have had to commit us to the construction of a railroad in Alaska, which was subsequently done by act of Congress. I believe that the American people should have something to say about the policy of this Government with reference to its investment in foreign corporations. I believe that the taxpayers, through their representatives, should have something to say about the policy in this regard that involves the expenditure of untold millions of dollars.

The President has committed the country, without any sanction of Congress, to a policy that is going to take a great amount of money, as Acting Secretary Polk has well said in his cablegram. When will this thing ever cease? How long are we to be committed to this policy? Is it part of this new internationalism? Is it part of the new policy or new freedom upon which we are entering to undertake to involve this country not only in the political and territorial affairs of other countries, but in their internal improvements? I think it is high time the American people should know something of the extent of our foreign operations upon which we are going thus so afield. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the cable of Mr. Polk, dated January 24, 1919, just read by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], in which he states, in the second paragraph:

> By attack on personal conduct of Ambassador Francis, LAGUARDIA apparently got his information from Consul Winship, now at Welland, and Lieut. Commander Crolley, formerly at St. Petersburg and now naval attaché at Madrid.

This was on January 24. I made my remarks on January 22. On January 23 Mr. Polk wrote a letter to Congressman HENRY D. FLOOD, then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They picked out one sentence, and he said:

> My attention has been called to a statement by Mr. LAGUARDIA in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday's date in criticism of Ambassador Francis, to the effect—

Here is the sentence:

> Our Allies had to call the attention of the Department of State to the personal conduct and associations of our ambassador with certain of his friends of Teutonic tendencies.

Here comes in a negative pregnant—not a categorial denial, but a negative pregnant such as is indulged in by shyster lawyers in the police courts. It is as follows:

> In justice to Mr. Francis, I desire to inform you that no representations have been received from any foreign Government regarding improper conduct on the part of Ambassador Francis.

Then, the next day, he turns around and cables the Secretary of State in Paris. This lets the cat out of the bag. They seemingly had the information, but particular pains were taken to say that the gentleman got his information from Consul Winship, now at Milan, and Lieut. Commander Crolley, formerly at St. Petersburg and now naval attaché at Madrid. That is the way the State Department conducts itself. The State Department of the United States as at present constituted is absolutely incompetent and undecided in its attitude toward Russia. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Democratic side.] Answer that now, if you can.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, this matter was debated before on this bill in this committee. The situation has not been changed at all either by the editorial which was read or by the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] or by the gentleman from New York. The fact is that the records of the State Department show conclusively and the statements made by those connected with the State Department having the matter in charge show these negotiations commenced not only before the armistice was signed, but quite a good deal of time intervened prior to that, because the negotiations first commenced with the Kerensky government, and it having been destroyed the Kolchak government then was being organized to fight the Bolshevist movement——

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Kolchak government?

Mr. SISSON. The Kolchak movement being one which our Allies determined to recognize for the purpose of aiding and assisting, being supported by about 90 per cent of the Russian people who were against the soviets in establishing a real government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I do not yield. I have only five minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is not stating the facts.

Mr. SISSON. Do not take it out of my time; how is that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman's facts are incorrect.

Mr. SISSON. I am simply stating the facts as they come from the State Department.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, that is all right.

Mr. SISSON. I am absolutely sure that the gentleman from New York will never find a time in the history of his entire life when his statement will receive more credit than the statement coming from the present State Department. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What does this gentleman know about this situation? What source of information has he superior to that of the State Department of this great Government? I am sure his means of obtaining information is not superior to that of all other Members of Congress, both Senators and Representatives. Yet he indulges in all sorts of criticism of all the departments of Government and all the officials.

Now, Mr. Chairman, legitimate criticism of the officials of this Government at any time from any source is proper. I have never believed that any man holding official position is to be exempted from just criticism for wrongdoing in office. I have no such feeling that an officer is other than a servant and to be held accountable. But if you want discontent to prevail, if you want people to continue to lose confidence in government—in this representative Government, which I claim is the best on earth to-day, a Government where every young man, rich and poor, has opportunities which are not presented by any other Government in the world, you have but to continue these indiscriminate assaults upon the honesty and integrity of men in public life, impugn their motives and statements, accuse them of ulterior designs, and claim that they are not rendering good service to the country in which they live. If we shall continue on the floor of this House and if the newspapers of the country shall continue to make unwarranted assaults upon government, whether Republican or Democratic, you will only increase the sentiment against the Government in this country. I think it is high time that those of us who believe in representative government, in a government of equal opportunities, we whose ancestors were in the Revolution or who have for generations loved this Constitution and Government, should take this matter in hand and begin to uphold the hands of the Government officials instead of endeavoring to instill in the minds and hearts of the American people a lack of confidence in the Government and its officials. [Applause.] Partisan criticism, if just and fair, is permissible and does good. I believe in a virile minority party. I believe in a minority on the floor of this House holding the Government that happens to be in power to a strict accountability——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SISSON. May I ask for two or three minutes by unanimous consent?

Mr. GOOD. We have 10 pages of the bill to read yet.

Mr. SISSON. Of course, I did not inject these matters into it.

Mr. GOOD. I did not do it, surely.

Mr. SISSON. I am sure the gentleman did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he may continue for three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, do not do that.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken up much of the time of this committee. I did not inject these matters into it. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I state frankly that I believe it is my duty to help these gentlemen——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is out of order. He raised the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [The Chair proceeded to count.]

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not insist on his point.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Treasury Department, including printing required by the Federal farm-loan act, $475,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. You will have to stick to the text from this on.

Mr. GARNER. Make the point of no quorum, then.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I can stick to the text without any further question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the motion to strike out the last word, page 164, line 13.

Mr. SISSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, criticisms have been made, and in order that I may not put myself in the attitude of unnecessarily delaying the committee for the balance of the afternoon—and I will say to my good friend that I do not want to do that—I will ask that I may be permitted to speak for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he may speak for three minutes out of order.

Mr. EMERSON. Reserving the right to object, I would like three minutes. I have conferred with the chairman of the committee, who says I can not have it.

Mr. GOOD. I wish to say that after these requests have been granted I shall object to any request made to speak out of order, and I shall make the point of order if anybody is not speaking to the matter under discussion. We can not finish the bill to-day unless we stop this talk.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman allow me three minutes?

Mr. GOOD. When we finish the bill.

Mr. EMERSON. I object, then.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, then I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SISSON. This item appropriating $475,000 under the Federal farm-loan act is carrying out the provisions of a law which was placed on the statute books by a Democratic Congress, and this appropriation for the Federal Farm Loan Board is to-day rendering as great a service to the agriculture of the country as any appropriation that has been made in many years.

In fact, in order that this appropriation may be thoroughly justified, it is only necessary that we should consider for a moment that the very basis of all civilization is agriculture; in other words, the very moment that agriculture begins to wane you have a dying nation. The basis of all civilization, the basis of all growth, the basis of all development, is the soil production, and when a nation shall embark upon an extravagant policy of not permitting its agricultural production to keep pace with its growing population, when the production of the soil per acre ceases to be what it was the year before, that moment the nation is beginning to perish.

All the great political economists hold, without a single exception, that the brawn, the muscle, the moral, the mental, and the intellectual development, of a people depend upon the food and the quantity of food which they eat and consume. That being true, this Democratic administration has put in force this magnificent farm-loan act, and this Congress is doing exactly right in supplying the funds necessary to the enforcement of the law.

If there is any criticism to be made of the committee, it is that perhaps they did not give the entire amount asked for by the Farm Loan Board. But in view of the fact that we are now embarking upon a magnificent scheme of economy the committee may feel justified—those on the majority side—because you purpose, at least by word of mouth, if not in fact, to reduce the appropriations and make a splendid political showing in the next presidential election, if you can do so.

Therefore, gentlemen of the committee, I sincerely trust that in the future these appropriations will be sufficiently large to continue the magnificent growth of this great institution, because, as I said, when a people shall turn their backs upon the agricultural interests of the country it is not long until your cities and manufacturing establishments will begin to wane, and without proper food production, without the proper cultivation of the soil, no nation can be great.

In the great war just closed the appeal was made to the farmers throughout the country that they should raise food products, and that they themselves should devote their time and attention to the production of those things that are necessary to maintain the armies in the field; and but for the American farmer victory would not have perched upon the allied banners, because we not only fed our own armies and our own people at home, but we also fed the armies of our Allies in Europe. For that reason the Democratic administration has taken hold of this plow with the farmer, and the Federal Government will continue to give him assistance, and will continue to give him encouragement, and will continue to give him the proper amount of help, and that bids fair for the future prosperity of the great Republic. I hope that the Republicans on the floor of the House will continue to give their support to this very remarkable and successful enterprise. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the United States Geological Survey: For engraving the illustrations necessary for the annual report of the director, and for the monographs, professional papers, bulletins, water-supply papers, and the report on mineral resources, and for printing and binding the same publications, of which sum not more than $45,000 may be used for engraving, $125,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, your committee in making provision for this item has not granted to the Geological Survey all the money that the officials of that establishment heretofore asked for, but I am inclined to believe that the committee was thoroughly justified in the position which it has taken. I am not sure whether at this particular hearing that was done or not, because all of the items, if you will recall, were not inquired about by the committee at this session of Congress, because this bill was carefully gone into and all of these items were inquired about at the close of the last session of Congress. The last session of Congress went carefully into the matter.

Now, the officials of the Geological Survey, in view of the fact that they themselves endeavored to get into the war work and did help to win the war, were most anxious to get a large appropriation. The committee at that time declined to give them all they asked for, and I am glad that the committee at this time has done exactly what was done at that time. I think this appropriation here of $125,000 is thoroughly justified, because the Geological Survey, in making surveys of the various portions of the States, making surveys as to the topography of the country, making surveys as to the mineral contents, making surveys as to the character of soils that we have, gave a great deal of valuable information, not solely to the scientists interested in the matter from the scientific point of view, but information that is valuable in view of the fact that those people engaged in agriculture——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LAYTON. I think it is time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman moves to strike out the last word, and he is discussing the entire geological survey. The last word is in relation to engraving illustrations.

Mr. SISSON. Then I move to amend the bill, in line 18, by increasing the amount from $125,000 to $130,000.

Mr. WALSH. There is an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already an amendment pending.

Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. SISSON. Then I ask that the vote be taken on the pro forma amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. SISSON. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the gentleman yields the floor when he asks for a vote. He can not occupy the floor when he asks for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman yielded the floor. The question is on the motion to close debate.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SISSON. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 18.

Mr. SISSON. I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-six members—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews, Md.	Eagle	Kettner	Reed, W. Va.
Anthony	Echols	King	Riddick
Ashbrook	Edmonds	Kreider	Riordan
Ayres	Elliott	Langley	Robinson, N. C.
Bacharach	Elston	Lanham	Rodenberg
Baer	Evans, Mont.	Larsen	Rogers
Bankhead	Fairfield	Lazaro	Rowan
Barbour	Ferris	Lea, Calif.	Rowe
Bell	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Rubey
Benson	Fields	Lesher	Rucker
Blackmon	Fitzgerald	Lever	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Flood	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Mo.	Fordney	Lonergan	Sanford
Bowers	Frear	Luce	Scully
Britten	Freeman	McClintic	Sherwood
Brooks, Ill.	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Sinclair
Brooks, Pa.	Gallagher	McGlennon	Slemp
Browning	Ganly	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Glynn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, N. Y.
Burdick	Goldfogle	MacCrate	Snyder
Burke	Goodall	Major	Steele
Burroughs	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Steenerson
Butler	Greene, Mass.	Mansfield	Stephens, Miss.
Caldwell	Griest	Martin	Stephens, Ohio
Candler	Griffin	Mason	Stiness
Cantrill	Hamill	Mays	Sullivan
Carew	Harrison	Merritt	Sumners, Tex.
Carss	Haskell	Montague	Tillman
Carter	Hastings	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Chindblom	Haugen	Morin	Timberlake
Clark, Fla.	Hawley	Mudd	Tinkham
Coady	Hayden	Murphy	Towner
Cole	Hersey	Neely	Treadway
Connally	Hersman	Nolan	Upshaw
Cooper	Hicks	Olney	Walters
Copley	Holland	Osborne	Ward
Costello	Houghton	Padgett	Watson, Va.
Crago	Humphreys	Paige	Webb
Cramton	Husted	Parker	Welling
Crowther	Hutchinson	Pell	Whaley
Cullen	Ireland	Phelan	Wheeler
Davey	Jefferis	Pou	White, Me.
Dempsey	Johnson, Ky.	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Dewalt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Radcliffe	Wilson, Pa.
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Ragsdale	Wingo
Dooling	Jones, Pa.	Raker	Wise
Doremus	Kahn	Randall, Calif.	Woodyard
Doughton	Kearns	Rayburn	Zihlman.
Dupré	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill, H. R. 6176, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 231 Members, a quorum, answered to their names; and he reported the names of the absentees to be entered on the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the committee resumed its session, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Smithsonian Institution: For printing and binding the Annual Reports of the Board of Regents, with general appendixes, the editions of which shall not exceed 10,000 copies, $10,000; under the Smithsonian Institution: For the Annual Reports of the National Museum, with general appendixes, and for printing labels and blanks, and for the Bulletins and Proceedings of the National Museum, the editions of which shall not exceed 4,000 copies, and binding in half morocco or material not more expensive scientific books and pamphlets presented to or acquired by the National Museum Library, $37,500; for the Annual Reports and Bulletins of the Bureau of American Ethnology, and for miscellaneous printing and binding for the bureau, $21,000; for miscellaneous printing and binding for the International Exchanges, $200; the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, $100; the National Zoological Park, $200; the Astrophysical Observatory, $200; and for the Annual Report of the American Historical Association, $7,000; in all, $76,200.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, on page 164, line 2, I move to strike out the words "in half morocco or material not more expensive."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SISSON: Page 164, line 2, strike out the words "in half morocco or material not more expensive."

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose of enabling the Smithsonian Institution to do a great deal more binding at very much less cost; because, as you know, one of the greatest leather countries in the world is Russia, and the leather industry in Russia, from which a great deal of leather comes to this country, has been practically destroyed. The leather industry and shoe business in Russia was taken over by the soviet government and the industry literally destroyed. A very careful study of the conditions of the leather market will show that this is no time to indulge in the luxury of binding the Smithsonian reports in half morocco. I believe in the right sort of economy. If you will put these reports in buckram, that magnificent binding in which they bind most of the law books because they find it more elastic and infinitely cheaper, you will have just as serviceable a binding.

Mr. BARKLEY. How many volumes are to be bound in morocco, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. SISSON. One thousand volumes to be bound in this kind of extravagant binding. If my Republican friends are really in earnest in their magnificent campaign of economy, I ask them to join me in striking out this item of extravagance and luxury. In other words, there is no way to economize unless we begin with small items like this, because all the items that make up many billions of dollars that this Government expends, in the last analysis, reduces itself to small items like this. No man knows better than the members of the Appropriations Committee how these small items when multiplied run up into such enormous figures and become so very expensive.

Therefore, in order that you may make good your professions of economy, I hope my Republican friends will vote in favor of striking out this language, and then I can offer another amendment, which will follow this, reducing the amount in line 4 to $35,000, thereby saving the munificent sum to the American Treasury, that is already in such a fearful condition, of something like $2,500. [Laughter.]

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, a distinguished Member of the House, making a great chairman of the committee, a man for whom we have nothing but the kindest feeling, and who, although many of the bills were practically new to him, has by industry and by faithfulness to duty been able to master these bills—he has told you of the condition of the Treasury, that we are going to be many billions short after the money is all paid in. Let us begin to cut down this deficit by saving this magnificent sum of $2,500 on the morocco binding of the Reports of the Smithsonian Institution. [Laughter.]

That will be the highest evidence of your good faith, because you know that when women want to economize, when their money is running low in the bank, they cease to buy fine silks and satins in which to dress themselves, and buy cheaper clothing of more durable stuff. So if you want to economize we ought to begin to dress our books in a more durable and cheaper binding.

Not only that, but there was an enormous demand made on the leather market by the War Department when they commandeered nearly all the leather used in the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the binding for these Smithsonian reports is for the National Museum. It is the same kind of binding that they were bound in last year and the year before and the year before that, and it makes a uniform binding of these reports and nothing else. I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SISSON) there were 108 ayes and 34 noes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. SISSON and Mr. GOOD.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 99 ayes and 32 noes.

So the motion of Mr. GOOD was agreed to.

The question was taken on Mr. SISSON's amendment, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Department of Agriculture, including not to exceed $47,000 for the Weather Bureau, and including the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture, as required by the act approved January 12, 1895, and in pursuance of the joint resolution No. 13, approved March 30, 1906, and also including not to exceed $200,000 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, $600,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, this paragraph carries with it an appropriation of something like $600,000 to be used largely in the publication of farmers' bulletins and such things as that. Now, if this Congress wants to render any service to the people of this country, if you want to prevent Bolshevism, the thing to do is to reduce the taxes that are now burdening the people of this country.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. EMERSON. I am moving to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not talking to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am talking on this paragraph. I move to strike out the paragraph. I contend that instead of appropriating money for the publication of farm bulletins to be sent out promiscuously, we should spend our time in saving this money to the taxpayers of the country. We have called upon the people of this country to save meat, to save heat, to save everything. We have called upon them to pay enormous amounts of taxes to carry on this war, and it is the duty of this Congress to economize. The greatest service that we can render the people of this country is to reduce in every instance, where we can, the taxes that are finally to be paid by the people of the country.

I know of no better place to begin than here and now, and if this Congress adjourns without doing something to reduce the great burden of taxation that is now hanging on the shoulders of this country, then the Congress has existed in vain. Instead of wasting our time on such paragraphs as this, we should do something about the high cost of living.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. I withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. EMERSON. Instead of wasting our time on this paragraph we should spend it in enacting better and more important legislation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Who is wasting the time of the committee now?

Mr. EMERSON. I do not know who is wasting the time of the House, but I am talking on this paragraph. Provision is made for $600,000 here, all to be spent on farm bulletins, with the possible exception of 45,000 for printing a report of the Secretary of Agriculture. Does the gentleman think that is proper? Is that economy? Should not this Congress strike this item out of the bill? If you want to sit here as a money-saving Congress to the taxpayers of the country, should you not strike this out? Am I right? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not on the witness stand, but I want to ask the gentleman if he considers the publication of farm bulletins a waste of money?

Mr. EMERSON. Some of it; yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much of it?

Mr. EMERSON. It is simply used by Members of this House——

Mr. KNUTSON. How much of it?

Mr. EMERSON. All of it. It is simply used by Members of this House to do electioneering. The gentleman knows that very well. This item does not belong in this bill and should not be in it. We can devote our time to better things than to passing legislation of this kind. This is not the only item that I would cut out of this bill, but I would cut this one out because it is an absolute waste of time and money.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SISSON) there were—aye 1, nays 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Department of Labor, $150,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph just read, there being no law for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the chairman of the committee desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. What is the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. There is no law for such an appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes, there is a law for the appropriation. This has been carried right along for a number of years and is carried in consequence of an authorization.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to see the law.

Mr. GOOD. The law creating the department itself provides for it. The law creating the department provided that it should have such printing and binding done as might be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The organic law justifies the appropriation. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this paragraph on the Department of Labor. I move to strike out the last word. A moment ago the Department of Labor was up under discussion, and I tried to get just a moment from the chairman of my subcommittee to make a reply in defense of the gentleman from Tennessee, and I was deprived of even a single minute, and therefore I want to say now about the Department of Labor——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman is speaking out of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. I was just getting to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. GALLIVAN. We do not discuss what takes place in the subcommittee on the sundry civil bill outside, and it is not my purpose to discuss what took place, but——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I renew my point of order that the gentleman is certainly speaking out of order. The item concerning the Department of Labor has been passed, and he is not discussing that item at all. It has been passed, anyway.

Mr. GALLIVAN. If the gentleman from Texas will possess himself in patience, I am going to talk about the Department of Labor.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. YATES). The point of order is well taken.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

A MEMBER. I move to lay that appeal on the table.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The appeal must be decided——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. WALSH. That is not in order.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I think I have five minutes under the rule.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. As many as are in favor of sustaining the decision of the Chair as the decision of the committee will say "aye"; those opposed will say "no."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes have it. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Division!

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Division, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask what the decision of the Chair was? I understood him to say that the ayes had it and that the appeal was sustained. Am I right?

The CHAIRMAN. The decision of the Chair was sustained as the decision of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have the right——

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). We will get along all right. It is just as well not to get excited.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us decide this one question first. The question that was put to the committee was, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the committee, and upon that question the ayes had it and the Chair so declared.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks for a division.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; there is another matter to be settled in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked to take the floor to discuss the appeal. I want to know if it is the ruling of this Chair under the rules in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union that you can not discuss an appeal from a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was not advised any such request was made.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It was, and the gentleman was insisting——

The CHAIRMAN. The present Chairman was not advised that such a question was raised, and he did not hear the request of the gentleman.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a moment; let the Chair state his own position. He did not hear any such request. The question on the appeal has been settled. The decision of the former Chairman has been submitted to the committee, and that question has been adjusted, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The request comes too late.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order in that connection. Then the Chair announced what the action of the House was, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] asked for a division. We want to proceed here under the rules. You have a majority of the votes, but we ask you to live up to the rules of the House. The gentleman from Massachusetts, immediately the announcement was made, asked for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. The Chair, in a desire to be absolutely fair, gave a decision on the question raised by the gentleman from Virginia now. The question has now been adjusted, and the gentleman is out of order, and the Clerk will proceed to read.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What was the question raised by "the gentleman from Virginia"?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman raised the question of the right of the Chair to refuse a division. The Chair decided that no such request was made, so far as the Chair noted.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I appeal to the record.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The moment the Chairman took the place of the gentleman who was temporarily in the chair he found the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] on his feet at that very time asking for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. The Clerk will proceed with the reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

For sanitation, quarantine, hospitals, and medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers, and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable, and including additional compensation to any officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed with the Panama Canal as chief quarantine officer, $850,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. How much of this $850,000 is used for the hospital facilities for the city of Panama?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the Panama item and the former item are ones in which the committee accepted the hearings of the former committee, and I will have to look at it. The gentleman was on the former committee.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman knows there was an agreement made by the United States Government in the act which acquired the land of the Panama Canal Zone, as to the hospital erected in the city of Panama, that persons sent there from the city of Panama should have certain care at the expense of the Government. I was wondering how much expense was incurred by virtue of the Panama Canal employees proper and the city of Panama, where we have to take care of the citizens of Panama under that old agreement?

Mr. GOOD. I can not give the gentleman that information.

Mr. COLLIER. Is it the Ancon Hospital or the San Mateo Hospital that is kept up by the United States and the Republic of Panama?

Mr. SISSON. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi it is the hospital that is in the city of Panama.

Mr. COLLIER. That is the San Mateo Hospital.

Mr. SISSON. Under the arrangement made the United States Government was to maintain that hospital, and the citizens of Panama, under the contract, had certain rights in it. I was wondering how much of that was occasioned by virtue of that agreement with the city of Panama and how much of the hospital was used by our employees in the operation of the Canal Zone.

Mr. GOOD. The only information I have here is of the number of employees engaged at the hospital which are paid out of this appropriation. There are nine persons, and that is all the information that is given.

Mr. McKEOWN. If the gentleman will yield, I will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the hospital is located at Ancon, and charges are made to the employees and people of the South American countries.

Mr. SISSON. That is purely a canal proposition. I am speaking of the one at Panama.

Mr. McKEOWN. In the city proper?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That all sums appropriated by this act for salaries of officers and employees of the Government shall be in full for such salaries for the fiscal year 1920, and all laws or parts of laws to the extent they are in conflict with the provisions of this act are repealed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 173, line 11, add the following: "*Provided*, That no limitation contained in section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 shall deprive mechanics, laborers, and workmen employed at the arsenals or navy yards of the $240 increase provided therein by reason of their having received during the fiscal years 1919 or 1920 an increase at a rate in excess of $200 per annum, unless such increase, exclusive of the $240 authorized in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 amounts in the aggregate for the fiscal year 1919 or 1920, respectively, to over $200; and that the increase hereby granted shall be in addition to their present basic rate of pay."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I will for a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I realize this is subject to a point of order. At the same time I think it is only fair to call the attention of the House to the fact that by the wording of the bonus-pay provision mechanics and others in the navy yards failed to get the bonus.

And because the words read "at the rate of $200 a year" and whereas the time was not sufficient for them to get $200 a year, they actually lost what it was intended that the Government should give to them. I realize that the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I hope the point of order will not be made.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 108, line 23, to correct a mistake that appears there. The word "monument" should be "park."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I move to strike out the word "monument" and insert the word "park."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 23, strike out the word "monument" and insert in lieu thereof the word "park."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, when the bill was read and when we had reached the item on page 111, line 3, St. Elizabeths Hospital, we passed it over in order that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] might offer an amendment. That item has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL.

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital of the insane from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, civilians in the quartermaster's service of the Army, persons transferred from the Canal Zone, who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, including exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, $875,000; and not exceeding $1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding $1,000 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and papers as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding $1,500 for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to adjust the compensation of officers and employees at St. Elizabeths Hospital on the basis of rates which shall not exceed the compensation paid for similar services in other hospitals in the country of like size and character.

Authority is granted to appoint a deputy disbursing agent, who shall give a bond satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and who shall have the same power as the disbursing agent during his absence.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph just read, beginning on line 5 of page 112.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending.

Mr. GALLIVAN. We had an agreement in the committee that I was to be permitted to offer an amendment to the first paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman permitted the first paragraph to be read, and now the second has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] reserves a point of order. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] offers an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is to the other paragraph, the first one.

The CHAIRMAN. It could not be considered now unless unanimous consent is given to go back to the preceding paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that we go back to the preceding paragraph for the purpose of permitting the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] asks unanimous consent to go back to the preceding paragraph for the purpose of allowing his colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] to offer an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GALLIVAN: Page 11, line 16, strike out the sum "$875,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "$997,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, can we have an agreement as to time?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I personally would like 15 minutes. It is for the soldiers who have come back and lost their minds. It is for the American Legion of Honor that this question comes in. I personally would like 15 minutes. If it were earlier in the day I would like more time, but I have not delayed the consideration of this bill.

Mr. GOOD. I was going to suggest that we have 10 minutes of debate, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] could take 8 of that and I take 2.

Mr. GALLIVAN. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, since this bill was called up by our committee, I visited St. Elizabeths Hospital, and I found there approximately 3,500 patients. Two thousand of them are boys in Army brown or Navy blue. Two years ago they were accepted by this country as physically perfect and assigned for service in the Army or Navy. Now they have lost their minds, and they have been sent to St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington, some of them thrown in with the criminal insane of Washington, with the colored insane of Washington, housed in like criminals and not being given the attention their heroic sacrifices command.

After a three-hour visit there I could not help recalling the old line—

How soon the world forgets!

These boys at various times since we entered the war offered to the service of their country whatever God gave them, and they are not being treated as they ought to be treated, like heroes, but honestly, gentlemen, owing to unfortunate conditions out there many of them are being treated like criminals. Now, it is not altogether the fault of the Committee on Appropriations, because the statements made before the committee were not in full as to the conditions surrounding these soldier boys who fought in this war and the boys from the Navy who chased submarines in European waters. I believe that the committee in marking up its bill did its level best, although Admiral Braisted, who has recently been appointed chairman of the board of visitors to St. Elizabeths, said that they needed every dollar they asked for because of the conditions relating to the care and comfort of the Army and Navy patients. Now, gentlemen, I have been there this week, and I never had a more broken heart than after my three hours' visit to St. Elizabeths. I talked with boys who had been at Soissons and at the Somme and at Chateau-Thierry. I saw boys who had been wounded, and I saw hundreds of these boys kept in crowded corridors during the glorious weather that Washington has had this week, kept in because there were not attendants enough to let them out under God's sky, in the green grass, to get even a breath of fresh air.

Admiral Braisted has said that if this amendment prevails the personnel of St. Elizabeths, which he hated to criticize, will be immensely improved. God knows that by the 1st of July it will need improvement, because two-thirds of the attendants out there now are soldier boys themselves. They have been detailed from various camps to act as attendants for their old comrades in arms, and, of course, those who still wear the uniform and act as attendants at St. Elizabeths, dealing with their former comrades in arms, are giving them humane treatment. But by the 1st of July every soldier attendant and every sailor attendant is to be ordered from St. Elizabeths, and the only class of attendants that there will be left to take care of our soldier insane will be that class that comes to St. Elizabeths in answer to public advertisements which are issued throughout the country asking for men to come here as attendants at an insane hospital. The only requirements are that they must be 16 years of age and that they must be citizens of the United States. Their pay is $32.50 a month. Imagine the class of men you can get to go to work in an insane asylum for $32.50 a month to take care of our soldier insane! Why, as I left those beautiful grounds I thought that the dead who lie in the fields of France or in Flanders Field are so much luckier and happier than those poor boys whose minds became shattered in this war, and who are now being cared for in the fashion I have described by a supposedly grateful Government. I appeal to this House to yield to Admiral Braisted that which he requests. He has been chairman of the board of visitors but a month. He says they have a very poor type of personnel, that he does not like to criticize anyone in that particular, but that the fact remains that the personnel out there, even in the way of doctors, consists largely of young men who seek that place because of not being able to get any better place. So they do not draw the best type of personnel. He told the committee they pay the doctors but $1,200 a year.

In the first place, I believe that the system of sending our insane soldier laddies to St. Elizabeths was wrong. They never should have been thrown among the criminal insane of the District of Columbia. Then the method of treating their cases collectively is wrong. They require individual attention. I believe that this additional appropriation which I ask for, and which Admiral Braisted asks for, will help very much in improving present conditions, and that every man in this House who loves to think of the physical condition that those boys were in two years ago when they offered, as I said before, all that God gave them for their country's cause—that every man in this House will go to bed happier to-night because he has voted to improve the conditions surrounding those boys. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended so that I may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may have five minutes instead of two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the committee went through this matter very carefully, and I believe if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] had been present when the hearings were had upon this subject he would not have made some of the statements which he has made.

These unfortunates have appealed to the sympathy of every man, and the committee wanted to give every penny that was necessary for the insane confined over at St. Elizabeths. We do have about 2,000 of our soldiers and sailors and marines

there, but it is not true, if Admiral Braisted and the physician in charge told the truth when they were before the committee, that these insane are put in the same wards with the criminal insane. We were told by Dr. White——

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman does not want to make a misstatement. I was there and saw them.

Mr. GOOD. I read from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Do you take charge of the criminal insane in this hospital?

Dr. WHITE. Yes, sir; Federal prisoners and court-martial prisoners.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you permit the criminal insane to mix with the Army, Navy, and Marine patients?

Dr. WHITE. We have a special prison building.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are kept separate?

Dr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Now, they do pay too low a wage. What does the bill do? The provision is subject to a point of order. We say that the Secretary of the Interior shall have the right to readjust the pay to rates that are commensurate with salaries of like positions in well-regulated institutions. It is to the discredit of the institution that our attention has not been called to the fact that they paid nurses only $30 a month. Of course, they give them board and lodging, but notwithstanding that that is not a sufficient amount to permit them to get the help that they require.

Now, what are the facts? Let us be fair in this matter; let us give them every dollar they need. We thought we were liberal. The current year they have $526,750. The committee that reported the former sundry civil bill increased that by $150,000, giving them $675,000. This bill carries $200,000 more than was carried in the former bill. This bill carries $348,250 more than the present law, and if that is not enough, if they find they need more, they will not have to beg long of Congress to take care of these men. [Applause.] We have given them, in our opinion, all that is necessary.

Why did they ask as much as the gentleman wants to give them? Because they wanted to increase the building program. They wanted to build a large laboratory and they wanted $100,000 for porches to be put on the old buildings. They asked for $225,000 for officers' quarters.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Not in my amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for officers' quarters. Their estimate was made to take care of new buildings. We did not give them that amount, because the things they were asking for were not to take care of the patients, but for laboratory and officers' quarters at a very high rate.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman does not mean that my amendment provides for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GALLIVAN) there were 26 ayes and 78 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist on his point of order to the next paragraph?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment on line 13, page 92.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 13, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. [After a pause.] The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment which the Clerk has reported.

The question was taken; and on a division (at the suggestion of the Chair) there were—ayes 70, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to correct the totals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LARSEN, for 10 days, on account of important business.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the secretary of state of the State of Illinois, announcing the ratification by the legislature of that State of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to woman suffrage, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, it has been agreed by unanimous consent that on the conclusion of the sundry civil appropriation bill it would be in order to take up the resolution relating to clerk hire. Will that be in order on Monday morning?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will decide that question when it is raised, but he would suggest, without investigating, at first glance, that it is his opinion that it would be in order on Monday morning.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend in the RECORD a speech that I made this afternoon on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 796. An act for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 425. An act to establish the Zion National Park in the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3624) incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 50), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAPES, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5032) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 51), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5818) for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 52), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 6416) relating to the reinterment of soldiers in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) to permit the interment in national cemeteries of the bodies of parents or wives of deceased soldiers who are buried in such national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 6418) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Fairmont, Marion County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6419) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Benwood, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6420) to provide revenue for the Government and to promote and encourage the manufacture of certain synthetic chemicals in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 6421) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Monterey, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 6422) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Glenwood, Schuyler County, Mo., one German cannon, including proper carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 6423) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Paw Paw, Morgan County, W. Va., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 6424) to prevent the keeping of food products in cold storage for a longer period than two months; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 6425) to authorize advances to the reclamation fund and for the issue and disposal of certificates of indebtedness in reimbursement therefor; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6426) to provide for creating new opportunities for permanent and profitable employment by developing and rendering work accessible the unused land and other natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 6427) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Fredericktown, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 6428) for the erection of a post-office building at Rutherfordton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6429) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Lawrenceville, Ill., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 6430) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bonham, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6431) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Denison, Tex., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6432) amending an act entitled "An act approved February 3, 1879, authorizing the Secretary of War to erect headstones over the graves of Union soldiers who have been interred in private, village, or city cemeteries"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 6433) to provide for the erection of a public building on ground already acquired at Caruthersville, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 6434) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River about 2 miles above its confluence with the Washita River, near Preston, Grayson County, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6435) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 6436) making provision for the construction of a canal across the State of New Jersey to connect the Delaware River with New York Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6437) to provide that any person honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States shall be credited with the time of such service under civil-service appointment; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6438) authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 6439) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of cannons and ordnance to designated towns and cities in Missouri; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 6440) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Straitsville, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6441) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bremen, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6442) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Shawnee, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6443) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Crooksville, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6444) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Somerset, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece and other trophies of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6445) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Corning, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 6446) appropriating funds for the transportation and burial of bodies of persons giving their lives while doing patriotic work abroad; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6447) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Pipestone, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6448) to declare White River, in the State of Indiana, a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6449) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Rossville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6450) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 6451) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, and to certain helpless and dependent children of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) extending relief to the Territory of Hawaii by providing additional shipping facilities between the Territory of Hawaii and the mainland of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) to make provision in the constitution of the league of nations for the protection of the Jews of Poland, Ukrainia, and Roumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK: Resolution (H. Res. 129) for the omission from the RECORD of certain remarks of Mr. GALLIVAN; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 130) directing the Speaker of the House to appoint a committee to draft legislation to prevent profiteering; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TINCHER: Resolution (H. Res. 131) appointing a committee for investigation, hearings, and report on Charles J. Brand, Chief Office of Markets and Rural Organization, United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, favoring appropriation of ample funds for the operation of the Frankford Arsenal, located in Philadelphia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOONEY: Memorial of the Legislature of Ohio, favoring action by the peace conference giving the Jewish people opportunity for national development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, urging the continuation of appropriation of funds for the operation of the Frankford Arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REBER: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, favoring appropriation of ample funds for the operation of the Frankford Arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania asking appropriation for the continuance of work at Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BABKA: A bill (H. R. 6452) for the relief of Charles V. Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 6453) granting a pension to Jacob Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 6454) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6455) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence P. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6456) granting an increase of pension to Allen Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 6457) granting a pension to Orilla Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6458) granting a pension to Flora B. McCain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6459) granting a pension to Lola E. Hutsonpillar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6460) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Ledgerwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6461) to aid in winding up the affairs of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 6462) granting a pension to Thomas W. Trent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 6463) granting a pension to Eliza Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 6464) granting a pension to Huldah A. Budd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6465) granting a pension to Mary E. Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6466) authorizing the President to reinstate Garrard Post Nightingale as a lieutenant in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 6467) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 6468) granting an increase of pension to Laura C. Slack; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 6469) for the relief of Edward Flanagan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6470) granting a pension to Frances Langguth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6471) for the relief of Henry P. Kinney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6472) to correct the military record of Frederick M. Phelps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6473) granting a pension to Tillie Zerfoss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6474) granting a pension to Will D. Buchanan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6475) for the relief of Julius Zanone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6476) for the relief of Irene Gillespie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REBER: A bill (H. R. 6477) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Ruch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) to correct the military record of Christian Reichert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6479) granting a pension to Charles Inman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6480) granting a pension to Charles M. Fink; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 6481) for the relief of Albert N. Collins; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6482) granting a pension to Clemson Underwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 6483) granting an increase of pension to William Althaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6484) granting a pension to Daniel Best; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6485) granting a pension to Jesse W. Beam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6486) granting a pension to John A. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6487) granting an increase of pension to John N. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6488) granting a pension to James E. Householder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6489) granting a pension to Nancy J. Votaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 6490) for the relief of Cary B. Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 6491) granting an increase of pension to Cora B. Kretz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of International Paper Co., New York City, asking for an appropriation of $20,000 to investigate the cause of the decay of pulp wood; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society of Lexington Conference, Springfield, Ohio, urging the enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the City Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, indorsing passage of House bill 12258, providing for distinctive certificates of United States citizenship to the wives and children of naturalized citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of members of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, representing graduates of 75 universities and colleges of the United States, for a continuance of the present war emergency United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Petition of Stewart Brown, Reed City, Mich., and various others, requesting the repeal of revenue tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ruth Fleischeauer, Reed City, Mich., and various others, requesting the repeal of revenue tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Northern California Milk Producers' Association, in favor of S. 845, amending section 6 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Calif., in favor of H. R. 487, known as a national soldier settlement bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of 126 signers from Cass County, Mo., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition and for constructive legislation making it immediately effective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of L. F. Swift, of Chicago, Ill., relating to meat packing and shipping; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Maurice J. Cassidy, of St. Louis, Mo., for the repeal of war-time prohibition as recommended by President Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Camara Insular de Comercio Seccion de Ponce, of Ponce, P. R., relating to the American shipping commercial interests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Globe Manufacturing Co., of Peoria, Ill., opposing repeal of the zone advances on second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Farm Mortgage Bankers' Association of America, opposing exemption from taxation of the bonds of Federal land banks and joint stock land banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of citizens of Mountain View, Mo., urging repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of Haulton Ministerial Association, Haulton, Me., urging that national prohibition be continued after July 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Parents' Rights League of America, denouncing the film "Fit to Win," and urging that it be suppressed, as well as like films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of a member of the American Expeditionary Force, St. Nazaire, France, urging that double time be allowed enlisted men who have served in Europe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of members of the Church of Christ of Somerset, Pa., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Brownsville, Pa., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Rhode Island State Council, Knights of Columbus, against passage of Senate bill 5635, Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of sundry citizens of Newark, N. J., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Rotary Club of Buffalo, N. Y., asking for the establishing of a National Conservatory of Music in Washington, D. C., also in California, Illinois, and New York; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the Federal Employees' Union, Buffalo, N. Y., asking support of H. R. 4305, for maintenance of United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Andrews's Pharmacy, Buffalo, N. Y., asking for repeal of section 907, subdivisions 1 and 2, of revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local No. 374 of the National Federation of Postal Employees, relating to increase in salary of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOONEY: Paper relating to the Italo-Jugo-Slav controversy from a number of Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, urging necessary appropriation for operation of Frankford Arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Branch of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Mrs. Herbert F. Sill, president, urging the continuance of the present war emergency United States Employment Service until a permanent service can be established; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of residents of Madison County, N. Y., protesting against rural free delivery change in that county; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of residents of Oswego County, N. Y., against rural free delivery changes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of Biscuit and Cracker Manufacturers' Association of United States, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Rotary Club of Buffalo, N. Y., for the establishment of a national conservatory of music in Washington; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Farm Mortgage Bankers' Association of America, urging the repeal of tax-exemption laws on farm loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. J. Casey, New York, demanding immediate withdrawal of the English army of occupation from Ireland and recognition by United States of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Public Ownership League of America, relating to public ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the whole paper industry and International Paper Co. of New York, asking $20,000 to investigate the cause of the decay of pulp wood and wood pulp; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, representing graduates of 75 universities and colleges of the United States, St. Louis, Mo., for a continuance of the present war emergency United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of residents of New York City, requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Van Duzer Extracts Co. (Inc.) and Bayce Extract Co. (Inc.), New York City, against prohibition bill in connection with flavoring extracts, medicinal and toilet preparations, and perfumes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Religious Society of Friends of New York City, against the passage of a bill providing for universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the members of the Kuckville Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New York State, urging the passage of a bill defining as intoxicating all liquors containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol, and also urging the passage of legislation properly enforcing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Wyoming County Pomona Grange, protesting against recent rural delivery changes and urging the restoration of the routes as they existed in 1917; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of citizens of Renville County, N. Dak., for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of residents of Oriskany Falls, N. Y., for an enactment enforcing the prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jugo-Slavs of Little Falls, N. Y., for a plebiscite under an American commission in the matter of the disputed territory in the Balkans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Blount County rural letter carriers, seeking better conditions for rural letter carriers and increase of salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Fulton Co., Knoxville, Tenn., referring to tax on stock dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Petition of 400 residents of Beverly and Lincoln Counties, Kans., asking that war-time prohibition be not repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 50 citizens and residents of Cawker City, Kans., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition and urging the enactment of legislation to make constitutional prohibition effective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Powellton, Ill., urging immediate enactment of laws for strict enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the official board of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Alton, Ill., for enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of a mass meeting of the churches of Springfield, Ill., for enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Jacksonville, Ill., protesting against the repeal by Congress of the legislation against the manufacture of wine and beer, as recommended by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, signed by Anna A. Gordon, president, and Laura L. Yost, urging, in behalf of 1,000,000 women, the retention of the war prohibition law and the passage of an enforcement code to make effective war-time and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 23, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee in recognition of Thy right to rule not only in the laws of our land but in our hearts and minds. Every act of sovereignty comes from Thee, and in the discharge of our public and private duties we can hope to fulfill the measure of our usefulness only as we seek to do Thy will. Help us to-day to discharge its duties in Thy fear, and give us the satisfaction of knowing that we have done God's will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Harris	Kirby
Ball	Edge	Harrison	Knox
Beckham	Elkins	Henderson	La Follette
Borah	Fall	Hitchcock	Lenroot
Capper	Fernald	Johnson, Calif.	Lodge
Chamberlain	Fletcher	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCormick
Culberson	Gay	Kellogg	McCumber
Cummins	Gerry	Kendrick	McKellar
Curtis	Hale	Kenyon	McNary
Dial	Harding	King	Moses

Nelson	Pomerene	Smith, Md.	Underwood
New	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.	Wadsworth
Newberry	Robinson	Smoot	Walsh, Mass.
Norris	Sheppard	Spencer	Walsh, Mont.
Nugent	Sherman	Sterling	Warren
Overman	Shields	Sutherland	Watson
Page	Simmons	Swanson	Wolcott
Phipps	Smith, Ariz.	Thomas	
Pittman	Smith, Ga.	Trammell	

Mr. KING. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $10,000 required by the Pan American Union for printing and binding, fiscal year 1920, etc. (S. Doc. No. 37), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Labor submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the sum of $3,396,845 required by the United States Housing Corporation for the fiscal year 1920 (S. Doc. No. 38), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the establishment of a national food commission, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
House of Representatives, June 9, 1919.

Ordered, That

Whereas it is almost universally agreed that the present food prices are unreasonable, exorbitant, and extortionate, and that such conditions naturally tend to breed dissatisfaction, discontent, and discord; and

Whereas the immediate creation of a national food commission, or some similar agency, is positively imperative, such agency to be vested with power and authority to investigate and punish acts involving storage hoarding, speculation, and profiteering in the staple necessities of life: Therefore be it

Ordered, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges Congress to recognize this paramount problem by the prompt passage of remedial legislation such as suggested herein; and be it further

Ordered, That the clerk of the house be directed to transmit forthwith a copy of this order to the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in Congress.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

A true copy:

JAMES W. KIMBALL,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the Friends of Irish Freedom Society, of Lowell, Mass., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the City Council of Malden, Mass., remonstrating against the massacres of Jews in Poland and Roumania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I present two memorials from the United Irish Societies of San Francisco, Calif., which have been handed to me by the Secretary of the Senate. I ask that the memorials be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorials were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED IRISH SOCIETIES OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, Calif., June 17, 1919.

CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a special session of the St. Patrick's Day Convention, held on Saturday evening, June 14, 1919, at Hibernian Hall, 454 Valencia Street, comprising delegates from over 60 Irish societies, and representing over 50,000 citizens of this city, the following resolution was submitted and unanimously adopted:

"The Irish societies of San Francisco, Calif., in convention assembled representing at least 50,000 citizens of San Francisco heartily indorse the resolution introduced by Senator KNOX notifying the peace conference that the Senate disapproves the proposed league of nations as a part of any treaty of peace, and also disapproves of the league of nations as it is reported to be framed. The said United Irish societies also emphatically disapprove and condemn any compact of any kind that will in the slightest degree allow any foreign nation or the representatives of any foreign nation having anything whatever to say directly or indirectly in the affairs of the United States, or having any direct or indirect power by vote or otherwise in the foreign relations, or foreign activities of the United States, and hope that the United States Senate will emphatically disapprove of any such treaty or compact that may be presented to the Senate for their ratification. Said united Irish societies also condemn in advance any proposition by treaty or compact of any kind which will make the United States, or the people of the United States directly or indirectly a part to any proposition that will result in the establishment of slavery, whether of the white, yellow, black, or any other race in any part of the world, or of any treaty or compact founded on wrong, injustice, or tyranny, or despotism, or mere physical power in any way, shape, or manner, and requests the United States Senate to emphatically disapprove of any such treaty or compact whenever presented to said Senate."

Respectfully, yours,

WALTER MCGOVERN, *Chairman.*
ED. M. O'REILLY, *Secretary.*

UNITED IRISH SOCIETIES OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, Calif., June 17, 1919.

CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a special session of the St. Patrick's Day Convention, held on Saturday evening, June 14, 1919, at Hibernian Hall, 454 Valencia Street, comprising delegates from over 60 Irish societies, and representing over 50,000 citizens of this city, the following resolution was submitted and unanimously adopted:

"The united Irish societies in convention assembled in San Francisco, Calif., on this 14th day of June, A. D. 1919, respectfully request the Congress of the United States as a part of its investigations now ordered by that Congress they shall also include an investigation of the operations of the secret service and the Department of Justice in its proceedings during the past five years, and especially all direct and indirectly connection with the British Government and any and all officials of the British Government during that time.

"We most respectfully request the Senators and Representatives from the State of California to present this request to the Congress of the United States."

Respectfully, yours,

WALTER MCGOVERN, *Chairman.*
ED. M. O'REILLY, *Secretary.*

Mr. HARRISON presented a resolution adopted by the Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College of Agricultural College, Miss., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KELLOGG presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the modification of war-time and national prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of malt liquors containing not to exceed 2¾ per cent alcohol, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented memorials of the Congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Scholls, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Brownsville, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Drain, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Myrtle Point, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Baker, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Ontario, the Sellwood Methodist Episcopal Church of Portland, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Yamhill, the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Roseburg, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Falls City, the Methodist Episcopal Church of North Bend, the Presbyterian Church of Mill City, the Eastside Baptist Church of Portland, the First Baptist Church of Medford, the First Christian Church of Roseburg, the University Park Congregational Church of Portland, the Lents Evangelical Church of Portland, the First Baptist Church of Salem, the United Brethren in Christ Church of Weston, and of the Monthly Meeting of Friends of Salem, all in the State of Oregon, remonstrating against the repeal or modification of war-time and national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WALSH of Montana presented a resolution adopted by Local Lodge No. 339, Slovak League of America, of Lehigh, Mont., favoring the independence of the Lithuanians and the recognition by Congress of the present Lithuanian de facto government, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BECKHAM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Louisville, Shepherdsville, Taylorsville, Shelbyville, and Sonora, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Rotary Club of Kansas City, the Industrial Club of Garden City, the Building Trades Council of Wichita, the Agricultural Assembly of Barton County, and of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers' Association of Wichita, all in the State of Kansas,

favoring the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISTRICT JUDGE FOR TENNESSEE.

Mr. SHIELDS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 661) to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

W. B. GRAHAM.

Mr. MOSES. From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 552) to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance, and I submit a report (No. 31) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill reported by him. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Let us hear the bill read and see what it proposes.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,335, to reimburse him for money expended for necessary clerical assistance.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 2198) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 2199) to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2200) granting a pension to Anna M. Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 2201) authorizing the enlargement and extension of the public building at Watertown, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2203) to promote the improvement of rural education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2204) for a Federal land settlement and homestead commission; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2205) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make further survey of the Pecos River and Valley in Texas and New Mexico to determine the feasibility and cost of an irrigation project thereon; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 2206) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to study the application of machinery to the various processes of the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2207) admitting civilian employees of the United States Government stricken with tuberculosis to Army and Navy hospitals; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 2208) for the relief of W. M. G. Mackechney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2209) for the relief of the Portland Iron Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2210) for the relief of the heirs of Julio Carrazco, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2211) for the relief of Henry N. Bird; and

A bill (S. 2212) for the relief of Almond S. Root; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2213) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah;

A bill (S. 2214) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use at his discretion surplus moneys in the Treasury in the purchase or redemption of the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the United States; and

A bill (S. 2215) for the relief of the Eldredge Bros. Live Stock Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2216) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain department publications and to provide for crediting the department's printing allotment with the proceeds; to the Committee on Printing.

A bill (S. 2217) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining, and to regulate the expenditures thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 2218) for the relief of Ira W. Hatch;

A bill (S. 2219) to consolidate national forest lands; and

A bill (S. 2220) granting to the Lincoln Highway Association, incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan, a right of way through certain public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2221) to secure greater cooperation between the United States Reclamation Service and irrigation districts organized under State laws; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 2222) granting a pension to Paul B. Gomoll; and

A bill (S. 2223) granting a pension to Richard A. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 2224) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing a survey and examination of the Rio Grande border of the United States to determine the advisability of constructing a highway for military and other purposes either along the entire border or certain sections thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FALL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) declaring that a state of war between the United States and the former Imperial German Government no longer exists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

END OF STATE OF WAR.

Mr. EDGE introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) declaring the state of war declared by public resolution No. 1, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved April 6, 1917, to exist between the German Government and the Government and the people of the United States to be terminated and at an end, and for other purposes, which was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas a treaty of peace between the United States of America and associated nations and Germany has been concluded by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments recently involved in war: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war declared by public resolution No. 1, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved April 6, 1917, to exist between the German Government and the Government and the people of the United States be, and hereby is, declared to be terminated and at an end.

SEC. 2. That all American soldiers of the forces of the United States now in Europe shall be withdrawn from such foreign service without loss of time and be returned to the United States, except such soldiers of the United States Regular Army as have enlisted specifically for service in Europe.

MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KENYON. I introduce a bill on the same subject as the one introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I desire to say that the bill is not antagonistic to the one introduced by the Senator from Wyoming, but goes further on the question of the regulation of packers.

The bill (S. 2202) to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KENYON. In connection with the bill I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], published in the Independent, of Dearborn, Mich. It is very short. I am sorry I can not have the picture of the Senator inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WHY UNCLE SAM SHOULD SUPERVISE THE MEAT BUSINESS.
(By John B. Kendrick, United States Senator from Wyoming.)

"During the hearings of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the bill which I introduced during the last session of Congress to control the meat-packing industry, the statement was made by one of the representatives of the big packers that the industry is the biggest commercial enterprise in America and that in dollars and cents it does as much business as the railroads.

"The startling significance of that fact, for it is a fact, is realized when we consider that this huge industry, dealing in the food supply of the Nation and rapidly extending its interest to trans-Atlantic and South American fields, is dominated by a few private citizens who are wholly free from governmental supervision.

"Many years ago the Nation was aroused to the necessity of establishing some form of public control of the railroads, and, since the beginning of the present administration, it was found advisable to extend and improve Federal supervision of our national banking system. In both instances the beneficent results of Federal regulation are beyond argument, yet we behold to-day an industry as large as the railroad industry and more important, because it directly affects the food supply of every individual in the country, without the slightest vestige of Government control. Not only that, but, although some of those who are engaged in the packing business have the vision to see the necessity for legislation, we find many of the men who dominate this industry resisting the proposal to bring it under the supervision of the agents of the people with the same energy that the railroads opposed Government control two decades ago. We find them criticizing proposed legislation with the same vigor with which the banks of the country six years ago criticized the Federal Reserve System. I can not avoid the conclusion that when legislation has finally been enacted, as it certainly will be, we shall find these men acknowledging, as the railroad corporations and the banks now acknowledge, that their own interests as well as the interests of the great public were best subserved by the passage of laws substituting certainty and order for irresponsibility.

"The argument for legislation to control the meat industry does not depend upon charges of discrimination and unfair dealing on the part of the packers. Personally I am not at all interested now in any violations of law or ethics that may have taken place in the past. I am willing entirely to forget the history of the development of the meat-packing business and to base our case upon the admitted results of development, accepting also at face value the statements of packers that they do not conspire to control the market nor combine to suppress competition.

"The investigations which have been held by the Federal Trade Commission, by the House Committee on Interstate Commerce, and by the Senate Committee on Agriculture demonstrate beyond all argument or denial—

"(1) That the five big packers do from 60 to 80 per cent of all interstate commerce in meat and meat products;

"(2) That through ownership of the stockyards of the country, as has been charged for years, they exert an undue influence on the producing market; and, finally,

"(3) That through ownership of the refrigerator cars they control the distributing system.

"Whether or not their operations are in all respects fair and honorable, whether or not they allow the law of supply and demand full play in their markets, the fact remains that this power which they exert over the food supply of a population of more than 100,000,000 is altogether too great to be vested in the irresponsible hands of a few private individuals. There is no divine right in industry. To the people belongs the right to assert final authority over commerce as well as over politics. In the absence of some system of governmental control of this industry we can have no certainty that the successors of the gentlemen who now dominate the food business may not return to the practices upon which their domination was built up.

"We owe a duty not alone to the producers and consumers of this generation but to the producers and consumers of the generations that are to follow us, to protect them against this hazard. Neither should we overlook the interest and the welfare of the packer himself. His stake in the enactment of law which shall eliminate suspicion is in direct proportion to his wealth, and he ought to realize at this time, when it is written across the sky line of half the civilized world, that the greatest security for property interest begins with absolute right and justice for the individual, and that this security must have some firmer foundation than the mere good will of a few immensely wealthy, but nevertheless private, citizens.

"The theory upon which this regulation is to be exercised must, it seems to me, still be the Jeffersonian doctrine that government interference with the individual should be as little as safety for all will permit. For that reason I have no thought of proposing Government ownership either of the packing plants or of any of the attendant facilities. I do not seek an adjustment that will interfere with the right of private interests to engage in any business that may attract their energies and their ambitions. Rather do I seek a solution that will make it possible for private initiative to enter a field from which it is now practically excluded by the control which the five big packers exercise over this industry. In the place of this untrammeled private control I would substitute a Government supervision that would guarantee a free American market into which every American citizen might enter upon absolutely equal terms.

"It is acknowledged by the packers themselves that they own the stockyards. It is not necessary to prove it. The packers defend it. But as long as this ownership continues, as long as the men who buy 80 per cent of the meat product own the market in which the producer sells his product, it will be impossible to eliminate the suspicion that the purchaser will at least occasionally use his power improperly to indulge in discrimination; that sometimes he may yield to the ever-present opportunity, not to say temptation, to engage in unfair practices that stifle competition and increase profits. The time has come when, as the Secretary of Agriculture has so well said, the stockyards must be recognized not only as feeding and watering places but as great marts of trade, from which even the semblance of discrimination must be eliminated. Therefore, in the bill which I introduced at the last session of Congress it was provided that the packer should no longer be permitted to own the producing market. The result of this provision will inevitably be an impetus to competition, because the market will then be free to all.

"Again, it is acknowledged by the packers that they own the refrigerator cars; that is to say, they control the means of distributing fresh-meat products, and consequently are able to restrict competition. Their ownership of these cars gives them an immense advantage, an advantage that would enable them to dominate the consumer's market, even though more efficient packing methods were developed by other companies which could not secure transportation. Certainly it requires no argument in this age to prove that the means of transportation should be furnished to all alike. Therefore, my bill proposes that refrigerator cars shall be made common carriers.

"Finally, it is proposed that a licensing system by the Federal Government shall be established to apply not only to packing houses but to all other agencies that share in the industry, including commission firms and traders. The object of this system is not to destroy or even to disturb legitimate business but to provide that supervision by an agency of the whole people which has been found so necessary whenever private industry has taken on the forms of monopoly. Only thus can we remove the suspicion and distrust with which the activities of the packers are viewed. Only thus can we turn on the light of publicity that will prevent the growth of the evils of monopoly. Only thus can we level the artificial barriers which now prevent full and unfettered competition. Only thus can we breed a spirit of confidence so that the time will come when the attitude of the American public toward the product of the meat industry can be expressed in the words, 'This is an American product, produced, prepared, and delivered in an American way, under American conditions, and with American integrity.'

"This legislation is in no sense local in its scope; it is of national importance. It is not in the interest of the few but in the interest of the many. It is not intended for the benefit of the producer but for the benefit of all classes alike. It will clothe the business of producing and distributing our national food supply in a garment of honesty that will inspire not merely a belief but a positive assurance that our markets are free, open, and above all suspicion."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with this bill, a letter from Mr. L. F. Swift, which has been sent to every Senator, I think, on the subject of the regulation of packers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SWIFT & CO.,
UNION STOCK YARDS,
Chicago, June 13, 1919

Hon. JOHN B. KENDRICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have read your article in the Dearborn Independent of May 24, 1919, advocating certain legislation for the regulation of the packers, and beg briefly to submit my opinion as to the effect of such legislation.

Before doing this, however, I wish to call your attention to a fact which you seem to have overlooked, and which, if considered, might modify your position. In stating that the packing industry "is dominated by a few private citizens who are wholly free from governmental supervision," and, again, that "we behold to-day an industry as large as the railroad industry and more important, because it directly affects the food supply of every individual in the country, without the slightest vestige of Government control," you evidently overlook the meat-inspection act, which has been in force for a number of years and subjects the business and premises of packers engaged in interstate commerce to minute and careful supervision by the efficient Bureau of Animal Industry.

The legislation which you propose consists of three propositions:

1. That the packers shall not be permitted to own stockyards.

Swift & Co. invested its capital in stockyards either to create a market which did not before exist or to improve a market previously existing. Its only interest is that these markets near which it has made large investments in packing houses be efficiently conducted, and, with this condition fulfilled, it is willing at any time to dispose of its interest in stockyards. Legislation is not necessary to bring about such a disposition of the stockyards if a purchaser can be found. Swift & Co. denies that its investment in any stockyards results in discrimination, unfair practices, or the stifling of competition, and has seen no proof to the contrary.

2. That refrigerator cars shall be made common carriers.

Swift & Co. has been compelled to acquire refrigerator cars in order to make prompt and efficient distribution of its products. The Interstate Commerce Commission has pointed out that the operation of these cars is done at cost, or even at a loss. If the railroads will perform the service, it is for the financial interests of the packers to discontinue the building and operating of private cars, but the destruction of the private-car service before the railroads have created and are prepared to offer an equally efficient service will necessarily slow up the distribution of meat products and, consequently, the buying of live stock, for the reason that the packers can not buy live stock faster than they can store and ship the meat. Swift & Co. denies that its control over its own refrigerator cars in any way restricts competition or interferes in the slightest degree with the railroads' obligation to serve all alike without discrimination.

3. Finally, you propose a license system to apply not only to the packers but to all other agencies that share in the industry, including commission firms and traders.

To place the ultimate control of the industry under Government employees, who have had no practical experience in the business and have no financial or other interest in the business, will, in my opinion, have the effect of destroying private initiative and making it difficult, if not impossible, to obtan new capital for the purpose of the maintenance and expansion of the business. Such a radical experiment should not be tried.

You "accept at face value the statements of the packers that they do not conspire to control the market nor combine to suppress competition." So long as the packers are not in agreement, conspiracy, or combination in restraint of trade or competition, and so long as the profit received by them for performing their services in the distribution of meats and meat products to the people does not exceed a fraction of a cent a pound, no charge can be made that the public is in any way injured, and it would seem to me to be the height of unwisdom to embark an industry which you say "is the biggest commercial enterprise in America" and "directly affects the food supply of every individual in the country" upon the uncharted sea of bureaucratic supervision and regulation.

As this letter states my position upon a question in which I am deeply interested, because it vitally affects the business in which I am engaged and in which, likewise, the public is immediately interested, I have mailed copies to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Sincerely, yours,

L. F. SWIFT.

Mr. KENYON. I further ask that a copy of a letter of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], in reply to the letter of Mr. Swift, be inserted in the RECORD. I should also like to have this letter read, because the question raised by these two bills as to the control of the packing monopoly in this country is going to become a very acute question before this Congress, and I think the letter of the Senator from Colorado is a reply to Mr. Swift's letter that will be indorsed by a good many of the Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

JUNE 21, 1919.

LOUIS F. SWIFT, Esq.,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 19th instant, inclosing copy of one recently addressed by you to Senator JOHN B. KENDRICK, of Wyoming, and which I have read, as you requested.

I have no disposition to be unfair to the packers of the United States or to any other industry. The fact, however, that you and those engaged in the packing business are constantly increasing the domain of your activities by obtaining and holding control of nearly every article of food consumption, including, as I am reliably informed, a very serious invasion into the domain of the wholesale grocer and threatening to absorb his industry as well, justifies Senator KENDRICK and his associates in the effort to do something to prevent the inevitable control of the absolute necessities of life by the representatives of a single industry.

On the other hand, a new consolidation of so-called independent packers was recently organized with a capital out of all proportion to the sum invested in the business. This incident projecting itself upon the attention of the public at this time, when lawlessness, Bolshevism, anarchism, and appeals to dynamite are distracting this country, and, I think, threatening to overthrow some of its fundamentals, was most inconsiderate and indefensible.

The one effectual appeal which these people are successfully making to the discontented masses of the country is based upon the constant progress of these combinations.

Nothing can justify lawlessness, but many things lead to and prompt lawlessness in its most violent and dangerous form.

We can not hope, even by force, to which we must appeal if necessary, to overcome the tremendous movement toward the wholesale seizure and destruction of property and the elimination of property-holding and law-abiding people from the political and industrial world so long as we are unable to deny the assertion that the necessities of life are commandeered by a few men whose iron grip upon productive industry is being constantly strengthened by new combinations and consolidations, aggravating an already intolerable situation.

I confess some astonishment that many of the heads of American industry, men of intelligence and capable of the most earnest thought and reflection, seem blind and deaf to the appalling signs of the hour and go their way and continue their plans for universal conquest, apparently without a thought of the approaching tempest.

Please understand, my dear sir, that I am not consciously reflecting upon you either as an individual or packer. What I have said is of general application and appropriate in greater or less degree to combined and consolidated producers and manufacturers throughout the country.

I am not a believer in undue governmental control of business enterprises, but when the latter becomes a menace to the peace and well-being of society, either because of its size or its methods, or both, to what other recourse than the Government can the citizen resort?

Very truly, yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment relative to the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for inquiries and investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, etc., from $100,000 to $150,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $25,000 to pay Mrs. Blanche Winters, of Kansas City, Mo., as compensation and relief for the death of her husband, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of Labor, during the present emergency, to maintain a national system of employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

BUREAU OF MANUFACTURE.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91), which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures:

Whereas the further development of manufacturing processes is one of the most important and powerful means of increasing the Nation's efficiency, wealth, and prosperity; and

Whereas departments of the Government are now devoted to agriculture, commerce, and labor, but so far no department or bureau has been established for manufacture, the other fundamental source of national progress; and

Whereas there is a wide field for the making of useful articles by hand and without machinery, a field which should have especial study; and

Whereas the distribution of knowledge among the people as to the practicability of conducting manufacturing processes, both with and without machinery, on the cooperative plan and otherwise, will open up new channels of popular occupation and achievement; and

Whereas the adaptation of modern machinery to small factories in rural districts, villages, small towns, and in the home itself will open up an avenue of economic independence of incomparable value to the people; and

Whereas the farm is of itself a factory, and its higher profits and possibilities will be unrealized until its processes are carried to the finished state within its own limits or as near thereto as practicable; and

Whereas one of the principal needs of the United States is the conversion of its raw materials into finished products within its own boundaries, it being a source of national shame that we ship such enormous quantities of our basic raw materials abroad to be made by foreign countries into finished products and resold by them to us and others at a great profit; and

Whereas the conversion of raw material into finished products should be effected as near the place of production as may be consistent with access to markets for finished products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the practicability of establishing a bureau of manufactures at the seat of government for the purpose of studying manufacture in all its forms and diffusing information relating thereto among the people of the United States.

The said committee is hereby authorized and directed to report to Congress the result of its investigation during the present Congress; and if the committee finds such a bureau desirable, to submit a plan and bill to Congress therefor.

GARDEN CITY MOVEMENT.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the garden city and garden suburb movement in Europe has made wonderful progress during the first eight years of its existence; and

Whereas the object of this movement is to secure permanent and comfortable homes for the people on terms within the reach of the average income and to combine the advantages of town and country in the same community; and

Whereas this movement is contributing materially to the health, comfort, and prosperity of the people who have experienced its benefits; and

Whereas the movement, in the estimation of many, points the way to the long-sought goal of a contented, home-owning population; and

Whereas a beginning along this line is claimed to have been made in the United States; and

Whereas thousands of American citizens have petitioned Members of Congress for an investigation of the movement both in Europe and the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized and requested to hear and consider such testimony as may be produced before said committee in Washington regarding this movement both in Europe, in the United States, and elsewhere, to initiate such further investigation as the committee may deem proper, and to report its findings to the Senate.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN SIBERIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask that Senate resolution No. 13, relating to the policy of this Government in Siberia and to the troops now there, submitted by me on May 20, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. If I may be permitted a sentence in explanation, I desire to say that I do this because I have reached the conclusion that perhaps I can more rapidly obtain action upon it in that way than if I now endeavored to put it before the Senate and endeavored to have it debated and to have action taken upon it here, which I desire at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 6176. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LETTERS OF HON. ELIHU ROOT ON LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand two letters written by ex-Senator Root in regard to the league, his first letter and his second appearing on Sunday. I ask that they be printed as a Senate document and in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, before the request is granted I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the request. I am asking the Senator from Utah to give his attention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Utah give his attention to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SMOOT. I always give attention to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator from Utah has been enforcing the rule here in regard to printing speeches and articles of prominent men in the RECORD. He has objected to that proceeding in the case of a speech by ex-President Taft. There is a request now made by the Senator from Massachusetts to the Senate, and seeing that the Senator from Utah was busily engaged at the time I thought probably he would like to know what the request was.

I will say now that I will not make any objection to publication in the RECORD of a speech by a prominent man, especially one who has studied and discussed this question so carefully as I understand Mr. Root has. I think also that the whole Senate have a right to the advice of the special counsel of the opponents of the league.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that I do not know what he is talking about. I suppose some request he has made.

Mr. LODGE. I will remind the Senator from Nevada that when he asked leave to print he found support and not objection from me.

Mr. SMOOT. And from me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to have the Chair state just what the request is.

Mr. LODGE. It is a request that two letters from Mr. Root be printed as a document and in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly they ought to be printed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Printed as a document or printed in the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. Both.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada is that a rule has been stated here that anything of that character requested to be printed in the RECORD should go to the Committee on Printing, and the Senator from Nevada wants to know whether that rule is to be enforced or whether it is not.

Mr. LODGE. I did not know that there is such a rule.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] paid no attention to the understanding—there is no law, however—that whatever documents were printed should be printed either in the RECORD or as a public document. He insisted that they should be printed both ways, and they were printed both ways, both in the RECORD and as a public document.

Mr. PITTMAN. Will the Senator yield? Who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor, the Chair assumes, to make an inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator from Nevada will defer a moment, all that the Senator from Nevada has requested is that whatever rule shall be adopted shall be carried out consistently on both sides.

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. LODGE. There is no rule whatever. It is a matter of unanimous consent, and anything can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On the other hand, the Senator from Utah on several occasions within the last two weeks has made the point that all such requests must be referred to the Committee on Printing. He even made that point when it was requested that an article by former President Taft should be printed.

I am sure I agree with the Senator from Nevada that all we want is consistency. We are perfectly willing to have this letter written by former Senator Root printed, but if it is printed in the RECORD we would like to have it understood that objection will not come from the other side when requests are made from this side that similar productions shall be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had been in the Chamber as much as some of us in the last week, he would know that every morning, or during some part of the day, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has come into the Chamber with editorials from papers all over the country and asked that they be printed in the RECORD, and they have invariably been printed, for, after my objection, he said he would read them into the RECORD. The Senator from Nevada himself, in the last request that he made, asked that they be printed in the RECORD

and also as a public document. I think myself they ought to be printed only one way.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Navada?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I simply asked the Senator to yield because I do not desire to have my position misstated. I know the Senator from Utah has confused two or three different occasions.

About 10 days ago I asked unanimous consent at this hour in the morning that the speech of ex-President Taft be printed in the RECORD. I made no other request. The Senator from Utah asked that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct; I did.

Mr. PITTMAN. I said if there is objection then I will withdraw the speech, because I am unwilling to have it smothered in the Committee on Printing, and I will read it at the proper time. The Senator from Utah said, "Very well." The objection of the Senator from Utah was maintained, and later in the day it was necessary for me to read it into the RECORD, that it might get there.

On a former occasion I asked that a speech of the President of the United States be printed in the RECORD and as a public document. To that the Senator from Utah said it must either be one or the other, not both.

Mr. SMOOT. So I have already stated.

Mr. PITTMAN. On that occasion I simply limited my request first to printing in the RECORD, to which the Senator did not object, and then made the subsequent request that it be printed as a public document, to which he did not object.

Mr. SMOOT. So I stated.

Mr. PITTMAN. As far as the incident that I had in mind is concerned, the printing of the speech of ex-President Taft in the RECORD on the 15th day of June, the Senator did object and stated that he wanted it referred to the Committee on Printing. Subsequently he explained that it was the understanding of the committee that all such matters should first go to the committee.

I simply call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts so that the Senator, who is a member of the Committee on Printing, a very active, insistent member of it, may do what conscience might dictate in the matter, and at least maintain a consistent attitude.

I do not approve of an objection of that kind.

Mr. SMOOT. I only wish to say to the Senator from Nevada that he has stated the case just as I stated it, but since his request that it be printed as a public document and also printed in the RECORD there have been editorials that took pages of the RECORD that have been printed in it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, can we not have my simple request passed upon?

Mr. FLETCHER. May not I make a suggestion to the Senator?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the order requested by the Senator from Massachusetts was granted by unanimous consent, and the order has been entered.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to say that it has been the unbroken rule to regard messages by the President on a different footing from speeches or communications from others. There never has been a time to my knowledge when a request to print an address of the President as a public document and in the RECORD has received objection. But that does not apply to communications from others or addresses made by others.

The Senator from Utah has uniformly objected to the printing of any paper in the RECORD and as a public document, and I will state that it is not a question really of rule, but the law is that no motion to print the paper as a public document can be acted upon until there is an estimate of the cost of such printing. That is the law, and therefore the Senator from Utah is entirely correct when he insists that a paper presented here and moved to be printed as a public document shall go to the Committee on Printing. I do not think the rule applies to printing in the RECORD but to printing as a public document, where it should properly go to the Committee on Printing under the law, because in that way you get an estimate of the cost. However, I am not objecting to this request.

Mr. LODGE. We constantly give unanimous consent. Unanimous consent can be granted; but I had always supposed that if it cost more than $500 that would act as a stop on the publication of the document. Of course, the cost in this case to print as a document will be very small.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I regret that the controversy has arisen over the request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Mr. Root is one of our most eminent citizens. He has had a long, honorable, and useful career. Apart from his high position of the head of the American bar, he has been Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and Member of the United States Senate. What Mr. Root has to say to the American people is always interesting and is nearly always instructive. I think it is to our benefit for the welfare of the people that any announcement of opinion of Mr. Elihu Root should be received, when offered, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without objection. I understood the Chair to announce that the request of the Senator from Massachusetts had been granted by unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I was not aware of that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been granted without objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HON. ELIHU ROOT DISCUSSES LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND SUGGESTS AMENDMENTS TO ITS CONSTITUTION.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 31.*

The Republican national committee to-day made public the following correspondence:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 24, 1919.*

Hon. ELIHU ROOT,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR ROOT: Americans are seeking earnestly for further light on the question of the so-called league of nations.

In the same spirit in which Republicans during the recent war measured their every act by how they could contribute most to effective action, so now they are determined to meet this new phase of the war problem in that revived spirit of fervent Americanism which is the glorified result of our experience of fire and blood, moving with a full appreciation of this country's duty as a responsible factor in the world of to-day and to-morrow and with the earnest determination to do all that can possibly be done toward the maintenance of peace without sacrificing our own supreme nationalism, the preservation of which in its integrity is the greatest safeguard for the future, not only for the citizens of this country but for all peoples everywhere.

With a seriousness commensurate with the magnitude and complexity of the problem the people are seeking the fullest information and best judgment to enable them to reach a correct conclusion. I know that I express the feeling of great numbers of your fellow citizens when I say that they will be under real obligation to you if you will present your views upon this vital subject.

Trusting you may see your way clear to meet this obvious demand, I am, with great respect,

Sincerely, yours,

WILL H. HAYS, *Chairman.*

Mr. Root's reply was as follows:

NEW YORK, *March 29, 1919.*

Hon. WILL H. HAYS,
Chairman Republican National Committee,
452 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter of March 24 and I give you herewith at perhaps inordinate length my views regarding the proposed covention for a league of nations.

I am sure that all of us earnestly desire that there shall be an effective international organization to preserve the peace of the world and that our country shall do its full share toward the establishment and maintenance of such an organization. I do not see much real controversy about that among the American people, either between parties, or within parties, or otherwise.

There is, however, a serious question whether the particular proposed agreement which is now under discussion by the peace conference in Paris under the title a "Constitution of a League of Nations" will accomplish that end in its present form, and whether it can not be made more effective and free from objection. A careful study of the paper under the urging of intense interest in the subject has led me to the conclusion that a large part of its provisions will be of great value, but that it has very serious faults which may lead to the ultimate failure of the whole scheme unless they are remedied, and some faults which unnecessarily and without any benefit whatever to the project tend to embarrass and hinder the United States in giving its full support to the scheme.

IMPORTANT CHANGES NECESSARY.

I think there should be several very important amendments to the agreement.

This seems to be the general view. Mr. Taft, who joined the President in advocating the agreement, says it ought to be amended almost as strongly as his former Secretary of State, Senator KNOX, says the same thing. When Mr. LODGE and Mr. Lowell had their great debate in Boston both said the agreement ought to be amended.

A discussion of the merits and faults of the scheme with a view to amendment is now the regular order of business. It was to give an opportunity for such a discussion that the paper was reported to the Paris conference and made public by the committee that prepared it.

At the time of the report Lord Robert Cecil, who represented Great Britain in the committee, said: "I rejoice very much that the course which has been taken this afternoon has been pursued. It seems to me a good omen for the great project in which we are engaged that before its final completion it should have been published to the world and laid before all its people for their service and for their criticism."

Signore Orlando, who represented Italy, said: "We all expect from the discussion and development of the present act a renewal of peace of the whole world, but as the present debate has for its object to bring the whole scheme before the public opinion of the world, I wish to bring to that debate my personal contribution."

M. Leon Bourgeois, who represented France in the committee, said: "Lord Robert Cecil has said, 'We now present to the conference and to the world the result of our work'; but we do not present it as something that is final, but only as the result of an honest effort to be discussed and to be examined not only by this conference, but the public opinion of the world."

At that very time M. Bourgeois suggested an amendment about which I shall say something presently, and he went on to say: "The observations we have made on some points will, we hope, be of some value in the further discussions, since we are at the beginning of the examination of the whole plan."

These gentlemen represented all the great Allies by whose side we have been fighting in Europe, and it is plain that they expected and wished that the scheme which they had reported should be subjected to public discussion and criticism in their own countries and in ours. It is also plain that they saw no reason why the proposed agreement should be rushed through in such haste that there would not be an opportunity for public discussion and criticism and for communicating the results to the conference.

SENATE DISCUSSION A NATIONAL DUTY.

Under our Constitution it is the business of the Senate to take the lead in such a discussion, to compare the different opinions expressed in the several States, and to draft in proper form the amendments which the public judgment seems to call for. It is unfortunate that the Senate has not been permitted to perform that duty in this case. It seems to me that the Senate ought to have been convened for that purpose immediately after the 4th of March. In addition to the regular and extra sessions of Congress the Senate has been convened separately in special session 42 times since it was first organized, ordinarily to confirm a few appointments or pass on unimportant treaties, never for any reason more important than exists now.

There is a special reason why the Senate should consider this proposed agreement. Ordinarily treaties are negotiated by ambassadors, ministers, or delegates, and their work is supervised and corrected, if need be, by the President and Secretary of State at Washington, who from their different point of view frequently see things the actual negotiators overlook. In this case, since the President himself is negotiating the treaty in Paris, there is no one in Washington to supervise the negotiation, and there is no one with authority to give the negotiators the benefit of independent official judgment, unless the Senate is to perform that function.

This situation throws upon the people of the country the duty to answer the expectations of the conference by studying and discussing and expressing their opinions on the various provisions of the proposed agreement and to make their expressions of opinion heard the best way they can.

THIS NATION ASKS NO HELP.

The avowed object of the agreement is to prevent future wars. That is what interests us. We are not trying to get anything for ourselves from the Paris conference. We are not asking any help from the other nations who are in the conference, but we would like to do our part toward preventing future wars. How does the proposed scheme undertake to do that?

To answer that question one must call to mind the conditions to which the scheme is to be applied.

All the causes of war fall in two distinct classes.

One class consists of controversies about rights under the law of nations and under treaties. In a general way these are described as justiciable or judicial questions. They are similar to the questions between individuals which courts are all the time deciding. They cover by far the greater number of questions upon which controversies between nations arise.

ARBITRATION A FIXED POLICY.

For more than half a century the American Government has been urging upon the world the settlement of all such questions by arbitration. Presidents Grant, Arthur, Harrison, Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft strongly approved the establishment of a system of abitration in their messages to Congress. Thirty years ago our Congress adopted a resolution requesting the President to invite negotiations with every other government "to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which can not be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration and be peaceably adjusted by such means."

President McKinley in his first inaugural declared, "The adjustment of difficulties by judicial methods rather than force of arms has been recognized as the leading feature of our foreign policy throughout our entire national history."

We have illustrated the benefits of this method of settling disputes by the Alabama arbitration in 1872, the Behring Sea arbitration in 1893, the Alaskan boundary tribunal in 1903, the North Atlantic fisheries arbitration in 1910.

The two great international conferences at The Hague in 1899 and in 1907 established a permanent court of arbitration and rules of procedure. They also made great progress in agreeing upon and codifying the rules of international law which this court was to administer.

There was a weakness in the system devised by The Hague conference. It was that arbitration of these justiciable questions was not made obligatory, so that no nation could bring another before the court unless the defendant was willing to come, and there was no way to enforce a judgment.

But the public opinion of the world grew. Nations began to make obligatory treaties of arbitration with one another. Hundreds of such treaties were made. The United States made some 30 such treaties with most of the principal countries in the world, agreeing absolutely to arbitrate questions arising under international law and upon the interpretation of treaties. A strong opinion arose in favor of establishing an international court composed of judges who would devote their entire time to the business of the court. The second Hague conference adopted a plan for such a court, and while Mr. Knox was Secretary of State he negotiated a treaty with the other great powers for its effective establishment. It became evident that the world was ready for obligatory arbitration of justiciable questions.

PRIMARY AIM OF LEAGUE.

After the Great War began the American League to Enforce Peace, at the head of which are Mr. Taft and Mr. Lowell, made the first plank in its platform that "all justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers not settled by negotiation shall, subject to the limitation of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment," etc.

A similar group in Great Britain, of which Lord Bryce was a leading spirit, made the first plank in its platform the following:

"The signatory powers to agree to refer to the existing Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, or to the court of arbitral justice proposed at the second Hague conference, if and when such court shall be established, or to some other arbitral tribunal, all disputes between them (including those affecting honor and vital interests) which are of a justiciable character and which the powers concerned have failed to settle by diplomatic methods."

And both of these groups proposed to provide for enforcing the judgments of the court by economic pressure or by force.

The other class of disputes which give rise to war consists of clashes between conflicting national policies as distinguished from claims of legal right. They do not depend upon questions of law or treaty, but upon one nation or ruler undertaking to do something that another nation or ruler wishes to prevent. Such questions are a part of international politics. They are similar to the questions as to which our courts say, "This is a political question, not a judicial question, and we have no concern with it." The question whether Russia should help Serbia when Austria invaded Serbia, in July, 1914, is an illustration. Our own Monroe doctrine is another illustration. That is not an assertion of any legal right, but it is a declaration that certain acts will be regarded as dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, and therefore unfriendly.

Such questions are continually arising in Europe and the Near East, and the way in which the European countries have been in the habit of dealing with them has been to bring about a conference of the representatives of the different nations to discuss the subject and find some way of reconciling the differences or of convincing the parties to the dispute that it would not be safe for them to break the peace. For example, in 1905, when the German Emperor's dramatic challenge of the policy of France as to Morocco had made war seem probable, the Algeciras conference was brought about largely by the influence of President Roosevelt, and that conference resulted in preventing war. In 1912, when the Balkan Wars had brought Europe apparently to the verge of universal war, the ambassadors of all the great powers met in London, and the result of their conference was to avert war. So, in the last week of July, 1914, Sir Edward Grey tried to bring about another conference for the purpose of averting the Great War in which we have been engaged, but Germany refused to attend the conference, and she refused because she meant to bring on the war and knew that if she attended a conference it would become practically impossible for her to do so.

The weak point about this practice of international conferences in times of danger was that they were left solely to the initiative of the individual nations; that nobody had a right to call a conference, and nobody was bound to attend one.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES COMPULSORY.

The great and essential thing about the plan contained in this "constitution for a league of nations" is that it makes international conferences on political questions compulsory in times of danger; that it brings together such conferences upon the call of officers who represent all the powers, and makes it practically impossible for any nation to keep out of them. This effect is produced by the provisions of article 15, relating to the executive council of the league, or upon demand of either party to the body of delegates. Article 15 is the central and controlling article of the agreement. Putting out of consideration for the moment article 10, which relates to a mutual guaranty of territory, articles 8 and 9, which relate to the reduction of armaments, and article 19, which relates to mandatories, all the other important articles in the agreement are designed to make effective the conference of the powers resulting from the submission of a dispute upon a question of policy under article 15. Especially important among these ancillary articles is article 11, which declares war or threat of war to be a matter of concern to the whole league; article 12, which prohibits going to war without the submission of the dispute and without allowing time for its settlement, or contrary to a unanimous recommendation of the executive council or an award of arbitrators, if there shall have been an arbitration, and article 16, which provides for enforcing the provisions of article 12 by economic boycott or, should the powers choose to do so, by military force. I think these provisions are well devised and should be regarded as free from any just objection, so far as they relate to the settlement of the political questions at which they are really aimed. The provisions which, taken together, accomplish this result are of the highest value. They are developed naturally from the international practice of the past. They are a great step forward. They create an institution through which the public opinion of mankind, condemning unjust aggression and unnecessary war, may receive, effect, and exert its power for the preservation of peace instead of being dissipated in fruitless protest or lamentation. The effect will be to make the sort of conference which Sir Edward Grey tried in vain to get for the purpose of averting this great war obligatory, inevitable, automatic. I think everybody ought to be in favor of that.

I repeat that this scheme for the settlement of political questions such as brought about the present war is of very great practical value, and it would be a sad thing if this opportunity for the establishment of such a safeguard against future wars should be lost.

DEFECTS IN TENTATIVE PLAN.

The plan of automatic conference, however, is accompanied by serious defects.

The scheme practically abandons all effort to promote or maintain anything like a system of international law, or a system of arbitration, or of judicial settlement, through which a nation can assert its legal rights in lieu of war. It is true that article 13 mentions arbitration, and makes the parties agree that whenever a dispute arises "which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration," they will submit it to a court "agreed upon by the parties." That, however, is merely an agreement to arbitrate when the parties choose to arbitrate, and it is therefore no agreement at all. It puts the whole subject of arbitration back where it was 25 years ago. Instead of perfecting and putting teeth into the system of arbitration provided for by The Hague conventions, it throws those conventions upon the scrap heap. By covering the ground of arbitration and prescribing a new test of obligation, it apparently by virtue of the provisions of article 25 abrogates all the 200 treaties of arbitration by which the nations of the world have bound themselves with each other to submit to arbitration all questions arising under international law or upon the interpretation of treaties.

It is to be observed that neither the executive council nor the body of delegates to whom disputes are to be submitted under article 15 of the agreement is in any sense whatever a judicial body or an arbitral body. Its function is not to decide upon anybody's right. It is to investigate, to consider, and to make recommendations. It is bound to recommend what it deems to be expedient at the time. It is the States which act, and not the individuals. The honorable obligation of each member is a political obligation as the representative of a State. This is a method very admirable for dealing with political questions; but it is wholly unsuited to the determination of questions of right under the law of nations. It is true also that article 14 mentions a court of international justice, and provides that the executive council should formulate plans for such a court, and that this court shall when

established be competent to determine matters which the parties recognize as suitable for submission to it. There is no agreement or direction that such a court shall be established or that any questions shall be submitted to it.

RULES OF INTERNATIONAL CONDUCT.

International law is not mentioned at all, except in the preamble, no method is provided, and no purpose is expressed to insist upon obedience to law to develop the law, to press forward agreement upon its rules and recognition of its obligations. All questions of right are relegated to the investigation and to recommendation of a political body to be determined as matters of expediency.

I confess I can not see the judgment of three generations of the wisest and best of American statesmen, concurred in by the wisest and best of all our Allies, thus held for naught. I believe with them that, necessary as may be the settlement of political questions upon matters of this kind, it is also necessary to insist upon rules of international conduct founded upon principles, and that the true method by which public right shall be established to control the affairs of nations is by the development of law, and the enforcement of law, according to the judgments of impartial tribunals. I should have little confidence in the growth or permanence of an international organization which applied no test to the conduct of nations except the expediency of the moment.

OBLIGATORY ARBITRATION.

The first change which I should make in this agreement accordingly would be to give effectiveness to the judicial settlement of international disputes upon questions of right—upon justiciable or judicial questions—by making the arbitration of such questions obligatory under the system established by The Hague conference, or before the proposed court of arbitral justice, or, if the parties prefer in any particular case, before some specially constituted tribunal; putting the whole world upon the same footing in that respect that has been created between the United States and practically every nation now represented in Paris, by *means* of the special treaties which we have made with them. The term "justiciable questions" should be carefully defined, so as to exclude all questions of policy, and to describe the same kind of questions the Supreme Court of the United States has been deciding for more than a century.

When that is done the reference to arbitration in article 12 will have some force and effect instead of being, as it is now, a mere idle form.

The second change which I think should be made is to provide for a general conference, followed by regular conferences at stated intervals to discuss, agree upon, and state in authentic form the rules of international law, so that the development of law may go on and arbitral tribunals may have continually a more perfect system of rules of right conduct to apply in their decisions.

I send you herewith drafts of two suggested amendments designed to accomplish these results.

The distinction between the treatment of questions of legal right and questions of policy which I have drawn above has an important bearing upon the attitude of the United States toward the settlement of disputes.

So far as the determination of justiciable questions arising under the law of nations or under treaties is concerned, we ought to be willing to stand on precisely the same footing with all other nations. We should be willing to submit our legal rights to judicial decision and to abide by the decision We have shown that we are willing to do that by the numerous treaties that we have made with the greater part of the world agreeing to do that, and we should be willing to have the same thing provided for in this general agreement.

With regard to questions of policy, however, some different considerations are apparent.

MUST PRESERVE MONROE DOCTRINE.

In determining the extent of our participation in the political affairs of the Old World, we ought to be satisfied that a sufficient affirmative reason exists for setting aside to that extent the long-established policy of the United States to keep the Old and the New World from becoming entangled in each other's affairs and embroiled in each other's quarrels. Just so far as such a reason exists we ought to go, but no further.

We have to start in the consideration of such a subject with the words of Washington's Farewell Address: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities." And Jefferson's advice to Monroe: "Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs."

Unquestionably, the Old and the New Worlds have come into much more intimate relations since the time of Washington and Jefferson, and they have many more interests in common. Nevertheless, the basis of the expressions I have quoted remains in substance. The people of the United States have no direct interest in the distribution of territory in the Balkans or the control of Morocco, and the peoples of Europe have no direct interest in the questions between Chile and Peru, or between the United States and Colombia. Based upon this fact, the Monroe doctrine has hitherto kept the Old World and the New in two separate fireproof compartments, so that a conflagration in one did not extend to the other. There never was a time when the wisdom of the Monroe doctrine for the preservation of peace and safety in the United States was more evident than it is now. Some facile writers of late have pronounced the doctrine obsolete and useless, but I know of no experienced and responsible American statesman who has ever taken that view, and I can not help feeling that such a view results from insufficient acquaintance with the subject.

There has, however, arisen in these days for the American people a powerful secondary interest in the affairs of Europe coming from the fact that war in Europe and the Near East threatens to involve the entire world, and the peaceable nations of Europe need outside help to put out the fire and keep it from starting again. That help to preserve peace we ought to give, and that help we wish to give. In agreeing to give it, the following considerations should be observed:

AMERICA NEEDS NO AID.

We are not asking and do not need any help from the nations of the Old World for the preservation of peace in America nor is any American nation asking for such help. The difficulties, the disturbing conditions, the dangers that threaten, are all in the affairs of Europe and the Near East. The real reason for creating a league of nations is to deal with those difficulties and dangers, not with American affairs. It is therefore wholly unnecessary for the purpose of the league that purely American affairs should be included within the scope of the agreement.

When we enter into the league of nations we do so not with any desire to interfere in the concerns of foreign nations, but because the peaceable nations of Europe ask us to put our power behind theirs to preserve peace in their part of the world. It is not reasonable, therefore, that such participation as we agreed to in the activities of the league should be made the basis of an inference that we are trying to interfere in the Old World, and therefore should abandon our objection to having the Old World interfere in America.

With reference to the most important American questions, Europe as a whole on one side and the United States on the other occupy positions which however friendly are nevertheless in opposition. It must be remembered that the league of nations contemplates the membership not only of our present allies but ultimately of all the nations of Europe. Now, the Monroe doctrine was declared against those nations of Europe. It was a warning to them not to trespass on American territory, and, admitting exceptions and speaking only in the most general way, the nations of Europe are on one side of that question and the United States is on the other. To submit the policy of Monroe to a council composed chiefly of European powers is to surrender it.

I will add—without taking up space to discuss it—that I can not escape the conclusion that to ratify this agreement as it now stands would itself be a surrender of the Monroe doctrine, and that the agreement as it now stands gives to the United States no effective substitute for the protection which the maintenance of that doctrine affords.

IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION.

The same thing is true of immigration. The nations of Europe in general are nations from which emigrants go. The United States is a nation to which immigrants come. Apart from Great Britain, which would be bound to look after the similar interests of Canada and Australia, Europe and America are bound to look at questions of emigration and immigration from different points of view, and under the influence of different interests—friendly indeed, but opposing.

It hardly seems reasonable that under these circumstances the United States should be penalized for complying with the request of its friends in Europe to join them in the preservation of peace primarily for their benefit, and not for ours, by giving up our right to self-protection when that is wholly unnecessary to accomplish the object of the agreement. I think, therefore, that these purely American questions ought to be excepted from the jurisdiction of the executive council and body of delegates, and I have prepared and annexed hereto a third amendment in the form of a reservation, this being the method which was followed without any objection to accomplish the same purpose at the close of both The Hague conferences.

TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY.

The fourth point upon which I think there should be an amendment is article 10, which contains the undertaking "To respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league."

Looking at this article as a part of a perpetual league for the preservation of peace, my first impression was that the whole article ought to be stricken out. If perpetual it would be an attempt to preserve for all time unchanged the distribution of power and territory made in accordance with the views and exigencies of the Allies in this present juncture of affairs. It would necessarily be futile. It would be what was attempted by the peace of Westphalia at the close of the Thirty Years' War, at the Congress of Vienna at the close of the Napoleonic wars, by the Congress of Berlin in 1878. It would not only be futile; it would be mischievous. Change and growth are the law of life, and no generation can impose its will in regard to the growth of nations and the distribution of power upon succeeding generations.

I think, however, that this article must be considered not merely with reference to the future but with reference to the present situation in Europe. Indeed, this whole agreement ought to be considered in that double aspect. The belligerent power of Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey has been destroyed; but that will not lead to future peace without a reconstruction of eastern Europe and western Asia. The vast territories of the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Romanoffs have lost the rulers who formerly kept the population in order, and are filled with turbulent masses without stable government, unaccustomed to self-control, and fighting among themselves like children of the dragon's teeth. There can be no settled peace until these masses are reduced to order. Since the Bolsheviki have been allowed to consolidate the control which they established with German aid in Russia, the situation is that Great Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium, with a population of less than 130,000,000, are confronted with the disorganized but vigorous and warlike population of Germany, German Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Russia, amounting approximately to 280,000,000, fast returning to barbarism, and the lawless violence of barbarous races. Order must be restored. The allied nations in their council must determine the lines of reconstruction. Their determinations must be enforced. They may make mistakes. Doubtless they will; but there must be decision, and decision must be enforced. Under these conditions, the United States can not quit. It must go on to the performance of its duty, and the immediate aspect of article 10 is an agreement to do that. I think, therefore, that article 10 should be amended, so that it shall hold a limited time, and thereafter any member may withdraw from it. I annex an amendment to that effect.

LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT.

The fifth amendment which I think is needed is one suggested by M. Bourgeois in his speech at the conference, which I have quoted above. It is to the provisions regarding the limitation of armaments. The success of those provisions is vital. If they are not effective, the whole effort to secure future peace goes for nothing. The plan of this league is contained in articles 8 and 9. They provide that there shall be a reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety; that the executive council shall formulate plans for a general agreement as to the amount of these reductions; and that when an agreement has been made by the powers the parties will not conceal from each other, but will give full and frank information regarding their industries capable of being adapted to warlike purposes, the scale of their armaments, and their military and naval programs. Article 9 provides for a permanent commission to advise the league on the execution of these provisions. This full information is essential, otherwise one nation will suspect another of secret preparation, and will prepare to protect itself in the same way, so that the whole scheme of limitation will be destroyed. There would be some justification for this, because

there are some nations of whom it would be idle to expect the truth on such a subject; their public officers would regard it as a duty to conceal and mislead. The only way to prevent that sort of thing is by giving the permanent commission power of inspection and verification. Every country should assent to this, just as every trustee and treasurer is willing to have an independent audit of his accounts.

I annex such an amendment.

NOT A CONCLUSIVE INSTRUMENT.

Enough has been said already to indicate that this constitution of a league of peace can not be regarded as a final and conclusive instrument. It necessarily leaves much to be determined hereafter. We do not know yet what nations are to be the members of the league, what nations are to be represented in the council, what the limitations of armaments, what the regulations for the manufacture of munitions, or what the parties understand to be the scope of the provision for freedom of transit and equitable treatment for commerce.

The provision of article 19, of which I fully approve, relating to mandatories to aid or take charge of administration in new States and old colonies necessarily leaves both the selection of the mandatories and the character of their powers and duties unsettled. All these uncertainties are not matters for criticism, but of necessity arising from the situation. Still more important is the fact that no one knows when or upon what terms the Central and Eastern Powers are to be admitted to the league. The whole agreement is at present necessarily tentative. It can not really be a league of peace in operation for a number of years to come. It is now, and in the immediate future must be, rather an alliance of approximately one-half of the active world against or for the control of the other half. Under these circumstances it would be most unwise to attempt to give to this agreement finality and make the specific obligations of its members irrevocable. There should be provision for its revision in a calmer atmosphere, and when the world is less subject to exciting and disturbing causes. In the meantime the agreement should not be deemed irrevocable. The last amendment which I annex is directed to that end.

If the amendments which I have suggested are made, I think it will be the clear duty of the United States to enter into the agreement.

In that case it would be the duty of Congress to establish by law the offices of representatives of the United States in the body of delegates and the executive council, just as the offices of ambassadors and ministers are already provided for by law, and the new offices would be filled by appointment of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, under Article III, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States.

Very truly, yours, ELIHU ROOT.

The six amendments which Mr. Root suggests to the constitution of the league of nations, to which he refers in his letter, are as follows:

FIRST AMENDMENT.

Strike out article 13 and insert the following:

The high contracting powers agree to refer to the existing Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, or to the court of arbitral justice proposed at the second Hague conference when established, or to some other arbitral tribunal, all disputes between them (including those affecting honor and vital interests) which are of a justiciable character and which the powers concerned have failed to settle by diplomatic methods. The powers so referring to arbitration agree to accept and give effect to the award of the tribunal.

Disputes of a justiciable character are defined as disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact, which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the nature and extent of the reparation to be made for any such breach.

Any question which may arise as to whether a dispute is of a justiciable character is to be referred for decision to the court of arbitral justice when constituted, or, until it is constituted, to the existing Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague.

SECOND AMENDMENT.

Add to article 14 the following paragraph:

"The executive council shall call a general conference of the powers to meet not less than two years or more than five years after the signing of this convention for the purpose of reviewing the condition of international law and of agreeing upon and stating in authoritative form the principles and rules thereof.

"Thereafter regular conferences for that purpose shall be called and held at stated times."

THIRD AMENDMENT.

Immediately before the signature of the American delegates insert the following reservation:

"Inasmuch as in becoming a member of the league the United States of America is moved by no interest or wish to intrude upon or interfere with the political policy or internal administration of any foreign state, and by no existing or anticipated dangers in the affairs of the American continents, but accedes to the wish of the European states that it shall join its power to theirs for the preservation of general peace, the representatives of the United States of America sign this convention with the understanding that nothing therein contained shall be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions or to require the submission of its policy regarding such questions (including therein the admission of immigrants) to the revision or recommendation of other powers."

FOURTH AMENDMENT.

Add to article 10 the following:

"After the expiration of five years from the signing of this convention any party may terminate its obligation under this article by giving one year's notice in writing to the secretary general of the league."

FIFTH AMENDMENT.

Add to article 9 the following:

"Such commission shall have full power of inspection and verification personally and by authorized agents as to all armament, equipment, munitions, and industries referred to in article 8."

SIXTH AMENDMENT.

Add to article 24 the following:

"The executive council shall call a general conference of members of the league to meet not less than 5 or more than 10 years after the signing of this convention for the revision thereof, and at that time, or at any time thereafter upon one year's notice, any member may withdraw from the league."

NEW YORK, *June 19, 1919.*

The Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You were good enough to ask that after studying the whole of the proposed treaty with Germany and the amendments already made to the league of nations part of it I should write you my opinion as to the amendments and as to the action which would be wise in view of existing international conditions.

I should be glad to see the peace terms and the league of nations covenant separated, as proposed in the resolution offered by Senator KNOX, so that the latter could be considered by the people of the country without coercion from the necessities of speedy peace.

To avoid repetition, I inclose a copy of a letter which I wrote to Mr. Will H. Hays, March 29, 1919, proposing amendments to the league of nations covenant, and giving the reasons for them. Amendments similar in substance were proposed at about the same time by many Americans familiar with public affairs both in and out of the Senate. The amendments subsequently made in the covenant by the Paris conference, while to some extent dealing with the subjects of the amendments so proposed, are very inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Nothing has been done to provide for the reestablishment and strengthening of a system of arbitration or judicial decision upon questions of legal right. Nothing has been done toward providing for the revision or development of international law. In these respects principles maintained by the United States without variation for half a century are still ignored, and we are left with a program which rests the hope of the world for future peace in a government of men, and not of laws, following the dictates of expediency, and not of right. Nothing has been done to limit the vast and incalculable obligation which article 10 of the covenant undertakes to impose upon each member of the league to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the league all over the world.

The clause authorizing withdrawal from the league upon two years' notice leaves a doubt whether a mere charge that we had not performed some international obligation would not put it in the power of the council to take jurisdiction of the charge as a disputed question and keep us in the league indefinitely against our will.

The clause which has been inserted regarding the Monroe doctrine is erroneous in its description of the doctrine and ambiguous in meaning. Other purely American questions, as, for example, questions relating to immigration, are protected only by a clause apparently empowering the council to determine whether such questions are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. I do not think that in these respects the United States is sufficiently protected against most injurious results which are wholly unnecessary for the establishment and maintenance of this league of nations.

On the other hand, it still remains that there is in the covenant a great deal of very high value which the world ought not to lose. The arrangement to make conferences of the powers automatic when there is danger of war; provisions for joint action as, of course, by representatives of the nations concerned in matters affecting common interests; the agreement for delay in case of serious disputes, with opportunity to bring the public opinion of the world to bear on the disputants, and to induce cool and deliberate judgment; the recognition of racial and popular rights to the freedom of local self-government; and the plan, indispensable in some form, for setting up governments in the vast regions deprived by the war of the autocratic rule which had maintained order—all those ought not be lost if that can possibly be avoided. The condition of Europe requires prompt action. Industry has not revived there. Its revival requires raw materials. To obtain these credit is necessary, and for this there must be security for the fruits of enterprise, and for this there must be peace. Satan is finding evil work for idle hands to do in Europe—evil work that affects the whole world, including the United States.

Under these circumstances, what ought to be done?

I am clear that if the covenant has to be considered with the peace terms included, the Senate ought to include in its resolution of consent to the ratification an expression of such reservations and understandings as will cure, so far as possible, the defects which I have pointed out. You will probably be unable to do anything now about the system of arbitration and the development of international law. You can, however, put into the resolution of consent a reservation refusing to agree to article 10, and I think you should do so; you can clarify the meaning of the withdrawal article and you can also include in your resolution the substance of the third amendment which I proposed in my letter to Mr. Hays, of March 29, relating to purely American questions, and I think you should do so. These clauses of the resolution shape themselves in my own mind as follows:

The Senate of the United States advises and consents to the ratification of the said treaty with the following reservations and understandings to be made a part of the instrument of ratification, viz:

(1) In advising and consenting to the ratification of the said treaty, the Senate reserves and excludes from its consent the tenth article of the covenant for the league of nations, as to which the Senate refuses its consent.

(2) The Senate consents to the ratification of the said treaty reserving article 10 aforesaid with the understanding that whenever two years' notice of withdrawal from the league of nations shall have been given, as provided in article 1, no claim, charge, or finding that international obligations or obligations under the covenant have not been fulfilled will be deemed to render the two years' notice ineffectual or to keep the power giving the notice in the league after the expiration of the time specified in the notice.

(3) Inasmuch as in agreeing to become a member of the league of nations, the United States of America is moved by no interest or wish to intrude upon or interfere with the political policy or international administration of any foreign State, and by any existing or anticipated dangers in the affairs of the American Continents, but accedes to the wish of the European States that it shall join its powers to theirs for the preservation of general peace, the Senate consents to the ratification of the said treaty, excepting article 10 aforesaid, with the understanding that nothing therein contained shall be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions, or to require the submission of its policy regarding questions which it deems to be purely American questions, to the decision or recommendation of other powers.

This reservation and these expressions of understanding are in accordance with long-established precedent in the making of treaties. When included in the instrument of ratification they will not require a reopening of negotiation, but if none of the other signatories expressly objects to the ratification with such limitations, the treaty stands as limited as between the United States and the other powers.

If any doubt were entertained as to the effect of such action, the doubt could be readily dispelled by calling upon the four other principal powers represented in the council to state whether they do in fact object to the entrance of the United States into the league with the understandings and reservations stated in the resolution.

As to these limiting clauses, I wish to say something further. As to article 10:

First. It is not an essential or even an appropriate part of the provisions for a league of nations to preserve peace. It is an independent and indefinite alliance which may involve the parties to it in war against powers which have in every respect complied with the provisions of the league of peace. It was not included in Gen. Smuts's plan, the provisions of which have been reproduced almost textually in the league covenant. It stands upon its own footing as an independent alliance for the preservation of the status quo.

Second. If we agree to this article, it is extremely probable that we shall be unable to keep our agreement. Making war nowadays depends upon the genuine sympathy of the people of the country at the time when the war has to be carried on. The people of the United States certainly will not be willing 10 years or 20 years hence to send their young men to distant parts of the world to fight for causes in which they may not believe or in which they have little or no interest. If that is the attitude of the people when we are hereafter called upon to wage war under article 10, no general, indefinite agreement made years before will make them disposed to fight; and we shall be in about the worst possible position of having made an agreement and not keeping it.

Our people ought not to be forced into such a position, and we ought not to make any agreement that is liable to force them into such a position.

The recent controversies over the disposition of Kiao-chau and of Fiume illustrate very well the way in which territorial arrangements are likely to be made in councils of the great powers controlled by expediency. I would not vote to bind our country to go into a war in years to come in defense of those arrangements.

If it is necessary for the security of western Europe that we should agree to go to the support, say, of France if attacked, let us agree to do that particular thing plainly, so that every man and woman in the country will understand the honorable obligation we are assuming. I am in favor of that. But let us not wrap up such a purpose in a vague universal obligation under the impression that it really does not mean anything likely to happen.

Third. It is reported that Switzerland is much disturbed over the invitation to join the league of nations and wishes to preserve her neutrality, because her people are partly French, partly German, and partly Italian, and she wishes to keep out of all quarrels which may involve those nationalities. In this country the census of 1910 showed that 35 per cent (more than one-third) of our people were of foreign birth or the children of foreign parents. We can call upon these people to stand by America in all American quarrels, but how can we control their sympathies and their action if America interferes in foreign quarrels and takes sides in those quarrels against the countries to which they are attached by tradition and sentiment? How can we prevent dissension and hatred among our own inhabitants of foreign origin when this country interferes on foreign grounds between the races from which they spring? How can we prevent bitterness and disloyalty toward our own Government on the part of those against whose friends in their old homes we have intervened for no cause of our own? Article 10 confronts us with consequences very similar to those which Washington had in mind when he advised us to keep out of the quarrels of Europe and to keep the quarrels of Europe out of America. It is by following this wise policy that the United States has attained a position of unity and of disinterestedness which enables her to promote peace mightily, because she is not a party to the quarrels that threaten to disturb peace. She is free from suspicion; she is not the object of hatred or distrust; her friendship is valued; and her word is potent. We can be of infinitely more value to the peace of the world by keeping out of all the petty and selfish quarrels that arise than we can by binding ourselves to take part in them. Just so far as it is necessary to modify this settled historic American policy in order to put into effect a practical plan for a league of nations to preserve peace we ought to go, and we ought not to go one step farther. The step proposed by article 10 is not necessary for such a plan and we ought not to take it.

As to the statement of understanding about American questions contained in the foregoing paragraph No. 3, the most ardent advocates for accepting the league covenant exactly as it stands insist that the provisions already inserted about the Monroe doctrine and other purely American questions mean just what this proposed resolution says. If that be true, then nobody can object to the resolution which puts the meaning beyond question. It is important not only for the interest of America but for the peace of the world that such provisions should be free from doubt and occasion for dispute. If, on the other hand, their view is wrong and the provisions already inserted may be construed not to mean what the resolution says, then the resolution certainly ought to be included in the consent to the ratification.

There is one other thing to be mentioned, that is, the recital of the proposed resolution (No. 3) disclaiming any intention by the United States to intrude upon or interfere with the political policy or internal administration of any foreign State. I think that to be of real importance, because I perceive evidence of an impression in Europe that the part taken by the representatives of the United States at Paris in the local questions and controversies of Europe indicates an abandonment by the United States of her traditional policy and a wish on her part to dictate to European States and control European affairs, thus assuming responsibility for those affairs. That impression should be dissipated. It is not well founded. I am sure that the people of the United States have no such intention or wish. Such interposition in the affairs of Europe as our representatives have been engaged in was properly but a temporary incident to the fact that we had engaged in the war, and had therefore to discuss the terms of peace; and we should make it clear that we neither assume responsibility for nor intend interference in the affairs of Europe beyond that necessary participation under the organization of the league of peace, which we enter upon by the request of the European nations themselves.

To return to the subject of arbitration and the development of international law, I certainly should not advise regarding the league covenant in its present form as the final word upon an organization for the preservation of the peace of the world. I think that when the Senate consents to the ratification of the treaty with some such reservations as I have indicated, it ought also to adopt a separate resolution not a part of the action upon the treaty, but practically at the same time, formally requesting the President without any avoidable delay to open negotiations with the other powers for the reestablishment and strengthening of a system of arbitration for the disposition of international disputes upon questions of right, and for periodical meetings of representatives of all the powers for the revision and development of international law.

I think that hereafter, when the life of Europe has become settled, when credit and industry are reestablished there and governments are stable and secure, and we know what reduction of armaments the powers are going to consent to, the United States should insist upon a revision of the league covenant. I am sure that the changed circumstances will then permit material improvement.

Faithfully, yours,

ELIHU ROOT.

MR. TAFT'S REPLY TO MR. ROOT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement by ex-President Taft, published yesterday in the Public Ledger, with regard to the letter of Mr. Root that was ordered to be printed in the RECORD this morning by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SEES CHANGE BY ROOT—VIEWS ON LEAGUE ARTICLE X ARE "CONTRADICTORY," SAYS TAFT—CITES LETTER TO LODGE—WOULD THEREIN ABANDON ARTICLE, SAYS FORMER PRESIDENT, WHILE LETTER TO HAYS EXPRESSES APPROVAL AND DEFENDS IT—DOUBTS ALLIES WOULD CONSENT TO CHANGE.

CHICAGO, *June 22*.

Disappointment that Elihu Root "evidently has changed his mind" in regard to article 10 of the league of nations covenant was expressed here to-night by William Howard Taft in an interview given just as he was boarding a train for Cedar Rapids.

Mr. Taft said that it was his impression from reading the Root letter "that there is very sharp contradiction between the Knox resolution and Mr. Root's view as expressed in his letter." He also said that he thought it extremely doubtful whether the allied nations would consent to such a serious amendment as that of eliminating the United States from the obligations of article 10 without the delay of further negotiations.

DISAPPOINTING, HE SAYS.

Mr. Taft's statement follows:

"Mr. Root's letter to Mr. Lodge is, of course, disappointing to me, in that he wishes to abandon article 10. I have not his letter to Mr. Hays at hand, but I understood him in that letter to approve and defend article 10 with the qualification that it should operate only for five years to maintain the status established by the peace treaty.

"I understood his opinion to be that at the end of such a period it would be wise to attempt some revision of the arrangements made at the close of the war in the light of the subsequent developments and later conditions had become stabilized.

"He evidently has changed his mind, in the view he now takes of the effect of article 10 and the burden that the United States would assume under it. Otherwise I don't see why he did not propose to amend the treaty by limiting the operation of article 10 to five years and making such qualifying provision as that which he recommended in his Hays letter.

DISAGREES AS TO REMOTE WARS.

"It would be much easier to secure acquiescence in such a change by the other nations without further conference than in the one he now would make.

"I do not agree with him that article 10 would involve us in remote wars. But, more than this, the operation of the plan of fulfilling the obligation of the article, to be advised by the council by unanimous vote, would distribute the burden reasonably and fairly between the nations, probably limiting us to such police duty as might be necessary in this hemisphere, unless there was a general war, in which we would wish to engage promptly.

"The operation of the warning in article 10 to all bullying and robbing nations would prevent attempts by them to violate the principle of that article. This is clearly shown by the operation of the warning of the Monroe doctrine for a century, without one war.

DOUBTS IF ALLIES WOULD CONSENT.

"I should think it exceedingly doubtful whether the allied nations would consent to such a serious amendment as that of eliminating us from the obligations of article 10, without the delay of further negotiations. With respect to the other reservations of Mr. Root, I have no particular objection to offer if the other nations acquiesce.

"As I gather from Mr. Root's letter, he is in favor of ratifying article 8, as to limit of armament. He is also in favor of ratifying articles 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17, from which it must be assumed that he regards them as entirely consti-

tutional and within the treaty-making power. It will be interesting to see how Mr. KNOX and the others in the Senate who have urged objection to these articles on the ground that they are unconstitutional can reconcile themselves to the course of qualified ratification suggested by Mr. Root.

"Certainly there is a very sharp contradiction between the Knox resolution and Mr. Root's views as expressed in his letter."

MR. TAFT ON RELIGIOUS ISSUE.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I also ask that the article by Mr. Taft, published in the morning Post of to-day, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TAFT FLOUTS PLAN TO MAKE LEAGUE ISSUE OF RELIGION—DECLARES AGITATION OVER TEMPORAL POWER OF POPE IS EVEN MORE FANTASTIC THAN "COLOR-LINE" OBJECTION—CONTENDS "FAR-FETCHED" ARGUMENTS AGAINST COVENANT INDICATE NO REALLY GOOD OBJECTIONS CAN BE FOUND.

[By William Howard Taft.]

"The league of nations, if it has done nothing else, has stimulated the unrestrained imagination of its opponents in a most remarkable way. First, it has been denounced as a scheme for giving Great Britain universal dominion. Then the charge is that it puts the white people of the world under the scheming and cooperating domination of the black, yellow, and brown races. Now we learn that it is to be used to secure the return of the temporal power of the Pope and that it is really a means of fastening upon the world the control of the Roman Catholic Church.

"The concrete purpose of Great Britain suggested was to use the league armies to aid her in suppressing the Irish republic. The fact that articles 10, 12, 13, 15, and 16 deal only with differences between independent nations and can not by any strain upon the words be extended to internal trouble or revolutions has not prevented the attack upon Great Britain and also to stir up Irish opposition to the league.

TO AROUSE SOUTH, HE SAYS.

"The drawing of the color line was to rouse the constituencies of the Senators from the South to demand their votes against the league to avoid Negro domination. It was not pointed out just how the millions of Negroes in Panama, South Africa, and elsewhere were going to combine with the 400,000,000 of China or the 300,000,000 of East India, and cast their votes to change the color of present-world influences. Nor was it deemed of importance to show just what could be done through the proposed machinery of the league to take the votes or, when taken, to give effect to them. It was left to the ingenuity of the reader or listener to find some way of uniting colors and making them dangerous in the league. No such way could be found, and that 'scare' was only of a day's duration.

"The most recent of these efforts to rouse opposition to the league in groups supposed to be influential is the summoning from the vast deep of prejudice the odium theologicum. The A. P. A. is to be arrayed against the league. The fact that the Pope has expressed approval of the league is enough upon which to predicate another 'scare.'

MORE FANTASTIC THAN COLOR LINE.

"The same kind of reasoning that committed the world to Negro domination is indulged in to show the danger of the conspiracy to restore the same power to the present occupant of the Vatican which Hildebrand wielded. Catholic and non-Catholic countries which are or may be members of the league are counted, and as the former are said to exceed the latter, the conclusion is triumphantly drawn that a vote of the former will secure the broad temporal power of the Pope. Under what articles of the league this is to be achieved is not vouchsafed to us, for the simple reason that there are no such articles. The idea is even more fantastic than the color line.

"The far-fetched and wholly inconsistent arguments against the league, together with the palpable misinterpretation of ordinary terms used in the covenant to bolster up other objections, are fair ground for concluding that solid reasons against it are few, and do not satisfy objectors. Demagogic appeals, so unfounded, reveal the probability of motives personal or partisan, which influence no one conscientiously seeking to decide whether the league will help our country and the world."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, last week in addressing the Senate on the Knox resolution, I referred to what I understood to have been the attitude of the chairman of the National Democratic Committee as to the expediency of making a partisan issue of the problem of the league of nations. I then regretted that Mr. Cummings had expressed himself in favor of that policy. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] at that time undertook to correct the statement, and I accepted his explanation of the chairman's attitude. Since then I have received the telegram which I hold in my hand from Mr. Cummings, dated at Los Angeles, the 20th of June, which reads:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 20, 1919.*

Hon. C. S. THOMAS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I regret to observe that in an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, dated June 19, you are quoted as deploring a statement alleged to have been made by me to the effect that the league of nations is a partisan issue. At no time and under no circumstances have I ever said that the league of nations is a partisan issue. On the contrary, I have steadfastly maintained that it is an American issue, and that all forward-looking Americans of all political parties should unite in supporting the treaty of peace, including the league of nations. I regret that I have been misquoted and that you have been misled by the misquotation.

H. S. CUMMINGS,
Chairman Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Cummings is slightly in error in his understanding of my remarks. I did not quote him as saying that "the league was a partisan issue," but that he favored its becoming so. I am very glad, Mr. President, to be able in presenting this telegram to express my regret that I misunderstood the purport of Mr. Cummings's statement, said to have been made both here and in Chicago. He occupies the attitude which I have several times stated as my own upon this subject, and it is with great pleasure, therefore, that I find myself in accord with the official head of the party to which I belong.

NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

Mr. HALE. I offer an amendment to Senate resolution No. 76.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of section 5 of Senate resolution No. 76 it is proposed to insert:

That finally it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, and in order to promote and maintain a condition of peace throughout the world, to encourage the establishment of and to enter into a league of nations, open to all of the nations of the world, which shall embody the suggestions in the proposed covenant of the league of nations found on mature deliberation not to be in conflict with our interests, and shall bring about what our country has consistently stood for in the past and what the proposed covenant does not bring about, namely, the codification and development of international law, the establishment and maintenance of international tribunals which shall settle questions involving international law, and the settlement by arbitration of all differences between the nations which are not cognizable under international law.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a few remarks on the amendment at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, on the 10th of June the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] introduced in the Senate a resolution advising the peace conference that "the treaty of peace should be so drawn as to permit any nation to reserve without prejudice to itself for future separate and full consideration by its people the question of any league of nations." Whether or not this resolution can be acted upon in time, in case of its passage by the Senate, to bring about the necessary change in the peace treaty I can not say. At least the resolution reported favorably, as it was by a majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has given notice to the peace conference that the proposed covenant of the league of nations, which is included in the peace treaty, is not acceptable in its present form to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the committee to which the treaty of peace must later be referred.

We are told that the draft of the treaty of peace that came over to this country and was published in the RECORD has been changed, but we have not the final draft in our possession. The President himself has said within a few days that the treaty is still subject to amendment. It may be that in view of the action of this great committee of the Senate the requisite change may have been made in the treaty, but we have had no information or suggestion that such is the case.

When the President returned to this country for the adjournment of the last Congress he told the country that there was reason for every word and phrase in the first draft of the covenant which had been published shortly prior to that time, and that no changes of any kind could possibly be made. We were told, and defiantly told, that the league would be so closely interwoven with the treaty of peace that it could not be disentangled, and that if we rejected the league we would find ourselves obliged to reject the treaty.

There was a storm of indignation in the country, which took tangible form in the protest signed by 39 Republican Senators. The first covenant was amended, and the amended covenant comes to us a part of the treaty of peace. I am not going to

discuss the amendments or the covenant as it now stands beyond saying that to my mind the amendments do not meet the objections properly raised to the first covenant; that I regard the covenant in its present form as a direct menace to the interests of the United States, and I can not, consistently with my views of my duty to my country, vote to ratify a treaty that includes a covenant for a league of nations as it now stands.

Mr. President, when the peace conference assembled at Paris to settle the terms of peace with the Central Powers, we were entitled to be represented by men who would look after the interests of the United States as the representatives of all the other countries have looked after the interests of their countries, and who would make the best fight in their power for America and for the traditional policies under which our country has always existed. There was no mandate, express or implied, given to anyone that these policies be surrendered. Had we been so represented, and had these men, after making the best fight in their power for our interests and for the maintenance of our policies, been honestly convinced by the united opposition of the rest of the Allies that these policies could no longer be continued, they might have been justified in approving the treaty that they have approved; but they have made no such fight. In all the long colloquies that have been held by the peace conference, who has spoken out for the United States and for what we as a country have always stood? No single one of all our delegates. On the contrary, the President of the United States, with his board of dummy delegates, chosen because they would do his bidding without question, and with the immense prestige of our country back of him, has used that prestige to force on an unwilling world a project that in its present form violates every principle and policy of the country which he was supposed to represent; and to enforce the adoption of this project he has sacrificed not only the interests of his country but practically every tenet which he himself announced before the armistice as the basis of the future government of the world. With the great position which we occupied at the time of the armistice, and which unfortunately we have in large part lost through our persistent interference in the affairs of Europe, no country on earth would have dreamed of insisting on any forfeiture of our American rights.

Mr. President, as I have said once before on the floor of this Senate, the trouble with President Wilson is that his ideals and policies are not the ideals and policies of the American people. He has told us repeatedly that our fight against the Central Powers was a great crusade for democracy and humanity, and we have not challenged the statement, because it sounded well and because we thought that the statement would do no harm. But it has done harm—infinite harm. He has persistently gone ahead with this idea in his mind, and the fruits of this idea and its working out are the present covenant of the league of nations, to accept which he is seeking to force the American people.

Mr. President, I have never believed or taken any stock in the talk that we hear so much of that we went to war with Germany primarily to fight for democracy and humanity and the rights of the rest of the world. As I have already said, we went into this war because we believed that our country was directly menaced by the German Empire. We believed that a victorious Germany, or even an unwhipped Germany, meant a future conflict for us, or, if not an actual conflict, at least it meant the turning of our country into an armed camp to protect ourselves against the German menace. We went in for the specific purpose of whipping Germany, and, by the grace of God, we have done our job. We have destroyed, or contributed to destroy, the danger from Germany for at least many years to come; and as our job in the war was to free ourselves from this danger, so our job is now to make such a peace that we shall not be threatened by its repetition in the future. As a return for the sacrifice of blood and treasure that we have made in the war, we should secure as far as possible immunity in the future. The balance is all on our side. We should be paid for what we have done by advantages that will accrue to us, and not by continued demands for more sacrifices on our part.

The covenant is now, or shortly will be, before a body of Americans who will look after, and are in duty bound to look after, the interests of our country. Our position is that of trustees for the American people. As such, we have no right to administer our trust for any other purpose than the best interests of the people whom we represent. We have no right to forfeit to the rest of the world any of our country's assets, unless by so doing we are acting for the manifest advantage of our people. We are acting for them, not for the rest of the world.

As the President threatened would be the case, the covenant is interwoven with the treaty of peace. I hope that the peace conference will separate the covenant from the treaty; if so, we can ratify the treaty when it is presented to us, if in other respects it meets with our approval, and can then give the league covenant the time and consideration that its importance warrants. That the covenant should have been interwoven with the treaty, in view of the well-known opposition to it in the Senate of the United States, and especially in view of the general desire for haste in winding up the war, is somewhat surprising. This is in line with the tactics of the President throughout the conference: but that the other great nations concerned should have attempted to coerce the Senate of the United States in any such way seems incredible, and, perhaps, does not argue such entirely friendly relations with some of them in the future as we might have hoped.

Mr. President, faulty as the covenant is, un-American and antagonistic to our interests as it is, back of it all there is something of good, something of hope to this shattered world of ours, something that promises better things for the years to come; and that is, the prospect of some kind of an understanding between the nations that will lessen the likelihood of wars in the future. The whole suffering world wants peace now. The whole suffering world is looking for some plan to preserve that peace. Permanent peace, as long as human nature is what it is, we can not hope to get; but something we can do to make war less probable, and to refuse to do anything at all would bring too bitter a disappointment to too many people in the world to justify the United States Senate in permanently killing the whole plan for a league of nations. Let us go ahead, then, with the idea that we shall adopt in the future some form of a league of nations, and then let us formulate a league that will not betray our country.

Because President Wilson and the peace conference have put up to us a covenant for a league of nations that is hostile to the interests of our country does not mean that we should give up the whole plan. Let us have a league in spite of President Wilson if he will not subscribe to an American form of league—a league which will really bring peace to the world and at the same time will not sacrifice the interests of our country.

During the delivery of Mr. HALE's speech,

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has not concluded morning business.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Maine by making any objection——

Mr. HALE. I shall occupy only a few moments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is speaking by unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Maine is speaking under unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am making no objection to the proceeding of the Senator, and I wish him to understand that I am not making any objection to what he is saying, but I did not know whether the morning business had closed; and I was asking the question, not for the purpose of interrupting the Senator but for my own guidance as to matters that come under the head of morning business. That was my only purpose, and I beg the Senator's pardon if any interruption has been caused.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there appeared in the Philadelphia Record of the 22d of June an article by the Hon. George Gray, late a Senator from the State of Delaware, one of the greatest judges, one of the greatest lawyers, and one of the greatest statesmen of the country. It is entitled "Senatorial Precedents and Verbal Casuistry," and is in connection with the league of nations and the treaty of peace. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

GEORGE GRAY ON SENATORIAL PRECEDENTS AND VERBAL CASUISTRY.

Judge George Gray, former United States Senator from Delaware, a firm believer in the value of arbitration and a warm advocate of the possibility of its application to practically all questions, says he is amazed at the performances that have been going on in the United States Senate in connection with the treaty of peace and league of nations, a document of which the draft has not yet reached that august body.

The judge points out that during the war, and specially in its latter stages, there came to be an almost universal recognition of the need at the end of a conflict waged with such horrible methods and with such world-wide destruction of human lives and property of some sort of cooperation or association among the civilized nations to enforce and preserve future peace. This sentiment prevailed everywhere.

Even Mr. Roosevelt, a severe and constant critic of the administration, was emphatic in favoring some such association as would give what he called "teeth" to the enforcement of the treaty conditions.

Speaking with much feeling and earnestness on this subject of peace and a league to preserve it, Judge Gray said to a reporter for the Record, when seen at his law office in Wilmington last week:

CRITICISM NOT CONSTRUCTIVE.

"No discordant note was heard till Mr. Wilson came home with the draft of the league. Then broke out, with extreme violence, opposition to the covenant 'as it was framed.' That seemed as far as they meant to go. The inference from this attitude was, obviously, that with certain changes—never definitely outlined—it would meet with no serious opposition in the Senate. A few extreme men took the ground that there should be no league at all, but at that time this sort of opposition was negligible. I think the opinion of the country, as far as I can gauge it, was that if criticisms of the covenant could be fairly met, further trouble in that regard would be avoided and the speedy consummation of the treaty would be reached. Though there was an evident and sinister avoidance of definte proposals for amendment of the covenant, it was felt that there had been a substantial improvement in its framework as appeared, after some weeks, in the new draft. After this the opposition in the Senate seemed to flame up with increased violence, and now it would appear the stand has been taken by the opposition that there should be no league, certainly none as a part of the treaty of peace.

"Of course, this attitude of the Senators, so openly and aggressively taken, has had some effect on public opinion, yet I can not believe that the American people have been really shaken from their commonsense approval of a measure which, for so long a time before the armistice and for many weeks thereafter, seemed to them the obvious and necessary result of a treaty of peace.

"The present alignment of opinion in the Senate would seem to indicate an unfortunate spirit of partisanship in the attitude now taken. The charge of partisanship is easily made on either side, but we are all human, and it involves no disrespect, in diagnosing the situation, to say that partisanship and personal animosity have not been without their natural effect on the minds of those who are leading the fight against the covenant. It is most deplorable, at all events, that there should be grounds for such a charge on either side.

ONLY ONE CONSIDERATION.

"Technically we are still in a state of war, and I think all patriotic citizens would have been glad to know that there was a feeling throughout the country in regard to the attainment of peace and security for the future as united as it was while war was flagrant. It is hard to conceive how anyone can read the testimony taken the other day before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and not feel a serious concern over the present conditions in Europe, a concern which should override every consideration except the one of accomplishing a treaty of peace that will not only technically end the war, but will secure, as far as human contrivance can secure, the peace of the world and stem the wave of anarchy which threatens to roll over Europe.

"The only alternative would be for us to sign a treaty between the United States and Germany and withdraw from the scene to await, with such complacency as would be possible, the outbreak of a new war in Europe. Many selfish reasons have been given for taking such an attitude on the part of the United States. I can not, however, believe that they will strongly appeal to the manhood and Americanism of the people of our country. We will not have finished our work unless we stand by those with whom we fought to accomplish the purpose and high ideals with which we entered the war.

"In the event of the rejection of the treaty by the Senate, the peace conference will be thrown into inextricable confusion and the treaty of peace indefinitely postponed, leaving the United States and the Allies still at war with Germany, while the seething conditions of anarchy throughout Europe will become increasingly menacing to the ultimate peace of the world.

"I do not think our people are in a humor to see longer deferred the hope for a peace settlement that shall measurably secure the world from another such terrible cataclysm, and from the anarchy and social disintegration which now threatens Europe and are not without imminent peril to ourselves. Nor do I think the Senate will gain its own consent to prolong the period during which this country must endure the enormous war burdens which now so heavily rest upon it. However justifiable the reasons for opposing the treaty might be under other circumstances, they will appear trivial and negligible in the face of dangers so great and so imminent.

"We have heard a great deal from those who object to the league, about compromising or impairing our sovereignty, by binding ourselves to cooperate with our associates in war, to secure, as far as possible, the peace of the world. I can not help feeling that this sovereignty will be more fatefully compromised by our failing to recognize, as a high and imperative duty, the need to stand with the leading nations of the world in an endeavor to secure what we all believe should be the fruits of this unprecedented world war. What is our sovereignty and what is it worth to us, except to achieve worthy and high ideals? There is nothing mysterious about the word. Sovereignty is nothing more than the absolute self-control and independent will power of America, as a member of the family of nations. In a sense it is the aggregate personality of the American people; a personality to which the moral attributes of justice, humanity, generosity, or their opposites, can belong. As a sovereign, we can be bold, defiant, courageous, and generous, or we can be selfish, cowardly, and mean. We must decide, each one for himself, what he would wish the attitude of our American sovereignty should be in this crisis. I do not for a moment impugn the motives of those who think differently, and I have too much respect for such men as Senator LODGE and Senator KNOX to even think that they are not actuated by patriotic feeling and devotion to public interest; but I am compelled, as every other citizen is compelled, to form my own opinion as to the duties and proprieties of the situation as now developed in the Senate of the United States.

"We have also heard a great deal about the dangers the league of nations creates for the maintenance of our Monroe doctrine, or to our ability to control such intimate domestic policies as are involved in our immigration laws. If such fears disturb the equanimity of any man within or outside of the Senate, I would refer him to a speech made by Senator KNOX a short time prior to the war, before some such society as the League to Enforce Peace, in which, in a masterful argument, he defended the arbitration treaties between the United States and England and France, respectively, then pending before the Senate for ratification.

"Among other objections made in the Senate, it was said that their covenants would embarrass us with regard to the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine and our freedom of legislation in regard to immigration. Senator KNOX demonstrated, with cogent and unanswerable reasoning, that both these subjects were so inherent in and essential to the sovereignty of the United States that, without special provision in regard to them in the treaties, they lay entirely outside of their purview, and that no question could possibly arise in regard to these essential rights of such intimate domestic legislation. This reasoning applies precisely to the first draft of the league, in which the Monroe doctrine and the immigration laws were not referred to. Since then, by way of greater caution, special provisions preserving our rights in these respects have been embodied in the covenants of the league.

"I am quoting from memory the position taken by Senator KNOX at that time, but I am sure I have not misrepresented him.

"The treaty-making power of the Government is thus provided for in section 2, Article II, of the Constitution:

"'He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.'

"At this late day there is no room for differences of interpretation of these very plain words of the Constitution. The power 'to make' a treaty is lodged with the President. The making must be by his initiative. All negotiations necessary to the making must be conducted by him, and after the terms of the treaty are agreed upon between the President or his plenipotentiaries and the representatives of the other party, he must obtain the advice and consent of the Senate in the manner prescribed by the Constitution in order to consummate it as a binding agreement between the high contracting parties.

"There has been some attempt by a verbal casuistry to infer from the word 'advice' that the President is bound, either before or during the progress of the negotiation of the treaty, to seek advice of the Senate. There can be no such legitimate inference. The power of making a treaty, when he has the advice and consent of the Senate, still rests with the President alone. The practice of more than a century puts no other interpretation on the use of the word 'advice' in connection with that of 'consent' than that it is pleonastic, or, at most, covers the right of the Senate, which would exist at any rate without reference to that word, to suggest alterations or amendments which would enable the Senate to ratify the treaty.

"This function of the Senate as imposed upon it by the Constitution is, of course, one of great dignity and importance. It has been exercised throughout all our constitutional history in a manner that comports with that dignity and importance. The draft of a treaty proposed to be made by the President is communicated to that body in due course, and the deliberations of the Senate in the performance of its duty in the premises have always been conducted with a due regard to decorum and the proprieties that naturally belong to the performance of so high a constitutional duty.

"So important has this function of the Senate been considered that the discussions incident to its action have generally, if not always, been held behind closed doors, and any attempt to penetrate that secrecy, or to seek a disclosure of the procedure of such executive session, has always been indignantly repulsed by every Member of that body. I do not think any of the older Members of the present Senate will disagree with what I have just said. Of course, there is no obligation imposed by the Constitution on the Senate to consider a treaty with closed doors. It was an instinctive sense of propriety in the adoption of that course which controlled in that regard for more than a century.

"If the Senate should advise and consent to a treaty as presented by the President, it is returned to him with such certificate of its action. The President then may 'make' the treaty by having it executed, or he may refuse to consummate his action by allowing the matter to drop, or by definitely refusing to execute it. It is sometimes said loosely that the Senators may amend a treaty. Of course, this is not literally true. They can either advise and consent to the draft of the treaty, or may suggest, in any way they please, such alterations or amendments as they think would make it acceptable to the Senate. The President, on receiving such suggestions, may so far coincide with the Senate as to submit them to the opposite party and endeavor to have them incorporated in the treaty, or he may drop the matter entirely and refuse to go further in the negotiations. Even if the Senate were to ratify the treaty as submitted to it and certify that fact to the President, he may decline to proceed further and refuse to exercise his authority to 'make' the treaty."

"It should be noted here that there is a definite distinction between preparing or arranging or negotiating a treaty and the making or executing of it.

"I very much regret that this usual course of procedure in the Senate has been lost sight of in the present case. The draft of the treaty between the United States and the allied powers and Germany has not been completed or signed by the plenipotentiaries on either side. The Senate has been proceeding for weeks in an excited and inflamed debate as to what it will or will not do hereafter in the performance of its high duty when the draft of such a treaty is presented to it by the President.

OPEN-MINDEDNESS NEEDED.

"Surely it is the spirit and intent of this important provision of the Constitution that the Senate should bring an open mind to the performance of the high function imposed upon it, that its deliberations should be free and candid, and its decisions should be arrived at without bias or prejudice or preconceived opinion. If my recollection is correct, it has in the past been considered something of an impertinence to ask a Senator how he would vote on the question of ratification of a treaty. And the question at once arises whether the people of this country have not the right to expect that no Senator shall come to the performance of his duty in this regard with a mind so foreclosed as to preclude the benefit to be expected from a free and open discussion and contact of mind with mind in arriving at a final judgment.

"It is on the Senate, as an organized body and convened for that purpose, that this solemn duty is imposed by the Constitution, and we can understand how, in the past, it was considered inconsistent with the proper performance of this duty, that individual Members should be influenced by commitals pro and con on the question. Yet here, to the amazement of many old-fashioned people like myself, we have seen not only such commitals by the score but written pledges as to how individual Members shall act on the question of a treaty not yet formulated, much less placed before them. Surely, such prejudgment of the question must seriously detract from the value of the Senate's action in the performance of this high function, and measurably impair the usefulness of the procedure provided by the Constitution for safeguarding the making of treaties.

"It would be as consonant with propriety for the requisite number of Senators to refuse to receive a draft of a treaty for consideration as for the same number to pledge themselves beforehand that they would reject it when submitted. I can not but consider this a lamentable situation, and one which challenges the serious thought of the people of this country, without distinction of party.

"I am only speaking of the situation as it seems to me, and I disclaim, as I already have done, any intention of attributing motives of partisanship or want of sincerity to the Senators who have been conspicuous in this matter. I can understand how the President may have antagonized Members of the Senate in both parties by abstaining from any consultation with them before proceeding upon his important mission to Europe and his failure to seek advice or counsel from those from whom he might well have sought it, but surely I would be doing a grave wrong to Senators if I were to charge that such personal considerations as these could influence them at a time when the peace of the whole world seems in large measure to depend upon their action.

"In God's name, let us take this precious sovereignty of ours, about which some people seem to be so careful, and place it upright alongside the Allies with whom we have been fighting and put a new laurel upon its brow by saying, 'Yes; the power and might and sovereignty of the United States are here to stand by you in every honest, bold, and courageous endeavor to secure to the world the blessings of peace and the opportunities for happiness and well-being to all peoples, great and small.' Were we to do otherwise, it would be a mean and shriveled sovereignty that we kept at home, and we would have placed upon its brow the mark of an indelible shame that never yet has stained the sovereignty of America."

Mr. SMOOT. Is that the only article desired to be inserted by the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. My genial friend from Utah has asked me if that is the only one I have got. I have another, entitled "No legs to stand on." With the exception of the "entitlement," as the darkies say, the balance of it is totally unobjectionable. It goes on to tell how the Knox resolution has no legs to stand on, and it comes to me with a little private note:

N. B.—Leading Republican paper in Kentucky. I hope you will insert this in the RECORD. Best regards.

W. V. RICHARDSON,
Danville, Ky.

The article is taken from the Louisville Herald, which is a leading Republican paper. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD rather than to take up the time of the Senate in reading it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Well, let it go in. I think the Senator from Mississippi will get tired of this after a while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection; and it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

[The Louisville Herald, Friday, June 20, 1919.]

NO LEGS TO STAND ON.

There is much to be said for the contention of Senator KNOX that the covenant of the league of nations be separated from the main body of the treaty with Germany and the two state papers be considered on their merits, singly and separately.

But there is much more to be said on the other side.

And, first of all, there is this: The treaty can not be rewritten at this time; can not so much as be reconsidered in detail; can not be regarded as though it were a matter private and personal between whatever may be the government of Germany and whatever is the government of the United States. If there was at any stage of the proceedings time for action of that character the time is past and can not be recalled. If it may have been possible, in recent months, to perform the surgical operation for which Senator KNOX is so insistent, the possibility is become a matter of history.

We can not believe that he would wish the death of the patient; and yet, nothing is more certain than that death would be the result of his treatment. And we can not believe that he is either ignorant of, or indifferent to, this, that people are fairly clamorous for peace and, as we have said more than once before, are disposed to accept just any old kind of peace.

The league of nations, as part of the pact, is largely a Wilson demand. It was certainly not originally suggested nor wanted by either Clemenceau or Lloyd-George. But they adopted it, and, as we have it, it is a covenant insisted upon by the American, Woodrow Wilson, but drawn in great measure by the Britishers, Lord Robert Cecil and Gen. Jan Smuts. As matters stand to-day the interelationship, the interlocking of the two documents is so intimate and so vital that no separation is conceivable that does not bring death to both and reopen every question with respect to which it has all along been so difficult to secure a hearty and a practical cooperation.

It used to be said that the President's viewpoint was academic and scholastic; in this matter, however, of tying up the two arrangements he has been severely a man of business. What has been evolved is indissoluble. Everything must be accepted or nothing. Everything must go by the board or nothing. The features most angry are left for the league—the Saar Valley and the disposition of its peoples and its products; those highly debatable eastern frontiers; the standing of Schleswig, Silesia, and certain militant minorities—these fall to the share of the new body. And they can not be settled as in the past the Balkans were accustomed to settle things. They can not be determined along the old lines of seizure and hold till along comes some one better equipped to seize and to hold.

One does not have to fall in love with the treaty and the covenant to be for them. One does not have to be wedded to their every clause to feel that, to suffer accident to happen to them, would be a crime. They may not represent perfection—in point of fact they do not—but they represent what the people want; they constitute a means of safety and a measure of insurance for the weak and for those as yet clumsy and inexperienced in self-government.

But this is not all. The President has spoken for America. Within reasonable limitations he has bound America. To repudiate his delegation as our authorized spokesman is no longer possible; to seek to take from him the negotiating of the treaty and vest it in the Senate—and the Knox resolution amounts precisely to that—is a proposition at once revolutionary and ridiculous. We may pretend, if we choose, that this is a hole-and-corner business; that we have been kept in the dark, bamboozled, etc., but, as a matter of fact, though the covenant is neither open nor openly arrived at we do know more about it than is customary with such doings, and the opposition of Senator KNOX and his friends is based on ascertainable data.

We have been living through a dreadful experience. We have survided a day of tragedy and agony. Extremes call for extremes, and just as the war was not waged with milk and water, so likewise can not the peace be negotiated by resolutions and sentiments however lovely in the abstract.

The Knox resolution ought not to come to a vote.
It does not deserve to come to a vote.
And if it do defeat should be its portion.
Too wabbly to stand, say we.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has my request been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Then I do not care whether the Senator from Utah is tired of it or not.

Mr. SMOOT. I said I thought the Senator would get tired of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; the Senator will never get tired of inserting material in the RECORD for the information of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah will say that if such articles go into the RECORD after the appropriation bills are out of the way the Senator from Mississippi will read them into the RECORD, but so long as we have got to pass the necessary appropriation bills before next Monday—a week from to-day—we can not take the time to have these things read into the RECORD. After that date, however, we can take all the time desired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care particularly about the threats the Senator from Utah may make as to what he will do in the future. All I care about is the present accomplishment of my purpose.

SOLDIERS' INSURANCE PAYMENTS.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, on June 20 the attention of the Senate was called by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to a statement published in the Daily Digest of Reconstruction News, dated June 12, to the effect that Secretary Glass on June 11 had approved a contract for converting Government insurance held by men in the military forces under which beneficiaries may receive lump payments instead of annuity payments over periods of 20 years, as at present. The Senate adopted a resolution calling upon the Secretary for information as to whether such a contract had been authorized, as to what authority it was based upon, if such action had been taken, and the reasons for the authorization for the change in the contract. I am informed that the Secretary has submitted his answer to the Senate and that it has been laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter to which the Senator refers has not yet been laid before the Senate. If the Senator will permit the Chair to do so, he will do it now.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then I ask that the letter of the Secretary be laid before the Senate and that it be returned to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury making response to a resolution of the Senate of June 20 relative to lump-sum payments by the War Risk Bureau.

Mr. ROBINSON. Under date of June 21 the Secretary of the Treasury answers the inquiry contained in the Senate resolution. I request that the answer of the Secretary be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The communication is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 21, 1919.

SIR: Allow me to acknowledge receipt of resolution passed by the Senate of the United States on the 20th instant, directing that I inform the Senate whether I have approved a contract or contracts for converting Government insurance held by men in the military forces of the United States under which beneficiaries may receive lump-sum payments instead of annuity payments extending over periods of 20 years.

I am pleased to inform you that I have not approved any contract of the nature referred to. The Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance considers it desirable to offer, if possible, under the converted form of insurance policies, the option either of payments in lump sum or payments to be completed within a period shorter than 20 years. His reason for taking such position is that where men carry only $1,000 or $2,000 of converted insurance the amount of monthly payments over the period of 20 years would be exceedingly small.

In order that the question of the authority of the Treasury Department to fix terms and conditions for the proposed converted policies might be definitely determined, I have submitted to the Attorney General of the United States, at the instance of the Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, a request for a decision as to whether the bureau has, under existing law, the right to offer in its converted poli-

cies terms of payment other than those prescribed to be made each month extending over a period of 20 years. When I consented to submit this question for an opinion by the Attorney General I explicitly specified to the Director of the War Risk Bureau that I would not commit myself to the proposed policy, even if the Attorney General should hold that the bureau had the suggested authority, and that I should desire, before making up my mind on the subject, to give it careful investigation and consideration.

My attention was called to a notice in a Washington paper in which the statement was made that I had approved such a change in the method of payment of converted policies as is suggested in the Senate resolution. I immediately had investigation instituted and have found that no authority for this statement came from either the Bureau of War Risk Insurance or from any official of the Treasury Department.

I may state, also, that as yet the Attorney General has not rendered an opinion as to the authority, under existing law, to make payments of converted policies in any manner other than the prescribed monthly payments extending over a period of 20 years.

Respectfully, yours,

CARTER GLASS, *Secretary.*

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

Mr. ROBINSON. Among other things, the Secretary makes this statement:

I am pleased to inform you that I have not approved any contract of the nature referred to. The Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance considers it desirable to offer, if possible, under the converted form of insurance policies, the option either of payment in lump sum or payments to be completed within a period shorter than 20 years. His reason for taking such a position is that where men carry only $1,000 or $2,000 of converted insurance the amount of monthly payments over the period of 20 years would be exceedingly small.

In another paragraph the Secretary makes this additional statement:

When I consented to submit this question for an opinion by the Attorney General I explicitly specified to the Director of the War Risk Bureau that I would not commit myself to the proposed policy, even if the Attorney General should hold that the bureau had the suggested authority, and that I should desire before making up my mind on the subject to give it careful investigation and consideration.

In still another paragraph the following statement is contained:

I may state also that as yet the Attorney General has not rendered an opinion as to the authority under existing law to make payments of converted policies in any manner other than the prescribed monthly payments extending over a period of 20 years.

Thus it appears, Mr. President, that the Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance has recommended to the Secretary that a change be authorized in these converted policies, so that lump-sum payments may be made instead of payments in monthly installments as at present, and that the Secretary has withheld his decision upon the matter pending a determination of the question as to whether under existing law he has authority to make such change, and that the Attorney General of the United States is now considering the question, which has been submitted to him by the Secretary. I express the hope, Mr. President, that this change in the method of payment will not be made, even if the Attorney General finds that under existing law the Secretary has the power to authorize lump-sum payments.

The policy upon which the present method of payment is based was considered at great length by the Senate. It was the subject of discussion before the Senate for several days, and I concur in the conclusion expressed a day or two ago by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that the Senate regarded this installment payment as one of the surest methods of protection which the law affords to the beneficiaries under these policies, and that a change in the present method of making these payments to lump-sum payments will result or may result in many instances in great waste of the proceeds of the policies and in detriment to the beneficiaries.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to state again that I hope that no matter what the decision of the Attorney General is, the mode of payment of insurance to the beneficiaries under the existing law will not be changed; and I want to give notice now that if it is changed, or any effort is put forth by any department or bureau of the Government to change it, I shall undertake to have a law passed through Congress that will prevent it for the future.

I do not desire at this time to put in the RECORD again the statement made in the Daily Digest of Reconstruction News of June 12, 1919, issued by the Council of National Defense, Reconstruction Research Division, under the head of the Treasury Department, which positively states that on June 11 the approved contract for converted Government insurance held by men in the military forces, under which beneficiaries may receive lump-sum payments instead of annuity payments over a period of 20 years, as at present, was published to the world. I simply want to say that I am unalterably opposed to having the payments made in a lump sum, and if I have any power at my command in anyway I am going to see that they will not be made in that manner.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that Senators have been discussing the war-risk insurance I wish to call attention to what I think is a very much needed amendment to the law. Under the law as it passed Congress the beneficiaries are necessarily very limited in number, and rightly so, but this case has been called to my attention. One soldier, a boy from my own State, who was deserted as a child by his father, was left to the tender care of a maiden aunt who was substantially the only real parent the boy ever knew. He enlisted and served his country. He took out insurance making it payable to his estate. As conditions are this money will go to the father, who deserted the child in his infancy. I think it was within the intent of Congress at least that it should go to the real parent and during the course of the discussion on the Army appropriation bill I am going to offer an amendment which I think will take care of that situation.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that that question was given very careful consideration when the bill was before the subcommittee. There are a number of cases similar to the one that has just been referred to by the Senator from Ohio. A great number of them developed when the last amendment was offered to the existing law.

On the other hand, Mr. President, there were a great many persons who had acted as virtually father and mother to soldiers who had taken advantage of the insurance. The soldiers have no other one, as enumerated in the law, to make beneficiaries, but they could make it payable, of course, to their estates. I say to the Senator now I think there will be as many, perhaps, if not more, if the law is amended, who would receive the insurance to which they are not entitled as there are cases such as he has just cited, which are most meritorious. There are two sides to the question, I will say to the Senator, and it was decided that it was better to limit it, as the law now stands, than to open the door and take in a lot of unworthy so-called stepmothers and stepfathers of soldiers who had never done anything for them.

Mr. POMERENE. I think all must agree that my amendment would have to be very carefully drawn; but this is one of the cases that appeals to me very much.

Mr. SMOOT. And there are others, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. I have no doubt about it; and I think they ought to be cared for, if it is at all possible to do it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, there is one case which has recently come within my own knowledge, where a boy's mother died when he was 3 or 4 years old. His father abandoned him. He was reared and taken care of by an aunt. He lived with the aunt, and his aunt's home was his home and was practically a son until he enlisted in the Army. He went into the Army, and after a while he contracted pneumonia and died. Under the law he could not give the insurance to his aunt, and in the application he had to give it to his estate. His father had abandoned him and had not been heard of in 20 years. His mother was dead. His brothers and sisters were scarcely acquainted with him, and were scattered all over, probably slackers, and did nothing to help the country. They really are not entitled to the benefit of the $10,000 insurance, and that aunt, who reared him and who was his mother in all respects, as far as care and affection are concerned, is unable to derive any benefit whatever from the law.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the law she is the benefactress, and he could have made a will and given it to her. But, of course, very few people ever think of that, particularly young men.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am told by the department he could not have directed that she should be his beneficiary, because she is not within the class named in the law.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. FLETCHER. If not a mother or father or wife or brother or sister, she could not be named. I think that ought to be corrected.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is correct as far as that is concerned.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is another condition that has arisen under the law. I know an instance where the officers and crew on board the *Scorpion* were interned in the harbor of Constantinople when the war came upon us. Being interned, they could not be communicated with, could not get mail, and could not write letters. They did not know that the time for applying for insurance had expired on a certain day, and it was after the time had expired when they were set at liberty and were able to make application for insurance. They should be permitted to get insurance, and they are denied that opportunity. They were in effect prisoners, because they were interned and

in the charge of officers there in the harbor of Constantinople. I think they are entitled to the benefits of this law, but they have been denied it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from an old woman in Kentucky very much in need who had adopted a boy in his early youth, not by any legal process, but simply by taking him and taking care of him. He lived with her, as the story is told me, as though she had been his own mother. In fact, he knew of none other than her in that relation. He enlisted in the Army somewhere in Arizona. Under the war-risk insurance act he took out a policy of insurance. He died. The old lady is penniless. He could not leave the insurance to his benefactress in any way whatever. I see no way of bringing any aid to her except by some amendment to the law.

In cases of that kind there is no doubt that humanity itself demands that some provision should be made for those similarly situated, that they may get relief. The boy did not know either his father or his mother. At the time of his death he did not know of any kin that he had on the face of the earth except this benefactress. The bill ought to be amended, if it does not already carry such a provision, for just such cases as this, at least.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the two instances cited by the Senator who has just addressed the Senate are not isolated cases. I myself have had several cases called to my attention. Undoubtedly the law needs amendment so as to provide not only for cases which have been brought to the attention of the Senate this morning but to make necessary and proper provision for a good many similar cases. However, Mr. President, it is very natural that a law framed as was the war-risk insurance act—under stress; framed to suit one condition and then confronted suddenly with different conditions—should be somewhat defective. This particular measure has been already very frequently amended to meet conditions that were not contemplated at the time of its enactment, and it will have to be amended many more times.

But, Mr. President, when it is amended it ought to be amended by the Congress of the United States and not by the department. I say that not with reference especially to the cases cited by the Senators but I say it with reference to the purpose clearly manifested by the department at this time to radically change the very terms and conditions of the policies that we have established.

Mr. President, there was no bill more thoroughly considered than was this measure with reference to the provisions of the policies. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] were appointed by the Finance Committee as a subcommittee for the purpose of investigating and preparing the bill. The bill was prepared while the committee was engaged in the consideration of a revenue bill requiring the attention of all members of the committee. But that subcommittee gave its time night after night and day after day in an effort to provide a plan of insurance and a policy that would be just to the soldiers and to their dependents. One of the things that they prepared with most consideration and with the greatest care, and one of the things that the committee as a whole considered more deliberately probably than anything else, was the form of the policies themselves, because the policies are the very basis of the system.

There is nothing in those policies, Mr. President, that is more important in carrying out the policy of the Government in inaugurating this system of insurance for the relief of beneficiaries and dependents of soldiers than the provision which provides and requires that the payments shall be made at regular and stated times, monthly, during a period of 20 years. It lies at the very basis and foundation of the system, and is the policy that was adopted, and now, one of the departments of the Government, without any authority of law, undoubtedly is preparing and will accomplish, if it is not interfered with, a revolution in the system of payments that destroyed the policy which Congress had in mind at the time of the enactment of the legislation.

Mr. President, if this measure is to be amended even in minute particulars, it should be amended by the Congress of the United States and not by the department. If it is to be amended so as to change the policy of the system, established by the law, certainly the Congress of the United States and not the department or the Attorney General should decide that matter. I am saying this because I think we ought to serve notice upon these departments here that they must stop, at least now that the war is over, this arbitrary and unauthorized practice which they have been pursuing too long of interpreting the laws as they see fit and frequently changing and trampling upon the law in order to carry out some policy that to them seems to be wiser than the policy adopted by Congress, and to subserve possibly their own convenience.

It has come to my attention this morning, Mr. President, that certain departments of the Government are to-day considering the promulgation of orders with reference to the exportation of cotton from this country that will undoubtedly most seriously and injuriously affect every man who is interested in the production of cotton in this country. According to my opinion, their proposed action is without authority, and for the purpose of subserving some policy that has its origin in the departments and not in the Congress of the United States. For myself, I wish as one Senator to say to these departments here that the time for departmental legislation has ceased.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator had in mind what occurred to me when he made his last observation. There is a peculiar situation. For instance, the rate of freight as prescribed by the Shipping Board on cotton from New York to eastern ports abroad is less than the rate from South Atlantic ports. Why should there be a penny of increase in the rate on cotton from South Atlantic ports over the rate from North Atlantic ports to foreign ports?

Mr. SIMMONS. I know of no reason, except that some department here wills that it be so for some purpose of which the Congress is not advised.

Mr. FLETCHER. On the other hand, I will call the attention of the Senator to another question. The rates of freight from New York to Cuba by boat are the same as the rates from Jacksonville to Cuba.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the difference in distance?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is a difference of over 1,000 miles. So there is a clear discrimination against South Atlantic and Gulf ports as to all export business, both by rail and by steamer.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think it would be difficult to point out a great many instances of discrimination against certain sections and certain ports in connection with our foreign trade, but that was not the subject about which I rose to address the Senate. I rose simply to enter my protest against the departmental usurpation of legislative powers going any further and to express the hope that the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States will exercise their authority and their power if the departments undertake to continue this usurpation.

WAR EXPENDITURES.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I understand we are to proceed to the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, and that is to be followed by the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The military appropriation bill carries nearly $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920. The naval appropriation bill carries nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars, as I am informed.

Mr. President, I agree most earnestly with these appropriations, and while they are to-day about a billion and three-quarters of a billion dollars, respectively, in each succeeding year as we continue in the contest to overawe our neighboring nations they will grow from one billion and two billions and three billions of dollars until the nations in their own desperation, or a return of common sense among nations, shall agree upon some system whereby this awful expense may be lessened to the people, because it is the people of the nations and not the nations themselves, of course, that must bear the great expense of these armies.

Mr. President, I shall vote cheerfully to support these immense figures so long as it is necessary to do so in order to protect ourselves; but as we begin the consideration of the Army appropriation bill I think it quite appropriate that we should have before us at all times some of the facts and figures relating to the war through which we have just passed. About a couple of weeks ago I asked the War Department to obtain for me as much data and as accurate data as was possible upon the following subjects:

First. Battle deaths during the war, principal nations engaged;

Second. The warships destroyed during the war;

Third. The estimated gross tonnage of seagoing merchant vessels lost from August 1, 1914, to November 11, 1918;

Fourth. The cost of the war to the different nations; and

Fifth. The amount of damages to property of civilians destroyed or captured.

The response has given me these figures, quite accurately in most instances, and while they are only estimates in other instances, I think the estimates are approximately correct. I ask that these tables may be printed in the RECORD and also as a public document for our guidance and consideration as we are considering this great war measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The tables referred to are as follows (S. Doc. No. 40):

Battle deaths during the war, principal nations engaged.

[Estimate of all troops killed in battle and died of wounds, based on official statements where made and in other cases on the best information available.]

Russia	1,700,000
Germany	1,600,000
France	1,385,300
Great Britain	900,000
Austria	800,000
Italy	462,000
Turkey	250,000
Serbia and Montenegro	125,000
Belgium	102,000
Roumania	100,000
Bulgaria	100,000
United States	49,000
Greece	7,000
Portugal	2,000
Total	7,582,300

Warships destroyed during the war.[1]

Country	Enemy action.		Marine risk.[2]		Total.	
	Number of ships.	Displacement.	Number of ships.	Displacement.	Number of ships.	Displacement.
		Tons.		Tons.		Tons.
England	169	702,481	80	151,030	249	853,511
France	46	180,832	13	4,243	59	185,075
Russia	25	66,580	21	62,275	46	128,855
Japan	6	60,910	3	4,455	9	65,365
Italy	17	29,285	14	60,316	31	89,601
United States	5	38,360	4	2,950	9	41,310
Greece	1	350			1	350
Allies total	269	1,078,798	135	285,269	404	1,364,067
Germany[3]	128	382,905	9	12,972	137	395,877
Austria	38	56,071	4	1,100	42	57,171
Turkey	24	33,103	13	31,907	37	65,010
Enemy total	190	472,079	26	45,979	216	518,058
Grand total	459	1,550,877	161	331,248	620	1,882,125

[1] Information secured from the Navy. Displacement figures are partially estimated, since data were not available. Data are not yet available in summarized form for a complete statement, particularly of enemy losses.
[2] Includes losses, causes of which is unknown, probably enemy action.
[3] Does not include losses of submarines.

Estimated gross tonnage of seagoing merchant vessels lost Aug. 1, 1914–Nov. 11, 1918.

Countries.	Enemy action.	Marine risk.	Total.
Allies and neutrals:			
United States	391,658	430,759	825,417
Great Britain	7,756,659	1,143,000	8,899,659
Norway	1,177,001		
Italy	846,333		
France	888,783		
Denmark	240,860		
Sweden	200,829		
Greece	345,516		
Russia	182,933		
Holland	203,190		
Spain	167,865	710,285	5,302,642
Portugal	93,136		
Belgium	83,819		
Japan	120,176		
Brazil	25,464		
Argentina	4,275		
Uruguay	6,027		
Peru	1,419		
Roumania	3,973		
Persia	768		
Total Allies	12,743,674	2,284,044	15,027,718
Enemy countries:			
Germany	187,340	86,265	273,605
Austria	15,166	20,433	35,599
Total enemy	202,506	106,698	309,204
Grand total	12,946,180	2,390,742	15,336,922

To find deadweight tonnage, multiply these figures by 1½.

Cost of war to different nations.

[Present information in regard to expenditures of the various nations is not consistent, but the following figures may be taken as giving the limits within which correct figures will fall. The first column gives the total cost of conducting the war up to Apr. 30, 1919, excluding the normal expenses of the Government and amounts loaned to Allies. The second column gives an approximate figure for amount raised by taxation beyond normal where available. The third column gives increase of debt during the war. The fourth column gives the total of loans to Allies. All figures are in billions of dollars as of Apr. 30.]

	Total war cost.	Taxes.	Increase in debt during war.	Loans to Allies.
Great Britain and colonies	36 to 40	7 to 9	35 to 38	7
France	24 to 28	3 to 4	23 to 25	2
United States	22	7	24	9
Russia	18 to 20			
Italy	12 to 14	1.5 to 2	10 to 12	
Belgium, Roumania, Portugal, Jugo-Slavia	5 to 7			
Japan and Greece	1			
Germany	37 to 39		38 to 40	2 to 3
Austria-Hungary	20 to 23			
Turkey and Bulgaria	2 to 3			
Total	180 to 195			

Amount of damages to property of civilians destroyed or captured.

[Figures for the nonmilitary property damage are now being compiled and those available are subject to revision. It is believed that the following are substantially correct. Figures for countries other than the four mentioned are somewhat uncertain and, with the possible exception of Poland, considerably smaller.]

France	$10,000,000,000
British Empire (mostly shipping)	4,580,000,000
Belgium	4,740,000,000
Italy	2,710,000,000

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5227.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the head of "Contingencies of the Army," on page 2, line 15, after "$1,000,000," to insert:

Provided, That the restrictions concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

So as to make the clause read:

For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., or in the Army at large but impossible to be anticipated or classified; to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, including the payment of a per diem allowance not to exceed $4, in lieu of subsistence, to employees of the War Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That the restrictions concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain this item of the bill providing for an appropriation of $1,000,000 for contingencies of the Army. I should like the Senate to understand just what it is; and, if the Senator is willing to do so, I hope he will first explain his point of view.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this item, which is headed "Contingencies of the Army," appropriating $1,000,000, is to include the expenses of the office of the director of sales. Senators will remember that on the signing of the armistice in November last the Government had accumulated an enormous quantity of supplies of all kinds and descriptions. It is estimated roughly that the War Department now has on hand something like $2,500,000,000 worth of supplies, nearly all of which will eventually be declared surplus. It is necessary to organize an agency of the Government to sell these goods. The estimate given to us by the War Department was that in the neighborhood of $900,000 will be required to organize a great selling agency, with its headquarters in the War Department here in Washington, with agents and representatives all over the country. Thus far $340,000,000 worth of goods have been

sold. They represent a return to the Government of about 85 per cent of the original cost of the goods. The director of sales is Mr. C. W. Hare, appointed by the Secretary of War, who has been urged to leave his business to undertake this work and employment. Under him are the best business men he can find.

The proviso at the end of this item, on page 2, line 15, is to enable the War Department to employ men who are capable of undertaking the greatest effort in selling goods that the world has ever known. The War Department and your committee believe that this work can not be done with any effectiveness or with any degree of promptness unless the department is enabled and authorized to pay the right kind of men to do it. That is the purpose of this item of the bill and of the proviso.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator from New York if this item includes the disposition of aeroplanes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. CURTIS. I am told—I do not know whether or not there is anything in it—that aeroplanes which have cost the Government $20,000,000 have been sold back to the same firms which manufactured them for about $2,000,000. I am also told that machines that cost this Government from $6,000 to $8,000 are being sold back to the companies from which they were purchased at $800. I am further told—and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] was present on the day before yesterday when the statement was made—that there are a number of individuals who are ready to pay more for those machines than the Government is getting for them.

If that is true, there ought to be some amendment provided for in the bill requiring the Government to sell those machines where we can get the best bids for them. It is neither right nor fair to the Government that machines costing $20,000,000 shall be sold back to the manufacturers for $2,000,000. I do not care who attempts to defend it, it is not defendable.

Mr. SIMMONS. What kind of machines does the Senator from Kansas refer to?

Mr. CURTIS. I refer to airplanes. If the Senator from New York has any information on the subject, I should like to hear it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the committee made inquiry of Gen. Menoher when he appeared before the committee with respect to the sale of some of these airplanes. The planes which I think the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] has in mind are known as the JN–D–4 planes.

Mr. CURTIS. They are the planes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They were the Curtiss and Standard planes. They were training planes. We have some 2,700 of them. Gen. Menoher gave this testimony:

> We have sold a lot of the JN–D–4 planes; that is, the Curtiss and some Standard planes, considered obsolete, all of them. We sold about 2,700 of those, as I recollect—that is, the director sold them—and we realized $2,700,000 on those.

They were sold for $1,000 apiece. They were planes which the department assured us were obsolete and could not be expected to bring any more. I may say to the Senator from Kansas that I hold no brief for the director of sales or for the War Department generally on the sale of these planes. I am not competent to say how much they were worth. Our whole airplane program, as the Senator will remember, was in a very chaotic condition, and the Government undoubtedly acquired a great many things that will be worth very little money now that the war is over, and particularly in the airplane business, for airplanes are out of date one year after they are built.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman who called upon the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] and myself—or rather he called upon me, and I introduced him to the Senator from Indiana because that Senator was on the committee and the chairman was absent—stated that he and others had tried to bid upon these machines but that they were not given an opportunity to do so; in fact, that their bids were refused. He said the same course was being pursued with reference to the machines that were now on hand; that they were trying to get the War Department to let individuals bid on these machines; and he stated to the Senator from Indiana and to me that he was ready to bid more than was being bid by the Curtiss Co.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to discuss this question for just a moment. I gave notice in the committee that I would make a point of order against the amendment found on page 2, lines 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. My understanding is that this sales arrangement is in the hands of a man by the name of C. Willing Hare. For the information of the Senate I desire to read short excerpts from the hearings held before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on Senate resolution 386. I read from page 611. The reason I read this is because I want the Senate to know exactly what kind of a man is going to have placed in his hands the million dollars appropriated by this item and who is going to have placed in his hands also $2,500,000,000 worth of Government property to be disposed of. I read as follows:

> Senator HARDWICK. What is your present place with the Government? Have you a permanent place with the Government?
> Mr. HARE. No. I thought I explained yesterday that on the 1st of August, after this work had been going on in the field, they asked me if I would come down here and form a national committee——
> Senator HARDWICK. Yes; you told us about that.
> Mr. HARE. On the 1st of September. At the present time I am assistant director of munitions.
> Senator HARDWICK. At what salary?
> Mr. HARE. At $4,000 a year. I am at the present time an employee of the Government.
> Senator FRANCE. Are you also employed by the United Gas & Improvement Co. at the present time?
> Mr. HARE. I am; yes. They are continuing my salary.
> Senator FRANCE. You draw a salary from both?
> Mr. HARE. From both, at the present time.
> Senator HARDWICK. From whom?
> Mr. HARE. From the United Gas & Improvement Co.
> Senator HARDWICK. Do you mean of Philadelphia?
> Mr. HARE. Of Philadelphia.
> Senator HARDWICK. Do you still draw a salary from them?
> Mr. HARE. They have been keeping me on the pay roll right straight through, as they have a number of other men whom they thought could help the Government in the emergency.
> Senator HARDWICK. While they were doing that you were getting a dollar a year, though, were you not, when that started?
> Mr. HARE. All that time I was; yes.
> Senator HARDWICK. But now you are getting $4,000 a year. Do they still keep you on their pay roll?
> Mr. HARE. They still keep me on at $15,000.
> Senator HARDWICK. Do you regard that as proper?
> Mr. HARE. Well, it never entered into my head.
> Senator HARDWICK (continuing). That you should draw a salary from the gas company and $4,000 from the Government at the same time?
> Mr. HARE. I do not see any objection to that.
> Senator HARDWICK. All right.
> Senator TRAMMELL. Your services have been given to both the Government and this company, have they?
> Mr. HARE. No. I will tell you exactly how the United Gas & Improvement Co. treated the entire question. When the war came on, they, like every other corporation of the country, said they wanted to do all they possibly could to help the war through, and men were called for from every part of the country, as you know, to leave corporations and leave their business; and the corporations kept those men on their pay rolls. I came down here and worked without any salary until they finally said, "We are going to put you all on at $150 a month." I think it was sometime in September that that decision was reached.

Then there follow various matters which I will not read, but I ask that they be printed in the RECORD, so that the entire matter may be seen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

> Senator FRANCE. Yes; we are finding a number of instances where men are drawing salaries from the Government and are serving the Government while they are also drawing salaries from private corporations, and this is another instance.
> Mr. HARE. Well, what are you trying to indicate by that, sir—that I am not looking after——
> Senator HARDWICK. We are simply getting the facts.
> Senator FRANCE. There are no inferences at all. We are after facts, and not arguments. Now, this United Gas & Improvement Co. is a large corporation, carrying on business in Philadelphia and also in Pittsburgh, is it not?
> Mr. HARE. No; I will tell you: It carries on business in a great variety of towns.
> Senator FRANCE. Yes; in a great variety of towns all over the country. Do you know whether this corporation has entered into any contracts with the Government for the supply of service, traction service, illuminating service, or any other service?
> Mr. HARE. That I would not know anything about. It would not come under my work at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I quote again from the same report.

> Senator FRANCE. It seems to me that you have had general supervision over determining where the contracts should go, and the United Gas & Improvement Co. is a very large undertaker so far as the supply of gas and electric light and public-utility service is concerned. Now, you have been telling us the policy which you pursued in letting contracts; and in connection with that I should like to know whether you knew whether the United Gas & Improvement Co. had been furnishing any services to the Government?
> Senator HARDWICK. That is very proper.
> Mr. HARE. That is a perfectly proper question. I do not know of my own knowledge, but I take it for granted that any enterprise that was within reach of their lines they would naturally, as a public-service corporation, offer service to. We operate—if I may tell you just briefly—in Concord, N. H.; Manchester, N. H.; we have interests in the Connecticut Railway & Lighting Co.; we operate the gas works in Philadelphia; we have an interest in the Atlanta Gas Light Co.; we operate in Savannah; we operate in Kansas City; in Omaha, Nebr.; in Des Moines, Iowa; in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; in Janesville, Wis.; the Northern Indiana Electric property, which is in the neighborhood of Chicago; and Charleston, S. C.; and some of those undoubtedly, if they were asked for service, would render it.

Senator HARDWICK. During the time you have been down here, what salary have you been drawing from this corporation?

I call especial attention to this, in view of the statement which has been made by the committee, to which I will refer hereafter. I continue the quotation:

Mr. HARE. Fifteen thousand dollars a year.
Senator HARDWICK. Do you still get that from them?
Mr. HARE. I do; yes.
Senator FRANCE. What are your duties with that corporation?

Here is the great selling expert, the man who knows how to sell every conceivable thing that the Government desires to dispose of; here is the experience stated, here are the qualifications set forth of the man they say they can not get along without:

Mr. HARE. I began there 20 years ago and worked my way up. I started in as a complaint clerk at $50 a month, and from there I was advanced by what I considered, as every young man does, very slow stages, until finally the first job that was really offered to me was to manage the claim department, which had to do with looking after accident cases.
Senator FRANCE. Claims against the company?
Mr. HARE. Claims against the company.

He was a claim agent of the gas company—

Senator FRANCE. But you are not an attorney?
Mr. HARE. I am not an attorney; no. I come from a family of lawyers.

That seems to qualify him to be the greatest sales agent that perhaps the world has ever known. It is now sought to pay him a salary of $25,000 a year, as I understand the testimony before the committee, on the theory that he was receiving $30,000 a year from some other company. His own testimony shows that the highest he ever received was $15,000 a year, and if the statement before the committee is correct and the information I have is correct, then Mr. Hare is undoubtedly wrong. For these reasons, believing that Mr. Hare ought not to be the representative of the Government in so important an undertaking as this, believing it is wrong for a man to be a buyer and a seller at the same time, or connected with those who buy while he is representing the Government as the seller, and seeing in this proviso a conflict with the law governing personal service to the Government—that is, the statute that provides that a man can not represent the Government and at the same time represent those who buy from it and sell to it—I must make a point of order. I reserved that right in the committee. It is new legislation.

I make the point of order that this is new legislation, and I ask that it be stricken out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, before the point of order is ruled on I desire to explain to the Senate just what happens when this goes out of the bill. It means that this $2,500,000,000 worth of goods now in the hands of the Government in effect can not be sold. It is all very well to complain against the payment of comparatively large salaries in a matter of this sort, but I challenge the attention of the Senate to this observation: We will never sell this enormous accumulation of supplies by the employment of $2,500 and $3,000 a year men. We will have to get the very best ability in this country.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment.

I hold no brief for Mr. Hare. I had nothing whatsoever to do with his selection. I do not know whether he is going to remain in that position or not; but whether it is he or some one else, the director of sales and his principal assistants have got to be exceedingly able men, whose word and judgment can be depended upon, and who are competent to undertake and carry through to a successful conclusion the biggest selling undertaking the world has ever known.

The purpose of this proviso is to permit the War Department to employ the best men they can find. I do not know whether they have employed them or not. The committee has no affirmative power over the selection of the men, either Mr. Hare or anybody else. That is the responsibility of the Secretary of War, which the committee does not share with him; but the committee does have the responsibility of enabling the Secretary of War, by legislation, to find the right kind of men. If he fails to find them, it is his fault and not the fault of the Congress.

I had hoped that the Senator from Tennessee would not press a point of order against this provision, for if it is sustained, and later sustained by the Senate, I shall be compelled to move for a suspension of the rules. It is my duty to do it in the interest of the efficiency of the Government and the selling of this enormous accumulation of goods.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it proposed to coordinate and put under one head the sale of all these goods—ordnance, munitions, quartermaster supplies, and everything?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; at home and in France.

Mr. HARRISON. And this man Hare is to supervise the whole work?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; he is, so we are given to understand.

Mr. HARRISON. Otherwise, they would have some lower-paid men doing this work?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Otherwise, as I understand, if authority does not already exist, it must be asked for each of the departments to sell their own goods of which they have a surplus in stock. They are endeavoring now, we were told, to establish a reasonable degree of coordination between the selling of the goods now in the United States and the selling of the goods that are in France. The sale of goods in France has not proceeded with any great degree of success. In fact, very little has been accomplished. There is a commission over there that was sent over, separate and distinct and with no connection with Mr. Hare; and they are now endeavoring to hook these two efforts together under the general supervision of the director of sales. I do not care whether his name is Hare or Smith; it makes no difference whatsoever; but I do know that you can not get this work done without paying good salaries and getting the right men to come here and do it. The war is over now. Men who are worth good salaries are working for private corporations. You can not expect them to come to Washington and spend two or three years—for this work will take two or three years, Senators—and work for a dollar a year. They can not afford to do it. They did it, many of them, during the war, when the Government was in an emergency; but you can not expect them to do it now. You have got to pay them; and if you do not get the right kind of men, the taxpayers of this country will lose millions and millions of dollars in the inefficient sale of this enormous supply of goods.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not press the point of order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KING. I understand that some of the agencies of the Government have been disposing of supplies which they have. For instance, a large number of horses have been sold—and, by the way, they have been sold for a great deal less than the market price. What the Senator from Kansas has stated is true, according to information which has come to me. I understand that automobiles and various other supplies of the Government have been sold. Has that been done without authority? And if there was authority, why may not the same authority which has justified the sale of the articles to which I have referred be continued to dispose of the remainder of the supplies which the Government has on hand?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The articles that have been sold thus far are but a drop in the bucket. As to the horses to which the Senator from Utah refers, they were sold very largely on the say-so of the Army officers in charge of the auxiliary remount depots. They were sold, so we are told, in order to save the cost of feeding them and taking care of them generally. I think 163,000 animals have been sold. Of course, they were sold for less than the sum paid for them; but had they been kept all last winter and all this spring, as horsemen say, they would simply have been eating their heads off; and so the Government sold them.

I am not certain, but I do not believe that Mr. Hare, the director of sales, had much to do with the sale.

Now, as to automobiles: The Congress passed a law last year, I think, instructing the Secretary of War to turn over to the Secretary of Agriculture all the trucks and automobiles that were not needed by the War Department. There are no automobiles being sold by the director of sales. They are all being handed over to the Agricultural Department; and it is a fact that thousands of them are exposed to the air and are in great accumulation, parked in great numbers, waiting for the Agricultural Department, as we understand, to take them away and distribute them all over the country for the purpose of aiding in the building of good roads. That, I believe, was the purpose of the act of Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? The Senator states that the Government has sold 100,000 horses. This bill carries an item of $1,000,000 for the purchase of 72,000 more horses. These horses were purchased, according to the testimony given at the hearings, for around

$190 apiece. They were sold around $100 apiece, losing about $90 a horse. Does the Senator think that is good business policy?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I could tell if I had seen the horses.

Mr. HARRISON. That was the average price of the horses, as I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I interrupt to say this about the horses: One hundred and sixty-three thousand horses have been sold at greatly reduced figures, much less than the Senator from Mississippi states, as I understand the testimony; and, instead of $1,000,000 being appropriated in the bill for the purchase of other horses, there is about $2,000,000 carried in this bill for the purchase of horses. Any sales department that will permit a thing of that sort to happen—the sale of 163,000 horses at sacrifice prices and a request made to buy $2,000,000 worth more of horses—is doing something very unusual, and it seems to me to be poor business. We ought to take that kind of a sales agent or that kind of a representative of the Government out of his place.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President——

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator should be fair about the matter. As I said before, I hold no brief for Mr. Hare; but I venture the assertion that the director of sales had nothing to do with the sale of the horses.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought that was what he was for. I thought that was why he was paid this salary of $25,000 a year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment. They were sold before his office was organized. They were sold, commencing immediately after the armistice, and dribbled away through the winter. My information is that the director of sales had little or nothing to do with it; that the Army officers themselves sold the horses, and largely at public auction. I think they were sold at public auction. Now, of course, I understand the intensity of the feeling of the Senator from Tennessee; but I do think he should be fair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to be absolutely fair, and I am not going to be any other way.

Mr. BECKHAM and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, and then I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BECKHAM. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if it did not develop in the testimony that a large number of these horses were sold over in France?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall that, but I suspect that that is true.

Mr. BECKHAM. And was it not also testified that the cost of keeping a horse—forage, feed, and so forth—amounted to a little less than $200 a year?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is unquestionably true; but I see very little difference in the feeding of one horse and the feeding of another. We sell 163,000 horses in the spring, and buy $2,000,000 worth more in the summer. I do not see that there is a great saving there.

Mr. BECKHAM. Was it not testified before our committee that it was considered a much better business proposition for the Government to sell these horses, especially in France, and save the cost of their upkeep, and buy other horses when the time came?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I understand that the statement was made there that it was better business policy, but that is exactly what I am objecting to. I know perfectly well that it is not good business policy for the Government to sell this great number of horses at sacrifice prices, at about one-third to one-half of what they cost, and buy other horses in their place at very large prices. I do not care what the testimony is on the subject; you can not convince me of that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Possibly the Government failed to get as much as these horses were worth; but I feel that under the circumstances they got a very good price at $90 a head. When the armistice was signed the Government in the remount division were in possession of 188,000 horses. Some of those horses, I understand, were in France, some in the United States. They had been through the tremendous pressure of the war. Many of them were in poor condition. Some of them, it is true, were not. The cost of forage and substance alone for those horses was estimated at $200 a year. That did not include the care of the horses by the men. Possibly $100 to $150 more should be added to the cost of their upkeep; and, therefore, they sold those horses down to 83,000, at an average of $90 a head. It may be that they were sacrificed; but the Army believed that it was better economy to sell those horses and save their upkeep. Then, when the question of reorganizing came, having 83,000 left, when they needed some 36,000 horses for their Cavalry alone, finding that in those 83,000 horses they had only 12,000, it was necessary for them to buy 24,000 to equip the Army, as estimated in this bill; and so with pack mules, and so with the mules of the Transport Service. Therefore, they are asking for an additional appropriation for new horses. Possibly these horses were not fit. Possibly they could get a better class of horses by paying $190. Possibly the horses should have been condemned and sold. I believe they should; and I believe the Army officers acted wisely when they sold those horses.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that these horses sold at about $90 a head.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am informed that that is so.

Mr. BORAH. They did not have any of those horses around near Washington, did they?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know where they sold them. I think possibly they sold some of them in France and some in the South.

Mr. BORAH. How much a head does the Senator estimate they will have to pay for the horses they are going to buy?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The bill provides that they shall pay $190 apiece.

Mr. BORAH. Well, they will be fine horses. You can not buy horses for $190 a head around this region. I do not know where they are going to buy them. Where do they expect to buy them?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think they are to be bought in Texas and in the West.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the argument is sound that these horses were sold so as to prevent their eating their heads off, every farmer in the country would sell his horses at some time during the year at a sacrifice, at something like one-third of what they are worth. The kind of horses the Government got $75 to $100 for they paid somewhere in the neighborhood of $225 for, involving a sacrifice of about 50 to 66⅔ per cent, and almost in the same breath, while all of these horses are sold, here is a provision in the bill which provides for the purchase of $2,000,000 worth of horses at top prices. Now, I doubt the wisdom of having these horses at all. Surely, we have enough in the Army already. We have somewhere in the neighborhood of 88,000 horses now.

Mr. BORAH. We will not need cavalry if we have the league of nations, will we?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think so; certainly, not to the extent that we needed it before, and we all know that cavalry as an important arm of the service is becoming of less consequence all the time.

I do not believe this matter ought to be permitted to go into the bill. I will say in all frankness that I am not objecting to the appropriation for the sale of this property. What I am objecting to is putting this whole matter in the hands of a claim agent for a gas company as an expert at $25,000 or $30,000 a year when our report of what he has actually done is the kind that we have before us. If he has not done it himself, he is responsible or should be responsible for it.

Therefore, this being clearly, beyond the shadow of a doubt, legislation on an appropriation bill, I make the point of order against it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will withdraw his point of order if the words "personal services and" are stricken from the proviso?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I can not withdraw the point of order, for this reason: I have taken up this matter and have had this discussion about it in the hope that we may call the attention of the people to it. Remember, Senators, that this is one of the most important transactions before Congress at this time. It is the sale of two and a half billion dollars' worth of property that we are putting in the hands of a claim agent for a gas company as an expert, with the reports that we have as to what he has already done in the matter of horses and the matter of airplanes, and giving him twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars a year, as proposed in this proviso.

My purpose is to call the attention of the country sharply to what is being done, if I can, in the hope that the whole Government may be saved ultimately, that its rights may be protected just a little. The proviso as originally framed was fixed so that this director could be interested in any kind of

horse raising or otherwise as director of sales. I do not know whether he is or not; I have no knowledge of that. I will say that it is outrageous in practice and immoral in theory.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, just a word as to the horse question before we leave it. The Senator ought to consider one point that has not been touched upon which is perfectly familiar to horse growers. Horses are not accepted in the Army until they are 4 or 5 years old, and their life in ordinary work covers only three or four or possibly five years, and in the Army generally only for an average of a year or two, and when in active warfare or on border raids the average is but months instead of years. These horses were bought some years ago. They have done active service, and a great many of them have been examined, condemned, and ordered sold at auction, the usual way. They were older than were desired for future use. When it came to selling them off for about one-half their cost, they were doing very well to get rid of these horses and get rid of the feeding they would require for a long period before again needed.

This proposed appropriation is not for to-day. It is for the entire 12 months following, and it is to buy partly young horses of 2 or 3 years old and put them at some of the remount camps, buying them at lower prices and training them for service until they are 4 years old.

The Senator must remember that horses have to be used in service in the Artillery, while the Senator speaks only of the Cavalry. There is all the luggage, ammunition, implements, and supplies that have to be moved, a great deal of it in parts of the country where you can not well use motors, and we are always short of motors. The horses are used to move freight, and they are used in the Artillery. Artillery is useless without horses. The consequence is we have got to provide for the future and to provide horses not only for the Cavalry but large draft horses for this purpose just as well as for the Cavalry. We have to have them young and vigorous. We do not want worn-out, infected, and condemned horses.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not a fact that the Government is now selling horses?

Mr. WARREN. I presume so; and it always will be selling them. It always should sell them from time to time as they become inefficient.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think we ought to have a larger Cavalry force in time of peace and, as my good friend the Senator from Idaho suggested a little while ago, especially in view of the fact that we are going to have a league of nations, does he think we ought to have more Cavalry horses in time of peace than in time of war?

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator think we are going to have a league of nations and that it is going to provide that we shall have no army anywhere?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is going to provide an army, but I hope it does not provide an army of Cavalry to take care of us in peace times larger than during war times.

Mr. WARREN. So far as local use of the Army is concerned and so far as use in the past four years has been concerned, it is Cavalry almost entirely on our border that is needed instead of Infantry. Furthermore, cavalrymen to-day are trained as infantrymen, and all they have to do is to dismount at any place, put a guard on the horses, and enter into action as Infantry.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not disagree with the Senator at all about the question of Cavalry on the border, for we all know it is important. I do not disagree with him about that, but what I do disagree with him about is the purchase and keeping of apparently a greater Cavalry force in time of peace than in time of war.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator overlooks the fact that this is providing money to buy what may be necessary all through the United States and abroad, and for the next fiscal year to have horses, many of them bought when 2 or 3 years of age, for development and future use. These can not be used until they are 4 or 5 years of age, and when they are about 8 to 10 years of age they must be disposed of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to be led away from the principal point. The horse question we shall probably always have with us. The point of order I made goes to the fitness and capability of this man by the name of C. Willing Hare, who seems to be very willing to have a Government position and hold another position at the same time with a private company. My proposition is to know his qualifications for selling this $2,500,000,000 worth of property, and why he should have this extraordinary salary without confirmation by the Senate, and without any string on him at all.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, regarding the qualifications of Mr. Hare, I never saw Mr. Hare until he appeared before the committee the other day. He made a very favorable impression upon me, particularly when he presented to the Senate subcommittee a letter in which he stated his position in regard to his appointment as sales agent for the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I decline to yield unless the Senator wants to ask me a question, and then I shall be very glad to answer the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is not this proviso put in simply and solely for the purpose of taking care of Mr. Hare?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Not only Mr. Hare, but his assistants and his organization. Mr. Hare is not a sales agent of a gas company. He is president of a gas company. He is a man of reliability and stability and character in Philadelphia. He is a man of executive and organization ability. When he came here early in the war, he was 47 years of age and could not serve in the line. He organized a sales agency and a training camp association for the benefit of the Army to inspect and supervise the camps. He had associated with him men prominent in all activities of life throughout the country. When that work ceased he desired to go back to private life, to his business affairs. When he came here he was earning $29,000 a year, and when Assistant Secretary of War Crowell asked him to come here, he asked his company to give him a leave of absence, which they granted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In just one moment. They allowed him $15,000 a year, which was his regular salary. The Government paid him $4,000 a year. After the armistice was signed, about December 1, Mr. Crowell asked him if he would temporarily supervise, as assistant director of munitions, the work of disposing of surplus property. Gen. Jamieson was appointed director of sales in December, 1918, but resigned shortly thereafter on account of ill health. Mr. Hare says, in a statement submitted to the committee:

> A salary of $4,000 was attached to the position of the assistant director of munitions, but, in view of the fact that I was sacrificing considerably more than this on account of remaining in Washington, and further in view of the fact that my company had no connection whatever with the Government, neither Mr. Crowell nor myself saw the slightest impropriety in my accepting the salary attached to the position of the assistant director of munitions.
>
> After Gen. Jamison's resignation, Mr. Crowell asked me if I would assume the two positions, namely, that of assistant director of munitions and director of sales. I told him that I would do so, desiring to return to my business by the 1st of April. When that time arrived Mr. Crowell asked me if he could make the necessary salary arrangements and pay me $25,000 a year would I be willing to stay. I told him that he would have to take this matter up with my company, which he did, and the attached letter, marked "Exhibit A," was addressed to the president of the company, dated April 3, 1919. On April 8 the general manager of the company wrote to Mr. Crowell stating that they had arranged to give me leave of absence for a period not exceeding one year, without pay, with the understanding that at any time within that period my position with the company would be open to me. Copy of this letter is attached and marked "Exhibit B."
>
> Mr. Crowell therefore addressed the attached memorandum, marked "Exhibit C," to Gen. Lord setting up a tentative organization at the salaries designated in the memorandum.

All that is in the hearings. Then Mr. Hare stated as follows to the committee, and it is the statement of a straightforward, direct, upright business man, which I believe Mr. Hare to be, and a very capable organization man:

> I wish very emphatically to state that all that I have said in my testimony before the Military Affairs Committee of the House in support of the present type of overhead organizations has nothing whatever to do with the fact as to whether I remain as director of sales or not. I am here at a pecuniary sacrifice and at a greater sacrifice that can not be measured in money; separated from my family and from the natural enjoyments of home life, but I am emphatically of the opinion that it would be a serious mistake to attempt to turn this supervising control over to the Army or to attempt to have the work done except by business men specially qualified for the work.
>
> I have found it exceedingly difficult to persuade men engaged in active business, who would be qualified to aid me in my work, to leave their business, no matter what salary was offered to them, and if the salaries are reduced it will be practically impossible. The work is temporary in character and the financial sacrifice entailed on any active business man at this time is more than the average man feels that he can afford, and I do not approve of the principle of dollar-a-year men, as they naturally feel that they are not under the same obligation to abide by the rules of an office than if they were being paid an adequate salary by the Government.

Mr. Hare has formed an organization of business men. He has sold a considerable amount of property at very fair prices. I do not think he had anything to do with the sale of the horses, but he has disposed of war munitions, Army property, and I

understand his record has been very satisfactory. I think Mr. Hare is a very capable business man.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does Mr. Hare testify there that he was getting $29,000 a year?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; he gets $15,000 salary and $14,000 from other sources.

Mr. McKELLAR. He testifies here that he was getting $15,000 a year salary, and he makes no statement further than that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This is a signed statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is quite a difference between $29,000 a year and $15,000 a year, as testified by him a short time ago. However, that is neither here nor there.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I read to the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This is Mr. Hare's own statement:

The company continued me on my salary of $15,000 per year, but I had to give up an additional earning capacity in the neighborhood of $14,000 a year, and I paid all my traveling expenses.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will put Mr. Hare's testimony in the RECORD. I would like to have it there. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. C. W. HARE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF MUNITIONS AND DIRECTOR OF SALES FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in order to explain the necessity of this appropriation and to state clearly what the appropriation is to be used for, I should like to go back a little bit as to how the organization originally started. After the armistice the Government found in its possession in this country approximately $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus supplies, and the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, was charged with the responsibility of finding some organization for the proper disposal of those supplies. He asked me at that time when I was assistant director of munitions if I would take general supervision over the matter. Gen. Jamieson was appointed director of sales, but he resigned shortly thereafter on account of ill health, and Mr. Crowell then asked me if I would assume the dual position and I explained to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House why such an organization was necessary, but there have been some misconceptions, I might say, in regard to the nature of the work, and why I was selected, and why the salaries were paid, and with your permission I should like to read into the record a statement which I think will put the whole matter before you in its proper light. When a salary such as $25,000 is asked for as compensation for the director of sales it is perfectly proper that the country should know why a particular man has been selected and unfortunately I am placed in a very awkward position of talking in my own behalf. It would have been the duty of Mr. Crowell, who employed me, to explain this, but he is abroad, and I have been asked by the Secretary to go into the matter very fully.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, your salary as director is $25,000?

Mr. HARE. $25,000, and I will show you why it is that and why other salaries that are being asked for are as they are. [Reads:]

STATEMENT BY C. W. HARE.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DIRECTOR OF MUNITIONS,
Munitions Building, Washington, D. C., June 16, 1919.

There have been so many misstatements made in regard to my possible qualifications for the position of director of sales that in the absence of the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, I feel impelled to lay the facts before you which probably influenced Mr. Crowell in asking me to assume the position of director of sales.

My first employment was with the Public Ledger in 1893 as a reporter, advancing within a year or two to the position of assistant dramatic editor.

In 1898 I left the Public Ledger to accept a position with the United Gas Improvement Co., my first work with them being at the complaint desk, where I had to answer complaints made by our consumers in regard to any misunderstandings which they might have had with the company, settle bills of disputes, etc. In a year's time I was given charge of one of our district offices where I had to take charge of all the office work that came in touch with our customers, namely, the answering of complaints, the selling of gas appliances, the receiving of money in the payment of bills, etc.

When the company acquired certain trolley interests I was made general claim agent for the company and organized a very large claim department, having entire charge of the settlement of all claims in connection with trolley-car accidents for the Connecticut Railway & Lighting Co., which operated lines throughout Connecticut; the Rhode Island Co., which operated the trolley system in Providence, as well as all claims for damages in our gas and electric properties. This naturally brought me in very close touch with all classes of people and gave me invaluable training along certain lines.

In 1908 the company decided to go intensively after business, and appointed me manager of the new business department in charge of all sales of appliances throughout the more than 40 properties in which the company was interested. I not only had to organize a department for the actual sale of the various appliances which consumers of gas and electricity need, but in those properties in which we were in competition with the electric interests had to devote a great deal of time to the work of developing plans and appliances to meet this competition.

I organized thoroughly up-to-date salesrooms in every city in which we operated, and in Philadelphia leased a large store on the principal retail street of the city, and by intensive sales methods succeeded in increasing our business all along the line. I organized a large advertising department and a large maintenance department for the proper care of our lighting business.

In 1913 I was elected president of the National Commercial Gas Association, and the sales policies adopted by my company were gradually followed almost universally.

Prior to 1917 I had taken a great interest in preparedness as a director of the National Security League and a director of the Military Training Camps Association. I was a great believer in the Plattsburg idea and went through the prescribed course of one month's training with a great deal of interest. When our country went to war, although 47 years of age, I naturally was very anxious to go to a training camp, but my physical condition would not permit of it.

My company very generously therefore granted me a leave of absence which enabled me to head a small committee of training camps men who, with the permission of the Secretary of War, made reports on the officers' training camps and National Army camps as they were developed, in an effort to speed up our preparations. The company continued me on my salary of $15,000 per year, but I had to give up an additional earning capacity in the neighborhood of $14,000 a year and paid all my traveling expenses. This work continued until August 1, 1918, when I was asked by the Assistant Secretary of War to make my headquarters in Washington and form a larger committee, national in scope, to carry on the same general line of work. The following is a list of the members of this committee: Edgar N. Wrightington, vice president Boston Consolidated Gas Co., Boston; Henry S. Crew, President National Union Bank, Boston; D. D. Jackson, professor of engineering Columbia University, New York City; J. B. Myers, commercial agent U. G. I. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Edwin F. Johnson, manufacturer, Atlanta, Ga.; A. P. Coles, real estate dealer and banker, El Paso, Tex.; Fred A. Jones, consulting engineer, Dallas, Tex.; J. W. Billingsley, consulting engineer, New Orleans, La.; L. E. Patterson, real estate dealer, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Isham Randolph, consulting engineer, Chicago, Ill.; Donald R. Cotton, district sales manager, Illinois Steel Corporation, St. Paul, Minn.; Sewall D. Andrews, vice president Minneapolis Drug Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; John D. Towne, vice president Walden W. Shaw Livery Co., Chicago, Ill.; Geo. D. Roper, president Eclipse Gas Stove Co., Rockford, Ill.; B. S. Read, vice president Southwestern Bell Telephone System, St. Louis, Mo.; Charles S. Pillsbury, president Pillsbury Flour Mills, Minneapolis, Minn.; C. S. Walker, president Kratzer Carriage Co., Des Moines, Iowa; W. B. T. Belt, vice president Northwestern Telephone Exchange Co., Omaha, Nebr.; H. A. Rhodes, merchant, Tacoma, Wash; Dixwell Davenport, general agent National Union Fire Insurance Co.; San Francisco, Calif.; E. E. Brownell, merchant, San Francisco, Calif.; A. B. MacBeth, vice president Southern California Gas Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

About December 1, Mr. Crowell asked me if I would temporarily supervise, as assistant director of munitions, the work of disposing of surplus property, and Gen. Jamison was appointed director of sales in December, 1918, but resigned shortly thereafter on account of ill health.

A salary of $4,000 was attached to the position of the assistant director of munitions, but, in view of the fact that I was sacrificing considerably more than this on account of remaining in Washington, and further in view of the fact that my company had no connection whatever with the Government, neither Mr. Crowell nor myself saw the slightest impropriety in my accepting the salary attached to the position of the assistant director of munitions.

After Gen. Jamison's resignation, Mr. Crowell asked me if I would assume the two positions, namely, that of assistant director of munitions and director of sales. I told him that I would do so, desiring to return to my business by the 1st of April. When that time arrived Mr. Crowell asked me, if he could make the necessary salary arrangements and pay me $25,000 a year, would I be willing to stay. I told him he would have to take this matter up with my company, which he did, and the attached letter, marked "Exhibit A," was addressed to the president of the company, dated April 3, 1919. On April 8 the general manager of the company wrote to Mr. Crowell stating that they had arranged to give me a leave of absence for a period not exceeding one year, without pay, with the understanding that at any time within that period my position with the company would be open to me. Copy of this letter is attached and marked "Exhibit B."

Mr. Crowell therefore addressed the attached memorandum, marked "Exhibit C," to Gen. Lord setting up a tentative organization at the salaries designated in the memorandum.

I wish very emphatically to state that all that I have said in my testimony before the Military Affairs Committee of the House in support of the present type of overhead organizations has nothing whatever to do with the fact as to whether I remain as director of sales or not, I am here at a pecuniary sacrifice and at a greater sacrifice that can be measured in money, separated from my family and from the natural enjoyments of home life; but I am emphatically of the opinion that it would be a serious mistake to attempt to turn this supervising control over to the Army, or to attempt to have the work done except by business men specially qualified for the work.

I have found it exceedingly difficult to persuade men engaged in active business, who would be qualified to aid me in my work, to leave their business, no matter what salary was offered to them, and if the salaries are reduced it will be practically impossible. The work is temporary in character and the financial sacrifice entailed on any active business man at this time is more than the average man feels that he can afford, and I do not approve of the principle of dollar-a-year men, as they naturally feel that they are not under the same obligation to abide by the rules of an office than if they were being paid an adequate salary by the Government.

One of my chief assistants, Col. Fred Glover, is leaving on July 1 to accept an important business position and feels that no matter what salary I was able to offer him that he could not afford to remain.

I believe, however, that with the proper energy applied it will be possible to keep together a reasonably strong organization, provided it meets with the approval of the Congress. As has been explained to you, the reason for asking for a larger sum of money than that appropriated by the Assistant Secretary of War is due to the fact that it has recently developed that it is important to create a sales organization on the other side of the water to aid in the dispoal of some of our vast surplus overseas.

The functions of the director of sales office are to direct and coordinate the sales work of the various bureaus of the War Department, and to this end every sale, no matter in what amount, must be reported to the director of sales office. If the amount of money involved in a sale is more than $100,000, request for clearance must first be made before the sale can be proceeded with. My clearance board meets every day

and gives the closest scrutiny to every suggested sale. Where large amounts of material have to be disposed of, meetings are held with the industry affected in order to work out the best method to obtain the maximum results in money for the Government with the least disturbance to the business conditions of the country possible, and many contracts have been arranged with the industry affected through which they agree to market our material together with theirs, paying us market prices therefor. Other classes of material are sold at public auction or by sealed bids, and the materials disposed of to the highest bidder.

It is, of course, obvious that in such a large enterprise as the disposal of billions of dollars' worth of property amounts to, that every safeguard should surround the work to insure the faithful carrying out of the policy adopted, and to this end we are working in the closest cooperation with the Bureau of Military Intelligence, and I attach hereto one of the many orders issued by the director of sales, marked "Exhibit D," emphasizing the importance of throwing around the work certain necessary safeguards.

I am also attaching hereto a statement from Maj. Senior, marked "Exhibit E," showing what intensive work has succeeded in doing in the way of securing a better price for certain rifle and hand grenades.

Also a statement by Maj. Mercer, marked "Exhibit F," showing savings of more than $4,000,000. Also a statement by Mr. Gleason, marked "Exhibit G," showing savings of $80,650. I am also attaching a statement from Maj. Harvey, marked "Exhibit H," which shows a very interesting piece of work.

I have simply selected a few examples from the many branches of the work going on in the Director of Sales office to indicate the possibilities of securing better results for the Government in the return to be had from this surplus property, provided a business organization of this type is maintained, and will be glad to furnish you any detailed information which you may require.

Yours, very sincerely, C. W. HARE, *Director of Sales.*

—

EXHIBIT A.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
DIRECTOR OF MUNITIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1919.

Mr. SAMUEL T. BODINE,
President United Gas Improvement Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. BODINE: I have been charged by the President with the responsibility of disposing of surplus stocks held by the Army, and, as you are aware, have appointed Mr. C. W. Hare assistant director of munitions and director of sales to personally take charge of this very important work for the department.

In view of the fact that the Government has in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus stocks to dispose of, it is of the utmost importance that such disposal should be made under the direction of a properly qualified personnel. Mr. Hare's experience and ability are such that he is peculiarly well qualified to direct this work, and during the past few months has developed an organization and accomplished certain definite results which are so satisfactory that I am exceedingly anxious to retain him in the service of the Government for approximately another year, during which period I believe the vast majority of our surplus can be disposed of.

Mr. Hare has told me that he has only been able to render service to the Government through the generosity of the United Gas Improvement Co. in continuing him on its pay roll, and I, of course, appreciate that now that the war is over the Government has no right to expect the business concerns of the country to continue loaning their valuable men to the Government.

For this reason the Secretary of War and myself have arranged to pay the necessary salaries out of proper appropriations in order to command the services of business men at somewhere near their real worth. It will, however, even under this condition be exceedingly difficult to secure the proper personnel unless the civil employer is willing to hold the individual's job open for him at the expiration of his term of service with the Government.

I am, therefore, writing to you to express my earnest hope that you will be able to permit the Government to avail itself of Mr. Hare's valuable services for a period not to exceed one year, the Government, of course, to pay him a proper salary, with the assurance that at the end of this period of Government service Mr. Hare will find his position with your organization still open for him.

While this is perhaps an unusual request, I feel impelled to state that unless the disposal of this surplus property of the Government can be placed under the direction of trained minds properly qualified to undertake the work that the Government will not secure by many millions of dollars the amount it should reasonably expect to secure if the work is undertaken by men of Mr. Hare's ability and experience.

I hope very much, therefore, that you will be willing to accede to my request.

Yours, very sincerely, BENEDICT CROWELL,
The Assistant Secretary of War.

—

EXHIBIT B.

THE UNITED GAS IMPROVEMENT CO.,
Philadelphia, April 8, 1919.

Mr. BENEDICT CROWELL,
The Assistant Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CROWELL: Your letter of the 3d instant, addressed to our president, Mr. Bodine, has been referred to me for answer.

After careful consideration we have decided to accede to your request to permit the Government to avail itself of Mr. Hare's services in the disposal of surplus stocks for a period of approximately one year, and we have therefore arranged to give Mr. Hare a leave of absence without pay for a period not exceeding one year, with the understanding that at any time within that period when he feels that he has accomplished his task, and you can release him, he shall return to his position and duties with this company.

It is a great gratification to us to know that Mr. Hare's services have been of such great value to the Government during the period of the war, and we trust that he may be equally successful in the work you are now assigning to him.

Yours, very truly,

LEWIS LILLIE, *General Manager.*

EXHIBIT D.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES,
Washington, April 18, 1919.

Director of Sales Information Bulletin, No. 5.
Subject: Protecting Government interests in connection with sales.

1. The attention of the various selling organizations is invited to the care which must be exercised throughout their field forces in seeing that there is no fraud or collusion in connection with the selling of material.

2. Instances have occurred recently where prospective bidders have attempted to influence some one connected with the sale in their interests. For example: In one particular case a certain bidder endeavored to arrange with the man in charge of the opening of bids to accept a blank bid, and, after other bids had been opened, to fill in the price a few cents above the highest bid submitted. The man in charge of opening these bids apparently accepted the corrupt bidders' suggestion, but actually turned the matter over to the Military Intelligence, with the result that the entire scheme was fully exposed.

3. This is not the only case that has actually happened and it becomes extremely important to surround sales with every safeguard. Officers in charge of this matter are directed to make this a subject of a bulletin to their field forces, calling attention to these various matters and urging not only that every possible care be taken but that the retained records in every sale indicate clearly that such care was taken, and that the particular sale was made to the best interests of the Government and in accordance with the principles laid down by the director of sales.

4. The officers in charge of the various selling organizations will see—

(a) That all advertisements of sales give an exact and full description of the articles to be sold.

(b) That this advertisement and distribution of proposals are made to all possible bidders.

(c) They shall keep in touch with the market for the kind of goods to be sold, either through the materials section of the director of sales' office, trade papers, or such other means as he may be able to use.

(d) They must obtain information regarding the standing of the bidders. This can be done through either Dun or Bradstreet reports and other channels.

(e) In the event only a few bids are received, they must see that there has been no "ring" or "clique" formed to fix the price.

(f) They should see that, in the event scrap or second-hand material is sold, no new material is included in it, either through fraud or inadvertence, and that no more than the specified amount is delivered to the purchaser.

(g) Bids must be submitted in a sealed envelope clearly marked on the face: "Bid on advertisement No. — for (material). To be opened on (date)."

5. So that an adequate supervision of these sales may be always maintained, officers in charge of various district-selling organizations will designate an officer in their command whose duties will be as outlined above.

6. The officer so designated will see to it that any matter which appears to be irregular is referred at once to the local intelligence officer or to the Director of Military Intelligence, attention M. I. 13, Washington, D. C., in order that a full and complete investigation may be made.

7. The names of the officers thus designated will be reported to the director of sales, Washington, D. C., at once.

C. W. HARE, *Director of Sales.*

—

EXHIBIT E.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES,
Washington, June 16, 1919.

Memorandum to Mr. Hare.

1. Below is a brief digest of the material which this office has been instrumental in securing better prices for than the Ordnance Salvage Board contemplated.

2. Tanks: Two 6-ton tanks were regarded as scrap, and the Ordnance Department figured they would be willing and glad to sell them for anything up to $1,000. These tanks were sold through the efforts of this office at $3,000; minimum total saving, $4,000.

3. Gas hand grenades: Approximately 700,000 gas hand grenades were to be sold as scrap at approximately $0.0125 each. This entire quantity has been sold by this office to one purchaser at $0.09 each. This sale was made by suggesting to the purchaser how these grenades might be sold as souvenirs in the form of savings banks, and exhibiting sample bank.

Proceeds as souvenirs	$63,000
Proceeds as scrap	8,750
Total saving	54,250

4: Defensive hand grenades: This section had a small number of hand grenades made into savings banks, and exhibiting same, have sold approximately 10,000 to large concerns as samples at from $0.10 to $0.25 each. It is believed that over 1,000,000 can be sold at these prices. These savings banks were brought to the attention of the Treasury Department, and I am informed by the Treasury Department, Savings Division, that they expect to take our entire remaining surplus for distribution to school children through the Federal reserve banks. There is a surplus of hand grenades of approximately 10,000,000.

Average proceeds as souvenirs	$1,800
Proceeds if sold as scrap	150
Total saving	1,650

5. Rifle grenades: This section has had sample rifle grenades converted into cigar lighters, which have proved so attractive that a sale has been made to one firm of 1,000,000 at $0.03 each. The Ordnance Department expected to dispose of the entire surplus of rifle grenades, 15,000,000, as scrap at $0.0075 each.

1,000,000 sold as souvenirs	$30,000
Scrap value	7,500
Total saving	22,500

6. Gas masks: Previous to the regulations by this section on the sale of gas masks, approximately 12,500 gas masks were sold at the camps at approximately $0.125 each, and 5,000 at $0.31 each. This matter

was investigated by this section, with the result that orders were issued establishing minimum prices at which gas masks were to be sold as follows: New gas masks, $7 each; used gas masks, $1 each. Since that time, approximately 800 gas masks have been sold at $7 each and 5,000 used gas masks at from $1 to $2 each.

Proceeds on gas masks	$12,600
Average proceeds if sold as formerly	1,100
	11,500

7. Tractors: Thirty 45-horsepower Holt tractors were located at Fort Sill. Three of them were condemned and were to be sold to George L. Miller for $500, $600, and $825, respectively. This sale was stopped by this office, and investigation instituted. I found that these tractors cost the Government approximately $5,800 each, and that in their present condition they should be worth $3,000 each. The three tractors which were nearly sold are now being transferred to other divisions of the War Department and are valued at $9,000.

Forty-eight Gray wide drive drum tractors, reported surplus by the Ordnance Department, costing the Government $105,000, were to be sold back to the Gray Tractor Co. at $50,000. This office negotiated with the Gray Tractor Co., and their offer was raised to $65,000. This was not accepted, and the Gray Tractor Co. were to make a better offer. Three of these tractors were sold through this office to the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce, for use in connection with the seal industry. These were sold at the cost price to the War Department. Practically all of the rest have been transferred to the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads.

Twenty-eight Cleveland tractors were appraised by the Ordnance Department at $400 each, and sales were being made at the appraised value. This office stopped these sales, and all but two of these tractors have now been transferred to the Department of Agriculture. The remaining two have been sold by this office for $600 each.

Minimum saving on sale of tanks	$4,000
Saving on gas and hand grenades	54,250
Saving on defensive hand grenades	1,650
Saving on rifle grenades	22,500
Average saving on gas masks	11,500
Saving on second-hand Holt tractors	7,075
Saving on Gray tractors	32,000
Approximate saving on Cleveland tractors	4,500
Approximate saving on Holt tractors	640,000
	777,475

PHILIP H. SENIOR,
Major, United States Army, Chief of Section, Ordnance and Ordnance Stores.

—

EXHIBIT F.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES,
Washington, June 17, 1919.

From: Maj. A. L. Mercer, Chief Raw Materials and Scrap Section.
To: Mr. C. W. Hare, Director of Sales.
Subject: Reports on activities of Raw Materials and Scrap Section.

1. The following memoranda are issued from this office regularly:
(a) Semiweekly price sheet.
(b) List of inquiries.
(c) Reports of surplus.
(d) Requirements.
(e) Raw materials and scrap memorandum.

2. The following conferences have been held:
(a) Steel.
American Board of Scrap Iron Dealers.
Committee representing steel producers.
(b) Nonferrous metals.
American Zinc Institute.
Brass Statistical Exchange.
Committee representing copper producers.
National Association of Waste Material Dealers.
Platinum group.
(c) Chemicals.
Sulphur.
Importers of sodium nitrate.
Alcohol producers.
Acid manufacturers.
Caustic soda producers.
Soda ash producers.
Phenol.

3. The following sums of money have been saved to the Government through the activities of this section:

(a) Nonferrous metals.

(1) Sale of 449,165 pounds of grade A spelter located in the Toronto district at $6.25 per hundredweight disapproved and Ordnance instructed to get higher price, resulting in a sale at $7.25 and a net increase to the War Department of		$44,916.50
(2) Sale of 6,500,000 pounds of lead, located in Baltimore, Md., to the National Lead Co., at $4.25 per hundredweight, refused, and Ordnance instructed to get better prices based on an allowance for loading and freight not to exceed 45 cents per hundredweight, as approved by Mr. Cornell of the lead committee. Latest offers—$5 per hundredweight, and a net increase to the War Department of		48,750.00
Total saved on nonferrous metals		93,666.50

(b) Ferrous metals.

(1) The sale at Morgan, N. J., of 25,000,000 pounds of shell steel, various sizes, 643,000 pounds of copper bands attached, total 25,643,000 pounds. Sale price $8.96 per gross ton on the ground. The sale was readjusted and the following prices obtained:		
11,160 gross tons steel, $14 gross ton	$156,240.00	
643,000 pounds of copper, $14.12 per hundredweight	90,791.60	
Total receipts	247,031.60	
Saving		144,457.00
(2) The sale of 15,000 gross tons of shell forgings, located at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., to the National Exporting Co.:		
Original offer refused by this office, per gross ton	$13.50	
Final offer, per gross ton	14.50	
Saving		$15,000.00
(3) The sale of 5,500 tons of 82 mm. shell steel forgings, Cleveland district:		
Best offer refused by this office, per gross ton	$15.00	
Final offer, per gross ton	15.25	
Saving		1,375.00
Total saved on ferrous metals		160,832.00

(c) Chemicals, acids, and explosives.

(1) Sale by Chemical Warfare Service of 45,000 pounds of sodium cyanide held up until we could get better prices, resulting in a net increase over that of the first offer of	8,000.00
(2) When we first negotiated with the American importers with regard to the disposition of our surplus nitrate of soda they stated that we would be mighty lucky if we got $3 per hundred pounds, and they thought possibly we would not get more than $2.50 per hundred pounds. Since then we have already sold 75 per cent of our surplus nitrate of soda in this country, amounting to 106,000 tons, at a price of $4.07½ per hundred pounds, which would indicate an enormous saving, approximately	3,000,000.00
(3) On caustic soda we have a bid price of $1.90 per hundred pounds, which price was raised to $2.85 through the efforts of this department. Approximate saving	49,970.00
(4) On 28,000,000 pounds of phenol the best price offered, until the matter was taken up directly by the office, was approximately 6 cents per pound. We are contracting for its sale at a minimum price of 9 cents per pound. Approximate saving	840,000.00
(5) The best price obtained until this office took charge of the sale of soda ash was $1.20 per hundred pounds. At present a contract has been offered to this department which will net $1.60 per hundred pounds. Approximate saving	21,272.00
(6) We have practically sold all of our surplus benzol at a price of from 1 cent to 1½ cents above cost.	
(7) The Boston office solicited bids on 1,640,000 pounds of mixed acid, and after trying for over 60 days to dispose of it reported that the highest price they could get was $25 per ton. This office took charge and sold it for $100 per ton. Approximate saving	61,500.00
(8) The Boston office had 2,955,000 pounds of mixed acid to be sold for which they could obtain only $25 per ton. This office obtained $71 per ton. Approximate saving	65,642.00
(9) The Nixon Nitration Co. of New Jersey offered the claims board only $29,000 for all the mixed acid at their plant, amounting to 2,436,000 pounds, and all the spent acid at the plant, amounting to 600,000 pounds. This office took charge of the sale of this material and sold the mixed acid alone for $121,800 and will obtain at least $10 per ton for the spent acid, which is not at the plant. Total approximate saving	97,000.00
(10) The Aetna Powder Co. for a long while would not pay more than $17 per ton for oleum. This office stood firm on a price of $22.50 per ton and obtained it. Approximate saving	2,700.00
Total saved on chemicals, acids, and explosives	4,146,084.00

(1) Saving on nonferrous metals	93,666.50
(2) Saving on ferrous metals	194,432.00
(3) Saving on chemicals	4,146,084.00
Grand total	4,400,582.50

A. L. MERCER,
Major, United States Army, Chief, Raw Materials and Scrap Section.

—

EXHIBIT G.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE, AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES,
Washington, June 16, 1919.

Memorandum:
To: Mr. C. W. Hare, director of sales.
Subject: Government saved money on cast-iron pipe at Mobile, Ala.

1. There is located at Mobile, Ala., 2,076.30 tons of cast-iron culvert pipe. This is lock-joint pipe, 12 inches, 18 inches, 24 inches, and 36 inches diameter. It can be used only for drainage culvert pipe.

2. This pipe was manufactured by the American Casting Co., Birmingham, Ala., and cost the Government an average price of $61.41 per ton, or a total of $127,380.61.

3. The M. & E. M. Branch, surplus property division, made several attempts to dispose of this pipe, but had finally concluded that the best proposition that could be made was to sell it back to the manufacturer at a price of $22 and $23 per ton. The director of sales, under date of April 23, was requested to give permission to sell this pipe at the above-named price.

4. This office disapproved the sale of this pipe at such a small return to the Government and recommended that an effort be made to dispose of same to the Department of Agriculture, in connection with their highway development scheme, and if this could not be done to make sale of same by sealed proposal. The highway department now signify their desire and have requisitioned the entire amount of this pipe at cost to the War Department, thereby saving the Government a loss of $80,650, which would have been incurred had the pipe been sold back to the manufacturer.

W. P. GLEASON,
Chief Railway and Contractors' Equipment and Building Materials Section.

EXHIBIT H.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE, AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES,
Washington, June 16, 1919.

Memorandum for Mr. Morse:
Subject: Work of the Contract Section.

1. With reference to the work of the contract section, aside from the usual routine work of drafting and revising contracts, supervising the performance of same, and compiling, indexing, and filing all instruments and data relating thereto, I invite your attention to two accomplishments of more than ordinary interest, which are of material advantage to the Government.

(a) The Government had expended approximately $600,000 in the partial completion of buildings upon land leased from the Holt Manufacturing Co., of Peoria, Ill. The Government also had on hand various artillery tractor materials, which cost approximately $6,000,000, and now surplus, which it desired to dispose of. This artillery tractor material was of no value to anyone other than the Holt Manufacturing Co., except as scrap. The Holt Manufacturing Co. were willing to extend the Government's lease on the land at a nominal figure, so as to enable the Government at an expenditure of approximately $322,000 to complete the buildings, and when completed purchase same from the Government. It also desired to purchase the surplus artillery tractor material for a consideration of $3,000,000. However, the Holt Manufacturing Co. was unwilling to enter into either agreement unless they could at the same time lease from the Government 100 artillery tractors. The Judge Advocate General's office had held that the lease of the artillery tractors could not be legally made. This section, by calling attention to an act of July 28, 1892, secured from the Attorney General's Department an opinion to the effect that the artillery tractors could be leased as desired. The making of this contract saved the Government the difference between the price paid for same by the Holt Manufacturing Co. and the scrap value of same.

(b) The contract between the Ordnance Department and the Holt Manufacturing Co. covering the extension of the lease, the completion of the buildings thereon, and the subsequent sale of the buildings to the Holt Manufacturing Co., referred to above, was covered by separate contract, and was a character of contract with which this section has nothing to do. As originally drawn this contract contained no provision requiring the purchaser to furnish bond to insure the performance of the contract. We inserted a clause in the contract requiring bond in the sum of $500,000 to secure performance.

L. I. HARVEY,
Major, J. A., Chief, Contract Section.

Mr. HARE. I should like to read here the memorandum addressed to Gen. Lord by the Assistant Secretary of War:

EXHIBIT C–1.

APRIL 2, 1919.

Memorandum for Gen. Lord:

Your memorandum of April 2 has been received, and you are directed to make an allotment for the appropriation for storage and shipping facilities sufficient to cover the salaries for the civilian personnel attached to the office of the director of sales and for the salaries of the director of sales and his assistants at the following annual rate, salaries to become effective upon advice of the director of sales:

	Annual rate.
Director of sales	$25,000
First assistant director of sales	10,000
Second and third assistant director of sales	8,000
9 chiefs of section	6,000
22 assistants to chiefs of section	3,600
45 secretaries, stenographers, and clerks, at salaries ranging from	1,200–2,000

It is understood that the funds appropriated from storage and shipping facilities are only available until June 30, and additional appropriation will then have to be made from such funds as become available when the new appropriations asked for from Congress become operative.

BENEDICT CROWELL,
The Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. HARE. The total is approximately $250,000 yearly. To date we have spent about $75,000 in this overhead organization. The reason the Secretary of War has now asked for an appropriation of $900,000 is due to the fact that he has very recently discovered that the organization that was set up abroad to dispose of surplus property over there has not been able to accomplish the results, and he feels that if this appropriation is made that we would be able to establish an overseas organization somewhat similar to the one on this side of the water. Neither he nor I have any idea as to really how much money is necessary to accomplish that task. That has only been put before me within the last few days. I believe that about $250,000 would probably care for an organization to handle the work satisfactorily. The remainder of the appropriation is to cover the expenses of the men who might be employed. I do not know what those expenses are, but I understand it is very much more expensive to live abroad than it is here, and I feel quite positively that we can not get the right men to undertake work of that kind unless we pay their actual expenses, whatever they may happen to be.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Who is representing the Government abroad now?

Mr. HARE. The commission which was appointed by the President—Judge Parker—the liquidation commission; and their principal duty, as I understand it, has been not only to settle claims that are constantly arising between our Government and other governments, but to take general supervision over the sale of surplus property.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Are you cooperating with them?

Mr. HARE. We have been cooperating with them. There is an assistant director of sales representing me over there with them, but, for one reason and another, our results have not turned out well.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. What are those reasons?

Mr. HARE. Those reasons seem to be, sir, that the job is an enormous one, and that the commission has had more than it could attend to in settling the very intricate claims which have arisen as a result of the war, arisen between France and England and Italy and ourselves.

Senator NEW. I understood you to say a little while ago that you found about $2,000,000,000 worth of supplies?

Senator SUTHERLAND. Surplus stores for sale.

Senator NEW. Surplus supplies owned by the Government at the conclusion of the war?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Senator NEW. Now, the Secretary said yesterday, as I remember it, that there were about $1,500,000,000, I believe he said——

Mr. HARE (interposing). I believe those figures were approximately correct for the surplus overseas.

Senator NEW. Now, was that $1,500,000,000 included in your estimate?

Mr. HARE. No.

Senator NEW. It means, then, that the Government has a total amount of $3,000,000,000?

Mr. HARE. $3,500,000,000.

Senator NEW. Of surplus supplies?

Mr. HARE. But this organization with which I am connected was established to deal with matters in this country.

Senator NEW. Well, what are you aiming at is to get one organization to deal with the whole $3,000,000,000?

Mr. HARE. That whole situation, the whole $3,000,000,000. It seems to us that if we have, we will say, $25,000,000 worth of machine tools here and $10,000,000 worth of machine tools there, we will make a better deal by combining the two lots and selling them as a whole; and there are probably a great many other details that can be worked out in that way. I do not know how far you want me to go into this general matter, but there seems to be some misconception as to exactly how this organization functions and what it really has to do with the other organizations of the various Army bureaus. Now, our Army bureau salvage boards were set up to do a variety of things; selling is only one of the many duties assigned to the salvage members of the various bureaus. I was asked before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House as to what was the total selling expense for this entire organization, and I replied that it was impossible to give an accurate idea as to the total selling costs unless an analysis of the time spent by the members of the bureau on salvage work was made in order that we might allocate the selling expense—the actual time spent in it.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Right in that connection I prepared a bill, and was going to introduce it, to consolidate all of these sales of surplus properties into one board, but I understood that they had organized a body in the War Department itself to do this very thing. Now, that is yours?

Mr. HARE (interposing). That is my organization.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Now, in that connection, has the War Department, those in authority down there, seen to it that the different bureaus that have surplus stores consulted with your bureau before offering anything for sale?

Mr. HARE. Absolutely so. The first thing I asked for, as the head of the sales department, was a memorandum of what we had for sale. I found it exceedingly difficult to get it; I have not got a complete one to-day, and I doubt if we ever get a completely accurate list of surplus property.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. You ought to get it. I understood at the time the bill was prepared by me that Army officers were selling horses and saddles and a number of other surplus stores, and that they were frequently selling them at a very large discount over their cost. Have you dealt with that situation?

Mr. HARE. We have general supervision in this way: I framed the policy of having every sale reported to me. I held a meeting of the chiefs of all the various bureaus, and I told them that I wanted every single sale, whether it was for 5 cents or for $100,000, reported instantly to me, but that for the time being I would allow them to sell without first obtaining clearance from office of director of sales commodities of which the bureau does not have over $100,000 in value, providing each one of those sales were reported instantly, and sold in certain specified ways, which had been approved by Director of Sales.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. I think that is unfortunate, Mr. Hare. Do you not think, as Director of Sales, that you ought to have supervision of them?

Mr. HARE. Well, I have supervision of it in this way, that an immediate report is made, and if a sale is not right it is checked up at once.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Can you stop it after the sale is made?

Mr. HARE. We have stopped a great many—thrown them out, because we did not consider the sum we received was fair; but everything over $100,000—they can not sell a block of $100,000 of any material when the bureau has in stock more than $100,000 of that material. The reason for putting that check on it was that I wanted to control absolutely the large surpluses. I did not want to be dribbling out $50,000 worth of machine tools and $50,000 worth of lumber—I wanted to make a deal which would take care of all of it at a fair price.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. However, in selling the property belonging to the Government and getting a fair price for the Government, great care has to be taken to prevent a dislocation of industrial life.

Mr. HARE. I think that is one of the most important considerations. I told Mr. Crowell that I could not look upon this particular piece of work when they had asked me to take control of it in the same way I would if it were my own corporation—I had to look at it from the standpoint of the entire country, for it was obvious that if we dumped on the market our vast stores of material, no matter when that might be, that it would inevitably dislocate certain branches of industry.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. It is bound to. Now, do you need further legislation to invest in you jurisdiction over all of these surplus stores? If you do, you ought to have it, in my opinion.

Mr. HARE. I think, naturally, sir, that it would make my task infinitely easier if, as was proposed at the very beginning, an organization had been formed entirely outside of the Army which would have taken in their charge and control the sale of all our surplus, but for one reason and another that was not done.

The CHAIRMAN. What were those reasons?

Mr. HARE. I do not know, except that I think it seemed a very involved question. They would have had to ask for legislation, but it was obviously the best way to handle it. The Government had no sales organization. It had no means of seeing that these vast supplies were properly distributed and the maximum results returned to the Treasury. They should have started at the very first to form a business corporation outside of the Army and have them handle whatever stuff they had on a commission basis. That could have been done. I believe it is too late to adopt that to-day. I believe we are too much in the middle of the stream, as we are working; but, as far as the control of the general policy, I have that absolutely in my hands. Nothing can be sold over $100,000 without coming before our sales review board; and we are so closely in touch with the sales under $100,000 that I feel confident that that little leeway is necessary. The reason for that, sir, is this: We have men in New York, and they have a chance to sell $5,000 worth of shoes, or $5,000 of something else, they have got to make a quick decision, and since they can only sell at market price, or under sealed bids, or by public auction, they are limited to the methods in which they can sell. It seemed proper, if they were to do anything,

to give them that amount of authority instead of forcing them to come all the way back through the usual channels, which unfortunately sometimes takes seven or eight days in order to get an answer "yes" or "no."

The CHAIRMAN. You are satisfied that the best results are being obtained now with the present system?

Mr. HARE. I think the present system is reasonably good, but if I could have more direct control over the personnel in making the sales I would get better results. Of course, in this matter, if we try to please everyone in the country, we are not going to get anywhere. We have got to make up our minds as to some sane reasonable course to follow and then stick to it. I asked the Military Affairs Committee of the House the other day whether they considered it a sane and reasonable proposition to get the maximum return into the Treasury of the United States from the sale of these goods to the highest bidder so that our taxes might come down and everyone receive a benefit of it, and some of them said individually they were thoroughly in favor of that proposition.

Naturally, I am under continual pressure to meet this condition and that condition by selling below the market, or by accepting the lower price, but if I have reason to believe I can get more, my instructions to the men of the department have been that they are to be guided by the spirit that they are to get the best returns, and we have recently effected a saving of considerably more than $4,000,000 by what I call intensive efforts.

A man might come along and say, "I will offer you $5 for a certain thing"; but I believe the article is worth more, and by using good judgment I am able to get $6 or $7. That is the spirit I am trying to create in the group of men who are working with me at the present time.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. I quite agree with you that you should not throw a great mass of material on the market and dislocate the industrial conditions; but how far can you go with that policy? You have got a large number of motor trucks that are being stored at Harrison—several thousand of them; I think there are a large number stored at Dayton, Ohio. Now, they are in the open air and they are deteriorating.

Senator NEW. There are a lot stored at Indianapolis and Jeffersonville,

Senator SUTHERLAND. And at Baltimore.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Now, the market for second-hand cars was never so good as it is right now, and would it not serve the interests of the Government to get rid of them while the demand is good?

Mr. HARE. These trucks can not be sold, sir. Under an act of Congress all surplus trucks are to be turned over to the Post Office Department, Bureau of Public Health, Treasury Department, and the Department of Agriculture for use in road work throughout the various States, and every surplus truck has been turned over to the Department of Agriculture, and they are now distributing them between the different States of the Union.

Senator SUTHERLAND. Without charge?

Mr. HARE. I think without charge; but I am not very familiar with the details of the original bill. The States have to raise a certain sum of money for road repair and the Government in return, as I understand it, would either supply an additional sum of money or turn over these trucks. There are other gentlemen here who can answer that question in greater detail than I can.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. How about these passenger automobiles which are reported stored in large quantities over at Baltimore and various other places which were advertised for sale a little while ago and then the advertisements withdrawn?

Mr. HARE. I should like to put into the record here what to me is a very important point. The director of sales has nothing to sell until it is declared surplus; it has been exceedingly difficult to have surplus stock of various kinds declared surplus, due to the fact that there has been no decision reached as yet as to the probable size of the Army. The consequence is that they tentatively formed a plan to keep in reserve something like 100 per cent over and above the requirements of an army of 1,000,000 men. Now, that has been keeping in reserve vast stores of property which undoubtedly will come on the market when the final decision in regard to the size of the Army is reached.

The following are the instructions on which requirements have been estimated. The first one was in force until May 7, 1919; the second is now in force:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE, AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
GENERAL STAFF,
Washington, February 1, 1919.

From: Acting Chief Statistics and Requirements Branch.
Subject: Program for equipment and supplies.

1. It is requested that requirement schedules be submitted to this office without delay for the purpose of establishing total requirements, to be used as a basis in determining surplus stock. With that end in view and pending the formulation of a definite program of demobilization for the Army, the following instructions will govern:

2. For the present existing forces the calculation of requirements for equipment and nonperishable supplies will be made on the basis of the strength of 2,500,000 as of February 15, 1919, and the rate of demobilization of 300,000 per month until the forces are reduced to peace-time strength of 500,000.

3. Regarding equipment and supplies to be retained after complete demobilization, calculate requirements on the following basis:

(A) Initial equipment for—

	Officers.	Men.
(a) 20 combat divisions	19,740	541,800
4 depot divisions	3,940	106,680
1 Cavalry division	1,217	23,843
5 Corps troops	3,690	91,225
1 Army troop	8,986	215,436
(b) Coast defenses in United States	1,501	37,534
Coast defenses, insular possessions	350	8,771
(c) Philippine Scouts	344	8,185
(d) Medical Corps, etc	22,733	110,485
(e) Bureaus and other overhead	24,000	217,000
Total	86,501	1,360,959
Aggregate		1,447,460

(Of this the equipment for 500,000 men will be in the hands of troops and the balance in storage.)

(B) A reserve of 100 per cent of initial requirements for 1,447,460.

(C) Sufficient nonperishable supplies to maintain 500,000 men in the United States and in fixed establishments in insular possessions from September 1, 1919, to July 1, 1920, organized as follows:

(*a*) Four combat divisions, distributed: One in Philippines and Alaska, one in Hawaii, one in Panama, one in the United States.

(*b*) Sixteen skeletonized combat divisions (one-third strength commissioned and enlisted), four skeletonized base depot divisions (one-third strength commissioned and enlisted), one skeletonized Cavalry division (one-third strength commissioned and enlisted), all in the United States.

(*c*) The balance of approximately 180,000 necessary to complete the total of 500,000 is to be distributed among Coast Artillery, Army, and corps troops for five corps (skeletonized), and the necessary Army service and staff organizations. Sappers, engineer trains, and pontoon organizations are included in the above.

4. The Regular Army will utilize the existing facilities in cantonments, garrisons, posts, forts, and stations. Accordingly only requirements for maintenance will be calculated. Any exception to this principle will be determined on its individual merits in conformity to the spirit of paragraph 1 above.

5. Equipment intended for the exclusive use of the American Expeditionary Forces will be disregarded in the calculations of requirements. However, certain articles of equipment which, due to lack of sufficient supply, were restricted for use to the American Expeditionary Forces are not intended for their exclusive use; for example, trailmobile movable kitchens, oilskin clothing, woolen gloves.

6. Requirements on seasonable clothing will be computed on the basis of six months for summer clothing and six months for winter clothing for 1,447,460 men.

7. Requirements for expendable nonperishable supplies will be computed on a basis of six months' supply in the United States and insular possessions. However, in the case of ammunition estimate requirements for an army of 1,447,460 on the unit basis of six months' wastage and consumption in the American Expeditionary Forces during active operations.

8. It must be understood that nothing contained herein will be construed as an authorization for the procurement of additional equipment or supplies to cover estimated shortages resulting in the requirements for the above program.

By authority of the Director of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic.

LEIGH S. KEITH,
Major, United States Army.

—

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE, AND TRAFFIC DIVISION, GENERAL STAFF,
Washington, May 12, 1919.

From: Chief Statistics and Requirements Branch.
Subject: Program for requirements.

1. In accordance with latest program for equipment and supplies issued by the Operations Division of the General Staff, May 7, 1919, the following instructions will govern in the preparation of requirements schedules:

2. Calculate maintenance for the Army, serving under normal peace conditions, during the demobilization period, from the date of the latest inventory or stock record to September 1, 1919. For this purpose, consider the strength of the Army on March 1 as 2,200,000 and a rate of demobilization of 300,000 per month.

3. From September 1, 1919, to July 1, 1920, calculate maintenance for the peace-time Army of 500,000.

4. Calculate requirements for initial equipment for: (a) A National Guard organization of 5,500 commissioned and 100,000 enlisted personnel, divided into eight Infantry combat divisions at peace strength, exclusive of the proportionate part of corps and Army troops: (b) the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, estimated at 100,000 students. The basic allowances for personnel and organization equipment will be forwarded under separate cover.

5. Owing to the nonexistence of equipment tables for the peace Army, the following ruling has been approved for the computation of requirements: (a) Individual equipment for the peace Army will be deducted by taking one-third of the requirements already calculated by the bureaus for the war Army. (See par. 3 (A) of letter from Acting Chief of Statistics and Requirements Branch, Purchase, Storage, and Traffic Division, General Staff, date Feb. 1, 1919; subject: Program for equipment and supplies.) (b) For organizational equipment, the calculations already made for the war Army will hold good. (c) For all other equipment, requirements will be calculated in accordance with the nature of the case.

6. In determining the amount of equipment and supplies to be retained as a war reserve, the following principles will govern: (a) In the case of supplies of standard commercial type which can be procured at once, during an emergency, a reserve for the difference between four Infantry combat divisions at war strength and at peace strength will be retained. (b) In the case of supplies requiring more than a month to produce, initial equipment will be retained in reserve for the difference between the Army at peace strength (500,000) and the Army at war strength (1,500,000), or 1,000,000. (c) In the case of supplies requiring more than six months and less than one year to produce, there should be provided a sufficient quantity to maintain 1,500,000 men for six months. (d) In the case of supplies requiring more than a year to produce, there should be provided sufficient quantities to maintain 1,500,000 men for a year.

7. The above requirements for the reserve are general. They will require modification in regard to certain articles. Supplies which are liable to deterioration should not be kept on hand in the same amounts as those supplies having longer life. Equipment which is liable to become obsolete should also be limited. Illustrations of this could be given in the case of aircraft and tanks with their accessories. Neither of them are yet standardized. They are still in the process of evolution. Also, material for which no ready market can be found and which, therefore, either can not be disposed of at all or at a great sacrifice, should be retained in large quantities. This refers particularly to such ordnance supplies as rifles, pistols, field guns, caissons and limbers, etc. Directions have already been issued that all the model 1917 rifles will be placed in the war reserve. This will be done irrespective of what the requirements might be on the above figures. Some other items may be treated in the same manner.

8. The requirements schedules will be prepared and submitted to this office without delay. Upon approval a letter will be forwarded to the bureau concerned stating that fact. Thereupon the information contained therein will be transcribed by the bureau concerned upon a pre-

pared form entitled "Analysis of stocks, requirements, and storage space." This form is in preparation, and when completed copies will be forwarded to all bureaus, with detailed instructions concerning its preparation.

9. It must be understood that nothing contained herein shall be construed as an authorization for the procurement of additional equipment or supplies to cover estimated shortages resulting in the requirements for the above program.

By authority of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Director of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic.

C. G. HARVEY, *Colonel, General Staff.*

Mr. HARE. In regard to passenger automobiles, answering you, sir, Senator FRELINGHUYSEN, none has been declared surplus and made available for sale to the public. There are a certain number of second-hand cars which have been declared surplus, and arrangements are now being made to sell them by public auction where they are, at the storehouses.

However, there have been some stories widely circulated that the Government was selling these cars at a nominal price; and the Military Intelligence Division finally succeeded in making the arrest of a certain man, camouflaged as a major, who was representing himself as a Government agent selling these cars at a nominal figure. I think that the information that seems to have been broadcast comes from such sources.

Senator NEW. I think so, too. I would like to ask right there how many of those cars have been declared surplus.

Mr. HARE. Col. Glover, can you furnish that information?

Col. GLOVER. Approximately 30,000 trucks and about 6,000 cars—all passenger cars and second hand.

Senator NEW. About 30,000 trucks and passenger cars. What character of passenger cars?

Col. GLOVER Well, there is a miscellaneous lot. Some were bought a long time ago and some of them had worn out. Some are Dodges, and a good many of them are Fords. Out of about 4,000, if I remember rightly, about half of them are Fords, which are new.

Senator NEW. They are to be sold now at public auction?

Col. GLOVER. No, sir; they are not. They are transferred to the Department of Agriculture for use on the public roads.

Senator NEW. The cars as well as the trucks?

Col. GLOVER. Yes, sir; and to the Post Office Department, and to the Public Health Service under the three acts of Congress.

Senator NEW. Then, there are to be no cars sold?

Mr. HARE. My understanding was, Colonel, that there were some second-hand cars which were to be sold at public auction.

Col. GLOVER. Those auction sales will come between now and the 15th of July for selling second-hand cars.

Senator NEW. How many?

Col. GLOVER. Now, on that I could not say positively; I should say a thousand to twelve hundred.

Senator SUTHERLAND. Does that include 100 per cent more than the requirements of the Army and the surplus, that number of passenger cars?

Col. GLOVER. This is not official, but just what I learned in talking with officers of the General Staff: The 36,000 vehicles declared surplus and a total of 16,000 on hand which might be declared surplus at a later date. All we have declared surplus was 36,000, but there was held in sort of a temporary reserve 16,000 additional vehicles, which may be turned over as surplus.

Senator SUTHERLAND. How many of them are new and how many second hand?

Col. GLOVER. I should say the majority of them are new.

Senator SUTHERLAND. You are holding back all the new ones?

Col. GLOVER. Yes; the Army is saving the best trucks; there is no question about that.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, how many trucks have we altogether?

Col. GLOVER. I have not been in touch with that for about six months.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN Well, approximately.

Col. GLOVER. I think the Army is keeping about 18,000 trucks—18,000 to 22,000 trucks.

Senator SUTHERLAND. How many passenger cars?

Col. GLOVER. I can not tell you; I do not even know approximately.

Senator SUTHERLAND. Could you not give us an approximation?

Col. GLOVER. No; I would not want to state; I do not know. I can get that information for you and have it inserted in the record.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 19, 1919.

Memorandum for Mr. Morse.

Subject: Government stock of motor vehicles.

1. On April 14 a board, consisting of Col. Seaman, Col. Blain, and Maj. Zacharias, reported to Secretary Crowell a tentative statement showing the amount of vehicles on hand in the Army. The figures of this statement which appear in the tabulation below are the best figures available to date. However, the Motor Transport Corps expects within a very few days to have a fairly accurate inventory complete, a copy of which will be furnished us.

2. On April 15 Gen. March issued a memorandum to the Director of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic stating that the Chief of Motor Transport Corps had been instructed to turn over to the Director of Sales for disposal the number of automobiles and trucks as stated in the tabulation below as surplus. This statement of Gen. March of April 15 constitutes the official declaration of surplus upon which we are working.

3. The following statement shows the number of machines on hand in the War Department April 15, the number to be retained for the use of the Army, and the number declared surplus and available for disposal:

	Passenger cars.	Trucks.	Total.
Total in Army	11,179	64,334	75,513
Total to be held	5,676	33,485	39,161
Total to be disposed of	5,503	30,849	36,352

4. All of this surplus has been allotted to the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads, Treasury Department, Public Health Service, and Post Office Department. The only cars which will be sold to the public are such cars as may be rejected by the bureaus named above, and these will be offered for sale either at public auction or by sealed proposal.

W. A. LESHER.

Approved:
E. C. MORSE,
Assistant, Division of Sales.

Senator SUTHERLAND. I think it would be a good thing to do that.

Senator NEW. About airplanes. Now, the Government sold a lot of airplanes recently. Had they been declared surplus? I would like to know the facts about that airplane contract and the circumstances of the sales.

Mr. HARE. I can put it before you in a comprehensive way. The way it first came to my attention was when I was requested to agree to a contract to sell about $20,000,000 worth of airplanes to Curtiss for something over $2,000,000, and I said, "I am not going to agree to anything of the kind without going into it with a fine-tooth comb."

Senator NEW. Who asked you to do that?

Mr. HARE. That came from Gen. Menoher, the Director of the Air Service. The Curtiss Co. had taken it up with them, and they had gone over it, and then they came to me with a prepared contract, and the first clause that I did not like in the contract was a clause which obligated the Government, in addition to making this sale to Curtiss, to agree to sell any additional surplus planes that might be declared surplus at the same price; and I said, "We can not agree to any such arrangement as that;" and I threw the contract back and at the same time asked for a very complete statement as to what efforts had been made, prior to the matter having been brought to my knowledge, in an effort to dispose of them; and I should like to insert in the record and read into the record the following letters which bear on this transaction:

EXHIBIT B.

WAR DEPARTMENT AIR SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1919.

From: The Director of Air Service.
To: Mr. C. W. Hare, Assistant Director of Munitions, Munitions Building, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Sale of surplus aeroplanes and motors.

1. Pursuant to instructions contained in your letter of March 20, I hand you herewith "Complete statement of all steps which have been taken to dispose of aeroplanes, indicating the results in each particular method and also outlining clearly your reasons for the final adoption of the method now under discussion; that is, the sale of this equipment to the Curtiss Co."

2. The first steps that were taken, looking to the sale of obsolete aeroplane equipment, were by the salvage branch, supply section, Division of Military Aeronautics, before I was detailed to duty as Director of Air Service. A complete report of the bids received for aerial material advertised for sale has been made to your board.

3. All of these bids were rejected by Maj. Gen. William L. Kenly, Director of Military Aeronautics, for the reason, I understand, that, after bids were invited, he decided that it would be an unwise policy to sell obsolescent planes (Standard) and condemned motors (Hall-Scott) to the public where it was not practicable to make complete overhaul, substitute OX-5 motors for Hall-Scotts and give to the purchaser a guaranty equivalent to that which should go with a new plane and engine. Furthermore, there was no knowing into whose hands these semiobsolete planes and engines might fall, nor whether the purchasers knew how to properly handle and fly them. Also, there was great probability of heavy suits for damages being brought against the War Department in case of crashes with ensuing injuries to pilot and passenger.

4. About this time (Jan. 15 to Feb. 15) numerous requests were coming into this office to purchase serviceable Curtiss planes for use during the coming summer, these requests coming mostly from ex-flying officers of the Air Service. Lieut. Eddie Stinson wished to buy 20 planes; Civilian Instructor Smith wished to buy 10; Lieut. Logg and associates wanted 5 or 10; etc. Many other inquiries are on file.

5. I directed that a study be made of the probable needs for Air Service training for the next two years, setting aside sufficient of our newest and best equipment for this work and adding 100 per cent as a margin of safety—all this based on the General Staff study of a future air force of 24,000 officers and men—and listing all the rest of our flying training equipment as obsolete, obsolescent, and surplus; and request authority from the Secretary of War to sell it to individual purchasers as they might apply from time to time.

6. On or about February 7 my executive officer, Col. Milton F. Davis, prepared a list, as outlined in preceding paragraph, and made an engagement to bring the same to your office for the purpose of discussing the possible sale and methods of sale of the surplus planes and engines. He made an engagement by phone with Mr. Morse, met Mr. Morse for a few minutes, and was turned over to Col. Glover, with whom the question was discussed at length. Col. Glover directed Col. Davis to prepare a memorandum showing all of the surplus planes and motors in question, together with the prices at which the Director of Air Service thought these articles should be sold, bring it back to the Director of Sales, and he (Col. Glover) was of the opinion that the Director of Sales would give blanket authority to sell this material as requested by the Director of Air Service.

7. In order that aeroplane manufacturers and especially the Aircraft Manufacturers' Association should not object to the sales in question and endeavor, through political influence, to prevent these sales, Col. Glover and Col. Davis agreed that it might be good policy to discuss the question with the representative of the Aircraft Manufacturers' Association and possibly with some of the manufacturers in question. Following this idea, Col. Davis called Mr. Bradley, secretary of the Aircraft Manufacturers' Association; Mr. Flint, of the L. W. F. Co.; and Mr. Houston, of the Wright-Martin Co., to his office for a discussion of the subject. Three or four days later Col. Davis had another conference with Mr. Keyes and Mr. Kepperley, of the Curtiss Aeroplane Co.; Mr. Ware, of the Thomas-Morse Co.; and Messrs. Mingle and Williams of the Standard Aeroplane Corporation.

8. Mr. Flint, of the L. W. F. Co., suggested that a corporation be formed to take over from the Government, at a fixed lump sum, all of the surplus material in question and sell it to the public. The Curtiss representatives promptly made a proposition to take back all of their products. At first thought, Col. Davis, in consultation with Col. Deeds, informed these gentlemen that he did not think the War Department would approve returning each manufacturer's products to the said manufacturer, for the reason that such an act would immediately offer an opportunity for criticism on the part of politicians and disappointed buyers, and would not consider this phase of the question. However, in conference over the phone, Col. Glover informed Col. Davis that resale to manufacturers was being made by the director of sales, and that there was nothing wrong in such resale—in fact, that it was highly proper to do so, in order that the manufacturer might protect his own product—and authorized Col. Davis to proceed along such lines if by so doing he could more satisfactorily solve the problem.

9. Mr. Flint stated that neither he nor his company would be interested in any material excepting the Hall-Scott motors. Later Col. Gillmore (chief of the supply section) was informed that the Assistant

Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, had notified the board that no sale of aeroplanes should be approved until Mr. Flint had been given an opportunity to bid; that Mr. Flint had stated to Mr. Crowell at the aircraft show, held in New York March 1 to 15, that he was interested. Mr. Flint was called on the telephone and denied that he had made this statement, later said he would bid, and would present his bid to the Director of Air Service not later than Monday, March 10. He failed to do so. He was again called on the telephone and stated that he would not bid.

10. Messrs. Mingle and Williams have made a tentative offer on the Standard planes and a quantity of Curtiss OX-5 motors. They have made no definite offer. Their tentative offer is not as high as the Curtiss offer for the same material. The offer of the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation is the only definite offer for any large quantity of this material that has been received.

11. Following the conference with the Curtiss representatives above referred to, draft of contract was prepared and agreed to by Mr. Kepperley, representing the Curtiss company. The whole matter was then presented to your Mr. Morse, Col. Boggs, and Col. Glover, who expressed the belief that the sale was an advantageous one for the Government. Some changes in the form of the contract were suggested by your Mr. Schultz (attorney for the board), which were agreed to by Mr. Kepperley. I then sent forward my letter of March 8, which was delivered to your board March 10.

12. A representative of your board called at this bureau and made a most thorough investigation of the amount and condition of aerial material. I am informed members of your office have had several long conferences with representatives of the purchaser, and that values, state of repair, probable profits, and kindred subjects have been most thoroughly discussed.

13. My reasons for adopting the plan of sale now proposed are:

(a) It brings the Government the most money for this surplus aerial material.

(b) It saves the Government from liability for damage claims because of defective material sold to individual purchasers, for claims for infringement of patents, etc.

(c) It obviates the expense of peddling these planes and motors.

(d) It most quickly relieves storage facilities.

(e) It will aid the development of the areroplane industry in this country.

(f) It met with the approval of your Mr. Morse, Col. Boggs, Col. Glover, and Mr. Schultz.

14. The assurance I have "that the price the Government is receiving is a fair one" is that all reasonable effort has been made to secure purchasers; that Curtiss is the only one we can secure, and the price named in the contract is the best we can get them to offer.

15. As pointed out above, your board has made a thorough investigation of the value of this property, expense of overhauling, and the like, and has compiled a statement of values. This was presented to Col. Davis, of the Air Service, and he remarked that it was a fair estimate except as to 716 JN-4 planes and the 1,100 Standard planes, and as to those that they have no values.

16. As to figures indicating "the probable cost to the contractor of placing the plane and engines in selling condition," no accurate data is available. It will not be less than $400 for a plane complete and $250 for a motor. The cost of materials, the price of labor, and the newness of the industry lend uncertainty to figures on this subject. Probably the average cost of overhauling these planes complete will be about $800 and motors about $500.

17. As to "dealers' profits," "manufacturers' profits," and "overhead charges" I have no data. The aeroplane industry is new, and what those costs will be I can not say. They must, of necessity be high. Demonstrating fields must be maintained, in many instances the purchaser taught to fly, and a competent corps of high-priced mechanics, pilots, and salesmen, with liberal expense accounts, must be retained.

18. The Curtiss Co. will not execute this contract without the exclusive-option clause. They maintain they can not realize a profit on this contract, but that it is entered into to protect the Curtiss name; that they do not want a Curtiss plane or motor sold that is not in proper condition to fly or sold to some one who can not fly it.

19. The JN-4 planes proposed to be sold are not new, are either obsolete or obsolescent type. The Standard J-1 planes are obsolete. There are no new planes and but 212 new motors in the lot proposed to be sold. No comparison with $8,000 catalogue price of Curtiss plane is possible.

20. I am informed that there is urgent need for prompt action in this case. I believe your Mr. Schultz has approved draft of proposed contract, and I again state that I deem it expedient and for the best interests of the Government that this sale be consummated upon the terms and conditions set forth in draft of contract, and renew the recommendation made in the first paragraph of my letter of March 8, 1919.

(Signed) CHAS. T. MENOHER,
Major General, United States Army.

—

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1919.

From: The Director of Air Service.
To: The Director of Sales, Purchase, Storage and Traffic Division, General Staff.
Subject: Sale of aerial material.

1. It is recommended that the Director of Air Service be directed, under authority of the Secretary of War, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 9, 1918 (Public, 193, 65th Cong., p. 6), to sell to the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation the following property:

(1) 4,608 Curtiss OX-5 motors.
(2) 1,616 JN-4 Curtiss type aeroplanes, without motors.
(3) 1,100 standard J-1 aeroplanes, without motors.

And it is further recommended that the attached draft of contract for the sale of the above property be approved and that the Director of Air Service be directed to execute and deliver same as contracting officer.

2. The expense to the United States of carrying out this contract will be comparatively small. The hangars set aside for the purpose of holding this property are not needed for other purposes and can be guarded and cared for by the Air Service personnel necessarily retained at these stations. A large number of the planes complete will be flown to the place of delivery to the purchaser. Such crating and boxing of other material for delivery as may be necessary can be done with material now at the fields. The cost of freight is the only item of consequence. The purchaser has the opportunity to elect to take property at its present location instead of requiring it to be concentrated at the stations mentioned in the contract and will doubtless avail himself of this opportunity as to some of the property. Shipments will be made to the nearest point of concentration. The 1,100 standard planes are now crated and in storage at Houston, Tex., where they are to be delivered to the purchaser. There will be no expense of delivery of same to the purchaser.

3. This property was purchased by the Government since April 6, 1917, for the purpose of training Air Service personnel.

4. The need for this material has ceased, and it is decmed expedient to sell the same before further deterioration.

5. A large part of this property is worthless to the Government because some of it is worn out and some is out of date. Such of the above property as is in running condition and adaptable for use at the present time is surplus stock. The Air Service has ample planes and motors of these types aside from the above for its present and prospective needs.

6. The standard aeroplanes described above will have to be changed in design before they can be flown, and consequently all of that material is practically worthless to the Government, because the expense of changing the design would be almost as much as the value of the planes, and this type of plane is not a desirable training plane.

7. Effort has been made since November 11, 1918, to sell aerial material by advertising for bids. In response to these requests for bids, which were given wide publication, only a few offers were received for the best aeroplanes and motors, and these offers were at a comparatively low price.

8. Effort has been made to secure an offer for the sale of part or all of this material to the manufacturers of aeroplanes. All manufacturers of aeroplanes, including the L. W. F. Engineering Co., have been solicited to make an offer to purchase this property. Some of them have declined entirely to make any offer whatsoever.

9. The Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation has offered to purchase the above-described material, and a contract for that purpose has been prepared, a copy of which is attached. The terms and conditions of this agreement have been agreed to by the purchaser. This is the best offer that the Director of Air Service has been able to obtain for this property, and he has made diligent effort in this direction.

10. There is no general market for aeroplanes or aeroplane motors. This industry is in its infancy. Designs change rapidly, so that material that is of substantial value to-day may be of little value in the near future.

11. The operation of an aeroplane requires the constant attention of a skilled mechanic. No air routes have been thoroughly established in the United States. It is represented that these planes should not be sold to the general public, for the reason that under present conditions it would too greatly endanger the lives of people and property.

12. Most of these planes will have to be overhauled before they can be flown. If they were sold to the general public, damage might result from their operation, due to defects now existing in this material, some of which are latent and some of which are patent, and it is probable that large claims covering such damage would be presented against the Government, and it is believed the War Department might be severely criticized for selling aeroplanes indiscriminately to the public.

13. It is, therefore, urged that the welfare of the public demands that these planes and motors be sold to a reliable manufacturer, who can overhaul them and sell them, with his guarantee, to such purchasers as may properly operate them.

CHAS. T. MENOHER,
Major General, U. S. A., Director of Air Service.

—

MAY 12, 1919.

Memorandum for Mr. Hare.

1. Following is a digest pertaining to the sale to the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation of certain airplanes and motors:

2. Material proposed to sell is as follows:
(1) 4,608 Curtiss OX-5 motors.
(2) 1,616 JN-4 C type airplanes without motors.
(3) 1,100 standard J-I airplanes without motors.

3. These planes are all surplus in the Army according to Gen. Menoher, Chief of the Air Service, and are all of the Curtiss type and standard type which the Army can sell at this time, the Air Service having retained for its use sufficient planes and motors of this type to last them for two years, provided Congress passes the bill authorizing an Air Service with 24,000 men and officers.

4. There is a possibility that some of these planes may be required for the use of the militia, should Congress pass such a bill. Inasmuch as no one knows what Congress will pass on the militia, it is questioned whether or not any of the above material should be held pending the passing of some such act. If none is to be held, these planes and motors are surplus in the Army and should be sold. The Curtiss Co. offer us $2,720,000 for all of this material. There were many provisions in the first contract drawn, which were not acceptable to this office, but the contract now is in proper shape in my estimation, provided we wish to sell the planes. This copy will be submitted to you within a day or two.

5. The material to be sold cost the Government over $20,000,000, and we are receiving an extremely low price compared to the cost, but this material is worth the amount it will bring, and it is believed that Curtiss has offered more than the Government can realize by selling or attempting to sell to other people. Their interest is in protecting their market.

6. Lieut. Dissette advises that about 1,000 inquiries have been received on these types of planes and motors, and a digest showing the result of his investigation on the inquiries is attached hereto. Considering his investigation the writer still believes that the Government will receive a larger amount from Curtiss than if it sells to other parties. Doubtless 300 or 400 planes could be sold at a higher price to aviators and promoters of flying schools, etc., but it is believed that great difficulty would be experienced in getting rid of all the planes and motors under consideration. Naturally it is impossible to state definitely which method will bring the greatest net returns.

7. I believe the contract as now being drawn is a businesslike contract and protects both parties and expresses the intent of both parties.

8. The material to be sold is partly new and partly used. The contract calls for the delivery of the specific planes as have been inventoried and states that of the deliveries in any one month not more than 14 per cent of the motors shall be new and of the total delivery of planes in any one month not more than 11 per cent shall be new JN4-D's, not more than 36 per cent shall be of the used JN4-D's, not less than 13 per cent shall be of the used JN4-A, JN4-B, and Canadians, and not less than 40 per cent shall be of the standard J-1's. To the contract will be attached a definite schedule giving the numbers on the motors and the numbers on the planes which are to be delivered and Air Service states that these planes and motors have been inventoried and that they do run in the percentages as stated above.

9. The contract also provides that if any further surplus of the Curtiss type planes is declared the Curtiss Co. shall have the right to buy these, provided they will pay the price asked for by the contracting officer. In the event they do not buy either party may declare the contract canceled excepting as to the part already performed. I believe this provision is fair and can do no harm to the Government.

10. No doubt there will be criticism from many quarters after this contract is signed on account of the low price, but there will also be criticism if this contract is not gone through with, for the reason that we will have great difficulty in disposing of this material to other parties. Gen. Menoher and his assistants believe that it is a good deal for the Government, and they should know the condition, etc., of the material being sold.

F. GLOVER,
Colonel, Quartermasters Corps,
Assistant Director of Sales.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1919.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of War.

The Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation have, as you know, made an offer to purchase 4,608 Curtiss OX–5 motors, 1,616 JN–4 Curtiss type aeroplanes without motors, and 1,100 standard JN–1 aeroplanes without motors, which have been declared surplus by the Air Service, for the sum of $2,720,000. This material cost the Government approximately $20,000,000.

As the price the Government was to receive for this equipment was so small, I addressed a letter, under date of March 20, copy of which is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A," to Gen. Menoher, Chief of Air Service, and received in reply a letter from him, under date of March 24, copy of which is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit B," in which he makes the statement under paragraph 19 thereof:

"The JN–4 planes proposed to be sold are not new, are either obsolete or obsolescent type. The standard J–1 planes are obsolete. There are no new planes and but 212 new motors in the lot proposed to be sold. No comparison with $8,000 catalogue price of Curtiss plane is possible."

When the contract, as prepared by the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation, in conjunction with officers of the Air Service, was submitted to this office, it was found to contain an exclusive option clause giving the Curtiss Co. the right to purchase at any time within the next two years any additional planes that might be declared surplus by the Army at the average price agreed upon under the proposed contract.

Our legal advisers told me that we could not properly accept such an exclusive option clause, and I therefore sent for Mr. Keyes, vice president of the Curtiss Co., and told him that while we would be perfectly willing to offer first to the Curtiss Co. any planes that might during the next two years be declared surplus, that if they declined to buy them at a fair market price the Government must retain the right to dispose of them in some other way.

Mr. Keyes informed me that they would have to be given some definite assurance that they could control the market for any additional surplus Curtiss planes, as that was one of their principal reasons for entering into the contract. He further stated that he had just discovered that certain of the planes which he had contemplated purchasing under the proposed contract had been damaged at some of the fields and that therefore he desired a careful inventory taken before negotiations were proceeded with.

We then made arrangements to have a representative of the Curtiss Co. and a representative of the Air Service visit the various fields and pick out the planes which it was proposed that the Government should sell to the Curtiss Co.

In the meantime a new contract was prepared which gave the Curtiss Co. the right to terminate the contract immediately upon the declaration of additional surplus planes by the War Department during the period of the contract, and gave the Government the right to terminate the contract at the expiration of 30 days after the declaration of such surplus, provided that within that period the Curtiss Co. did not agree to purchase the additional planes at a fair market price; the Curtiss Co., of course, to pay for all planes delivered up to the time of the cancellation of the contract.

The purpose of this clause in the contract was in effect to give both the Curtiss Co. and the Government an opportunity to discuss the terms of a further sale of surplus when such an occasion might arise. If no proper agreement could be reached with the Curtiss Co. it enabled the Government to dispose of this surplus in some other direction.

The inventory of the planes to be taken by the Curtiss Co. under the contract has just been completed, but unfortunately this record is in no shape to adequately determine the actual condition of the planes to be sold. A certain number of new planes are designated and a certain number of second-hand planes are designated, but we have no means of knowing whether or not many of these so-called second-hand planes have been flown for more than an hour or two. A proportion of them may be to all intents and purposes, practically new, and immediate arrangements have been made to have a more accurate estimate of their condition arrived at.

The fact that new planes are to be included in the contract for sale is contrary to the understanding had with Gen. Menoher when the original contract was under discussion, as you will note in paragraph 19 of his letter of March 24 he states, "There are no new planes."

The Curtiss Co., however, stated that it had always been their understanding that they were to secure under the contract a certain proportion of new planes.

Another complication, however, has arisen due to the fact that it seems highly probable that Congress will pass the necessary legislation to have the War Department supply, in so far as it can from surplus stock, the requirements of the Militia Bureau for aeroplanes of various types and I have therefore addressed to-day a letter to Gen. Menoher copy of which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit "C," and am addressing this memorandum to you with the thought in mind that you may desire to take this entire question up with the Secretary of War in order that he may discuss it with members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and Senate.

While it is true that a careful study of the entire situation has been made in so far as developing markets for these surplus planes and no one has come forward and offered as good a price for all of these planes as has the Curtiss Co., it is still of course obvious that the price offered by the Curtiss Co. is exceedingly low and if it is thought that within a reasonable period of time the Militia Bureau will be in the market for similar training planes it might be well for the War Department to hold these planes in stock until the requirements of the Militia Bureau are known.

On the other hand it must not be lost sight of that the aeroplane industry is in its infancy and will require the support of the Government if it is to thrive. The Curtiss Co. have from the nature of their contracts with the Government, been unable to manufacture any aeroplanes to sell on their own account and I learn from Mr. Keyes that one of the principal reasons for securing these planes from the Government at this time is to enable the Curtiss Co. to compete with aeroplanes of foreign manufacture at present being sold in China, South America, and elsewhere. If the Curtiss Co. is not put in a position to meet this competition promptly at this time it is feared that this market will be temporarily, at least, lost to American trade.

You will see from the above that the entire question is quite an involved one and involving as it does other policies than those directly connected with the office of the director of sales I feel that this entire question should be brought to the attention of the Secretary of War for such action as he may deem advisable under the circumstances. May I suggest that a prompt decision be reached in view of the fact that Mr. Keyes is planning to sail for Europe on May 24.

C. W. HARE,
Assistant Director of Munitions.

THE DIRECTOR OF AIR SERVICE,
May 20, 1919.

SALE OF MATERIAL.

The DIRECTOR OF SALES,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION, GENERAL STAFF,
Washington, D. C.

1. Pursuant to instructions from your office, the contract for the sale of material to the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation has been rewritten, and draft of same is submitted herewith.

2. It is again recommended that the Director of Air Service be directed, under authority of the Secretary of War, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 9, 1918 (Public—193—65th Cong., p. 6), to sell to the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation the following property:

(1) 4,608 Curtiss OX–5 motors.
(2) 1,616 JN–4 Curtiss type aeroplanes without motors.
(3) 1,100 standard J–1 aeroplanes without motors.

And it is further recommended that the attached draft of contract for the sale of the above property be approved, and that the Director of Air Service be directed to execute and deliver same as contracting officer.

3. In answer to your letter of May 17, in reference to this subject, the representations made in my letters dated March 8, 24, and 28, as to the character of this material are correct. It was not my understanding that under the original contract the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation were to receive any new planes, and but 212 new moters. The new planes and additional new motors included in this contract have been included since the arrangements were made to take a joint inventory, and set aside for sale to Curtiss the run of the field as to planes and motors. It was not my intention to include new crated planes and motors in this inventory, but the Curtiss representative states that it was his understanding that those set aside were to include new as well as old. As to the newness of the material, this contract is now different from that formerly presented to you.

However, if 246 new JN–4 planes and 644 new OX–5 motors are sold, the Air Service will have a sufficient amount of this type of material for its present needs and prospective purposes. Should the Air Service again enter upon an extensive training program a better type plane and motor are available, and it is my belief that before long further desirable planes and motors for military purposes will be obtainable.

4. I do not wish to be understood at present or from any of my previous letters that all of this material is worn out. Much that has been used is in a very good state of repair. The JN–4 plane and OX–5 motor have been valuable training material, but they are rapidly becoming obsolete. The standard J–1 plane is not a desirable plane for any military purpose.

5. As to price, the Curtiss Co. insists that it will not pay more. No other company has bid on this amount of material or any considerable portion of it. There is a question as to the right of the United States to sell the JN–4 plane and OX–5 motor as Curtiss type material, for the reason that a very small per cent is in truth made by the Curtiss Co.

6. I do not think this trade is as desirable for the Government as the previous one would have been, but all things taken into account, I think it is the best that can be done at this time, and I therefore recommend it.

7. The basis of the designation of the surplus was the action of the board of officers who considered the needs of the training program in so far as JN–4 planes and OX–5 motors were concerned, and who are of the opinion that the amount designated was surplus. There will be left in the possession of the Air Service approximately 2,000 Curtiss type training planes, consisting of JN–4 D's and JN–4 H's, and approximately 3,750 OX–5 motors.

8. It is my opinion that if the Air Service is to be required to furnish the militia planes for training purposes, that the number required to be furnished should be deducted from the total number of planes and motors declared surplus. This opinion is based upon the assumption that the Air Service will consist of the personnel recommended by the General Staff.

CHAS. T. MENOHER,
Major General, United States Army,
Director of Air Service.

MAY 21, 1919.

Memorandum for the Director of Sales.
Subject: Sale of airplanes to Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation.

I have examined the attached papers. It seems to me that the sale in question ought to be made. The planes proposed to be sold are, of course, rapidly becoming obsolescent. The opportunity for selling them to individuals is not open to us, nor should the War Department propose to sell airplanes to individuals because of the very hazardous character of their use. Should the Congress decide to direct any comprehensive training of National Guard or other forces in aircraft, a different type of plane ought to be used for that purpose.

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. HARE. I am glad to go into that to show you the care with which these various problems are studied. I am not saying that we are not going to makes mistakes; we are; we can not go ahead unless we do make some mistakes: but we want to make just as few as we can.

This sale has been consummated.

Senator NEW. At that figure?

Mr. HARE. At that figure.

Senafor THOMAS. With the option?

Mr. HARE. No; without the option.
Senator NEW. Without the option?
Mr. HARE. Yes.
Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Before we get away from it I simply want to finish that motor truck proposition. Now, I find from the reports that there were 50,712 trucks and 23,543 trailers. Those trucks, as I understand it, have been disposed with as follows: Thirty thousand assigned to the Department of Agriculture. What in thunder they are doing with 30,000 I do not know, but nevertheless they have asked for them. Fifteen thousand have recently been made surplus, have they not?
Mr. HARE. No. That 15,000 is in dispute, as I understand it. They may be made surplus.
Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, then, but you have got 32,000 trucks left. Now, these trucks are in the open air; they are deteriorating. Of course, all of the departments want to get those trucks, more than they need, but what trucks can be sold now for the benefit of the Government and salvaged should be, because if you do not hurry up they will all melt away and all this value will be destroyed.
Mr. HARE. I have no control over that policy, sir. The only control that I have is when surplus is declared and they are turned over to me for disposal.
Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, then, you can not act; you can not formulate any policy as to the disposal of any property until it is declared surplus?
Mr. HARE. That is a part of the exceedingly difficult task given me to perform. I am in the position to-day of trying to find a market for a certain quantity of goods, knowing perfectly well that inside of another month a lot more of that is going to be dumped into my lap. It would be much simpler, of course, if we could rapidly arrive at the size of the Army necessary to be provided for and could declare surplus those things not needed for the maintenance of such an Army.
Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; but, Mr. Hare, you have already got 18,000 trucks for the Army; you have got 11,000 trucks left surplus. Now, is it not possible to have the Secretary of War issue an order releasing those trucks and releasing the other material so that it can be disposed of? If it goes on for six months or a year longer the values will all melt away and the Government will get no salvage.
Mr. HARE. My understanding is that the General Staff has made a very close study of the requirements of the Army in all classes of material, including trucks, and they have reached the decision that they need what they have not declared surplus.
Senator SUTHERLAND. Mr. Hare, how much surplus cotton have you—baled cotton?
Mr. HARE. I can not tell you exactly. Col. Glover, I think, is better informed along that line than I am.
Col. GLOVER. Treated nitro cotton, we have about 15,500,000 pounds which is going to be declared surplus.
Senator SUTHERLAND. How much of it is baled cotton?
Col. GLOVER. I do not know, sir.
Senator SUTHERLAND. There are 52,000 bales of it lying on the ground at Nitro, W. Va., exposed to the weather since last fall. Some of it, of course, is deteriorating very rapidly. Has that been declared surplus?
Mr. HARE. Is not that cotton linters?
Senator SUTHERLAND. What?
The CHAIRMAN. Linters.
Senator SUTHERLAND. Well, I am not advised as to that, but it is baled cotton.
Col. GLOVER. Yes; in bales; cotton linters in 500-pound bales.
Senator SUTHERLAND. Well, but is that surplus material?
Col. GLOVER. Yes, sir.
Senator SUTHERLAND. What is to be done with that?
Mr. HARE. I would like Col. Glover to explain this cotton linters proposition. We thought that we had sold it at a pretty good price a short time ago, something over three weeks ago; but I was told yesterday that that contract had been upset, as the men who were entering into it believed that the price was a good deal more than the linters were worth, or something to that effect.
Senator SUTHERLAND. Is that at the market price of linters per bale?
Mr. HARE. There is practically no market price on linters. Col. Glover can tell you more of the details about it than I can. We were questioned very closely in the House committee regarding this cotton linters situation, as to whether or not by holding these linters off of the market we could not have gotten very much more than 3 cents, but we felt, from our experience, that three and a fraction cents was a very good price to get for them. Previous to this, from all our efforts, all over the country the highest bid we got was 1¼ cents, and it was only by an excellent stroke of work by Col. Glover and a few others that this price was obtained; but now the whole contract seems to be up in the air for the moment, because they feel that the linters are not worth that amount of money or they are not in a position to take them.
Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Well, are you caring for it in any way to prevent it from deterioration?
Mr. HARE. I understand that the Army is looking after that. The storage of all these things comes under other supervision than that of the Director of Sales.
The CHAIRMAN. You do not, then, have the responsibility of caring for surplus things?
Mr. HARE. None whatever.
Senator NEW. Do you know whether the fact that it has been exposed to the weather all this time and has probably deteriorated in value because of that has anything to do with the present refusal of your prospective purchasers to carry out their contract?
Mr. HARE. I think that may, sir, have something to do with it. I am not prepared to answer that.
Senator NEW. How about your supply of canned vegetables, Mr. Hare?
Mr. HARE. The canned vegetable situation was another very awkward situation. The policy that I adopted as soon as Mr. Crowell asked me to take hold was that we were not going to store anything, but we were going to sell it, and, very naturally, business men of the country said: "Well, if you begin to sell this stuff you will ruin our markets." I said, "Well, we have got to find some way to get the money flowing back into the Treasury, and, at the same time, dispose of our various materials." And that is the policy we have been following from the beginning. We have found the industries in every instance very helpful now; since they find that we have no intention of starting out to dump material indiscriminately they are very glad to find some way by which it could be offered on the market and not disturb their business.
Senator NEW. Let me ask right there about how much surplus stock of vegetables was there—what would it amount to in dollars and cents?
Mr. HARE. I am not able to give it to you right offhand, but the situation in regards to canned vegetables proposition was that I found that Gen. Wood had made an agreement with the canners to hold this material off the market.

EXHIBIT C.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PURCHASE AND STORAGE,
Washington, December 6, 1918.

From: Director of Purchase and Storage.
To: Mr. Frank E. Gorrell, secretary National Canners' Association, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Canned tomatoes.

1. You are advised that the director of finance, after consultation with the comptroller, advises adjustment may be made with packers on balance of reservations along general lines prescribed in Supply Circular No. 111, attached.
2. You are further advised that it is not intended to offer the surplus that the Army owns to the domestic trade during the present season.
3. Arrangements have been made through the zone supply officer in Baltimore to release public warehouse space to take care of in the neighborhood of 500,000 cases of tomatoes. A list of these canners and quantities are to be supplied by your office to the zone supply officer in Baltimore, so that he may properly instruct the warehouse people. This list is to be submitted to the zone supply officer within one week.
4. It is clearly understood that the Army is only arranging this warehouse space as an accommodation for these particular canners who were requested to reserve certain quantities of goods and for which no purchase orders were issued.

R. E. WOOD,
Brigadier General, Director of Purchase and Storage.

Below is a copy of Supply Circular No. 111, referred to in the above letter:

"1. The above letter from Brig. Gen. Wood refers only to that portion of the requisitioned product for which no formal purchase order has been issued.
"2. Canners holding purchase orders should apply to their district depot quartermaster for immediate shipping instructions.
"3. Canners having products coming under section 4 of the above letter who are without fireproof storage should immediately arrange to ship their products to safely protected warehouses so that the Government's interest as well as the interest of the canners can be properly protected.
"4. As a considerable portion of the canned products described in section 4 of Gen. Wood's letter are within the eastern territory, where public warehouse space has been commandeered, arrangements have been made by the Quartermaster General's office to release public warehouse space in Baltimore to take care of the 500,000 cases of tomatoes for which no purchase orders were issued.
"5. Canners in the other depot quartermasters' zones who need warehouse space and can not obtain same conveniently should wire this office, and a request will immediately be made to the Quartermaster General's Office to supply this space.
"6. Canners in the Baltimore district are urged to immediately communicate to the National Canners' Association Office, Washington, D. C., the amount of space required stated in cases. Under the order of Gen. Wood, a complete list of the space required must be submitted within the week of December 9, 1918.
"7. It will be understood that the canner is required to exercise due diligence in seeing that the goods are properly stored and intelligently marketed.
"8. Canners in localities where there is no danger of freezing or canners having frost-proof storage can properly protect their product in their own warehouses, provided same are otherwise suitable. Recent bulletins of the Food Administration give full particulars in reference to interest, storage, and other carrying charges.
"9. Further information will shortly be issued in reference to the adjustment mentioned in section 1 of Gen. Wood's letter."

That agreement had been further amplified——
Senator NEW (interposing). That is, Gen. R. E. Wood, is it?
Mr. HARE (continuing). Yes; and had been further amplified without drawing the matter to the attention of the director of sales in the following letter:

EXHIBIT D.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PURCHASE AND STORAGE,
Washington, March 17 1919.

FRANK GERBER,
President National Canners' Association,
1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GERBER: Your letter of March 15 to Maj. Gen. H. L. Rogers has been referred to me for reply.
I am glad to be able to relieve your mind on the subject of any surplus of canned vegetables to be dumped on the market.
Acting along lines suggested by you, canned peas, corn, squash, and string beans will be added to the ration list, which has always contained canned tomatoes. This will entirely dispose of our stock and eliminate surplus.
I trust this will relieve your mind and those of your associates in the canners' association.

Yours, very truly,

A. M. DAVIS,
Colonel, Quartermaster Corps, Director of Storage.

Now, I found that this addition to the ration list had not taken care of all our surplus canned peas, corn, squash, and string beans, and that we had vast quantities of them on hand, and when I got into it I found that to my way of thinking there had been no adequate reason for agreeing with the canners or anyone else to hold this material off of the market indefinitely. After discussing the matter with the Secretary of War, and he agreeing, I called the canners and had an interview with them. I told them that I was not going to be bound by that agreement; that we had to find some way of disposing of this surplus. After much discussion they agreed to help us, and, as a result of that, we are to-day advertising canned vegetables, with the exception of tomatoes, for sale generally around the country, and hope to reach an agreement in regard to tomatoes shortly.
I would like to insert here statement prepared by Col. Glover:

EXHIBIT D-1.

JUNE 17, 1919.

Subject: Canned corn, peas, and tomatoes.

1. One of our most embarrassing problems has been the disposal of canned corn, peas, and tomatoes. On December 6 Gen. Wood, then Director of Purchase and Storage, wrote the secretary of the National Canners' Association in part as follows:

"You are further advised that it is not intended to offer the surplus that the Army owns to the domestic trade during the present season."

On March 17, Col. Davis, Director of Storage, wrote to the president of the National Canners' Association in part as follows:

"Acting along lines suggested by you, canned peas, corn, squash, and string beans will be added to the ration list, which has always contained canned tomatoes. This will entirely dispose of our stock and eliminate surplus."

2. The National Canners' Association has felt that these two letters eliminated the selling of any surplus canned vegetables by the War Department. However, it has developed that there is a large surplus of these goods, and a statement showing the estimated surplus is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A."

3. Realizing that the letters above referred to had created a delicate situation, we held several interviews with the National Canners' Association officials, and finally, on June 7, we advised them that we could not be bound by Gen. Wood's or Col. Davis's letters, inasmuch as conditions had changed, and that we would be compelled to sell these canned goods forthwith. The canners finally agreed that if we would market the canned corn and canned peas at this time there would be little, if any, objection on their part, for the reason that the demand for these vegetables is good, and we would no doubt get good prices, provided the request for bids would state the specific lots and brands which we had for sale, and with the further proviso that they would be offered progressively and as a demand for them was shown. We advised them at this meeting that it would be impossible to separate all of the canned goods by grades and by brands, for the reason that the Army did not keep an inventory in this manner, and if we were to do this it would be necessary to take a complete inventory of each depot throughout the country and a large amount of time would be wasted.

4. On June 9 this office wrote them a letter, copy of which is attached and marked "Exhibit B," which letter advised them that we would put the canned peas and canned corn on the market at once, but that we would wait one week before offering the tomatoes, in order to give them more time to give us helpful suggestions as to the best manner of handling these goods.

5. Capt. Clement, of the subsistence branch, Surplus Property Division, was instructed on June 7 to prepare instructions to the zone supply officers, in order that they might immediately advertise for bids on such canned goods as had been declared surplus in their zones, and these instructions went forward to the zone supply officers on June 13 and 14.

6. At the same time Capt. Clement was advised to prepare the necessary papers instructing zone officers to call for bids on canned tomatoes, but he was instructed to hold these papers in his office, pending our conference with the canners on June 16.

7. A further meeting with the Canners' Association was held in our office on the afternoon of June 16. Mr. Gerber, president of the association; Mr. Gorrell, secretary; and Mr. Baines, also of the association, were present, and the Government was represented by Col. Glover and Capt. Clement. The gentlemen representing the association objected to our calling for bids on miscellaneous lots of corn and peas, stating that intelligent bids could not be submitted by buyers unless specific brands and grades were listed in the request for bids. It was explained to them that it was impossible to do this in all cases, for the reason that the stocks had been depleted, regardless of the brands and grades, and that a complete inventory would have to be taken if their wishes were complied with and the inventory would hold up the issuing of the bids for too long a time. It was further explained to them that the request for bids would state that the goods were subject to inspection and that bidders could go to the warehouse, inspect the goods, and bid on such specific lots as they might select, our only restriction being that they bid on not less than carload lots. After further consultation and realizing that there is merit in their contention that the Government would likely secure better bids if specific lots and grades can be shown, we prepared a telegram to the zone officers, which Capt. Clement agreed to send out on the evening of the 16th, which telegram is in substance as follows:

"In reference to our letter of June —, regarding advertising for bids on canned corn, peas, and beans, you are to divide the goods into lots and brands in so far as possible and call for bids on the separate lots. This is important, as bidders will pay more for specific lots than for miscellaneous assortments. It is not desirable at this time to advertise large quantities of miscellaneous lots. Notify each packer the amount of his goods you are offering, inviting him to bid. Where specific information regarding lots and brands is not available, call for bids on reasonable amounts only."

8. This telegram will reach the zone officers in ample time so that they can prepare their bids accordingly.

9. On account of lack of time, no specific decision has been reached regarding the canned tomatoes, and the representatives of the Canners' Association are to call again at this office at 2 o'clock, June 17, in order to discuss this situation.

10. The Wholesale Grocers' Association were called to Washington on June 7 in order that we could discuss with them the best method of disposing of these canned goods, and they have advised us that they should be marketed expeditiously, but that we should not accept bids unless we receive the approximate market price. It has, of course, been our intention from the beginning to accept no bids unless they would approximate the market price, although we expect to be compelled to accept bids slightly lower than the market on account of the goods being sold "as is" and without warranty.

11. The Canners' Association seem to feel that the Wholesale Grocers are anxious to break the market and wish us to sell these goods immediately in order to do so. The Wholesale Grocers did not show that this was their desire at the time of our meeting. They suggested that they might handle these goods for us, but inasmuch as they have at least a 12½ per cent overhead and would expect a 2½ per cent profit in addition, we felt that it would be impracticable and poor business to market these goods in this manner, as they would, in turn, have to sell through the retailer, who would doubtless expect at least 15 or 20 per cent to cover his expenses and profit, with the net result that the Government would receive perhaps 40 per cent less for the goods than the consumer would pay for them. The Wholesale Grocers agreed with us that it was perhaps best to call for sealed bids on these goods and sell in accordance therewith, provided the bids would be rejected if the offers were not in line with the market.

12. There seem to be many diverging opinions regarding the way in which the Government should sell the surplus canned vegetables. I am attaching herewith copy of a telegram from the Canners' League of California, dated June 15 and marked "Exhibit C"; also a telegram from the president of the Central Inland Waterways Association, dated June 13. Mr. Thomas Roberts, jr., of Philadelphia, in charge of the canned goods department of the Food Administration for 20 months and president of a large canning concern, advises that it will do no harm to market these goods immediately, and that they should be gotten off the market without further delay. Mr. W. R. Roach, of Grand Rapids, Mich., president of one of the largest pea canneries in the country, states that he realizes the Government should sell the goods, but he objects very seriously to them being sold below the market or in such manner as will break the market, and he further states he believes the Government will secure much better prices if we wait until September or October before placing these goods on the market. The National Canners' Association object to selling any tomatoes at this time, and, in fact, dislike the idea of selling peas and corn, but offer no serious objection if they are sold in small lots and as a demand is indicated. The Wholesale Grocers feel that they should be sold at once, and some individuals feel that they should be sold at a low price in order to lower the high cost of living. The Director of Sales feels that the goods should be marketed as quickly as they can be sold for an advantageous price, and is preparing to sell them along these lines, although there will be no specific action taken regarding canned tomatoes until a final interview is given the National Canners' Association.

13. None of the bids now being asked for will be accepted unless they conform closely to the present market. It is now planned, if these bids are rejected, to negotiate with exporters in the hopes that they will offer prices approximating the market quotations.

F. GLOVER,
Colonel, Quartermaster Corps, Assistant Director of Sales.

EXHIBIT A.

Vegetables, canned surplus, June 3, 1919.

Articles.	Unit.	Surplus.	Declared surplus.	To be declared.
Asparagus	Small cans	232,647		232,647
Beans, baked	No. 1 cans	9,208,602	526,819	8,681,783
Do	No. 2 cans	855,289	22,000	833,289
Do	No. 3 cans	14,646,869	354,944	14,291,925
Do	No. 10 cans	1,505		1,505
Beans, stringless	No. 2 cans	3,513,229	2,459,165	1,054,064
Do	No. 10 cans	37,261	25,485	11,776
Beets	Small cans	9,538		9,538
Carrots	do	10,317		10,317
Corn, sweet	No. 2 cans	31,804,644	14,697,441	17,107,203
Hominy, lye	No. 3 cans	78,136		78,136
Peas, green	Small cans	24,607,658	10,464,391	14,143,267
Potatoes, sweet	do	779,556	112,400	667,153
Pumpkin	do	2,615,309	1,139,213	1,476,095
Do	No. 10 cans	10,018	5,028	4,990
Spinach	Small cans	204,618		204,618
Squash	do	90,169	20,328	69,841
Do	No. 10 cans	5,961		5,961
Tomatoes	No. 1 cans	188,569		188,569
Do	No. 2 cans	20,122,731	33,970	20,088,761
Do	No. 2½ cans	10,301,924	593,414	9,708,510
Do	No. 3 cans	52,410,242	3,059,994	49,350,248
Do	No. 10 cans	1,992,868	65,000	1,936,868
Turnips	Small cans	676		676

EXHIBIT B.

JUNE 19, 1918.

From: Office Director of Sales.
To: National Canners' Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. Attention of Mr. Frank Gerber.

1. This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of even date, which has been carefully noted. I regret exceedingly that necessity compelled us to advise you as we did Saturday morning at our conference, that conditions have changed since you were advised by representatives of the War Department that certain goods would not be sold except for export during the present season, and that they have also changed since you received advice that all of these surplus goods would be used as rations for the Army.

2. Under existing instructions we intend to put the canned peas and canned corn on the market at once. In response to your verbal request of to-day, however, we will wait one week in order that your association may present to us an outline of their proposal for disposing of our canned tomatoes, and this confirms Col. Glover's telephone message to you of this afternoon.

3. We can assure you that we will use our very best endeavors to keep these canned goods out of the hands of speculators and will endeavor in every way to so distribute the goods that they will supply the current demand and will not be stored for speculative purposes.

C. W. HARE, *Director of Sales.*

EXHIBIT C.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 14.*

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
Washington, D. C.:

Relative to surplus Army and Navy canned food, every effort should be made to sell this for export, but if this is impossible, then Canners' League recommends that surplus quantities be offered to civilian trade promptly, thereby removing all uncertainty, and Army and Navy should come out with statement of excess quantities and definite time of sale, so packers can shape future pack accordingly. Fact that Army has large quantity of tomatoes in storage here has had serious effect on packing and jobbing trade. If, however, these tomatoes were sold now, liberal quantity could go into consumption before new pack is ready for delivery. California fruit packers and pineapple packers are prepared to take back any surplus quantity of fruit and pineapple on basis of Government cost.

CANNERS' LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA,
PRESTON MCKINNEY, *Secretary.*

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 13.*

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

Immediate action must be taken by you to open up cold-storage houses operated by Government, as well as privately owned, and dispose of this enormous surplus to the people at reduced prices to reduce the high cost of living, instead of turning it over to Beef Trust or speculators con-

trolled by Beef Trust. The only remedy that will prevent a bloody bread riot which will eclipse even the horrors of our late war and to prevent such a calamity open up the storage houses, smash the food prices by selling direct to consumer.

ALBERT KRELL,
President Central Inland Waterways Association.

There was no agreement made in regard to our canned meats, but a great deal of discussion has arisen in the papers as to whether we would sell that can by can over the counter—we had no organization to handle and distribute all our canned meats that way—we had to dispose of the stuff in carload lots, and if you have before you always the guiding principle that you want to sell in the best market, which happens to be overseas for this canned meat, I see no objection to selling it abroad to exporters. At the same time I want to state that the packers and grocers' associations and all of them have been perfectly willing to help us in the disposal of any of this material; but in analyzing their offer they very naturally wanted to charge us the cost of disposal of it and also make a small profit on it, but we asked ourselves why we could not cut out their profit and sell directly to exporters and in other ways.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. They have already made a good profit in selling it to the Government?

Mr. HARE. I fancy they made a small profit.

Senator NEW. You are progressing now, however, in selling vegetables through the cooperation of the canners?

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Senator THOMAS. Why can not some arrangement be made with the Hoover food commission with regards to this surplus?

Mr. HARE. I thought that was the most reasonable outlet. I tried to get in touch with them by cable. I sent them a cable nearly three weeks ago, but to date have not received any reply. I was quite surprised, however, to find a representative of Mr. Hoover on this side had obtained large stores of meats that had been held by the Italian Government. I do not see why they should buy from the Italian Government when the United States Government had these large stores on hand for sale.

Senator THOMAS. It seems to me that is a queer transaction.

Senator NEW. Now, what about the meat surplus, Mr. Hare?

Mr. HARE. I should like to place in the record a very complete statement in regard to this entire meat question, but I will just briefly, for your information, state that we have 47,000,000 pounds of bacon, 30,000,000 pounds of roast beef, 36,000,000 pounds of corned beef, 20,000,000 pounds of corned beef hash. Now, the way that we are trying to dispose of this is that we have sent out some 40,000 requests for bids in carload lots. Those bids will be opened on the 20th of this month. If they are right we will accept them, if they are not we will not.

Senator THOMAS. We have this surplus, and it seems to me the Hoover commission is using our appropriation of $100,000,000 for the purchase of duplicate stores, of course, at a much larger sum of money, from the Italian Government.

Mr. HARE. I am not at all familiar with his appropriation. I am familiar with that particular incident.

Senator NEW. These stores are ours and are paid for.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you taken it up with the Secretary of War, or any other officials?

Mr. HARE. I have discussed this entire meat subject with the Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I mean this matter of——

Mr. HARE (interposing). Mr. Hoover's case?

The CHAIRMAN. Of the Hoover commission making original purchases in this country where you have all this stuff for sale?

Mr. HARE. I mentioned that fact to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, has that arrangement been made to discontinue this system?

Mr. HARE. That I do not know. I believe that the matter is being taken up through Judge Parker's commission on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Parker's commission on the other side has no jurisdiction over Mr. Hoover's commission on this side.

Senator NEW. No; it has nothing to do with the surplus stocks which are here.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I am not criticizing Mr. Hare at all, because, apparently, he is the only man that has noticed this thing up to date; but I was wondering whether any responsible authority of the Government was doing anything to stop it.

Mr. HARE. That I can not answer.

We believe we can get very much better prices from exporters for this food than we can get from men in this country. In the first place it is especially prepared for export; it is all ready to be shipped, which is a valuable asset. The people in other countries need it more than our people do in its present shape, and I am inclined to believe that on the 20th we will get some very good prices.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. How long will it last, Mr. Hare?

Mr. HARE. I have taken that up with men who know, and they tell me it is entirely a question of storage. In some particular places our storage is very bad; in some it is very good. All of this canned stuff deteriorates if it is exposed to rapid changes of temperature from hot to cold. They call it, I think, "swells" and "leaks" or some technical term. It, therefore, seems important, as this is perishable stuff, to get rid of it as soon as possible.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Can we get you to furnish us the amounts for the bids you get on the 20th instant and which prices you accept?

Mr. HARE. I will certainly furnish it to you.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. And if you can get the prices Hoover paid for the same stuff, we would like to have them.

Mr. HARE. I will try to get them for you.

(The following statement was furnished by Mr. Hare for insertion in the record:)

EXHIBIT F.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES,
Washington, June 18, 1919.

Memorandum to Mr. E. C. Morse, first assistant director of sales.
Subject: American Relief Administration (Grain Corporation).

1. Mr. Rickard, at 42 Broadway, New York, Mr. Hoover's representative, stated over the telephone to-day that their purchase of 18,000,000 pounds of pork bought from the Italian Government consisted principally of what is technically known as clear backs, which is a different cut and more expensive cut than bacon. The price paid was 33 cents per pound; date of purchase, April 17.

2. Capt. Clement states that the bacon that was recently sold by surplus property in Baltimore was declared surplus April 15. On April 14 he was in Mr. Barnes's office in New York and brought to the latter's attention the stock of meats, canned goods, etc., that the Government held. It is not clear that this specific lot of bacon was mentioned, but the general extent of the Government stocks was made known to Mr. Barnes. However, he was not interested but gave Capt. Clement considerable assistance by putting him in touch with representatives of foreign Governments in New York City.

3. Mr. Neal Smith, of surplus property, states that the lists of surplus issued by that branch were sent to the Food Administration for the attention of Mr. Sherwood in Washington, and that the list of April 5, which is the one issued just previous to the purchase in question, showed a parge amount of bacon on hand. Specific inquiries for subsistence items have not been received from the Food Administration by surplus property, but Mr. Smith is keeping that office posted on his stocks.

S. D. GRAFF,
Captain, Ordnance, United States Army.

JUNE 3, 1919.

STATEMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES AS TO THE SURPLUS CANNED MEATS OF THE ARMY.

"The approximate surplus of canned meats held by the War Department was furnished the director of sales by the Quartermaster General of the Army about May 5, as per attached inventory. This consisted of:

	Pounds.
Bacon	47,000,000
Roast beef	38,000,000
Corned beef	36,000,000
Corned-beef hash	20,000,000
Total	141,000,000

"These meats cost the Government average prices as follows:

Bacon issue, ser. 8, crates	per pound	$0.40
Bacon issue, ser. 10, 12-pound cans	do	.46
Beef, roast, 6-pound cans	per can	2.70
Beef, roast, 2-pound cans	do	.82
Beef, roast, 1-pound cans	do	.51
Beef, roast, 12-pound cans	do	.35
Beef, corned, 6-pound cans	do	2.09
Beef, corned, 24-pound cans	do	.70
Beef, corned, 1-pound cans	do	.45
Beef, corned, 12-pound cans	do	.38
Hash, corned beef, 2-pound cans	do	.48
Hash, corned beef, 1-pound cans	do	.28

"This represents in round figures a total cost to the Government of $60,000,000.

"The question of the disposal of this large quantity of canned meat was discussed, and it was decided to call in conference representatives of the packing industry who sold the meat in question to the Government; following the general policy adopted by the War Department in the disposal of all its surplus to consult with the industry affected before decision was reached as to the best method to adopt for its disposal and to endeavor to avoid dumping vast stores on the market in such a way as to entail an undue sacrifice of the Government's interests.

"The following Government representatives were present at the meeting:

"Gen. Kniskern, zone supply officer of Chicago district, who acted as chairman.
"Col. Fred Glover, assistant director of sales.
"Col. Quackenbush, assistant director of storage.
"Capt. Foster, chief, surplus property division.
"Lieut. Clement, chief of subsistence section, surplus property.
"Mr. Birkenstein, storage division, purchase and storage.
"Maj. Squire, chief of quartermaster stores, director of sales office.
"Mr. Elcock, chief of sales promotion, director of sales office.
"Representing the packers there were present the following:
"Mr. J. A. Hawkinson, Wilson & Co.
"Mr. M. C. Plainer, Wilson & Co.
"Mr. D. B. Russell, Morris & Co.
"Mr. J. J. Deady, Armour & Co.
"Mr. A. F. Peiffer, Armour & Co.
"Mr. W. F. Wardell, Armour & Co
"Mr. G. C. Shepherd, Cudahy & Co.
"Mr. F. E. Wilbur, Cudahy & Co.
"Mr. E. D. Baldwin, Libby, McNeil & Libby.
"Mr. Burroughs, Swift & Co.

"The general question was discussed as to how this canned meat could be marketed in this country to the best advantage. The department had no organization to retail this large supply to individual consumers and the packers' opinion was therefore asked as to what was the best method to dispose of it.

"In substance they stated that the canned meats were not in commercial packages and that the canned roast beef had never been sold to the consuming public in this country, its use having been heretofore incident to the supply of various mining expeditions and logging camps, etc. Furthermore, the shape in which it was packed made it necessary to repack it before it could even be offered for sale and any reasonable price realized. It was further brought out that this canned roast beef was not even used for the Army in peace times, fresh beef being the ration.

"It was stated that there is a market for corned beef in 12 and 24-ounce cans, but it was believed that the Government could secure no more for the 2-pound cans, containing almost 33 per cent more corned beef, if sold generally to the consuming public than they could for the commercial size 12 and 24-ounce cans, and that therefore before making any attempt to sell this to the consuming public in this country it should be repacked in commercial sizes.

"The market for corned beef hash it was stated is limited, most of it being sold in 6-ounce cans on individual order, and in order to market this to the public to the best advantage to the Government it would be necessary to repack it in commercial size cans.

"The bacon was specially cured for the Army. It contains an unusual amount of salt and has gone through a process of eight days' smoking instead of the usual 48 hours for the bacon prepared for the trade. The majority of this bacon is put up in sealed cans for export to the troops overseas.

"In regard to the 8,000,000 pounds of bacon crated and located in Chicago, Baltimore, and Columbus, it was brought out that sealed proposals were about to be asked for in connection with a supply of approximately 2,400,000 pounds at Baltimore. This quantity had been

offered the meat packers and meat dealers and the meat trade in general located east of the Mississippi.

"In view of these various statements, and further in view of the fact that it had come to the attention of the Director of Sales' office, that Mr. Hoover had very recently purchased in this country for shipment overseas bacon held by the Italian and French Governments in this country, it was decided advisable to get in touch with Mr. Hoover and ascertain whether or not he would not purchase a certain amount of the canned surplus meats held by the Army.

"If it was found that the canned meats could not be sold to advantage overseas, the packers were willing to cooperate in any way possible to help in the disposal of it in this country, and it was suggested that if it was decided to use the packers' distribution facilities that they would be willing to act as the Government's selling agents and sell the canned meats at prices dictated by the Government and charge the actual expenses involved.

"It was explained at this meeting that this amount of canned meat was produced by the packers in about five months, running at full capacity three shifts per day, and represented as much canned meat as would ordinarily be packed in two and one-half years. Therefore if an effort were made to dump this entire supply on the American market, irrespective of the prices secured for it, it would probably lead to a disruption of the entire canning industry for a period of a year.

"Immediately after this meeting a cable was sent to Mr. Hoover through the United States Liquidation Commission asking him whether or not he was in the market to purchase a proportion of the canned meats held by the Government. Mr. Hoover's representative in this country, Mr. J. S. Barnes, was also consulted, but Mr. Barnes did not believe that he was in the market to purchase them.

"The question of the disposal of these canned meats in this country was discussed with the Salvation Army; Red Cross; the Farmers' Union, who distribute food products through cooperative stores; the Central Purchasing Committee of New York City, which does the purchasing for all charitable, penal, and hospital institutions in the city of New York; Austin Nichols & Co., of Brooklyn, and R. C. Williams & Co., of New York City, two of the largest wholesale grocery houses in the country.

"Col. Parker, representing the Salvation Army, stated that they might be able to buy a limited amount of the canned meats, provided a satisfactory price were named, as they are obliged to sell at very low prices.

"The Red Cross have no distributing means.

"The Farmers' Union stated that they did not care to purchase any of it, and advised strongly that it be sold for export.

"The Central Purchasing Committee of New York City stated that they purchased only fresh meat and unless a considerable change were made in their dietary regulations they would not be able to purchase it.

"Austin Nichols and R. C. Williams & Co. stated that they would be interested in a small quantity at a price for export.

"The matter was also taken up with A. B. Rodway & Co., exporters of canned food products in New York City, and Nogan Garrison & Co., merchants representatives of groceries and canned meats of New York City, who stated that they would be interested in small amounts for export solely, and that no market, in their opinion, existed for this type of canned meat in this country.

"Since the meeting with the packers bids have been received for the 2,400,000 pounds of bacon held at Baltimore. This bacon cost the Government approximately 40 cents a pound. Several thousand circular letters were sent out requesting bids, and only 12 bids were received. The highest bid for all of this bacon was 21 cents per pound. None of the bids were accepted, and negotiations are now under way and it is believed that a sale of all of this bacon can be made for approximately 28 cents per pound to a commission house in Baltimore who represent Texas interests and will sell this bacon to be used for the colored trade in the South.

"We are now circularizing approximately 20,000 State, municipal, and charitable institutions, asking them to bid on this surplus meat, and we may be able to dispose of a certain amount of it in this way. We are also circularizing all of the dealers, wholesale and retail grocers, and other dealers in food products who may be interested, and this sale is being advertised in all daily papers in cities where the meat is stored and in trade papers appealing to produce men, wholesale grocers, hotel men, and large dealers in foodstuffs.

"We are also seeing if arrangements can not be made through which some of this canned meat may be offered direct to the public at the warehouses where it is stored in Chicago, Columbus, Schenectady, New Cumberland, Pa., Newport News, Baltimore, Omaha, New Orleans, Boston, San Antonio, New York, St. Louis, El Paso, Atlanta, and San Francisco. On account of the inaccessibility of the warehouses where this food is stored, however, it is doubtful whether any considerable portion of the public will come to a sale if carried out.

"Before any of these sales, however, can take place the important question must be decided as to what price we are to market this vast store of foodstuff for. It is obvious that if the price is made low enough and the articles sacrificed that all of it can be disposed of in this country. It must not be forgotten, however, that a very much better price can be secured through export.

"We already have offers from various firms averaging approximately 70 per cent of the cost price to the Government, and an inquiry arrived on the 28th from the American Oceanic Corporation stating that they were authorized to purchase foodstuffs in amounts up to $10,000,000 for shipment to Roumania, payment to be made by two-year Roumanian treasury notes at par, bearing 6 per cent interest, payable in gold dollars.

"It must be remembered that all of this canned meat is considered perishable; i. e., that under the storage conditions maintained by the Army it is doubtful that it will remain marketable for a longer period than nine months. I also want to draw your attention to the fact that once a can is opened it spoils very rapidly, which would make it rather difficult for the average small household to make use of the larger sized cans which the Army has for disposal.

"It seems advisable, therefore, that we continue our present effort to market as much of this surplus as possible in this country at the best prices obtainable and sell the remainder for export. It must be borne in mind, however, that if a low price is established here for domestic sales, it will make it more difficult to secure a higher price for the same class of canned meats from exporters."

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. You said there were $2,000,000,000 worth of material that the Secretary of War stated was surplus, did you not?

Mr. HARE. Approximately $2,000,000,000 in this country.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, has that been declared surplus?

Mr. HARE. It has not. That is just a rough estimate of what will be surplus.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Then those figures mean $2,000,000,000 worth of material, some of which may be surplus, but most of which will be retained by the Army?

Mr. HARE. No, sir; it means that the best guess that men who are supposed to be familiar with the particular subjects is that it will be surplus and considered as such. I have that prepared in a statement showing it by bureaus.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Have you an inventory of it?

Mr. HARE. I have an approximate inventory. The inventories, I think, are very inaccurate, and the amount of surplus of any given material is being changed from day to day. We have in certain instances gone so far as to practically negotiate a sale only to find that the material has been withdrawn for the use of the Army.

EXHIBIT G.

Rough estimate of amount of surplus supplies held in the various bureaus.

[May 16, 1919.]

Bureau.	Estimated total surplus.	Sales to date.	Balance to sell.
Air Service, Aircraft Production	$62,000,000	$1,500,000	$60,500,000
Air Service, Military Aeronautics	85,000,000	500,000	84,500,000
Chemical Warfare	6,000,000		6,000,000
Construction	2,000,000	800,000	1,200,000
Military Railways	126,000,000	71,100,000	54,900,000
Ordnance	300,000,000	47,600,000	252,400,000
Purchase and Storage	1,350,000,000	114,600,000	1,235,400,000
Signal Corps	500,000	30,000	470,000
Total	1,931,500,000	236,130,000	1,695,370,000

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Let me ask you, in this connection, if it would assist you any if this Congress were to pass a resolution in connection with the appropriation bill directing the War Department to turn over all this property to you and let you qualify what you consider surplus?

Mr. HARE. I would not be qualified to do that, because that is conditioned upon the needs of the Army.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Could you not determine it after hearing from the Staff Corps and others?

Mr. HARE. I think that a better form of procedure would be this: That an immediate decision be arrived at as to the strength, the proposed strength, of the Army. There are many experts in the Army who can very quickly figure out the needs of a force of a definite size, and that amount can be subtracted from our stores and that will give you a fair basis to work upon.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. There is not any man outside of the War Department that has a question in his mind but what the Army will not be over 500,000 men at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The maximum estimate of the War Department is 509,000 men.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. I suggest that this committee ask the War Department to make an estimate of the amount of material they will retain on an Army based on a total strength of 500,000 and then declare surplus beyond that all material in the possession of the Government. If you get that then you can dispose of these materials. If you do not, you are going to have them deteriorate and the Government is going to lose millions of dollars. There are 750,000 saddles and bridles to an Army of 500,000 men, when they do not need over 40,000 or 50,000. Those saddles and bridles are new and can be disposed of now while the leather is new—they are the best saddles in the world. There is a whole lot of harness in excess of their needs. Now, that goes right down the whole line of supplies, and unless they are disposed of shortly the Government is going to lose a great deal of money, and there should be some better policy to take care of it.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. There is another subject on which I would like to touch incidentally: How much T. N. T. was there on hand when the armistice was signed?

Mr. HARE. Vast stores; I have not the figures in my head.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. There was over 30,000,000 pounds in New Jersey alone.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Now, has there ever been any determination as to whether or not that T. N. T. which had accumulated was surplus?

Mr. HARE. Yes, there has; though I believe at one time it was thought the best way to get rid of it was to dump it overboard, and then finally they decided to turn it over, or at least a certain amount of it, to the Department of Agriculture.

Col. GLOVER. It was to be turned over to the Department of the Interior.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Now, was there an order issued by any department of the Government to dump that overboard?

Mr. HARE. I am not familiar with that. I know that it was discussed, but whether the order was actually issued or not I do not know.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. You do not know that. What was the value of that T. N. T.?

Mr. HARE. That I do not know. Do you, Mr. Morse?

Mr. MORSE. About $10,000.000.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. About how much?

Mr. MORSE. About $10,000,000.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Why was it the American T. N. T. was not dumped and the French material was?

Mr. HARE. I can not tell.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Was any of it (the French T. N. T.) dumped?

Mr. HARE. Yes, it was.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. It was, and ours was not dumped?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Senator CHAMBERLAN. And now our Government is paying a claim against it because it was French T. N. T. which we threw overboard.

Mr. HARE. I can not tell you that.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Answering your question in a hearing last January it was testified to that there were 88,000,000 pounds of T. N. T. that could not be satisfactorily disposed of.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Could you state whether or not the order was issued ordering that this T. N. T. be thrown overboard?

Mr. HARE. I can not state that. I know that it was discussed, but whether an actual order was given I could not say; I do not know.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Well, General, do you know?

Gen. LORD. I beg pardon?

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Was that an order issued by any of the departments of the Government that this T. N. T. on hand, some 88,000,000 pounds, be thrown overboard?

Gen. LORD. Not to my knowledge.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Senator, I might throw some light on that question. When the war stopped these various ammunition factories were simply stored to the brim with T. N. T. They had had several explosions in New Jersey and in other States. The people were very anxious to have it shipped out. The greatest problem the Secretary of War had to face was how to dispose of it. They built a big warehouse at Fort Wingate, but that only took a portion of it. They took part of it to the various arsenals. I may state that there is some 15,000,000 pounds stored there which we are trying to have him remove. He did take a few million pounds and dump it overboard, and the people were glad to get rid of it, I think, from a very much congested manufacturing section, but it has not been the policy to destroy it. They have simply tried to store it and keep it.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. What I am trying to find out is not by way of criticism.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. But let me say, Senator, in addition, that they have got in New Jersey nearly 15,000,000 pounds of ammonium nitrate which can be distributed through the Agriculture Department. The New Jersey farmers need nitrate to-day, and yet it is stored there, and it is the lack of any definite policy in regard to the distribution and sale of these things that is going to cost the Government a lot of money.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. I want it thoroughly understood that what I am trying to find out now is not by way of criticism. I simply want to find out the facts about this material. My understanding is that an order was made to throw it all overboard, but that that order was subsequently revoked, and the Secretary of War concluded to turn it all over to the Department of the Interior for blasting stumps and clearing land in the West.

Col. GLOVER. Twenty-six million pounds was set aside for that purpose.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Then there would still be a very large surplus. Can you tell me whether that surplus is being disposed of in any way?

Col. GLOVER. No; 26,000,000 pounds is all that I know about that was declared surplus.

Senator NEW. That would represent a surplus of 62,000,000 pounds according to those figures, Senator.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. They are correct.

Senator BECKHAM. In the investigation we had last winter Senator FRELINGHUYSEN, Senator MYERS, and myself, some officer testified, as I recall it, that this T. N. T. was not valuable in commerce. I had never heard of this use in agriculture. That may have been developed afterwards, but when it is stored it can be kept very well, and it might be useful that the Government should keep a great deal of it on hand for an emergency and that they were preparing to store it in certain places, I believe in the West, New Mexico.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Fort Wingate, N. Mex.

Col. GLOVER. I will be glad to get a complete statement on that subject.

—

EXHIBIT H.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF SALES,
Washington, June 18, 1919.

From: Maj. A. L. Mercer, Chief, Raw Materials and Scrap Section.
To: Mr. E. C. Morse, First Assistant Director of Sales.
Subject: T. N. T.

1. Ordnance has a total stock of 62,016,919 pounds of T. N. T. of grades 1, 2, and 3 material. Of this quantity 37,000,000 pounds are held as reserve for the War Department. The difference represents the surplus of 25,000,000 pounds being held for the Department of Interior. This quantity is to be transferred to this department to be used in blowing out stumps, etc.

2. There is an additional quantity of some 1,500,000 pounds of T. N. T. scrap, which figure has not been included in the foregoing.

3. Inasmuch as this T. N. T. was purchased under various contracts the price ranges from 35 to 50 cents per pound, depending upon the particular lot and time of purchase.

4. There is attached a letter from The Adjutant General under date of December 7, paragraph 3, of which directs certain T. N. T. to be dumped into the ocean. There is also attached a copy of a letter from The Adjutant General under date of December 21 which revokes this order. Also attached is a copy of a letter, dater January 17 from Chief, Explosives, Chemicals, and Loading Division, Ordnance Department, advising the destruction of the T. N. T.

5. This office has endeavored to get some definite idea as to the T. N. T. dumped into the ocean by the French Government. No definite information is available, any more than Mr. Appel's office advises that no claim has been made against this Government for T. N. T. so disposed of and which later, it is rumored, came back on the Jersey coast.

A. L. MERCER,
Major, United States Army,
Chief, Raw Materials and Scrap Section.

Approved:
E. C. MORSE,
First Assistant Director of Sales.

—

DECEMBER 7, 1918.

From: The Adjutant General of the Army.
To: The Chief of Ordnance.
Subject: Disposal of Surplus T. N. T.

1. The Secretary of War directs that all further shipments of T. N. T. to Fort Wingate, N. Mex., Reservation, be stopped with the understanding that everything that is actually on the way by rail be delivered at Fort Wingate Reservation and there stored temporarily on the ground without expense of constructing buildings.

2. He further directs that any further surplus T. N. T. that is absolutely essential to get out of the State of New Jersey on short notice be stored on the Tobyhanna Military Reservation, Pa., said storage to be simply on the ground without the expense of constructing buildings.

3. He further directs that any further surplus of T. N. T. that must be immediately removed from the Atlantic seaboard and can not be disposed of as hereinbefore directed shall be taken out to sea and dumped in suitable safe locations.

4. The above-directed procedure is intended to provide for the rapid disposal of such quantities of this high explosive as is necessary to remove from the thickly populated sections of the Atlantic seaboard. While this is going on it is directed that further study be given to the use of the Sparta Military Reservation at Sparta, Wis., for the temporary storage of such T. N. T. as may be produced or accumulated in that vicinity, that the use of Picatinny Arsenal as a temoprary storage place be considered, that the use of the portable buildings, of which it is understood that the Engineer Department has a considerable stock, for temporary magazines in suitable locations be considered, and finally that competent chemists of the Ordnance Department and of the Chemical Warfare Service be directed to investigate the possibility of resolving this T. N. T. into its component parts by some harmless method with the view to determining whether the components of this explosive can be applied to any useful purpose.

ADJUTANT GENERAL.

F. B. STIEG, *Captain.*

—

DECEMBER 21, 1918.

From: The Adjutant General of the Army.
To: The Chief of Ordnance.
Subject: Destruction of T. N. T.

So much of paragraph 3, letter of December 7, from The Adjutant General of the Army to the Chief of Ordnance, which directs that surplus T. N. T. that can not be disposed of as thereon directed should be taken out to sea and dumped, is hereby revoked. No action will be taken toward dumping or destroying this T. N. T. until further orders. Immediate steps will be taken to move all T. N. T. now on railroad sidings or in yards into the nearest arsenals, where it will be held on the cars until further directions are issued.

By order of the Secretary of War.

F. B. STIEG, *Captain.*

ADJUTANT GENERAL.

—

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 17, 1919.

From: Explosives, Chemical, and Loading Division.
To: Salvage Board.
Subject: Disposal of scrap explosive at loading plants.

1. To remove a most serious menace to life and property, to relieve the Government of the expense of guarding, to conform to the various State laws relative to the storage of explosives, it is essential that disposition be had of the scrap explosives at the following plants:

Contractor.	T.N.T.	Tetryl.	Amatol.	Oxplosive D.	Smokeless powder.
American Can Co., Kenilworth, N. J.	150,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Atlantic Loading Co., Hammonton, N. J.	140,000	.....	.....	.....	700
Bethlehem Loading Co.:					
Mays Landing, N. J.	80,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Castle, Del.	.....	18,650	.....	51,000	.....
DuPont Engineering Co., Penniman, Va.	300,000	7,000	350,000	.....	.....
E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Penniman, Va.	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,000
T. A. Gillespie:					
Parlin, N. J.	50,000	.....	50,000	.....	.....
Runyon, N. J.	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
J. D. Evans, Old Bridge, N. J.	426,960	.....	.....	.....	.....
California Loading Co., Old Bridge, N. J.	.....	5,600	.....	.....	.....

2. The cost of caring for this material more than equals its value. Orders for its disposal by destruction or otherwise are urgently requested.

H. C. DAVIS, Jr.,
Lieutenant Colonel, Ordnance Department, U. S. A.

F. B. STIEG, *Captain.*

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. I wish you would, because I think you will find that an order was made—and I would like you to get it if you can—an order was made to throw this T. N. T. into the sea, and later the order was revoked and a large portion of it was ordered to be turned over to the Secretary of the Interior, and still another large lot which was to be for the French was to be thrown into the sea. Now, why was the French product thrown into the sea and made the basis of a large claim against the United States while that which was for the use of the United States has been kept on hand? I would like to know the status of that material.

Col. GLOVER. We will see that you get it.

Senator NEW. I want to ask Mr. Hare something about the investigation of the military camps conditions. If he has ever had any correspondence with the Secretary of War on that subject, and, if so, what it was.

Mr. HARE. I headed a small committee on the Military Training Camps Association—went around from one camp to another trying to speed up our Army preparations and came down to Washington and gave these reports to the Secretary of War. Sometimes we would get action and sometimes we would not. The Secretary of War sent me two letters which indicated that he believed the work which the committee was doing was helpful. Later on, when Mr. Crowell gave me the authority to enlarge it, we did even more constructive work. There are two letters from the Secretary which I would like to insert in the RECORD):

(The papers referred to are as follows:)

EXHIBIT I.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 29, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. HARE: I want to send you a word to let you know how useful I have found the report of your special committee on Camp Devens. It reached the office just as I was about to leave for a visit to the camp and I read it on the train, so that I had an opportunity to profit by the information which it contains and at the same time to check its accuracy and the sense of relative values. I am sure that the other reports which you and your associates are preparing will be made up with equal care and will be likewise of great value to the department.

With best wishes and many thanks for your generous and patriotic help, I am,

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. C. WILLING HARE,
Chairman Military Training Camps Association,
1401 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXHIBIT J.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 4, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. HARE: I have just read your report for the Committee of the Military Training Camps Association of Camp Dix at Wrightstown. This report is really very helpful, and I am grateful to you and the committee for the earnestness with which the study has been made.

The next time you are in Washington, I'd like to talk with you about the comments made on page 6 with regard to the use of training rifles. But the matter is one of no pressing importance and would not justify any special effort on your part to see me just now.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. C. W. HARE,
1401 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. HARE. In response to that I came right down to Washington. That work very naturally put me in very close touch with the military situation as it was developing in this country. No large enterprise such as we were about to embark on could be conducted without loads of mistakes being made, and what I am anxious to see is that in tackling this large commercial problem, while we recognize that there are all kinds of mistakes that may be made, we want to get the necessary legislation to avoid them if possible.

Senator FRELINGHYSEN. I would like to ask you how much material you disposed of and what the value of it was.

Mr. HARE. To date we have disposed of approximately $340,000,000 worth, of which we have recovered about $290,000,000, or within 15 per cent of its cost. In connection with that I want to say that I do not believe we can continue to make any such returns. Obviously, if many more things have to be sold at the price we got for some of this stuff, the recovery is going to be less. The money that we are asking for is not coming out of the Treasury; it is only part of that which is coming into the Treasury. If we make a general return of 50 per cent on the cost of this vast surplus, I believe we will be doing as well as can be expected. All of this material was bought at war prices and has got to be sold at peace-time prices, and while we have made a recovery which I think is one which we should all be proud of, I do not believe that the same percentage of return can be expected in the future, although I want to say—I would like to get this into the record—that a small branch of my department is trying all the time to study ways and means through which to get better returns than apparently appear on their surface. Just one instance: We had 20,000,000 yards of cartridge cloth, which is pure silk. It cost the Government in the neighborhood of 90 cents a yard, and the highest offer we got for it was approximately 12 cents. By making an intensive study of it we found that by a very slight expenditure of a few cents a yard the material could be put in such shape that it can be sold at a dollar a yard, and there will be a saving of some $18,000,000 to $20,000,000; and yet, we would have been perfectly justified, under the law, in selling all of that surplus at the market price. This shows the various ramifications of this work. As you get into it, and make a careful study of this work you are able to dispose of the surplus to better advantage.

Senator BECKHAM. I want to ask one or two questions. How much is it you are asking for?

Mr. HARE. We are asking for $1,000,000 in the bill, but now it is $900,000.

Senator BECKHAM. Is that going to be sufficient?

Mr. HARE. Yes; for the reason that I can run the department over here on about $250,000 annually, and I believe that a sales department can be run on the other side of the water for the same price; that makes $500,000 and leaves $400,000 as an estimate, it is purely an estimate, as to the expenses necessary for such a force while they are on foreign soil. I should much prefer myself, if I may be permitted to say so, to have, at some future time, an opportunity to come before you from time to time and show the progress of our work, if you decide to continue it; and if we need additional funds they could be appropriated at that time when we saw the necessity for them.

Senator BECKHAM. Then, you are not asking us to change the provision in the House bill?

Mr. HARE. No, sir; except we are asking you to change the wording. The wording as it stands in the House bill does not give the Secretary of War the authority to pay the salaries which I believe will be necessary to hold any business organization at all; nor does it make any provisions for paying the necessary expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you drawn that up in the form of an amendment?

Mr. HARE. I have gone over it with Gen. Lord.

Gen. LORD. It was submitted this morning while you were out of the room.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now 1.25 o'clock; what is the pleasure of the committee about adjourning for recess?

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. I think this chart ought to be inserted in the record.

(Senator Frelinghuysen submitted the following chart for insertion in the record):

[Chart omitted from the RECORD.]

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] will withdraw the point of order made against this amendment. We are confronted with a condition and it is such a condition as never has arisen before in the history of the world. We have acquired $2,500,000,000 worth of surplus property during the war that ought to be disposed of. Necessarily so great an undertaking is going to require the service of men of great ability. It will at least require some agency that can not operate without expense.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does not the Senator think it requires men not only of the best ability and best kind of reputation, but also a man who has not had to undergo an examination with reference to his acts, as is shown about this man?

Mr. KIRBY. I think men ought to be appointed who are of the best ability and the best character and the best reputation, so far as that matter is concerned. But the condition is here and must be met. We must dispose of $2,500,000,000 worth of property to the best advantage, and the appropriation, large though it may seem by itself, is so small as to be negligible as compared with the greatness of the undertaking. Two billion five hundred million dollars worth of property must be disposed of, and we might lose millions and millions of dollars in the sale of this property if it is not properly looked after.

The War Department and the agencies established by it were intrusted with the care and duty of purchasing this property and all other munitions and supplies and transporting what of it went to France, and they ought to be able to set up a selling organization that will protect the Government's interests in disposing of the surplus. They have said they want to do that, and must have this much money to perfect and operate the agency; and I believe we ought, without any hesitation, to appropriate the amount that is asked here to take care of this condition. I do not know the man who is being discussed in connection with the matter. I do not know anything about him.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator if this proviso does not go out of the bill, upon what theory he contends that this director of the organization is going to go on and the present salary continue to be paid?

Mr. KIRBY. My understanding is that they have made a survey of the entire situation with the best ability they can command out of all the departments of the Government, and they have determined that this is the best method to be proceeded with in the sale of the property.

Mr. LENROOT. Is the Senator aware that Mr. Hare is now receiving $25,000 a year and that the members of his sales organization are now receiving salaries, and does the Senator contend that the Secretary of War is violating some law in so doing?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not understand that he would ask for an appropriation to pay a man if he already had the authority and the money with which to do it.

Mr. LENROOT. But this is not a matter of appropriation. It is a matter of repealing certain restrictions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May it not be that he is being paid now under some emergency appropriation?

Mr. LENROOT. This is an emergency appropriation to take care of the situation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My impression is that the power to pay salaries expires on July 1, with the expiration of the appropriations out of which they are paid.

Mr. KIRBY. I suggested the withdrawal of the point of order upon the theory that its being sustained would necessarily result in handicapping this agency in proceeding with this business of the Government. If it will do that the point of order in my opinion ought to be withdrawn. Certainly this surplus must be disposed of. It must be disposed of with the agencies we already have, supplemented by others that are necessary in order to improve the organization already established. The War Department has said that this is necessary, as I understand it, and I believe that the point of order ought to be withdrawn. The question whether we shall buy more horses hereafter has nothing to do with it. The question of whether money has been lost in the sale of horses heretofore by the Government has very little to do with it. It is shown conclusively that we have saved more in the forage and feed that have been required and consumed by the horses if they had not been sold than we could possibly lose in the purchase of new ones.

Under these conditions and unless it can be shown where the Government is going to be injured by the amendment, I ask that the point of order be withdrawn. Of course nobody can compel the Senator from Tennessee to withdraw it. It is a question within his own discretion; but I believe it ought to be withdrawn, and I ask the Senator from Tennessee to consider the matter fully and withdraw it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very fond of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], as he well knows, and I regret to differ with him, and I regret to differ with the chairman of the committee. I have stated to them very frankly that I believed there was something improper about the employment of this man, Mr. Hare. I was very frank about it. I still believe it. The testimony that I read, his own testimony, as well as that of others in the other hearings, taken in connection with his own testimony here, makes me believe that Mr. Hare ought not to be with the United States Government at all; and believing that it is my conscientious duty to make the point of order, I, of course, stand by it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield the floor. I have spoken at greater length than I expected.

Mr. KING. If the point of order is urged by the Senator, and supported, have we any assurance that the War Department will get rid of Hare? My experience is that there are some individuals in the War Department who seem to have fastened themselves upon the Government and you can not get rid of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I realize that the Senator from Utah is entirely correct about that. I thought about offering a resolution in the Senate providing that Mr. Hare should not be employed by the Government. I understand a movement like that is on foot in the House. I think it ought to be done. I do not think the War Department, or any other department of the Government, ought to employ a man under these circumstances. I will cheerfully join the Senator in any method he may have of eliminating Mr. Hare as an employee of the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I question very much if the amendment is subject to a point of order. It is not distinctly and affirmatively new legislation in an appropriation bill, nor legislation in an appropriation bill except in so far as it qualifies the expenditures of a particular sum of money. After making the appropriation of $4,000,000, the proviso reads:

Provided, That the restrictions concerning personal services and the amounts allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

I suggest that that is simply a qualification of the appropriation and shows how the fund is to be expended.

Mr. KING. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does it not impliedly, at least, repeal an existing law which would prevent the payment as provided in this tendered amendment? My understanding is that there is an existing law which would operate to prevent the performance of the things referred to in the proviso; and, if that be true and it does operate as a repeal, impliedly or otherwise, of an existing law, it would seem that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know of any such law. Really, the Secretary of War is paying this man now. He must be doing it pursuant to some statute. It is possibly under an emergency law for the current year ending June 30, 1919. He is evidently paying under a statute now in existence. So it is not a qualification of any statute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon the point of order raised by the Senator from Tennessee the Chair is inclined to believe that the amendment is in conflict with section 3 of Rule XVI, and therefore rules that the point of order is well taken.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "General Staff Corps," subhead "Military Intelligence Division," on page 3, line 19, after the word "War," to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$500,000," so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses of the Military Intelligence Division, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference; subscription to newspapers and periodicals; drafting and messenger service; and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad; the cost of special instruction at home and abroad, and in maintenance of students and attachés; and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, $500,000.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, when the full committee considered this item it was stated before the committee that $82,000 of the $500,000 would be expended abroad. Since that time, upon an examination of the estimates and hearings, I find that $70,000 of the $500,000 is estimated for use in connection with the army of occupation abroad. It does not seem to me that at this time Congress ought to assume that there will be any army of occupation during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1919. The assumption ought to be exactly the contrary—that there will be no army of occupation. If there be no army of occupation, certainly the $70,000 is not required. Assuming, as we have a right to assume, that there very shortly will be a termination of the present war with Germany, Congress ought not to authorize the sum of $70,000 for a purpose that presumably will not exist; and, if it is to exist, Congress itself should determine the fact. Therefore I move that "$500,000" be stricken out and "$430,000" be inserted, so that the matter may go into conference; and if the conferees should then be of the opinion that this is necessary, very well.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Service Schools," on page 4, line 9, after the word "Arms," to strike out "at Fort Sill, Okla.," and in line 22, after the word "Arms," to strike out "Fort Sill, Okla.," so as to make the clause read:

To provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Army service schools (including the Army Staff College, the Army School of the Line, the Army Field Engineer School, the Army Field Service School and Correspondence School for Medical Officers, and the Army Signal School) at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., and the School of Fire for Field Artillery, and for the Infantry School of Arms, by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, the purchase of modern instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction, employment of temporary, technical, or special services, and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, to be allotted in such proportion as may, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, be for the best interests of the military service. Not exceeding $300 per month may be used for the payment of $100 per month to a translator at the Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., $100 per month to a translator at the School of Fire for Field Artillery, and $100 per month to a translator at the Infantry School of Arms, to be appointed by the commandants of the schools named, with the approval of the Secretary of War, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

FIELD ARTILLERY ACTIVITIES.

For the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, the purchase of modern instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction, employment of temporary, technical, or special services, and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, for Field Artillery brigade firing centers at Camp Bragg, N. C., and Camp Knox, Ky., and a basic school for Field Artillery at Camp Taylor, Ky., $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Chief of Coast Artillery," subhead "Purchase of typewriting machines," on page 7, line 12, after the words "given in," to strike out "exchange, but shall not apply to special prices granted on typewriting machines used in schools of the District of Columbia or of the Indian Service, the lowest of which special prices paid for typewriting machines shall not be exceeded in future purchases for such schools," and insert "exchange," so as to make the clause read:

That no part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used during the fiscal year 1920 for the purchase of any typewriting machine at a price in excess of the lowest price paid by the Government of the United States for the same make and substantially the same model of machine during the fiscal year 1918; such price shall include the value of any typewriting machine or machines given in exchange: *Provided*, That in construing this section the Commissioner of Patents shall advise the Comptroller of the Treasury as to whether the changes in any typewriter are of such structural character as to constitute a new machine not within the limitation of this section.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will not be adopted, because the only effect of its adoption will be to prevent schools in the District of Columbia and Indian schools from procuring these machines at a lower cost than is secured generally. These machines are put in the schools at a very much lower cost, I understand, for the purpose of advertising the machines. The adoption of the amendment can not benefit the Government and can only handicap the schools. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Unless some other member of the committee insists upon the amendment of the committee, I shall not insist upon it. The language of the House was stricken out by the committee under the impression that it had no place in an appropriation bill.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for telegraph and telephone systems, under the head of "Office of the Chief Signal Officer," subhead "Signal Service of the Army," on page 9, line 20, after the word "required," to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,500,000," so as to read:

Experimentation and research for the purpose of developing improvements in apparatus and methods of signaling, including machines, instruments, and other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease, construction, alterations, and repair for such buildings required for storing or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel when not otherwise provided for, including the land therefor, the introduction of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading; roads and walks, and other equipment required, $3,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system," on page 10, line 11, after the word "War," to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$140,000," so as to make the clause read:

For defraying the cost of such extensions, betterments, operation, and maintenance of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system, as may be approved by the Secretary of War, to be available until the close of the fiscal year 1921, from the receipts of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system which have been covered into the Treasury of the United States, the extent of such extensions and betterments and the cost thereof to be reported to Congress by the Secretary of War, $140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Air Service," on page 10, after line 13, to strike out:

Creating, maintaining, and operating at established Army flying schools, course of instruction for aviation students, including cost of equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of

students, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; equipment, maintenance, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, fields for testing and experimental work; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage; purchase of stoves and other cooking and heating apparatus, kitchen and table ware, and furniture and equipment for kitchens, mess halls, officers' quarters, barracks, hospitals, and other buildings; screens, lockers, refrigerators, and all other equipment; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, and aviation engines; purchase, manufacture, maintenance, repair, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith.

And also for the purchase or manufacture and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes, $15,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding $250 in amount for damages to persons and private property, resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post, and approved by the officer in charge of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $150,000: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to apply to any civilian flying instructor dismissed prior to December 31, 1918, for misconduct or incompetency.

And insert:

Appropriations, Air Service: Creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools courses of instruction for aviation students and enlisted men, including cost of equipment and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; improvement, equipment, maintenance, lease, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, plants for testing and experimental work, including the acquisition of land, or any interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation, where necessary to procure helium gas; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, accessories thereto, including helium gas rights, and aviation engines, including patents and other rights thereto, and plans, drawings, and specifications thereof; purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith, and also for the purchase or manufacture and the issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expense connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, including the hire of civilian employees, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of such consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Service as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, including necessary traveling expenses: *Provided*, That the entire expenditures for the services of consulting engineers for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $100,000; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs, and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Service; for the establishment of aviation stations in the Philippine Islands, including the lease of land or any interest in land and the preparation of land necessary to make the same suitable for the purpose intended, buildings, heating, lighting, plumbing, water, sewer, roads, and walks, $55,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding $250 in amount for damages to persons and private property, resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Director of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $150,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter actual and necessary expenses only, not to exceed $8 per day, shall be paid to officers of the Army and contract surgeons when traveling by air on duty without troops, under competent orders: *And provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation: *And provided further*, That not to exceed $982,617.90 of the funds herein appropriated for the Air Service may be expended for the purchase of all the buildings, grounds, machinery, equipment, and other facilities of the Curtiss Airplane & Motor Corporation which go to make up what is known as the Curtiss Elmwood plant, situated on North Elmwood Avenue, in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and which consists of 79.1 acres, more or less, of land, together with all the buildings, factories, warehouses, machinery, equipment, and other improvements, facilities, and appurtenances thereon or thereunto belonging; that not to exceed $3,260,000 of the funds herein appropriated for the Air Service may be expended for the purchase of all the buildings, grounds, machinery, equipment, and other facilities which go to make up what is known as the Dayton Wright Airplane Factory, situated on the Cincinnati Pike, south of the city of Dayton, Ohio, which consists of 33.89 acres, more or less, and 1,552.77 acres of adjoining land, making in all 1,586.66 acres of land, more or less, together with all the buildings, factories, warehouses, machinery, equipment, and other improvements, utilities, and appurtenances thereon or thereunto belonging, and for the construction necessary to render these buildings and land available as an Air Service engineering experimental station; that not to exceed $250,000 of the funds herein appropriated for the Air Service may be expended for the purchase of not over 2,531.11 acres of land in Burlington County, N. J., for use as an airship (dirigible) station, and not to exceed $3,230,000 for the construction thereon of hangars, barracks, quarters, gas plants, warehouses, and all other buildings, structures, equipment, utilities, and improvements necessary to render it available for use as an airship station; that not to exceed $470,200 of the funds herein appropriated for the Air Service may be expended for the purchase of the tract of land known as Ream Field, situated in San Diego County, 12 miles southeast of the city of San Diego, consisting of 1,200 acres of land, more or less, and for the construction thereon of buildings, other structures, utilities, and improvements necessary to render it available for use as an aerial gunnery school and aviation field auxiliary to Rockwell Field, San Diego, Calif.

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain at one or more established flying schools courses of instruction for aviation students.

Aviation students shall be enlisted in or appointed to the grade of flying cadet, Air Service, which grade is hereby established: *Provided*, That the total number of flying cadets shall not at any one time exceed 1,300. The base pay of a flying cadet shall be $75 per month, including extra pay for flying risk as provided by law. The ration allowance of a flying cadet shall not exceed $1 per day, and his other allowances shall be those of a private, first class, Air Service.

Upon completion of a course prescribed for flying cadets, each flying cadet, if he so desire, may be discharged and commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to discharge at any time any flying cadet whose discharge shall have been recommended by a board of not less than three officers.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I move to strike out on page 15, line 10, all following the word "belonging," down to and including the word "station," on page 16, line 1.

Mr. President, this provision authorizes an expenditure of $3,260,000 for the purchase of what is known as the Dayton-Wright Airplane factory, near the city of Dayton, Ohio. The provision immediately preceding this provides for the expenditure of $982,617.90 to acquire the facilities of the Curtiss-Airplane and Motor Corporation situated in the city of Buffalo.

A word of explanation with reference to these two items as to why I move to strike out one and do not move to strike out the other may be in order. I have examined the contracts with reference to these two plants, and in both of the contracts it is provided that the Government at the termination of the contracts shall pay to the company the difference between the appraised value of the plant at the termination of the contract and the cost less any contributions that the Government may have made. Under the contract an appraisement has been made both of the Buffalo plant and of the Dayton plant. The appraisement at the Buffalo plant was under the board of arbitrators provided for in the contract. The award was not signed by the Government appraiser, but the majority of the arbitrators agreed that the value of the plant was only 7½ per cent of its cost, a most amazing situation, Mr. President, a situation that I hope will be investigated by the Committee on Military Affairs as to the correctness of the award. But the award is there; the Government is bound by it; and this appropriation proposes to take over the plant at the amount of the appraised value—7½ per cent of its cost—plus about $200,000. I am satisfied that this appraisement must be outrageously low, but under the circumstances, the only way the Government can get out of it is to purchase the plant. So I favor the Government purchasing the Buffalo plant.

In the case of the Dayton situation, however, we have a different condition there. The contract provided that the contractor should be entitled to receive from the Government the difference between the appraised value and the cost; and he, in turn, was obligated to pay to the Government, if he wished to use the facilities placed there by the Government, the appraised value of the Government's plant. Arbitrators were appointed; their official award has not been made, but I hold in my hand a memorandum from Col. Downey, chief of air-service finance, stating that the appraisal was approximately 40 per cent of the cost as against 7½ per cent in Buffalo; and presumably the facilities or buildings were not of a very different character. But there was transmitted also a statement of all the property covered by the contract, and the appraised value of the assets furnished by the contractor was about $328,000; the appraisal of the assets furnished by the Government on this plant was in the neighborhood of $50,000, as I recollect. So, on the termination of the contract, the Government could not be obligated to any such extent as it was in the case of the Buffalo plant.

But it is provided here in this amendment, in addition to purchasing the plant and some 31 acres of land, there shall be purchased 1,500 acres of additional land, and as to what land is to be purchased and the value of the land to be purchased I can not find one word in the hearings. In the appraisement of these 31 acres upon which the plant is situated, the appraisers found it to be worth $1,100 an acre, from the information before me and which I admit may not be correct, for I have not as full information as I should like, but from such information as

is before me it would appear to me that we are authorizing the purchase of these 1,500 acres, 31 acres of which have been appraised at $1,100 per acre, at something like $1,700 per acre.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that we should continue longer giving general authority for the expenditure of millions of dollars in the purchase of land without Congress having specific information with respect to it. There is no reason why this appropriation, if it is desirable, should not be postponed until the Senate may have some specific information as to the value of the land and the reasonableness of the purchase price.

Mr. President, we hear it said that we must trust the departments in these matters. During the war we were compelled to trust the departments in expending billions of dollars, but now that the war is over there is no reason why this blanket authority should any longer be given to the Secretary of War or to the War Department, and it is fair to say that, in some cases at least, there has been a most gross violation and breach of trust in the purchase of land by the War Department. Before the consideration of this bill is concluded I think it will develop at least one breach of trust upon the part of the War Department. But in view of what has happened, in view of present conditions, there is no reason why this appropriation of $3,000,000 should be made at this time. In support of that I wish to read from the testimony of Secretary of War Baker before the House committee on this bill. In speaking of the Dayton plant he said:

> I am not asking that the hearings be prolonged or that the results be embodied in legislation on the appropriation bill, but that the questions of policy involved be taken up by the committee and, if it seems wise, some sort of special legislation be authorized to continue the provision.

The Secretary does not ask that this amendment go in. We have not sufficient information upon which to base any intelligent judgment of why it should go in, and I hope that the amendment which I propose striking out this appropriation will be agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. KING. I have just come into the Chamber and have not heard all that the Senator has said. Has anything been said by the Senator, or by any other Senator, indicating whether or not this is the plant with which Col. Deeds was connected or is still connected?

Mr. LENROOT. I understand that it is.

Mr. KING. Then he is interested in this plant?

Mr. LENROOT. I have no information at all upon that subject. It was my information that while he had previously been interested in some of the land in this plant or in one of the other plants before the contract was consummated he had disposed of his interest.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LENROOT. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the proposed purchase of the Dayton property very naturally and properly arouses the interest of Senators who are directly or indirectly familiar with the early history of aviation development in this country. After we entered the war the development, or perhaps I should better say the lack of development, of our aircraft program, due to many causes, some avoidable and some unavoidable, prompted the Senate Committee on Military Affairs last year to institute, through the agency of a subcommittee, an investigation of some features of the subject, which resulted in a report by a practically unanimous committee, which was printed as a Senate document. It was my fortune, good or bad, to be one of the members of that subcommittee and to participate in the preparation of the report to the main committee. The Members of the Senate who were then in office familiarized themselves with that report and with the testimony upon which it was based, and the circumstances attending the construction of the Dayton plant, the transfer of our experimental activities from Langley Field to McCook Field, and the identification of Col. Deeds, just before then at the head of the construction section of the Aviation Bureau, with aviation contracts, very naturally lead to an antagonism to any further appropriations of money to be expended in Dayton, which in the abstract I largely share.

This appropriation, Mr. President, was made by a practically unanimous vote of the Senate committee having charge of the bill, after extensive hearings from those now in charge of the Military Bureau of Aeronautics. I voted for it, with my associates, after receiving that information and because it appeared to me that while there were objections to a further expenditure of money in that section of the country, there were more serious objections to its expenditure elsewhere under all the circumstances.

In order to intelligently consider this proposed appropriation it is perhaps desirable to refer briefly to aircraft conditions since the war, both here and abroad, and also to the necessities which confronted the Nation, if it shall be our purpose, as I hope it is, to continue experiments and development in aircraft as a means of offense and defense and as one of the industrial and economic agencies of the immediate future.

I need not refer to the wonderful progress made during the war and because of the imperious necessities of war conditions in aircraft for military and naval purposes and to the amazing mastery of the air which was, toward the close of the war, acquired by the allied forces. Suffice it to say that every thoughtful man perceived in that development the existence of a new agency in warfare, perhaps the controlling one ultimately, and also of a new agency for commercial and industrial purposes.

After the war ended, or, to be more precise, when the armistice was signed, our developments and activities were at once practically abandoned. We had at the time a very large number of training planes and between four and five thousand DH–4 battleplanes, or planes constructed for use upon the front, nearly all of which became valueless with the armistice, and now exist as part of the flotsam and jetsam of the struggle. They are practically worthless, except as they may be utilized in newer and better construction.

The Bureau of Aeronautics shortly after the armistice was, for some reason, reorganized or reconstructed by the General Staff. Mr. Ryan, who was at the head of the construction section, resigned, and his place was filled by the appointment of Maj. Gen. Menoher, a most gallant officer, who won distinction during the war, but in other branches of the service. Gen. Kenly, who had been selected in March to head the new Bureau of Military Aeronautics, one of the best selections made during the war, one of the most prominent and capable aircraft officers in the country, one of the most efficient men we had in the service, was demoted to the rank of colonel, and ordered to report to the section of artillery, his place being taken by an equally gallant and competent officer, Gen. Mitchell. Due, I presume, largely to the desire to economize in public expenditures and due also to the fact that we had no means for the construction of machines for other than war purposes, all construction ceased, many of our aviation fields were closed, and a disproportionate number of aviators and those engaged in aviation training were released and sent home. That was the condition when this Congress convened.

On the other side of the water the opportunities and the possibilities of aircraft development were so potent and so patent that our Allies were prompted to pursue a different course. They have continued the work of aircraft discovery, experiment, and development, and have devoted large sums of money to that purpose. I am told on the best of authority that Great Britain has this year appropriated £65,000,000 for the purpose, and while the committee does not know the amount which the French are devoting to that pursuit, we certainly know enough to justify the statement that their appropriations are fully equal to those of Great Britain. It is the purpose of these countries, and it is a laudable one, to make aircraft, the development and construction of heavier-than-air and lighter-than-air machines, one of the principal objects of the immediate future. They believe, and they believe justly, that if we are to have wars hereafter, of which I think there can be no doubt, the nation which controls the air is the nation which will be proclaimed the victor; the nation which can dominate the air will dominate the land and the sea; the nation which dominates the air will be the lord of the universe, should another world war inflict itself upon the sons of men, and it will dominate its antagonist if such war be limited to two or more nations.

We have a very small world in the twentieth century, Mr. President. It has shrunk, when considered from the viewpoint of time and space, to one-third or one-fourth of its dimensions when the old century expired. The Atlantic was spanned the other day in a trip of 19 hours only, by a heavier-than-air machine, the precursor of a fleet of airships, most, if not all of them foreign-made and foreign-owned, unless we too take to heart the lessons of the war, and enter with a spirit of generous rivalry upon the work of airship construction.

Mr. President, those at present in charge of the Bureau of Military Aeronautics, and I think those in charge of aircraft construction, are a unit in their conviction of the imperious

necessity resting upon their shoulders and the shoulders of this Congress of making due provision for an adequate line of experiment and construction, so that as the days and the months and the years shall pass, we too may be in a position of adequate preparation for whatever ills the future may have in store for this Nation. They believe, and I think a majority of this committee believe also, that every step made in the progress of aircraft production for military purposes is equally a step in the direction of development for economic and commercial purposes; and this is true not only of airplanes, but as well of dirigibles.

The dirigible situation is a most interesting one. A great many years ago a British scientist, detailed to view a total eclipse, I think in the year 1868—I am not certain that I state it correctly—discovered in the spectrum of the sun certain peculiar rays which indicated to him the existence of an unknown gaseous substance. He called it "helium." Certain European scientists subsequently discovered what was undoubtedly the same thing in some of the substances of nature, and they designated it "argon." Their developments were carried sufficiently far to demonstrate that such a gas existed, that it was much lighter than air, and that it was noninflammable. Further progress in scientific investigation disclosed that certain grades of natural petroleum, found to be largely noninflammable, contained this substance in appreciable quantities.

Hydrogen is the substance generally utilized for the inflation of the lighter-than-air machines. It is effective for the purpose, but is very inflammable, so that, when penetrated by an incendiary bullet, explosion and disaster are inevitable. The substitution for this inflammable gas of some other noninflammable substance equally efficacious, or nearly so, during the war became the subject of investigation in all the nations taking part in it; and ours had the honor of leading, largely perhaps because of the existence in Kansas, in Oklahoma, and particularly in Texas, of large quantities of petroleum containing helium; and after making that discovery the problem resolved itself into the determination of some means of economical extraction. That has been solved, so that the United States is in a position to produce all the helium needed—a noninflammable substance having 90 per cent of the lightness of hydrogen, and therefore almost as efficacious for balloon purposes.

As a result of these conditions the dirigible, in all probability, will be the aircraft of the future, because there is practically no limitation to the dimensions of dirigible construction, and the ability, therefore, of increasing the carriage or tonnage capacity is very much larger than is possible with the heavier-than-air craft. England, conscious of this situation, France fully alive to it, are developing the dirigible machine. England to-day has the largest machines in the world. One of them will soon visit this country. When the Navy Department accepted the responsibility of looking after this monster upon its arrival, it was discovered that we had no place in the United States, either natural or artificial, capable of accommodating it, of anchoring it, and of keeping it in proper condition while in this country. After considerable investigation and inquiry, the War Department assumed the responsibility of the custody of this machine, and it will be anchored and cared for at Mineola, on Long Island, where workmen now are engaged in the construction of huge concrete anchor bases of enormous dimensions, but necessarily so, since the task of holding a machine of the size of this one is prodigious. We are not constructing these machines, first, because we have no appropriations for them; next, because our activities along the line of aircraft production have suffered paralysis since the declaration of the armistice.

Mr. President, we believe, and I hope the Senate will agree with the committee, that one of our most pressing and imperious duties is to enter into this field, go into competition with the other great nations across the sea, utilize these stores of helium which nature has conferred upon us, and at least secure an equal place in the air along with these other nations, to do which requires a program of construction, with all of the needs and accessories therefor; and this brings me, Mr. President, to a consideration of the objectionable feature of this amendment.

There is no market—or at least very little private demand—for aircraft. The expense involved in aircraft construction, the skill required for navigation, and the obvious dangers of the pursuit necessarily limit private demand so closely that private enterprise in construction receives undue discouragement. That being so, the occurrence of another war would find the United States deprived of the facilities for manufacturing airships. In other words, we would occupy the identical position which we unfortunately occupied when we went into this war. I hope that my fears are unfounded and that my apprehensions will prove illusory; but I greatly fear that before we are many months older we shall have occasion to use—how extensively I do not know—such aircraft as we can secure for military purposes. We have no machines now that are available. If a war should occur to-morrow, I doubt whether we could muster 25 well-equipped, efficient machines for war purposes. The DH–4 is obsolete. It never was worth much when equipped with the Liberty engine, but it is not now available for active, efficient, modern warfare.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we had 25, would not that be more than we received during the whole administration under Col. Deeds in the late war?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, it would be 25 more than we received under Mr. Deeds; the Senator knows that.

Mr. McKELLAR. We did not get any at all, as I recall.

Mr. THOMAS. I think during his administration we got one.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that was lost.

Mr. THOMAS. That never reached its destination; but that is merely an episode.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my friend yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I did not understand that we were so badly off for aircraft as the Senator stated, if I understood him correctly, namely——

Mr. THOMAS. I said "efficient machines."

Mr. KING. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago that we probably could not muster 25.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think we could muster 25 efficient machines.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator a question on that point. While perhaps it is an improper question——

Mr. THOMAS. If it is, I will not answer it.

Mr. KING (continuing). Because it may cause him to digress from his very interesting remarks. I should like to ask the Senator what has become of those vast appropriations made, and what have we to show for them, either in the shape of machines or flying fields or plants for the manufacture of machines? We have spent, as I understand, considerably over six or seven hundred million dollars. Certainly there must be something to show for this vast sum.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope the Senator will not ask me to assume the burden that an explanation of that sort would place upon me. I hope, for the sake of the Senate, if not my own sake, that he will not insist, because this bill must pass before the 1st of July, and I could not effectively answer the question within the brief interval between to-day and that date. I will answer, however, with regard to the machines which were manufactured.

We produced in all, speaking roughly, including training planes, somewhere between twenty and twenty-five thousand machines. That is my recollection, which, I must confess, is not at all accurate. The only so-called fighting machine which we produced was the DH–4. We were on the eve of an enormous production of efficient fighting machines of nearly all types when the armistice was proclaimed. Of the DH–4, I think something like 1,400 or 1,500, perhaps more, were sent across the sea. The others were ready for shipment, and would have been shipped had the war continued. They are scattered over the country, and they are, generally speaking, boxed up. Last April I was in San Diego and I went over to North Island, which is generally known as Rockwell Field, and I rode for perhaps three-quarters of a mile between rows of huge boxes, each containing a DH–4. I felt as though I were riding between huge rows of coffins, because they resembled them, not only in shape but in that they contained the remains of machines whose usefulness was dead and gone. It was one of the necessary wastes of war. If the Senator will figure an average—and I think that average is low—of $12,500 per machine for all machines, he will discover where a great part of the money went to.

But, Mr. President, if we are to have a program, as I said or was about to say when interrupted, it is necessary for us to have establishments, factories, testing grounds, experimental grounds for the purpose; and it is equally necessary that the project should be a public one, since, as I have attempted to show, the private demand for machines is not sufficient to justify the investment of private capital for their development. Now, where are we to get most economically the facilities for the proposed program? Where, by the expenditure of the

least amount of money, can we lay the foundations for an efficient bureau of aeronautics? That, of course, assumes that the public will demand and that Congress should make provision for aircraft development. I shall take that for granted.

The Government made a number of contracts during the war for the development of aircraft which were in full force and operation when hostilities ceased. These contracts—some of them, at least—obligated the Government to make certain advances for the construction both of plants and of machines, where needed, and to safeguard investors against the tremendous loss inevitably ensuing from the termination of these contracts, or from a termination of the war, which virtually means the same thing. Of these contracts two are conspicuous, and those are involved in the recitals on pages 14 and 15 of the amendment now under consideration. One of these contracts relates to the plant at Buffalo. Its recitals have been very clearly and correctly stated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. I think the Government advanced a total of $4,000,000 to the Curtiss Co. and guaranteed it contracts aggregating $30,000,000 in order to enable it to construct the enormous plant which it built on Elmwood Avenue, thus enabling it to meet the Government's demands for aircraft construction.

That building is good for aircraft construction, and largely good for nothing else, except storage. It covers an area of 25 acres of ground, and is of steel and concrete construction.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know whether the building of which he has just spoken is on what is known as the South Field?

Mr. THOMAS. I am talking now of the Curtiss. I will say, however, that the Dayton-Wright adjoins what is called the South Field on the north, as I now remember.

During the progress of the war, the Aircraft Construction Section made a number of contracts with the Curtiss people. Among them was a contract for 2,000 Spad machines in September, I think, of 1917. It was an enormous contract, and the company at once set about preparing for its execution. About the time actual construction was to begin the contract was canceled by the Government, and it was followed by another contract for another class of machine. After a series of experiments, the aircraft authorities adopted an English machine or plane called the Bristol as adaptable to the Liberty engine, and assigned to this company a contract for the construction, I think, of 3,000 of them. They were a ghastly and a deadly failure. Their size and weight were inadequate to the size and weight of the Liberty engine; and after several experimental machines had been completed and tested, and after two or three fine young fellows were sent to eternity in consequence, and after Mr. Ryan had taken charge of construction, the Bristol machine was abandoned, shortly before which another contract was made with the Curtiss Co. for 2,000 SE–5's, the English equivalent of the Spad; and production of these machines was just about to be had when the armistice put a quietus upon its activities.

The Curtiss Co. has not business enough, and never will have private business enough, at least for a great many years, to keep this plant going. It perhaps will have sufficient business to enable it to operate its other plants, with which this contract has nothing to do. Under the terms of that contract, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated, the Government must make good to the company the difference between the cost of the plant and its appraised value, which has been reported at 7½ per cent, based upon a number of reasons, some of which are good, but which, I think, are inadequate to support the tremendous discrepancy between cost and value.

The Government can make use of this structure for storage purposes. The Government is using the structure for storage purposes, and pays a very heavy rent for such use. We have on hand of accumulated material of all sorts, acquired by the Government for war purposes, and which at the time of its acquisition were absolutely necessary, property of the aggregate value of over $2,500,000,000. It consists of almost every article of merchandise known to the average citizen, and a great many articles which are special in their character, such as T. N. T. and other explosive and gun materials.

The Government must care for this huge accumulation. It never will be able to obtain the cost price of the articles. It will through judicious businesslike handling be able to dispose of it at salvage rates that will bring an enormous return, provided the property is cared for, sheltered, housed, and protected in the interim. To do that we must either have storage houses of our own or we must lease storage facilities from those who possess them. The $4,000,000 advanced by the Government to the Curtiss Co. can never be collected except by taking over the property and paying the appraised value. That is impossible. It is true we might exhaust it by renting these quarters and crediting the rent values upon the amount of the debt; but there is no assurance, and I hope there will be none, that these accumulations of property will be held long enough to effect that result.

As a business proposition, independently of any other consideration, what should the United States do with that contract? What would a business man faced by a similar condition probably do?

Mr. FLETCHER. I would like to ask the Senator what rent we are now paying?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know. Perhaps the chairman of the committee could answer that question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not hear the question.

Mr. THOMAS. What rent is the Government paying for the use of the Elmwood plant for storage purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is paying at the rate of $320,000 a year if it takes all the space. It now has two-thirds of the space. I think it is now paying $195,000 a year for two-thirds of the space, and it will cost considerably more to get the rest of it, which they must have eventually or get storage elsewhere.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I am glad to say, agrees with the subcommittee that as to the Elmwood plant the Government should take it over and pay this sum of $900,000. I agree with him also that further investigation should be made concerning this value, particularly as the Government appraiser refused to sign the return, so that, if possible, we may be still further protected in this outlay.

Lest I forget it, let me here say that the real estate is taken over at the cost of same to the Curtiss Co., depreciation being upon the buildings, and I think upon nothing else, although I may be mistaken as to that.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. KING. I was unavoidably called out for a moment, and perhaps the Senator during my absence explained the cost of the Curtiss plant and the amount the Government contributed, if any.

Mr. THOMAS. The amount contributed was $4,000,000. I think I can give the Senator the exact figures of the cost of the plant, including the real estate.

Mr. KING. That is my recollection. My understanding was that the Government advanced that and had received no reimbursement.

Mr. THOMAS. No; it has received no reimbursement whatever. It could not receive reimbursement from the company while continuing to give it contracts and then cancelling them. It was impossible.

Mr. KING. If the Government built the plant, why should the Government pay for it now?

Mr. THOMAS. The Government is paying the difference between what it cost and its present value, as by its contract it is bound to do. The Curtiss people put in all the money they had.

Mr. KING. I thought the Government paid it all.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no. I can give the Senator the figures. The total cost, including land, was $6,114,126.03.

It may be, Mr. President, that some time in the future the Government can dispose of this property and thus largely recoup itself. Of course, that is mere conjecture, but with the expansion of our business activities, with the constant tendency to increase in the size of factories and plants engaged in manufacture and production, I am not at all sure but that when the period of storage need shall have expired the Government can do something with that plant. But whether it can or not, the problem is, Shall we lose the $4,000,000 by declining to take over the property at its appraised value or save a part of it, at least, in the storage cost necessary for the housing of our surplus material in that section of the country? I think but one answer can be made to that proposition.

So much for the Buffalo plant. The situation at Dayton is, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has so clearly revealed, in many respects, and in many essential respects, different from the situation at Buffalo. Without going into any personalities or insinuations or charges at this time, because I think they could serve no good purpose here, let me state the situation as I understand it at Dayton:

The aircraft authorities, between our declaration of the existence of a state of war and the 1st of April, 1918, leased near the city of Dayton, Ohio, a flying field and training camp, known as the Wilbur Wright Field. The property belongs to a local semipublic corporation called, I think, the Dayton Conservancy Association, and is designed as a part of a reservoir to be con-

structed in order to prevent destruction of life and property consequent upon recurrent periods of flood in the Miami River Valley, and upon that field has been erected a very large number of buildings and much improvement upon the surface. The establishment of sewers and water mains and other needed accessories to the camp were almost at once installed. The lease is a comparatively short one, and there is no intention, and should be no intention, to renew it. It is an expensive field, and under Gen. Kenly's administration of the Bureau of Aeronautics it was used for the purpose of experimenting with and testing out by Army officers machines constructed in or near the city of Dayton.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. KING. Was that the field as to which there was so much criticism because it was alleged it was practically a reservoir which could not be used——

Mr. THOMAS. Not a reservoir. It is intended as part of the area of a reservoir. It is the field which was criticized as being subject to inundation when unusual rains occur, that is, some of it.

Mr. KING. And the physical facts supported that criticism, did they not?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. KING. And yet, notwithstanding it was subject to inundation, the Army officers or some one went there and erected and constructed a field at great cost to the Government?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but that has nothing to do except by way of historic reference, leading up to this situation. That is not the ground covered by this appropriation.

Mr. KING. That was ground which Col. Deeds owned?

Mr. THOMAS. No; it belonged to this concern. Col. Deeds never owned any portion of it, so far as I know. He was in some way connected with a piece of ground adjoining upon which was constructed a large warehouse.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am not familiar with all the details by any means, but we have in Ohio certain conservancy legislation growing out of the flood of 1913. There is no reservoir there. They intend and probably are now building and it may be that they have completed some of the dams, but those dams are for the purpose of retaining the water in case of high floods so as to avoid inundation. I do not think it is quite fair to say it is a mere reservoir.

Mr. THOMAS. I have not so stated.

Mr. POMERENE. I had reference, rather, to what the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] stated on the subject.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a portion of the area of a contemplated reservoir.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. The dam for which was in process of construction last June.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will yield, I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio is justifying the misconduct of the officials of the War Department or not; that is for him to determine; but I do charge that there was gross neglect and dereliction of duty upon the part of some officials of the Government in the selection of this particular place as a field in connection with the airplane development.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] has never justified any wrongdoing since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will permit me, in view of the remark that has just been made, I wish to say I am not attempting to justify anything. On the other hand, I am not going to accept charges before proof when it comes to matters of this kind. I realize that there has been a good deal of wastage growing out of the development of the art of flying machines, and so forth, and those who are bent upon finding fault charge the lack of knowledge to criminal conduct. That is the objection I am making to some of the assertions that have been indulged in here. So far as Mr. Deeds is concerned, I met him, I think, once, and I talked with him at one time by telephone, probably two years ago. Whatever may be said of his connection with this matter, the leading people of Dayton do not believe these criminal charges.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is almost impossible to outline the bare details of aviation procedure in Dayton without provoking controversy. Far be it from me to needlessly arouse it at this time. We are confronted, I think, with a condition and not a theory. The question before us is the expediency or nonexpediency of taking over this property as a business proposition, and in order to give my view of it I thought it necessary to state the condition existing there.

In addition to the Wilbur Wright Field another field, called the McCook Field, within the boundaries of the city of Dayton, and consisting, if my memory serves me right, of not to exceed 160 acres, was taken over by the Government for engineering and experimental purposes. All machines and all parts of machines, engines, propellers, cloth, and other material needed in aircraft construction were tested out on the McCook Field. It was the center of enormous activity during the war period after it was established. It is too small for the purpose, since an experimental station should be combined with the flying field, a change made by Gen. Kenly almost immediately after taking charge of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

The Dayton-Wright factory is also a building of enormous dimensions, situated to the west of the city of Dayton, on the line of the Big Four and, I think, one other railroad. It is about 6 miles from the city. South of it is the flying field, consisting of something like 1,200 acres—I speak in round numbers—used by the Dayton-Wright people during their manufacture of machines for their own tests before being turned over to the Government. That field is admirably situated for the purpose. It is large enough, it is level, it is elevated, there is no danger of flood, unless we have a recurrence of antedeluvian conditions, and it is sufficiently ample for the engineering, experimental, and flying work of the department.

In view of the fact that the business has been centered in Dayton, where a considerable proportion of the skilled labor necessary for aircraft construction resides, and which is therefore more available than any other section of the country, in view of the fact that Dayton is a huge railway center, and that the Government, both for business and for economic reasons, should center its aeronautic production as much as possible. After giving the subject the most exhaustive consideration, Gen. Menoher and Gen. Mitchell united in recommending that the Government take over the Dayton property as the best and the cheapest under the circumstances to be found anywhere.

They may be mistaken. I do not pretend, Mr. President, to say that they are not. But I do think that when competent or prima facie competent men are in charge of a departme. t of our governmental activities, men of high reputation and character, come before a Senate committee and say that they have given a specific subject under their jurisdiction the most careful and painstaking consideration and recommend to us their conclusions, they are entitled to our profound consideration and to our acceptance of their report if we conclude to continue the project to which the particular subject relates.

That was done by these gentlemen; by Col. Bain, the Chief of Engineers; and by others equally well informed and as anxious to serve the Government of the United States honestly and sincerely as any Member of the United States Senate.

We advanced $2,000,000 to the Dayton-Wright Co. That has been repaid to the Government. So we do not and need not feel obliged to take over this property in order to cover any consequent or resulting deficiency to the Government. It is, in my judgment, a plain, unvarnished business proposition; and if so, then I think it makes no difference whatever as to the character or previous record of any man or set of men interested or heretofore interested in the property. If I want a good horse, and his pedigree and his price suit me, and the title of the owner is all right, it is a matter of no concern whatever to me whether the owner is a scoundrel or an honest man. I may suspect him, I may look more carefully into some of his representations if he is the former; I protect myself because of what I know about him; but if the subject of the contract is sound, serviceable, and of the value demanded, why should I go to some one capable of offering a similar bargain but at a much higher price? Business men are not in the habit of encouraging morality in that way, and until all of them begin doing it none of them can be expected to.

So I do not care a rap as far as this project is concerned what its antecedents may be. If Uncle Sam needs this ground, and if he can get a good title to it and get it cheaper than a site, everything considered, can be acquired for elsewhere, why not take it? The price may be too high. I do not know. There is no question about its location. It is south of the factory and separated from it, I think, only by a highway. I speak from personal knowledge, having had occasion to visit it about a year ago.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator whether the adjoining land is estimated for separately? This seems to be a lump-sum appropriation for two things, one being "the Dayton-Wright airplane factory, situated on the Cincinnati Pike, south of the city of Dayton, which consists of 33.89 acres." That is one proposition. Of course, whether this is an overestimate or not depends upon how much money we have spent on this factory and on the buildings included there.

Mr. THOMAS. That has been refunded.

Mr. FLETCHER. In addition to that there are 1,552.77 acres of adjoining land. I suppose that is the tract the Senator has estimated at about 1,200 acres?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator know how much we are paying for that land, or is it all bought together, the factory and the land in one estimate?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] stated the acre cost of this additional land, I think, at $1,000 an acre.

Mr. LENROOT. No; the acre cost of the land upon which the plant is situated is $1,100, and according to the appraisement there it would leave about $1,800 an acre, I think, for the remaining land.

Mr. THOMAS. For the 1,000 acres?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator to refer to it as costing about $1,000 an acre.

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. THOMAS. The appraisement of 33.89 acres at Morraine City, where this plant is located, is $37,279, at $1,100 an acre, plus $5,000 for such improvements as sidewalks, and so forth. I am very sure that that represents the cost price of this land to the present owners. That is my construction of the contract. I do not think that the appraisement included the south field, and if I am wrong about that the Senator from Wisconsin will correct me.

Mr. LENROOT. No; the south field was not covered by the contract at all.

Mr. THOMAS. No; it was not covered by the contract, but is entirely outside of it, so that the appraisement confines itself to the property covered by the contract. The present value of the property as contrasted with its cost price is 14 per cent, or nearly twice the amount allowed by the appraisers at Buffalo.

Mr. LENROOT. Forty per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. Fourteen per cent was the statement made before the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. You will find a letter here on the subject which states it at 40 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very sure Col. Gilmore put it at 14 per cent.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the Senator will find, if he will examine, that it was 40 per cent. You will find the official letter there.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not question the Senator's reference to the contract, but I feel very sure that that was Col. Gilmore's statement before the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. This letter from Col. Downey says the official report of the board of appraisers has not been transmitted to this office, but I have been apprised that the official estimate placed a value of 40 per cent of its cost.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that is June, 1918. I may have misunderstood Col. Gilmore. He may have said "40" instead of "14." I am pretty confident, nevertheless, that I state it correctly. However, the statement of Col. Downey is much better upon the face of things than is disclosed by the appraisal of the Elmwood Curtiss plant.

Mr. President, aside from any question of excessive value of the field, if the Government can get this plant, which is well adapted to aircraft construction, vastly cheaper than it can get any other and very much less than it can be duplicated by the construction of a new building, I think on the face of things it must be said that the Government should take it. But aircraft construction requires something more than a factory. Every plane must be tested out, all materials used in its construction must be tested, and this necessitates a field of considerable dimensions. We have a field in Virginia called the Langley Field admirably adapted to the purpose, and where I think the engineering and experimental work should have been done. But to utilize Langley Field for this purpose one of two things is necessary, either the transportation of completed machines 600 or 700 miles or the testing of them upon the ground in the vicinity of the manufacturing plant. Is it to the interest of the Government to make these tests upon the ground or to transport the machines a distance of several hundred miles and then make them? It seems to me, Mr. President, we can draw but one conclusion. Concentration of the entire industry and in as small an area as possible is both scientific and economical. One of the reasons for our vast expense during the war was the widely separated agencies or units utilized in handling the enormous business of the war.

I imagine about the only difference between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and myself upon this subject is the question of the cost of this field. If it costs $1,800 per acre and $1,800 per acre is too much, then, of course, the Government should not pay it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. But there are upon this field large improvements made by the company and utilized for its engineering and experimental purposes. If they go, as they must go, with the land itself, it puts a very different construction upon acreage value as a whole unless they are separately inventoried and are paid for exclusively by land value.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I must first yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I think we are discussing this question as to this purchase without an accurate knowledge of what we are buying. At the present time the $360,000 appropriation is placed at that figure for the purpose of paying $360,000 for the Dayton-Wright plant, which is amortized at that figure; $1,500,000 for two tracts of land, one known as the Morraine tract, having 876-odd acres, and the other the tract that was formerly used as a flying field, having 700 acres, all placed at approximately about $1,500,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Those two tracts are virtually one, are they not?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes, they are virtually the same. It gives a two-mile sweep for the field. The sum of $1,250,000 is in the appropriation for the erection of hangars, the building of the necessary roads, and other changes and improvements. At the present time on this property there is $630,000 worth of buildings, consisting of a lumber plant, a garage, and barracks to house the men who were stationed there during the war. That is the situation. So the land is estimated at about $1,000 per acre.

Mr. THOMAS. Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I wanted to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether he or the committee know what the assessed valuation of this land is?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand it was appraised—I think it was 12 years ago—at the price of $1,000 an acre, and it was put into the Government at that price.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask whether there was any evidence whatever before the committee as to the value of the land except the mere bald statement of these officers that it could be purchased for so much?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is all the statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] for calling attention to the facts he has just given the Senate. He has stated them more concisely than I could and has relieved me of the necessity of referring to them. I think that he put the situation in a nutshell, so far as the main project is concerned.

Let me say just here, lest I forget it, that this building is also essential to the Government for storage purposes. Much of its surplus property is in and around the city of Dayton. It, too, must be cared for, and economy suggests the purchase of this building and its utilization for storage purposes until the work of aircraft construction can be entered upon, and for which no part of this appropriation is intended. That of itself is a most cogent reason for the acquisition of the property.

There are in connection with this proposal some other plans, the need for which I am not so sure about. For instance, there is a plant at Miamisburg, Ohio, and what is called plant No. 3, at Dayton, described as buildings Nos. 1 to 6, inclusive, and appraised at $28,622.56. They are included here, however, because they are subject to the provisions of the contract under which the appraisement is made and under which this action is to be taken. They are, therefore, inseparable from the main proposition. We can not perform our contract with regard to items which it covers which are favorable to the Government and reject it as to items or as to conditions which are unfavorable. Men do not perform their contracts in that way, and the Government certainly should be as honest as are its citizens.

Mr. President, we realize the necessity of such strict and rigid economy in the administration of governmental affairs from now on as is consistent with our welfare, our safety, and the efficient discharge of all public functions. We realize also that military science is highly progressive and that war now means the enlistment of all of the activities, all of the energies, and all of the productive capacities of a nation. We know now that 60 per cent of an efficient army must be composed of men skilled in engineering, in business, in trades, and in all those operations which constitute the activities of peace. We also know, at least we feel the conviction, that the nation which lags behind now in aircraft development is the nation which will be sorely pressed and sorely tried should the day of trouble again confront it. Therefore, the question resolves itself into the proposition with which I opened this discussion, Shall the Government of the United States have an active and shall it prosecute a vigorous aircraft program or shall it suspend all work in that direction

until the day of reckoning returns? Shall we imitate Great Britain and France or shall we pursue our old course and surrender the mastery of the air to other nations? If so, then both from a military and commercial standpoint we must hereafter occupy a secondary position in the affairs of the world, for the younger men of this body who sit around me will live to see, although I may not, a large portion of the transportation in the economic and industrial world, both national and international, conducted by machines traversing the air, by dirigibles, and by those vast and constantly expanding heavier-than-air machines cleaving the atmosphere at the rate of 150 miles an hour, annihilating distance, bringing the nations closer and closer together, and setting the seal of supremacy, commercial and military, upon the nation whose advancement in that line shall be constant and expanding.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, even assuming that the facts have been correctly stated, I desire to ask the Senator what emergency exists for placing this appropriation upon this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. I have failed to make myself understood if I have not conveyed the impression that the emergency is here and has been here ever since the war ended.

Mr. LENROOT. What I mean by that is, Why should not the committee consider this matter in the ordinary way? The full committee has had no opportunity, as the Senator well knows, to give this subject any considerable consideration.

Mr. WADSWORTH rose.

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield to the chairman of the committee in a moment; but I desire to state——

Mr. LENROOT. If I may finish my question, I desire to say that the Senator from Colorado knows that the Secretary of War expressly stated that he did not ask that this appropriation be included in the bill. If we can secure this land at any time at its appraised value, the Government is losing nothing, as it would in the Curtiss case.

Mr. THOMAS. The Government is also storing some of its surplus material in this building, but I am not certain about that——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The emergency is just this: The engineering experimental station of the entire air service is now located at McCook Field, near Dayton. It is a very badly situated field. The land of that field is leased by the Government, which has erected upon it a large number of temporary buildings of the lightest and flimsiest structure, merely to suit the purposes of the war.

Under the terms of the lease the Government must turn that land back to its owner eight months after the declaration of peace. When that is done the Government will have no experimental station at its disposal and it must go somewhere else. The committee was persuaded that here was the best business opportunity that the Government could possibly expect to meet; that here was an ideal place near by, with permanent buildings, which had been used for a factory, at a price which did not seem excessive, though it may be generous. If this is not done, we shall have to hunt the country over to find a place and erect new buildings of a permanent character. Instead of spending $3,260,000 we shall probably be required to spend five or six million dollars.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Under the Senator's own statement, then, we have at least eight months following the declaration of peace in which to determine this question. There is no occasion, therefore, for putting it in this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is going to take a little time to make this Dayton field, if it is purchased, available for taking over the equipment and the personnel of the McCook Field. It will not do to wait until the McCook Field is abandoned before we even purchase the Dayton field.

Mr. LENROOT. But there are no buildings upon this field.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is just it. We shall have to put up some buildings.

Mr. LENROOT. Not upon this field. This is to be a flying field.

Mr. THOMAS. It is to be both.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Wisconsin is mistaken. It is to be both a flying and a manufacturing field.

Mr. LENROOT. It has only 39 acres.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have to erect hangars. However, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has gone over the matter, and I dislike to go over it again.

Mr. THOMAS. The field to which the activities of the McCook Field are to be transferred comprises about 1,200 acres, embracing two tracts of ground immediately adjoining.

Mr. President, it may be true that the Secretary of War has not recommended this.

Mr. LENROOT. I did not say he had not recommended it.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think he has recommended it.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not know about that.

Mr. THOMAS. I entertain the most profound respect for the judgment of the Secretary and the Chief of Staff as to matters of military concern, but I fear they are not so solicitous about aircraft matters and production as I should like to have them. They are very naturally and very properly disposed at the present time to cut off expenditures wherever possible. That is the reason assigned for the cessation of all activities in aircraft and other production; and it is an excellent one. I wish, Mr. President, that they were more alive to the exigencies of the situation, but the fact that the department having control of aircraft seems comparatively indifferent to its present and as to its future is the strongest possible argument in favor of the bill heretofore introduced by my friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], for the creation of a separate department of aircraft, and for the establishment of a committee on aviation, for the recognition of the fact that a new force has come into the military and industrial life of the nations—a force which bids fair not only to dominate but possibly to supplant very largely many other activities; a force whose dimensions the imagination of man can not at present limit; a force so stupendous that the mightiest empire of all time and the greatest republic of Europe, alive to its importance and possibilities, have girded on their armor and begun the contest for construction, while we, lagging behind, may repent of our folly only when they shall have established a domination of the air that we may not hope to challenge. Unless we take advantage of present opportunity, arouse ourselves to its vast importance, seize it, enter the lists and bring American genius and enterprise to the performance of the mighty task, we can not hope to hold a commanding position in the military and economic developments of the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I think the Senate ought to have the proper perspective of this transaction as it relates to the other plants now at Dayton. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has explained in regard to the McCook Field, but I think the Senate should be informed of the entire situation around Dayton.

When we declared war there was located at Dayton a small experimental plant. There Wilbur Wright, who invented and developed the heavier-than-air machine, was experimenting. Col. Deeds urged the Signal Corps to locate at Dayton several of their plants; and they took the Wilbur Wright field as a flying field and as a training station for aviators. It was not a proper location, and has been abandoned. They built at the end of a 7-mile trolley line, which had to be reconstructed to carry the heavy freight, a large warehouse costing, I think, $500,000. Then they organized the Dayton-Wright factory, located near the tract which we contemplate purchasing. It is a modern up-to-date plant. Then they leased near the city of Dayton a flying field to be used for experimental work, and built an experimental engineering department at what is known as McCook Field. That experimentation consisted in taking all kinds of engines and running them to destruction in order to test their stability. The sand-bag test on airplanes to ascertain structural defects and other tests were conducted in these engineering laboratories. Whenever there was an invention that could be applied to airplane construction and development in any part of the country it was sent there for a Government test, and the Government engineers who conducted the tests either condemned or approved the various airplane inventions. That is an established department of the Government, and it is necessary that it should be conducted if we are to make any progress in our aircraft service. So the aircraft branch of the service have considered the question of buying the Dayton-Wright plant, in which we already have an investment of $360,000. I think the Dayton-Wright concern manufactured some 2,000 De Havilland-4 airplanes.

They have also considered the purchase of 876 acres, known as the Morraine tract of land, belonging to the Morraine Development Co., as it is called. The purchase of that land is provided for in this bill at the price which the Morraine Development Co. paid to the individual owners 10 years ago. The other 700-acre tract is an assembly tract under option. Whether it can be bought for less than that the officers who have inspected the tract do not know, and the books of the Marraine Development Co. do not show; but they believe that the amount suggested represents a fair value for that tract of land.

It is absolutely essential that the engineering department should have a field for flying tests. The McCook Field was too small. There were, I think, two or possibly more men killed

there, because it was too small and was surrounded by a growth of trees that did not allow proper space in which to alight. The field proposed to be purchased is 2 miles in length, nearly one-half a mile in width, I believe, and affords an opportunity for the aircraft branch to transfer their engineering department from the McCook Field, which they must very soon vacate, to the Dayton-Wright plant, a modern, up-to-date, fireproof plant, with $635,000 worth of Government investment, in addition to the factory and the opportunity of securing this large flying field, which is absolutely essential for the extension of the service.

I have been prejudiced against the purchase of this piece of property; I have been prejudiced against anything that Col. Deeds had anything to do with, but I believe that this property should be purchased if we are to extend our Air Service. We can not bring the aircraft engineering branch of the Government here; it must be in the Middle West. It would cost us far more than we are proposing to invest in this plant if we brought it East; it will cost us from five to ten million dollars to relocafe this engineering plant if we do not avail ourselves of the opportunity of acquiring a plant where we already have an actual investment of approximately a million dollars.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly; I will be very glad to answer the Senator.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] called attention to the fact that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] offered some time ago a bill providing for a department of aeronautics. I am very reluctant to express an opinion upon so important a question as aircraft and aeronautics, particularly in view of the fact that Senators, such as the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Colorado, and others, have given it a great deal of attention; but it does seem to me that the establishment of a department of aeronautics is the solution of this question, and that we will come to that. In the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator will recall, we have been considering this question, a very large sum having been asked for by the Secretary of the Navy for aerial craft for the Navy. The House appropriated $15,000,000. The Senate has increased that amount very considerably; indeed, has doubled it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Trebled it.

Mr. KING. Yes; more than doubled it.

Mr. THOMAS. Nearly quadrupled it.

Mr. NEW. Yes; nearly quadrupled it.

Mr. KING. I did not understand that we had gone so far. Now, as I understand, in the amendment presented by the committee with respect to this bill $50,000,000 is carried. Does not the Senator think that it would be the part of wisdom, before we enter upon any large expenditures, to make an assessment and find out the mistakes of the past—and they are multitudinous—profit by those mistakes, and deliberately and in a sane and rational way provide some plan to deal with a question so important?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I should like to say, in reply to the suggestion just made by the Senator from Utah, that that is precisely what this plant is for—to conduct investigations and profit by the mistakes of the past. It is intended to house and accommodate the engineering section, the scientific section of the aeronautical department of the United States Army. It is for that very purpose that the construction, investigation, and research work is being carried on. In order that it may be properly carried on, there must be not only a factory where the machinery and everything necessary can be kept, but there must be immediately adjoining a flying field. It is the case of the old story of the fellow who had a dam by a mill site, but had no mill by the dam site. In this instance, we have both the mill and the dam, the factory and the flying field. There is no other place in the United States where those two necessary things are found together.

Mr. President, I have gone over this Dayton matter as a member of the subcommittee that investigated the aeronautical situation last year. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who is not present now, I believe, and myself were on that subcommittee and went all over this plant and this field. I am thoroughly familiar with it. I believe it is now the chief necessity of the aeronautical service of the United States Army that this particular plant at that place be continued.

I do not like Col. Deeds or many of the things that Col. Deeds has done any better than does the Senator from Utah or the Senator from New Jersey, with whose mind my own is in complete accord, but I do believe that the purchase of this facility at this time is a necessity for the proper continuance of experimental and scientific investigations and tests by the Army, and that if we do not get it at the figure for which it is at present offered we will, in a very short time, have to get another field and another factory, another plant, which will cost us two or three times the money which we are called upon to expend for this. That is why I am for the purchase of this plant and for including this item in this bill. I believe the appropriation is a very necessary one.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] asked me whether I believed it would not be a good plan to stop and check up and wait until we had organized an aircraft department. I believe that would be extremely disastrous. Unless we go on and continue our development, we are going to fall so far behind in this branch of the service and this science that we will be in the same position we were when the war broke out.

The airplane is strictly an American invention. It was Wilbur Wright and Langley who developed the heavier-than-air airplane; and yet when this war broke out England had developed her Rolls-Royce and her other types of aircraft engines, France had developed aircraft, and we had nothing. We started off; but it is true we made many mistakes. We spent more than $600,000,000; we spent $1,786,000,000. Those were the appropriations.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have great confidence in the judgment of the subcommittee, particularly in view of the fact that some of the subcommittee and the Senators who were named by the Senator from New Jersey awhile ago were out on this particular ground and inspected the location; but I have received some letters in reference to the Dayton-Wright Field that make me hesitate now as to what my duty is in the premises.

It has been stated here that the subcommittee took no evidence as to this particular field; and I am wondering if there would be any loss to the Government, even if all that the Senator from New Jersey claims were admitted, if the matter were postponed awhile, until some further investigation could be had as to this particular field?

It has been reported to me that the heavy concrete roof on this building is sinking because the foundation at Morraine City is bad; that it is a part of the old river bed; that the foundation is poor; and that it is difficult to establish there buildings that will be permanent in character. What loss, if any, would occur to the Government if the matter were postponed for some further consideration as to this particular place?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I do not know anything as to the facts stated by the Senator from Oregon, and I do not know whether or not it would matter particularly in regard to the field if this were delayed. I do believe, however, that it would be an extremely costly delay if the engineering experiments were stopped. As I said before, I was opposed to the purchase of this plant. I believe, after what I have heard from the officers, and further investigation, that it is absolutely necessary.

The Senator from Utah asks whether we had better go on with the development of our airplane service or not. Let me say to the Senator that England has appropriated $330,000,000 for the coming year for the development of her airplane service. England has been the empress of the seas. She is now going to dominate the air from horizon to horizon. She realizes that not only as an arm of defense but as a commercial advantage it is necessary that the development and the achievement of the aircraft service should be advanced.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes.

Mr. KING. I am asking for information, because, as I stated, this is a subject which to most of us is unknown. We have not given it attention.

As I understand, England, profiting by the experiences of the war, has established a department of aeronautics, and has placed

the production and handling of all aircraft, both for the army and for the navy, in charge of this department. She has a program, one which is rational, and one which has been evolved as the result of experience and as the result of investigation since the war. We do not seem to have any. I am not saying this by way of criticism. As I understand, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] has introduced a bill for the consolidation of the aircraft departments or bureaus into one. Does not the Senator think it would be better, before we make any very extensive appropriations, that we should have a program, the same as England has, and if we are going to consolidate the aircraft, naval and military, under the head of one department, that that should be done, and done speedily, and that the appropriations should be made with reference to that consolidation?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Answering the Senator, I will simply say that I am for Senator NEW's bill creating a ministry of aircraft, and I trust from what the Senator has said that he is, too; but until we can get the minds of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to meet on the question of a consolidation of the service we must go on developing each service separately. There is a definite program considering the question of 22,000 men, with a certain number of flying fields, and the utilization of the aircraft supplies and machines that we have now, and also experimentation as to the newer machines. We have a large number of flying fields, and we have 14,000 Liberty engines which can be utilized, and we have the best asset of all, several thousand men who have been trained in flying. Those should be utilized, and it is Gen. Menoher's plan to have a definite program; but in order to carry it out we must go on with this appropriation and these plants. Possibly the Senator can influence the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to support Senator NEW's bill and have an aircraft ministry.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, one moment before the Senator takes his seat. In addition to all these reasons given in support of this measure, does not the Senator feel that this is a good business proposition for the Government?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The development of our aircraft?

Mr. HENDERSON. The development of our aircraft, and the purchase of these plants in order to save what we have already put into them at this time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I most certainly do; particularly the development of our aircraft at this time. If we do not go on, if there is another war, we will do just as we did in this war—buy on inflated prices and pay three times what we ought to pay. Besides, the place for the American eagle is in the air, not on the ground or in a cage.

Mr. HENDERSON. And we ought to be prepared at all times for air service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FRANCE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harding	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Harris	Nelson	Smoot
Curtis	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Edge	Henderson	Newberry	Thomas
Elkins	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Underwood
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
France	King	Sheppard	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Shields	Wolcott
Gay	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] are detained on important public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-three Senator have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. CUMMINS and Mr. MCCORMICK entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little delay, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. DIAL, Mr. HALE, and Mr. SPENCER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of the aircraft program. I voted, I believe, for even a larger sum than that reported out by the committee. I voted, of course, for the $55,000,000 provided in this bill. I indorse all that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has said about aircraft and their future; but the question that we have under consideration now is a totally different question.

I want to call the attention of the Senate, and particularly the attention of the Senator from Colorado, to a report that was filed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] from the Committee on Military Affairs on August 22 last about this very fact. That report says:

> A number of concerns, like the Dayton-Wright Co. and the Standard Co., have been practically organized since the war, and the former—

That is, the Dayton-Wright Co.—

> was given enormous contracts before its factories were completed.

And on page 14 of that report it is said:

> Due to her vast automobile industry, Detroit doubtless possessed greater facilities for gas-engine production than any other American community, and the Fisher Body Co. was well equipped for the manufacture of planes in quantity. A generous recognition of these facts was therefore inevitable.
>
> But Dayton possessed no such advantages. Her manufacturing interests were for the most part in other directions. Industrially considered, the concentration of the greater part of the new pursuits in these two cities may perhaps be justified, but the committee is forced to the conclusion that the personnel of the Aviation Board, from its formation to its reconstruction, explains the fact.

Here is a report from the Committee on Military Affairs last August in which it is stated that the factories that had been purchased or had been leased by the Government were not the kind of factories that the Government ought to have had, and that they had been put there by the personal influence of one of the men connected with the industry. That man, of course, as we all know, is Col. Deeds. He has been the subject of inquiry ever since he was put there; and it appears that in everything connected with the Dayton matter Col. Deeds's name must necessarily arise.

The committee goes on to say:

> The Wilbur Wright Field is physically and geographically unsuited for the purpose, and the giving of huge contracts for airplanes to a corporation created since the war began, of which he—

Meaning Col. Deeds—

> was one of the first officers, and owned exclusively by his former partners and business associates, has provoked, and we think justly, much of the public comment which made the investigation imperative and much of the resentment of less-favored manufacturers in other localities.

Mr. President, I say that this appropriation of $3,260,000 of the people's money ought not to be made at this time to acquire this manufacturing plant. There has not been a sufficient investigation. Sufficient facts are not before this body to warrant the expenditure of any such sum. There is no reason for haste in the matter. There is no reason why further facts as to values should not be submitted. It ought not to be done. There is no reason for the hurry. This is a bad way to legislate, anyway—legislating on an appropriation bill, providing a lump sum to buy the land at enormous cost, and no man can tell the value of the improvements on it. We have a report from some arbitration committee or valuation committee. We do not know whether it is fair and just, or what it is. Our experience with these people, with the head of this corporation, is such that we ought not to expend these huge sums of money for any such purpose.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to another thing—that the property on which this factory is situated is probably the property of Col. Deeds. I read from the testimony of Mr. Talbott in the aircraft-production hearings in the Sixty-fifth Congress:

> Mr. TALBOTT. Yes, sir; the south field—

On which, as I understand, the factory is built—

> The south field, which consists of about 120 acres belonging to Col. Deeds, who leased it to our company for a dollar a year, and the Government is getting the benefit of it in that way without charge. Our company put up the buildings.

I call the attention of the Senate to the peculiar wording of this part of the amendment, which the Senator from Wisconsin has moved to strike out. It does not say "the property owned by the Dayton-Wright Co." It does not name any particular property. It is broad and generous enough to include any property that they may want to include. Listen to it:

> Equipment, and other facilities which go to make up what is known as the Dayton-Wright airplane factory.

That would include any kind of property that was leased—this property that was leased from Col. Deeds, or any other property that was leased or might have been leased—in which anybody has an interest. It is not confined to any particular company's property. We do not know with whom we are dealing. We have not got sufficient facts; and to spend $3,260,000 for a cat in a bag, so to speak, is something that I do not think this body ought to agree to.

I hope the Senate will vote in favor of the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to strike out this provision. There is no necessity for so many airplane factories.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is not to be an airplane factory.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is to be a warehouse, I think we can get our warehousing facilities for a great deal less.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not to be a warehouse.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is it to be for?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is to be an experimental engineering station. The Government now has one at McCook Field, as the Senator knows. It must be moved from McCook Field, because the Government must get out of that field; and it is proposed to put it into the permanent buildings in this particular factory, with the adjoining land, upon which to conduct the experiments. I only interrupted the Senator in the interest of accuracy.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to have the interruption of the Senator; but in reply to that I merely point him to the report of the Committee on Military Affairs, under date of August 22, 1918, in which they say that the facilities at this field were physically and geographically unfitted for the purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Which field?

Mr. McKELLAR. This very field.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator name it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Dayton Field. I read the language from the report.

Mr. THOMAS. It is there, but it refers to the McCook Field. There is no intention of buying the McCook Field.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the McCook Field is referred to in another part of the report. This refers to the Dayton Field—the Wilbur Wright Field.

Mr. THOMAS. The Wilbur Wright Field is outside.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is not the Wilbur Wright Field.

Mr. McKELLAR. It refers to the Dayton Field also, where this property is located.

Mr. THOMAS. This is the Dayton Field.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will pass the report to the Senator and let him read it himself. It is unquestionably so. We are without information, and I hope the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is highly apparent that the Senator from Tennessee is without information.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, it seems remarkable that we can not get the information from the committee. There is no reason why the committee should not furnish it. I do not know why it is that we are required to devote this large sum of money to this purpose. Why is this amendment rushed through here on an appropriation bill, when we have ample time to have it brought up before the entire committee and thrashed out in committee, so that we may see what the value of the land is and what the value of the so-called experimental station is before putting Government money into it. It ought to be examined carefully.

Mr. THOMAS. I was compelled to leave the Chamber for a moment during the address of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I have been informed that he made the statement that this report discloses a personal ownership by Col. Deeds of 120 acres of the ground the purchase of which is contemplated by this amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I made no such statement. I read from the testimony of Mr. Talbott on page 283 of the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 1. I now refer to it. I would like to know whether it is true or not. I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the 120 acres here referred to must be a part of the property.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suppose so, and so stated, and that is what I said, but I did not state that the Senate report had it in.

Mr. THOMAS. I was of the impression that the Senator had referred to some recital of the report upon the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. THOMAS. The statement to which the Senator refers reads as follows:

> The south field, which consists of about 120 acres, belonging to Col. Deeds, who leased it to our company for $1 a year, and the Government is getting the benefit of it in this way without charge. Our company put up buildings.

Which is probably a part of the 1,200 acres now known as the Morraine or south field.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I had forgotten that this statement had been made. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The south field has nothing whatever to do with the Morraine tract or any of the land contemplated in this purchase.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator is sure of that, it relieves my mind of apprehension.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator if it does not state in the language of the witness Mr. Talbott "the factory buildings."

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. What does it say?

Mr. THOMAS. There are a lot of buildings on the south field, but they are not the factory. The factory and the south field, in other words, comprise different tracts of land. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] says, and I have no doubt of the fact, because he has studied this matter very carefully, that this is no part of what we call the south field, or rather the ground south of the factory. But upon the face of it it would appear to the contrary.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly would; and upon the face of this amendment it makes the Government deal with what is known as the Dayton-Wright Aeroplane Factory, which makes it more apparent.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I wish to take only a moment to address the Senate. Most of the discussion this afternoon concerning the amendment I have proposed has been with reference to a policy to be pursued in the future. That is not the question before the Senate at this time at all. The question, and the sole question, before the Senate is whether we shall hand $3,280,000 over to the War Department to be expended for the acquisition of this property and this land without the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, without the Senate, without the House Committee on Military Affairs, without the House, having any evidence whatever before it concerning the value of the land.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator say that it has been recommended by the Secretary of War or the War Department in any way? As I understand it, it has not. I may be mistaken. I would like to know, as a matter of fact, whether any recommendation has come in here or to either House that this money should be expended.

Mr. LENROOT. I will say the Secretary of War did call the attention of the House Committee on Military Affairs to this proposition, but he expressly stated to the committee that he was not asking and did not ask that it be included in the appropriation bill. He merely asked that it be taken up as a matter of separate consideration by the committee.

RECEPTION TO PRESIDENT ELECT PESSOA OF BRAZIL.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief request of the Senate. I have been informed that the President elect of Brazil is here, and I suggest that the Senate take a recess for 15 minutes, and that the President elect be conducted to the floor by a committee of two Senators to be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is agreed to. The Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] as the committee, and the Senate will be in recess for 15 minutes.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. THOMAS escorted into the Chamber Dr. Epalicio Pessoa, President elect of Brazil, accompanied by his secretary, Mr. Penoa Quiroz; Capt. Burlamaqui, naval aid to Dr. Pessoa; Mr. Alberto de I. Moreiro, chargé d'affaires of the Brazilian Embassy at Washington; and Mr. Banoso.

Dr. Pessoa was given a seat on the right of the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators, I esteem it a very great privilege and high honor to be permitted at this time to introduce a very distinguished guest. It is a pleasure to remember the long period of amity and good will that has remained unbroken between these sister Republics.

I have the honor of introducing to you the President elect of the Republic of Brazil, Dr. Pessoa. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT ELECT PESSOA, OF BRAZIL.

Dr. PESSOA. Gentlemen, I have no words to express all my thanks for the honor you tender to me by receiving me in this House. It is not remarkable that I have no words to express my thanks, because my thanks are very great and very extensive and my English is very short. But I can assure you that Brazil, the ancient friend in the life of the United States, will keep in her heart the memory of this cordial reception. [Great applause.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President elect of Brazil will, I am sure, be glad to meet the Senators personally. It may be imposing some hardship upon him, but we take it for granted that he would like to shake the hands of some of the citizens of his sister Republic.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore and the committee stood in the area near the Secretary's desk with Dr. Pessoa and personally presented the Members of the Senate to him.

The recess having expired, the President pro tempore resumed the chair.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senate will proceed now with business, and as soon as the particular amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin is disposed of I shall move that the Senate stand in recess until 8 o'clock. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber until the pending matter is disposed of.

Mr. SPENCER. By the courtesy of the Senator from Wisconsin, I submit an amendment to the bill, to be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, at the time the recess was taken I had just stated that the Secretary of War had expressly stated that he did not ask that this appropriation be included in this bill; that he only asked that the matter be considered separately by the committee. I also stated that there was not a word of evidence before the committee as to the value of the property that is proposed to be purchased by this appropriation.

Mr. President, recognizing as I do the custom of the Senate to attach very great weight to the recommendations of the Committee on Military Affairs, as to other committees, it is only fair to state that this bill, as usual, was referred to a subcommittee, the bill carrying something like $800,000,000 of appropriations. The subcommittee completed its labors and called a meeting of the full committee at 2.30 o'clock on Friday afternoon. Recognizing the need of the greatest expedition possible, the full committee completed its consideration at 12 o'clock at night on that same day. It was utterly impossible for the full committee to give any serious consideration to these propositions, which are really legislative in their nature, even had they the testimony upon which the subcommittee acted, but they did not have even that. I have since examined the testimony, Mr. President, upon which the subcommittee made its recommendation, and it covers less than two pages, and there is not one word in that testimony concerning the value of the land that is proposed to be purchased.

I had supposed, in this Congress at least, that the time had come when before handing out millions of dollars to the War Department, to be spent in its discretion, there would be some investigation and consideration of the merits of a proposition. I had understood that this very Committee on Military Affairs had charged the War Department with extravagance in the administration of aeronautical funds. I am surprised that the majority, especially of this committee, are now willing to continue the practice of handing out $3,000,000 to the War Department, to be expended in its discretion, without one syllable of testimony as to the value of the land that is proposed to be purchased.

Well, it is said that it is only proposed to spend about $1,500,000 of this appropriation for the purchase of land; but, Mr. President, Senators will observe that there is no limitation in this amendment upon the amount that may be expended for the purchase of land. The department may, if they choose, expend the entire $3,200,000 for the purchase of this 1,500 acres of land and the buildings upon it. There is no occasion for any haste in this matter. The only reason given up to this time——

Mr. NEW rose.

Mr. LENROOT. Just a moment. The only reason given up to this time was by the chairman of the committee, wherein he said that the Government lease of the McCook Field would expire eight months after the proclamation of peace, and that it would be necessary by that time to secure some place of this character. Granted, Mr. President; but surely there is ample time for the Committee on Military Affairs to take up this matter, to consider it upon its merits, to get some evidence before it as to the value of the land, and then make its recommendations.

Now I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator from Wisconsin says as to the absence of a reason for immediate action, I desire to say that the fact is that the Government has no option or anything like an agreement that is binding to have that property delivered to it. Its owners may sell it to anybody else at any time if they get a purchaser. I do not know whether they have one or not; but the Government would lose on it about $1,000,000. I will ask the Senator from New Jersey to state the exact figures, if he has them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The buildings on the land, which were placed there by the Government, are said to be worth $630,000. They consist of a lumber plant, garages, and certain quarters or barracks. In addition to that, I think, $360,000 is the amortized value of the plant.

Mr. NEW. Those are the facts.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I have here the report of the arbitrators on the appraised value of the property, both that belonging to the company and that belonging to the Government. The appraised value of the Government assets, to be sold to the contractor at the appraised total value, is $50,000, and the total value of the contractor's property is about $330,000. I think the Senator stated it as $360,000, although I think it is about $330,000; but the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] is absolutely mistaken when he says that the Government will lose money, for the Government, if this appraisement was an honest appraisement, can not lose money by postponing this purchase. If this was an honest appraisement, if the property is worth only what the appraiser said it was worth, the Government can get it at the same price by virtue of the exercise of the right of eminent domain at any time. The Government will be losing no money; and this is the first time in this entire discussion that any claim has been made that the Government would lose money by not buying this property at this time.

No, Mr. President, there can not be, to my mind, any good reason for including this amendment in this appropriation, unless the Senate wishes to take the onus of permitting the fullest discretion to the War Department to pay any price that it chooses for land. Admitting for the sake of argument that this is a location that ought to be acquired, the Government can lose nothing by giving to the Committee on Military Affairs an opportunity to get evidence concerning the value of the land and to consider the matter upon its merits. The full committee has never had an opportunity to do that; and in fairness to the committee it ought to have that opportunity before this proposition is included in this appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether there were hearings with respect to this item?

Mr. LENROOT. There were; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], I think, has a copy of them; and it is stated therein for what amount the land could be purchased. There was no evidence as to its value.

Mr. KING. Have there been any hearings as to the necessity of the acquisition of this field and all cognate questions that would be involved in a purchase of this character?

Mr. LENROOT. There has not been, that I know of.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I might add something to the information of the Senator from Utah. Gen. Menoher, Gen. Mitchell, and Col. Gilmore came before the committee, and were heard upon several points contained in this general aircraft-service item. Amongst them were the Curtiss and Dayton factory cases. Later on when the subcommittee had gone into executive session to make up this bill as it thought it should be made up, the question of the Curtiss-Dayton factory site was brought up in the committee. There was some uncertainty as to some of the facts and figures which had been given. So we sent for Gen. Menoher and Col. Gilmore to come to us again. We then had a long talk, but unfortunately that was after the stenographer had been sent away and we had gone into executive session. We had a full attendance, as I remember, of seven members of the subcommittee. The result was, if my recollection is correct, the vote was 6 to 1 in favor of reporting favorably on both these projects; and that one vote has since been persuaded to support the project. I regret that no stenographer was present on the second visit of Gen. Menoher and Col. Gilmore. There is nothing mysterious about it.

Mr. POMERENE. How did the committee arrive at the amount indicated in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We took the estimate of the air-service people, who have been conducting negotiations. Some of it is by appraisement made by appraisers who were appointed according to the terms of the contract which the Government entered into with the Dayton-Wright factory. I repeat, there is nothing mysterious about the appraisal; it is all a matter of record. The appraisal must stand under the terms of the contract.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the past record of the War Department in relation to aircraft and aeronautics, its suggestions are not received with that confidence that recommendations of a great department should have.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is not the Senator from Utah thinking of the conditions of a year ago? This is, I may say in all frankness, a very different outfit from the one we had here a year ago.

Mr. KING. I had in mind when I made that observation, and intended to qualify the statement so as to clearly indicate the thought within my mind, the situation that prevailed prior to the armistice, and particularly in 1917 and 1918. I felt then that there were some flagrant abuses, to put it in a very mild way, in the War Department in connection with aircraft production. Indeed, I called attention some time ago to the statement made to me by an officer who was familiar with conditions, who stated that some one should be court-martialed for the conditions that at one time existed in the Aircraft Service. I felt, from the inquiries which I made, that some officers ought to be called to account and that there were some civilians who were connected with this service who deserved punishment.

In my opinion there were serious mistakes in the aircraft branch of the War Department during 1917 and 1918. Upon a number of occasions I went to the War Department and protested against the policy that was being pursued—the cost-plus contracts that were being entered into—and stated to officials that there would be waste and extravagance resulting from the course which was being followed and that inefficiency was inevitable.

The evidence, it seemed to me, was quite conclusive that the Dayton field or fields and those connected with them were subject to investigation, and the conduct of those who had charge of those matters was subject to censure. When the Dayton-Wright Field is now brought up for consideration, and when the name of Mr. Deeds is associated with this transaction, the memories of the past are revived, and we can not forget what occurred in 1917 and 1918.

Mr. President, I am not satisfied with this item. No good and sufficient reasons have been suggested by the Senators who have spoken for it to warrant the appropriation. I find that there is nothing to limit the appropriation except, of course, the amount of $3,260,000. There is nothing to indicate how much of that is to be paid for land and for buildings, and how much is to be used for construction necessary to render the buildings and land available as an Air Service engineering experimental station. For aught that appears, the entire $3,260,000 could be paid to the Dayton-Wright Airplane Factory Co., if there is such an organization. I repeat, there is nothing to indicate how much of the proposed expenditure is for buildings, how much for land, and how much is needed for additional construction in order to render the buildings and the land available for an experimental station. I think the information is too limited for Senators to act intelligently upon this enormous appropriation, and, with the limited information which has been submitted, I shall vote against the appropriation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask that the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment on page 15, line 10, by striking out the following:

That not to exceed $3,260,000 of the funds herein appropriated for the Air Service may be expended for the purchase of all the buildings, grounds, machinery, equipment, and other facilities which go to make up what is known as the Dayton-Wright Airplane Factory, situated on the Cincinnati Pike, south of the city of Dayton, Ohio, which consists of 33.89 acres, more or less, and 1,552.77 acres of adjoining land, making in all 1,586.66 acres of land, more or less, together with all the buildings, factories, warehouses, machinery, equipment, and other improvements, utilities, and appurtenances thereon or thereunto belonging, and for the construction necessary to render these buildings and land available as an Air Service engineering experimental station.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his named was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HENDERSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and let my vote stand.

Mr. HARDING (after having voted in the negative). I note the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with whom I have a general pair. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. KING. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] are detained on official business.

The roll call resulted—yeas 18, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Capper	France	La Follette	Shields
Curtis	Harris	Lenroot	Smith, S. C.
Dial	Harrison	McKellar	Wolcott
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	
Fletcher	King	Sheppard	

NAYS—30.

Ball	Harding	Overman	Sutherland
Beckham	Henderson	Page	Swanson
Cummins	Keyes	Phipps	Thomas
Edge	Kirby	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Elkins	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Smoot	Warren
Gay	New	Spencer	
Hale	Newberry	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—48.

Ashurst	Gronna	McNary	Robinson
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Martin	Sherman
Borah	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Simmons
Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Owen	Stanley
Colt	Kendrick	Penrose	Townsend
Culberson	Kenyon	Phelan	Trammell
Dillingham	Knox	Pittman	Underwood
Fernald	McCormick	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	McCumber	Ransdell	Watson
Gore	McLean	Reed	Williams

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin the yeas are 18 and the nays 30. The Chair notes that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] is paired with another Senator and announced his presence. Therefore, there is a quorum present, and the amendment to the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if necessary, I wish to announce that I reserve the right to reoffer the amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, before moving to take a recess I desire to give the notice which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The notice will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from New York hereby gives notice of a motion to suspend Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate to propose the following amendment to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 5227):

On page 2, after line 15, insert:

"*Provided*, That the restrictions concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the fund herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies."

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask to have printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order will be made.

RECESS.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the chairman of the committee having the bill in charge asks for a recess, I desire to inquire of him whether it would not be a little fairer to the Members of the Senate to adjourn until to-morrow, and give us a chance to examine the testimony given before the committee? I know how important the passage of this bill is, and I am sure that none of us desire to offer any impediments; but some of us are quite interested in it, and we would like to see the testimony that was given. My judgment is that it will facilitate, rather than otherwise, the passage of the bill. The Senator can have a night session to-morrow night, and the bill will be passed to-morrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I should like very much to conform to the wishes of the Senator from Utah; but the time is so very short that it is incumbent upon us to sit, I believe, every evening this week, not only on this bill but on the other appropriation bills that are following it. I do not enjoy it, and I know that I, too, would like to get printed copies of the hearings; but the emergency is such that I can not consent to the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, Mr. President, this is only one of a number of supply bills that must be passed, if possible, between now and the 1st of July.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In other words, we must get this bill out of the way so that the naval bill can go through, the sundry civil bill can go through, and perhaps others. I do not want to stand in the way of the others. I want to have this bill gone.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are a number of Senators, Mr. President, who do not know about the session to-night. The notice was given just a little while ago, as I recall.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The word has been passed to a good many.

Mr. McKELLAR. A great many of them would like to be here, I am sure. I hope the Senator will let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I can not do it with a clear conscience. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 8 o'clock to-night.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move as an amendment, if it is necessary, that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah moves, as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from New York, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gay	Moses	Smoot
Chamberlain	Gronna	Newberry	Thomas
Cummins	Hale	Nugent	Underwood
Curtis	Harrison	Overman	Wadsworth
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Warren
Dillingham	Lenroot	Sheppard	Watson
France	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. EDGE, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. TRAMMELL, and Mr. WOLCOTT answered to their names when called.

Mr. ELKINS entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to notify absent Senators that their presence is desired.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. KING, Mr. HARDING, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KEYES, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. KIRBY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little delay Mr. STERLING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GERRY, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. SHIELDS, and Mr. CAPPER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for the other side. As I understood, the Chair said there was not a sufficient number calling for a quorum. It takes one-fifth, and I merely ask for the other side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rule provides that one-fifth of the Senators present shall second the motion on a request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. My purpose in asking for the other side, which, I think, it is perfectly proper to do under the rule, is that the rule provides that not one-fifth of a quorum, but one-fifth of those present shall second the call of the roll. I merely want the other side to vote so as to see whether or not there is a one-fifth vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to be perfectly fair in the matter and will again put the question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, there were only four hands raised.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They were counted, and the Chair is sure they were counted honestly.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that case I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No business has transpired since the last quorum was called.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been a vote taken since the last roll was called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gay	Lodge	Sheppard
Beckham	Gerry	McCormick	Shields
Capper	Hale	McKellar	Sterling
Chamberlain	Harding	McNary	Sutherland
Cummins	Harris	Moses	Swanson
Curtis	Harrison	Newberry	Thomas
Dial	Henderson	Nugent	Trammell
Dillingham	Kellogg	Overman	Underwood
Edge	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Elkins	King	Phelan	Warren
Fall	Kirby	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pomerene	Wolcott

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. NEW, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PAGE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 32) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make this statement:

This bill appropriates something like $900,000,000. It has in it a very large amount of important legislation. The bill was considered by a subcommittee appointed by the full committee, and hearings were had before the subcommittee and not before the full committee. The full committee met, and those members who had not been on the subcommittee did not have the hearings before them when the bill was reported out. Those hearings never have been submitted. They are not printed yet, so far as I am informed. I have been unable to get them if the printer has printed them. My information is that the hearings are not yet out.

My proposition is that it is very unwise and very improper for the Senate to pass upon the important questions that there are in this bill without information, comparatively speaking. We ought to have the hearings. The members of the committee who were not on the subcommittee ought to have the hearings. We ought to have the opportunity of looking into them and passing upon the questions in an intelligent way before we vote these immense sums of money.

It was for that reason that I asked the chairman in charge of this bill to let the bill go over until to-morrow, when members of the committee might have the opportunity of looking into the hearings; and I want to say in all frankness that I shall oppose, with all the ability I can muster, any further consideration of the bill that can be avoided until we have the printed hearings. I think it is fair that the Senate should have the hearings before they pass upon the big questions in this bill.

Here it is. We are voting $55,000,000. We are raising the estimate of the House from $15,000,000 to $55,000,000. It is doubtless a very wise raise. We are adding legislation to that. We are providing here that out of this appropriation nearly a million dollars shall be used to buy a plant in New York. We are providing $3,260,000 to be used in purchasing a plant in Ohio.

We have no recommendations about this from the department. I am talking about the Secretary of War. He has made no recommendations, so far as I know. If they are in the hearings, that has not been disclosed. Some officers, perhaps, in the department have made these recommendations.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in just one moment. Here is another appropriation of $3,230,000 for the purchase of land and the building of a dirigible station in New Jersey. This is legislation. There is great question about whether that is the wisest thing to be done. It is brought in here in a half-baked condition. It is brought in here on the report of a subcommittee and the formal report of the full committee without the full committee having the hearings, and it is sought to be rushed through the Senate without the Senate having the hearings to go by.

It does seem to me that we ought to permit this matter to go over until to-morrow. I understand that the hearings will be printed and put in the hands of Senators by that time. I believe, and, in fact, I know, that we can save time by letting this matter go over until to-morrow, as has been suggested.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was simply going to ask the Senator if we could not consider those portions of the bill which are practically adoptions of the provisions of the bill as it came from the House. In other words, there is very much of the bill that is simply formal, and to which I think there will be no objection; and the Senator could indicate the portions of the bill that he would like to have go over until to-morrow, and if that meets with the approval of the chairman, I think we might finish a good portion of the bill this evening.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I can understand, of course, that there may be some impatience on the part of some Members of the Senate at not having copies of the printed hearings. It was utterly impossible to get them. We tried our best. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, it is the custom of all the committees of the Senate, when a representative of the administration appears before a committee, to send him immediately thereafter a copy of his testimony, in order that he may correct it. This was done in all the testimony taken before the subcommittee. Incidentally, it was not a small subcommittee. It was a subcommittee of seven Senators. I think the last one of the corrected manuscripts came back early this morning. As chairman of the committee, after consulting with many other Members of the Senate, I did not feel justified in losing the whole day of Monday and all of Monday evening waiting for the printed hearings to come in. I regret that the Senator from Tennessee is without the information that he desires. I might say, however, that he could have had a great deal more information had he attended the meeting of the full committee on the evening upon which it made its report. He did not attend.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am speaking of the full committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was done by the full committee was without any notice at all, just as without notice this afternoon a meeting of the Senate was called for to-night. The first I ever knew of it was when it was called, and I am sure the other members of the committee will bear me out in this statement. The result is that this bill is reported out by a subcommittee of seven of the Committee on Military Affairs, and approved to a large extent at a night meeting of that committee, when there were probably—I do not know how many members were present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I may say to the Senator that there was a very full meeting of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know that there was a full committee meeting, but we have no hearing of that yet; and I do not think so important a matter as this should be dealt with in this way. I think the hearings ought to be available, especially about the legislation. There is a lot of legislation on this appropriation bill, and the Members of the Senate ought to have the hearings on that legislation before voting on it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will not consent to let the Senate go on with the unobjectionable amendments, if the Senator in charge of the bill will agree to that course?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do that. I want the entire amendment, beginning on page 12 and ending on page 17, at line 13, to go over; and I will suggest others as we come to them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, is not that the amendment we have agreed to?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That amendment has been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to say that the amendment to which the Senator from Tennessee has just referred has been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I reserve the right to have it voted on again when the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if any other section in the bill treats of the compensation to be paid to officers in the aviation section or division of the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The officers in the Aviation Service receive their pay under the general item "Pay of the Army." The only other provision in the bill that I can remember which affects the compensation of officers of the Aviation Service is the amendment which will be found on page 14, line 17:

Provided further, That hereafter actual and necessary expenses only, not to exceed $8 per day, shall be paid to officers of the Army and contract surgeons when traveling by air on duty without troops under competent orders.

Mr. KING. The reason why I made the inquiry is that at the appropriate time and place, if the matter has not been dealt with by the committee, I desire to offer an amendment which will

prevent a large number of officers, particularly those who are majors and officers of higher rank, from receiving extra pay for flying. A great many complaints have been made to me by those who do fly, those who are trained to fly over the lines and who did fly over the lines, against the policy by which officers who were in Washington and who were doing staff duty would go to some place where there were machines and fly for four hours a month in order to get the 35 per cent extra compensation—officers who never expected to fly over the lines or to expose themselves to the dangers that were incident to active participation in combat work.

If the committee has not made provision for that I shall desire at the appropriate time and place to offer an amendment on that subject.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he thinks there are in the Army officers capable of such conduct?

Mr. KING. My amendment, when it is tendered, if that has not been cared for, will express my views as to what ought to be done. If it does not reach anybody, then of course there can be no objection to it.

Mr. THOMAS. I should have a very poor opinion of the Army of the United States if I supposed it was composed, even in part, of officers who would be guilty of such petty dishonesty.

Mr. KING. Well, let me ask the Senator if it is not a fact—and this statement has been made to me by officers who are flying and who have engaged in flying—that there were officers who were serving in a staff capacity, officers who were in the War Department here, who would go to some place where there were airplanes and fly for four hours during the month, around the airdrome or near by, and put in their claim for 35 per cent additional compensation?

Mr. THOMAS. It may be, Mr. President. I never heard of it before, and I certainly hope that the rumor is not well founded.

Mr. KING. I hope so, too; but I have reason to believe that that is the fact.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry as to the amendment on pages 12 to 17. Will it be necessary to reserve for a separate vote each one of the provisos beginning on page 14? I desire not to make any reservation in so far as the appropriation itself is concerned; but from page 14 I desire to make, if it is necessary, a separate reservation as to each proviso.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the present opinion that it will be necessary to reserve the entire amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also make the reservation as to the entire amendment, if it is necessary. In other words, I want to be in a position to have it voted on just as if it were in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the head of "Provost Marshal General's office," subhead "Completion, preservation, and transportation of the records," on page 17, after line 16, to strike out:

For all expenses necessary for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft under the act of May 18, 1917, entitled, "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Estabiishment of the United States," $25,000.

And insert:

That not to exceed $5,000,000 of the unexpended balances on June 30, 1919, of the appropriations "Registration and selection for military service, fiscal year 1919," contained in the Army appropriation act for 1919, approved July 9, 1918, and the deficiency appropriation act for 1919, approved November 4, 1918, are reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920, for all expenses necessary for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft under the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, including the employment of the necessary clerical and other help for duty in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army in connection with the arrangement, operation, and maintenance of the files of those records: *Provided*, That such part of this appropriation as may be necessary shall be available for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be disbursed by such officer as may be designated by the Secretary of War for the purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire that to go over. That is matter about which we had no hearings. I am rather inclined to think that it is probably all right, but I should like to see the hearings before it goes in.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senator will not insist upon that. That is a matter in which the adjutant general of every State in the Union is exceedingly interested.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand the situation by word of mouth in discussing it, but I have never seen the hearing. I do not know what it is.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can tell the Senator in two minutes. I think he can trust me to tell him accurately.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will hear the Senator about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Tennessee, as doubtless all other Senators, knows that the records of the draft boards have all been brought to Washington—a tremendous bulk of records, containing the names and occupations and ages and personal history of 24,000,000 men. They are now stored at Washington Barracks. It was said before the committee in the hearings that were they to be so arranged they would be 7 miles long and 15 feet high. It is tremendously important that they be preserved and that they be properly arranged, because many interests all over the United States want access to them in order to give certain information. There is at present an unexpended balance in the appropriation made during the war for the administration of the draft law of nearly $9,000,000. This amendment reappropriates $5,000,000 of that $9,000,000, and authorizes The Adjutant General to take charge of these records, and incidentally to employ clerical assistance in order to make them available to the adjutants general of the several States, who are exceedingly anxious to get the records of the soldiers of those several States at their capitals.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand all that, but that is not what my inquiry is about. What estimates have we from the department as to the cost of this work? Five million dollars for caring for the records and even copying the records would appear to be a very large sum of money for that character of work. What is it they propose to do about it? Are we to put men on the pay rolls to do it in one year or five years, or how is it to be done?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not tell how long it will take to accomplish the task. It is a tremendous task. It has to be indexed, collated, and made available for litigants and for the Department of Justice, that wants to look up the records of the men, some of whom are deserters, and for the adjutants general of the States, who want to complete the records of the soldiers in the several States. The estimate came to us from The Adjutant General, supported by an earnest request from the Secretary of War, and supported by requests of many adjutants general of States, and it was estimated that $5,000,000 would be required to do this work, which will undoubtedly consume a good deal of time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Who testified about it? Did Gen. Harris?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Secretary of War. The Adjutant General was present, but the Secretary of War made such an illuminating statement upon the matter that we did not call upon Gen. Harris himself to testify, but he submitted a written memorandum with reference to the matter.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, one gentleman present before the committee referred to the nature and extent of the work and the dimensions of the task by saying that the records would constitute a pile 7 miles long and 7 feet high. So the appropriation would be a little less than a million dollars a mile.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand it is quite a stupendous task, but it looks like we are legislating in the dark. I heard the testimony of the Secretary of War on this subject. As I recall it, he gave no figures. We are appropriating $5,000,000 for this purpose without knowing whether it will take five or fifty or three or two, so far as any information that has been given is concerned. There is no estimate made, as I understand it. If Gen. Harris made an estimate, I have no knowledge of it. It must be, in the very nature of things, somewhat indefinite, judging from the magnitude of the proposition. Careful plans ought to be had as to how this work shall be done. I would like to have the amendment go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to avoid confusion in this matter, and he must have a clear understanding. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] suggested that upon a single objection any amendment should be passed over, but the Senate has not adopted such a rule. It is due to the Chair that if that be the understanding unanimous consent be asked and given.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understood it, and if I am wrong about it I should like to be corrected. I understood the chairman of the committee to say that was satisfactory to him. I am perfectly willing that that should be done, and I have been proceeding on that theory.

Mr. KIRBY. If the objection has been sustained and the amendment is to be passed over, I do not care to say anything; otherwise I desire to say a few words.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to understand its relation to the subject.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am willing that that shall be the understanding. I had hoped that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], having himself heard the testimony of the Secretary of War on this very matter, would feel as if he had as much knowledge on it as the rest of us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will put it in the other form. If there be no objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is, under the head of "Quartermaster Corps," subhead "Pay, etc., of the Army," on page 18, after line 23, to strike out:

For pay of officers of the line, $20,300,000.
For pay of the officers of staff corps and department, $17,429,367.
Pay of officers, National Guard, $1,000,000.
For pay of the officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, $2,325,000.
For pay of warrant officers, Mine Planter Service, $83,700.
For pay of the officers, Bureau of Insular Affairs, $15,000.
Aviation increase, to officers of the Signal Corps, $775,000.
For pay of the officers, Philippine Scouts, $483,600.
Additional pay to officers for length of service, $392,925.

PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

For pay of enlisted men of the line, $75,728,230: *Provided*, That the pay due enlisted men of the Army shall not be withheld from them by reason of the fact that their service records or other official papers showing the status of their accounts with respect to pay have been lost or not returned from overseas, and, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, these men may be paid upon their personal affidavit as to date of last payment and condition of their accounts: *Provided further*, That payments made in accordance with such regulations (or which have already been made upon the affidavit of the soldier) shall be passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury to the credit of the disturbing officers making them.

For pay of enlisted men of National Guard, $5,000,000.
For pay of enlisted men of the staff corps and departments, $47,662,500.
For pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves, $224,750.
For pay of enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, $77,500.
Aviation increase, to enlisted men of the Signal Corps, $7,750.
For pay of the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, $1,007,500.
Additional pay for length of service to enlisted men, $3,875,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 10 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, in so far as it increases the pay of the enlisted men of the Army, be, and the same hereby are, continued in force and effect from and after the date of the approval of this act.

PAY OF PERSONS WITH RETIRED STATUS.

For pay of the officers on the retired list, $2,500,000.
For increased pay to retired officers on active duty, $200,000.
For pay of retired enlisted men, $3,000,000.
For pay and allowances of retired enlisted men on active duty, $20,000.
For pay and allowances of Regular Army reservists on active duty, $40,000.
For pay of retired Philippine Scout officers, $45,000.
For pay of retired pay clerks, $18,000.
For pay of retired veterinarians, $3,500.

CLERKS, MESSENGERS, AND LABORERS, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

One chief clerk, at $2,500 per annum, $2,500.
Three clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $6,000.
Six clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $10,800.
Ten clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $16,000.
Twelve clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $16,800.
Seventeen clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $20,400.
Eight clerks, at $1,000 each per annum, $8,000.
One captain of the watch, at $900 per annum, $900.
Six watchmen, at $720 each per annum, $4,320.
One gardener, at $720 per annum, $720.
One packer, at $840 per annum, $840.
One chief messenger, at $1,000 per annum, $1,000.
Three messengers, at $840 each per annum, $2,520.
Fifteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $10,800.
Two laborers, at $720 each per annum, $1,440.
One laborer, at $600 per annum, $600.
Five charwomen, at $240 each per annum, $1,200.

PAY OF CLERKS AND MESSENGERS AT HEADQUARTERS OF THE SEVERAL TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENTS, TERRITORIAL DISTRICTS, TACTICAL DIVISIONS AND BRIGADES, AND SERVICE SCHOOLS.

Eighty clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $144,000.
Seven clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $14,000.
One hundred and seventy-two clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $275,200.
Eleven clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $19,800.
Two hundred and twenty-two clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $310,800.
Fourteen clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $22,400.
Five hundred and twenty-six clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $631,200.
Thirty-two clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $44,800.
One hundred and nineteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $85,680.
Fifty-seven clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $68,400.
Forty-nine clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $58,800.
Thirty-nine messengers, at $720 each per annum, $28,080.
Additional pay while on foreign service, $8,000.
For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, $23,040.
For commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, $76,800: *Provided*, That said clerks, messengers, and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve: *Provided further*, That no clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

For pay of contract surgeons, $90,000.
For pay of nurses, $800,000.
For pay of hospital matrons, $3,600.
For pay of reserve veterinarians, $350,000.
For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, retiring boards, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending same, and expenses of taking depositions and securing other evidence for use before the same, $200,000.
For additional pay to officer in charge of public buildings and grounds at Washington, D. C., $500.
For commutation of quarters and of heat and light to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men on duty at places where no public quarters are available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, $4,821,150.
For interest on soldiers' deposits, $145,000.
For pay of expert accountant for the Inspector General's Department, $2,500.
For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty for periods of not less than 10 days in the offices of Coast Defense Artillery Engineers and Coast Defense Ordnance officers, and as switchboard operators at seacoast fortifications, $25,000.
For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty as switchboard operators at each interior post of the Army, $19,215.
For extra pay to enlisted men of the line of the Army and to enlisted men of the Quartermaster Corps, Medical Department, and of the Signal Corps employed in the Territory of Alaska on the Washington-Alaska cable and telegraph system for periods of not less than 10 days at the rate of 35 cents per day, $38,430.
For mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, $2,500,000.
For additional 10 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That hereafter warrant officers shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed to commissioned officers of the Army.
For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, $4,000,000.
For pay of one computer for Artillery Board, $2,500.
For payment of exchange by acting quartermasters serving in foreign countries and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the Quartermaster Corps when serving in Alaska, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Quartermaster Corps at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,000.
For additional pay to officers below the grade of major required to be mounted and who furnish their own mounts, $240,000.
For amount required to make monthly payments to Jennie Carroll, widow of James Carroll, late major, United States Army, $1,500.
For amount required to make monthly payments to Mabel H. Lazear, widow of Jesse W. Lazear, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, $1,500.
For amount required to make monthly payments of $100 to John R. Kissinger, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry, also late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, $1,200.
All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous, except the appropriation for mileage to commissioned officers, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

And to insert:

For pay of officers of the line, $19,528,212.
For pay of officers of staff corps and departments, $15,420,040.
For pay of officers, National Guard, $100.
For pay of the Officers' Reserve Corps, $3,000,000.
For pay of warrant officers, Mine Planter Service, $107,880.
For pay of three officers, Bureau of Insular Affairs, $15,000.
Aviation increase, to officers of the Army, $800,000——

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from New York, recurring to the question I propounded a moment ago, whether any part of this $800,000 is to go to offiers of the General Staff for additional compensation for flying.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The officers of the General Staff are not fliers; they are not members of the air service; and this appropriation goes to men who are qualified fliers—pilots and observers. This is in accordance with an act of Congress giving them extra pay for the risk involved.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know what amount is allowed in the bill for so-called extra compensation for officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amount allowed flying officers over and above standard compensation as I recollect is 35 per cent increase.

Mr. KING. But I am asking if the Senator knows what amount of the appropriation will be required to meet the extra compensation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, Mr. President; $800,000.

Mr. KING. Will that be the limit that will be paid for extra compensation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the limit.

Mr. KING. For all fliers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The whole item has been very carefully calculated in the most accurate and scientific way. We have the best assurance of that.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from New York tell us how many officers are estimated for as being entitled to this increase?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I can not. They are of different grades and we can not make a simple arithmetical calculation by dividing $800,000 by the number to see what is given, because there are second lieutenants, first lieutenants, captains, majors, and even a brigadier general, as I happen to know.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator advise us how many aircraft squadrons have been provided for in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I doubt if I could recollect the number of aero squadrons. Under the scheme of the War Department for an Army of 509,000 men it was the idea of the War Department to keep 22,000 enlisted men in the Air Service and 2,000 officers. It may be of interest to the Senator from Utah to know that we have not a single aero squadron in the United States today organized and fit to take the air.

Mr. KING. I was advised of that fact and that is the reason why I propounded the question this afternoon as to what had become of the large appropriation made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, we have several squadrons in France and in the occupied territory of Germany.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator if the appropriation for Air Service is based upon an Army of 400,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Four hundred thousand. This whole pay item is based upon an Army of 400,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from New York having the bill in charge. I notice that the House appropriated the sum of $1,000,000 for pay of officers of the National Guard. The Senate committee struck out that appropriation and substituted in lieu thereof this item:

For pay of officers, National Guard, $100.

Is that a misprint or is it the sum actually intended to be appropriated? That would not pay very many officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that the pay of National Guard officers is taken care of under the National Guard item at the end of the bill. This is to keep alive the account of the National Guard officers' pay in the event that the National Guard is brought into the Federal service, as it was at the time of the border trouble. It is merely a bookkeeping affair of $100 to keep the account alive on the page.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Will the chairman of the committee permit a question? The House provision relative to the pay of officers is for an army of 300,000 and the Senate committee provision is for an army of 400,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not quite understand the discrepancy in the amount, in view of the fact that, being the same items, if anything the House appropriation is a little larger. Will the chairman of the committee explain that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had intended to make a full statement on the question of pay and also subsistence for an army, first of 500,000, and second of 400,000, and third of 300,000. The Secretary has started to read the amendment, and upon its conclusion I desire to submit some figures to the Senate which I think will be of great interest to Senators on the question of pay and subsistence of the three recommended forces. I will cover the point raised by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMEL. That is the information which I desire, and I shall be very glad to hear from the chairman when the amendment is read. However, I do not want to lose the opportunity to object to the final disposition of the amendment tonight if I see proper to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As yet the Secretary has had no opportunity to complete the reading of the amendment. The Secretary will continue the reading.

The Secretary continued to read the amendment, and read as follows:

For pay of the officers, Philippine Scouts, $624,004.
Additional pay to officers for length of service, $3,605,546.

PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

For pay of enlisted men of the line, $114,067,416: *Provided*, That the pay due enlisted men of the Army shall not be withheld from them by reason of the fact that their service records or other official papers showing the status of their accounts with respect to pay have been lost or not returned from overseas, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, these men may be paid upon their personal affidavit as to date of last payment and condition of their accounts: *Provided further*, That payments made in accordance with such regulations (or which have already been made upon the affidavit of the soldier) shall be passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury to the credit of the disbursing officers making them.

For pay of enlisted men, National Guard, $100.

For pay of enlisted men of the staff corps and departments, $24,227,537.

For pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves, $290,000.

For pay of enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, $100,000.

Aviation increase to enlisted men of the Army, $8,000.

For pay of the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, $1,326,648.

Additional pay for length of service to enlisted men, $4,044,100: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the military establishments of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, in so far as it increases the pay of the enlisted men of the Army, be, and the same hereby are, continued in force and effect from and after the date of the approval of this act.

PAY OF PENSIONS WITH RETIRED STATUS.

For pay of the officers on the retired list, $2,788,650.

For increase pay to retired officers on active duty, $229,760.

For pay of retired enlisted men, $3,404,844.

For pay and allowances of retired enlisted men on active duty, $25,000.

For pay and allowances of Regular Army Reservists on active duty, $50,000.

For pay of retired Philippine Scout officers, $54,000.

For pay of retired pay clerks, $18,562.50.

For pay of retired veterinarians, $3,570.

CLERKS, MESSENGERS, AND LABORERS, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

One chief clerk, at $2,500.
One assistant chief clerk, at $2,400.
Three clerks, at $2,250 each, $6,750.
Six clerks, at $2,000 each, $12,000.
Eight clerks, at $1,800 each, $14,400.
Thirteen clerks, $1,600 each, $20,800.
Twenty-one clerks, at $1,400 each, $29,400.
Twenty-four clerks, at $1,200 each, $28,800.
Twenty-six clerks, at $1,000 each, $26,000.
One captain of watch, at $900.
Six watchmen, at $720 each, $4,320.
One gardener, at $720.
One packer, at $840.
One chief messenger, at $1,000.
Three messengers, at $840 each, $2,520.
Fifteen messengers, at $720 each, $10,800.
Two laborers, at $720 each, $1,440.
One laborer, at $600.
Five charwomen, at $240 each, $1,200.

PAY OF ARMY FIELD CLERKS AND CIVIL-SERVICE MESSENGERS AT HEADQUARTERS OF THE SEVERAL TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENTS, ARMY AND CORPS HEADQUARTERS, TERRITORIAL DISTRICTS, TACTICAL DIVISIONS AND BRIGADES, SERVICE SCHOOLS, CAMPS, PORTS OF EMBARKATION AND DEBARKATION, AND AT SUCH OTHER STATIONS AT WHICH, IN THE DISCRETION OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR, THESE CLERKS OR MESSENGERS MAY BE ASSIGNED TO DUTY.

Thirty-six clerks, at $2,000 each, $72,000.
Ninety clerks, at $1,800 each, $162,000.
One hundred and seventy-one clerks, at $1,600 each, $273,600.
Two hundred and forty-three clerks, at $1,400 each, $340,200.
Five hundred and forty clerks, at $1,200 each, $648,000.
One hundred and fifteen messengers, at $720 each, $82,800.
Additional pay while on foreign service, $8,000.

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, $23,040: *Provided*, That hereafter Army field clerks shall have the same allowances and benefits as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, not including retirement: *Provided, however*, That the minimum or entrance pay, exclusive of said allowances, of said Army field clerks shall be $1,200 per annum: *Provided further*, That Army field clerks shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed by law to commissioned officers of the Army: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to employ, during the present emergency and for a period not exceeding four months thereafter, such additional Army field clerks as may be necessary, not exceeding 4,272——

Mr. KING. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee on what theory they allow a field clerk as much additional compensation as is allowed a commissioned officer. I suppose there were reasons for allowing commissioned officers additional compensation where they were beyond the limit of the United States, because of the increased expenses to which they would be put.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Army field clerks are subject to some of the same expenses the commissioned officers are. For instance, they have to subsist themselves and buy their own uniforms and equipment. When a commissioned officer is sent abroad to serve in a foreign country he is allowed a certain percentage of increase, and it is only fair that the Army field clerks, who have to bear the same kind of expenses, should get the same kind of increase.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senate ought to permit the amendment to be read before it is the subject of discussion.

Mr. KING. I want to know whether the entire four or five pages is one amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is one amendment. The committee has proposed to strike out certain parts of the bill as passed by the House and insert all that the Secretary is now reading in lieu thereof. The Secretary will continue the reading.

Mr. KING. Very well; I will wait until the reading is concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed with the reading.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment, as follows:

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, $76,800: *Provided*, That said clerks, messengers, and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve: *Provided further*, That no clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

For pay of contract surgeons, $72,000.

For pay of nurses, $1,370,064.

For pay of hospital matrons, $3,600.

For pay of reserve veterinarians, $631,040.

For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, retiring boards, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending same, and expenses of taking depositions and securing other evidence for use before the same, $400,000.

For additional pay to officer in charge of public buildings and grounds at Washington, D. C., $500.

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men on duty at places where no public quarters are available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, $8,046,420.

For interest on soldiers' deposits, $145,000.

For pay of expert accountant for the Inspector General's Department, $2,500.

For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty for periods of not less than 10 days in the offices of Coast Defense Artillery Engineers and Coast Defense Ordnance officers, and as switchboard operators at seacoast fortifications, $25,000.

For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty as switchboard operators at each interior post of the Army, $19,215.

For extra pay to enlisted men of the line of the Army and to enlisted men of the Quartermaster Corps, Medical Department, and of the Signal Corps employed in the Territory of Alaska on the Washington-Alaska cable and telegraph system for periods of not less than 10 days at the rate of 35 cents per day, $38,430.

For mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks, of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, $2,520,000.

For additional 10 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service, $1,209,310: *Provided*, That hereafter warrant officers shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed to commissioned officers of the Army.

For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, $5,552,000.

For pay for one computer for Artillery Board, $2,500.

For pay of one computer for Field Artillery Board, $2,500.

For pay of one computer for Infantry School of Arms, $2,500.

For payment of exchange by acting quartermasters serving in foreign countries and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the Quartermaster Corps when serving in Alaska, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Quartermaster Corps at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,000.

For additional pay to officers below the grade of major required to be mounted and who furnish their own mounts, $240,000.

For amount required to make monthly payments to Jennie Carroll, widow of James Carroll, late major, United States Army, $1,500.

For amount required to make monthly payments to Mable H. Lazear, widow of Jesse W. Lazear, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, $1,500.

For amount required to make monthly payments of $100 to John R. Kissinger, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry, also late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, $1,200.

All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous except the appropriation for mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active service, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks, of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That any part of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 that is not required for the service of that fiscal year may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, there has been much discussion during the last few months as to the size of the Army of the United States for the ensuing year. It will be noted that the bill does not specifically fix the number. The number, however, is fixed by the money appropriated for the pay of the officers and men, and also by the money appropriated for subsisting the enlisted men.

Senators will remember that the Committee on Military Affairs reported to the House appropriations for pay and subsistence which would be sufficient to maintain an Army of 400,000 men for 12 months. In other words, the average strength of the Army in the opinion of the House committee for the ensuing fiscal year should be fixed at approximately 400,000 men. Upon the floor of the House that provision for pay and also for subsistence was amended for the purpose of reducing the average strength of the Army for the next 12 months to 300,000 men. Unfortunately, the amendment being offered upon the floor of the House the calculations were done rather roughly. A simple proportional reduction was made in some of the pay and subsistence items. The result was that they were exceedingly inaccurate, so that the amount passed by the House for the pay of the Army would not actually pay 300,000 men; they made it too little. When the bill came to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the whole question of the average size of the Army for the next 12 months was gone into pretty carefully, not only in the hearings but in the sessions of the subcommittee and of the full committee, and it was decided by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate that it would be wiser and safer, all things considered, if the average strength of the Army for the next 12 months should be 400,000 men. The Secretary of War and the War Department generally had asked for an average strength of 500,000 men. It will be seen, therefore, that the two committees—the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate—are of the same mind as to the average strength of the Army for the next 12 months.

Now, I desire to read to the Senate very briefly some figures which will illustrate the progressive decrease in the strength of the Army month by month under each one of the three proposals: First, for an army of 500,000 on the average; second, for an army of 400,000 on the average; third, for an army of 300,000 on the average, and also a modification of that average figure.

Mr. President, on July 1, 1919, there will be in the Army of the United States 1,039,000 men. The plans for demobilization and the bringing home of the troops from France are under full swing, the average of demobilization being in the neighborhood of 300,000 men a month. So, on July 31, one month later, the number will be reduced to 748,288; on August 31, one month later, the number will be reduced to 472,288; then, if we adopt a 500,000 Army as the average, the number will be reduced on September 30 to 448,414 men. That same number will be maintained for the last nine months of the ensuing fiscal year, and we will end the fiscal year with an Army of 448,414 men, if we adopt 500,000 as the average for the 12 months; that is the proposal of the War Department.

The proposal of the House as they passed the bill would work out in this way: Starting on July 1 with an Army of 1,039,000 men, on July 31 it would be reduced to 748,288; on August 31 it would be reduced to 471,788; and on September 30 it would have to be reduced down to 195,835, and maintained at that figure for the last nine months of the next fiscal year, ending the year with that number of men in the Army of the United States. The House intended to pay and subsist that number of men when they cut the appropriation down by the amendment upon the floor of the House, but, unfortunately, the amount appropriated by the House—and this in part answers some of the inquiries that were made a moment ago—would not even pay and subsist that number of men.

Another phase of this question should be understood. The national defense act, which is known as the Chamberlain-Hay law, provides for an army of 225,000 men by annual increments extending over, as I remember, three years. When we went into the war with Germany we took the three years' increment in one, in order to hasten recruiting, and we did it by authority of Congress. The House provision, which would establish an average army of 300,000 men for the 12 months, compelled the Army for the nine months of that year to go down to 195,000 men, which is 30,000 less than the national defense act now commands. If it is the desire of Congress to come down as closely as possible to the figures 225,000, as fixed by the national defense act, and to which act Congress, lacking any other legislative act, is morally bound, it will be necessary to fix the average strength of the Army for the next 12 months at not 300,000 men but 312,000 men. That is probably, I may say—and I do not mean to be disrespectful to the other branch—what the House really intended to do, to make an average army of 312,000, instead of an average of 300,000 men; and were that done we would have for the last nine months of the next fiscal year an army of 225,000 men. But the Senate committee, as I said a moment ago, agrees with the House committee that that is below the limit of safety, in view of the possibilities of the next 12 months, and particularly in view of the fact that we no longer possess a National Guard. The National Guard was practically wiped out of existence, so far as its personnel was concerned, when it was drafted into the Federal service. It was a more or less reliable body of troops prior to our entrance into the war, and could be called upon by the Federal Government to meet any emergency which the Regular Army was unable to meet; in other words, it could piece out and supplement the efforts of the Regular Army.

But the National Guard is now down to a very few hundred officers and enlisted men, and, although it is the intention of the Guard and of the Militia Bureau of the War Department to recruit the National Guard under the terms of the national defense act up to its former strength, it is going to take at least all of this year and, in my judgment, it will go beyond this fiscal year, before we can restore the National Guard to its original position in the Military Establishment. Incidentally, in the meantime, we may pass legislation for the permanent reorganization of the Army, which may change the status of both the Regulars and the National Guard. So the Senate committee has decided to recommend to you an average army for 12 months of 400,000 men. That will work out in this way: Starting out July 1 we will have 1,039,000 men; on July 31 we will have 748,288; on August 31 we will have 472,288; and on September 30 we will come down to 322,000 men. We will stay at that figure for the rest of the fiscal year, a total of nine months.

The pay item as printed in this bill as substituted for the House pay item is an accurate, mathematical, entirely reliable computation of the amount of money needed to pay the officers and the men of an average army of 400,000 men for 12 months.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WADSWORTH I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that case, what is the object of the proviso on page 34, which reads as follows:

Provided, That any part of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 that is not required for the service of that fiscal year may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will be entirely frank about that item. I was slightly in error in my last statement. The figures contained in the Senate amendment for the pay of the Army will not quite pay 400,000 men for 12 months. There is an unexpended balance, which the head of the Finance Division of the War Department, Gen. Lord, estimates to amount to a little under $100,000,000, which is left unexpended from the preceding appropriation for the pay of the Army. We have adopted the proposal to reappropriate, as it were, or to make available that estimated sum of $100,000,000 to be used for the payment of the troops for the next 12 months, and we have taken $100,000,000 out of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, Mr. President, as I understand, the total pay of the Army appropriated by this bill would be $100,000,000 more for an average army of 400,000 men if it were not for this unexpended balance of $100,000,000 which is included in the estimate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. I desire to say to the Senator and to my colleagues in the Senate in all frankness that this item has been worked out with the greatest care, and I believe it reduces the total appropriation for pay of officers and men in the United States Army down to rock bottom. It can not with safety be placed any lower. The average is settled; the pay of every private, every first-class private, every corporal, every sergeant, every line sergeant, every first sergeant, every quartermaster sergeant, and on up through the grades of noncommissioned officers and commissioned officers is accurately known, of course, being established by law. The number of the various grades is actually known for an average Army of 400,000 men, and the money is appropriated for that number, if you take into account the unexpended balance of $100,000,000 left over from the item of pay of the Army for the last fiscal year.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. Does that estimate provide for any increase in the average pay of privates and on up through the various ranks over the pay now being received?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It includes no increase in the pay of enlisted men or officers, but it does include the $50 bonus which must be given to every enlisted man upon his discharge in pursuance of an act of Congress.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. Has the committee taken into account the number or the proportion of this four hundred and odd thousand that may be called for overseas duty, and, if they have, upon what basis have they made their computations for increase or decrease which would result therefrom?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the only estimate for overseas extra pay is, first, for the number of men who from July 1 to July 31 it is estimated will be in France; for the number of men who from July 31 to August 31 will still be left in France, and from August 31 to September 30 the number of men who will still be left in France. If present plans are carried out by September 30, there will be no men left in France, aside, perhaps, from a scattering few indulging in a last clean-up.

Mr. KING. And the figures have been predicated upon the assumption that at the last date mentioned by the Senator our forces will be in the United States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The figures are predicated upon the assumption that the Army will be out of France, according to plans already announced by the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War, on the date indicated. So that the question left for the decision of the Senate and the Congress is how large an Army on the average we should support for the next 12 months? The Senate committee recommends one of 400,000 average strength.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator think that the Regular Army when peace is signed and ratified by the Senate need be larger than it was before we entered the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the conditions in this country were the same as they were upon April 6, 1917, I should violently protest against any increase of the number of 225,000 fixed by the Hay-Chamberlain bill; but the conditions are not the same.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it not true that under the Hay-Chamberlain bill the peace strength of the Army was fixed at 175,000 men and the war strength at 225,000 men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it not true that prior to the Spanish-American War our Regular Army numbered but 25,000 men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. HARRISON. And that we increased it during the Spanish-American War to 100,000, at which figure it remained until in 1916 the Hay-Chamberlain bill was passed, which made the peace strength of the Army 175,000?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The President in his message to Congress—I think about the 15th of December, 1915—suggested an Army of 400,000, raised in increments of 133,000 each year, which would have made 400,000 in three years. The act which carried that recommendation into effect was the national defense act of 1916. That was the one which fixed the Army at practically 40,000 at the end of three years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a further question. Not having seen the hearings on this subject, I do not know just exactly how the $100,000,000 which has been referred to is worked in. The Senator will notice that for the pay of every branch of the Army the amount is fixed and provided for. For instance, for pay of officers of the line $19,528,212 is provided; for officers of the Staff Corps and departments, $15,420,040. Apparently the pay of the Army for 1920 is specifically provided by the bill, and I desire to know how the $100,000,000 is apportioned?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The $100,000,000 is to be used just as it was intended to be used for the fiscal year 1919. Let me say to the Senator that when this proposal occurred to us we asked Gen. Lord, of the Finance Division of the War Department, who, I may say, was of infinite assistance to the committee in matters of this kind and whose advice was most disinterested and valuable and saved us making many an error—we asked Gen. Lord if we should take $100,000,000 from the pay items of officers and enlisted men could he revise the figures, clipping off amounts here and there through that long table of figures, where he, as an expert and responsible for the maintaining of all the accounts of the Army in proper condition, knew that they could be taken off, provided the $100,000,000 was reappropriated or made available.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not see the aggregate of the full pay of the Army. Has the Senator those figures in the hearings? What is appropriated by this bill and what is reappropriated?

Mr. WADSWORTH. For the pay of the Army there is carried in this bill $215,885,978.60.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, there is the addition of the $100,000,000 to that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The $100,000,000 is an estimate. The amount will not be over and will probably be less than that; in other words, we wanted them to dry up that fund that is unexpended and apply it upon the expense for the next fiscal year, thereby enabling us to reduce the bill. I will be perfectly frank with the Senator about that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how that $100,000,000 of available balance will be applied?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will be applied in paying officers and men if it is needed. It is all in one fund.

Mr. LENROOT. Then, of what value is the segregation of the specific appropriations in this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The law requires that, but the Senator will notice that there is a provision in this bill, if I recollect correctly, authorizing, as a bookkeeping matter, all these items to be grouped in that one fund for the purposes of administration.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the pay of the Army is in one general pay fund, but it is appropriated for in items as the law directs. Of course this group of items covers the full pay of the Army, but as to taking money out of the Treasury, it takes out the amount of all these items less what is reappropriated from last year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct; and it is paid from one fund.

Mr. LENROOT. It is paid from one fund; but are these specific appropriations to be added together, plus $100,000,000, to arrive at the appropriation for pay of the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Approximately. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon; let me see.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will pardon me, this should show the entire pay of the Army. If you have $100,000,000 in bank—balance of last year's appropriation—your actual expenditure would be $100,000,000 less than what these appropriations show on their face.

Mr. LENROOT. Then do I understand that the totals of these segregated items will be $100,000,000 more?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If needed.

Mr. LENROOT. If needed. Does that mean that, for instance, as to this increased aviator's pay, they could increase that to any extent up to $100,000,000 if they saw fit?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Scarcely.

Mr. LENROOT. Why not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They could if they turned the greater part of the Army into aviators. Of course they could do the same thing if the President should send the names of 10,000 men to the Senate for brigadiers general. It would not be done.

Mr. LENROOT. As a matter of fact, the specific appropriations for these various branches are no limitations at all upon the amounts that may be used for that purpose?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not item by item. It is quite impossible to limit them, because the numbers vary from month to month. For instance, a great deal depends upon your recruiting campaign.

Mr. LENROOT. What I mean is this: On the face of this we appropriate, for instance, for pay of the Officers' Reserve Corps $3,000,000; but with this proviso that $3,000,000 is not a limitation at all upon the amount that is appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If there are too many officers in the Officers' Reserve Corps to be paid under that item of course the money will have to be taken from others, or they will have to go without pay. The thing has been estimated just as closely as it can be done with that estimated unexpended balance figured in.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think the Senator understands what I am getting at. What I mean is this: If it were not for the proviso these specific appropriations would inform the Senate as to the amounts that were to be appropriated and to be utilized for these various items; but with this proviso it does not follow at all that that is so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It informs the Senate probably within a few thousand dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that he must be mistaken about that, for this reason: The House has made this appropriation on a basis of about $300,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But they did not. That is the trouble.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, substantially.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; they did not come anywhere near it.

Mr. McKELLAR. They may have made a mistake.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They were far from the mark in certain cases.

Mr. McKELLAR. How far were they from the mark?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, some millions of dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. Some millions of dollars? They could not have made a mistake of one hundred millions; and the House has appropriated on the theory that the appropriations would be less than $200,000,000 without adding the $100,000,000. There is no provision for the $100,000,000 in the House bill; and the specific appropriation of the Senate amounts to $215,000,000 for pay of the Army, and my recollection is that the figure of the House was about $175,000,000, which is in the same proportion as the $300,500 and the $400,000, or virtually so. I may be some millions out, but the House did not take into consideration this $100,000,000 that is reappropriated by the Senate bill. So that it looks on the face of it at any rate—I have not seen the hearings—as if the Senate has increased the specific appropriations, made the necessary corrections of improper calculations that the House may have made, as the Senator points out, and then added the $100,000,000 by reappropriation. A careful examination of the figures here will indicate it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; that is not the way we did it. I explained before that we had submitted to us the items which would pay the officers and men of an average army of 400,000. We then had brought to our attention the fact that there was an unexpended balance from the preceding year which was estimated to amount to something close to, but under, $100,000,000. We therefore authorized the expenditure of that money, as yet unexpended, and we then took $100,000,000 off the items as they had been submitted to us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will look on page 19 he will find the largest item in the House bill, "for pay of enlisted men of the line, $75,000,000." Look on page 27 of the Senate amendment, and you will find the pay of enlisted men of the line given as $114,000,000. That accounts for the increase in the Senate bill. It figures up 100,000 more men than in the House bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It accounts for more than that, because the House appropriation for its own Army was too small—far too small.

Mr. McKELLAR. It accounts for that. Now, the $100,000,000 in part is added to that. It seems to me the Senate has made good the mistake that the House made, and that there is no necessity of the reappropriation of $100,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is quite immaterial to me how we arrive at the result. If the Senate prefers to strike out the proviso, I then state that it will be absolutely necessary to add the $100,000,000 to the item. You can do it either way you wish, but you can not support an Army of 400,000 men for 12 months for less than that figure.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. EDGE. As a matter of bookkeeping—perhaps not applicable to the present discussion, excepting for the future—would it not be very much better to have the $100,000,000 lapse and reappropriate it, separating it in the items as the committee thinks it should go? Then you would not have this question of $100,000,000 bulk appropriation, to be used at the discretion of the department whenever or wherever they wanted to use it. In other words, you would have a practical budget system, with no lapsed money remaining, but the money rather lapsing and going into your appropriation bill by the items as you separated them. Of course, I think, it is entirely too late to attempt to do that now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I have stated before, it is entirely a matter of policy. The Senate, of course, is master of the situation.

That concludes my remarks as to the strength of the Army. I desire to remind the Senate that this figure of an army of 400,000 is purely temporary. It has no relation to the past and it has no effect upon the future. It will be incumbent upon the Congress of the United States, and I hope it will be done within the next eight months, to pass legislation establishing a permanent military policy in the United States. We never have had a permanent military policy; and in such legislation, of course, we must decide how many men we shall keep in the so-called Regular Army.

This army of 400,000 is not what should be called a regular army. They are to be enlisted and are being enlisted to-day under a changed form of enlistment contract, two-thirds of them for three years and one-third of them for one year. Under the old Regular Army provision the enlisted man had to enlist for three years with the colors and three years in the reserve. That is the old Regular. There are very few of those left. This is a temporary army, raised temporarily under the act passed under the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] at the last session, changing the terms and contract of enlistment.

It should be clear to everybody, and to the public at large, who are so much interested in this matter, that this provision of an average army of 400,000 men is absolutely temporary and does not bind future Congresses as to the strength of the Regular Army; as to the strength of the National Guard, if it is maintained; or as to any policy of universal military training.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator desire a vote upon this question to-night? There are so many new items in it——

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are no new items.

Mr. KING. Well, new in the sense that it is a reduction of the Army from the present status and deals with a great many subjects.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think when a quorum of the Senate is present it is competent to do business. I think we ought to go ahead with the bill.

Mr. KING. I understood the Senator to accede to the request that was made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] a short time ago, that these items as to which there might be some controversy should go over until to-morrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator objects, of course it will be done.

Mr. KING. We have had no opportunity to see the testimony relative to these items. I ask that the vote upon this item go over until to-morrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I regret that I have taken so much time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to passing over the amendment until to-morrow? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, out of order I ask leave to offer an amendment; and I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the amendment which I propose. I merely ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let the amendment be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

Whenever in his opinion it is advisable to do so, the Secretary of War may purchase any lands now under lease for aviation fields or camp sites, and thereafter sell the same, provided that in such cases no sale shall be made of lands for any less amount than the cost thereof, and that such sales shall be consummated within six months after the date of purchase.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from New York I should like to make just a brief statement with respect to this amendment now, in order that it may be understood and considered, particularly by him.

There are some camp sites and one aviation field which I have in mind upon which the Government has placed in improvements property of the value of several hundred thousand dollars in the form of buildings. The land upon which these buildings are located is leased to the Government, and the Government has an option or right to purchase these lands which has not yet expired. It can purchase the land, for instance, in the case I have in mind, for $68,000, and then, if it decides to abandon that aviation field, resell the land with the improvements on it for a much larger sum than it would have to pay for the land. If it undertook to sell the buildings as distinguished from the land—which it would have to do if it failed to purchase the land—the buildings, which are of great value in connection with the land, would be sold at a very great sacrifice, and would yield to the Government practically nothing.

I know of this one case, and there may be a number of other cases; and since the proposed amendment requires that the sale must be for more than the purchase price, the Government can not lose anything. I ask the Senator from New York to consider that amendment, and, if practicable to do so, at the proper time agree that it may be inserted in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Subsistence of the Army," on page 34, line 22, after the word "duty," to insert "members of Reserve Officers' Training Corps at camps," and, on page 36, line 19, after the word "Army," to strike out "$67,500,000" and insert "$85,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $22,500 of this sum be made available for the care of the peach orchard on Poole Island, Aberdeen Proving Ground, and the grain now growing at this and other reservations and the harvest and disposal of the crops; and such disposal by sale or otherwise shall be made pursuant to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as 'miscellaneous receipts,'" so as to make the clause read:

Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue as rations to troops, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, members of Reserve Officers' Training Corps at camps, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, nurses, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, general prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made), Indians employed with the Army as guides and scouts, and general prisoners at posts; for the subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army transport service; hot coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlistment while under observation; for sales to officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and enlisted men of the Army: *Provided*, That the sum of $12,000 is authorized to be expended for supplying meals or furnishing commutation of rations to enlisted men of the Regular Army and the National Guard who may be competitors in the national rifle match; *Provided further*, That no competitor shall be entitled to commutation of rations in excess of $1.50 per day, and when meals are furnished no greater expense than that sum per man per day for the period the contest is in progress shall be incurred. For payments: Of commutation of rations to the cadets of the United States Military Academy in lieu of the regular established ration, at the rate of 68 cents per ration; of the regulation allowances of commutation in lieu of rations to enlisted men on furlough, enlisted men and male and female nurses when stationed at places where rations in kind can not be economically issued, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, and when traveling on detached duty where it is impracticable to carry rations of any kind, enlisted men selected to contest for places or prizes in departments and Army rifle competitions while traveling to and from places of contest, male and female nurses on leave of absence, applicants for enlistment, and general prisoners while traveling under orders. For payment of the regulation allowances of commutation in lieu of rations for members of the Nurse Corps (female) while on duty in hospital, and for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, civilian employees who are entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general prisoners sick therein, to be paid to the surgeon in charge; advertising; for providing prizes to be established by the Secretary of War for enlisted men of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers and cooks, the total amount of such prizes at the various schools not to exceed $900 per annum; for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army, $85,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $22,500 of this sum be made available for the care of the peach orchard on Poole Island, Aberdeen Proving Ground, and the grain now growing at this and other reservations, and the harvest and disposal of the crops; and such disposal by sale or otherwise shall be made pursuant to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as "miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps, including their care and protection, etc., under the subhead "Regular supplies," on page 39, line 13, after the word "reports," to strike out "$87,083,334" and insert "$90,000,000," so as to read:

For remounts and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; for seeds and implements required for the raising of forage at remount depots and on military reservations in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and for labor and expenses incident thereto, including, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of War, the cost if irrigation; for straw for soldiers' bedding, stationery, typewriters and exchange of same, including blank books and blank forms for the Army, certificates for discharged soldiers, and for printing department orders and reports, $90,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Incidental expenses," on page 40, line 22, after the words "donation of," to strike out "$5" and insert "$10"; and on page 41, line 3, after the word "department," to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For a donation of $10 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement under court-martial sentence, involving dishonorable discharge; and such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operation of the Army, and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other department, $40,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee give us the proof on that item of incidental expenses and tell us why there should be that tremendous increase?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the estimate of the War Department for this item of incidental expenses was $50,831,866.73.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For how large an Army—500,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The estimate was on the basis of an Army of 500,000 men; but it is fair to say that the incidental expenses do not rise and fall with the rise and fall of the number of troops in the Army. In other words, you can not reduce your incidental expenses one-fifth just because you reduce the number of men one-fifth. We went over these estimates very carefully with Gen. Marshall and Gen. Lord. The House reduced the estimate from $50,000,000 down to $20,000,000 in their appropriation. As a matter of fact, it seemed to the full committee that that was utterly inadequate. They simply could not meet the expenditures which fall under that item. We put it up to $40,000,000, and the best assurance

we could get was that that would make them, so to speak, "scratch gravel" to get along.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. TRAMMELL addressed the Chair.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If there is to be objection, I do not want to hold the Senate over the item.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it had better go over with the other.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator desire it to go over?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, if we are to pay these recruiting officers, I should like to know if it is contemplated that majors and lieutenant colonels will be assigned to recruiting duty when heretofore that work has been performed by a sergeant?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The recruiting officers, no matter what their rank, have a pay fixed by law, no matter where they are; so, whether a brigadier general is put to recruiting or in command of a brigade, his pay is just the same.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The reason why I suggest that is that I have noticed in the press occasionally where some officer, evidently having run out of employment at some camp, has been ordered to Washington and then detailed—a lieutenant colonel, for instance—for recruiting duty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That does not raise or lower his pay. It has no effect upon it.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I should also like to know if the chairman is acquainted with the fact as to whether or not this includes the pay of majors and lieutenant colonels and captains in the clerical departments here performing practically clerical duties and drawing those high or officers' salaries?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; all of the pay of the Army, officers and men, comes under the item which we passed a moment ago. No pay of officers or enlisted men is provided for except under the item "Pay of the Army," and whether the man is serving in Siberia or serving in Panama, whether he is serving at a desk or living in a dugout, his pay runs with his rank.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the chairman state whether there is any testimony other than mere departmental estimates as to this item? The House provided $20,000,000 and the Senate has increased that 100 per cent, to $40,000,000. My inquiry is on what proof was this item changed to that extent? Was it merely the estimate for an army of 509,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee changed the item on a statement of facts which we could not controvert.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whose statement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. A statement from the officers who appeared before us—Gen. Lord and Gen. Marshall. They made such a good case to the effect that $20,000,000 was utterly inadequate even for an army of 400,000 instead of 500,000 men that we put it at $40,000,000. I will say very frankly to the Senator that I do not know how the House reached those figures. There is nothing whatsoever to show upon what principle they made these reductions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator expect to have the committee hearing in print in the morning?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; at 9 o'clock in the morning the printer promised it. Do you want this to go over until tomorrow?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; let it go over.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Before the amendment goes over, I think the Senator will permit this item to be passed if he knows the facts. I have here the hearings. Maj. Shawn appeared for the Quartermaster's Department. He stated that the estimate was $49,647,000. The reason given is as follows:

> This amount of $49,000,000 is required for the pay of civilian employees of the Quartermaster Corps, employees utilized in connection with the feeding, clothing, and housing of the troops, and the transportation, issue, sale, and salvage and distribution of supplies. They are located at the large supply depots, at the camps and posts, and stations in the United States, and in the insular possessions, and also overseas.
>
> We have at the present time handling the quartermaster's functions 101,000 employees.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Civilians?
>
> Maj. SHAWN. Civilian employees. That is costing us approximately $101,000,000 a year.
>
> Senator THOMAS. Let me ask you, will that force be necessary if we fix the size of the permanent Army at 500,000 men?
>
> Maj. SHAWN. Yes, sir; it will be necessary for the next three months, at least.
>
> Senator THOMAS. We have a proportion, then, of about one civilian to five military employees of the Government?
>
> Maj. SHAWN. Yes, sir. The number at present employed has very little to do with an army of 500,000 men, because of the enormous amount of property we have on hand being moved and transported, the movement of troops incident to the demobilization, and——
>
> Senator THOMAS. It is necessary for the time, and will be necessary for some little time in the future, to keep 101,000 employees?
>
> Maj. SHAWN. That is, approximately, from three to six months. For three months we figure that we will have about the same number we have now, of 101,000 employees. We hope to get it down to an average of 49,000 employees for the fiscal year 1920, which will require, at $1,000 per man, $49,000,000.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is your estimate?
>
> Maj. SHAWN. That is our estimate. The House committee has cut that amount to $20,000,000. That would pay our 101,000 men about two months during the fiscal year 1920.
>
> Senator CHAMBERLAIN. It would either do that or would require you to have enlisted men to do the work that the civilian men are now doing?

This is what I want the Senate to bear in mind:

> Maj. SHAWN. Yes, sir; and I have some figures on that. We have yet to discharge from the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, of the temporary enlisted forces, 31,000 men. They must go out by not later than August 1. Our schedule was to get the 100,000 enlisted men of the temporary forces of the Quartermaster Corps out by July 1. We expect to get them out by August 1, and to do that we have to pick up nearly that number of civilian employees.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The 101,000 just stated in the testimony does not include, as I understand the testimony of Maj. Shawn, the 25,000 or 40,000 employees now in the War Department and the multitude of employees overseas—Army field clerks, and so on?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; it includes the overseas clerks, but not the clerks in the War Department here.

Mr. KING. I understand the War Department has substantially 150,000 to 200,000 clerks.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; not at all. These men are employed in the warehouses, in the Quartermaster Department, taking care of $2,500,000,000 worth of war supplies. The Senator is under the impression that you can liquidate this war and discharge these men within six months after the war ends. You can not do anything of the kind. This vast amount of material and property has to be cared for. It has to be moved; it has to be transported. The demobilization is slow as well as the discharge of these men. They must have the men to take care of the property, and the $20,000,000 that the House appropriated was not sufficient by one-half to take care of the pay rolls necessary for the coming year, according to the best and most economical estimates.

Mr. KING. I do not mean to have the Senator indulge in the thought that I ever thought you could speedily demobilize or that all the property of the Government to which he has referred could be quickly disposed of. I know that it is the work of months. But it does seem to me that the number of civilian employees, taking into account the large number of men in the service who are doing this sort of work, is entirely too great; and yet when I come in contact, as I have within the last few days, with some of the agencies of the War Department, I can appreciate the inefficiency which characterizes some of those agencies, and that perhaps they will need not only this number but an additional number.

If I may be pardoned for one additional sentence, the War Department was directed to turn over to the road department a number of trucks. For weeks and weeks efforts were made to have the War Department ascertain where those trucks were and to make the distribution, and with the vast amount of machinery which they have it is only recently that they have been able to ascertain where the trucks were. One would have supposed that they would have known where the trucks were and would be able to make an allocation of them within reasonable time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is there objection to this item, Mr. President?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it had better go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I want to be courteous to the Senate. I do not want to keep the Senate here discussing an item for 15 or 20 minutes' time and then have the suggestion made that it go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope that the suggestion can be made in the beginning and save the conversation and the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I made it at the beginning.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I request of the Senator from Tennessee that he withdraw his objection and this item be passed to-night, so that we can dispose of it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think such a tremendous increase ought to be looked into.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee asks that the amendment be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am willing that it shall be passed to-night, reserving the right to have a separate vote in the Senate. In that way we can dispose of it now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Tennessee to reserve the right to have a separate vote in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I reserve the right to ask for a separate vote in the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," on page 41, line 10, after the word "crating," to strike out "for transportation overseas to the United States of the bodies of officers and enlisted men who died upon foreign soil in the present war," so as to read:

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including transportation of the troops when moving either by land or water, and of their baggage, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, including the cost of packing and crating; for transportation of recruits and recruiting parties; of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; for travel allowance to officers and elisted men on discharge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 19, page 44, the last clause read being the following:

For the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles and motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several depots; for the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman whether the authority to purchase motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles was considered by the committee and what reason there can be for authorizing the purchase of automobiles with the thousands that we have now on hand that we do not know what to do with?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That language has been in the appropriation bill for several years, and I suppose that accounts for its being in now. The fact is, of course, that they have now, or soon will have, a great surplus of automobiles, both passenger-carrying and trucks.

Mr. LENROOT. There is no danger of their purchasing any others if this is in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not care whether it stays in or goes out. I would just as soon take it out.

Mr. LENROOT. The trouble about taking it out is that it also provides for maintenance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; they must be maintained.

Mr. LENROOT. I will let it stay in, then.

Mr. McKELLAR. Do I understand the Senator from Wisconsin to move to strike out the word "purchase"?

Mr. LENROOT. No; because there is a provision there involving the maintenance of the machines, which, of course, is necessary. Some of it is very proper and it would require some time to prepare an amendment striking out the purchase of motor vehicles. I am not prepared to do that now. We can do it in the Senate if necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 22, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "$235,672,000" and insert "$230,000,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That $225,000 of the appropriation hereby made shall be available for additional pay of employees on harbor boats, quartermaster service, in lieu of subsistence, $230,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water and sewers at military posts," on page 44, after line 23, to strike out:

For procuring and introducing water to buildings and premises at such military posts and stations as from their situations require it to be brought from a distance; for the installation and extension of plumbing within buildings where the same is not specifically provided for in other appropriations; for—

And to insert:

For the maintenance of water supply and sewage systems, repair and replacement of plumbing—

and on page 45, line 8, after the word "employees," to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the maintenance of water supply and sewage systems, repair and replacement of plumbing, the purchase and repair of fire apparatus, including fire-alarm systems; for the disposal of sewage, and expenses incident thereto, for repairs to water and sewer systems and plumbing; for hire of employees, $10,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, etc."; on page 46, line 22, after the word "thereto," to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000," so as to read:

For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War for remounts, for officers entitled to public mounts for the Cavalry, Artillery, Signal Corps, and Engineers, the United States Military Academy, service schools, and staff colleges and for the Indian Scouts, and for such Infantry and members of the Medical Department in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto, $5,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. I should like to ask the Senator from New York concerning this item. I notice that the committee proposes to appropriate $5,000,000 and the House appropriates $1,000,000 for the purchase of horses, animals, and so forth. Can the chairman of the committee tell us how many horses we have now in the service?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield just long enough for me to say, so there can be no misunderstanding, that I want this amendment to go over?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then I think the Senator from Mississippi will agree with me that it is rather useless to discuss it now.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I am opposed to the amendment, of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clothing and camp and garrison equipage," on page 46, line 2, after the words "not exceeding," to strike out "$10" and insert "$15," and in line 12, after the word "reasons," to strike out "$18,750,000" and insert "$25,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; for issue and for sale at cost price according to the Army regulations; for payment for clothing not drawn due to enlisted men on discharge; for altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary; for equipment and repair of equipment of laundries, dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat repairing shops, shoe repair shops, clothing repair shops, and garbage reduction works; for equipage, including authorized issues of toilet articles, barbers' and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment, and issue of housewives to the Army; for expenses of packing and handling, and similar necessaries; for a suit of citizens' outer clothing, to cost not exceeding $15, to be issued upon release from confinement to each prisoner who has been confined under a court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge; to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison; and to each enlisted man ordered interned by reason of the fact that he is an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; for indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, etc., destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, $25,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Barracks and quarters," on page 48, line 20, after the words "United States," to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$18,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery; for construction of reclamation plants; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees; for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for noncommissioned officers and enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty; for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters at military posts as may be approved by the Secretary of War; for wall lockers in permanent barracks and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks, offices, and quarters, and for flooring and framing for tents, and for the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, $18,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that this item go over. It is an increase of $16,000,000 for barracks and quarters, and we have appropriated very large sums during the war for barracks and quarters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee asks that the amendment be passed over. Without objection, that will be the order.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military post exchanges," on page 49, line 9, after the word "War," to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$1,350,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms, and gymnasium, including repairs to buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, for the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at

training and mobilization camps now established, or which may be hereafter established, and for such purposes not enumerated above as the Secretary of War may deem advisable, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of War, $1,350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Barracks and quarters, Philippine Islands," on page 49, line 20, after the word "China," to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$300,000," so as to make the clause read:

Continuing the work of providing for the proper shelter and protection of officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States lawfully on duty in the Philippine Islands, including repairs and payment of rents, the acquisition of title to building sites, and such additions to existing military reservations as may be necessary, and including also shelter for the animals and supplies, and all other buildings necessary for post administration purposes, and for shelter and repair thereof, and rentals for the United States troops in China, $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage," on page 49, line 26, after the word "stations," to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the construction and repair by the Quartermaster Corps, of roads, walks, and wharves; for the pay of employees; for the disposal of drainage; for dredging channels; and for care and improvement of grounds at military posts and stations, $5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Shooting galleries and ranges," on page 51, line 8, after the word "War," to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For shelter, grounds, shooting galleries, ranges for small-arms target practice, machine-gun practice, field-artillery practice, repairs, and expenses incident thereto, including flour for paste for marking targets, hire of employees, such ranges and galleries to be open as far as practicable to the National Guard and organized rifle clubs under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, Army War College," on page 51, line 25, after the words "engineer, at," to strike out "$900" and insert "$1,000"; on page 52, line 1, after the words "carpenter, at," strike out "$900" and insert "$1,000"; and in line 2, after "$720," to strike out "$14,420" and insert "$14,620," so as to make the clause read:

For supplying the necessary fuel for heating the Army War College Building at Washington Barracks and for lighting the building and grounds; also for pay of a chief engineer, at $1,400; and assistant engineer, at $1,000; carpenter, at $1,000; four firemen, at $720 each; one elevator conductor, at $720; $14,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, under the subhead "Rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps," on page 52, line 6, after the date "1920," to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$75,000," so as to make the clause read:

For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for military purposes during the fiscal year 1920, $75,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The item for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia is one with reference to which the Senator from Utah has some information which he desires to give the Senate, and therefore I will ask that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over without objection.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Vocational training," on page 52, line 25, after the word "arts," to strike out "$10,500" and insert "$5,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the employment of the necessary civilian instructors in the most important trades, for the purchase of carpenter's, machinist's, mason's, electrician's, and such other tools and equipment as may be required, including machines used in connection with the trades, for the purchase of material and other supplies necessary for instruction and training purposes and the construction of such buildings needed for vocational training in agriculture for shops, storage, and shelter of machinery as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 27 of the act approved June 3, 1916, authorizing, in addition to the military training of soldiers while in the active service, means for securing an opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations, part of this instruction to consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts, $5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rifle ranges for civilian instruction," on page 53, line 15, after the word "expended," to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$100,000: *Provided*, That the governors of the States, Territories, or the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate which team shall represent their respective States, Territories, or District of Columbia," so as to make the clause read:

To establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, and approved by the Secretary of War; for the employment of labor in connection with the establishment of outdoor and indoor rifle ranges, including labor in operating targets; for the employment of instructors, for clerical services; for badges and other insignia; for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and to remain available until expended, $100,000: *Provided*, That the governors of the States, Territories, or the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate which team shall represent their respective States, Territories, or District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that that amendment go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it will be passed over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was diverted for a moment. Recurring to the item just passed over, vocational training, I understand the former bill which was passed carried an appropriation dealing with that subject, and that the amount was placed under the control of the Vocational Board.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; this amount must be carried in the Army appropriation bill as an annual charge against the Treasury under this heading. Congress enacted a law providing that every soldier in the Army should be offered vocational training and every encouragement given to him to learn a trade and become a skilled mechanic, a carpenter, a mason, an electrician, so that after he has finished his enlistment term he can go out into private life and earn higher wages, if he is a wage earner, than he did before he went into the service. There are so many men in the Army and the estimate is that a certain percentage of them will claim this right under the law, but strange to say the House of Representatives only allowed $10,500, which simply means that the law would not operate at all.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Utah has in mind the vocational rehabilitation bill for disabled soldiers.

Mr. KING. Yes; I had that in mind. I supposed this related to the same subject. Does the Senator from New York have any information as to whether in the past the entire sum of $5,000,000 has been utilized for the purpose indicated?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; because immediately following the passage of the act authorizing vocational training we went to war, and, of course, the whole thing was suspended, or very largely so, except that the Army found by experience in this war that 60 per cent of all the enlisted men in the Army had to be skilled workmen at some trade before the Army was efficient as a whole, so during the war they did have to educate a large number of men to be mechanics and electricians.

Mr. McKELLAR. Do I understand the Senator from Utah to say that he did not reserve this amendment?

Mr. KING. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not reserve it, because nothing is more important to my mind for the Army than this vocational training, and I think it ought to be given by all means.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster supplies, equipment, and so forth, Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 54, line 15, after "1916", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the procurement and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, such public animals, uniforms, equipment, and means of transportation as he may deem necessary, and to forage at the expense of the United States public animals so issued; for transporting said animals and other authorized equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and return of same to place of issue when necessary; for the maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit; for the payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at such rate, not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act of Congress approved June 3, 1916, $4,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Storage and shipping facilities," on page 55, line 4, after the word "and," to strike out "purchase of land, the"; and in line 5, after the word "employees," to strike out "$22,750,000" and insert "$45,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For inland and port storage, including all necessary buildings, docks, tracks, handling, and other facilities for Government supplies, including rentals and hire of the necessary employees, $45,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Medical Department," subhead "Medical and Hospital Department," on page 57, line 9, after the word "Department," to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships, and transports, for laundry work for enlisted men and Army nurses while patients in a hospital, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, select types and makes of motor ambulances for the Army and authorize their purchase without regard to the laws prescribing advertisement for proposals for supplies and materials for the Army; for the purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; for expenses of medical supply depots; for medical care and treatment not otherwise provided for, including care and subsistence in private hospitals, of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, of applicants for enlistment, and of prisoners of war and other persons in the military custody or confinement, when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract: *Provided further*, That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furlough; for the proper care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measure to prevent the spread thereof, and the payment of reasonable damages not otherwise provided for, for bedding and clothing injured or destroyed in such prevention; for the pay of male and female nurses, not including the Nurse Corps (female), and of cooks, and other civilians employed for the proper care of sick officers and soldiers, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignments, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War; for the pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men; and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; for the pay of other employees of the Medical Department; for the payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; for supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the enlisted force of the Medical Department; for the supply of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, printing, binding, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, $5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hospital care, Canal Zone garrisons," on page 57, line 20, after the word "hospitals," to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

For paying the Panama Canal such reasonable charges, exclusive of subsistence, as may be approved by the Secretary of War for caring in its hospitals for officers, enlisted men, military prisoners, and civilian employees of the Army admitted thereto upon the request of proper military authority: *Provided*, That the subsistence of the said patients, except commissioned officers, shall be paid to said hospitals out of the appropriation for subsistence of the Army at the rates provided therein for commutation of rations for enlisted patients in general hospitals, $50,000.

Mr. KING. I beg the Senator's pardon. I should like to ask his attention to the item in line 5, on page 55. I do not comprehend why there should be such a large increase, from $22,750,000 to $45,000,000, in view of the fact that many of these buildings and real and personal property therein referred to have been acquired, I understand, during the progress of the war. I thought we had a surplus on hand and would not be required to make any purchases of this character.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; we have not a surplus of storage space on hand. We are short of storage space. Supplies coming home from France and supplies that came out of our factories in the last month of the war and the first few weeks following the armistice, before the contracts could be cut off on a just basis, have filled and are filling our storage warehouses to overflowing. In fact, the Government is short of storage space and is renting storage. We had a discussion to-day over the Curtiss plant in Buffalo. The storage part of the Army administration is crazy to get hold of the Curtiss plant in order to store motor trucks and all kinds of things in it that are piling up in our storage houses.

Let me tell the Senator this item bears no relation to the size of the Army. This is a part of the problem which has not yet approached the demobilization. This is the enormous surplus. These enormous storage warhouses and depots and shipping facilities are in tremendous use to-day, just as much in use as if we were in the thick of the fray with Germany. They are piled high and it take thousands of men to take care of them. If the Army was reduced to 100,000 men during the next year it would make no difference in this item. The representatives of the department came before us and insisted that they would have to have $60,000,000 under this head and we said to them you have got to get along with $45,000,000. The House gave them $22,000,000. That would mean, in my humble judgment, that they would be back here with a large deficiency bill in two months, and the committee did not think it wise or good legislation to simply slash things to that extent merely to make the item appear small for a little while.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that a few pages back 101,000 employees were provided for to handle, as I understood the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the personal property which the Government has on hand and which is to be disposed of. That calls for a large number of employees, I imagine, also.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Those are a part of the 100,000 employees mentioned by the Senator from New Jersey. The number 101,000, which he mentioned, includes all the civilian employees of the Quartermaster's Department. They are put under different items in the bill, and this is one of them; incidental expenses is another; and there are some others.

Mr. KING. Well, the Senator from New York will remember that provision was made under the item which was discussed by the Senator from New Jersey, and as to which he read testimony, for 101,000 employees.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. This calls for additional employees evidently, and the $45,000,000 which this item provides for is in part to pay the compensation of those employees. It seems to me that the Government, if it would get some suitable business man to dispose of this $2,500,000,000 worth of goods which it has on hand, and dispose of them quickly, would save a great deal rather than by attempting to continue it for an indefinite period.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would suggest to the Senator from Utah that he go down to the department and scold them the way he is scolding me. Mr. President, I think what I shall now read answers the question of the Senator from Utah. It is the testimony of Col. Alexander M. Davis, Quartermaster Corps, director of storage.

If the $20,000,000 appropriated by the House is all that we should receive, we would be faced with one of several alternatives. We would have to either abandon two-thirds of the property which we have stored, in round numbers——

The CHAIRMAN. Are your storage houses all full of property now?

Col. DAVIS. They are practically full. I do not mean by that that we have not some available storage space, but they are all in operation, and they are all largely filled—considerably filled.

We would have, under that appropriation, sufficient for the interior depots only. We could abandon all the Army reserve depots and all the Army supply bases, or we could abandon the interior depots and a large portion of the Army reserve depots and the bases at the ports. I simply state that to give you an idea of what it would mean to cut the estimates which we have made to the figure passed by the House. We would have those alternatives to confront us.

We have in the neighborhood of 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 square feet of storage. We are caring for between a billion and two billion dollars' worth of Government property.

Mr. TRAMMELL and Mr. MCKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Will the Senator from New Jersey kindly inform me whether or not in this inquiry there was any information given to the committee as to the activities of the department in trying to dispose of this surplus material, or if their activities have been confined solely to the purpose of getting storage for it?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has received some information on that subject from the department, and I will defer to him.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think it is very vital, and I should like to know what they have been doing in trying to provide some method to get rid of this surplus material.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That matter was touched upon this morning in the discussion of the very first item of the bill, but let me say to the Senator from Florida that the director of sales has thus far sold about $340,000,000 worth of these surplus supplies; that is really more than 10 per cent of the total. He has received for those supplies on an average 85 per cent of their original cost, which, I think, is pretty good. If we get rid of these supplies at 80 per cent of their cost, we shall be mighty lucky. I have no idea that we can do it at 85 per cent, because so many of these supplies are perfectly worthless for anything except for the use of the Army.

There has been discussion recently about the canned meats that are in stock surplus—$60,000,000 worth. Several days ago the director of sales sent out 40,000 notices to the entire wholesale and retail grocery and butcher trade inviting bids, which were to be opened on June 20. They were opened in several districts around the country, and Mr. Hare said to me this morning over the telephone that he had not yet been able to hear from his agents over the country as to how those bids are running. He hopes that he can get rid of the canned meats at reasonable prices. I say this to show that they are not holding back these canned meats for the purpose of maintaining prices, but that they are offering them to the highest bidder.

The same is true as to canned vegetables. There is $18,000,000 worth of canned vegetables which have been declared a surplus, and on June 30 next bids are to be put in by 20,000 people—that is, if the 20,000 accede to the invitation to put in bids for those goods. We shall soon know what success the director of sales is going to have in getting rid of this surplus.

But when you come to getting rid of surplus airplanes, surplus belts, surplus leggings, and surplus things that nobody except a soldier wants, you have got to be prepared to take a very low price. Thus far the director of sales has sold

$350,000,000 worth of these surplus supplies on an average of 85 per cent of their original cost. I hope that we shall get the biggest and best business organization we can get together, regardless of the salaries, to carry out this work of getting rid of $2,500,000,000 worth of supplies—the biggest selling effort the world has ever known.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I am very glad to hear of activities along the line of trying to dispose of these surplus supplies. I am glad that they are active in this line as well as in the line of selling horses. I think they should be equally as diligent and vigilant in selling the various other supplies as they seem to have been in making disposition of the horses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 57, after line 20, to insert:

For the purchase of land contiguous to the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia, 26.9 acres, more or less, for the final location of the Army Medical Museum, the Surgeon General's Library, and the Army Medical School, and of the improvements now on the land to be purchased, $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Engineer Department," subhead "Engineer equipment of troops," on page 60, line 16, after the word "equipment," to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$400,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for 'Engineer equipment of troops,' 'Engineer operations in the field,' and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $300,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each," so as to make the clause read:

For pontoon material, tools, instruments, supplies, and appliances required for use in the engineer equipment of troops, for military surveys, and for engineer operations in the field, including the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of the necessary motorcycles, the purchase and preparation of engineer manuals and procurement of special paper for same, and for a reserve supply of above equipment, $400,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for "Engineer equipment of troops," "Engineer operations in the field," and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $300,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civilian assistants to Engineer officers," on page 61, line 8, after the word "commanders," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

For services of surveyors, survey parties, draftsmen, photographers, master laborers, and clerks to Engineer officers on the staffs of division, corps, and department commanders, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engineer operations in the field," on page 61, line 19, after the word "Department," to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For expenses incident to military engineer operations in the field, including the purchase of material and a reserve of material for such operations, the construction or rental of storehouses within and outside the District of Columbia, the operation, maintenance, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such expenses as are ordinarily provided for under appropriations for "Engineer depots," "Civilian assistants to Engineer officers," and "Maps, War Department," $5,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask for some information in reference to the item on engineering operations in the field providing for an increase of $3,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think I can give it to the Senator. The original estimate for this item of engineer operations in the field was $30,500,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was for the war, was it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; for the ensuing fiscal year. Of that amount $28,000,000 consisted of an estimate which was sent over by Gen. Pershing's staff to the Chief of Engineers in this city as being the amount necessary to defray the expenses of engineering operations in France and in occupied Germany. However, that item of $28,000,000 was sent over early in the winter, and was the estimate which was given to the House committee, which, with another small amount, made up the official revised estimate of $30,500,000. After the House committee had finished its hearings the staff of the American Expeditionary Forces sent over a supplemental estimate, saying that instead of $28,000,000 they would only need $5,000,000 in France and in occupied Germany. The $5,000,000 was included in the official estimate given to the Senate committee of $7,350,000. The Engineer Corps stated that they needed the $7,350,000, $5,000,000 of which would be necessary in France. We have only given them $5,000,000. I do not care to go any lower; that is rock bottom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Construction and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska," on page 62, line 16, after the word "available," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$300,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Territory of Alasaka, to be immediately available, $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Ordnance Department," subhead "Ordnance Service," on page 63, line 6, after the word "Ordnance," to strike out "and for purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, $5,000,000," and insert "$14,000,000," so as to read:

For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, and advertising, stationery, typewriters, and adding machines, including their exchange, and office furniture, tools, and instruments of service; for incidental expenses of the Ordnance Service and those attending practical trials and tests of ordnance, small arms, and other ordnance stores; for publication for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office; subscriptions to periodicals, which may be paid for in advance; and payment for mechanical labor in the office of the Chief of Ordnance, $14,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I think that amendment was made by the committee at my suggestion; but, on reflection, I think the word "purchase" is all that should be stricken out. "Maintenance" should be continued. I therefore move to strike out the word "purchase," in line 6, and then ask that the remainder of the amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is, that we first disagree to the Senate committee amendment and then perfect the language?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes. The question, I think, should be upon agreeing to the amendment, and, if the amendment is rejected then the text can be perfected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, I move to strike out, in line 6, the word "purchase" and the comma.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. I desire to ask the Senator the reason for this great increase from $5,000,000 to $14,000,000? I have read the preceding lines in the same paragraph, and it seems to me that there are not sufficient items there to call for such a large appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the estimate of the Ordnance Department for this item is $20,652,111. The House cut that to $5,000,000. We have raised it to $14,000,000. The Chief of Ordnance appeared before the committee and gave us some exceedingly interesting information. Under this item must be paid the expenses of the ordnance officers and soldiers to handle T. N. T. and other high explosives, loaded shells, rifles, and ordnance property of every kind and description. There is on hand now over and above the needs of an Army of 400,000 men $500,000,000 worth of material and $300,000,000 worth of machinery.

The Government had to secure the manufacture of and purchase enormous amounts of exceedingly expensive machinery to put in munition plants, huge lathes 50 feet long that will turn 12-inch and 14-inch guns down to the smallest machine tools that will handle the Springfield rifle and do the machining on a little machine gun and its component parts. All that machinery belongs to the Government; it has to be taken down by skilled mechanics employed by the Ordnance Department, and supervised by Ordnance officers and noncommissioned officers. Every bit of it has to be slushed with oil; it has got to be packed and crated and taken out of the factories, loaded into cars, and sent to the storage depots, to be later sold by the director of sales. It is an enormously expensive undertaking. There are $300,000,000 worth of that machinery alone, and there are $500,000,000 worth of material, from raw copper,

zinc, and lead to forgings great and small, 14-inch gun forgings and little bits of forgings. The amount of material is something enormous, and it has all got to be handled by men who know about it.

Gen. Williams told us that he would have to have $10,000,000 to handle that $800,000,000 worth of supplies, and we gave him a total of $14,000,000; and out of the $14,000,000, in addition to taking care of these supplies, he has got to run the Watervliet Arsenal, the Watertown Arsenal, the Rock Island Arsenal, the Springfield Arsenal, and other arsenals, aggregating in all 16, either manufacturing arsenals or arsenals of supply and distribution. He said he would have to have $20,000,000, but we have given him $14,000,000. I do not dare go any lower. How the House reached this figure in the bill passed by them I do not know. It would wreck him; he simply could not do this work. These are things that have got to be done. It is not pleasant to see the items of this bill go over the House figures, but we can not demobilize from this war without spending money and taking care of these vastly valuable supplies and machinery. We are up against it; we have got to do it. If Gen. Williams did not do it, if he neglected that machinery and let it rust and perish, the Congress would never forgive him.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator—no doubt this received attention——

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] reminds me that there are 156,000 of these machines in munitions plants, all of which have to be taken down. The average cost to handle them, take them down, flush them with oil, pack them in crates, and load them on the cars is $15 a machine.

Mr. KING. Did Gen. Williams think that was the wiser course to pursue? Did he not think that it would be better to try to sell them in the places where they are now housed?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. He said that he had tried that and had not been successful. That is in his testimony which the Senator will see to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that there may be no misunderstanding the Chair desires to advise the Senate that the appropriation remains at $5,000,000 under the action of the Senate. The Senate rejected the committee amendment. That leaves the House text in force. The Senate then struck out the word "purchase," leaving the appropriation at $5,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are two separate committee amendments there, and we only meant to reject the first one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think they are separate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Chair is mistaken. The $5,000,000 was stricken out separately from the language preceding. The microscope will develop the fact that the striking out lines does not continue from the word "vehicles" through the figures "$5,000,000"; they are separate strike outs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair assumed that it did, and it so appears to him as he now looks at the House text.

Mr. KIRBY. I suggest to the chairman of the committee, the committee amendment having been rejected, and the word "purchase" stricken out on his motion, that "$5,000,000" be also stricken out and "$14,000,000" inserted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well.

Mr. KIRBY. Then, I move to amend by striking out "$5,000,000" and inserting "$14,000,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Ordnance stores, ammunition," on page 64, line 11, after the word "homes," to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$1,600,000," so as to make the clause read:

Manufacture and purchase of ammunition for small arms and for hand use for reserve supply, ammunition for burials at the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., ammunition for firing the morning and evening gun at military posts prescribed by General Orders, No. 70, headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1867, and at National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several branches, including National Soldiers' Home at Washington, D. C., and soldiers' and sailors' State homes, $1,600,000.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will be rejected. I understand that there are 1,700,000,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition on hand now. I understand that they are going to continue this particular manufactory at full capacity with this $1,600,000 appropriation and make 250,000 rounds of ammunition a day. I do not see why we should continue to make 250,000 rounds of ammunition at this factory when we have 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition already on hand. I understand that the War Department only recommended $150,000 for the continuation of this manufactory. I do not think this ought to be increased to $1,600,000, and I insist that $200,000 is sufficient.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, is not the Senator discussing an entirely different amendment from the one that is before the Senate?

Mr. KIRBY. I understand that this is the one.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is right.

Mr. KIRBY. This proposes to run the Frankford Arsenal——

Mr. THOMAS. On page 64?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; at full capacity, 250,000 rounds of ammunition a day, $1,600,000, when we have on hand 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition already, and when the War Department only recommends $150,000. This $200,000 is sufficient, in my opinion; and I do not think we ought to increase it to $1,600,000 in order to keep going this particular manufacturing plant when there is no possibility of ever using the stuff that is to be manufactured.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let that item go over, Mr. President. I make this request because the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] is informed upon this matter.

Mr. KIRBY. I have no objection. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Small-arms target practice," on page 64, line 22, after the word "prescribe," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000: *Provided*, That the President may, in his discretion, appoint an officer of the Army as director of marksmanship and musketry for the Army: *Provided further*, That the director of marksmanship and musketry, United States Army, shall be ex officio a member of the General Staff," so as to make the clause read:

For manufacture and purchase of ammunition, targets, and other accessories for small arms, hand, and machine-gun target practice and instruction; marksmen's medals, prize arms, and insignia for all arms of the service; and ammunition, targets, target materials, and other accessories which may be issued for small-arm target practice and instruction at the educational institutions and State soldiers' and sailors' orphans' homes to which issues of small arms are lawfully made, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, $50,000: *Provided*, That the President may, in his discretion, appoint an officer of the Army as director of marksmanship and musketry for the Army: *Provided further*, That the director of marksmanship and musketry, United States Army, shall be ex officio a member of the General Staff.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Manufacture of arms," on page 65, line 5, after the word "armories," to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$500,000," so as to make the clause read:

For manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories, $500,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee the reason for reducing that sum from $1,000,000 to $500,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Army now has on hand 3,000,000 rifles, and the committee thought it would not be worth the while of the Government to manufacture more than $500,000 worth during the ensuing year.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to ask, also, if under this item the amount named in the bill before the last session was not $2,500,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true; but we had hardly any rifles then.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Did not the Congress know then the number of rifles they had on hand?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; and they were insufficient.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Now, I should like to ask the Senator if this does not mean a reduction of a very substantial character in the number of employees in the armories of this country? In fact, does it not mean that the number of employees will be reduced from the number employed in prewar times down to not much more than 20 or 25 per cent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not answer the Senator's question accurately. I do not know how many men will be discharged as the result of this reduction in the item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, would the Senator like to have this go over until to-morrow? I am going to suggest to the chairman of the committee that we adjourn now and let this amendment go over until to-morrow.

Mr. THOMAS. If we adjourn, it certainly will go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it will go over if we adjourn.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to suggest that while we are trying to conserve the property of the Government, we ought to do something to conserve the faithful employees

in our armories who have been working for the Government for years and years, and who, by a reduction of this character, are likely to be scattered all over the country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator from Massachusetts desires this item to go over I will endeavor to get some information that is reliable as to what effect that will have, I assume, upon the Springfield arsenal.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes, sir. The Senator will not have to look very far. I have some of the information in my possession already.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Springfield Arsenal is the arsenal where most of the rifles are made. Some are made at Rock Island, also. I will ask about both of them.

Then, Mr. President, if that is the feeling of the Senators present, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 24, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June 23, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in whose sacred presence we dwell, uphold, support, and guide us in right thinking and in right living.

When we wander from the paths of rectitude, and thus prove recreant to the trust Thou hast reposed in us, let Thy condemnation be upon us and make the way difficult, that we may come into harmony with Thy plans and purposes.

Grant that the enemies of civilization may meet the crucial test of the day and sign the peace covenant, that war may be forever banished and brotherly love reign supreme in all the kingdoms of all the earth. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution authorizing the loan of aircraft material to educational institutions;

S. 1362. An act to authorize Hiram I. Sage, a citizen of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Perdido River at Nunez Ferry; and

S. 18. An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 18. An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment; to the Committee on Education.

S. 1362. An act to authorize Hiram I. Sage, a citizen of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Perdido River at Nunez Ferry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution authorizing the loan of aircraft material to educational institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REFERENCE OF A BILL.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the reference of the bill H. R. 5939 from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let us have the bill read by title.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5939) providing for the experimenting of nursery stock.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish the Clerk would read that title over again.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5939) providing for the experimenting of nursery stock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that the Chair is satisfied that the reference was a mistake and the correction ought to be made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Chair has made up his mind, there is no use fooling with it. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4226, being the District of Columbia appropriation bill, to disagree to all the amendments placed thereon by the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the District appropriation bill be taken from the Speaker's table, and that the House disagree to all Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I not only reserve the right to object, but I desire to make a point of order against the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The point of order is this: The measure which passed the House on June 6 or 7, the District appropriation bill, has never been sent to the Senate by the Clerk of the House, and consequently the Senate has never had the bill which passed the House. However, the Clerk did send over to the Senate what purported to be a copy of the bill which the House had passed, but which, in fact, was not a true copy. Therefore, I contend that the bill which is now before the House is not the bill which should have gone to the Senate; that it had no right to go to the Senate, because it is not a true copy of the bill which the House passed. When that bill was up for consideration—the matter to which I refer can be found on page 762 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date of June 6—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date shows that the Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the Board of Education is authorized to use all necessary floor and room space in the Franklin School Building for office purposes.

To that language I made the point of order which appears on page 762 of the RECORD. After a very limited discussion of the matter, the RECORD shows that the Chairman said:

The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Therefore, that language went out; but the Clerk sent the bill to the Senate with that language left in it. The Senate has sent the bill back here with that language stricken out. Now, this condition exists: The conferees on the part of the House may insist, and the Senate may yield and permit that language to remain in the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. As I was about to say, the bill with that language in it having gone to the Senate, and the Senate having stricken it out, it is possible under present conditions for that language to be restored and become the law, whereas if the Clerk of the House had sent the true bill to the Senate, the Senate could not have stricken out that language, for the very good reason that that language would not have been in the bill, and I want to suggest, without wishing to delay for one moment even the passage of the bill, that if it can be agreed upon in a binding way that the House conferees will let this language go out of the bill, then I will not insist on the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the gentleman's contention very well, and I recollect also that this item was stricken out on a point of order. I also know the fact a mistake was made in printing the bill which was sent over to the Senate. While I can not say positively what all the conferees will do, because they are not here, I will say to the gentleman I shall not wear out my life trying to get that back into the bill.

In other words, I was not very much in favor of it to begin with. But I can not say what the other conferees will do on the question, because I do not know yet who the conferees are to be. But I am free to say that I shall not exhaust all my energies to have the Franklin School proposition put back in the bill. I think the gentleman from Kentucky stated——

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It seems to me the gentleman from Minnesota ought to say more. "The gentleman from Kentucky" fails to understand the gentleman from Minnesota when he says he will not exhaust his energies in having the item remain in the bill. I should like to hear him say that he will insist that it shall not remain in the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will exert all my energies to keep it out of the bill. I can not speak for the other conferees. One gentleman, who will probably be one of the conferees,

stands by my side, and I will yield to him sufficient time to make an explanation to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. What is before the House? A point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Kentucky made a point of order.

Mr. DYER. Then I make the point of order that the matter being argued now is not to the point of order. It is an effort to obtain an agreement.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say that if I happen to be a conferee that, being familiar with the matter referred to, I shall do everything I can as one of the conferees to accomplish the purpose raised by the gentleman, or, in other words, to have it stricken out. But while I am on my feet, I would like to say that, after looking into the matter, I find that the enrolling clerk of the House is in no way responsible for the error.

Mr. GARNER. Let us get at this matter. As I understand, two of the conferees and probably the third conferee, my colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], will agree to the Senate amendment; but let us make the matter conclusive. It occurs to me that the Senate might want to take back its amendment, as it did once before. It has happened once since I have been here.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman no doubt has been heretofore upon many conferences, and while the three conferees on the part of the House might agree in expressly what the Senate has done, suppose the Senate should change its mind. There are 100 amendments in here. I do not like to use the word "tinker," as I do not think we will do any such thing.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the Speaker if a motion to concur in the Senate amendment would be in order now?

The SPEAKER. It would not. A point of order is pending.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. Could not the House, by unanimous consent, concur in this amendment if the point of order was withdrawn?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would be glad, before losing my right on the point of order, to know what the attitude of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the majority leader, is.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter with which "the gentleman from Wyoming" has nothing to do. He assumes that the amendment having gone out on a point of order and not having been in the bill properly when it went to the Senate, that the conferees must agree with the Senate amendment, and would think it most extraordinary if the item should be in the bill as it passes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] just there that——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (continuing). That I do not have any distrust of the House conferees, but the Senate might recede from its own amendment voluntarily.

Mr. MONDELL. If it will help any——

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I want the gentleman's assistance in order to help me.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). I will say to him that I should expect the conferees to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I did not catch the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. I would expect the House conferees to agree to an amendment striking the item out.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And I will say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] and myself will agree on striking out the Senate amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order and ask unanimous consent that the conferees be instructed to leave that language out of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 81.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The motion is not in order. I object.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to the request made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] for unanimous consent. I want to state to the gentleman from Minnesota that there are two or three amendments in the bill that I should like to discuss before it goes to conference. I have no desire to prevent the bill going to conference, as he knows, but I do have a desire to discuss at least three of the amendments, and I will do what I can to facilitate the bill getting to conference and having it agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] this, that as soon as we satisfy the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] and he withdraws his point of order, I am perfectly willing to take up the matter that the gentleman from Mississippi talks about now.

Mr. SISSON. Just so that I do not lose any of my rights in the premises, I am more than willing that the point the gentleman from Kentucky has insisted on should be settled at this time, and with the reservation of the right to object after the settlement is made, I will not object to the course taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. With the assurance of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that he will withdraw his motion, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] asks unanimous consent that the conference report be taken from the Speaker's table and that the Senate amendments be disagreed to. Now, until that consent is granted no motion can be made to concur in any Senate amendment, because the report is not yet before the House. But as soon as it is before the House it will be in order, and it will be in order for any gentleman to move to concur in the Senate amendment, which would at once relieve the entire embarrassment on account of the mistake that was made. The first thing is to give unanimous consent to have the bill taken from the Speaker's table. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit it.

Mr. MAPES. Under the rules of the House, to-day, in the regular course, is set aside for the consideration of bills pertaining to the District of Columbia. What I would like to know is whether the order that was made relative to House resolution 104 would give that resolution precedence to-day over District business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it does have precedence.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I understand that after to-day the business of the House will not be so pressing. If this bill is brought up to be sent to conference, and debate is to be had on it, and the clerk-hire resolution is brought up after that, it is apparent that the District of Columbia Committee will be deprived of its day. Unless some agreement can be arrived at for debate on this proposition I shall feel obliged to object.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We will be out of the way.

Mr. WALSH. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks for the regular order. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. I object, unless we can have time in which to arrive at some agreement in regard to the debate.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan withhold his objection?

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no question but that he and I will agree on that.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. To call up resolution 104. It is the regular order.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, can I go on with my motion?

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Speaker's desk.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

LOAN OF TENTS.

Mr. KAHN. I ask consideration of House joint resolution 65.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law the War Department loans tents for the Grand Army of the Republic reunions and Confederate Veterans reunions. The purpose of this resolution is simply to extend that right to the War De-

partment in the cases of the veterans of the World War and also of the Spanish-American War.

There are quite a number of resolutions pending before the Committee on Military Affairs where communities are endeavoring to give receptions to returning soldiers. If this general law is passed, the War Department can handle the situation and can make the loans, accepting bonds for the careful use and return of the tents under proper regulations permitting their use for these reunion or encampment purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the full resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the last proviso of H. J. Res. 11, approved March 2, 1913, be, and the same is, amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter no loan of tents shall be made except to the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans and to organizations of veterans of the late World War by whatever name they may be known."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk read the committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. The committee amendments will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

With the following committee amendments:

In line 6 strike out the word "and" and insert a comma after the word "Republic"; in line 7, after the word "Veterans," insert the words "the United Spanish War Veterans"; and at the beginning of line 8, after the word "to," on line 7, insert the word "recognized," so that as amended the text will read: "That hereafter no loan of tents shall be made except to the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Confederate Veterans, the United Spanish War Veterans, and to recognized organizations of veterans of the late World War by whatever name they may be known."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution as amended.

The House joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

CLERK AND SECRETARY TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. IRELAND rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana calls up House joint resolution 104.

Mr. IRELAND. I have a privileged resolution which I would like to get in first, which I send to the Clerk's desk. I have three privileged resolutions which I would like to get in first.

The SPEAKER. The only way they can come in is by unanimous consent, because the House has made House joint resolution 104 the special order.

Mr. GARNER. I suggest to the gentleman that he take up House joint resolution 104 first.

Mr. IRELAND. Very well, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up House joint resolution 104, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of House joint resolution 104, providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I think the joint resolution ought to be read.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Let it be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall have for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties one secretary at $2,000 per annum and one clerk at $1,200 per annum, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and who shall be paid in monthly installments by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Such secretary and clerk shall be appointed by the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner and certified to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall be subject to removal at any time by said Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be entitled to the benefits of this provision.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect July 1, 1919, and that the appropriation for clerical assistance for the fiscal year 1920 carried in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," shall be applied during said fiscal year in the manner above set forth.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the appropriation in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 1, 1919, for clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners may be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to one or two persons to be designated by each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, the names of such persons to be placed upon the roll of employees of the House of Representatives, together with the amount to be paid each, and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress shall likewise be entitled to make such designations: *Provided*, That such persons shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause."

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Is not this resolution on the Union Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It is on the House Calendar.

Mr. BLACK. I make the point of order that this resolution should be on the Union Calendar, because it places these employees on the roll and involves the payment of a bonus of $240 each, and therefore involves an additional charge on the Treasury. I have no objection to it being considered, but I think it ought to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole in order that it may be read for amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is under the impression that the money has already been appropriated by the legislative bill.

Mr. GARNER. Yes; but this bill, taken in connection with the statute that now exists, will place an additional charge on the Treasury. For instance, if this resolution should pass and each Member put two clerks on the roll it would involve an additional expenditure of $480 for each Member of Congress, or $240 for each name on the roll. Therefore this joint resolution, considered in connection with the statute now on the books, will impose an additional charge on the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was informed that it would involve no additional expenditure. If it does, of course it should go on the Union Calendar. The Chair will ask the chairman of the Committee on Accounts about that.

Mr. IRELAND. I was absent at the time this resolution was considered by the committee and I know nothing about the question of the calendar to which it was referred.

Mr. SISSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SISSON. Can we not adjust that by simply asking unanimous consent that this resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. IRELAND. I was about to suggest that.

Mr. SISSON. Unquestionably this will carry $480 additional charge on the Treasury for every Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. If that is true, then it should be on the Union Calendar, and unless there is some evidence contradictory to that the Chair will order it upon the Union Calendar. The joint resolution is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. IRELAND. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. I object.

Mr. IRELAND. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Pending that, may we have some understanding with regard to debate?

The SPEAKER. The motion has been carried, and the Chair thinks it is too late.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. J. Res. 104, with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I offer this resolution with considerable reluctance, conscious of the fact that no resolution can be brought into the House that will please all the Members or suit all the conditions of each Member as he finds them in his district; also, that no rule may be promulgated of which there may not be some abuse.

This joint resolution conforms almost exactly to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] in the last session of Congress and offered in this session by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

It was unfortunate that the language of the legislative appropriation bill was perhaps ambiguous or paradoxical to some extent, and that a strict construction of it was almost impossible. I had hoped, however, that this matter might be handled without mandatory or positive legislation on the subject, through an arrangement with the Clerk and a ruling from the Comptroller of the Treasury. We evidently got a little bit nervous and did not believe it might be handled in that way, and this joint resolution is the result.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to take up as little time as possible, and make a brief statement and yield time to every one who desires it, but ask that all will use as little time as possible, so that the business of the House may proceed with dispatch.

It was the effort of the committee in offering the amendment which has been reported to endeavor to please the greatest number of Members of the House, and I believe we have so fashioned it.

It is the thought of the majority of the committee that the Members should, in so far as possible, have the option and discretion of controlling and dispensing the allowance for clerk hire.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Did the committee consider the proposition that this resolution, placing the names of two employees for Congressmen on the rolls, would entitle, under another statute, the employees to a bonus of $240 and result in an increase of the compensation to the Congressmen's office of $480 each each year?

Mr. IRELAND. I can not positively say to the gentleman that it was or was not. I imagine it was informally discussed. Unfortunately, I was compelled to be at home at the time the matter came up and was considered by the committee. I can say to the gentleman, however, that on Friday last I called on the Comptroller of the Treasury and he was of that opinion.

Mr. SISSON. I think it is unquestionably true.

Mr. IRELAND. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. SISSON. Would the committee consent to an amendment to this resolution providing that the employees under this resolution should not get the bonus?

Mr. IRELAND. I think not; I believe that would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. SISSON. One other question. A Congressman's secretary now gets $2,000, or $2,000 is paid to Congressmen for clerk hire.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. A little over a year ago the compensation was $1,500 and then it was raised to $2,000. The last Congress allowed a stenographer at $1,200, making $3,200. Now, with the $480 it would make $3,680 within two years, more than 100 per cent increase in clerk hire for Congressmen. Did not the committee consider that that was rather an extravagant increase in view of the fact that the war is over and the correspondence of Members is less?

Mr. IRELAND. I will say to the gentleman that, to my mind, I have always regretted the fact that the House saw fit to take the control of this clerks' allowance out of the hands of the Members. It seems to me a sad commentary and almost a tragic travesty upon the greatest representative legislative body in the world that they may be intrusted to spend billions of dollars of the people's money but can not be trusted to properly dispense their own clerks' salaries. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. IRELAND. While that feature has many advantages, the disadvantages so far outweigh these improvements that it is absolutely incomparable. I think we made a grave mistake. As one Member said, he wanted to be boss of his own office, but under the present regulations he was severely handicapped.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. As I understand the gentleman, the Comptroller of the Treasury has not made a formal ruling on the question?

Mr. IRELAND. No; he has not.

Mr. LANGLEY. His opinion was an offhand opinion?

Mr. IRELAND. He seemed positive, and I do not think he would change it.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. The resolution in the title makes it mandatory that the Members shall appoint one secretary and one clerk. In the text of the resolution it gives them the option of appointing one or two.

Mr. IRELAND. The text of the amendment.

Mr. KEARNS. The question I want to ask is, Would it be optional with Members to appoint one clerk or two clerks?

Mr. IRELAND. In the resolution as amended he can appoint one or two clerks.

Mr. KEARNS. Then you will have to amend the title.

Mr. IRELAND. In what respect?

Mr. KEARNS. Because in the title it is mandatory that we must appoint two.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it not a fact that if the resolution as reported by the committee is adopted the clerks go on the roll, not by reason of this resolution but by reason of a previous law that places other Government employees on the rolls, for which practically every Member of Congress voted?

Mr. IRELAND. I think that is correct.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Why should not our clerks go on the roll? Can the gentleman give any reason?

Mr. IRELAND. No; you lost any possibility of clerks being deprived of their bonus when you took it out of the hands of the Members. Any other action would be a discrimination, and an unjust one, against your own employees.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. POU. Does the gentleman think that his substitute is so drawn that it becomes permanent law, or will we have to have a biennial or annual row over clerk hire in the future as in the past?

Mr. IRELAND. I hardly feel qualified to answer that, as I have given it no thought whatever.

Mr. GARRETT. It will not be permanent law.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It will not.

Mr. IRELAND. That is my impression, but I have given it no thought whatever.

Returning to the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS], I think the present committee amendment to the resolution offers the Members the option of employing one or two clerks or secretaries, or paying the entire amount, should they so desire, to one. It seems to be the sense of the House that they do not want to allow Members the privilege of employing only one, but I question whether it is correct or not. I shall at the proper time, however, offer an amendment making it mandatory that the allowance be divided between two clerks.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. As I understand existing law, to do that the amendment will have to be amended. The resolution gives one authority to appoint one or two.

Mr. IRELAND. I must plead not guilty to having anything to do with drawing the amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As I understand existing law, clerks receiving $2,500 or less are entitled to a bonus, so that if a Member of the House should name one clerk and give him the $3,200 he would not be entitled to any bonus at all.

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly not.

Mr. ALEXANDER. He would have to employ two clerks in order to get the bonus.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of offering an amendment, so that it may be considered pending?

Mr. IRELAND. I will ask the gentleman to wait for a time. I will be glad to yield at the proper time.

Mr. HICKS. As I understand this amendment that is being offered, it provides for one or two.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Did the committee take into consideration the advisability of enlarging that so that a Member could employ two or more?

Mr. IRELAND. I have not heard many advocates of more than two, for the reason that the bonus would grow into such proportions, if you left this open, and be subject to such abuses by anyone so disposed to handle it that it should be unquestionably limited to two employees.

Mr. HICKS. There was so much confusion here at the beginning of the discussion that I could not hear all that was going on. Do I understand that if these two are appointed, both will receive the bonus provided for in the recent law?

Mr. IRELAND. That is my opinion.

Mr. HICKS. But if we appoint more than two, then the bonus would not apply to that extra number?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes, it would; and that is the meat of the whole question.

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman's idea is that we should provide for only two to avoid the possibility of abuse?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Would the gentleman be willing, if we could frame it in some way so that that abuse could be eliminated entirely, to have, say, three placed on the rolls if desirable?

Mr. IRELAND. Personally, I would not. I believe that would only result in further complications. It is a trifling piece of legislation that we have already wasted too much time over and entirely too much discussion.

Mr. HICKS. I wanted to get the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. IRELAND. I do not think that would be the opinion of the committee, either.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I gathered from the gentleman, in response to a query a moment ago, that he does not understand this resolution is intended to be permanent law.

Mr. IRELAND. That is my opinion. However, I have not given that phase of the matter any thought.

Mr. HASTINGS. The original resolution would not be a permanent law, but the substitute, the amendment, would make it temporary.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am talking about the substitute. If that is the fact, it does not make much difference how much we speculate about what the number of employees may be, as limited by this substitute. The fact is that we may not be able to get any, unless we can assure some competent person who is worth the money named in the resolution that he can come here and at least have a fair chance of getting what may be permanent occupation under it.

Mr. IRELAND. That is correct.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then you have to start with another proposition which is worth taking into consideration. If the character and value of services of a man we want to go into our office have to depend upon the possibility of his getting a bonus, which is admitted to be only a temporary expedient and not related to the permanent salary list at all, we are again handicapped.

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I wish the gentleman might state more clearly just what the outcome will be.

Mr. IRELAND. Does not the gentleman think that, having had this clerk-hire question up years and not being able to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion and having to change it from time to time, it would be a little bit dangerous to make it a permanent law at present? Possibly a term of experience would not be a bad thing.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then, to trespass on the gentleman's courtesy for one question further, I would suggest that in all other affairs of life where men have secretaries the secretaries are expected to stand in a confidential relation to their employer and his affairs, and the selection of the secretary is usually expected to be what might be called a purely office or personal matter, a matter of confidential relationship, and not one of such concern to the general public that it should be regulated by law.

How has it come about that the secretarial positions in this instance are to be public property and that the public is to be permitted to state just how you are to divide the money and, second, what kind of a secretary we shall have? I can understand how the public may limit the amount of money it will allow us to pay them, but how is it going to work with this explicit mandatory direction given us concerning our confidential secretaries?

Mr. IRELAND. The gentleman is arguing along the line on which I spoke earlier.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am very glad to find myself in accord with the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. IRELAND. And I regarded the arrangement as a very unfortunate one when we drifted into it.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand it, the bill as introduced provides for two clerks, one at $2,000 and one at $1,200?

Mr. IRELAND. The original resolution; yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. And the resolution which is proposed by the committee gives the option, as I read it, to appoint one clerk, who shall receive $3,200, or two clerks, one at $2,000 and one at $1,200?

Mr. IRELAND. No; the amounts are not specified in the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. But to appoint two clerks, not more?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. But, for instance, take my own case. Under this amendment as proposed by the committee I shall appoint one clerk, who will receive $3,200. I can get better service out of that one clerk than out of two or three, as far as that is concerned, and I do not desire to be hampered in the matter. Now, it seems to me, if I understand this resolution, that you can have two clerks and divide the $3,200 between them, if the Member chooses to do so, or to have one clerk at $3,200.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. If he appoints one at $3,200, there is no bonus; but he can appoint two clerks and divide it, making it, say, $2,000 and $1,200. As between the two I am for the report of the committee. [Applause.] I shall protest and vote against any settlement of this matter that would deprive me of my one clerk at $3,200.

Mr. IRELAND. Now, let me answer the gentleman from Illinois. That is exactly the point that the committee was evidently striving for.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. The gentleman from Illinois presents an unusual case. There are half a dozen others in the House I recall, and it was thought by the committee that these cases were so exceptional that the Members should have the privilege and the option if they so desired.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Now, as to making the employment of these two clerks mandatory: First, under the original resolution, it was my personal thought and brought to my mind by a case of a Member who lives on the Pacific coast. Now, it was absolutely an impossibility for that Member to bring a clerk on here at $2,000 with the excessive car fare and get a competent man. That man is in just the position the gentleman from Illinois is, and he ought to have the privilege of dividing the allowance as he chooses, bringing a man on here and paying him a sum in excess of $2,000, and, since it took no privileges from us, and it accommodated parties whom we found in such a position very nicely, the committee took that position.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. If the provisions of this resolution are enacted into law, a great many Members of the House will appoint one man, who will get $3,200. A great many people will appoint two. They will get the $3,200 and $480 in addition as a bonus.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not believe that when the House voted to pay $3,200 for clerk hire to the Members that they ever intended the payment of $3,680.

Mr. BUTLER. Never did.

Mr. MADDEN. And, as far as I am concerned, I propose to offer an amendment before we get through with this thing to provide that no person appointed under authority of this act shall be permitted to draw any bonus. I think it would be iniquitous for this House to go on record in favor of giving $3,200 for clerk hire and then by some chance or other, because a bonus was granted to people in the departments, we should so change the law as to make it possible for us to collect $3,680.

Mr. IRELAND. Answering the gentleman from Illinois, assuming that your clerks should secure the bonus at salaries of $2,500 or less, I am sure the gentleman would not say that a man is less efficient and less entitled to it than a man in the departments uptown somewhere simply because he was working for a Member of Congress?

Mr. MADDEN. I did not say that at all; I say this: It was never intended by any chance for the legislation to provide for anything except to provide the $3,200 for clerk hire and that was all, and if there is anything done here that provides for $3,680 instead of $3,200 you will have to account to the American people for it.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. IRELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Under the amendment which the chairman contemplates offering will it be optional with the Member as to how he shall divide that $3,200 between the clerk and secretary?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly; that has been stated several times over and over again.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not understand.

Mr. IRELAND. I beg your pardon; I may not have explained it properly before, or the language was not very clear.

Mr. LANGLEY. This is not a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. IRELAND. I should say it was not; I think there was a slight division.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. Replying to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I do not think it was contemplated by this House when this increase of $3,200 for clerk hire was given last session that there was ever any thought of increasing the salary of any man from $2,000 to $3,200. [Applause.] The whole argument used in favor of this increase of clerk hire was to give more help to the Members of Congress, and it was not contemplated to increase the salary of any man from $2,000 to $3,200. But it is the law that if two clerks, or one clerk and one secretary, go into a Member's office, one at $1,000 and the other at $1,200, they automatically receive an increase of salary of $240 each per year, the same as any other employee of the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Then you make them Government employees. You do not make them employees of the Member of Congress at all.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield just now.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. For just a question.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would like to ask the gentleman if the very fact of putting the name of these employees on the roll, and thereby entitling them to bonus, does not in effect constitute them mere Government employees rather than our own confidential assistants? Is it not out of our jurisdiction to make them a statutory part of the help of the Government?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The proviso contains the language that such person shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, and so forth.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose you employed a stenographer and put him on the roll at $1,200 a year; if those services are unsatisfactory and you discharge or dismiss such a stenographer and then employ another one for the following six months, which one of those two would be entitled to the bonus?

Mr. IRELAND. The bonus is paid monthly. They would each receive their proportionate share.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the objection offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] will hold good, because, in line 5, page 3, it says "such person shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner." Now, as long as I have the privilege to employ and discharge whenever I wish, that is all I ask for. I am not looking for a father confessor. I want a secretary and a clerk, and I think that is what we all want.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield the floor in a moment. I want to reassert that it has been the effort of the committee, impersonally and impartially, to endeavor to satisfy the greatest number of the Members of the House. There is no question in my mind, and possibly there is not in yours, that the allowance for many Members, from some districts, is excessive, but that for others it is much short of the amount expended by the Member. Personally, I should divide mine, if I may be pardoned for making a personal reference, just as the original resolution provided. Yet that would not by any means suit a great number. I am satisfied in my own mind that many Members can not, even with the present allowance, pay their office expense for the service that is demanded of them. It has cost me twice my clerk-hire allowance, and more, during the short period I have been in the House, and I know I am below the average in what it has cost many Members.

Now, there is another phase of this matter that we have juggled ourselves into when we took this clerk hire out of our hands and placed the clerks on the roll. The individual membership of this House should have a little more courage in dealing with this question, and we would not be wasting time over such a trifle. The trouble with us all is that we are cowardly in doing it and we are afraid of what some grandmother's gray goose may say about it at home. I am willing to account to the public for every cent I spend through my office. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] if he cares for any time. If so, I will yield such time to him as he desires.

Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WOOD of Indiana, and Mr. HASTINGS rose.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] gets his own time, and I would like recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] a member of the committee?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes, sir; I am a member of the committee, and I desire recognition in my own right.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move that the committee do now rise for the purpose of settling the time for general debate.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I make the point of order the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] has not yielded the floor.

Mr. IRELAND. I have not yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] moves that the committee do now rise——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I wonder if we can not at this time make some arrangement for general debate. Mr. Chairman, I now move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House joint resolution No. 104, providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reports that that committee has had under consideration House joint resolution 104 and has come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 104; and, pending that, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the resolution be limited to one hour, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] and one-half by myself.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HASTINGS. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] asks unanimous consent that the general debate on the resolution be limited to one hour, half to be controlled by himself and half to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say that I do not think that is a fair division of the time. The gentleman from Illinois now has had about three-quarters of an hour——

Mr. IRELAND. Yes; but——

Mr. HASTINGS. And I think I am not giving away any secrets of the committee when I say that both he and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] are on the same side of this question and entertain the same view. I do not think it is hardly fair toward some of us who entertain a different view, seeing that the gentleman from Illinois has already had three-quarters of an hour, which he has occupied, and then proposes that the time should be limited to one hour, and that he and the gentleman from Georgia should divide that time equally.

Mr. IRELAND. I am sure the gentleman from Oklahoma knows that I did not use that time intentionally with any desire to deprive him or any other Member of the House of time, and that a large part of the time was occupied by gentlemen interrupting me on the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman, however, has had three-quarters of an hour. It would be fair to give gentlemen differing with him in their views three-quarters of an hour, and then divide the time equally between those in favor and those who are opposed to the resolution.

Mr. IRELAND. Would the gentleman say that one hour and a half would be fair, three-quarters of an hour to be given to each side?

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. IRELAND. Would not an hour and a half be satisfactory to the gentleman, three-quarters of an hour to be used by each side?

Mr. HASTINGS. Would not the gentleman think it would be fair to say half an hour on his side and three-quarters of an hour on this side?

Mr. IRELAND. We have pretty well jumbled this question all the way through and provoked considerable debate.

Mr. HASTINGS. Would not the gentleman think that three-quarters of an hour should be given to the opposite side, so that the time would be divided equally?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be somebody who would have the right at least to parcel out the time to those who are against the substitute as offered by this committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I object.

Mr. HASTINGS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I object if the regular order is demanded.

Mr. IRELAND. I move, then, Mr. Speaker, that the general debate be limited to one hour and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the general debate be limited to one hour and a half——

Mr. IRELAND. One-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK] and one-half by myself.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I want to offer an amendment to that motion, Mr. Speaker, that the general debate be limited to one hour and a half on each side.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That general debate be limited to one hour and a half on each side, one-half of that time to be divided equally between the two sides, one half on this side to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the other half to be controlled by some one who is opposed to the substitute offered by the committee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not make the motion as to how the time shall be controlled. The only motion in order is to limit the time for debate.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think it would be perfectly fair to have the time controlled one half by himself and the other half by some one on the other side of the question?

The SPEAKER. It can not be done.

Mr. HASTINGS. I ask him if he does not think that is fair, and is he not willing to agree to that?

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent could be asked for that.

Mr. HASTINGS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that one half the time be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. HASTINGS. Such time as is allotted—one hour and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to one hour and a half, three-quarters of an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] and three-quarters of an hour to be controlled by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 104, with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 104, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the special order, one hour and a half is given to general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] and one-half by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois want to yield some of his time now?

Mr. IRELAND. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, every Member has his personal views on this question of distributing this clerk hire. Personally, I am for the original resolution.

The substitute resolution was brought in by reason of the fact that certain elder Members on both sides of the House appeared before the committee and stated that they had clerks who had been with them a long time and who would not serve for the $2,000. For that reason the Committee on Accounts submitted the substitute resolution, to let the House decide whether or not it would put the resolution in such shape that these elder Members who had old clerks who would not work for $2,000 could pay them the full $3,200.

I do not think that any discussion on this question will change the mind of a single Member of the House. I believe that every man has his mind made up, and I am for the resolution providing $2,000 for the secretary and $1,200 for the clerk.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. IRELAND. How much time did the gentleman from Georgia yield back?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am sorry that I have no more time than five minutes, but I am going to try to give you hurriedly my view of these two resolutions.

You remember that when the legislative bill was up the clerk-hire proposition was increased from $2,000 a year to $3,200. Now, all of the debate on that provision when the bill was under consideration was to the effect that we, each of us, needed an additional clerk, and I believe that the entire membership of the House voted for it upon the theory that we would each have an additional clerk; in other words, that we would each have a secretary and a stenographer. Now, it so happens that the language of the legislative bill is ambiguous, and it was thought it ought to be clarified by this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman read that language?

Mr. HASTINGS. The language of the legislative bill is:

Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: For clerk of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for clerk hire, necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, $3,200 per annum, in monthly installments, $1,408,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part thereof shall be paid to any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

Of course, that contemplated that the names of the clerks should be placed upon the roll and the checks made directly to them. But in the debate in the House I believe every Member understood that we were going to have two, one at $2,000 and another at $1,200. Now, I am in favor of the original resolution and not in favor of the substitute.

Let us see what is the difference between these two resolutions. The substitute will not increase the expense any more than the original resolution, but the original resolution makes it permanent law, because it provides that hereafter you shall have these clerks at these salaries. That makes the original resolution permanent law. Now, the substitute resolution allows you to employ one or two and allows you to divide the $3,200.

Mr. IRELAND. Would it be satisfactory to the gentleman if an amendment were offered to the amendment simply making it mandatory that Members appoint two, with the amount paid to be discretionary with the Members?

Mr. HASTINGS. No; that is not my thought. I want to use the next two or three minutes on that point. Gentlemen of the House, I believe these checks ought to be made payable to the clerks and I believe their salaries ought to be fixed. They perform like service, and I believe that the secretary for one Member ought to get what the secretary of another Member gets and I think the stenographer of one Member ought to get what the stenographer for another Member gets. In other words, those performing like service ought to receive the same compensation.

Let me invite your attention to this fact, that the clerks in the various executive departments are not employed under a lump sum, giving the power to the Secretary of the Treasury to say that if one clerk is worth a little more he may be paid a little more. No; you classify the clerks, and there are many clerks of a certain class, and all the clerks in that particular class receive $1,400, $1,600, or $1,800, and it was not contemplated by this House when this item was added to the legislative appropriation bill that the Member should put $3,200 in his pocket, or that he should divide it up, but I believe every Member who voted for it understood that he wanted additional clerk hire and that it was going to give him two clerks, one to receive $2,000 and the other to receive $1,200, and that it was not the thought of anyone here that one secretary should receive $3,200.

Mr. KEARNS. You would have to amend the original law, to make it $2,000 and $1,200, would you not?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is why the original resolution is here.

Mr. KEARNS. That is the reason of this resolution here to-day, because the Comptroller of the Treasury did not know what to do.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. A man is a man and a woman is a woman, and one man will do better service than two or three for some of us. I want one man, who is something of a stenographer and was my private secretary for eight years when I was Speaker, and he knows public men and affairs, and I would not give him up for half a dozen clerks.

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, well, in answer to that, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of the Interior or the head of any bureau down here might say that he had some men who were much more efficient than others and that Congress should appropriate a lump sum of $500,000 or $1,000,000 and turn it over to him, and that he could get clerks who would be more efficient if he were allowed to fix the amount of their compensation, and that they ought not to be classified. The argument of the gentleman from Illinois would be in favor of that sort of method of appropriating money; but I believe that the secretaries and clerks to Members of Congress ought to be paid a uniform salary. I believe their names ought to be placed upon the roll, and I believe that the salary checks ought to go to them direct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied five minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield 10 minutes to the author of the original resolution, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the only justification that can possibly be offered for this action is that we are in need of more clerical assistance. Long ago we fixed the salaries of our secretaries at $2,000 a year. At the time that this measure was introduced at the last session, a copy of which I introduced at this session, the assumption was that we each of us needed an additional clerk and that the salary of $1,200 that is provided for would be paid to that clerk. The abuse of clerk hire heretofore has amounted to almost an open scandal. Newspaper after newspaper has criticized the action of Congress with reference to this clerk hire and its abuse. The purpose in putting their names on the roll is to make it perfectly clear to the public that this is not, as many people have been contending, and as the public have been led in large part to believe, an indirect attempt to increase the salaries of Congressmen. There should be no question about that proposition. There is another very great reason to my mind why the original resolution should become the law. If the practice is adopted, as some suggest they would like to have it, permitting them to pay the entire amount of $3,200 to one or to divide it between two, and they elect to pay it all to one, what is going to be the result? A few secretaries in the House who, I am informed, have been promised this entire amount if the bill can be so amended as to permit it are stating that they are going to be the elect and the high-priced secretaries of Representatives. The result will be that it will cause dissatisfaction and confusion, and will do more harm than good. Rather than do this it would be better not to change the law at all but permit the thing to remain at $2,000.

I do not believe that gentlemen who have had secretaries 8 or 10 years, who are so valuable as they say, would permit them to go. They would still retain them and pay them the additional amount of money out of their own pockets and use the $1,200 for the purpose it was intended when we passed this bill last session—for the purpose of employing additional help; and if we do not need to employ additional help then I say we are not justified in any action at all.

With reference to the suggestion that has been made that we will have no control over our clerks, I do not think that objection is well taken for the reason that the appropriation bill provided that no portion of the money shall be paid to any Congressman or Delegate or Commissioner, so that this measure has nothing to do with that; that feature is fixed. But this measure provides that each Congressman, Commissioner, and Delegate shall have the right to name his secretary and clerk and have the right to discharge them. So it is not a surrendering of the privacy of our office.

I believe that the original amount paid the secretaries of $2,000 should remain because that is the price already fixed for a secretary, and I believe that $1,200 is not too much for an additional clerk. I do not think you could get a very efficient clerk for less than that. Their names should be placed on the rolls and the checks made payable to them, so that there shall be no longer a suspicion of a practice going on in the House that the Members are taking the money and paying a portion to their secretaries or clerks and putting the rest in their pockets.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. I believe that there is a widespread concurrence in the gentleman's proposition and what he wants, with one exception. They do not want at this time, under the condition of the Treasury, under the terrible burdens that rest upon the people of the country at large, to place an additional burden of $480 as a bonus, which would bring the clerk hire of a Congressman to approximately $4,000.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In answer to that, I have no objection to the bill being amended so as to prevent the bonus feature. It was not in my mind at the time the resolution was drawn, but it was suggested afterwards that that would be the result.

Here is another proposition I wish to present to the committee. The substitute will only last for this session. It will be fought over again. I think, after the consideration this measure will receive, before it is finally acted upon, it should be made permanent law, so that we may hereafter know what we are to expect, and not have it hashed and rehashed every time Congress meets.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Under the present law we will be compelled to put the names of the employees on the roll?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Under the act passed last session I am of the opinion we would have to put their names on the roll, but there is great uncertainty about it. It does not provide that the clerks shall draw the money; it says that we shall not draw it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If we put the names on the roll, do not they draw $240 bonus?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That would be by virtue of the law and not by this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Somebody has got to receive the money.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am of the opinion that if their names are put on the roll and they receive less than $2,500 they would receive the bonus.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And if we have two clerks they would get $240 each.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. SISSON. I think the gentleman is in error. If they are put on the rolls by act of Congress they cease to be clerks of the Member in fact and in law and are employees of the House, the Member having the right to remove them. Under the present law $3,200 is paid as clerk hire, but the Member may not receive it. Unless the law puts them on the roll, although you might register the party to receive it, he would not get the bonus.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is no difference between the gentleman from Mississippi and myself; that is what I contend. So far as this measure is concerned, I am not opposing any amendment that will prevent the payment of the additional bonus. But I do insist that for the best interest of the House and for the purpose of terminating the confusion that has been had ever since we have been discussing this measure something definite should be done at this time, and the best way to do it is not to disarrange the rule with reference to secretaries; that they be paid what we are now paying them and then pay the clerk the additional amount. That was the idea of every Member who considered this bill at the last session and it was for the purpose of giving us additional clerk hire that it was introduced, and we then determined how it should be divided. It passed the House without any opposition practically, but failed on the other side, simply because a rider was put on that killed it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman knows that that was the terms of the legislative bill. What I want to ask is why do you object, when each man is responsible for his own secretary, to having the bill amended so as to give the Member of Congress the right to say how much each shall receive?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The only objection I have is because of the fact that we are now paying our secretaries $2,000, and if we lessen the pay it would cause dissatisfaction. As far as I am individually concerned, I will pay the additional amount, no matter what the bill provides.

Mr. KINCHELOE. It is a question between the individual Member of Congress and his secretary.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MCARTHUR].

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, during the four years of my membership in this body no question has ever come before it that has been more of a political football than this clerk-hire question. We have had no question before us for consideration during my time here that has bred more demagogy and gallery

play for the consideration of the folks back home than this clerk-hire question. Last winter when we increased the total annual amount from $2,000 to $3,200 gentlemen on both sides of the aisle voted against that increase and then came down here in front of the Clerk's desk and held their breath while the clerks were figuring up the totals, saying, "I voted against it, but I hope it passes"—all for home consumption, if you please.

The time has come to settle the clerk-hire question and quit making a political football out of it. We vote untold amounts of money here for the departments. You can not go down to any of these departments without stumbling over messengers, clerks, secretaries galore; all at high salaries. Army officers and Navy officers ride around town in Government-owned automobiles, with Government-paid drivers, yet we have not the nerve to provide ourselves with sufficient office equipment and clerk hire to do the work which our constituents send us here to do. [Applause.] It is time for the membership of this House to show a little courage in the matter of clerk hire. It is time to get down to brass tacks, and if $3,200 per year is not enough, let us make it $4,200 a year, or whatever is necessary. It is immaterial to me whether these clerks go on the rolls and receive the bonus or do not receive it, but I do not see how any self-respecting clerk or stenographer can live here without the bonus during these war-time prices in the city of Washington. It is about all a Member of Congress can do to struggle along.

I do not like to make personal reference to my own case, but I have paid out more than $1,200 a year from my own pocket for clerk hire since I have been a Member of Congress. During some months I have had only one clerk in the office, and I have not paid out all of the $166.66 clerk hire that I get every month under the present law, but there have been other months, during the war, when the Army was being mobilized and the Navy was being increased, that I paid out as high as $350 a month, part of which, of course, came from my own pocket. It averages more than $1,200 a year in excess of what I get for clerk hire, and, like the majority of men in this House, I am a poor man, and can not afford this. I do not believe other Members can afford it.

I am talking generally about this thing, and not with particular reference to the committee amendment. I do, however, want to criticize the committee amendment in one respect. It does not make this proposition permanent. If we are going to meet this thing, why not make it a permanent proposition and settle it, so we will all know what we can figure on for next year? It ought to be made permanent law. We ought not to have to go over this old question again and again every time the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is under consideration. Let us make this a permanent proposition.

I am in favor of the committee amendment for the reason that it provides elasticity; it gives the Member the right to say that one clerk may get $2,000 and another $1,200, or that one may get $1,800 and another $1,400, or that two clerks may get $1,600 each. Those details of the conduct of a Member's office should be left to the discretion of the Member. I venture the opinion right here, without fear of successful contradiction, that there are very few cases under the existing law where persons in two offices receive similar amounts. Of course, there are a great many cases where the entire $2,000 is paid to one clerk, but there are a great many other cases where that is cut in two and part of it paid to one clerk and part of it, plus something a Member puts up out of his own pocket, paid to another. Therefore, I do not take any stock in this argument that we have to make these salaries uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McARTHUR. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield me three minutes more.

Mr. IRELAND. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. McARTHUR. There is no soundness in the argument that these salaries must be made uniform, because we all know that some of these clerks and secretaries are worth a great deal more to Members than are others, and that the matter of fixing the exact salary ought to be left to the Member himself, so that he can determine just how he wants it paid. I venture the opinion that there are not many Members in this Congress, particularly from the public lands States of the far West, where we have a vast amount of correspondence relating to the public domain, who can get along with the $3,200 that he is going to get, without going into his own pocket for several hundred dollars every year. If any Member can find a person who is competent and capable of doing all the office work of a Member, I think he is entitled to pay to that person $3,200. Therefore, on the whole, I feel that I must support the committee amendment; but I do hope that it will be made permanent law, so that we will not have to go over this old clerk-hire question year in and year out.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McARTHUR. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I had in mind that the old system was better than either of these systems.

Mr. McARTHUR. The old system subjected Members of Congress to the suspicion of paying out part of this money to their clerks and sticking the rest of it into their own pockets. I do not, however, take any stock in that charge.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman find in his own office that some months he needs one or two and in some months three or four?

Mr. McARTHUR. Absolutely; that was the point I sought to make in the opening of my argument—that some months a Member needs more than he needs in other months.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McARTHUR. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have never heard such a charge made against a Member of the House. I have never heard it made against any of the Kentucky delegation and it has never been made against me.

Mr. McARTHUR. I never heard it made against my genial friend from Kentucky or against any individual. I have simply heard it as a general charge, and I think that this legislation is desired in order to remove the possibility of that charge being made.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, we all know, those who served in the last Congress, when the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill passed and we appropriated ourselves $1,200 additional clerk hire that it was not contemplated to increase any clerk hire. We know that, and I do not want any of this money paid to me; I do not care about it. But what I want is the service. I would like to see this settled once for all, but I am for this committee amendment with the words "one or" stricken out of it. I think this $1,200 as carried under the last bill really was not contemplated to increase the salary of any clerk. Then there ought to be two on the roll. I think it ought to be left to the Member of Congress to distribute it the way he pleases. As far as I am concerned, my secretary is not a political appointment and never will be as long as I am in Congress, and I am going to hire and fire when I get ready. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KINCHELOE. No; I have not the time, and what I want is to see this made permanent legislation. I want to see it left to the Member how he shall divide this appropriation if they go on the roll. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR] says we are nothing but cowards. We all know we need extra clerk hire. We know we need extra help, and we are not fooling our people at home. They do not care anything about our extra help in the office providing we need it and are giving them service, and service is what they want. [Applause.] As far as demagogy is concerned about it, I will take the responsibility; but, gentlemen, what might suit one man might not suit another in the question of clerk hire. My secretary is as competent as anyone, but she can not do all of my work if I am to continue to serve my constituents efficiently. I know and you know that with this $1,200 appropriation you can not get a stenographer to come here and do your work for $100 a month. We need not deceive ourselves about that. Why not put two on the roll and let the Member distribute it to suit himself? As far as I am concerned, if they go on the roll I will get one at $1,760, so the $240 bonus will draw up to $2,000, and let the other receive the balance, which would be $1,680, and there you have got two good employees. I want to distribute this to suit myself, and I want to give you the privilege of doing the same thing. They ought to be on the roll, because the rest of them are on the roll, and I want to say to you the reason they ought to be on the roll is because they get more compensation and give better service. Everybody knows you can not get a stenographer at $1,200 a year that can come here and live. There is no such position in the departments here but what pays probably more than that. So I want to see this amendment amended so as to make it permanent legislation if we can and strike out the words "one or" and make them put two on the roll, because I do not believe we ought to increase the salaries of any of them; but I think we ought to arrange it in such a way that we can get the best possible services out of the two, which was contemplated, and everybody understood it was contemplated, in the original act. Now, as to the original amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, I like some features of it, because if it is made

permanent law I think it ought to be settled once for all, but I do not like arbitrarily to fix it at $2,000 and $1,200, because it is not elastic. If the gentleman from Indiana would word the amendment so as to give the Member himself the right to adjust these salaries and make it permanent law, all right. But, so far as I am concerned, I am driven to the other alternative of supporting the report of the Committee on Accounts with an amendment striking out the words "one or." I do not believe, in view of the fact that the last legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill that we passed was for additional service, for additional clerk hire, that we ought to turn around and in the next breath increase the salary of one from $2,000 to $3,200, because Congress never contemplated that at all, but to arrange these salaries where they will go on the roll. I believe, as a matter of law, they go on the roll now under the original act of the legislative bill, but put them where they ought to be and let the Member fix the salaries to suit himself and everybody will be satisfied. [Applause.]

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if it had been proposed at the time we had this matter under discussion in the last Congress that we should make available for one clerk, one employee, to get $3,200, there would not have been 15 Members of the House who would have voted for it, because they realized that when this increase was granted it was on the theory that we needed more help, not that we are underpaying our clerks particularly. [Applause.] I submit the resolution that was drafted and was introduced is the resolution that would be in better taste for this House to pass. Now, if we go to work and make possible for a Member to pay $3,200 to one clerk and across the corridor over in the Office Building a Member has two clerks, you will find that it will not be very long before there will be disaffection among the secretaries employed by Members here.

And, furthermore, you will find it will not be very long before another branch of this Congress will increase the salaries of its clerks. They have already increased the number since this Congress opened. I submit we should carry out the idea we had in mind when we put this amendment in the legislative bill, namely, that we give for increased clerk hire $1,200; that we should pay our secretaries $2,000, and, if we should have a stenographer, pay the latter $1,200. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] says you can not get a competent stenographer for $1,200, but I think the gentleman will find that he can get a fairly competent stenographer for that sum. He may not be able to get one who will be willing to come a long distance to Washington, across the country, or anything of that sort, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should enact this legislation upon the idea which we had when we put the increase into the legislative bill, and that is that we need more help. I do not know as it is necessary to make it permanent legislation. The increase in the help was because of many of the war activities and war needs—allotments, insurance, allowances, complaints about mail, and many of those other things. Now, some of those, I think, are already beginning to slack up with the discharge of the men from the Army, and I submit it is not particularly urgent that this should be made permanent at this time. But I do think we ought to carry out the spirit of the law as it was passed in the last Congress, namely, that we should increase the amount available for clerk hire by $1,200 without disturbing the salary of the secretaries we already had on the roll. Therefore, I am opposed to permitting this to be paid to one or both, not only, as I said before, because of the chance for a complaint that it will afford but because of the almost certain demand that will be made upon us as a result of the courtesy existing between the two Houses, in the very near future, to meet demands to put the employees of the other branch of this Congress upon the same basis; and I think it would be economy and proper legislation to follow out the idea which we had when we increased it in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill in the last Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time I may have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is a very simple proposition, although it has been agitated a great deal since I have been a Member of Congress. It strikes me there are just three objects in providing for clerical assistance that we should keep in view. First, whatever legislation we have ought to be permanent, so that we will not have this fight every recurring year, as it has been going on for 10 or 15 years when the appropriation bill is up. Whatever is right we ought to put in the law, and let it stay there until it is repealed. The amendment offered by the committee will not do that. That amendment simply qualifies the appropriation made in the appropriation bill last year for the payment of next year's clerk hire. What we want, and what this House, I think, ought to want, is that whatever we do should be permanent legislation. [Applause.]

Now, this does not do that. I shall offer a substitute amendment for the amendment of the committee which will make it permanent legislation. Another object, and the main object, is to furnish the Members of the House money with which to get sufficient clerical assistance to help them perform their duties as Representatives. The House last year almost unanimously thought, and the committee on this bill thought, that $3,200 was a reasonable amount; that that is to be appropriated, not as some Members think, judging from their talk, for the benefit of my clerk, or your clerk, or this clerk or that clerk, but, gentlemen, it is for the benefit of the Representatives. This $3,200 is to enable him to fully discharge his official duties as a Representative, and no one clerk, or two clerks, or a dozen clerks, or no special clerk or clerks of any Member, have anything to do with when and how he shall hire such clerical assistance. It is for the Member himself.

They talk about it destroying the morale of the clerks. Whenever my clerk gets "morale" into his head and tries to control my duties and say what I shall pay him or pay anybody else and how many I shall employ for the performance of my duties, he is going to get out of my office. [Applause.] And whenever my clerk is big enough to tell me how much he should have or how much another or other clerks should have, and whom or whom not I shall employ, then I am going to get out of Congress and tell my constituents to send him here, and I will apply for a clerkship under him. [Applause.]

The $3,200 is for the Members to assist them in the discharge of their official duties.

If that is so, then who should control that $3,200? The Member himself. With that he ought to be allowed to have 1 clerk, or 2 clerks, or 3 clerks, or 10 clerks, if in his judgment he can better perform and discharge his duties and can better render proper service to his constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Can not the gentleman from Illinois let me have some of his time?

Mr. IRELAND. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the second and main object, to give to the Member $3,200 to help him discharge the duties, not those which his clerk thinks he ought to perform but which the Member himself thinks he ought to perform. If that requires one or two or three or four clerks, let him pay two or three or four clerks out of his $3,200.

Now, the third object is to prevent these slanderous newspapers, every recurring year, trying to discredit the entire membership of the House by accusing Members generally without specific charge of pocketing the clerical hire money, because no record is required to be kept showing to whom and the amount such money is paid. Such a record should be required to be kept in the Clerk's office without putting such clerical employees or secretaries technically on the roll of the House. If you put them on the roll, then two clerks would be entitled to a bonus of $240 each, and it will cost the taxpayers $211,000 extra.

I dare challenge the Republicans to vote for this $211,000 increase for their clerk hire, especially in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], on Saturday, as to the great economies which the Republicans have effected in and by this House—I dare one Republican to vote $211,000 out of the people's pockets for bonuses for their clerks. [Applause.] You ought not to do it, and we on this side ought not to do it.

The amendment which I shall propose at a proper time effectuates these three objects. It makes the legislation permanent. It provides that with the $3,200 a Member can employ one or two or more to aid him in the discharge of his duties according to his judgment. It declares that the name or names of such person or persons, together with their address and the amount or amounts paid or agreed to be paid to such person or persons, shall simply be filed with the Clerk by the Member. That does not put them on the roll. That does not take $211,000 of the taxpayers' money to give as bonuses to clerks. Let us read the proposed amendment and see if it will not accomplish what is desired by every man here who has the interest of the membership of the House at heart rather than the special interest of his clerk or clerks:

That hereafter each Representative and Delegate and Commissioner Resident of the House of Representatives shall be allowed for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and Representative duties $3,200 per annum, payable in monthly install-

ments, the name or names of such person or persons, with the address of each so employed, to be filed with the Clerk of the House, together with the amount or amounts paid or to be paid to such person or persons.

Gentlemen, that will settle the question and do what I believe is the right and wise thing. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there are three great subjects which annually come before this House which I have never discussed heretofore. One is garden seed, another is mileage, and the third is clerk hire. I am taking part in this debate because I am hopeful that it will be the last time this subject will be discussed here.

I can not persuade myself to believe there is a man in this House whose reputation for honesty is so low that the people who sent him to Congress believe he would steal his clerk hire. If there is, if he will stand up and admit it and will not resign, I myself will resign, because I do not wish to serve with a man who has so little reputation and character. [Laughter and applause.]

I am out of patience with men who stand here and say that we must do these things in order to protect our good name. Why, God bless your souls, if any man here has such a poor reputation that if he has been paid his clerk hire without getting a certificate, supported by two witnesses that he paid it over to the clerk, he will be suspected of committing larceny, he ought never to have run for Congress; he ought to have stayed at home and followed that occupation which gave him that reputation. [Laughter.]

Now, for our own sakes, there are some things that this Congress ought not to continue to discuss. We ought not to have this annual wrangle as to whether we should have one package or two packages of beet seed to send to our constituents. [Laughter.] We ought not to contend forever with each other about whether it takes 2 cents or 5 cents a mile to bring us here and take us home. And we ought not to wrangle and dispute with each other in arguments such as we are making here to-day to the effect that if we do not stand on this or that side of a question we are in danger of leaving open the door of opportunity for somebody to steal. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] says that if you pay one clerk $2,000 and another Member pays his clerk $3,200, the $2,000 clerk will be dissatisfied. If you are going to take into your office two clerks and pay one of them $2,000 and the other $1,200, if a disparity of salaries will cause dissatisfaction, you have thereby broken up your clerical force at once. As long as I hire clerks at all I am going to stipulate with them in advance how much they are to be paid, and then I am going to pay them every cent that I have agreed to pay, and I am going to pay out to my clerks every cent the Government permits me to pay for clerk hire, and when that proves insufficient I am going down here, as I have sometimes done before, and sell my salary checks and hire additional clerks and pay them out of my money. I know of some clerks who are worth $2,000 a year, and I know of others who are worth $1,200; and if a man has a good clerk and pays him $3,200, why should I object, or why should my clerk prevent him from making a contract that seems to be fair and reasonable and just?

If there are men here who have not sense enough to know what a clerk is worth and need to have some one to regulate their clerical force, I should like to suggest to the people of that district that it ought to send some one else to represent them in Congress. [Applause.]

That is the way it appeals to me, and if they have no one in their district that would be any better, there are several down in my district that want to come to Congress whom I would be willing to ship and pay the freight on, and I will give them a certificate of character to the effect that if they are elected they will not steal one dollar of their clerk hire. [Laughter.]

I think, gentlemen, we ought to settle this question. I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], so far, at least, as it makes it permanent law. Let us settle this matter and let us settle it now. It is beneath the dignity of Congress to be perpetually wrangling as to whether we are honest or not. For God's sake let us quit it. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this resolution, in whatever form it may be adopted, does not take a single dollar out of the United States Treasury.

When the last legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill was before Congress, of which it so happened that I was in charge, an amendment was offered on the floor increasing the clerical hire of Members from $2,000 to $3,200, and it was adopted over my protest. Owing to the rules of the House it was impossible for the proposer of the amendment to divide it as he intended it to be divided and as his remarks, made at the time, will show.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is clearly correct in his statement that there was not a speech made upon the floor of this House in advocacy of the increase for clerical hire to the effect that it was not intended for the purpose of procuring additional clerical help. [Applause.] There was not the slightest suggestion that anyone wanted an increase of the appropriation in order to increase the salary of the secretary he then had.

Something has been said about putting the clerks on the rolls. As I construe the action of Congress at its last session they will be on the rolls after July 1, and I am glad of it, because for years I have been advocating on the floor of this House the placing of the clerks to Members on the rolls. There are Members who say they do not want them placed on the roll because they will lose control and supervision of their clerks.

I do not question the sincerity of those gentlemen, but that argument has never appealed to me, because to-day the secretaries and clerks of Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol are on the roll, and have been all the time, as far as I know, and I am sure that such fact has not interfered with any Senator's control of his office. Each Senator has four clerks, who are on the roll and who are paid out of the National Treasury, and who, by the way, get the $240 bonus in addition to their regular salaries. A Senator's secretary gets $2,500 and the other clerks range down, I think, to $1,440, which, I believe, is the lowest paid to any one of the four clerks to a Senator. I may be wrong about that. But they are on the roll to-day, and I believe that our action in the last session placed our secretaries on the roll, because the provision said that the money should not be paid to the Member, and not being paid to the Member it must be paid to the clerk, and I fail to understand how it can be paid to the clerk by the disbursing clerk of this House unless the Member's clerk is on the roll, just as the clerks to Senators, at the other end of the Capitol.

Now, coming to another proposition, some gentleman has said—I think it was the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]—that we are here legislating for Members and not for our secretaries, that we are here to legislate in the interest of the service that we are rendering to the people, and I agree with him in that statement. But I submit, gentlemen, if you adopt his amendment, which will permit any Member to pay $3,200 for a secretary, that is very poor economy, because by so doing we shall permit our secretaries to be raised from $2,000 to $3,200 a year. I repeat without the fear of contradiction from a single Member that that was not in the minds of Members at the last session when they voted this increase from $2,000 to $3,200.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I should like to know the gentleman's opinion as to the lack of authority to pay this money to the clerks with their names on the roll as he suggests. It has been intimated that the Comptroller of the Treasury has suggested that nobody could be paid under the law as it now stands.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know what the Comptroller of the Treasury has ruled on the subject.

Mr. IRELAND. If the gentleman will yield, I want to correct a misapprehension. I do not think any such statement as that has been made. At least I have not heard of it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I understood that statement to have been made, and others with whom I have conferred understood it in like manner.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I should be surprised if the Comptroller of the Treasury had made any such ruling, because this money was appropriated for clerk hire for the benefit of the Members, and since it provides that the money shall not be paid to the Members themselves, necessarily there follows the implication that it will be paid to those who actually render the service. So far as I am concerned, I believe the Comptroller of the Treasury will rule, when the time comes, if no other provision is adopted, that it shall be paid to the clerks of Members. In that sense, I say, gentlemen, since they will be on the roll—because they can not be paid unless

they are on the roll—I think it is a mere waste of time to discuss whether they should have been placed on the roll.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman think that the bonus attaches to the existing law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In my judgment, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that it does attach, but of course that is a matter for the Comptroller of the Treasury to decide and not for me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman think the $240 bonus attaches to the resolution offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I believe under the provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill it attaches to every employee who gets less than $2,500 and who is paid directly out of the Treasury of the United States, unless Congress says in express terms that it shall not apply to him.

Now, gentlemen, I have no objection to Members paying their clerks more than $2,000 if they desire, but I do not think Congress ought to be in the attitude of increasing the salaries of their secretaries to more than $2,000. I want to see the Members of this House given the widest latitude in the employment of their clerical help, and I would rather see an amendment adopted to this bill which would permit Members to divide the $3,200 as they pleased, provided that no clerk shall receive more than $2,000 out of the $3,200. That would give Members who desire to do so an opportunity to pay $1,600 to each of two clerks. It would give the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] the privilege of making the division that he suggests, and would give all the Members some latitude in the matter. Of course, if a Member wished to give one clerk $2,000 and one $1,200, he would have the privilege under that amendment. But I do not think Congress ought to be in the attitude of increasing the salaries of Members' secretaries. Congress did not intend that by its action at its last session. When you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] or when you adopt the committee amendment you are then in the attitude of permitting the increase of the salaries of your secretaries. I for one am opposed to that. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. IRELAND. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman: The foundation for our action at the last session was the suggestion that the Members of this body, in order to afford a more efficient discharge of their public duties, needed more help in their offices; not necessarily more clerks, but relief from office details secured either by more clerical help, or greater efficiency in the present force. Whether that relief shall be afforded by more employees, or by a more efficient and accomplished single employee, is a matter of application of the allowance for clerk hire that should be determined by the individual Member.

I resent the suggestion that the Members of this House are mentally and morally so incapable that they are unable to determine for themselves how this amount of $3,200 which is appropriated for our office force shall be most efficiently expended to afford the result of relief intended to be secured. It will be recalled that in the debate in the last session of this body many Members stated that two clerks were not needed but that if we were enabled to employ a more efficient and accomplished single clerk, such as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has in contemplation, we would effect in those cases a much more expeditious and satisfactory disposition of the ever increasing volume of work in our offices, and enable the Members to take a larger personal part in the business of the country as conducted on the floor of the House.

I have no doubt that in many cases it would be possible to find at $3,200 a year a clerk of such intellectual force and competency and with such a knowledge of affairs, and capacity to discharge the business in the office of a Member, that this work, and in considerable measure the work at the departments, could be efficiently discharged by him to our very great relief. This would leave the Members free to devote a much larger portion of their time than is possible under present conditions, to active participation in the proceedings on the floor of the House.

Why should we undertake to say to Members of this body, because that is in effect what we say by this resolution, that they are incapable of making a proper determination of the expenditure of the money appropriated for clerk hire, and seek to compel them to expend this money in a fashion which their own judgment and experience tells them is an unwise and injudicious expenditure? [Applause.]

Why should we say to a Member who would far prefer in his office a single secretary at $3,200 that we distrust his ability to make the most effective dispositions for his office, and intend to compel him to employ a secretary at $2,000, and a stenographer at $1,200?

I have always objected, Mr. Chairman, to the suggestion that our secretaries should be placed on the clerical roll. No reason for this suggestion has ever been offered save the irresponsible intimation that there were Members of this body of so degraded a character that they put into their own pockets the money which was paid them for clerk hire. I do not personally believe that there is a Member of this body guilty of conduct at once so reprehensible and so contemptible. Moreover unless he expended the full amount now appropriated for clerk hire he could not dispatch his office work. This fact alone sufficiently protects any Member, even if his character does not, against the suggestion that he is pocketing a portion of his allowance for clerk hire. I resent the suggestion to put our office force on the roll for the manifest reason that such action if taken is admission on our part that the reason assigned for this suggestion has merit in it. The suggestion carries a reflection on this body that should not be given force and currency by affirmative action on our part.

The amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is not open to the objections that I have urged to the committee amendment. It will enable the Members of this body to employ two, three or more clerks, if by that action, they will secure in their judgment a more satisfactory disposition of their office work. At the same time it will give to other Members of this body the right to employ a single clerk, if under the conditions prevailing in their offices they prefer a single clerk, to two or more clerks. This amendment will leave the determination of the number of clerks to the Member himself. This is as it should be, from every point of view.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is it not frequently the case that a Member's work is of such quantity, at times, that two employees could not possibly do it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes, that is the experience of every old Member. There ought to be no such limitation on our discretion as is proposed. It puts the Members of the House in swaddling clothes, and says to them in substance that they are neither intellectually, nor morally competent to be intrusted with the appropriate expenditure of this sum of $3,200. [Applause.]

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. ROSE. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] raised a doubt in my mind when he said that under the provisions of the law and under the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] we could not escape the payment of this bonus.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Tennessee drew a conclusion in which I can not acquiesce. I do not agree with the gentleman. There is nothing in the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, in its legal effect, that to my mind supports the contention of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me say to the gentleman that it was drawn with the idea that it will be impossible for them to get the bonus.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman wants to make it absolute, why does he not say that the clerks shall not receive a bonus?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, for the very good reason stated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], I will vote to strike out the word "one," line 24, page 2, which will prevent a raise in the secretary's salary not contemplated by the last act of Congress. I am also heartily in favor of making it absolutely certain that there shall be no bonuses paid under the provisions of this resolution. I am willing to pay bonuses to our soldiers, sailors, and marines, but to no others. I believe that the provision for clerk hire is ample without the bonus. If we want to pay our help more than the allowance, let us do it out of our own pockets. There has not been a month since I came to Congress that I have not had as many as two employees in my office, and right at this time, to-day, I have three employees working in my office, and one of them is receiving $2,000 a year, which amount is allowed me by the Government, and I am now paying the other two out of my own

pocket, one being my son. I expect to keep one of my sons in my office as my employee and pay him out of my own pocket as long as I am in Congress, because he can act as my confidential clerk, attending to all confidential mail, and can do certain work for me that no other employee can do, and attend to it properly. And yet, because of the fact that since time immemorial Congressmen have appointed relatives on the pay roll of the Government, we can not now ever raise our voice against a proposition concerning legislation of this Government unless that question is brought up to confront us in Congress as though it was something improper when there is no law against it. If it is improper, we ought to have a law against it. I see nothing improper in a Member appointing his relatives as long as there is no law against it, and if the relative can do this work as well as anyone else, and, as I say, I can not attend to the enormous business of my district without the help of one of my own boys, and I expect to keep him in my office and pay his salary out of my own pocket regardless of action taken to-day, for it is service of the very best that my people expect and demand, and this kind he helps me to give. A Member of Congress is expected to hold himself as blameless as Cæsar's wife, and we must, regardless of personal expense, hold ourselves above certain criticism that comes by reason of the fact that there has always been somebody trying to get our jobs and always will be, and I am going to offer an amendment, and in order to have it considered as pending I ask that the Clerk read it in my time, and later on when a vote is had upon it I hope that it will pass, and we can forever settle this one issue of criticism.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. IRELAND. An amendment is not now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is just for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution on page 3, after the word "cause," on line 7, as a new paragraph, insert the following new section, to wit: "SEC. 2. That after June 30, 1919, Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners in the Congress of the United States shall not appoint to any position, the salary for which is paid by the Government, any person related within the third degree by consanguinity or affinity to the Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such appointment, and all existing appointments violative of the intent and purpose of this provision shall terminate before July 1, 1919."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] for bringing forward the resolution such as has been presented here to-day. I think when he stood there in front of the Speaker's stand and made the statement that for years we have been afraid to do what we should do he told the absolute truth. I believe we have been moral and political cowards by our failure in not providing for our clerical force, a duty we owe ourselves and a duty we owe our constituents in order that governmental business may be properly transacted. I remember last winter when we voted for this provision that is now stricken out, providing for an increase in our office personnel, a prominent Member of this House came to me and said, "You do not dare to vote for that increase, because the people in your district will criticize you for it." My answer to him was that I would vote for it, and I did, and I further said that I wanted the people of my district, whose commission I held, to know that whenever the time come when my office needed extra assistance to take care of their business I was not afraid to ask for it. These clerks are in our offices not for our personal benefit or profit but for the benefit and aid we may render the people we represent. I have confidence in my district, and I believe it has in me, and I look upon my office and the conduct of its affairs as a business proposition, and shall so administer it, and I believe my constituents approve that policy, for these clerks are not mine, but theirs.

To-day we are confronted with the proposition as to whether or not we are afraid of minor picayune criticisms that may come if we dare to conduct our offices in a way to render efficient service to our people. I care not what that criticism may be, because I know it will not be founded on business principles. I know further, that in my office, and I know in the office of many Members of Congress, the requirements are so pressing and are in such volume that unless we have an additional force we must pay for the clerk hire out of our own pockets. I do not believe that our districts demand that sacrifice or that the Government expects it. It is unfair to those who can not afford it and undemocratic, because it places uneven burdens on Members of Congress. I for one believe that whenever a Congressman's office warrants additional help to take care of business which is governmental we should have courage enough to stand up and vote for that additional help when it is for the public good, let the criticism fall where it may. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the differences of opinion which have been expressed by Members, and because this is a proposition which concerns the official discharge of duties of Members of the House, I hesitate to enter this discussion although I have very strong convictions respecting it. In the last executive, judicial, and legislative appropriation bill, the annual amount for clerk hire was increased from $2,000 to $3,200, but it was provided that no part of the sum should be paid directly to a Member of Congress. As I recall the discussion when the bill was before the House it revolved around the necessity for additional clerks. I recall no discussion regarding the amount of $2,000 paid at present, but that the Members desired the liberty of employing an additional clerk. Mr. Chairman, what has been and what is the status regarding clerk hire for Members? At the present time an allowance of $2,000 per annum is made and paid. Each Member gets his check in his own name for $166.66 each month, and he spends it as he pleases. Under existing law he must certify that it is necessary and that he has expended it for clerk hire.

Almost every year for 20 years when the legislative bill has been under consideration and this item has been reached there has been discussion, and the intimation has been made that Members have not paid out to clerks the entire amount which they have received. I am loath to believe it and I do not intimate that such is the case, but public opinion in the United States, in your district and my district, to a greater or less extent holds that to be true. Just so long as this matter remains unsettled there will be criticism. You can not settle this question until it is provided that the clerks which are allowed the Members of the House are placed upon the pay roll at a certain salary and the checks are made payable to them and delivered to those clerks. I wish this matter to be settled and I hope we may enact some permanent law. You may adopt the amendment offered by the committee or you may adopt other amendments, but you have not settled and will not settle it unless the provisions which I suggest are enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minutee more.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the resolution as originally offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] is a proper and wise solution. It gives each Member a secretary at $2,000 and a clerk at $1,200.

Two thousand dollars will employ a good secretary; $1,200 will employ a good stenographer. There are hundreds, aye, thousands, of clerks employed by the Government who are not receiving in excess of $100 per month and Members can employ them likewise. I believe that is a wise solution and until we have a permanent law to this effect, this House will not be free from the criticism. Let us do just as the other body does. Let us adopt the same policy that we compel the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Navy, and other departmental chiefs and heads of the bureaus to do. We allow him certain clerks at certain salaries. Let us be consistent. Let us remove once and for all this suspicion, unfounded though it may be, of the people and the American press that we are indulging in this petty peculation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time because I think my own situation explains the common sense of this whole proposition. I have two clerks in my office of such equal ability that I hardly know which one I would prefer. They are both gentlemen who have splendid talents, splendid capacity, and they do the work, I think, with equal zeal and equal ability. Now, I believe if this law is passed in the shape in which the committee reports it I will divide the salary that comes to me exactly equally and yet if one of those men for some reason resigned and I had to get a green one I would feel that the man who was most competent was entitled to more pay. There may be other circumstances. One of these men is a married man and the other is not a married man. I might feel in equity and in good conscience I was authorized and justified in paying the man with the heavier burdens to carry a little more salary than the other man. All these are matters that ought to be left to the Members, and therefore I believe that

the provision that the Member shall divide the salary that he receives as he thinks right is just and proper. It is a question of plain common sense and I do not see any use in splitting hairs about microscopic points of construction, and it seems to me that the amendment as submitted by the committee is exactly what ought to be done. Now, I believe it ought to be made the permanent law so that we would not have this controversy every year to come upon us. As to bonuses I have nothing particular to say except this, that if these clerks are put upon the permanent roll I have no objection. In fact, I rather prefer it and if for no other reason than this, that whenever we pass legislation affecting the salaries of other employees of the Government generally it would automatically apply to our clerks and we would not be called upon to meet the question that their particular salaries were to be raised when we treat them just as we do somebody else. I think, therefore, that this law ought to be made the permanent law, these clerks ought to be put upon the pay roll, and while on the pay roll be subject to any law made for other Government employees. They ought to be removable at the will of the Member who appoints them and he ought to be allowed to use his own discretion as to their relative value and to the amount that he should pay to each of his clerks, and to remove once for all this question, this should be made the permanent law of our country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to call the attention of the committee to what you do when you adopt the amendment for $2,000 and $1,200. Your clerk hire salary up until two years ago was $1,500. You increased it to $2,000 and at the end of this year you will have drawn it two years. That is a considerable increase from $1,500 to $2,000. Then you increased in this year's bill the clerical hire of your office from $2,000 to $3,200. By the adoption of this amendment you add $480 additional. Now, we are taught by Josephus, or rather told by Josephus, that Jerusalem was the cleanest city in the world because every man swept in front of his own door for they were required to do so by law. Now, my Republican friends, you want to sweep clean in your professed campaign for economy you are going to have to sweep in front of your own doors. You can not consistently economize in other departments of the Government now, if you also pay to the employees of the House an extra months pay as has been your custom when in power, and to that you also add $240 to each clerk in your own office, making in this bill $480. That is $3,200 for two clerks, $480 bonus and $120 each, extra month's pay or $240 to the two, making in all for clerk hire to each Congressman, $3,920. Can you face your people on such a proposition?

Mr. WASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I can not yield, I have only 5 minutes. That makes not $211,000 in your offices as the gentleman from New York told you, but it makes $317,000 increase to employees in your offices here in one year. Can you in conscience do this thing? Is it not a crime against the people you represent? You know you do not need this $3,940 for any legitimate service. Now, my friends, listen. The pay is $3,200 and no man contends that under the law as it is now written in the statute book that these men go upon the pay roll. When you get them upon the pay roll of the House you must get on by a statute passing both Houses of Congress placing them on the roll. It must be an employee of the House or of the Government.

Under the law as it is now drawn the clerk is the employee of a Member of Congress, paid out of an allowance to the Member, for clerk hire, and there is no individual Member of this House who has investigated who will ever claim that because you certify the name of the man who gets the money that he is on the pay roll of the House. If he goes upon the pay roll of the House and you gentlemen decide to give him an extra month's pay in addition to the $240, each one of those men will get an addition of $120. Now, my friends in Congress, let me tell you that if you expect to economize, should not you be willing to economize yourselves in your own offices? Do not take this $211,000 for your own clerical help. You can not justify it. It is not right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I would like two minutes more, if I may have them.

Mr. IRELAND. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Does not that mean that in less than six months there have been three-quarters of a million dollars added to the clerical force?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; that is true. It means that in two years Congressmen increase the pay to clerks in their offices from about $600,000 in the aggregate to over $1,600,000 in the aggregate, or $1,000,000 in two years, or 200 per cent. This is extravagance run wild. Men are mad for clerk hire. Now, if a man wants to increase the activities in his own office, there is not one of you that does not know that he can find some excuse for the use of $10,000. In other words, when you had $1,500 and had one clerk, you got along pretty well until this war broke. The war is over. My work was heavier during the demobilization than it will be again in many, many years. It is nothing more or less than an increase in your own office, which you try to justify on account of war. Oh, war, how many crimes are committed in thy name! Many Congressmen have members of their families as clerks; they have this right, but you ought not for this reason raid the Treasury for their benefit. I made this statement when the matter was up before. There is not a man in this House but knows that $3,200 will get him every cent that the Government ought to pay for clerk hire, and more, too. That is true. If you want to be fair with the American people; if you want to meet the demands made by the department clerks here; if you want to look people honestly in the eye, you should have the courage that you have when it comes to increasing the compensation of other people in other parts of the Government and keep the expenses down not only in the departments but in your own offices. Sweep in front of your own doors; and you Republicans should sound the warning now that you are going to be true to yourselves; and if you are, you can not be false to any man. Say that you are going to economize at home, in the office of every Congressman, in your own office, and then you will accomplish something to go before the country on.

Mr. WASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. If I have time.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman think that secretaries to Members of Congress are not entitled to the same percentage of increase that the administration gave to railroad employees and others?

Mr. SISSON. But we denied it to all those people who had their salaries fixed during the war. Those people who are under the regular civil-service rules, whose salaries were fixed years ago, are the ones who get the $240 bonus.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. I do not want to put myself in the attitude of indorsing very much of Democracy, but I must say that I heartily concur in the very able and interesting speech of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY]. It was the clearest and most sensible speech I ever heard a Democrat make, I think. [Laughter.]

I know from my own experience that the less handicap a Member of Congress has in the matter of utilizing the clerk-hire allowance the better it is for him and his work. What the people of my district want is not clerk hire for patronage purposes; they want good service from their Congressman, and they are sensible and liberal enough to trust him to handle it in the way that is best calculated to give them the highest efficiency possible from his office. I have never had any complaint of the way in which I have handled my allowance for clerk hire.

I am quite sure that many Members have had the same experience that I have had, and that is that there are certain periods of the year when the work is so voluminous and so congested that it can not possibly be done expeditiously even by two clerks. This is particularly true during the season when garden seeds and things of that sort are being distributed. It is also true, in a measure, as some one has suggested to me, during the period when a Member is engaged in a campaign for reelection.

Some gentlemen may be squeamish about acknowledging that, but I am not, because I think it is generally recognized that it is perfectly legitimate for a Member to utilize some of his clerical help to aid him in the heavier correspondence which is thrust upon him at such a time. As you know, we have been literally deluged with work practically all the year round ever since our entry into the European war, and there is no let-up in sight yet, even though the war is over. There have been many times in recent years when I have been compelled to employ temporarily four or five or even six clerks to look after different branches of my correspondence and the details of my work. And lest that might be construed as meaning that I do not give it my personal attention, I wish to say that all of the time that I can spare from

departmental and committee work and attendance upon the sessions of the House I devote to the routine work of my office, doing secretarial work which many Members leave almost entirely for their clerks to do. If the proposition as it is now presented by the committee is adopted, this congested situation to which I have referred can not possibly be met without the Member paying the expenses out of his own private funds, which is an embarrassment to a poor Member of Congress, who has to depend entirely upon his salary for support.

Mr. Chairman, the work of a Member of Congress in recent years has increased so many times over in volume—which is due to many causes which I need not stop to enumerate—that it is absolutely impossible now, at times, with all the work that the Member must do, for one employee, or even two, to attend promptly to the routine work of his office. It requires long training and experience for a clerk in a congressional office to be of real help to the Congressman, because there are so many details that it takes long training and actual contact with the work to be able to handle it. It is not only important, but much of it is of a very confidential nature, and if there is any class of appointments in the Government service that ought not to be made for political capital for the Congressman it is this class.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, I think that we ought to settle this matter here and now, not temporarily but permanently. We ought to make it a permanent law. I have been here now for more than 12 years, and every year of that time we have had this annual set-to over this question of clerk hire. Every year we have these insinuating, insulting, contemptible innuendoes thrown out that there are some Members of Congress who are trying to get the provision for clerk hire so framed as to enable them to purloin a part of it. I do not believe that there is a Member of this House, or that there ever was a Member of this House, who would do such a thing as that. During the 12 years or more that I have been here, and especially before the allowance was increased to $2,000, I spent on an average—and I would be willing to make oath to this statement—at least $50 a month, or over $6,000 in all, in excess of the clerk-hire allowance. This, of course, had to come out of my salary, which I could ill afford in view of the many other expenses and obligations that I had to meet.

I know from my personal acquaintanceship with the membership of this House that there are scores of others who have had exactly the same experience. I think the $3,200 allowance provided at the last session was perhaps enough, although I see no good reason why an employee in a Congressman's office should not receive the same benefits as an employee of the Government in the matter of a bonus. They have to live under the same conditions, meet the same high cost of living, and certainly work as hard as the average departmental employee, and in many cases harder. Speaking for myself, there is not one evening out of ten that I do not, in addition to being busy the entire day, stay in my office and work as late as 11 o'clock, and sometimes later—this to say nothing of working all day Sunday, which I am frequently compelled to do.

I hope this matter will be settled now and in a shape that will leave the membership with as much freedom as possible in the handling of this clerk hire and with as little handicap as may be. And I hope also that it will be settled in a manner that will be becoming the dignity of this great body, and settled by making it a permanent law.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, when I voted for the increased clerk hire last winter I did so with the understanding that the additional $1,200 was to be devoted to the hiring of an additional clerk, not that the clerk already employed, whoever he might be, should receive $3,200, and I believe that if we leave this resolution in such a way that it will enable any Member to pay his secretary $3,200 it will be a breach of faith on the part of this Congress.

I can not speak for any other Member's office, but I will say this, that as far as my office is concerned, I employ two clerks, to one of whom I pay $2,000 and the other $1,500. I am a man of small means, and I can not afford to continue paying $1,500 out of my salary indefinitely, and that is what caused me to vote for the increase in the clerk hire when the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill was up last winter.

Some talk has been had on the floor during this debate on what is being paid over in another body for clerk hire. I have taken the trouble to look the matter up, and with your permission I will read the figures:

Clerk hire to Senators who are not chairmen of Senate committees:
Secretary, $2,500; increase of $500 over previous acts.
Clerk, $1,600; increase of $400 over previous acts.
Assistant clerk, $1,500; increase of $300 over previous acts.
Messenger or clerk, $1,200, made statutory, 1919, from the contingent fund.
Each of the above clerks will receive the $240 bonus.

Now, I believe that the American people are willing that we should hire all the clerical help that is necessary to do the business we have on hand. I do not believe that they will object to our hiring sufficient help to handle expeditiously all the work that comes to us. In my office we endeavor to answer every letter the day it is received, and I often have to work 16 and 18 hours a day in order to do this. I for one will vote for the original resolution introduced by Mr. WOOD of Indiana. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I expect to offer, which, according to my opinion, would solve some of the difficulties that we have heard expressed on the floor to-day.

In the first place, I think we will all agree that each Member needs a secretary. My amendment would put that secretary on the roll on equal basis of compensation at $2,000 per annum. My amendment would go further and allow to each Member not to exceed $100 a month for such other necessary clerical assistance as he may need in the discharge of his official duties and certifies to the Clerk of the House. In my time I will read the amendment that I hope to have the opportunity to offer:

Strike out the committee amendment and insert the following: "That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall have for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, one secretary at $2,000 per annum; that in addition to such secretary there may be paid to each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner not to exceed $1,200 per annum for such other clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official duties, the same to be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives upon the certificate of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner that he has actually paid or agreed to pay such sum certified for such purpose."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall use the entire five minutes. I am in favor of the substitute presented by the Committee on Accounts. If I were writing that substitute, however, I would strike out, on line 24, page 2, the words "one or," so that the substitute would provide for two clerks, their names to be placed upon the rolls, with the amount each is to receive, as determined by the Member. And, further, hoping not to shock my friend from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] overmuch, I will announce that I am in favor of these clerks receiving the bonus. [Applause.]

I am not alarmed by the presentation of figures as to what it costs to properly conduct the public business brought before Members. If gentlemen think that Congress is costing too much, they might suggest a reduction of their own salaries. [Applause.]

I do not know with regard to the business of all the districts, but I do know that the very proper requests and inquiries of the people of my district require a very great deal of attention, and I know that I need clerks, and efficient clerks, to transact the business of my constituents and to look after their proper and legitimate public interests. I do not believe that we will have a greater allowance for clerk hire than we ought to have if we have $3,200 and, in addition to that, a bonus paid to two clerks. [Applause.]

There is one feature of this matter with regard to which I have a very fixed, definite, and emphatic opinion, and that is that the names of our clerks should go on the rolls. I think that everyone should know who our clerks are, and that the rolls should not only bear their names but the sums that we expect to pay them, dividing the sums as we see fit. So, Mr. Chairman, I think we shall best provide for this matter by striking out the words I have suggested in line 24, thus making provision for two clerks to be placed on the roll, the amount to be paid each to be fixed by the Member, each of which clerks shall receive the bonus.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield a minute?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the remainder of my time, three minutes, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, as has been said many times during the course of this debate, when this bill was up for passage, and did pass at the last session, there was no other thought in the mind of any Member who voted for this increase in the amount of clerk hire except that it should be paid to two persons. If at that time there had been any suggestion that one man was to receive $3,200, the propostion would not have received the required number of votes to put the legislation across. And I want to say to my friends on this side of the House that, almost to a man, those on my side of the aisle who are advocating the proposition that all this money should be paid to one man are chairmen of committees having additional clerks. I know that it will break down the morale of the clerks in your office and in mine if you pay $3,200 to some secretaries while others are paid $2,000.

I was sorry indeed to hear the great leader of the Democratic side make the suggestion that if we voted for giving the bonus to these clerks it would mean our political oblivion. I think that is a sad commentary upon the citizenship in your district and in mine. As I have had occasion to say before upon the floor of this House, I do not believe there are men or women of any consequence in your district or in mine who will object to paying a liberal living wage to these boys and girls whom we bring here from our homes to do the work of our constituents. It did not require very much persuasion on the part of those who were instrumental in securing the passage of the measure to give to the numerous clerks down in the departments the bonus of $240 a year. Why should we vote for that and still hesitate to give to our own clerks the same rights that are enjoyed by others? Simply because certain organizations of labor were backing these department clerks. I want to say to you that if Members' clerks should receive the indorsement of Mr. Gompers and others I doubt whether there would be as many men on the floor arguing that these boys and girls who are working in our offices—not 7½ hours a day, but from 14 to 16 hours a day—should not receive this bonus. I would like to see an amendment to this resolution that would give us one clerk at $2,000 a year and one assistant clerk at $1,200, and have it written into the law, if there is any doubt about it, that they are to get the bonus of $240 a year. I would be ashamed to represent a constituency for which I would have to appear before you on the floor of the House and apologize and tell you that I was estopped from voting to pay a decent living wage to some girl or some boy because I was afraid that in doing that I would be digging my political grave.

I want to say that if I represented such a constituency I would be ashamed to appear here on the floor of this House and make that acknowledgment. The men and women in my district are not different from the men and women in your districts. They are not caring how much you pay when the payment is justified. It is not my work that I am doing. It is not your work that you are doing here. It is work for the men and women living in your districts. You are working for them. It is their inquiries that you are answering. You are looking up matters for them in the departments, making investigations at the departments, not in your own interest, but in their interest, and they want these boys and girls who are assisting you to be paid a living wage.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield a minute?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall have for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties one secretary at $2,000 per annum and one clerk at $1,200 per annum, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and who shall be paid in monthly installments by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Such secretary and clerk shall be appointed by the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner and certified to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be entitled to the benefits of this provision.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I have an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. The committee amendment must be reported first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that amendments to be offered by Members from the floor wait until the reading of the joint resolution is completed.

Mr. BLACK. I suggest that it be read by sections rather than as a whole, and that now is the time to offer amendments.

Mr. CANNON. The committee amendment comes first.

Mr. BLACK. Certainly, if the gentleman offers it.

Mr. WALSH. It does not have to be offered. It offers itself when the joint resolution is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is under the impression that amendments should not be offered from the floor until the committee amendment is disposed of.

Mr. BLACK. I make the point of order that in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union bills are read by sections, and that this section having been read, an amendment is in order.

Mr. IRELAND. The committee amendment has not been read.

Mr. BLACK. It has not been offered yet.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee amendment is a substitute for the entire bill. The resolution should be read, and then the committee substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the Chair hold that amendments are not in order at the end of this section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the whole of the joint resolution should be read.

Mr. BLACK. I submit that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND], who has charge of the committee amendment, wants to offer it as a substitute he should offer it now and give notice that if his substitute is adopted he will move to strike out section 2; but now is the time to offer it.

Mr. MAPES. The Chair has ruled on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to offer his substitute now?

Mr. IRELAND. Not at present.

Mr. BLACK. Is the Chair going to hold that the whole resolution must be read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was under the impression that it would save time to read the whole of the joint resolution.

Mr. BLACK. But I have an amendment to this section.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the whole joint resolution may be read without interfering with the right of any Member to go back and offer an amendment to the first section after the reading is completed.

Mr. BLACK. I have no objection to an agreement of that kind, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the entire bill be read without prejudice to the right of any Member to offer an amendment in the first section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill, as follows:

That the appropriation in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 1, 1919, for clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners may be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to one or two persons to be designated by each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, the names of such persons to be placed upon the roll of employees of the House of Representatives together with the amount to be paid each, and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress shall likewise be entitled to make such designations: *Provided*, That such persons shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the substitute, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after the word "to," strike out the words "one or."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the substitute.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] has the floor.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I have offered in the belief that it pleases the greater number of the Members of the House. It was thought that in a few isolated cases, and a very few cases, that it was desired to give a Member an option or a privilege of retaining one secretary or clerk if he so desired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, will it make any provision as to the amount of salary to be paid to each of the two persons, or is it to give each Member the privilege of dividing it so that he may pay $1 to one and $3,199 to the other?

Mr. IRELAND. It might.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. As to how this will be construed if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois shall prevail, the effect of this amendment is to require the Member to put two persons on the roll?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. And a man, I assume, could not draw anything unless the Member puts two persons on the roll?

Mr. IRELAND. I should say not.

Mr. GARRETT. If a Member desired to put one person on the roll at $2,000 and leave the other out, he could not do it.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes; I imagine he could.

Mr. GARRETT. Then he could put one person on the roll at $3,199 and not draw anything for the other.

Mr. IRELAND. The gentleman's legal opinion is far superior to mine. It is not to be supposed that Members are going to do the ridiculous thing or that they will take advantage of this provision. They would hold themselves up to public ridicule if they did such a thing as that.

Mr. GARRETT. Let me suggest to the gentleman that I may have put a very extreme case; but take a different basis. Might it not be said that you must divide it equally, $1,600 to one and $1,600 to another? If you are going to regulate it——

Mr. IRELAND. It was the idea of the committee not to regulate it.

Mr. GARRETT. And yet, if you strike out the word "one" and compel him to appoint two, what division is a Member to make?

Mr. IRELAND. Any that he desires; but he would not want to make himself ridiculous by giving one member $1 and the balance to the other clerk.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want recognition after this amendment is disposed of.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] one question.

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does it not seem a proper solution of the difficulty to try to make the bill meet the necessity of Members? Every Member wants a secretary—a very good man or woman—and then provide for $2,000 or whatever sum you determine shall be paid to that secretary; then, as every Member knows, there comes a high tide of business in his office. Why in the name of common sense do not we provide a total amount of money, beyond what we pay the secretary—say $2,000—that may be spent by the Member of Congress according to his necessities, paid out to three or four people in one month if he needs them, or to nobody in the next month if he does not need any? I know there comes a time in my office when there is a very large amount of business and when I want three or four people.

Mr. IRELAND. If you had such a provision as that, it would require additional clerks to keep track of it, and it would complicate it very much.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It seems to me it is a practical thing. Let each Member turn in the vouchers; put a limit beyond which he can not go, and let him turn in the vouchers to show the amount of money he has expended.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND], because it will confuse a situation which is already sufficiently confused. I do not believe as Members of the House that we should put ourselves in control of those whom we appoint to assist us in our offices. The tendency of all the recent legislation has been to do that very thing—to take away from the Member of the House the right to administer his own affairs.

I do not object to the appropriation of $3,200 for clerk hire. I did not vote for it as it was presented in the act approved March 1, 1919, because I foresaw then exactly what happened—that clerks would compare notes, that one would complain to his Member and another would complain to her Member, with a result that certain very necessary inequalities would be shown, which it would be difficult to explain to the people back home and to the county newspapers; but I observed then what I observe now, that the work of the Members of Congress is constantly increasing, and has been and will, so long as these extra sessions are held. I can not get along with one clerk. I have a splendid secretary, but he knows nothing about stenography or typewriting. I would not dispense with his services, and yet, while he might be worth $3,200, if I gave him that amount then everything else I have in the way of clerk hire would have to be paid for out of my pocket. I must have two sometimes, sometimes three, sometimes four and five persons to do my work here and in Philadelphia, where my district is. I do not intend to vote to have others say how my office work shall be apportioned.

I propose that my office shall be run as I say it shall be run, or until the people who elect me turn me out. I am not elected by the clerks or by my fellow Members. I am elected by a vast constituency, and to them I am responsible. It may be all right for the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has an excellent clerk, who can also run a type machine, and who can take all of the correspondence and attend to it, who can meet all of the people who come and go, to pay him the entire amount of $3,200, but my secretary is over yonder most of the time, and he has a stenographer, and I have one here, and there are times when there are extra people in my office. We all have plenty to do. Must I put three or more names, even per diem employees, upon the pay roll here and report every one of them, though I may not have the same assistants during the next month or the next year? The effect of the gentleman's amendment, so long as I have not time to discuss it at length, would be this: Whereas when we passed this $3,200 provision, every clerk was willing to take the $3,200, and let the Member go to Ballyhack to get the extra work done; now, if this amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and presented in the form of an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] passes, the second clerk whom you now employ would expect $1,600. You have another scrap in some of your offices the minute this amendment passes. It is going to lead you into discussion and trouble.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman agree with the construction of this amendment given by the gentleman from Illinois, that unless you do put two people on the roll you can not get anything? At least I understood that to be his construction.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I expect that the moment that this amendment passes there will be two persons in the gentleman's office and in the office of the gentleman from Illinois who will be wondering who is going to get the most money, and that question will have to be determined. Each clerk will probably claim $1,600 or more. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggests to me that he does control his office. Let me say to him that his position and that of every chairman in the House is vastly different from that of other Members who have no special appointments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We do not all have special clerks assigned to us, and we who are not chairmen do not have committee clerks.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This matter is one that has been before the subcommittee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for 10 years. Last year it was thought that the plan outlined in the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] would be agreeable to the membership of the House. A similar resolution passed the House but failed of final enactment. If there is one thing that tends more to corrupt the executive departments and bring about inefficiency in the service more than anything else, if there is any one thing that the people of America are condemning to-day, it is the matter of appropriating lump-sum appropriations. We must stop it. [Applause.] We have said that we were going to get away from it. We have said that we denounced it, and yet seriously here is a proposition that we will bring the lump-sum appropriation right to our own offices and each Member will have $3,200 to do with as he pleases within the limits of clerk hire if we adopt the resolution the committee brought out. When we passed the resolution last winter it was with the unanimous judgment of the committee that every Member should have all of the clerk hire that he needed, but this resolution is quite different, for it will give him what we are denying practically to every department of the Government.

Take the legislative bill all the way through and we have given each department a chief clerk, so many clerks of class 4, so many clerks of class 3, and so on. And now we say that we are going to make an exception to that rule. In that bill you will find that there are a large number of Senators who are not chairmen of committees, and each has a clerk at the rate of $2,500 a year. Enact this legislation and I have no doubt some of those Senators not chairmen of committees and others will demand clerks at $3,200, and that will mean an annual appropriation of $200,000 or more for that purpose. I think we should agree to the amendment offered to the amendment so as to have two clerks, just as was intended when Congress passed the bill. But you say there are times when a person wants more than two clerks. That may be true, but there are times when every executive department needs more clerks, but what we have to do is to have our secretaries so arrange their work that they can per-

form it with the allowance that we have made. My own judgment is that we will get along better, we will not transgress the rules that we have laid down for the other departments, if we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and then vote down the amendment as amended, because what we do want is a permanent proposition. If you do not enact a permanent law at this time, you will have this same fight that has been going on over and over again ever since I have been a Member of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose we do what the gentleman suggests, would he then advocate the adoption of the first and second paragraphs of the resolution?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would fix specifically the salary of the secretary at $2,000 and the clerk at $1,200?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and if this amendment is adopted I propose to offer another amendment limiting the amount to $2,000 which any Member can pay to one person.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman I think I would vote for that amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The only way for the gentleman from Illinois to get recognition will be by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT. Oh, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the Chairman hold that it is not competent for me to move to strike out the last word? Is not that an amendment?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That motion has already been made.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, all right; I am willing to abide by the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. IRELAND), there were—ayes 146, noes 69.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Is a substitute to the entire committee amendment in order—a provision to the amendment that amends the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not by way of amendment——

Mr. GOOD. I desire to offer a preferential amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor? I want a ruling from the Chair whether or not I was recognized and have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized to speak, but his amendment can not be voted upon at the present time.

Mr. MADDEN. Have I the right to debate it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD——

Mr. MADDEN. I want my amendment reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Strike out the amendment of the committee and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall be allowed for clerical assistants necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties $3,200 per annum, payable in monthly installments. The name or names of such person or persons with the address of each so employed to be filed with the Clerk of the House, together with the amount or amounts paid or to be paid such person or persons."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offered a substitute for the entire committee amendment. That can not be voted upon until the paragraph is perfected, but the gentleman from Illinois can proceed to speak upon the proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, just prior to the close of the Sixty-fifth Congress an item was reported in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill providing for the expenditure of $3,200 per annum for clerk hire for each Member. Up to that time $2,000 had been allowed. Twelve hundred additional means 60 per cent of an increase. That is more increase than has been permitted or allowed in any one activity of the Government during the war. Nobody supposed that anybody expected that more than $3,200 would be collected for this purpose, but now after we have had a breathing spell of a few months we find a desire to collect $240 a year bonus for each and every man or woman who may be placed upon the roll. Now, if we want $3,680 a year for clerk hire, why do we not say so? If $3,200 is not enough, make it $3,680, and if we act in good faith we will say beyond question $3,200 is all we said we wanted. That is 60 per cent more than was ever paid before. Now, if you want to increase it by 25 per cent more by indirection, I do not believe there is a man on the floor of this House who would dare to vote to make this $3,680——

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not; and yet if we do what the amendment of the chairman of this committee proposes, you have done by indirection what I am afraid you would not propose to do directly. Now, what is my proposal? My proposal is to make the law paying $3,200 permanent law. The proposal that you have before you is temporary. It may be good for this year, but it can not be good for more. If you adopt my amendment you have adopted a permanent law and you have allowed all that should be allowed for the payment of clerk hire for any man of this House, I do not care how busy a man he may be. Oh, you say that the work of my office is so intense that it can not be done for $3,200. Well, I will undertake to do the work in any of your offices for less than that if it becomes necessary.

Mr. IRELAND. For how long?

Mr. MADDEN. For any year, any year.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman could not do it.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say to you now the thing which I have proposed is an honest proposal.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I want to ask the gentleman how much he pays per annum in his own office?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, if I have to pay I pay it out of my own pocket.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will not yield; no. What do I propose? I propose to make permanent law. I propose to pay $3,200 a year for clerk hire. That is what you voted for, that is what the people of the United States think you wanted, and that is all that you expected. That is what you said you needed. Did you mean it?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is not as much as the gentleman pays himself.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, that is nobody's business what I do. I do not take it out of the Public Treasury. I have the right do with my own funds what I please.

I make no apology to anybody for what I do with what I own, as long as I do not break the law. Now, what do I do? I say to the Members of this House that we place at your disposal $3,200, and if you place the people whom you pay on the roll of the Clerk of the House, you shall indicate how much you pay within the $3,200; that whether you employ 1 or 10 or 20 stenographers, you do not spend more than $3,200; and that if, whether you employ 1 or 10 or 20 stenographers you do not spend more than $3,200, that is your business. The question is, Is the membership of the House prepared to say that no Member of this House is qualified to manage the expenditure of $3,200 a year? If you vote against the amendment I have offered, that is what you will say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has offered an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 3, line 7, after the word "cause," insert:

"*Provided*, That no person so employed shall receive an excess of $2,000 of the $3,200 appropriated for clerk hire for each Member."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen will note the wording of that amendment. It does not involve the question of a bonus at all. I think that there can be a great deal said in favor of these clerks receiving the bonus. The clerks over in the Senate will receive it; but whether or not you want to give them a bonus, I have tried to separate it in this amendment so as to bring the proposition fairly and squarely before the House that out of the $3,200 appropriated not more than $2,000 of that sum can be paid to one person. Now, what would be done? We have stricken out the words "one or," in line 24, page 2, and, just as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] says, unless we do adopt some further amendment that amendment is meaningless, because a person can employ two clerks, one at $1 a year and one at $3,199 a year, or any place between the two. Now, I contend that it will be much

better to adopt the resolution that $2,000 be paid to our clerks with $1,200 for the stenographer. This Congress, pledged to economy, can not afford to say we will pay $2,500 or $3,000 to any one of our clerks.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I want to ask the gentleman if the clerks of the House and clerks of the Senate do not receive that bonus under the present law?

Mr. GOOD. At the present time the clerks of the House do not.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I am speaking of the clerks of the committees and clerks of the House.

Mr. GOOD. I am not sure about that.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask if this is the last amendment the gentleman proposes to offer to this paragraph?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I want to ask the gentleman, if his amendment should be adopted and then the committee amendment as amended by the two amendments shall stand as the law, would it be necessary for a person to put a $1,200 employee on in order to get the $2,000?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely not.

Mr. GARRETT. Why not?

Mr. GOOD. Because you can employ not more than two persons. You might as well say it would apply in the executive departments, where we appropriate so much money for so many clerks, and in many of which departments at times they do not use all of the amount appropriated and do not employ all of the clerks authorized. I know about that.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman misunderstands me, I fear. The House adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND], which strikes out "one or" and says, in substance, that this money shall be paid to two persons, and absolutely to two persons. Now, all that the gentleman's proviso does is to say that neither of them shall get more than $2,000; but in order for one of them to get $2,000 you must, whether you want to or not, pay the other one $1,200.

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely not. The Comptroller of the Treasury has ruled hundreds of times that because we provide by appropriations for 10 clerks, say, at given salaries, and appropriate a certain amount, that it is not necessary to employ more than 1 if there is no use for the others. It is the common sense of it. And in this case if a Member wants only a clerk at $2,000 he could have it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa does this, if I read it correctly: It permits any Member of this House to appoint two people at $1,600 each, and each one of them will get $240 bonus, and still be under the $2,000.

Mr. IRELAND. I rise in opposition, Mr. Chairman. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], so far as I am personally concerned I should follow along the lines he indicates. I should like to appoint my clerk at $2,000 a year, and not to exceed it, but it seems like a trifle of selfishness to me. We are not considering the man who lives on the Pacific slope and has to bring a secretary here. Of course, he wants to bring a good secretary, and he wants to give as efficient service as we who live at closer range, and he is under a handicap in bringing a secretary here at vast expense.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman should remember that those Members get a thousand dollars a year mileage.

Mr. IRELAND. The Member does, but the secretary does not.

Mr. GOOD. Well, the Member gets it, just as the Member has received the clerk hire.

Mr. IRELAND. And he usually expends several times that. Do you not do so?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SISSON. I move to strike out the last word. [Cries of "Vote! Vote!"] I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Members to be mistaken about this. If the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is adopted, and there is a division of your clerk hire, so that each clerk gets $1,600, under that amendment the $240 bonus can still be paid, because $1,840 will be paid as salary to each clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order to do so. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 88, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I offered be reported.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I have an amendment to the substitute, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, at the end of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I move to strike out the period and insert a colon and add the following provision——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the House is now perfecting the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] has a preferential amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I have a preferential amendment that I wish to have the Clerk report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has a preferential amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. An amendment or substitute is pending to the committee resolution, and a substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is also pending before the House. You have a right to offer an amendment to the committee amendment and an amendment to the substitute. The gentleman from Texas has been attempting to offer an amendment to the substitute, and that gives him the floor, and nobody can take him from the floor. The preference is a preference to him not to offer an amendment, but as to the order in which it is presented to the House. The preference relates entirely to the submission of the matter to the House for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK (reading)—

Provided, That no one person employed shall receive a greater compensation than $2,000 per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the Madden substitute offered by Mr. BLACK: At the end of the substitute insert "*Provided*, That no one person employed as clerk shall receive a greater compensation than $2,000 per annum."

Mr. BLACK. Now, Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the substitute of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and adopt the amendment that I have offered, we will provide the same sum of $3,200 for clerk hire for Members as was provided in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill which we enacted last March. If we adopt the committee substitute which has been offered by the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND], we not only vote that $3,200 but we will vote an additional bonus of $480 to be paid to the two clerks, which will add $210,000 to the amount which we are about to provide for clerk hire.

Now, let us see what situation that leaves us in. In 1916 the entire appropriation for clerk hire was $660,000. For the fiscal year 1917 we increased it to $880,000. In our bill in March of this year we provided an appropriation of $1,408,000, and if we adopt the committee substitute that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] has offered, we will add $210,000 more, making an aggregate for clerk hire of more than $1,618,000, or nearly $1,000,000 more for clerk hire than we had in 1916.

I submit that such extravagance is indefensible, and I for one will not vote for it.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. IRELAND. Would not that be true with the original bill? But has my amendment anything to do with hanging on the bonus?

Mr. BLACK. No. I do not think they would draw the bonus at all, under the original bill passed in March, 1919.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is talking about the original resolution.

Mr. BLACK. Let me explain first to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] that I understood the gentleman to mean the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill passed in March carried the bonus and from that statement I dissent, but if he means resolution No. 104, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], of course I agree with him in his statement that his amendment does not add anything to that. Both propositions carry the bonus payment and that is why I am objecting to them and intend to vote against both.

Mr. IRELAND. And also to the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] last session, and by implication the appropriation bill as well.

Mr. BLACK. I do not agree with the gentleman as to the last part of his statement.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As the gentleman's amendment has been read, would not this be the result, that the $2,000 man would not receive the bonus but that the other man would?

Mr. BLACK. No. Under the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] neither one is put on the roll, and therefore neither would receive the bonus, but the whole $3,200 is to be allowed to the Member for clerk hire, provided that he certifies that he has actually expended that much for such purpose. My amendment limits the amount to be paid to any one clerk to $2,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Do I understand that the gentleman an hour ago was advocating the payment of the bonus to the $2,000 clerk and not to the $1,200 clerk?

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman has not understood me to advocate the bonus in either case. If I had my preference and if the House would follow me, I would give each Member a secretary at $2,000 and such additional amount for clerk hire as he might certify that he had actually expended, not to exceed $100 per month.

Mr. FLOOD. And cut out the bonus?

Mr. BLACK. If my amendment is adopted here, yes; and I would be glad to see it adopted.

Mr. FLOOD. Has the gentleman changed his views?

Mr. BLACK. No; I have not changed my views. I have not expressed any contrary views. I believe that the House is either going to adopt the original proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] or the substitute by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I prefer the latter, and I would be glad to see it amended so that not more than $2,000 could be paid to each clerk. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois—and the same question applies to the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS]—why are the words "Resident Commissioner" left out in that section?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. They ought not to be left out.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The words "Resident Commissioner" are left out in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois and in the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi. Is not that an inadvertence?

Mr. IRELAND. Those words should be inserted.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I move to insert the words "or Resident Commissioner."

Mr. McARTHUR. Why not ask unanimous consent?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREYS: On page 2, line 8, after the word "Congress"——

Mr. CALDWELL. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that that is the wrong place. It should be on page 3, line 4, insert what is on page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREYS: Page 3, line 4, after the word "designation," insert "and Representatives and Delegates to Congress and Resident Commissioners."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A point of order. The amendment is not offered in proper form.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that he send up his amendment in writing.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the resolution and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object——

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND]——

Mr. KEARNS. I move a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the motion of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KEARNS. I am making a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] has the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to know what is the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the Chair recognize me to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to know what is the motion of the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is seeking information from the Chair, and the Chair is seeking information from the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the resolution and all amendments thereto and to the substitutes close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by making it 20 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know whether that motion is debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. I move to amend by making it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] moves to amend the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] by making it 20 minutes instead of 10 minutes. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Illinois by moving that all debate close now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment reported by the committee may be amended so as to include the words "Resident Commissioners." I move to amend, in line 3, page 3, by striking out the word "and," after the word "Representatives," and insert the words "and Resident Commissioners" after the word "Delegates."

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the Ireland amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. When this resolution was called up the other day the chairman, when the unanimous consent was agreed to, assured us that we would have plenty of time and opportunity to offer amendments and vote upon them. That was again assured us to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no objection to offering amendments, but debate has been closed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: At the end of the resolution, on page 3, after the word "cause," on line 7, as a new paragraph insert the following new section, to wit:

"SEC. 2. That after June 30, 1919, Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners in the Congress of the United States shall not appoint to any position, the salary for which is paid by the Government, any person related within the third degree by consanguinity or affinity to the Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such appointment, and all existing appointments violative of the intent and purpose of this provision shall terminate before July 1, 1919."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation and not germane to the subject matter. This only has to do with the secretaries and clerks of Members of the House of Representatives, and the gentleman's amendment deals with clerks of Senators as well as of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas covers Senators' clerks as well as Members of the House, and therefore is not germane, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the substitute be again reported.

The Clerk again read the substitute.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McARTHUR. Is this to make it permanent law?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. IRELAND) there were 131 yeas and 102 noes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MADDEN and Mr. IRELAND.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 125, noes 134.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee substitute.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. If the committee substitute is voted down, will the vote recur on the Wood resolution?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. And that is permanent law.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the original text.

Mr. WALSH. That is not now in order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. After line 19, page 2, to insert the amendment that I have proposed.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, no point of order would lie against this. We have a right to perfect the text.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the committee is now perfecting the amendment offered by the committee, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri would not be in order at this time, the Chair thinks.

Mr. ALEXANDER. But would be in order later?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; if this is voted down.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the committee amendment is not agreed to, then the matter recurs upon the original resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that we have to vote upon the substitute before the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is in order? That can not be sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that we can save time by doing it in that way. The gentleman's rights are not in any way taken from him.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That may be, but if the gentleman wishes to offer his amendment before the vote is taken on the substitute, he surely has the right to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right. The gentleman's rights will not be interfered with. He could offer it now or he could offer it later, just as he desires.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I have the right to offer that amendment to the original text now and have it voted on before the substitute is voted on, and I desire to have that done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ALEXANDER: At the end of line 19, page 2, insert:

"*Provided*, That such secretaries and clerks shall not be entitled to receive the bonus provided for in the executive, legislative, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALEXANDER) there were—yeas 37, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the text of the original resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK moves to strike out all the language on page 1, after the enacting clause, and also on page 2, down to and including line 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall have for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and Representative duties one secretary, at $2,000 per annum, whose name shall be placed on the rolls and who shall be paid in monthly installments by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Such secretary shall be appointed by the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner and certified to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, with or without cause: *Provided*, That in addition to such secretary there may be paid to each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner not to exceed $1,200 per annum for such other clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and Representative duties, the same to be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives from time to time upon the certificate of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner that he has actually paid or agreed to pay such sum certified for such purpose: *Provided further*, That Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress, whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to the benefit of this provision."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the Black amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send it up.

Mr. BLANTON. After the word "rolls" insert the words "who shall not be paid any bonus."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for one minute.

Mr. BLANTON. But I have been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will not be deprived of his right.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for one minute, in order to make an announcement in which the Members of the House will be interested.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Pessoa, President elect of our neighbor Republic of Brazil, is visiting the United States as the guest of the Nation. At the request of the Speaker of the House our distinguished guest is now in the Capitol Building. The Speaker and the Members desire to have the opportunity to meet and greet Dr. Pessoa and the members of his party. With that object in view I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GOOD having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House joint resolution 104 and had come to no conclusion thereon.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now stand in recess for 15 minutes to meet the President elect of Brazil, Dr. Pessoa.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, one minute. Is it the intention of the gentleman from Wyoming after we resume our session to continue to proceed with the bill at present under consideration?

Mr. MONDELL. If it is the desire of the House, which I hope it will be.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess for 15 minutes.

RECEPTION TO PRESIDENT ELECT OF BRAZIL.

At 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m. the Speaker escorted Dr. Epitacia Pessoa, President elect of Brazil, to the rostrum.

Dr. Pessoa was accompanied by Mr. Moreira, chargé d'affaires of Brazil; Mr. Pessoa Quiroz; Capt. Burlemoqui, naval aid; and Mr. Barroso.

Also by Mr. Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State; Mr. Breckinridge Long, Third Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. Justice H. Stabler, Chief, Latin-American Division.

Mr. Hallett Johnson, Mr. George Corwin Tyler.

Also by Rear Admiral W. D. Caperton.

Maj. Gen. Joseph E. Kuhn.

Maj. S. W. Cramer.

Commander Cecil Sherman Baker.

Lieut. Commander W. Y. Boyd.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, knowing that you would all be glad and proud to meet the President elect of our great sister Republic of Brazil, who is visiting

this city as the Nation's guest, I invited him on your behalf to come to the Capitol at his convenience, and he has come this afternoon. The United States has for a hundred years declared to the world its special interest in the other Governments of this hemisphere. I believe that interest was never greater than it is to-day, and I am sure it was never more disinterested. All that we wish is that there should prevail among our family of nations on this hemisphere a reign of peace, amity, and law, so that our friendly relations and our commercial intercourse may constantly strengthen and increase. [Applause.] We hail this visit of our distinguished guest as a step in that direction. [Applause.] Our relations with Brazil have always been most friendly, but I assure you, sir, that just now there is a peculiar warmth of sentiment and affection, for we can not forget how promptly your nation followed our example and declared war against the common enemy of mankind. [Applause.] You cast in your lot with us, and we shall long remember it.

And so, Your Excellency, we welcome you most heartily to this Capitol, both on account of the distinction you yourself have achieved and on account of the great Republic which you represent. We thank you for accepting our invitation to come here, and the Members will now avail themselves, with pride and pleasure, of this opportunity to meet you personally. [Applause.] [Cries of "Speech!" "Speech!"]

Dr. PESSOA. Gentlemen, I am very glad and very proud of the honor you tender to me by receiving me in the Hall of your House of Representatives. It is a pity I can not speak the English language sufficiently to express all my thanks, but I assure you that Brazil will not forget the honor you tender to her representatives. [Applause.]

Dr. Pessoa and the members of his party then took their places at the right of the Speaker's rostrum and the Members of the House were presented to them.

The distinguished visitors were then escorted from the Hall of the House by the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called together by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Speaker of the House and the President elect of Brazil during the recess be printed in the proper place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day's proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the remarks of the Speaker and of the President elect of Brazil during the recess be printed in their proper place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House again resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution No. 104.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution No. 104, with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the resolution by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 104, providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, is it in order to have the amendment pending reread in the committee before voting on it?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WATKINS moves to amend: Page 3, line 7, after the word "cause" insert:

"SEC. 2. That each Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner be allowed no more than $2,000 per annum for his entire clerical help."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the committee substitute were to be voted down, which I hope it will not be, will it then be in order to offer a further amendment to the original resolution?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes so. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it be reported.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. IRELAND. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 129, noes 84.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. IRELAND and Mr. HUMPHREYS took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 141, noes 68.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House joint resolution 104 and had directed him to report the same to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment?

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] moves the previous question on the resolution as amended to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I demand a separate vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. IRELAND. There is only one amendment, Mr. Speaker, and that is equivalent to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that there is but one amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. The statement was made that a favorable vote on the amendment was equivalent to passing the bill. I want to ask the Speaker if the amendment was voted down if the vote does not then recur on the original resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know what the amendment is.

Mr. SIMS. It is a substitute for the original resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the amendment is in the nature of a substitute. Therefore, if the amendment is voted down, the vote would then come upon the original resolution.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that question I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment. Those in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-one gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands the other side. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen have risen in the negative. On this vote the ayes are 31, noes 218, not a sufficient number demanding the yeas and nays.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the bill as amended to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. That will come later. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to it?

Mr. MADDEN. I am, every inch of it.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman a member of the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is anyone who is a member of the committee opposed to the resolution? If not, the Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would not Mr. WOOD of Indiana, the introducer of the resolution, have the right to make the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not know that he was the introducer of the resolution. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moves to recommit the House joint resolution to the Committee on Accounts with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all of the committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall be allowed for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and Representative duties $3,200 per annum, payable in monthly installments, the name or names of such person or persons, with the address of each so employed, to be filed with the Clerk of the House, together with the amount or amounts paid or to be paid such person or persons."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the motion to recommit and insert a substitute.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my motion to amend by striking out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and all amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to modify his motion.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion to recommit involves the striking out of a committee amendment that is already agreed to, and that a motion to recommit striking out an amendment which has already been agreed to is not in order.

Mr. MADDEN. I move, Mr. Speaker, that my instruction be modified so as to strike out all after the enacting clause. I do not have to have consent to do that.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois give attention? Does the gentleman mean—he does not state it in his motion—to strike out all after the enacting clause?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken; that the committee has already substituted an amendment for everything after the enacting clause, and what the committee has already inserted can not be taken out.

Mr. WALSH. The House has done that, too.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I now move to recommit the resolution to the committee with instructions to report the same back forthwith, amended as follows.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD of Indiana moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Accounts, with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That hereafter each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives shall have for clerical assistance necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties one secretary at $2,000 per annum and one clerk at $1,200 per annum, whose names shall be placed on the rolls and who shall be paid in monthly installments by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Such secretary and clerk shall be appointed by the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner and certified to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be entitled to the benefits of this provision.

"SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect July 1, 1919, and that the appropriation for clerical assistance for the fiscal year 1920 carried in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes,' shall be applied during said fiscal year in the manner above set forth."

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against that motion.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] makes a point of order, and the Chair is constrained again to sustain the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. What is the gentleman's point of order?

The SPEAKER. The point of order, the Chair supposes, is the same as before. The Chair will state that this is a peculiar situation. The Committee of the Whole has stricken out the entire resolution as it originally stood and has reported a substitute. Now that substitute is an amendment, and the House can not strike out an amendment which already has been adopted by the committee and by the House. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CANNON. Is another motion to recommit in order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. It is, because both the motions which have been offered were subject to a point of order, and it is practically the same as if no motion to recommit had been offered. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Accounts with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment. At the end of the joint resolution insert:

"*Provided*, That one of the clerks appointed by the Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Member shall receive $1,200 per annum."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question being taken, the motion was rejected.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

Mr. WALSH. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. That motion comes too late. One motion has already been offered.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays. As many as favor taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Forty-two Members, not a sufficient number.

Mr. DYER. I ask for the other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks for the other side. Those opposed to taking the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] On the demand for the yeas and nays, the ayes are 42 and the noes are 214. Not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The ayes have it. The joint resolution is passed.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Clerk be authorized and instructed to amend the title to conform to the text of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the Clerk be authorized and instructed to amend the title to conform to the text of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. IRELAND, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend very briefly my remarks on the clerk-hire resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the joint resolution just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 4226, being the District of Columbia appropriation bill, disagree to all the amendments placed thereon by the Senate, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the District of Columbia appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. SISSON. I reserve the right to object for the purpose of seeing whether we can make an agreement as to time for debate. How much time does the gentleman from Minnesota want?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not care for any.

Mr. SISSON. I should like to have not less than 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman take 25 minutes?

Mr. SISSON. I have three matters that I should like to discuss at this time.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We will give you 25 minutes, and we want 10 minutes on this side.

Mr. SISSON. Then make it 35 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. All right, 35 minutes. Personally I do not care to consume any time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that debate on this bill be limited to 35 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the question of unanimous consent has not been granted to take this matter from the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is right. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to take the bill from the Speaker's table?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to limit debate to 35 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Now I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

DISTRICT BUSINESS IN ORDER TO-MORROW.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield for me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business which was in order to-day under the rule be in order to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the District business in order to-day may be in order to-morrow.

Mr. MONDELL. With the understanding that it shall not interfere with conference reports or matters on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. With the understanding that it shall not interfere with conference reports and matters on the Speaker's table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, of course I can not go into the matter as I would like to go into it, but in view of the fact that we have many new Members here I want to discuss one proposition which is in this bill and has been in controversy for several years.

Taxation always has been and always will be a subject of controversy. There has perhaps never been devised by man a system of taxation under which every man should pay exactly his portion of the taxation and never more nor less than what he ought to pay. The American system in theory is as nearly perfect as it can be made; that is, that all taxation shall be equal and uniform. Every State in levying its taxes must apply the tax law fairly and impartially to every man in the State. The Federal Government must also observe the same just rule. The same rule should be followed in the District of Columbia not only in the application of the rule to every man in the District alike but the people of the District of Columbia for the blessings, benefits, and privileges which they enjoy should pay taxes equally and uniformly and in amount about what other States pay. This is just and fair, and every man in the District of Columbia has not only the right to expect this but the right to demand it. On the other hand, because he lives in the District of Columbia he has no right to a special privilege and no right to have the Federal Treasury pay any part of his just taxes. The question is, under the present law in force in the District of Columbia, Does the citizen of the District pay what he ought to pay for the benefits and privileges which he enjoys?

The people of the District of Columbia occupy a position which is not occupied by the people of any other portion of the Government. The fathers of the Republic desired the seat of government to be on land controlled absolutely by Congress. The State of Maryland ceded to the Federal Government her sovereignty over the 65 square miles upon which the city of Washington now stands. Under that cession Congress, as the representative of the people of all the States, have been vested with all sovereignty over the territory which the State of Maryland had before the cession. This was done so that the will of Congress should be absolute and supreme in that territory. This could only have been brought about by having one of the States voluntarily surrender its sovereignty over some of its territory. I, therefore, take no stock in the idea that the people of the District of Columbia have any right to complain that they do not have the right of suffrage as the people of the States have. This is the seat of government. The District of Columbia was created for that purpose. Every man coming into the District is charged with knowledge of this and no one in the District is compelled to remain, but as long as he does remain he must remain with the distinct idea and understanding that the property of the District must be subject first to the needs of the Government. Personally, I am sorry that the Congress did not acquire title to all the property in the District of Columbia and absolutely own it as we do the Canal Zone and run the District purely as a governmental institution.

This, however, was not done, and we must deal with the problem as it confronts us to-day. Several times on former occasions the Congress has experimented by permitting the people of the District of Columbia to run their own affairs. Each and every experiment has proved a monumental failure. The failure that brought about the present condition of affairs in the District occurred just after the Civil War. The negro population were vested with the right of suffrage along with the whites. A few residing white men were able to organize the negro vote and control it for their own benefit, and during the years of that control the so-called Legislature of the District of Columbia was so bad in its legislation and in its extravagance that the District of Columbia was plunged into bankruptcy. Corruption and graft was the rule and not the exception. A saturnalia of crime was daily enacted, and the people of the United States, who had the right to expect the District of Columbia to be decently governed, and especially the Congress of the United States, who had been vested with the sovereignty and charged with the responsibility of governing this small territory, found themselves confronted with a horrible condition. After quite a good deal of debate and discussion the present form of government was instituted.

In 1878 the District of Columbia was about $44,000,000 in debt. The population was about 60,000. A very large floating debt not covered by bonds was being carried. Bonds could not be sold in the market to take up this floating indebtedness, because no one had any confidence in the then District government. The bonds that had then been issued were about falling due, and these bonds could not be refunded because there would be no sale for them. Without going further into details, as I would like to do, about the condition at that time and as to what transpired in the two Houses, it is only necessary to say a joint commission was appointed, which recommended the present system of government which we have here, whereby the Federal Treasury, in view of the enormous indebtedness of the District of Columbia, agreed to pay one-half of the expenses of the District government during the time that this indebtedness was so overwhelming. If this had not been done it would have meant confiscation of private property and bankruptcy of the property owners of the District of Columbia. In order that the bonds might be sold and the debts paid, the Congress also underwrote all of the bonded indebtedness of the District of Columbia and agreed to pay half of the debt, which Congress had had nothing to do with incurring.

So, under that arrangement, the Federal Government assumed 50 per cent of the debt, and from that day to the present moment has been paying 50 per cent of that debt and one-half of the interest as it accrues, and has been since paying 50 per cent of all the expenses of the District of Columbia.

But I want to call attention to this fact, that at the time they fixed the rate of taxation in the District of Columbia at a higher rate than the District now pays, even then the rate was not as high as was paid by most cities. But since that time they have from time to time reduced the rate in the District of Columbia until it reached the very low rate at which it now stands.

This, of course, could not have been done if the Federal Government had not continued for all these years to pay one-half of the District expenses. The Government thus coming to the rescue, the District of Columbia was able to float the bonds at 3.65, which was a very cheap rate of interest at that time for any city to pay. But the District of Columbia enjoyed that

special privilege because the Federal Government guaranteed payment of the debt.

In 1922 all of these bonds will be due and paid. A sinking fund was created at the time to take care of the principal and accrued interest. Since that time wonderful improvements have been made in all of the facilities necessary to conduct an up-to-date municipal government. So that under that arrangement the District of Columbia has continued to pay only one half of her expenses and the Federal Government the other half. The rate of taxation has not been changed for years, nor has the rule of assessment been changed. The assessment then provided that property should be assessed at two-thirds of its value and that 1 per cent would be collected upon its full value or 1½ per cent on the two-thirds value.

I call your special attention to one feature of the law that has not been heretofore discussed in the House. That is, that no taxes were levied at all against the choses in action, money in bank, or that character of security. Only visible personal property and real estate was taxed in the District of Columbia.

After a long fight a year or two ago we finally got the Senate to agree that there might be a tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent on choses in action, and so on. That is the situation now. I have made a careful investigation extending over several years and have written many letters to many of the cities. I have not the time to read the answers about the rule of assessment and the rate of taxation, but any man who will make an investigation will find that the people of the District of Columbia pay on an average less than one-half of the tax that is paid in any of the cities of the United States.

In many of the cities the taxation, State, county, and municipal, is nearly three times as much as it is in this city, on the same rule of valuation of property. Do Members of Congress in the Senate realize this? Do all the Members of Congress know this? It is contended that the reason for that apparent discrepancy is on account of the question of assessment, but if you will make an investigation you will find that they assess property in the District of Columbia about as property is assessed in other cities. But I endeavored to arrive at it in another way to see whether this is true, so I prepared a statement which I think will give some light on the question from another angle. In other words, if it is contended that the assessment is higher here than in other cities, would it not be a reasonably fair method of testing this statement by getting the amount of taxes paid per capita in the respective cities of like size in the United States? I contend that the taxes in the District of Columbia are but one-half of what they are in other cities in the United States; in some cities one-third as much. Let us look for a moment. I am not going to give you the amount of revenue actually raised, but I am going to take the actual amount of money expended in the various city governments. In New York City the per capita expense to maintain the city is $39.41; Chicago, $36.66; Philadelphia, $34.02; St. Louis, $31.69; Boston, $42.75; Cleveland, $36.35; Detroit, $43.72; Pittsburgh, $39.72; and Los Angeles, $53.74. Those cities that I have named have a population of over 500,000 people.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. This per capita expenditure of the various cities, as stated by the gentleman, does not include the interest on bonded indebtedness and the amount put into the sinking fund?

Mr. SISSON. It does.

Mr. JUUL. That takes care of that expense?

Mr. SISSON. Yes. Now, let us take the cities where the population is under 500,000 and over 300,000: Buffalo, $37.01; San Francisco, $46.67; Milwaukee, $33.51; Cincinnati, $39.69; Newark, $39.25; New Orleans, $28.78; Washington, D. C., $18.10; Minneapolis, $35.43; Seattle, $46.01; and Kansas City, $40.61. These rates were in force in 1917.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the $18 per capita for the city of Washington figured upon the basis of the portion paid by the District or upon the full amount of the expenditures?

Mr. SISSON. The full amount of expenditure is $36.20, and includes the amount contributed by the people of the District of Columbia to the support of the District. That is $18.10. I am struck with how uniformly the amount runs at about $35 to as high as $46 in all cities.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why does the gentleman leave out the most important of all cities, Cincinnati?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, I mentioned Cincinnati, $39.69. That is what is paid per capita in the gentleman's city. By the way, on the rate of assessment in that city, including the county and State taxes, it is nearly two and a half times as great as in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LONGWORTH. On what valuation is the tax assessed?

Mr. SISSON. I think I could give the figures. I have them here.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is not on the full value?

Mr. SISSON. I am not sure about Cincinnati. I have all those data here in this file of letters.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Under the Ohio law now they assess at full value.

Mr. SISSON. If that is true, you actually pay more than twice that much.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is on a two-thirds valuation here?

Mr. SISSON. Yes. I have those data about these cities, but I will not have time to give them all.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will permit, of course all the statements the gentleman is making now are per capita statements.

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. And that has absolutely nothing to do with the percentage of assessments or the tax rate levied under it.

Mr. SISSON. I believe it is contended in the District by those people who favor the half-and-half plan that the trouble is that the assessments here are higher than elsewhere, which is not true at all.

Mr. JUUL. Everybody knows, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SISSON. I think as far as that is concerned the assessment of property in the District of Columbia is about the same as the assessment in other cities. That is where the shoe pinches, for the defenders of the half-and-half must take this position or their case is lost. But I endeavored to get at these facts and approach it from another angle which has not been argued here before.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield——

Mr. SISSON. Since the gentleman has raised the question——

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. So as to make it as definite as possible, referring to the figures of the city of Cincinnati, $39 and something——

Mr. SISSON. Thirty-nine dollars and sixty-nine cents.

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume that is on the basis of the city expenditure only, and would not include the expenditures of the county and——

Mr. SISSON. I think it includes the county and State tax as well. Now, you see in the District of Columbia they have only one tax.

Mr. LONGWORTH. They are all paid in one lump in Cincinnati.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to my friend [Mr. CRAMTON] my time is so limited and I have so many things I want to say, otherwise I would be glad to answer any question, so as to make myself clear; but they only have one tax, of course, in the District of Columbia, which is all carried in other cities under three heads—State, county, and city.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the gentleman will recognize in reference to a county tax that in a county like Hamilton, which is approximately the same territory as the city of Cincinnati, it should properly be figured in. As to the State tax, it might perhaps be argued that the District would have no State tax, and to that extent might be allowed the difference.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the gentleman, too, that in States like Pennsylvania we do not have the same kind of taxing system as obtains, for instance, in the State of Ohio.

Mr. SISSON. That is absolutely true.

Mr. ROSE. The reason I want to call attention to that is that the table will not be exact, unless you make mention of the fact where the taxes are not paid at one place.

Mr. SISSON. That is why I tried to get at the per capita tax of the various cities, so as to approach it from that angle.

For the purpose of comparison in the cities having a population of 300,000 to 500,000, I will give the per capita tax in each city and under it the per capita tax for Washington for the year 1917, the latest statistics available; but the Washington rate is the same; others, if changed, are a shade higher:

Buffalo, N. Y.	$37.01
Washington, D. C.	18.10
San Francisco, Calif.	46.67
Washington, D. C.	18.10
Milwaukee, Wis.	33.51
Washington, D. C.	18.10
Cincinnati, Ohio	39.69
Washington, D. C.	18.10
Newark, N. J.	39.25
Washington, D. C.	18.10
New Orleans, La.	28.78
Washington, D. C.	18.10
Minneapolis, Minn.	35.43

Washington, D. C	$18.10
Seattle, Wash	46.01
Washington, D. C	18.10
Jersey City, N. J	26.49
Washington, D. C	18.10
Kansas City, Mo	40.61
Washington, D. C	18.10

For the purpose of comparison in the cities having a population of 500,000 and over, I will give the per capita tax in each city and under it the per capita tax for Washington (for same year as cities of over 500,000):

New York, N. Y	$39.41
Washington, D. C	18.10
Chicago, Ill	36.66
Washington, D. C	18.10
Philadelphia, Pa	34.02
Washington, D. C	18.10
St. Louis, Mo	31.69
Washington, D. C	18.10
Boston, Mass	42.75
Washington, D. C	18.10
Cleveland, Ohio	36.35
Washington, D. C	18.10
Detroit, Mich	43.72
Washington, D. C	18.10
Baltimore, Md	28.56
Washington, D. C	18.10
Pittsburgh, Pa	39.72
Washington, D. C	18.10
Los Angeles, Calif	53.74
Washington, D. C	18.10

Now, I am going to take the rates in other cities. My eye falls on Louisville, Ky. The Louisville rate is 2.72 on the full valuation; that is property assessed under the law at the fair cash value. In the city of Dallas, Tex., where the assessment is made upon a full cash valuation, it is 2.97. At Buffalo, N. Y., the rate is $28.76 per thousand, which is $2.87½ on the hundred. In New York City there are various rates. For example, in one subdivision of New York on a full valuation it is 2.36, 2.40, 2.41, and 2.46. Those are the various rates there. In St. Louis it is $23.50 per $1,000, or $2.35 per hundred; Philadelphia is $2.75; Atlanta, Ga., $2.50; Memphis, Tenn., 3.48, and so on.

Mr. JUUL. What is the Chicago rate?

Mr. SISSON. The Chicago rate is a very peculiar one; it is most difficult because in Chicago while they have different rates in different sections of the city owing to certain improvements——

Mr. JUUL. The difference is slight.

Mr. SISSON. In the city of Chicago the tax ranges from 5.92 to 6.50, 6.15, 5.61, 5.50. Here are the Chicago tax rates [holding up official assessment]. The rule in the city of Chicago is this: They assess the property at its full value and then they take one-third of that to collect the taxes upon; so, apparently, the city of Chicago is higher than other cities, but as a matter of fact the tax in the city of Chicago is just about what it is in other cities. Now, in those cities which I have mentioned in addition to these taxes there are certain sidewalk, street, and sewerage taxes, and in all the cities the original sidewalk and the original pavement is laid entirely by the property owner. In the District of Columbia one-fourth of the street is paid for by the property owner on each side, one-fourth by the Federal Treasury, one-fourth by the District government, so on both sides they contribute one-fourth where streets are laid, 25 per cent each. In Washington the property owner only pays for one-half of the sidewalk. Is it fair to tax the people of the States to build streets and sidewalks and to lay sewer mains when they pay all of theirs and then are taxed to pay for these improvements in the city of Washington?

So it is not fair to the other cities to compare their rates with the Washington rates, because they pay all of their original sidewalk tax and all of their street tax. But that still is not the worst feature of the system in Washington.

Men of great wealth who expatriate themselves at home, convert their fortunes into stocks and bonds other than United States bonds, can come to the District of Columbia, and up until two or three years ago, when we had a hard fight here and passed through this House a provision to tax that character of property, that is taxed in all of the other cities of the United States, could only be taxed a nominal rate. So that men of great wealth in New York and Chicago and other cities come to the city of Washington, because by coming here they avoid the payment of taxes at home. I am going to mention but one name, and that was in litigation and is a court record.

A man named Post, who manufactured Postum, a substitute for coffee, came to Washington and took up his residence here, built himself nothing but a home, and after being here long enough to be a citizen that residence was nailed up, and he went back to his native city and thereby avoided the payment of the taxes in his own State, his city and county taxes, and only paid the half tax here in the city of Washington on his residence and up until the last few years nothing on his vast fortune. And when he died his own city thought he ought to pay an inheritance tax, because he was not a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia, and his executor went into court upon the proposition and defeated the payment of the inheritance tax because he was a citizen of the District of Columbia. And it might be amazing to some of you gentlemen if you were to watch the tax rolls here and see how many people of great wealth come to this city for the purpose of escaping taxation.

Now, I want some gentleman representing these cities to answer me, in this end of the Capitol or the other, how can you justify the system of taxation here? My friend—now chairman of the subcommittee—and I have been on the committee a long time, and when we first made the fight here it was not clearly understood, and it was defeated by a few votes. The next time we made the fight on the floor of this House it was carried by a considerable majority, and the last two times it was voted on here it was carried by over a two-thirds majority; and in addition to that, on the last two bills no roll call was even demanded on it. Now, the Senate put this half-and-half back in the bill, and if you will look at the RECORD you will see that not one word of debate was had on the floor of the Senate about the matter. I am willing to say to the Senate that if they will give us one real good reason, one real sound reason, that they are willing to go before the country on, stating why the Federal Treasury should respond to half of the expenses of the District of Columbia, and put that in the RECORD, and that that is the one reason they hold to, I will cease my opposition to it.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. May I ask the briefest kind of a question?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. If all these things that have been read to us are facts, and I believe they are—I know some of them are facts—how have you gentlemen succeeded from year to year in getting the Members of this House in not finally to vote on a bill that has done the injustice you have just stated?

Mr. SISSON. They did not do it in the last Congress. This bill failed then because the membership of the House told your conferees not to bring that provision back to the House, and when we did bring it back we were overwhelmingly instructed not to yield. Then, in the bill prior to that time we batted back and forth here several times and by the most overwhelming majority this House declined to recede. And finally we made a motion to adhere.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. I would just like to get into the RECORD, for the benefit of our new friends here, that when our distinguished Speaker, Mr. GILLETT, who is familiar with this matter and for years served on the Committee on Appropriations, addressed the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Washington this year, he made the statement that this half-and-half plan ought to be repealed, in that it had ceased to subserve any useful purpose and no longer should exist. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Not only that, but you will find gentlemen of the House, in view of the fact that this District matter is one in which they are not especially interested, have taken it for granted it is all right; but after investigation you do not find any of these Members of the House finding any reason for it. But that is not all——

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. When I get through with the statement. The House was at loggerheads with the Senate a year or two ago. We had made a motion to instruct the conferees, which was carried by two-third majority.

We went to the Senate and could not agree. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] was then the majority leader of the House, and he made a motion that we agree to strike out our provision and put the half-and-half provision back in the bill, with the proviso that a joint commission be appointed, three from the House and three from the Senate, to investigate the half-and-half principle. That motion prevailed, as I recall, by a margin of one vote. The Committee was appointed. Mr. Page, of North Carolina, and I were the two Democratic members of the House conference, and my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], was the Republican conferee. We then felt very much outraged because the Speaker of the House at that time appointed three men on that commission all of whom had voted to sustain the half-and-half policy—my friend Mr. RAINEY, of Illinois, Mr. GARD, of Ohio, and Mr. Cooper, of Wisconsin. But you can imagine our delight when,

after meeting for several months during the summer, when after every single Member of the Senate had voted against the abolition of the half-and-half principle, that commission brought in a unanimous report that the half-and-half policy was not tenable, and Mr. GARD, of Ohio, who up to that time had always voted to sustain it, offered an amendment to this bill, which was carried by an overwhelming majority, and which the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Cooper, supported, setting aside the half-and-half principle. And on every occasion wherever a fair commission has investigated the matter it has been ascertained that the half-and-half policy is unfair and unjust to the taxpayer.

But it is not only unjust and unfair but it is creating an atmosphere around the Capital in the District of Columbia which is not a good atmosphere to surround a legislative body, because every time an extravagance is demanded on the part of the District of Columbia they demand that payment be made out of the Treasury to equal the sum that they shall expend, and it makes a most riotously extravagant government here.

But another thing: As long as they can keep the half-and-half rate, they can continue to invite people of wealth to come to this city, and as long as they can extend that invitation a man can come and build a home here and take up his residence here and have his fortune untaxed at home and practically untaxed here. When I first came to Congress I remember the local newspapers here had a great deal to say about this being a place for men of great wealth to come, because they could escape the payment of taxes at home. But I notice they have ceased to urge people to come here so as to dodge their taxes at home. If a man in New York or in other States makes a great fortune, and after making his fortune there moves to the District of Columbia and takes up his residence here, he defeats the tax back home which should go toward the education of the people of the State and defeats the tax to build roads at home, and then asks the people back home to come and pay one-half the expense of educating his children in the District of Columbia.

Can a Congressman or a Senator, with that statement confronting him, go back home and justify it? I do not care whether he owns property here in the District of Columbia or not; a man representing the taxpayers of the United States ought not to vote to make this a haven for tax dodgers, to come here and avoid the payment of taxes at home.

I do not think a Member of this House can say that the subcommittee has neglected to give every item asked for that is just. During the time I have been a member of the subcommittee and during the time the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], who is now the chairman of the subcommittee, was a member on the minority side of the subcommittee we have put legislation on the statute books that was desired here for a number of years. I am not going to mention the several matters, but it was done. Now, what is the amendment that the House asks to be adopted?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. There remain two other questions that I want to refer to before I stop.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Now, if you will look at the bill, under "police department," you will see on page 55, beginning on line 17, a Senate amendment that goes on this bill, and I want to call it to the attention of the Members of this House, and especially my colleague on the subcommittee and my friend from Minnesota, the chairman, Mr. DAVIS. Listen:

Provided, That the War Department may, in its discretion, furnish the commissioners, for use of the police, upon requisition, such ordnance, worn motor, mounted, or other equipment as may be required.

Now, one of the officials of the District came to me and asked me to consent to that amendment, and I said to him, "How much money is involved in it?" He said, "No money at all. We just want the War Department to turn over this property." I said, "What property?" And after some discussion I found that they wanted 25 or 30 vehicles, numerous machine guns, a couple of tanks, and I have forgotten what else. In other words, they wanted the Federal Government to turn over this property belonging to it to the District government without any cost to the District government, without the District government paying even its half, and the argument used to me was that the Post Office Department would get it, and the Interior Department would get it, and that the District ought to be treated just like they were.

Why, bless your souls, don't you see the difference? In one case they were simply departments of the same Government; and it does not matter if property belonging to the War Department is used by the Post Office Department or some other department, because they are all parts of the same Government. But do you suppose the Members of this House are going to give blanket authority to the police department of the District of Columbia to make requisitions upon the War Department, and let the War Department exercise their own discretion about turning over to the District of Columbia any and all property that they may see fit and proper to turn over? Gentlemen, it is in this way that so many items are paid for out of the Federal Treasury which are used solely in the District of Columbia. Now, if they need this property, if they need these machine guns, if they need these 25 or 30 vehicles for the purpose of carrying the police from one part of the city to the other, if they need the two tanks, why, let them make an estimate for it, and let Congress know what they are doing, and know how much money is being involved in this property transfer, and let the District pay its half of it.

Now, there was another matter that I wanted to call to your attention, but the time is entirely too short. I have a great deal of data about the salaries of teachers. Those of you who are familiar with it know that the longevity-pay provision makes it difficult to find out just exactly what the school-teachers get in the District of Columbia. The city of Boston, in the lower graded schools, has paid the highest salaries of any city in the country. By a provision which went into effect in Philadelphia last year that city, according to my recollection, now pays about the Boston rate; but when you add the $240 bonus, and when in addition to that you add the longevity pay, the very hub of knowledge is outstripped in the payment of the salaries of school-teachers by the city of Washington.

In conclusion let me say that if you want to collect taxes fairly upon the fortunes of these men who come here to avoid taxes, there is an opportunity to do something about it here. Under the half-and-half system the Federal Government has not only paid for half of the school buildings and school-teachers' salary, books, and half of the streets up until last year, but for half of all the police force, in addition to policing our own buildings, guarding and protecting them. When we pay for half of all these things the men who have great fortunes who come to live in the District of Columbia do not pay any tax on their fortunes, except such parts as are in the form of visible property, like goods on the shelves of a store or on actual real estate. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I insist that unless the Senate recedes from its amendment insisting upon the people of the several States paying one-half of the expenses of the District of Columbia the House should have the courage to do right and permit this bill to fail. Let us pass a joint resolution simply continuing the appropriation in the current law, and unless the Senate will take up and discuss fairly and fully this amendment to the present iniquitous half-and-half law never to pass another District bill through this House.

There are several other amendments to this bill that I want to discuss, but the hour is late and my time has expired, and I will try to avail myself of another opportunity at an early date and discuss some of these matters.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, finally, I believe we are going to get the District bill into conference. I appreciate the fact that the Senate has made many changes in the present appropriation bill, not only concerning matters that the gentleman from Mississippi has talked about, but many others. But it would be folly for me at this late hour to attempt to reply to anything that has been said by the gentleman from Mississippi. Therefore I shall do my talking in conference in the next week or 10 days.

Mr. SISSON. I want to say to my friend, who wants to get this bill to conference, that if the Senate does not recede I would like to have the conferees bring back to the House the amendment in reference to the teachers, the half and half, and the motor-transfer proposition.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not say positively, but I think I will get them to do that.

Mr. SISSON. All I ask is that we may have an opportunity to vote on these three amendments.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will do the best I can.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman can state he will do it absolutely. I would not hesitate to say to the House that I would bring matters back for action of the House. It leaves the conferees perfectly free, if the Senate will recede. I only ask that on three amendments, that they be reserved for action of the House. It is frequently done here.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say one thing sure, I will bring back the half and half to the House, and in all probability the other two amendments.

Mr. SISSON. I will say to my friend the hour is late and I do not want to try to instruct the conferees, and these are the only 3 out of the 100 amendments.

Mr. MONDELL. I will suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that the hour is rather late. The half-and-half proposition is, of course, very important. It seems to me that the House should have an opportunity to express its views in that regard, but the other amendments, it seems to me, my friend, can rely upon the conferees to come to some sort of an agreement.

Mr. SISSON. Does the gentleman understand what the three amendments are that I wish brought back to the House? The half and half, the salaries of the teachers, and the motor transport amendment——

Mr. MONDELL. I think, under the persuasive eloquence of the gentleman from Mississippi, the conferees will reach an agreement.

Mr. SISSON. But I am not to be one of the conferees, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] will be a conferee.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make any promises, because I always carry out a promise if I make it. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the half and half I will bring back, but when it comes to the teachers' salary and the motor proposition he knows that it is easy to move to concur or recede and get a vote, and the chances are they will both be back here.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will bring back the motor proposition and the half and half and do the best he can on the other, I will be satisfied.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman will get a chance to vote on it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, after we have been held here to listen to the gentleman from Mississippi for 25 minutes, why should we be held longer to hear him catechise the conference committee hitching them up with boylike promises?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, the gentleman grows facetious. If he had been a Member of the House a little longer, he would know——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman knows me well enough, and I think he will have a chance to express his opinion on everything in the bill that he desires.

Mr. CRAMTON. Did I understand the gentleman from Mississippi to state that the particular thing on which he desired a vote was the half and half?

Mr. SISSON. Yes. I would like very much to have a vote on the motor-transfer proposition, but I expect the Senate to recede if the conferees insist on that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not think the gentleman need to fret about these conferees, but I dislike to come out and say that I will bring these matters back to the House. I have been asked by Members to bring back a dozen matters, and I have said that I could not agree to bring them back.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked for. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 24, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Department in order to comply with the provisions of House resolution No. 74, requesting certain information as to Government employees (H. Doc. No. 129); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for additional clerical force in the office of the Auditor for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6323) for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 53), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. McKINIRY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 753) for the relief of Susie Currier, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 54), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3844) for the relief of Della James, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 55), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5939) providing for the experimenting of nursery stock, and the same was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 6492) to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live-stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 6493) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of St. Henry, Mercer County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 6494) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the towns of Berlin, Mercer, Girard, Greensburg, and Perryopolis, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6495) to regulate the importation of coal-tar products, to promote the establishment of the manufacture thereof in the United States, and as incident thereto to amend the act of September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 6496) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan unused or obsolete machinery and scientific instruments to recognized scientific and engineering schools; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 6497) for the erection of a public building at Fredericksburg, Gillespie County, Tex., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6498) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Falmouth, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 6499) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6500) to provide increased compensation for all candidates for commission in the Air Service (Aeronautics) while receiving instructions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6501) authorizing retirement of members of the Army Nurse Corps (female); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) to transfer the tract of land known as the Lighthouse Reservation at North Point, Md., from the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce to the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) to extend certain provisions of the war-risk insurance act of September 2, 1914, as amended to cadets at United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6504) transferring the tract of land known as Craney Island from the jurisdiction of the War Department to the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department and transferring the tract of land known as Fishermans Island from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6505) to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6506) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 6507) providing a pension rate of $30 a month for certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and the Mexican War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6508) to provide for the payment of a salary to letter carriers in the Free Delivery Service of the Post Office Department of the United States who are absent from duty more than 15 days by reason of disability, and to fix the amount thereof, and to provide for substitute carriers to serve during the disability of the principal carriers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 6509) to provide for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6510) to provide for the erection of a public building at Fredonia, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6511) to provide for the erection of a public building at Oswego, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6512) to provide for the erection of a public building at Neodesha, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6513) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Bands of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6514) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 132) to investigate in re payment of interest and principal on Russian bonds; to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) to pay Beatrice I. Manges damages for injuries received; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) incorporating the World War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 132) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to use the military forces of the United States to protect the lives and property of our citizens in Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) extending the thanks of Congress and providing an appropriate medal to governors, adjutants general, members of local and district boards, medical and legal advisory boards, and Government appeal agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) authorizing the participation of the Government of the United States in the Permanent International Agricultural and Industrial Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the creation of a national food commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging the Government of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to insure life and liberty to the Jewish inhabitants of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6515) granting an increase of pension to Urias Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 6516) for the relief of the estate of John McQuiddy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 6517) granting a pension to Francis A. Grennen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6518) granting a pension to Elizabeth Harmoning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6519) for the relief of Austin G. Greer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) for the relief of Francis A. Grennen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6521) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Whalon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 6522) for the relief of F. M. Barfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 6523) for the relief of Patrick J. Purcell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6524) authorizing and directing the transfer of 10 acres of land to rural high-school district No. 1, Lapwai, Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6525) granting a pension to Esther A. Van Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 6526) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6527) granting a pension to Josephine J. Teeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6528) granting a pension to Sarah Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) granting a pension to Caroline V. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 6530) granting a pension to Jane E. Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) granting an increase of pension to Adolph Reuschmeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 6532) granting a pension to Kate C. Kraig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6533) granting a pension to Katherine Shurts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) granting an increase of pension to Avril Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 6536) for the relief of Joseph A. Stevenson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 6537) for the relief of George R. Campbell, Milton B. Germond, and Walter D. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 6538) for the relief of Alexander W. Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6539) granting a pension to Jennie D. Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6540) granting a pension to Lurinda F. Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6541) granting a pension to Christie Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Condit, Ohio, opposing the lifting of the ban on wine and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of sundry citizens of Cessua Park, Ill., asking repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Master Plumbers' Association, Atlantic City, N. J., relating to self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of the Florida Bottlers' Association, asking for the repeal of section 628 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Fort Plain, N. Y., praying for the immediate repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of numerous residents of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the legislative committee of Bowman's Creek Grange, No. 1440, town of Canajoharie, State of New York, protesting against the appropriation of $500,000,000 to reclaim swamp, desert, and cut-over land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of S. S. Frank and others, of Cleveland, Ohio, asking for repeal of soda water and soft drink tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of S. S. Kresge Co. and others, of Cleveland, Ohio, asking for repeal of soda water and soft drink tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Blackfoot, Springfield, and Salt Lake, Idaho, and Denver, Colo., protesting against the tax an sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Commercial Telegraphers, relating to standardization of salaries, etc., and other matters in connection with the strike; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of 101 citizens of Mendota, Ill., favoring repeal of all taxes on soda water, ice cream, and other such articles of food and drink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Swedish Evangelical Lutheran Zion Church of Rockford, Ill., opposing any repeal or modification of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., for the repeal of the tax on ice-cream cones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: Petition of Mrs. H. L. McClesky et al., of Hattiesburg, Forest County, Miss., protesting against the modification of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jackson Board of Trade of Jackson, Miss., indorsing the Poindexter amendment to the interstate commerce law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif., urging return to agricultural districts of labor taken to industrial centers during the war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the chief petty officers of the United States Navy, as represented by Richter-McKinnon Camp, No. 2, San Francisco, Calif., urging increase of pay of chief petty officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Southern California Organization for Public Health Nursing, Los Angeles, Calif., indorsing the Lewis-Raker bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Rialto, Calif., urging retention of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of the City and County of Sacramento, favoring the national soldier settlement act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of San Diego County, Calif., against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Edwin R. Snyder, commissioner Department of Vocational Education, Sacramento, Calif., indorsing H. R. 3143, to provide for loan to public educational institutions of material of War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Northern California Milk Producers' Association of Sacramento, Calif., urging passage of bill of Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce relating to rider on railroad appropriation bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Baltimore Varnish Works, asking support of Senate bill 1351; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Maryland Federation of Women's Clubs of Baltimore, Md., indorsing the Smith-Towner bill, H. R. 7, and urging support of same; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of citizens of Baltimore, Owings Mills, and Custis Bay, Md., protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, candy, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of the Larkin Co., Buffalo, N. Y., relating to prohibition bill in connection with flavoring extracts and medicinal and toilet preparations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of John Morgan, Mrs. H. Palmer, F. A. Smith, and 90 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of the Paris Factory, other business concerns, and citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., to the number of 500, for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the city of New York for recognition of the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Edward M. Van Cleve, president, New York Institute for the Education of the Blind, New York City, relating to H. R. 2847; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PELL: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, urging repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of 250 citizens of Illinois, favoring repeal of taxes on soda water, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of El Dana, Church of Christ of Timewell, Loyal Boys' Centenary Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Jacksonville, all of Illinois, protesting against any repeal or modification of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of the First Methodist Church, of Pasadena; and Methodist Church of Norwalk, Calif., favoring strict prohibition-enforcement legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petitions of G. I. Smythe, Simon H. Goldstein, T. P. Walters, and 103 other merchants of the city of Beloit; William Martison, Henry S. Brown, John McKue, W. E. Donley, and 52 other citizens of the city of Kenosha; and L. A. Thompson, S. L. Beckman, and 46 other citizens of the city of Waukesha, all in the State of Wisconsin, urging repeal of luxury tax on sodas, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the Lowell Retail Jewelers' Association, against tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSE: Petition from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, requesting that the Congress of the United States appropriate ample funds for the operation of the Frankford Arsenal, located in Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of residents of Albany, N. Y., against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of citizens of Keeseville, N. Y., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Gouverneur, N. Y., for the enforcement of war-time and constitutional prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of St. Lawrence district, northern New York conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, at Hermon, N. Y., for enforcement of war-time and constitutional prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, relative to the repeal of section 630 of the war-revenue bill, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Platteville, Colo., protesting against any amendment to the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a resolution from the City Council of the city of Pueblo, Colo., protesting against the continued high price of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of citizens of New Haven, Conn., for repeal of tax on soft drinks, sodas, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petition of 2,981 employees of Cambria Steel Works, Johnstown, Pa., against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of the federal council of the Churches of Christ in America, signed by Charles S. MacFar-

land, general secretary, praying for the enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Springfield, Ill., entering solemn protest against repeal of war-time prohibition, and reciting that the President has seen fit to recommend to Congress an appeal to lift the ban on beer and wines, thereby betraying the organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Greenville College, of Greenville, Ill., signed by E. G. Burrett and 300 students, praying for enforcement of prohibition, and also a definition of intoxicating liquors in accordance with the findings of science; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Laurel Methodist Episcopal Church, of Springfield, Ill., praying for Congress to defeat any revocation of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Freeport, Ill., deeply deploring the recommendation of the President, protesting against repeal of the war-time prohibition law, and urging adequate enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles F. McKown, of Athens, Ill., chairman Red Cross and pastor Methodist Episcopal Church and mayor of the city, and brother citizens, protesting against the repeal of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Leo Howard, of Whitehall, Ill.; H. C. Reichel, of Kewanee, Ill.; G. R. McCasland, of Granite, Ill.; and Mount Auburn Methodist Episcopal Church, by C. L. Lotz, pastor, all protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 24, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 42).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of $550,000 required by the Steamboat-Inspection Service for "Contingent expenses, Steamboat-Inspection Service, fiscal year 1919," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and has appointed Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. BUCHANAN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War; and

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of two persons, whose names shall be placed on the rolls of employees of the House of Representatives.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted at a conference of Union Churches at Greenwood, Mass., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the National Garment Retailers' Association, praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of comrades of James Bryant Post, No. 119, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the Bolshevist propaganda openly carried on in that city, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERNALD presented a memorial of the Aroostook and Penobscot Union, Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Littleton, Me., and a memorial of the Aroostook Federation of Farmers, of Caribou, Me., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of lands for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COLT presented a memorial of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Woonsocket, R. I., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry naval-torpedo employees at Newport, R. I., praying for the establishment of a 44-hour week as the standard of employment at all navy yards, depots, stations, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the Aroostook Federation of Farmers of Caribou, Me., and a memorial of the Aroostook and Penobscot Union, Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Littleton, Me., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of lands for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the sale of uncompleted ships to any foreign nation and favoring legislation for the completion of such ships, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Olympic Club of San Francisco, Calif., remonstrating against war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Calif., praying that Congress take such steps as are necessary to encourage the return to the agricultural districts of the labor that was taken to the industrial centers during the progress of the war, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 253) for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 34) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 248) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark. (Rept. No. 35);

A bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown (Rept. No. 36);

A bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas (Rept. No. 37);

A bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Simon M. Preston (Rept. No. 38); and

A bill (S. 1479) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane (Rept. No. 39).

WALSTON H. BROWN.

Mr. MOSES. On May 20 I introduced a bill, being the bill (S. 495) for the relief of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., and of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., and it was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I ask that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

PEND OREILLE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington, and I submit a report (No. 33) thereon. As it is a short bill and reported favorably from the committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Pend Oreille County, State of Washington, and the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, Pend Oreille County, Wash., their successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized, jointly or separately, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pend Oreille River, at a point suitable

to the interests of navigation between said towns, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 70, submitted by Mr. KNOX on the 5th instant, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 89, submitted by Mr. STERLING on the 21st instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 2225) granting an increase of pension to H. McFarlin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2226) granting a pension to Otis B. Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 2227) granting a pension to Carrie M. Birdsall; and

A bill (S. 2228) granting a pension to John E. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2229) for the relief of Henry von Hess; and

A bill (S. 2230) for the relief of Elijah L. Gum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 2231) granting to certain claimants the preference right to purchase unappropriated public lands in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) extending to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; also, authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions the members of such local and district boards; also, authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress an appropriate medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by the act approved March 3, 1919, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PHELAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $250,000 for an immigration station at San Francisco, Calif., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONDITIONS OF WAGE EARNERS.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I submit an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Labor to continue inquiry into methods of betterment of working conditions of wage earners, to collect and disseminate information and advice for the elimination of causes of strikes and industrial unrest. For the above purposes for salaries of officers and employees in the District of Columbia and in the field; per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding $4; traveling expenses; fuel, light, and heat; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; supplies and equipment; typewriters; telephone and telegraph service; contingent expenses and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $45,000.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice of a motion to suspend Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate in order to offer an amendment to the naval appropriation bill.

At the end of the bill add a new section, as follows:

That sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of Chapter XV of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Interdepartmental social hygiene board: That there is hereby created a board to be known as the interdepartmental social hygiene board, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury as ex officio members, and of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, or of representatives designated by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. The duties of the board shall be: (1) To make rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter; (2) to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under sections 5 and 6; (3) to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purpose of this chapter by their respective departments; and (4) to direct the expenditure of the sum of $100,000 provided in section 7 of this chapter. The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect annually one of its members as chairman, and shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business."

SEC. 2. That the interdepartmental social hygiene board is hereby authorized and directed to adopt measures for the purpose of assisting the various States in caring for civilian persons whose detention, isolation, quarantine, or commitment to institutions may be found necessary for the protection of the military and naval forces and the civilian population of the United States against venereal diseases.

SEC. 5. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this chapter: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein made shall not be deemed exclusive, but may be supplemented by other appropriations of a more general character which are applicable to the same or similar purposes.

SEC. 6. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,400,000 annually for two fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1918, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of $1,000,000, which shall be paid to the States for the use of their respective boards or departments of health in the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the interdepartmental social hygiene board; this sum to be allotted to each State in the proportion which its population bears to the population of the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska and the Canal Zone, according to the last preceding United States census, and such allotment to be so conditioned that for each dollar paid to any State the State shall specifically appropriate or otherwise set aside an equal amount for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases, except for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, for which the allotment of money is not conditioned upon the appropriation or setting aside of money by the State: *Provided*, That any State may obtain any part of its allotment for any fiscal year subsequent to June 30, 1919, by specifically appropriating or otherwise setting aside an amount equal to such part of its allotment for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases: *And provided*, That where a State has no legislative session between the date of this law and the 1st day of January, 1920, the interdepartmental social hygiene board may, in its discretion, allot to said State for the period from July 1, 1919, to December 31, 1919, the monthly proportion of the sum allotted to it in accordance with the provisions of this section of this chapter. In case any State receiving such allotment fails to appropriate or otherwise set aside on or before February 14, 1920, an amount equal to its allotment or such part of its allotment as it may have received between July 1, 1919, and December 31, 1919, then it shall be within the discretion of the interdepartmental social hygiene board to discontinue all other allotments to such State from each and every fund under this chapter until such appropriation may be made by the legislature then in session in such State: *And provided*, That an allotment refused by any State or States shall be available for the purposes of any of the appropriations made in this chapter; the sum of $100,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions as in the judgment of the interdepartmental social hygiene board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the interdepartmental social hygiene board, more effective medical measures in the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases; the sum of $300,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions or organizations as in the judgment of the interdepartmental social hygiene board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering and developing more effective educational measures in the prevention of venereal diseases, and for the purpose of sociological and physiological research related thereto.

SEC. 7. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of $200,000 to defray the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the division of venereal diseases in the Bureau of the Public Health Service, and the sum of $100,000 to be used under the direction of the interdepartmental social hygiene board for miscellaneous expenses of that board, including personal services and rent of offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, actual or per diem, in lieu of subsistence; printing and binding, periodicals, law books, and books of reference.

Any unexpended balances appropriated under this chapter are hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, for any purpose for which any of the appropriations made by this chapter are available.

SEC. 8. That the terms "State" and "States," as used in this chapter, shall be held to include the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. FERNALD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 93), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of two persons whose names shall be placed on the rolls of employees of the House of Representatives was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED SALE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and let it lie on the table, and to-morrow morning, at the close of the morning business, or as soon thereafter as I can be heard, I shall call it up and submit some remarks upon it. I should like to have it read and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That in the judgment of the Senate it is not advisable for the United States Shipping Board to sell at this time any of the merchant ships of the Government to foreign interests unless it be such as can not be successfully employed here.

Resolved further, That efficient merchant ships of the Government should not be sold at all at this time, except such ships as are undesirable for overseas trade and will bring approaching their actual cost or more, and then only with a view of replacing them with better ships and in order to properly balance the fleet.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Ordnance stores and supplies," on page 65, line 12, after the word "Artillery," to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For overhauling, cleaning, repairing, and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores in the hands of troops and at the arsenals, posts, and depots; for purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops; for Infantry, Cavalry, and Artillery equipments, including horse equipments for Cavalry and Artillery, $2,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the chairman if it is proposed out of this appropriation to purchase and manufacture ordnance stores?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Chief of Ordnance in his statement before the committee reminded us that this money is needed to take care of the ordnance supplies turned in by the returning troops that are being mustered out of the service on their return from France or being mustered out after service in the United States, such as rifles, bayonets, mess kits, and other kinds of equipment that have to be cleaned up and oiled and packed away. We thought they could do it for $2,000,000. They asked, I will say to the Senator, for this item $4,446,000. The House cut it to $3,000,000, and we cut it to $2,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator have any objection to striking out the words "purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops"? I think that authority ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection, because I believe for this next year they will not be purchasing or manufacturing any more.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is true, and with that in view I move, in lines 9 and 10, to strike out the words "for purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, I agree to it with the understanding that if it proves later to actually stifle some necessary purpose that I do not happen to know about now we can take it up in conference.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National trophy and medals for rifle contests," on page 65, line 18, after the word "Guard," to strike out "or Organized Militia" and insert "Organized Militia or State Guard," so as to make the clause read:

For the purpose of furnishing a national trophy and medal and other prizes to be provided and contested for annually, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, said contest to be open to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the National Guard, Organized Militia or State Guard of the several States, Territories, and of the District of Columbia, members of rifle clubs, and civilians, and for the cost of the trophy, prizes, and medals herein provided for, and for the promotion of rifle practice throughout the United States, including the reimbursement of necessary expenses of members of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, to be expended for the purpose hereinbefore prescribed under the direction of the Secretary of War, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 12, to insert:

TANK CORPS SCHOOL.

Incidental expenses in connection with the operation of Tank Corps schools, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "National Guard," subhead "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard," on page 66, line 18, after the words "Purchase of," to strike out "horses" and insert "animals," so as to make the clause read:

Purchase of animals for mounted units, $1,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee refer to the page in the hearings where this appropriation is asked for?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Page 332 of Gen. Carter's testimony as printed in the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House appropriated $1,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It did.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the purpose of forming Cavalry regiments?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The national defense act in its National Guard provision provides that the War Department shall issue to mounted units of the National Guard, Cavalry and Field Artillery and mounted Signal Corps troops, a certain number of horses per unit. The War Department asked $1,186,000 for this purpose. The House cut it to $1,000,000, and we leave it at $1,000,000. That is the provision of law.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many Cavalry troops have we now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not say how many we have now, as the National Guard is in process of reconstruction. Prior to the war we had very considerable mounted units such as Field Artillery and Cavalry and field signal battalions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 19, after the word "for," to strike out "horses" and insert "animals," so as to make the clause read:

Procurement of forage, bedding, etc., for animals, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 22, after the word "equipment," to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,250,000," so as to make the clause read:

Compensation of help for care of matériel, animals, and equipment, $1,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 4, after the words "United States," to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$43,750," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of property and disbursing officers for the United States, $43,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 8, after the word "inspections," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers making inspections, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 10, after the word "stations," to strike out "$9,000" and insert "$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers changing stations, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 12, after the word "instruction," to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers on visits of instruction, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 18, after the word "supplies," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

Transportation of supplies, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 21, after the words "armory drills" in parentheses, to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert: "$4,000,000: *Provided*, That all the moneys hereinbefore appropriated for the equipping and arming of the National Guard shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of National Guard (armory drills), $4,000,000: *Provided*, That all the moneys hereinbefore appropriated for the equipping and arming of the National Guard shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 23, after the word "equipping," I move to strike out the word "and" and after the word "arming" to insert the words "and training," so as to read:

For the equipping, arming, and training of the National Guard.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 1, to strike out "surplus" before "stores"; in line 4, after the word "act," to strike out "of" and insert: "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved"; in line 6, after "1916," to strike out "which law is still in force and applicable to State forces"; in line 7, after the word "issue," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 8, after the word "and," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 10, after the word "State," to strike out: "troops. Issue will be made as soon as the provisions of act of June 3, 1916, shall have been fulfilled," and insert "troops"; in line 12, after the word "section," to strike out "62" and insert "62 of the"; in line 13, after the word "act," to strike out "of" and insert: "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved"; in line 15, before the word "be," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 17, after the words "attained by," to strike out "December 31, 1919," and insert "June 30, 1920"; in line 20, after the word "this," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 21, before the word "section," to insert "said"; in the same line, after the number "62," to strike out "as now worded"; in line 23, after the word "Guard," to insert "shall"; and in line 24, after the words "upon the," to strike out "date this becomes a law" and insert "approval of this act," so as to make the clause read:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to issue from stores now on hand and purchased for the United States Army such articles of clothing and equipment matériel as may be needed by the National Guard organized under the provisions of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916. This issue shall be made without charge against militia appropriations and shall be reimbursed in kind for all Federal property brought into service by State troops: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 62 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, shall be considered fulfilled if the first strength mentioned therein be attained by June 30, 1920, and the other increments provided therein be attained by successive years thereafter: *Provided further*, That this shall not prevent any State from compliance with the provisions of said section 62: *Provided further*, That the appropriations and provisions of this act referring to the National Guard shall become applicable and available upon the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 1, after the word "act," to strike out "of" and insert: "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved," so as to make the clause read:

That section 69 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 1, after the word "contract," to insert: "and the previous enlistment shall in such cases and with the consent of the enlisted man be canceled," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 69. Enlistments in the National Guard: Hereafter the period of enlistment in the National Guard shall be the same as is or may be prescribed for the Regular Army: *Provided*, That all persons who have served as enlisted men in the Army of the United States or the Organized Militia of the several States subsequent to April 6, 1917, and who have been honorably discharged from such service, may within six months after such discharge or within six months after the passage of this act enlist in the National Guard for a period of one year, and may reenlist for like periods, and that such enlistments shall not be counted in computing the proportion authorized to be enlisted for one year to conform to the period of enlistment prescribed for the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That enlisted men in the National Guard of the several States now serving under contracts providing for a six-year period of enlistment—three years in an active organization and the remaining three years in the National Guard Reserve—shall be afforded an opportunity to enlist for the periods specified above, and upon entering into a new contract of enlistment for a period of three years under this authority shall be given credit for the period served under the old enlistment contract and the previous enlistment shall in such cases and with the consent of the enlisted man be canceled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 3, to insert:

That to comply with the provisions of section 110 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, it is hereby provided that staff officers, including officers of the Pay, Inspection, Subsistence, and Medical Departments, appointed in the National Guard of the District of Columbia shall have had previous military experience and shall hold their positions until they shall have reached the age of 64 years, unless retired prior to that time by reason of resignation, disability, or for cause to be determined by a court-martial legally convened for that purpose, and that vacancies among said officers shall be filled by appointment from the officers of the National Guard of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator explain this amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The national-defense act provides that in the issuance of commissions to staff officers of the National Guard there shall be a condition precedent—that is, that each State legislature shall enact a law providing that men who are to be commissioned as staff officers of the National Guard shall have had previous military service; furthermore, that they shall hold their positions in the National Guard until they shall reach the age of 64 years, the purpose being to eliminate politics in the several States from the staff serving with the National Guard. All the States of the Union have enacted those laws. The District of Columbia never has done so through the Congress, and the War Department—the Judge Advocate General, I believe, of the War Department—has ruled that it takes an act of Congress such as this in order to put the staff officers of the District of Columbia National Guard on the same footing as staff officers of the National Guard of all of the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Were there any hearings on this item?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There were not on this particular item. A memorandum was filed by Gen. Carter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was there not a separate bill introduced and would it not be better to have the matter take that form? It affects the peculiar military organization that exists here in the District of Columbia, which is about half National Guard and half not, as I recall the law. I think before we fix the National Guard here the matter ought to have very careful consideration from the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It did have the careful consideration of the committee. We discussed this matter at some length, and the memorandum of the War Department was gone into. It was filed before us. The National Guard of the District of Columbia is now being reconstituted under the terms of the national-defense act. They have something like six or seven hundred men enlisted now. They intend to go on recruiting in the usual way until they reach their old figure of something like 2,000 or 2,500 men, all in accordance with law. But we can not have any staff officers until Congress prescribes that the staff officers shall have had previous military experience and shall not be disturbed in their tenure of office except by court-martial or by resignation.

Mr. McKELLAR. In what way does this change the law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It makes the law in respect to National Guard staff officers in the District of Columbia uniform with all the other States.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were a number of these staff officers appointed under a modified act that we passed, I believe, since the war was on. I think it was passed about a year ago. There was a reorganization, and the National Guard of the District of Columbia was not permitted to go outside the District except into Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This does not apply to that National Guard at all. It applies to the National Guard organized under the national-defense act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Rifle ranges for civilian instruction," on page 70, line 22, after the word "law," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

For arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice for issue in connection with the encouragement of rifle practice in pursuance of the provisions of law, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civilian military training camps," on page 71, line 5, after the word "act," to insert "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual

provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,'" so as to make the clause read:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, horse equipment; ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice; and for overhauling and repairing arms for issue and use in connection with training camps for civilians in pursuance of the provisions of section 54 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, $100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Reserve Corps," subhead "Ordnance stores, equipment, etc., Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 71, line 14, after the word "act," to insert "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,'" so as to make the clause read:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for use in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, established by the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, $100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance supplies for military equipment of schools and colleges," on page 71, line 23, after the word "act," to insert "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,'" and on page 72, line 2, after the date "1916," to strike out "$100: *Provided*" and insert "$100," so as to make the clause read:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for issue to schools and colleges in pursuance of the provisions of section 56 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, $100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 6, after the words "of the," to strike out "appropriations: *And provided further*" and insert "appropriations," so as to make the clause read:

That the appropriations herein made for the support of the Army and the National Guard are available for such printing, binding, and blank books as may be necessary in putting in effect the objects of the appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 14, after the word "proper," to strike out "appropriations: *And provided further*" and insert "appropriations," so as to make the clause read:

That hereafter printing, binding, and blank books required for use outside of the District of Columbia in connection with the support of the Army and the National Guard may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally, the cost thereof to be paid from the proper appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 16, after the word "That," to insert "except as hereinbefore provided or in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made or definite obligations already incurred, or where it is necessary, in order to protect the interest of the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919, on the land to be purchased," so as to make the clause read:

That except as hereinbefore provided or in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made or definite obligations already incurred, or where it is necessary, in order to protect the interest of the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919, on the land to be purchased, no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, before this amendment is agreed to, and I shall support the amendment, I think the Senate ought to know why a provision of this character is deemed necessary at all. Yesterday in the discussion of another subject I stated that Congress ought not to vest in the War Department the fullest discretion in the expenditure of money, and there had been at least one gross violation of a breach of trust morally upon the part of the War Department, to which I would refer before the consideration of the bill was completed, and I think the Senate at this time ought to know the facts in the case to which I then had reference.

Mr. President, there was established at Camp Benning, in Georgia, an Infantry School of Arms, removed from Fort Sill, in Oklahoma. This matter received a great deal of discussion in the House, and I think I can, by quoting some of the letters and testimony, get the facts before the Senate in a much briefer way than if I undertook to state them myself. I begin by reading a letter appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 1060, written to Congressman MONDELL, of the House, by one C. C. Minter, of Cusseta, Ga.:

MY DEAR MR. MONDELL: I wish to call your attention to the large expenditure of money by the War Department on a military camp down here in Chattahoochee County, Ga., known as Fort Benning.

The War Department on November 2, 1918, filed a petition for condemnation of 130,000 acres of land in Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties, Ga., for a military reservation.

There lives within this area about 8,000 civilian population. They are taking from Chattahoochee County 72,000 acres of land out of a total of 165,000 acres in the entire county. Chattahoochee County is a small county, with 5,640 population. This camp is taking in about 3,300 of the population, most of whom are opposed to giving up their homes.

In January of this year we succeeded in getting a hearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in opposition to this camp. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, after hearing both sides, for and against the camp, passed a resolution disapproving the project. The War Department suspended work, and announced no further work would be done on Fort Benning and that proper steps would be taken to salvage same. Immediately after the adjournment of Congress on March 4 the War Department again began the construction of this camp, and are now very busily engaged in building same, working some 4,000 or 5,000 laborers and spending money in a most lavish and extravagant manner. It strikes me that the War Department is undertaking to build a permanent camp in an illegal and fraudulent way, spending money that was appropriated for camp sites, camps, and cantonments during the war emergency.

The department has succeeded in buying about 30,000 acres of this land at an average cost of $42 per acre. Much of the most expensive land within the area is yet to be purchased or condemned and paid for. For this project to go forward and be completed on the large scale proposed, means an expenditure in due time of $75,000,000 or $100,000,000.

Let me say, in passing, that the testimony appearing before the House Military Affairs Committee is to the effect that only an expenditure of $7,000,000 is contemplated. I have read the material portion of the letter. Before this camp of Infantry School of Small Arms was removed to Camp Benning, where the Government did not own an acre of land, where it proposed to acquire 115,000 acres, the same Infantry School of Small Arms was located at Fort Sill, Okla. I wish to read a letter from Hon. SCOTT FERRIS, of Oklahoma, a man of the highest integrity, one of the most prominent members of his party, to the Secretary of War, dated May 20, 1918:

MAY 20, 1918.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of your letter of May 15 regarding Fort Sill; also the memorandums from Brig. Gen. Brown and Brig. Gen. Snow.

I can not but feel that time will disclose that a serious mistake is being made at Fort Sill. The military reservation proper contains 56,000 acres. There is a forest reserve adjoining it, any part or all of which could be annexed by Executive order of the President merely by the stroke of a pen, without any additional law or legislation. This would give ample room not only for the School of Fire, School of Small Arms, but the cantonment as well.

To construct a cantonment at an expense of $2,300,000 and then abandon it in the midst of a World War, and go out buying and renting land, establishing new cantonments and acquiring new areas seems wrong to me. Again, the School of Small Arms, which was established in 1915, prior to the war, with all the time and money expended thereon, is now being abandoned and held for naught. This, too, seems wrong. I wish I knew something to say or something to do to spare you this mistake.

The press reports are to the effect that all other cantonments are being used to the limit, even large additional expenditures are being made for them. Large prices are being paid for material and lands to acquire and construct new cantonments and maintain the ones already constructed. In the face of this condition of affairs, to abandon Fort Sill seems to me to be poor economy, and seems to me to be a mistake which we might now avoid. I have, however, in person appealed to you regarding the matter. I have filed written data and bills of particulars as I understand them to exist. I would, if I knew how, do anything else I could or make any kind of an appeal possible to prevent this mistake, and what to me seems surely false economy. I repeat, if I knew anything else to do or say, if I knew any other appeal I could make to you, or any of the generals who have brought this about, I would make it. With great respect, I am,

Very sincerely, yours. ——— ———.

The Secretary of War replied to that letter, but his reply does not appear in the RECORD. However, the reply called out another letter from Mr. FERRIS, which I read, dated May 27, as follows:

MAY 27, 1918.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was good of you to write me your good letter of May 24 and to give me a chance to be heard on this matter. It is good of you to have a second investigation made about it.

That reservation down there is so large and so beautiful that to utilize it during the first year of the war and abandon it thereafter and go out and buy land, it does seem that somewhere along the line we should find some one to appreciate it and to recognize the necessity of using land that belongs to the Government and not go out and buy or rent land that is less valuable.

I had not intended to trouble you with this matter any further. I had intended to let it go, but your good, warm, and friendly letter makes me bold enough to again urge you when the second investigation is made to investigate the advisability of utilizing the 65,000-acre forestry reserve that lies immediately adjoining the Fort Sill military reserve. That entire reserve is barren of timber. It has a little herd of buffalo on it, but they consume such a small part of it that it is negligible, and the rest is only used for grazing cattle.

If the military authorities need more room, under the withdrawal act of June 25, 1910, known as the Pickett bill, the President can with the stroke of a pen withdraw this area or, rather, transfer and use any or all of it without disturbing any governmental function. This would afford a range large enough to carry on, without paying any rent, without buying an acre of land, and at the same time not sacrifice three or four million dollars of expenditure that has already been made there, but, on the contrary, could utilize it.

Again, I repeat that I had not intended to bother you further with this, but when I see a mistake being made that I am sure is a mistake, I have felt it my duty to tell you about it rather than wait until a shower bath of trouble comes down on us when it is too late. In other words, if I seem impatient or appear overzealous and almost bordering on a nuisance to you, it is in an effort to make certain that you do not abandon and fail to utilize Government property that could be economically utilized, and further to avoid mistake. With great respect, I am,

Very sincerely, yours, ——— ———.

That was the situation with reference to the transfer of this military site. Whatever may be said with reference to the advisability of that transfer when we were at war, Mr. President, there can not be the slightest justification for going on with it after the war has ceased, for going on with it at a time when the work had scarcely begun.

What was the situation with reference to this Camp Benning on the 11th day of November when the armistice was signed? It appears in the House hearings of last session that Secretary Baker appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and stated this:

When we went before the Senate committee, however, these Senators who were present expressed pretty confident judgment that it was wiser not to go forward with the Columbus, Ga., camp—

This is the Benning Camp—

which involves very large acreage, but the amount already purchased being exceedingly small. There had been no large construction actually carried out there, and it was more nearly at the beginning than the other two. For that reason, when Mr. Crowell and I talked about it afterwards, we came to the conclusion that it was pretty clear from the Senate committee's attitude that they did not look with favor on the purchase of the Columbus, Ga., camp, and therefore have entirely discontinued any purchases at Columbus, Ga.

That, Mr. President, was in January of this year.

What was the situation at that time with reference to the Government purchases at this camp? In January Mr. Woods testified before the House committee as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, at Camp Benning, what has been done there in the way of land?

Mr. WOODS. At Camp Benning the expenditures for land aggregate $29,818.75, and the acceptances are $118,975.75.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it contemplated that the land would cost if the project was carried out?

Mr. WOODS. The estimated cost at Camp Benning, as I now recall, was $3,500,000 for an area of about 115,000 acres.

Mr. CANNON. At how much per acre?

Maj. HOLDEN. About $30 per acre, roughly.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate that it would cost the Government to get out of that area?

Mr. WOODS. Probably from $300,000 to $400,000.

Mr. CANNON. You have not much in the way of construction there, have you?

Mr. WOODS. There is a substantial amount of construction, but not the amount that has been done at either Bragg or Knox.

Mr. CANNON. The construction has been largely in the matter of a railroad, has it not?

Mr. WOODS. They have some barracks and buildings completed, and there are some under construction.

Maj. HOLDEN. I think that Mr. CANNON'S statement about this particular project is more or less correct, and that the building of a railroad was the big expenditure there.

Gen. Marshall in the hearings upon this bill before the House committee testified as follows:

Gen. MARSHALL. The Secretary of War approved the purchase of land at Camp Knox on July 19, 1918; at Camp Bragg on August 8, 1918; at Camp Benning November 15, 1918.

The Secretary of War did not even approve the purchase of an acre of land at Camp Benning until after the armistice was signed. Gen. Marshall goes on to state:

The dates on which work was authorized at Camp Benning are as follows: September 21, 1918, an expenditure of $100,000 was authorized for temporary tent accommodations for 1,200 men. October 9, 1918, the Assistant Secretary of War approved the project for the construction of an Infantry School of Arms. This work was officially authorized by the office of the Chief of the Construction Division to the field on October 18, 1918. The contract with the Selden-Breck Co., of St. Louis, Mo., was signed on October 28, 1918—

Only about two weeks before the signing of the armistice—

and work immediately commenced. The project was modified and changed several times. The final change and adoption of project on which work is now in progress was made on March 12, 1919.

Mr. President, officials of the War Department did appear before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and asked for their advice upon this proposition, and the Military Affairs Committee passed a resolution disapproving of this project. The Secretary of War testified that in response to that resolution of the committee they abandoned work upon the project and did no proceed to go further with it. But, Mr. President, after Congress adjourned on the 4th of March last something happened. I do not undertake to say what it was, but something happened, so that while at that time we were only obligated for the maximum sum of about $300,000 we are now obligated to the expenditure of several million dollars for the establishment of a camp in Georgia, although we have all the land that is necessary in the State of Oklahoma at Fort Sill.

The Secretary of War in the hearings before the subcommittee undertook in a way to defend the action. He stated that after the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate had passed a resolution disapproving this project, he understood the committee had reconsidered that action, and, by a tie vote, had declined to make a recommendation, and, therefore, he stated he felt free to go on with this project.

Mr. President, assuming that the committees of either of the Houses had expressed approval of a project of this kind, it did not in the least degree warrant the War Department in time of peace in using money appropriated for war purposes for a camp that had never been authorized by Congress. Never been authorized! The fact is that the House Committee on Appropriations expressly refused to make a specific appropriation for Camp Benning. The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate never did reconsider its action; it never did by a tie vote decline to express any opinion concerning it. What did happen before the committee was this: Effort was made to have the committee reconsider its action disapproving the project, and that motion failed by a tie vote. That is what happened. So that the action of the Military Affairs Committee stands to-day as disapproving this project; and, notwithstanding the fact that the War Department or the Secretary of War had no more moral right to take these millions of dollars of the Government's money and put it into this camp than I would have the right to steal so much money from my neighbor, nevertheless they have gone on and expended millions of dollars upon this site out of appropriations made by Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war. The result is we are now obligated to an expenditure of $2,800,000 for the purchase of this land.

I wish there was some way by which the Congress could abandon this project without doing injustice to hundreds of people who have been deprived of their homes, and with whom the War Department made, it is true, a legal contract, because I admit that they had the naked legal right to do it. They had the naked legal right to do it, because Congress never dreamed that it would be necessary in making appropriations for war purposes to say to the War Department, "If the war shall terminate you shall not use this money for other purposes." That is the reason there was no restriction provided for in this legislation, because no one ever dreamed for a moment that there would be any such violation of good faith upon the part of the War Department as to use money appropriated for war purposes to buy military camps for a peace program that Congress has never adopted and that Congress has never been consulted about. As I have said, I wish there were some way in which this matter could be reached by a total abandonment of the Benning Camp. I wish there were some way, without doing great injustice to many innocent people, to prohibit the expenditure of a single dollar additional for the purchase of land at this point; but it can not be done, because they have legal contracts with the Government. We would force them to go into the Court of Claims, and they could recover in the Court of Claims.

The committee has gone in this amendment now pending as far as it can go, I think, without doing great injustice to a great many people. It will be observed that the amendment that is now pending reads as follows:

That except as hereinbefore provided or in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made or definite obligations already incurred, or where it is necessary, in order to protect the interest of the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919, on the land to be purchased, no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps.

This will stop any new obligations being incurred. This will stop a repetition of such a breach of trust upon the part of the War Department as has occurred in this instance. It can not be too strongly condemned; and I state deliberately that in normal times, in time of peace, such a violation morally upon the part of an official of the Government would come very close to leading to his impeachment.

I sincerely hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment as the committee has presented it, giving authority to the Secretary of War to use appropriations in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made and in order to protect the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919; but I can not permit the speech that has just been made by the Senator from Wisconsin to go unanswered. It is so far from an accurate statement of the facts that the real facts should be stated.

The assault upon the Secretary of War is, in my opinion, utterly inexcusable. I accept my part of the responsibility for his final action in this matter, and shall read the letter which I handed him with reference to what had taken place in the committee.

It was not long after the beginning of the war that Gen. Pershing found a serious lack of training on the part of our infantry. He urged upon the War Department the establishment of an infantry school of arms on a large scale. I will not stop the Senate now to read these appeals from Gen. Pershing. More complete training was required as a result of experience and observation in France by Gen. Pershing. A school of limited character was in operation at Fort Sill where wind and sand interfered with training part of the time. A shooting range was established at Perry, but here the size of the land controlled by the Government prevented extensive operations.

Boards were appointed to seek a place—boards from the Army and the staff—to determine upon a place where a school of the character Gen. Pershing desired should be established. No suggestion was made, so far as I know, by anybody in Georgia as to what place should be selected by these boards. It is true that the availability of land near Columbus for military activities had been suggested to the War Department, but this, so far as I am informed, was for a cantonment or for artillery.

The first board went over a number of places and advised that the most desirable place was at Columbus, Ga. Another board went over it and did the same thing, and the Infantry School of Arms was organized at Camp Benning, October 11, 1918.

For this peculiar kind of work, the testimony before the committee shows that a most varied topographical surface is required, and first the scheme was, before the armistice, to establish at Camp Benning, near Columbus, Ga., a training school which would occupy about 150,000 acres of land. This particular place, according to the reports of the boards that examined it, was selected on account of the great variety of topography, in part on account of the excellent climate, giving opportunity for training the year around, and because the place was accessible to cantonments and to the population of the country, all-year use being considered. If any one made a suggestion to a member of these boards that they should select a site near Columbus, Ga., I never heard it. It was purely an official act, done with the highest purpose of efficiency of training in the camp selected.

Now, what had we done? We had authorized the War Department to condemn and take immediate possession of any land needed for military purposes. Before the armistice took place the War Department, proceeding under the power given by Congress, took possession of this property and notified the owners that the fee-simple title would be taken by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. Were contracts made for all this acreage prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Contracts were not made at all. The Government simply proceeded to take it, and notified them to get out, and they got out.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Government took all the acreage involved prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Practically all of it. They had all been notified to leave, and over 75 per cent of the people had left.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Is not the Senator aware that the Secretary of War did not approve the acquiring of this land at all until November 15, after the signing of the armistice?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not a fact that the condemnation proceedings were not instituted until November 18, and no one could receive notice to get out until condemnation proceedings are instituted?

How can I be told to leave my property until I receive a notice that the Government has instituted condemnation proceedings? Who is to tell me? I just use that as an illustration. How could notice have been sent to these people prior to November 18?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have here the testimony of Gen. Marshall:

> The Secretary of War approved the purchase of the land at Camp Knox on July 19, 1918; at Camp Bragg on August 8, 1918; at Camp Benning November 15, 1918. The acquisition of land at these camps commenced immediately after the dates of approval.

It could not have been done before the armistice.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will read first from an act of Congress giving the Secretary of War authority to take land:

> That hereafter the Secretary of War may cause proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States, in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings for the acquirement by condemnation of any land, temporary use thereof or other interest therein, or right pertaining thereto, needed for the site, location, construction, or prosecution of work for fortifications, coast defenses, and military training camps. * * * That when such property is acquired in time of war or the imminence thereof upon the filing of the petition for the condemnation of any land, temporary use thereof or other interest therein or right pertaining thereto to be acquired for any of the purposes aforesaid, immediate possession thereof may be taken to the extent of the interest to be acquired and the lands may be occupied and used for military purposes, and the provision of section three hundred and fifty-five of the Revised Statutes, providing that no public money shall be expended upon such land until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title, nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land is located has been given, shall be, and the same are hereby, suspended during the period of the existing emergency.

I may be mistaken about the exact date but I am confident condemnation proceedings were begun before the armistice was signed. They were begun long before the facts were brought to my attention, so far as I can recall. At the time it came to my attention in January the condemnation proceedings had been instituted and the owners had been turned out of their lands and 75 per cent of them had moved off. Then it was that in my opinion the Government was bound to go on and pay for the land which it had seized with a claim of the fee simple title.

Now, it may have been a few days after the armistice was signed that condemnation proceedings were begun. The Senator from New York has the papers. It was on the 15th, was it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The 18th, sir. The condemnation proceedings were instituted on the 18th.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then it seems that the condemnation proceedings were instituted a few days after the armistice. A copy of the condemnation proceedings was before the Senate committee and my recollection was that they were filed before the armistice was signed, but the act of Congress authorized the procedure, and the procedure caused the dispossession of 75 per cent and more of the people who lived in that territory. None of them had sought to sell their land to the Government. There had been no effort to get the Government to take it. It was a deliberate selection by officers of the Army, at nobody's instance but theirs, and the parties were turned out, very many of them, when they did not want to leave.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the defense of the Senator seems to be defending these people who were required to leave the premises.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. OWEN. But the point which is involved is the conduct of the War Department after the armistice in locating this camp there and going into these enormous expenditures. That is the point.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The War Department had located the school at Benning in October. Subsequent action was a matter of discretion with the War Department. The war was not over. The armistice had been signed, but whether or not further fighting would take place nobody knew. But the part of the action of the War Department to which I desire to call attention is the subsequent action.

I insist that with the procedure for the condemnation of this land the Government took the fee simple interest under this broad act, and that the Government was in good faith and in law bound to buy the land. It occupied an entirely different status from the ordinary procedure under ordinary acts of State legislatures; and these people left their property in pursuance of the action of the department in instituting legal procedure to condemn their land and notifying them to leave. The Government had the right to take the fee; and, as I stated on the first of January, when this matter was brought to my attention, from 75 to 85 per cent of the people had moved out of their farms, had given up their property, and very many of them had gone elsewhere and bought property on credit. Now, in that situation I insisted, without a doubt of the soundess of my contention, that it was the duty of the department to go forward and pay for the land.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. By the same reasoning, would the Senator say that it was the duty of the department to go ahead with every war contract that it had made prior to the armistice and to pay the full value?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No. Such a case as the one mentioned by the Senator does not occupy the same position at all. Here were a set of farmers who by the act of the department were turned out of their property, sent away from their farms, went elsewhere, and bought other farms, relying upon the Government to pay for what it had said it intended to take and did take; good faith and law required that the Government go on with the transaction, and legally, in my opinion, the Government was bound to do so.

Now, as to what happened later on: The original project was for $14,000,000. It was reduced to about $6,000,000. This, I believe, did not include material unused at cantonments, which would sell for little and was to be used at Benning. The department, pending the hearing, sent a board to examine Camp Bragg to see if it could not be changed into an Infantry school of arms. The report from Camp Bragg was that it would cost practically as much to make the change at Camp Bragg necessary to establish there the school as it would to go on with Benning, and that it was not nearly so desirable as a location for a school of arms.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, would it not be better to call it a strong-arm school?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, a properly organized small-arms school is a very strong arm in the Army, and we have the opinion of Gen. Pershing to that effect; and, really, we won the war on the 18th of May by the men who had received special training in that line.

That committee reported that Camp Bragg was not suited to the work, and reported that Camp Benning was vastly better adapted to it. The clearest testimony was presented to the committee as to the absolute necessity for such a school, no matter what the size of the Army might be. The advantages of this place were presented by officers of the Army. I want to repeat that there never was any solicitation to locate the first camp there from anybody interested in it. It was purely a military act by the officers of the Army themselves.

After the Senate Committee on Military Affairs finally voted seven to seven on reconsideration, the Secretary of War received a letter from one Senator, not present at the committee meeting, stating that as between Bragg and Benning he preferred Benning, and another Senator, who had not voted, saw the Secretary of War, and expressed the same view. I presented the letter to the Secretary of War urging that the final action of the committee left the committee with no expression of opinion on the subject, it having been a tie, and that the department could very properly proceed, if the staff thought it desirable, and complete the camp. I still think so, and I think it was a wise thing to do. Just what the present status of Benning is, I do not know. I went down there just after Congress adjourned, and went over the land. I found one of the most remarkable tracts, topographically, I ever saw—quite a quantity, about 18,000 acres, perhaps, of level land in one body, and the balance diversified highlands, lowlands, valleys, and hills with numerous springs and clear water creeks; and I understood from Col. Ames, one of the officers who made or approved the selection, who took me over it and showed it to me, that the reason of their selection was in part this unusually broken character of the land, that furnished the opportunity for such great variety of experience in movements even in land of that size. Of course, a climate giving opportunity for all year training and accessibility to population lessening cost of transportation were most important. I felt that I ought to say this much with reference to it. I do not desire to discuss the matter further.

[Letter of Senator HOKE SMITH to the Secretary of War.]

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1919.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to bring to your attention the recent action of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and what I consider to be the attitude of that committee and of the Military Affairs Committee of the House with reference to the establishment of certain technical schools at Camp Benning, near Columbus, Ga.

Early in January, I think upon the 7th, the subject of certain camp activities was before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. At that time the scope and necessity for technical training in the Army, outside of Artillery, was not, in my opinion, fully appreciated by the committee. It certainly was not fully appreciated by me. This was due—certainly on my part and, I think, on the part of others—to the lack of that definite information as to what technical training meant and as to its great importance developed by the war with Germany.

At that time it was suggested that the Senate committee pass a resolution requesting the department to stop work on Camp Benning, and, on motion of Senator MCKELLAR, the committee unanimously voted not to proceed further with the work at Camp Benning, Ga.

At that time, also, the Camp Benning project was one which it was expected would cost upward of $14,000,000. Additional information was obtained and submitted to the committee; plans were revised to reduce the expense to less than half of the original amount. The original plan involved the use of 17,000 acres of land immediately adjoining the city of Columbus. The necessity for this land was in part due to the pendency of the war, to the large number of men who would be trained at Camp Benning, and to the importance of extending military regulations over the city of Columbus.

This situation does not now exist, and the chamber of commerce of Columbus has agreed to protect the Government from loss on the 17,000 acres if Benning is established.

On February 2 the subject came up again before the committee, and the original resolution advising the War Department "it is the sense of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that the Fort Benning project be abandoned" was reconsidered; but subsequently, about the same time, a resolution was passed to the effect that the Committee on Military Affairs disapproved the Fort Benning project. I think it was then the opinion that some other equally satisfactory tract might be used, where buildings had already been constructed, and the expense greatly lessened.

The only other available place with land sufficient, and located at a point where the transportation charges of the officers to and from the camp would be reasonable, and where climatic conditions would permit all-year training, was Camp Bragg.

The importance of technical training for the Infantry, for the Cavalry, for the tanks, and for the machine guns, operating together in a single field, has been urged by military experts, and Gen. Pershing has impressed the importance of such work as a result of his experience in France.

Under your direction Camp Bragg was studied. The result of this study showed that it would cost nearly as much to prepare for the school at Camp Bragg as to complete it at Camp Benning. By going on at Camp Benning we would have the Artillery School retained at Camp Bragg—so much urged by the Chief of Artillery—and we would also have Camp Benning for the technical training of Infantry, Cavalry, tanks, and machine guns and the best of facilities for both Artillery and these schools.

The report upon Camp Bragg also shows that the character of the land fails to give the opportunity for training in the schools, other than Artillery, which is really required, and that Camp Benning, selected by experts on account of its great variety of topography, will give an ideal site for these schools.

Under these circumstances, on Tuesday morning, March 4, I brought the subject to the attention again of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and asked for reconsideration of the disapproval of the Camp Benning project. Two votes were had. On one the vote stood 6 to 6. On the last the vote stood 7 to 7. While the vote was not an aye-and-nay vote, I attach a certified statement from the assistant clerk of the committee showing who were present. There were 15 Senators present I am quite sure Senator WARREN did not vote, and that Senators CHAMBERLAIN, HITCHCOCK, WEEKS, NEW, FRELINGHUYSEN, and JOHNSON voted nay, while Senators FLETCHER, MYERS, BECKHAM, REED, KIRBY, and myself voted aye. Senator THOMAS was not present. Senator THOMAS has since by letter expressed to Mr. Crowell, and through him to the department, his preference for Camp Benning over Camp Bragg, if the school is to be established. Senator WARREN has also orally discussed the subject with Mr. Crowell, and I believe I am justified in saying that he preferred Benning to Bragg.

In the meantime the subject was before the House Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee declined to take any action, thereby leaving it entirely in the discretion of the War Department.

I submit that the final action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by a vote of 7 to 7 of those present divided the committee equally, and thereby left the subject to the War Department. Senator THOMAS having definitely expressed in writing his preference for Benning, and Senator WARREN having in effect taken the same position orally, a majority of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs carry to you an expression in favor of Benning over Bragg.

I discussed the subject with Senator CHAMBERLAIN, chairman of the committee, on yesterday, and acquainted him of my purpose to bring these facts to your attention in the manner that I am presenting them. He expressed no dissent from the course I am taking, and stated that it was not his purpose to take any action in opposition. I have also conferred with Senator MCKELLAR, who originally offered the motion condemning the project, and I find his position much modified by the new facts which have been developed, and I am quite sure he will not further oppose the projects.

Under all these facts, I feel justified in urging that the subject is up to the War Department for action without advice from either of the Committees on Military Affairs in the House or the Senate.

My own thorough study of the question has convinced me of the absolute necessity to conduct a technical school for Infantry, Cavalry, tanks, and machine guns, where cooperation and individual work may be taught, if we have an Army of any size and make it really proficient.

I am sure this conviction will grow on all as the subject is understood, and I do not hesitate to urge a completion of the Benning project.

In addition to the foregoing reasons, it is certainly worthy of consideration that the procedure of condemnation instituted last fall before the armistice was signed, coupled with the assumption of immediate ownership and possession by the Government of the area involved in the project, caused from 75 to 85 per cent of the residents of 115,000 acres of land to vacate their homes, to move to other sections, and to assume in many instances contracts which they can not perform unless the Government completes its action by paying for their land. They are suffering now from the failure to have received prompt payment.

A knowledge of their condition may have at first prompted my close investigation of this project. Now, I am thoroughly satisfied of the necessity for the school, the wisdom of the selection, and the good judgment used by the department in the action which it took.

Very cordially, yours,

(Signed) HOKE SMITH.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I hesitate to take up the time of the Senate on this matter, but I think it due to the public that something be said as to what actually took place before the committee; and, in as few words as I can, I am going to try to tell that story.

The first thing that happened was that the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War came before the committee on January 7 to say that the War Department had in contemplation and in partial progress the establishment of three camps—one at Fort Bragg, N. C., one at Camp Knox, Ky., and the other at Camp Benning, Ga. They said they wanted the judgment of the committee as to whether or not those camps ought to be proceeded with, the armistice having been signed and the war evidently being about over. The committee heard all they had to say about what had been done with reference to condemnation proceedings, the purchase of land from some of the owners, the removal of tenants, and all that sort of thing. After a complete statement of the facts by the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary, the committee wanted to know if they regarded all of the camps as necessary. Both replied that they thought them desirable, but as to Camp Benning they did not think it necessary, and that as between the three Camp Ben-

ning was certainly the least necessary of the three, and they thought we might very well get along without it.

The committee said its purpose was to save every dollar of public money that then could be saved; that while it might be desirable to have such a camp as was contemplated at Benning, the condition of the public, having been taxed as it had been for two years of war and as it must be for the next two or three years, was such that it was entitled to relief wherever relief could be at that time afforded, and with the full knowledge and full approval of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary the committee voted not to proceed with Camp Benning.

Mr. OWEN. How did that vote stand?

Mr. NEW. I do not remember what the first vote in the committee was.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have it here.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have in the RECORD what the vote was.

Mr. NEW. The Senator from New York has the record and will read it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I find in the minutes of the committee, under date of February 1, 1919, this language:

The pending motion was that heretofore submitted by Senator McKELLAR, as follows:

"That the committee advise the War Department that it is the sense of the Military Affairs Committee that the Fort Benning project should be abandoned."

To this motion Senator SMITH offered the following substitute:

"After considering the revised plans for the consolidated Infantry school of arms, machine-gun and tank schools at Fort Benning, Ga., as submitted by the War Department, the resolution of January 7, requesting the abandonment of Fort Benning, is hereby withdrawn and the question of proceeding with the construction under the revised and less expensive project is remitted to the War Department."

Mr. OWEN. Did the substitute pass?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In a moment.

After some consideration, a vote was had on this substitute, and the following Senators voted in the affirmative:

I find five in the affirmative and nine in the negative. The substitute was lost, and thereupon Senator MYERS proposed another substitute:

So the substitute was lost, and thereupon Senator MYERS proposed the following substitute for the McKellar motion, to wit:

"Moved that we advise the War Department to complete the payment for the land involved and to do nothing more."

By the same vote as above the motion was lost, and thereupon Senator HITCHCOCK offered the following as an amendment to the original McKellar motion, to wit:

"That the Committee on Military Affairs, having considered the Fort Benning project and heard the testimony offered, disapprove the project."

Senator McKELLAR, with the consent of the committee, accepted the proposed amendment, and thereupon recurred this motion, which the committee adopted as an amendment.

And there were nine in the affirmative and five in the negative.

Mr. OWEN. What was the date of that action?

Mr. WADSWORTH. February 1. Then, on the morning of March 4 the committee was called in what might be termed an extraordinary session and an effort was made to reconsider the action of February 1, and that effort failed by a tie vote.

So far as the records of the committee are concerned and so far as the knowledge of practically all of the members of the committee was concerned, at that time the incident was closed.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order that there may not be any misunderstanding about it, I want to say of that meeting of the committee I was not notified, or if I was notified I did not receive the notification. As the Senator from New York said, it was an extraordinary meeting. I was not present, as the record of the meeting shows. The Senator from New York has the record, which shows that I was not present. Of course, my attitude was thoroughly understood by the motion that I offered.

Mr. NEW. I am very glad, indeed, the Senator from New York had with him the record from which he could read the exact vote taken at these meetings of the committee. I was just about to tell the story of the meeting of February 1 and the one of March 4 when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] asked for the vote. But the action of the Military Affairs Committee was taken after we had heard more witnesses than I have ever known to be summoned on any one case that has been heard before any committee of which I am a member since I have been a member of this body. We must have had at least 50 witnesses on both sides of the case, and we were thoroughly advised as to what all the conditions were. Every possible effort was made to induce the Committee on Military Affairs to reverse its action. Personal requests and every means that could possibly be employed were resorted to to induce the committee to reverse itself, but without producing that result.

The action that has been taken in proceeding with Camp Benning is absolutely in violation of the advice at least of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, to which the whole subject was referred, with the statement at the time that the future action of the War Department would be governed by the advice of that committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in connection with the pending provision I desire to suggest to the Senate an amendment somewhat modified, which I offered last night, and which is printed in the RECORD at page 1597. The Government has leased and has an option to purchase 960 acres of land near Lonoke, Ark., and is now using that as an aviation field. The field is known as Ebert's Field. This land can be purchased under the option for $68,000, which is a very reasonable price, if not a low price, for the land considered without regard to the buildings. The buildings which the Government has constructed on this land are worth several hundred thousand dollars. It is quite probable, at least within the range of possibility, that this field may be abandoned, and if this occurs the Government will be compelled to sell the buildings at a very great sacrifice.

The amendment which I propose is in this form:

On page 72, after line 17, insert the following: "That if in his opinion it is advisable to do so the Secretary of War may purchase 960 acres of land now under lease for an aviation field or camp site and known as Camp Eberts Field, and thereafter sell the same: *Provided*, That no sale shall be made of lands for any less amount than the cost thereof."

This will enable the Government to purchase the land at $68,000 under its option and resell the same if it abandons the field, which I understand is in contemplation. If the amendment is not adopted, the Government will lose nearly all its investment in the buildings that are now on the land. If the purchase is made, complications connected with claims for damages growing out of the removal of buildings and other improvements taken from the lands after the Government obtained possession will be avoided.

I called the matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee and of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who, I understand, has given especial consideration to this subject, and asked if there is any objection to adding this proviso.

The amendment as offered last evening was a general amendment. I was informed that there would be objection to making the provision general, and I have therefore limited it to this particular case.

Mr. ASHURST. Why should there be objection to a general amendment which saves the Government much money? This is the time when we should think about saving money for the Government. Why should a general amendment be objectionable?

Mr. ROBINSON. I thought when the amendment was first offered that it should be made general; that the same condition in all probability exists at a large number of fields and perhaps at some of the cantonments. I have heard that in the sales of buildings at some of the camp sites where sales have already been made merely nominal sums have been received for buildings of very great value. I believe that if the department had the authority to sell the buildings in connection with the land, which it can only obtain by procuring title to the land, great economies would result, which, of course, are desirable.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he has read the amendment of the committee on page 72, beginning with line 16 of the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly I have read the amendment. The amendment which I propose is in the nature of an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator not think the language of the amendment as proposed will permit the Secretary of War to sell?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, I do not. I want the express authority given the Secretary of War to buy this area of land and to resell the same if the field is abandoned in order to save the Government money. The amendment as written in the bill impliedly gives that authority, but it does not give any express authority to sell, and I think the matter should be made clear and beyond any doubt. I can not see how objection can arise on the part of any Senator who takes the view of the subject which the Senator from West Virginia seems to take.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If there is no objection from other Senators or members of the committee, I will accept the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate more than a few moments in further discussion of this Benning matter. It may be of interest to the Senate, however, to know that the original project had in mind the purchase of 126,000 acres of land. Since then the project has been reduced to 98,000 acres. They have purchased 59,283 acres and paid for it.

Eleven thousand five hundred and forty more acres have been contracted for, but the money is not yet paid. The whole project is to cost $9,200,000. This is the project which we thought had been abandoned on March 4.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield? Were the purchases of any part of the land described made after the action of the committee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Practically all of them—nearly all.

Mr. KING. So in the face of the action of the Senate the War Department proceeded to make those purchases?

Mr. WADSWORTH. According to my best information, no money had been actually paid out for the purchase of land prior to March 4. It has all been paid out since.

Mr. KING. This amendment would be a ratification of their, I was going to say, illegal, certainly their defiant, attitude?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This amendment as now printed in the bill would prevent them from buying any more, but it does not compel them to sell what they have already bought and paid for.

Mr. KING. Would it permit them to make improvements upon this project or any other project which they have bought in defiance of the wish of Congress?

Mr. WADSWORTH. You will notice the amendment reads:

That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made * * * shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments.

It stops further construction. The camp, including purchase of the land and construction of buildings, is about 65 per cent completed. It would seem as if they had already spent about $5,000,000 on it. The project was to spend $9,200,000.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] stated in his remarks to the Senate a little while ago that one or two of the members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs of the last session were persuaded to write to the Secretary of War stating that they preferred Camp Benning to Camp Bragg if it was a choice between the two. But the fact is that they have also gone ahead with Camp Bragg as well as Camp Benning, and the Camp Bragg project is another $10,000,000 project.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator from New York if he thinks legislation ought to be enacted now that in any way glosses over or indorses the conduct of officials who have proceeded in such a defiant way and obviously, or apparently at least, against the best interests of the country?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not accept that definition of this amendment. The amendment makes them stop right where they are in the matter of Camp Benning. The committee did not feel that it could with beneficial result to anybody turn around and undo the whole thing and wreck the entire project. There are two interests affected—one the people who have been moved off, and the other the taxpayers of the country. This is 65 per cent completed. A large portion of the expenditures is in buildings. We do not want to destroy the value of those buildings. They belong to the taxpayers of the United States. We do want to say to them you will not build another building or buy another acre of land. That is as far as we felt we could go. It is not glossing over what was done.

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. May I ask one other question, if the Senator from Oklahoma will pardon me? Did not all the evidence before the committee in some of the hearings indicate that a very large number of fields for aviation and for other purposes had been acquired during the war, many of which were wholly unnecessary, but the title to which is still in the Government?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I must reply to that by saying that the committee did not have brought to its attention in any detail the status of the flying fields. Of course some are being sold and others are being kept. Frankly, I do not believe any of the flying fields would be available for target practice; I mean they would not fall under this category of Camp Benning.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows there were a great number of fields acquired in various parts of the United States notwithstanding the fact that the Government had a large number of posts and had a great many fields which were available. It seems to me the conduct of the War Department is so reprehensible, so flagrant an abuse of power, that a fitting rebuke, if one can be administered to executive officers who fly in the face of decency and honor and propriety, ought to be administered, either here or in the near future. I do not know whether we can do it in this bill, but if we can curb the ambitions and usurpations of this department I think now is a very good opportunity to do it, and we ought to make some attempt to curb the usurpations of this department.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee who has the bill in charge if there is anything in the bill as it passed the House or in the pending amendment which tends to diminish the use or the equipment of Fort Sill, which is an old and established fort, now owned by the Government? It is now owned by the Government and contains some 56,000 acres, and is joined by the national forest reserve, containing forty or fifty thousand acres.

Mr. OWEN. It contains 65,000 acres.

Mr. GORE. It contains 65,000 acres, as suggested by my colleague. The Wichita Mountains are situated in this reservation, which is already owned by the Government. The mountains afford a splendid background for target practice, which is such an essential requirement of a complete military reservation. The reason I ask this is that an amendment was reported by the Military Committee last winter to the bill which failed and which did react unfavorably on Fort Sill, to which I felt obliged to interpose an objection at the time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is nothing in this bill which affects Fort Sill, except in this regard: On page 4 of the bill, under the heading "United States Service Schools," the words "at Fort Sill, Okla.," are stricken from the bill as it was originally printed in connection with the term "Infantry School of Arms," the reason for that being the Infantry School of Arms has been removed from Fort Sill and is as yet unstationed in a finished condition. Part of that work was to be at Benning, but Fort Sill is to be used to its fullest capacity by the Artillery School of Fire, as it has been for some time past.

Mr. GORE. The transfer of Fort Benning was under an Executive order and not under an act of Congress?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was under an Executive order entirely; in fact, the Infantry School of Arms had not space at Fort Sill, as we are informed, if the Artillery is to have all the space it needs. Modern artillery training and practice involve the laying down of barrages 3 miles away and the maneuvering of the Infantry under the barrage; it takes an enormous space of country, and they can not have both there at the same time.

Mr. GORE. I desire to ask, does the striking out of the name "Fort Sill" in this bill affect the situation or the use of Fort Sill in any way?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all. It is still a School of Fire for Artillery.

Mr. GORE. Would the rejection of this reported amendment striking out "Fort Sill" in any way preserve the use and the importance of the post?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would have no effect. That simply relates to the Infantry School of Arms.

Mr. OWEN. Would not leaving the words "Fort Sill" out require them to put back that School of Arms at Fort Sill, which they have removed?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. It has been absent from there for some time, operating better at another place, and it would force it back there and cramp both Artillery and Infantry.

Mr. OWEN. Sixty-five thousand acres plus 56,000 acres make 121,000 acres, which is large enough undoubtedly for both. One hundred and twenty-one thousand acres is a very large piece of ground; it is many miles in extent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. A 6-inch howitzer throws a shell 8 miles.

Mr. OWEN. As I understand the size of that area, they could throw a shell 8 miles and still be well within the limit of that land.

Mr. GORE. They could throw shells 25 or 30 miles in this reservation from southeast to northwest without crowding the possibilities at all. What is the parliamentary situation? Has this amendment been adopted?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has been adopted.

Mr. GORE. What is now pending?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The real estate proviso.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the other amendment we were discussing in relation to Fort Sill was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment on page 4?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not now the pending amendment.

Mr. GORE. I understand there is a pending amendment now, but I wish simply to give notice of my intention to reconsider the vote by which the other amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I presume it would be rather unprecedented, but, in view of what I conceive to be the misconduct of the War

Department in its purchases of so many places and its violation of the attitude of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, would the Senator from New York consent to an amendment by which the War Department would be restricted from making any purchases or expending any money whatever upon any of these fields without the affirmative approval of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and of the Senate? It seems that if we appropriate funds to the department, even surrounding the expenditure with such limitations as seem to be proper, it effectuates no result, and the limitations in spirit or in letter are ignored. In the light of that attitude of the War Department, it seems to me there must be some way of bringing them to an accountability and to a recognition that there is some force, some authority, superior to the War Department. While I admit that the legislation which I suggest would be unprecedented, it seems to me that legislation of that kind would be warranted when we have to deal with such a recalcitrant—I was going to say revolutionary—branch of the Government. Would the Senator from New York object to an amendment of that character?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not think it would be good legislation. Neither the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate nor the Military Affairs Committee of the other House could do that work. We would have to move up and open offices in the War Department if any such thing were attempted. There are hundreds, yes thousands, of cases of the purchase of real estate contemplated under this amendment reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, does he not mean that the War Department under this amendment would be authorized to buy hundreds or thousands of pieces of real estate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should like to illustrate it with one case which is typical of many others.

At Camp Lee, as I remember it—I have not the figures before me, but the subcommittee went into it and saw the figures, and if any of them have a better recollection of it than have I they can correct me—at Camp Lee, Va., there are some 62 parcels of land, and on the cantonment site the Government has either purchased and paid for or has incurred a straight obligation with an agreed price for two-thirds of those parcels. Those parcels vary in acreage from 5 acres up to 2,000 acres. As to the remaining one-third of the parcels, which would be about 20 parcels of varying sizes, checkerboarded around the cantonment, no agreement has yet been reached as to the price, and in order to protect the buildings on the cantonment and eventually some day get some value back from them, the department has commenced condemnation proceedings. We have got to permit them to do that, in my judgment.

Camp Lee is but an instance of 16 cantonments. There are many places also where we have put up munitions factories on leased land. I know of one case where a $2,500,000 permanent concrete and steel munitions plant has been erected on land which is worth but $5,000, which the Government is leasing. Now, we have got to buy that land or the $2,500,000 building will tumble into the lap of the landowner or the Government would have to erect a building, and you know what the cost of erecting a building comes to in dollars and cents. There are hundreds of those cases.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, a statement such as that of the conduct of the War Department discloses a condition which seems exceedingly scandalous.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of the Camp Benning site project I send to the desk and ask to have the Secretary read from page 304 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the Army appropriation bill a memorandum from the department giving the history of their expenditures and of their action in respect to that site.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

HISTORY OF THE INFANTRY SCHOOL OF ARMS PROJECT, NOW KNOWN AS CAMP BENNING, COLUMBUS, GA.

On August 30, 1918, upon a request from the War College, the Construction Division commenced the preparation of estimates for an Infantry school of arms at Columbus, Ga., for approximately 31,000 men. On September 25, $100,000 was authorized to be expended for a temporary tent camp for this project. This project was completed on October 8, which included five storehouses, medical infirmary, temporary water supply, and electric lights.

On October 9 the Acting Secretary of War authorized construction work in connection with the establishment of the Infantry school of arms at Columbus, based on a personnel of 3,305 men, to the amount of $1,569,875.

On October 18, 1918, a report was made by the chief of the real estate section to the Director of Operations regarding the acquiring of 115,000 acres of land for maneuver ground.

On October 30, 1918, the Assistant Secretary of War authorized the Camp Benning project increased to a size to accommodate 25,000 men. As at this time there was a question of changing the exact location of the camp, little work was done pending this decision.

On January 8 the Secretary of War ordered the abandonment of all new construction at Camp Benning.

On March 12, 1919, the Camp Benning project was reauthorized, and it is under this authority that the present work is now going on and land purchased.

The following is a financial statement of Camp Benning, which shows the present condition of finances and completion:

Weekly report—Financial condition, Camp Benning, Ga., week ending June 7, 1919.

Total cash disbursed:		
Land	$1,640,282.20	
Materials and labor	1,591,940.54	
		$3,232,222.74
Obligations:		
Land	340,298.19	
Materials and labor	452,770.68	
		793,068.87
Estimated cost to complete:		
Land	877,596.33	
Materials and labor	2,252,000.00	
		3,129,596.33
Total		7,154,887.94

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what steps have been taken for the salvaging of the war materials which have been bought on so large a scale? What protection is the United States receiving?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, that matter was pretty thoroughly discussed last night and yesterday afternoon. The War Department has established the office of director of sales, whose duty it is to coordinate the sales of the surplus supplies in the hands of the Government at this time in the War Department.

Mr. OWEN. Are they safeguarding those materials or protecting them from destruction by the elements?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The best information of the committee is that they are, with the possible exception of motor trucks and passenger automobiles.

Mr. OWEN. I heard at Fort Sill the statement made by a reputable citizen there that a large amount of supplies were lying out in the open weather—window sash, doors, and things of that sort—which are more or less perishable when exposed to the elements.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not give the Senator any information about that particular place. We had information to the contrary, except with respect to trucks and automobiles, which, under a law passed by Congress, are to be turned over to the Agricultural Department, to be distributed all over the country in aiding the building of good roads. Some of those trucks and automobiles are out in the open weather, although we are assured that at proper intervals the motors are turned over and also kept oiled. That is all the information I have.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the bill providing for the conservation of food and fuel—H. R. 4961—was passed in the Senate, July 26, 1917, the Senate adopted an amendment by a vote of 53 to 31 which I offered, pages 53 and 63, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, authorizing a legislative committee to keep itself informed with regard to war expenditures, as follows:

SEC. 23. A joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be appointed, composed of five Members of the Senate, including three Democrats and two Republicans, and five Members of the House of Representatives, including three Democrats and two Republicans, to be known as "the joint committee on expenditures in the conduct of the war."

It shall be the duty of said committee to keep itself advised with regard to the expenditure of all appropriations bearing on the conduct of the war made by Congress and the contracts relating thereto made by officers of the executive departments, and it shall be the duty of the executive departments, on request, to keep said committee fully advised as to such expenditures and contracts.

Such committee shall confer and advise with the President of the United States and the heads of the various executive departments, commissions, voluntary boards, or other organizations connected with the conduct of the war, with a view to safeguarding expenditures, and shall report to Congress from time to time, in its own discretion or when requested to do so by either branch of Congress.

The membership of such committee shall be designated by the respective committees of the Senate and House which select the members of the regular standing committees.

Such committee shall have power to act by subcommittee or otherwise and to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such clerical, expert, and stenographic assistance as shall be necessary; and to pay the necessary expenses of such committee there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000, to be paid out upon the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said committee.

The purpose of that amendment was to prevent the very waste with which we are now confronted, by using the moral influence of the committee. It passed the Senate by a very substantial vote, but was stricken out in the House because of the hostility of certain representatives of the executive department, who did

not wish to be restrained, and who denounced and ridiculed the proposed committee as a "smelling committee" and as equivalent to a vote of "no confidence" in the President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator might just as well say it was the hostility of the President.

Mr. OWEN. I decline to put the responsibility on the President. I believe it was largely due to other people and other interests. The President of the United States, however, can not in the nature of the case be omniscient; he is obliged to depend upon the advice of the trusted men who surround him. It is the settled policy of all great governments that the chief executive or head of the government is protected from the charge that he is personally responsible for everything that occurs, and the responsibility is properly and justly put upon his ministry, where it really belongs, and who may be held responsible without upsetting the smooth conduct of the government. I think it worth while to call attention of the Senate now to that amendment, which was drawn by me for the purpose of protecting the taxpayers of this country against the extraordinary wastefulness and extravagance during war on the part of the executive departments, and the Senate's effort to protect the country. I wish to wash my hands of the responsibility.

I offered another amendment at the same time for an administrative court, providing a means to hold officials to immediate responsibility for malfeasance and bad behavior, as follows:

There is hereby authorized and established a court to be known as the "official court," to consist of one judge for each judicial circuit of the United States, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the terms of said judges at the beginning of the service to be from one to nine years, respectively, to be determined by lot, and thereafter each successor shall hold for the term of nine years unless sooner removed for cause by the President.

The salary of each judge shall be $6,000 annually.

The judge of the official court shall have jurisdiction over every case of malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, or neglect of duty in office of any employee, adviser, committeeman, or officer appointed under the authority of the United States except members of the President's Cabinet and Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, with power to issue summons for witnesses, to require the production of evidence, to punish for contempt, and render judgment on questions involving official misconduct, and issue writs necessary to carry out the authority herein given. The marshal of the United States District Court shall serve the writs of the judges of the official court.

Any person, natural or corporate, upon filing bonds for the costs of the suit shall have the right to enter a complaint against any such employee of the United States for malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, or serious neglect of official duty. The judge of the official court shall impose a fine not exceeding $5,000 upon the complainant where the complaint is frivolous or insincere. The costs of the proceeding shall fall upon the complainant if not sustained and upon the defendant if sustained.

Upon such complaint being filed, the judge within whose circuit such complaint is made shall immediately require the evidence to be submitted orally and recorded or by depositions within 10 days from the date of the filing of the complaint, except upon special order where compliance is impossible, and within 10 days from receiving such evidence the judge shall make his findings.

There is hereby authorized an appellate official court to consist of three justices, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The appellate official court shall make rules and regulations and determine forms of procedure for the official court and for appeals therefrom; shall have power to issue such writs as may be necessary to exercise its jurisdiction; and shall sit in Washington City, D. C.

All appeals to the appellate official court shall be made within five days from date of the publication of the judgment of the judge of the official court and shall be passed upon within 30 days of the receipt thereof.

The appellate official court justices shall hold office for a period of nine years, one for three years, one for six years, and one for nine years, to be determined by lot, and thereafter each justice shall be appointed for a term of nine years and shall have original jurisdiction over cases arising in the District of Columbia.

The appellate justices shall receive a salary of $7,500 annually.

In the event of a final judgment by the official court against an employee or officer of the United States, he shall have the option of resigning within five days of the rendition of the final judgment. In the event his resignation is not submitted, the office shall be declared vacant and filled by a new incumbent.

The dismissal from office under the proceedings herein authorized shall not preclude a trial or conviction under the criminal code where a violation of the statutes is exposed.

This amendment should have been adopted. It is badly needed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Oklahoma, in connection with the waste of material and lack of care of material, that there are 52,000 bales of cotton at the plant at Nitro that have been exposed to the weather ever since last fall, and are still there lying on the ground.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who wish to vote upon this amendment, and, reluctant as I am to do so, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Henderson	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Stanley
Colt	Kellogg	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Kendrick	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kenyon	Overman	Thomas
Dial	Keyes	Page	Trammell
Dillingham	King	Phelan	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kirby	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
France	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Ransdell	Warren
Gore	Lenroot	Sheppard	Watson
Gronna	Lodge	Sherman	Williams
Hale	McCormick	Simmons	Wolcott
Harding	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before a vote is taken upon this amendment I want to call attention to a clipping which I have from the Columbus Dispatch under date of June 17, 1919. I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to this statement. It appears that immediately after the amendment was offered by Representative KAHN in the House to restrain the War Department from making real estate purchases, it sent Maj. J. J. McConnell, Army paymaster, to one particular place to purchase additional land or to consummate executory contracts. It would seem that this was done for the purpose of flouting Congress and showing the utter contempt of the department for any expression of opinion by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, or any contemplated action by the House of Representatives. The statement of the paper in question is as follows:

Maj. J. J. McConnell, Army paymaster, arrived in Camp Sherman and by Monday evening over $500,000 had been paid to landowners in the form of Federal vouchers. No grass has grown, it appears, beneath the War Department's feet During the past seven days, said McConnell, he has paid out over $5,000,000 in the purchase of Camps Lee, Taylor, Pike, Sherman, and Travis. He said that Pike brought $12 an acre, Custer $62, Travis $500, and Taylor, which thrusts a wedge into Louisville's choicest residence district, $550. The largest individual check to a Ross County landowner, he said, was for $105,900.

This merely indicates, Mr. President, the attitude of the War Department. There are officials there who seem to be obsessed with the idea that lands must be purchased wherever they can be bought, whether needed by the Government for military purposes or not. Millions of dollars have been wasted in the purchase of unnecessary lands and in the erection of unnecessary buildings. I think somebody in the War Department ought to be punished for this misconduct and for this willful and wanton expenditure of public funds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to have the amendment stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The SECRETARY. On line 15 it is proposed to insert:

That if in his opinion it is advisable to do so, the Secretary of War may purchase 960 acres of land now under lease for an aviation field or camp site, known as Ebert's Field, and thereafter sell the same: *Provided*, That no sale shall be made of lands for any less amount than the cost thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the question is on the committee amendment on lines 16 to 21.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from New York. I should like to move a reconsideration or ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 4, with relation to Fort Sill, was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I merely wish to say this in regard to the proposed amendment:

The chairman of the committee stated a few minutes ago, in explanation of it, that it would lead to the increased use of Fort Sill. If that judgment is correct, of course I shall be

very strongly in favor of the amendment. There is no fort in the country that is better equipped as a military reservation or adapted to more varied uses than Fort Sill. I happen to live within a few miles of the reservation. In the military reservation proper and the forest reserve there are 121,000 acres. The Wichita Mountains are situated within this reserve, and, as I suggested a few minutes ago, they make an excellent background for target practice. I should say that from southeast to northwest the two reservations are 25 miles in extent. There can be no crowding of this reservation. I understand that the School of Infantry has already been removed from Fort Sill. It seems to be now rather in the clouds—nowhere in particular.

I wish to repeat that if this amendment would lead to the increased use of Fort Sill and that splendid reservation I shall be for it. Everybody realizes the rush under which we are obliged to legislate at this time. The desire to secure the passage of this bill before the expiration of the fiscal year on June 30 denies us an opportunity to make as full an investigation as we otherwise would do and would like to do. For my own part I should like to have this matter go over until the next session in order that I may have a better opportunity to investigate the exact facts of this amendment on Fort Sill and its use for military purposes. I say that if it is to lead to its increased use I shall be very strongly in favor of the amendment.

I therefore hope the committee amendment will be rejected at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, just a word of explanation:

Prior to our entrance into the war the Fort Sill Reservation was used in a very small way, by comparison with recent developments, as a School of Fire for Artillery, and also to a certain extent, as I remember, for Infantry. When we went into the war the Artillery became so tremendously important, and the School of Fire for that branch had to be so tremendously expanded, that, according to the best information I can get—and I have talked with many Army officers who have no prejudice at all—the Artillery School of Fire practically crowded the Infantry School of Fire to such an extent at Fort Sill that the Infantry School of Fire could not be carried on there advantageously.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the area of those two properties owned by the Government makes a tract of country of 200 square miles, so that there is the greatest possible abundance of room for both of these services; and the plea that there is not room enough is obviously without any foundation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. Two hundred square miles is not a very big territory in these days, with guns that carry 8 and 10 miles.

Mr. OWEN. It is 10 miles one way, and 20 miles the other.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And, in addition to that, it is not only the area that was regarded as insufficient for the two schools together, but the facilities, particularly water——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. WADSWORTH. If I may be permitted just to close my statement, I shall not occupy the time of the Senate any longer.

Mr. GORE. Just in regard to the water, I will say to the Senator that the dam has recently been increased in height 10 feet. Before that increase in the dam was made, an area of 1,100 acres was embraced in the lake; and I think since the dam has been increased 10 feet, I believe at the expense of the city government, there can not be any possibility of a lack of sufficient water. That problem is solved.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is the situation so far as I know it: The use of Fort Sill is not going to be lessened. In fact, it is going to have more men stationed there and more training done there than was ever done prior to our entrance into the war; but it will be Artillery, instead of attempting to have both Artillery and Infantry. That is my understanding of it.

I hope the amendment of the committee will be sustained, because if it is not it will force the return of the Infantry School of Arms to Fort Sill, where the best men that the committee could consult with say it can not be advantageously conducted.

Mr. OWEN. Are these the same gentlemen who are expending these sums?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all. These are artillerymen and infantrymen.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to be informed with regard to the kind of advice we are getting from the War Department. I do not feel that we have been very well safeguarded in the advice that we have received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer state this question? We are now voting on the original committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the original committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 73, after line 1, to strike out "cantonments: *And provided further*, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and the completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this bill be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant: *And provided further*," and to insert "cantonments," so as to read:

No part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House provision that is stricken out has been in the military appropriation bill for the last four years. It prevents the use of stop watches or other time-measuring instruments. Every Senator is familiar with it. I think it ought to be retained in the bill, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in all probability this amendment will be voted down. It has been made by the Military Affairs Committee, I think, every time it has had a similar bill before it since I have been a member of the committee, only to be reinserted upon the floor.

I do not intend to occupy the time of the Senate in what I know would be a useless discussion of the merits of the amendment. It has been done with annual regularity heretofore, but the influences behind the House provision have always proven effective.

The amendment is designed to prevent the use of any agency the purpose of which is to ascertain and measure productive efficiency. It is said that in private enterprises these agencies have been abused, and that the capacity of the most efficient has been made the standard of capacity for all. It never has been used in any of the Government industrial institutions.

It never can and it never will be, because there is a minimum wage for all employees of the Government, which before the war was better than the average minimum wage in private establishments. It was designed and created before this amendment made its appearance not only to increase general efficiency without injuring in the slightest degree any workmen who might fall behind in production, but it enabled a great many intelligent and skillful workmen to increase their compensation to a very marked degree. I recall that two or three years ago when this subject was before the Senate upon motion of the late Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Gallinger, he and I read a number of communications from Government employees at different places in the country, those presented by myself coming from the Frankford Arsenal and written in protest against the inclusion in the bill of this provision. Some of them stated that with their extra compensation and because of the fact that they were probably able to continue obtaining it indefinitely they had purchased homes upon the installment plan and were engaged in making payments through their dependence upon this source of revenue, and many of them expressed the apprehension that they might not be able to comply with their contracts if this source of compensation were taken from them. That being the case, and in the interest of the Government, there being no possibility of a corresponding injury to anybody, this provision should not appear in any of our supply bills.

The proviso beginning on line 16 has no place in the bill if the proviso which the committee want to strike out is to be restored. It reads:

That no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government arsenals of the United States for a sum less than they can be purchased or procured otherwise.

The proviso preceding makes it impossible to manufacture or produce in any Government arsenal anything for a sum less than it can be purchased or procured otherwise. It is a contradiction in terms. Why it is there I can not understand, but with the previous proviso excluded from the bill it becomes cogent, reasonable, and logical. As the two stand together, the one makes economic production impossible while the other provides that nothing shall be purchased on the outside which can be manufactured by the Government for a sum less than the amount of such purchase. I think, Mr. President, that the proviso should be excluded and the amendment proposed should be agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, it seems there are two different subjects treated in the proviso which the committee recommends to be stricken out. One deals with the stop-watch system and the other deals with the bonus system. I should like to have those questions submitted separately, and I ask that that portion of the committee amendment commencing on line 2 and extending down to and including the word "work," in line 10, be submitted first and then that the rest of the amendment be submitted separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair). Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand the vote must be taken first on the stop-watch proposition and second on the bonus proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the case.

Mr. McKELLAR. I request the yeas and nays on both propositions.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Before the roll is called, I understand a vote "yea" sustains the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. ASHURST. As I understand the situation now parliamentarily, it is to agree to so much of the amendment as is embraced within lines 2 down to and including the word "work," in line 10. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand a vote "yea" strikes out the House provision as to stop-watch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. And so a vote "yea" would strike out the House provision as to the bonus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. And a vote "nay" is to retain the House provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; to retain it. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the first part of the amendment of the committee to strike out.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Mr. President, I am paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I am informed that I can transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer my pair to that Senator and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WATSON. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Has the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with that Senator and for that reason withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FALL. I inquire if the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. FALL. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I notice that my pair the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is not present. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to inquire if the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask if the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD. I inquire if the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. FERNALD. In his absence I withhold my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. NEW. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is detained upon official business.

Mr. KIRBY. My colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—20.

Colt	Hale	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Edge	Harding	New	Spencer
Elkins	Keyes	Newberry	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	King	Page	Wadsworth
Gronna	McCumber	Phipps.	Williams

NAYS—33.

Ashurst	Harrison	McCormick	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Henderson	McKellar	Stanley
Capper	Hitchcock	McNary	Trammell
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Underwood
Cummins	Kenyon	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kirby	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
France	La Follette	Ransdell	
Gay	Lenroot	Sheppard	
Harris	Lodge	Shields	

NOT VOTING—43.

Ball	Gerry	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gore	Overman	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Smoot
Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Sterling
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Sutherland
Culberson	Kellogg	Poindexter	Swanson
Curtis	Kendrick	Pomerene	Townsend
Dillingham	Knox	Reed	Warren
Fall	McLean	Robinson	Watson
Fernald	Martin	Sherman	Wolcott
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	

So the first division of the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the second division of the amendment of the committee striking out the part relative to the premium or bonus.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand it, the yeas and nays have been ordered on that also?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE. Making the same transfer as before, of my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. BECKHAM. Has the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a pair with that Senator, and in his absence withhold my vote.

Mr. NEW. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is detained on official business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON, after having voted in the negative). The Chair announces that he has a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK]. He transfers that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and lets his vote stand.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. He is not present in the Chamber at this time, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

The roll call resulted—yeas 27, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Ashurst	Gronna	New	Thomas
Chamberlain	Hale	Newberry	Underwood
Colt	Harding	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	Hitchcock	Phipps	Watson
Elkins	Keyes	Pittman	Williams
Fernald	Lodge	Shields	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—22.

Borah	Harrison	La Follette	Stanley
Capper	Henderson	Lenroot	Trammell
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
France	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Kenyon	Nugent	
Harris	Kirby	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—47.

Ball	Gore	Myers	Simmons
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Kellogg	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Kendrick	Penrose	Smoot
Culberson	King	Phelan	Spencer
Curtis	Knox	Poindexter	Sterling
Dial	McCormick	Pomerene	Sutherland
Dillingham	McCumber	Reed	Swanson
Fall	McLean	Robinson	Townsend
Fletcher	McNary	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	Martin	Sherman	

So the second division of the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I reserve a separate vote on the amendment when the bill gets into the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 15, at the end of the line appears the word "cantonments" in italics. That should appear following the word "or," at the end of line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the word "cantonments" will remain at the end of line 2 and be stricken out at the end of line 15.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 22, to insert:

That the several organizations of the War Department, with their powers and duties as defined in orders and regulations in force and effect on November 11, 1918, shall be continued until a reorganization of the Army is effected by statutes of Congress duly approved.

That officers of the emergency Army appointed to the Officers' Reserve Corps may be appointed therein to the grade held by them in the emergency Army, or higher grade, as the Secretary of War may direct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 6, to insert:

CHAPTER I.

Memorial archway at Vicksburg, Miss.: That there is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the unexpended balance of an appropriation under the deficiency appropriation act for 1916, approved September 8, 1916, for the national memorial reunion and peace jubilee, held at Vicksburg, Miss., which unexpended balance is understood to be about $35,000, for the purpose of securing designs and plans for, and the construction of, a memorial archway to be erected at the intersection of Clay Street, extended, in the said city of Vicksburg, within the bounds of the Vicksburg National Military Park.

SEC. 2. That the aforesaid memorial archway shall be constructed under the supervision and approval of the Secretary of War, and the work shall be committed to a commission, to be known as the "Vicksburg Memorial Arch Commission," composed of three members who served in the Civil War and participated in the siege and defense of Vicksburg in 1863. One of the members shall be the president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, who served in the Federal Army; one shall be the chairman of the Vicksburg National Park Commission; and one shall be a resident of the State of Mississippi, who served in the Confederate Army, and who shall be designated by the governor of the State of Mississippi. The duties of the commission shall be to secure appropriate designs and plans for the said archway, to select and employ the architects and sculptors for the erection of the same, and to make contracts therefor, not exceeding the available amount herein appropriated. The members of the commission shall receive no compensation. After the dedication thereof, the said structure shall become a part of the National Military Park at Vicksburg and be under the control of the Vicksburg National Park Commission.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I move to amend chapter 1, on page 74, by striking out all that part beginning with the word "That," in line 8, down to and including the words "Military Park," in line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the committee amendment in chapter 1, line 8, after the name "Mississippi," it is proposed to strike out:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the unexpended balance of an appropriation under the deficiency appropriation act for 1916, approved September 8, 1916, for the national memorial reunion and peace jubilee, held at Vicksburg, Miss., which unexpended balance is understood to be about $35,000, for the purpose of securing designs and plans for and the construction of a memorial archway to be erected at the intersection of Clay Street, extended, in the said city of Vicksburg, within the bounds of the Vicksburg National Military Park.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me a very few minutes, I want to explain just what this amendment is intended to accomplish.

A few years ago there was organized an association known as the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans. That association was composed of soldiers of the South and of the North. It was intended to prepare for a celebration of the North and the South to be held at Vicksburg. A Union soldier, named Capt. F. A. Roziene, was chosen as the president of the association. He at once devoted all his time and his strength to the project of getting together the soldiers of the North and of the South for the purpose of holding this probably last celebration and last memorial that will ever occur in which the veterans of both sides of that great war will participate. He is an old man; I think he is 84 years old. He is a poor man; that is to say, he is not a needy man, but he has no fortune whatever.

The bill as I introduced it, and as it is partly found in the committee amendment, provides for a reimbursement to him of $3,000 as a part of the expenses which he incurred in preparing for the celebration at Vicksburg, and especially in interesting Congress for the purpose of securing an appropriation to aid in the jubilee, as it was called in the literature of the old veterans.

Congress did appropriate, I think, $100,000 or $150,000 to be spent under the direction of the Secretary of War; but so careful and saving were all of them that there remains of the appropriation which was made, I think, in 1915 or 1916 about $35,000.

When these old veterans met at Vicksburg—and it was one of the most notable occasions of that or any other year—they not only had a delightful time among themselves but I think they helped to perpetuate a sentiment which does a great deal for American citizenship and unity throughout the country. At a meeting of these veterans there was passed a resolution which I shall read, because I do not want anybody to think that this old man is at the door of Congress begging for a reimbursement of the expenses which he necessarily incurred. I say now that he is not asking the reimbursement; he has never asked the reimbursement. It is asked on his behalf by the men who enjoyed the occasion which he was largely, if not wholly, instrumental in bringing about. This is the resolution which was adopted at Vicksburg on the 18th of October, 1917:

Whereas Comrade F. A. Roziene, president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, has by his personal efforts exerted in every honorable way possible, working both in season and out, traveling to Washington to speak before congressional committees, and throughout the length and breadth of the land to labor with State legislatures, paying in the meantime all his expenses for travel, clerical hire, and postage, he makes this great patriotic and fraternal reunion of the Blue and the Gray possible, all for the sake of the good it would do, and all this in spite of the weight upon him of more than 80 years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do hereby express to our good Comrade Roziene our heartfelt thanks for his good spirit and his persistent, generous, and loyal efforts to bring about this happy reunion of the Blue and the Gray; and be it further

Resolved, That we here assembled, Union and Confederate Vicksburg Veterans, hereby most earnestly urge upon the Congress of the United States an appropriation of $3,000 to repay in part the expense to which Comrade Roziene has put himself to make possible this patriotic and praiseworthy reunion in perfect harmony of the men who 50 years ago bravely fought one another for principles upon which they honestly disagreed but are now happily reunited.

I have brought this resolution to the attention of the Senate, because I know that one is apt to think of a man like Capt. Roziene as a lobbyist, as one who is endeavoring to secure an appropriation in his own interest and in his own behalf. This brave old soldier never occupied a position of that character. His work was purely altruistic before; it is altruistic still, and he does not suggest the reimbursement which my bill originally provided and which my amendment now proposes to incorporate in the proposal of the committee. I ask it in behalf of the thousands of Confederate and Union veterans who gathered in Vicksburg in 1917 and made the occasion one of the most memorable this country has ever seen. I ask it on their behalf, for they desire the reimbursement that is proposed in this amendment.

I may say that the Committee on Military Affairs recommended that part of the measure that I proposed which relates to the appropriation of $32,000 for the erection of a memorial archway on one of the highways leading into the great National Military Park at Vicksburg. For that I am very appreciative and very grateful, and I think it is wise; but I do beg the Senate to allow the prayer of these veterans and to reimburse this old man for the expenses which he incurred in these years of hard and weary struggle to bring about the reunion, which proved to be so happy and fortunate an event. It does not increase the appropriation. The recommendation of the veterans was that the $35,000 which remained unexpended should be divided, $3,000 to be used in the reimbursement of which I have spoken, and $32,000 in the construction of the memorial archway to commemorate the valor of the men who made the siege of Vicksburg immortal.

I have nothing more to say about it. I hope the amendment which I have suggested will be adopted, as it has no other effect upon the proposal of the committee than to take $3,000 of this money, and use it for the purpose of reimbursement, leaving $32,000 of unexpended appropriation for the construction of the memorial archway.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] will prevail. About four years ago, I think it was, I met Col. Roziene for the first time. He is not a citizen of my State; he is a citizen of the great city of Chicago. I met him here in Washington in company with an ex-Confederate soldier, one of the best men I ever knew, Capt. Webb, from my State, working on this plan for this peace jubilee to be held at Vicksburg in 1917. They appeared before the committee. I saw them afterwards at Vicksburg, Miss., working on the plans and creating a sentiment for this jubilee, and then afterwards here again, asking Congress to pass appropriate legislation for the holding of this great event. Congress appropriated $150,000, as has been stated by the Senator from Iowa, for the purpose.

I attended the celebration at Vicksburg. I was never more impressed in my life than by the gathering of those men there from the North and from the South on that occasion. For several days in tents and on the campus, in hotels and along the streets, they ate and slept together, talking over the old days, and all I am sure had a wonderfully good time. There must have been 10,000 ex-Union soldiers there from the North and thousands of Confederate soldiers were there from the South. The heart of Vicksburg was never more warmed than on that occasion. She outdid herself. Her hospitality was unbounded, her welcome refreshing. The people of my State and of the South were delighted that that jubilee was held and held at Vicksburg.

I live at a place called Belvoir, which was the last home of the ex-president of the Confederacy. I vote in a building where Jefferson Davis once wrote his memoirs. His former home is now occupied by the Confederate veterans of Mississippi; it is cared for by the State and by the daughters and sons of the Confederacy. To attend this jubilee I think every soldier in the Belvoir Home—certainly those who could get there—went on a special train. They enjoyed it wonderfully.

As I understand, there are $35,000 unexpended with which it is proposed to erect this archway at this most prominent street of that historic city, the one that leads into this beautiful national park. We could not spend the money to better advantage, and I am glad that the Senator from Iowa has seen fit to offer his amendment, and that he has changed it from the committee amendment so as to provide that $3,000 of the appropriation shall go to this gallant old gentleman from Chicago. When I saw him here so frequently and afterwards in Mississippi I did not know that he was spending money out of his own pocket, but I did know of the enthusiasm and the vigor he displayed for this great work and this great event; and I am sure I voice the sentiments of every old Confederate soldier at least when I express the hope that the Federal Congress will make this appropriation of $3,000 out of the unexpended balance to go to Col. Roziene. I hope that the committee will accept the substitute and that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not believe that the amendment as proposed to the committee amendment should prevail. The celebration at Vicksburg was desirable; it was had; it was a great occasion, and was thoroughly enjoyed. The Government of the United States came forward with a liberal hand and contributed $150,000 toward its success. After it has succeeded and passed into history as a memorable event we are asked now to expend the balance of the appropriation—for what purpose? No suggestion was made heretofore that the balance of this appropriation should be used in the erection of an arch at the entrance to the national park at Vicksburg until it was thought advisable to pay the gentleman who promoted the scheme $3,000 for the services that he rendered. He did not expect, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has said, when he rendered this service that the Government would repay him the money. He did not tell the people and Congress that he had lobbied here for a measure that he thought might cement the friendship between the old veterans who had fought each other in the Civil War. It was not expected that he should have any of this money. Now, why dim the glory of that achievement by paying to this man $3,000 for doing something for which he did not expect to receive compensation—for lobbying here before Congress to get $150,000?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sure that the Senator does not desire to do Col. Roziene an injustice. I recall having met the old gentleman about three or four months ago, and he wrote me at least a year ago suggesting that it would be a splendid idea if they could spend the unexpended balance for this memorial archway. He never said a word about himself. He is too much of a man to suggest it. This is not compensation for any services he rendered; it is to reimburse him for money he expended.

Mr. KIRBY. The committee propose to provide the money for the archway.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not believe he ever suggested to anybody that he wanted any money out of it. I think it is due to the spirit of the Senator from Iowa and the suggestions of ex-Confederate and Union soldiers, his comrades, if you please, that this $3,000 is proposed to be expended for the purposes indicated.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have read the origin of the proposal. It came from the assembled veterans at Vicksburg. It is not compensation for any services rendered by Capt. Roziene.

Mr. KIRBY. The amendment so states.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is simply a partial reimbursement to him for expenses incurred in bringing about the celebration or the jubilee. He has not proposed anything of that kind, but it is a generous, decent thing to do, in my opinion, not only because of its innate justice, but because the people who were there and who enjoyed the opportunity which he had been largely instrumental in presenting to them asked that it be done. It seems to me that it is just as proper to return a part of his expenses as it is to pay out of the Treasury any other part of the expenses of the jubilee.

Mr. KIRBY. The committe thought, owing to the peculiar wording of the amendment, that he should be paid $3,000 for bringing the matter to the attention of Congress and of the public that it was virtually to reimburse him for the activity he displayed in procuring the appropriation for the purpose for which it was used.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not entirely so.

Mr. KIRBY. It seemed so from the language of the measure.

Mr. CUMMINS. Capt. Roziene was chosen president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans. The purpose of that association was to arrange for a celebration at Vicksburg in the form of a memorial of the old days. To that end Capt. Roziene, who had been chosen president, traveled all over the country arousing interest in it, seeking aid from the legislatures of the various States, and organizing both North and South, so that a full attendance could be secured. It is furthest from my thought that there should be any recompense for services, but, as I have remarked, he is an old man; he is a poor man; but his enthusiasm led him to an expenditure which he can ill afford to bear. It is a mere matter of whether the generosity of Congress will consider that expenditure a part of the expense of the jubilee and do something to the restoration of Capt. Roziene of

money which he has expended. He has expended a large amount in excess of $3,000. He worked at this for four or five years before he was finally successful.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, to reinforce, as well as I may, what has been said by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and what has been done by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] in connection with this appropriation, I desire to say that Col. Roziene, of the State of Iowa, one of the bravest and truest Federal soldiers who ever trod shoe leather, cooperated with Gen. Stephen D. Lee, who was at that time alive and was the last living lieutenant general of the Confederate Army and who had had command of the wonderful Confederate artillery in the defense of Vicksburg.

They secured the appropriation to which reference has been made. There was to be a great reunion of the Blue and the Gray, and, by the way, not only the Blue and the Gray came to Vicksburg but the sons of the Blue and the sons of the Gray came. Nobody has done a more valuable work in the conciliation of the sections of this country than Col. Roziene, and nobody deserves recognition more highly than he does in every way. He has been broad-minded, nonpartisan, nonsectional, and has been the good, true, honest soldier after the war was over that he had been while the war was on.

I happened to have had a conversation one night with Gen. Stephen D. Lee, whom I mentioned a moment ago as the last lieutenant general of the Confederacy living at that time, and he told me that no man had ever impressed him as more true and honest, straight and brave, than Col. Roziene. I hope that the Senate will not accidentally or incidentally pass any provision or omit any provision which might possibly be construed into a rebuke of him.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I have said about all I care to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. KIRBY. I make the point of order against this amendment that it is not germane to the bill and is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am totally unfamiliar with the rules of the Senate, but it does seem to me that when a point of order is made it ought to be made when the amendment is read. After all this debate, certainly a point of order ought not to lie. I repeat, I am not altogether familiar with the rules of the Senate, but after an amendment has been discussed for several minutes and then agreed to by the Senate, certainly it is too late to raise a point of order.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not recognize the merit of the objection made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. The amendment as amended had not been agreed to, and before a vote had been taken on it I raised the point of order. However, on account of the request made by some Senators, I withdraw the point of order, and if the Senate sees fit to adopt the amendment I shall have nothing further to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas withdraws his point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 75, after line 16, to insert:

CHAPTER II.

Disposal of real property by sale, exchange, lease, or otherwise: That the President is hereby authorized, through the head of any executive department, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by him or such head of department, to sell, exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of real property or any interest therein or appurtenant thereto acquired by the United States of America since April 6, 1917, for storage purposes for the use of the Army, which in the judgment of the President or the head of such department is no longer needed for use by the United States of America, and to execute and deliver in the name of the United States and in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effectuate any such sale, exchange, lease, or other disposal.

SEC. 2. That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of any such sale or exchange shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of "Miscellaneous receipts" and a full report of the same shall be submitted annually to Congress.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I have no desire to make it if the chairman of the committee will accept an amendment limiting the authority to sales or leases. I do not think that we ought to commit to the War Department the general authority to make exchanges, to trade in real estate. I have not any idea that in any case it would result to the benefit of the Government if such exchanges were made. I approve the authority given to the President or the head of any department to make a sale or a lease of property, but that is as far as I think we ought to go. I shall make the point of order unless such an amendment as I have indicated can be agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, Mr. President, I understand the significance of the point of order. It would probably be sustained, and the whole thing would go out; but I think it is due to the War Department and to the committee to say just a word in explanation.

This matter was first brought to the attention of the Military Affairs Committee at the last session of Congress when Gen. Goethals, who at that time was Assistant Chief of Staff and head of the Division of Purchase, Storage and Traffic, came before the committee and very strenuously urged the insertion of this language in the military appropriation bill of that session. He put especial emphasis upon the word "exchange," because a situation had arisen, as I recollect, in the city of Chicago, where the Government had put up a large freezer plant at an approximate cost of $3,300,000. The plant was finished just as the war ended, which, incidentally, was the history of a great many of our transactions. If I recollect correctly, Gen. Goethals was exceedingly anxious to get the authority not only to lease and to sell, but to exchange, because an opportunity, as he said, presented itself to the Government to trade that plant for an ordinary storage plant near by, which would be of real value to the Government and which it could not get in any other way. It would be infinitely preferable to purchasing the ordinary storage plant, because by making the trade, the exchange of real estate, the Government could get rid of something it did not want and could not use and get something that it did want and could use. Of course, however, if the Senator from Wisconsin insists upon the point of order, I will have to consent to striking out the word "exchange." I have here a letter from the Secretary of War addressed to me, under date of June 6, which does not go into the Chicago matter as fully as Gen. Goethals did at the time, but which I think it is due the Secretary to have printed in the RECORD, without reading, as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 6, 1919.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WADSWORTH: I am submitting for the consideration of the Military Committee of the Senate a provision which I desire to have embodied either in the Army appropriation bill or such other bill as the committee may deem practicable at this time. This provision is designed to remedy a situation in which the War Department finds itself without statutory power to dispose of surplus realty acquired under urgent necessity during the war. The continued possession of such property will involve useless expenditure of funds for maintenance and very frequently a substantial loss through depreciation.

A concrete example of the general case stated above is the erection by the War Department of a large freezer plant at Chicago, Ill. Work was begun upon this plant in August, 1918, and the plant completed in March, 1919, at an approximate cost of $3,300,000. The War Department now has no use for this plant, and did existing law permit could dispose of it to commercial interests with advantage.

The provision by which it is proposed to remedy this situation is as follows:

"The President is hereby authorized, through the head of any executive department, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by him, or such head of department, to sell, exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of real property or any interest therein or appurtenant thereto acquired by the United States of America since April 6, 1917, for storage purposes for the use of the Army, which, in the judgment of the President or the head of such department, is no longer needed for use by the United States of America, and in its behalf, any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effectuate any such sale, exchange, lease, or other disposal."

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he should not add to his amendment a provision that in connection with every sale or exchange made a report should be made to some person or somebody, so that Congress ultimately might be advised of the transaction?

Mr. LENROOT. That had not occurred to me, but I shall be very glad to support the amendment if the Senator will draw it.

Mr. President, I offer to amend line 18 by striking out the word "exchange" and inserting the word "or."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Immediately following, on lines 18 and 19, I move to strike out the words "or otherwise."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On line 22, I move to strike out the word "exchange" and insert "or," and to strike out the words "or otherwise disposed of."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On page 76, line 5, I move to strike out the word "exchange" and insert the word "or," and to strike out "or other disposal."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On line 8 I move to strike out the word "exchange" and insert the word "lease."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that section 2 does provide for a report being submitted annually to Congress.

Mr. KING. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 76, after line 11, to insert:

CHAPTER III.

That the Boughton Memorial Association, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Kansas, be, and is hereby, authorized to erect and maintain a suitable building, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, in and upon the United States military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the plans of such building to be first approved, and to be constructed in such location as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the use of such portion of the ground floor of said building as may be necessary shall be given to the Post Office Department of the United States, free of charge, for the post-office service of the reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 77, to insert:

CHAPTER IV.

That sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of Chapter XV of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board: That there is hereby created a board to be known as the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, to consist of the Secretry of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury as ex officio members, and of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, or of representatives designated by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. The duties of the board shall be: (1) To make rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter; (2) to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under sections 5 and 6; (3) to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purpose of this chapter by their respective departments; and (4) to direct the expenditure of the sum of $100,000 provided in section 7 of this chapter. The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect annually one of its members as chairman, and shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to section 2, to come in at the end of section 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 2, on line 11, page 78, it is proposed to insert:

The allotment to the States and any funds under the control of said board not otherwise allotted by this chapter may respectively be expended by said States and said board for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of lands for sites; for the construction, enlargement, repair, improvement, equipment, furnishing, stocking, maintenance, and operation thereon and on lands already owned by the United States, or by the States or others, of buildings, hospitals, quarantine stations, industrial farms, and schools for the purposes of this chapter: *Provided, however*, That for sufficient cause shown or upon failure to carry out the conditions prescribed therefor any allotment or appropriation of funds made under any section of this chapter may be revoked in whole or in part in the discretion of said board.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I reserve the point of order against the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas on the ground that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, before the Senator insists upon the point of order I desire to state that the whole matter is general legislation, and the point would apply to the whole chapter as well as it would to this.

Mr. KING. If it will, I shall raise the point of order against the entire provision.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. KIRBY. If the Senator will let me make an explanation of this amendment, I think that the chapter should not be withdrawn or objected to even if the amendment offered by me shall fail. Here is the condition which the amendment was offered to meet:

In the State of Arkansas a cantonment was established at Camp Pike. The citizens of the State gave 3,000 acres of land, and they gave rent free 10,000 acres of land to the Government to be used as maneuver grounds. A great camp was established down there, one of the largest in the country, and necessarily there congregated about that camp women of easy virtue. They overran the town. The condition was so bad that the State was hardly able to cope with it at all. Something had to be done to protect the citizens and to protect the soldiers under those conditions and to protect the women and to take care of them.

Under those circumstances the Interdepartmental Hygiene Board went to the State of Arkansas and said: "We will pay one-half of the amount of the cost of the construction of an industrial school, if the State will pay the remainder of that cost, to take care of this condition, to take care of these women, and relieve the town of the menace and relieve the soldiers of the menace." That was the condition, and the board agreed with our people to put up $50,000 if the State would put up another $50,000 for the construction and erection of this school. The State raised its $50,000 for this particular purpose, and the board refused or was unable to perform its part of the agreement, because it was said that under the law there was not sufficient authority to contribute this money for the erection of a building.

That is the condition down there. The money has been raised for this purpose. It was raised under these conditions. The necessity existed for it, and I understand that in two other cantonments they made like promises of small amounts of money. Under those conditions it seemed to us that the Government ought to perform its part of the agreement, in order that the condition might be fully taken care of, the State paying at least one-half of it. On that account I have offered this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge to a bill that the Appropriations Committee is considering appropriating money for this very purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This does not appropriate a cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I am saying what we are considering by way of an appropriation. The Senator says this does not appropriate a cent. It says, in section 5:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000 to carry out the provision of section 2 of this chapter.

Is not that an appropriation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is merely a repetition of the language of the act as passed last year. It had to be recited, along with the rest of the section, because each of the six sections that are being amended contains language that has to be corrected, and it is merely a repetition of the former act. If the Senator desires, I can point out the changes in the language. It does not involve any increase whatsoever in the appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. I think perhaps it would have been better to simply state the amendments to the sections of the chapter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are quite a large number of them.

Mr. SMOOT. It may be that it would have taken just as many words to do that as it would to recite the whole law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; that is the trouble.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator, then, to point out briefly what changes are made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Before I point them out, I desire to say this:

After this act was passed and this board organized—and you will notice in the first section that it is very largely an ex officio board—and attempted to do business under the appropriations given to it, the Auditor for the Treasury Department rendered an opinion which, in effect, made the whole act inoperative, and they have been unable to expend any of these funds; or, if so, they have been able to expend very little; so they desire a correction in the language in order that the intent of Congress shall be carried out. The thing has been tied up. For instance, on line 16, page 77, you will notice the words "to make rules." In the old act it read "to recommend rules," and there is some little technicality as between "recommend" and "make," so we put in the word "make" instead of the word "recommend." On line 19, after the word "under," we struck out the word "said" that used to be there. It used to read "under said sections," and now it reads "under sections." Then, on line 5, of page 78, the language as proposed now reads:

That the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board is—

It used to read:

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are—

That was a mistake in bill drafting. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are two of several ex officio members of the entire board. The result was that the rest of the members of the board were quite powerless, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy apparently did not get together, and nothing happened. In other words, the majority of the board could not do business.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask the Senator a question. If the law is corrected as suggested by the Senator, will the appropriations that were made then be available for this purpose for the future?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They will.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will notice that on line 16, page 81, there is this new provision:

Any unexpended balances appropriated under this chapter are hereby reappropriated.

Now, "this chapter" means the law as passed last year.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, Mr. President, for this particular purpose there is $1,000,000, $1,400,000, $100,000, $300,000, and $300,000 reappropriated?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. There is no new appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. No new appropriation; but that money has either been expended or else it is to be expended.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Over a term of years, the Senator will notice.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. I notice, Mr. President, that the departments of the Government now are not content with asking appropriations through one appropriation bill, but we find them in every appropriation bill. We have to-day under consideration in the Committee on Appropriations the sundry civil appropriation bill. Gen. Blue was before the committee to-day, asking for appropriations for this very work. He had a number of doctors with him, telling the committee why these appropriations should be made.

Mr. THOMAS. He is not in the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but I say it is not only the War Department but it is the Navy and all. For the maintenance and expenses of the Division of Venereal Diseases established by sections 3 and 4, Chapter XV, of the act approved July 9, 1918, including personal and other services in the field and in the District of Columbia, they estimated for an expenditure for the coming year of $1,085,840. The House decided that they would give $200,000. They now claim that if given $330,000 instead of the $200,000 provided by the House they can get along another year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. KING. In addition to that amount, if I understand correctly, the department with which Gen. Blue is connected is asking for a very large appropriation for the Public Health Service.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; to prevent epidemics, in which are enumerated all sorts of diseases, the House gave them $400,000; and in the deficiency bill, the last one that passed the last Congress, we appropriated $1,000,000 for this very purpose.

Mr. KING. They have machinery already in existence, and have a number of appropriations for the services of those who are operating in this board and in boards that are connected with it aggregating hundreds of thousands of dollars if not millions of dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] suggests, this is to be done in cooperation with the States, just the same as in the case of this other law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I ask the Senator if Dr. Blue or any of those who were with him went into detail as to the condition of the public health with respect to these particular diseases?

Mr. SMOOT. They told the committee what had already been done and what they had endeavored to do, and also the condition, so far as venereal diseases were concerned, as existing at the time of the breaking out of the war and as developed through investigations since the war began.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will permit me to say so, the developments in the way of evidence before the Military Affairs Committee were so shocking as to civil life that it seemed to the committee that no amount of money could be ill spent that was appropriated for the eradication of these diseases. False modesty has prevented parents and civilians generally from talking to the young as plainly as they ought to about these diseases. A major general who returned from France the other day told me that in his division, which had been more or less afflicted with these diseases, when they came out of Germany for the purpose of demobilization or embarkation home, there were only three cases among 28,000 men. The proportion of men who went into the drafted Army from civil life who suffered from these diseases was simply astounding. The Senators who heard those witnesses will remember that. The result of this appropriation and others made along the same line has been practically to eradicate it from the Army, or to reduce it to a minimum, with a great tendency toward curing it in civil life; and it seems to me very much more important than the large appropriations of money for the cure of hog cholera. I think the human system is more entitled to have the money.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, where have they obtained the money to carry on the work that they seem to have accomplished already.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that the States, realizing the importance of it, are participating in the expenditure of money. Take the city of Portland, for instance. Following along the line that this bill proposes to follow, they are appropriating large sums of money, and engaged in the work independently of the Government; but now the Government proposes to cooperate with the States and with municipalities for eradicating these diseases.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is $3,200,000 included in these appropriations now.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is not too much.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator says that is not too much. That is not all that is appropriated. The general deficiency bill is yet to come, and I do not know how much that will carry; but I do know what the House has agreed to in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and of course I know that if we gave them $20,000,000 they will spend it. There is no doubt about that. It will be all spent, and I doubt very much whether there will be any more good accomplished by the $20,000,000 than there would have been by the $1,500,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him just a little bit further, what is known as the venereal-disease carriers can not be taken care of unless there is active participation between the Federal Government and the States. The Senator knows that. The mere statement of the fact will enable the Senator to understand just what I mean. Under this bill as it was the Government has been powerless to cooperate fully with the States, because, as the Senator has said, of some decision of the auditor; and it does seem to me that we can not appropriate too much money for the eradication of these diseases. In my opinion, they are more dangerous to the life of the Republic than consumption itself.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, the question in my mind is this: Who can best administer this law? The appropriation is right. It ought to be appropriated. Shall it be done by Dr. Blue, in the Public Health Service, or shall it be done by the War Department? We do not want both departments doing the same kind of thing in cooperation with the States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is not the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. This is not the War Department. This is an appropriation on an entirely outside subject in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Whether it is the War Department, or what it may be, one department ought to administer it. It ought not to be carried on by half a dozen departments, because, if that is done, there will be confusion. Dr. Blue is doing this work in cooperation with the States to-day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Gen. Blue is a member of this board.

Mr. SMOOT. This is an additional appropriation to the one they are asking the Appropriations Committee to make.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; that is not the substance nor the effect of this amendment. I can not agree with the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Is not the effect of this amendment to appropriate $3,200,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will have this effect: It will reappropriate the unexpended balance of the appropriation which they were authorized to spend last year, and which they could not spend because the decision of the auditor or the comptroller tied them up; that is all.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know how much there is of that unexpended balance?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not. There is no change in the total appropriation. I do think the point made by the Senator from Utah is a wise one, that when they come to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and ask for additional money that committee had better find out how much they have under their original law.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that we never know what is coming. I had no idea, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that this provision would be put into the military bill. It never ought to be there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the Senator on that. The reason why it happened to be presented to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate was that the original legislation came from the Military Affairs Committee as a rider on the military appropriation bill of July 9, 1918.

Mr. SMOOT. As a war measure?

Mr. WADSWORTH. As a war measure; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think it is due the Appropriations Committee, and it also ought to be required of the department, that whenever they want the expenditure of a dollar for this purpose the request ought to come through the regular committee and in the regular way. The sundry civil appropriation bill is before the committee now, and not two hours ago Gen. Blue was before that committee asking for an increased appropriation over and above what the House has granted for this very purpose; and the general never said a word to the Appropriations Committee in relation to the pending legislation.

Mr. President, there is a very important committee meeting that I have to attend. The other members of the committee are waiting, and I shall have to leave the Chamber at this time; but I will say to the Senator from New York that I really believe this chapter ought to go out of this bill, and the whole subject matter ought to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which has this very subject under consideration and will begin the marking up of the bill to-morrow morning.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I raise the point of order against the entire amendment. I shall insist upon the point of order. While I had some doubts, when I first suggested it, as to the propriety of the action, I am entirely confirmed in my view after having heard the explanation submitted by my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

I do not wish to interfere with any legitimate appropriation for the purposes indicated in the original act. The original act is still in existence. The Senator from New York states, as I understand him, that because of the ruling of one of the departmental officials the appropriation carried by that act was not made available. That being true, the money has not been appropriated. The entire subject is before the Appropriations Committee, and this agency that will expend the money will ask for additional appropriations for other departments of the Public Health Service. It will be far better to have one committee consider all of these questions, and the needs of the Public Health Service, and make appropriations so that there will be no overlapping.

I am confirmed in the view which I had when I raised the point of order, and I respectfully insist upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Utah that at this time the point of order is not in order, the pending amendment being the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY]. Does the Senator from Arkansas desire a vote on his amendment?

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to have my amendment voted on, and I should like very much to see it adopted. I think the justice of the condition requires that it shall be done.

I want to say to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that rather than see this section of the bill defeated I will very gladly withdraw my amendment. If he expects, however, to insist upon the point of order against the entire section, I am of opinion that the point is well taken; but I should prefer to withdraw my own amendment if that will satisfy the Senator's objection.

Mr. KING. No; it will not satisfy it, because I shall raise the point of order against the entire amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. Then I shall ask for a vote upon my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the point of order should not be made upon the chapter as a whole. The point of order ought to be made upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Wisconsin that under the parliamentary status a point of order against the chapter is not now in order.

Mr. LENROOT. But I am making the point of order upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests it is not in order to make the point of order, the pending question being upon the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LENROOT. But I am making the point of order against the amendment now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Against the amendment itself?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And the chapter?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I do not make a point of order against that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think the point of order lies against the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas as legislation upon an appropriation bill when it is an amendment to a provision which of itself is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. LENROOT. The Chair may be right about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the Chair overrules the point of order of the Senator from Wisconsin. The question is upon the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, anticipating that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is about to make a point of order against this legislation and strike it from the bill, I desire to present for the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN, under date of June 13, 1919, by Dr. T. A. Storey, the executive secretary of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, which explains in detail the necessity for these verbal changes in the act which was passed by Congress last year.

If the Senator from Utah desires to take the responsibility, he may do it. I would not if I were he. If this legislation or something closely akin to it does not go through, this act remains inoperative, and the great and beneficent work which the Congress decreed should be done will not be done. It may be that the Senator from Utah will himself take the responsibility of bringing this matter to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations and get them to attach it to another appropriation bill. I hope he will, because if he or some other Senator does not do it, and I shall try to do it myself if it is stricken out of this bill, the whole legislation fails, because to get it through as a separate bill would be extremely difficult.

I want to have the situation known. This does not increase the expenditures of the Government one penny. It merely corrects obvious errors in the legislative language of an act passed a year ago. That is its only purpose. It is subject to a point of order because it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, but for the life of me I can not see what is accomplished by striking it out of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have thought of all the admonitions which the distinguished Senator from New York has administered just now, and having them in mind and with a due appreciation of the importance, or lack of importance, of the action which I am about to take, I still insist upon the point of order. Let me say in conclusion it is not because of any opposition to the measure intrinsically, but this entire subject is receiving consideration at the hands of another committee. That committee will be compelled to legislate for other fields of activity equally as important into which the board which would administer this particular appropriation will be compelled to enter. Having the entire subject before it, it will deal with it in a proper and a rational way. I insist upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter submitted by the Senator from New York will be incorporated in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES INTERDEPARTMENTAL SOCIAL HYGIENE BOARD,
Washington, June 13, 1919.

Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By direction of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board I am submitting to you herewith certain amendments to chapter 15 of the Army appropriation bill of July 9, 1918. (See chap. 15, Public, 193, 65th Cong., "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.")

Interpretations of the language of this chapter made by the Comptroller of the Treasury on October 8, October 25, and November 26, 1918, have disclosed inadvertencies that establish unsuspected legislative limitations and make it impossible for the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board to meet certain of its obligations under the act or to accomplish certain very important purposes for which this chapter was devised and for which its merits were argued before committees and for which it was approved by Congress.

These limitations and their proposed corrections may be concisely stated as follows:

I.

On September 24, 1918, the chairman of the board addressed the following questions to the Comptroller of the Treasury:

"1. Whether salaries of employees, necessary rentals, printing, travel expenses, and miscellaneous expenditures necessary for the functions of the board in carrying out the purposes of the act are proper charges against appropriation of $100,000 made by section 7, chapter 15, Public 193, act of July 9, 1918."

On October 8, 1918, the Comptroller of the Treasury in his reply stated that—

"None of the appropriations is for the expenses of an organization of the board." (See communication of Oct. 8, 1918, p. 4, lines 1 and 2.)

Because of this decision the board finds unavailable for purposes of administrative organization the particular resource that was clearly intended by the framers of the act to enable the board to meet its administrative obligations and responsibilities under this act. The board finds, too, that there is no other appropriation under this act that is available for such purposes.

II.

On October 25, 1918, a communication from the Comptroller of the Treasury reads as follows:

"The duties of the board are prescribed by section 1 as—

"(1) To recommend rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter.

"(2) To select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under said section 5.

"The terms of the appropriation under section 5 do not provide for allotments to States, institutions, and organizations. Such an appropriation is provided for by section 6 of this act, but the allotments to the States are to be in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and those to organizations, institutions, etc., under the board. The duties of the board and the appropriations are thus not properly designated in connection with the statutory provisions."

III.

The attention of the board has been called to the fact that five States have no legislative session this calendar year and can not therefore qualify for the appropriation carried by section 6 of chapter 15, to which the following condition is attached:

"* * * and such allotment to be so conditioned that for each dollar paid to any State the State shall specifically appropriate or otherwise set aside an equal amount for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases * * *."

SUMMARY.

In brief, these proposed amendments would accomplish the following:

(1) They would release a fund already appropriated and render it available for the administrative expenses of the board and thus enable that board to meet its obligations and its responsibilities under this law.

(2) They would secure a proper designation of the duties of the board and clarify its responsibilities.

(3) They would remove a discrimination against those States that have no legislative session this calendar year.

(4) And they would reappropriate unexpended balances so that the budget of the board for the coming year would carry no new appropriations.

You will note that this letter is substantially a copy of the letter sent you under date of January 16 and signed personally by Mr. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy and chairman of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board; Mr. Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury; and Mr. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War. You will remember that all of these gentlemen are members of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board.

Very sincerely, yours,

T. A. STOREY,
Executive Secretary Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course, if the Senator from Utah insists upon his point of order, it will go out. The Appropriations Committee is considering this very question. Will not the Senator agree to let the whole matter be referred to the Committee on Appropriations which has the subject now under consideration?

Mr. KING. That would afford me very great pleasure, and it was my purpose to invite the attention of the Appropriations Committee to this measure if its attention had not already been invited to it, with a view of having the entire subject consolidated and all questions as to the board treated in one bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is a very important matter. This particular question is not before us. The appropriation for which Gen. Blue asks is, I think, only $400,000.

Mr. KING. I shall see that it is called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me that this is very wise legislation, and it ought to be considered by our committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of Senators to the parliamentary status. The pending question is the point of order submitted by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. OVERMAN. I would suggest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order unless the Senator from North Carolina wishes to submit some other suggestions upon it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that it would probably be best to make a motion to refer the matter to the Committee on Appropriations rather than to raise the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah makes the point of order——

Mr. KING. If that can be done, but I do not think it can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can not entertain a motion to refer a part of the bill to another committee.

Mr. KING. I know of no procedure which would permit that to be done.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah? In view of the importance of this legislation, let the matter be submitted to the Senate, and if it is adopted the conferees will have a chance to amend the provision in any way they see fit, but if it goes out on a point of order it ends the whole business. I think in view of the importance of it the Senator ought to let it go to conference.

Mr. KING. I am not willing to have the amount of the appropriation contained in the bill to be carried. The appropriation for 1918 is not available now, and it seems to me the whole matter ought to be dealt with by the appropriate committee when it is considering other expenditures that are to be recommended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah makes the point of order that chapter 4 is legislation upon a general appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 22, to insert:

CHAPTER V.

International Aircraft Standards Commission: That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, upon the recommendation of a committee consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce, delegates to the International Aircraft Standards Commission, at least two of whom shall be officers of the aeronautical technical or engineering staffs of the War Department and the Navy Department; to give official approval of the purposes, rules of procedure of said commission, and to publish its recommendations from time to time as he may deem advisable; and to appoint members of advisory committees of the commission and members of the National Aircraft Standards Committee upon the recommendation of the committee heretofore designated to recommend the appointment of delegates to the International Aircraft Standards Commission.

SEC. 2. That for the current fiscal year the actual and necessary expenses of delegates to the International Aircraft Standards Commission, or authorized agents on special duty, at home or abroad, for standardization purposes, including the sum of $1,000 for the payment of the proportionate share of the United States in the maintenance of the central office of the International Aircraft Standards Commission, and not exceeding in the aggregate $6,000, shall be paid from any other funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures are necessary for the study of the development of aircraft production for military purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make a point of order against this proposed amendment, chapter 5, on the ground that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill. I think the matter ought to be considered on its merits.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has raised a point of order against this proposal and said that it should be considered on its own merits. That is exactly what has happened. It has been considered on its merits by the Committee on Military Affairs. I suppose the point of order will be held as well taken, and therefore the insistence upon it will result in the defeat of the proposition. For one I shall greatly regret it.

We are at the eve of a wonderful era in the development of aircraft and the science and art of flying. Other great nations of the earth, all of them our friends in the recent contest, have organized this international commission for the purpose of exchanging information, comparing notes, standardizing definitions and technical terms and minor or component parts of aeroplanes or engines. They have invited the United States to join them. Their Governments have in turn indorsed this proposal, and our delegates, if we are to have any, can not sit in this international body unless the Government of the United States by legislative expression authorizes it.

The delegates were invited several months ago, in the first instance, to attend the first meeting, which met in the city of London last October before the armistice. We had several technical engineers over there at that time, who derived a great deal of benefit in their knowledge of this great and new art by coming in contact with the people who were gathered from these other countries. They could not sit officially because they had no credentials. The next meeting was called for this spring. The Secretary of War named seven or nine delegates, I forget which, composed of automotive engineers, technical people, scientific people, who have taken a very deep interest in the development of aircraft and who want to come in contact with the progress in aircraft of other countries. The Secretary of War then noticed that in the by-laws, as it were, of this international organization each set of delegates should have credentials from their respective Governments. He therefore had to withdraw the invitation extended to the seven or nine eminent men in this country in order to come to Congress and get some act of the legislative branch to authorize it; and the proposal contained in the bill is to make it possible for the United States

to march abreast of the times in the development of aircraft by being permitted to be represented in this international congress.

The expense is next to nothing. We would contribute $1,000 as our share of the expense toward keeping open the central offices, which for the time being are in London, and we would allow not to exceed $6,000 for the expenses of the first delegation which we send. It does not pledge the Congresses of the future with respect to appropriations. That was, in fact, asked for by some of the people who wanted this kind of legislation, but your committee refused to attempt to make a continuing appropriation.

I sincerely hope the Senator from Tennessee will withdraw the point of order. It seems a pity that we in this great country, who are to-day so hopelessly behind by comparison with other countries in aircraft development, should be denied the right, as this legislation attempts to secure it, to sit with the representatives of England, France, Italy, and Canada, who have formed this international commission.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not press the point of order.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, to what the chairman of the committee has said I should like to add that this meeting was originally called to take place three months ago, but was postponed until the 30th of June at the request of the United States in order that we might be represented at the convention.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can add very little to what has been urged by the chairman in support of this desired legislation. The Senator who makes the point of order states that it is a subject which should receive independent consideration and stand or fall upon its merits. Of course, that is true of all items of legislation, but because one happens to appear in a general appropriation bill it does not follow that it has not been considered upon its merits.

The subcommittee which was appointed to consider the bill gave very careful attention to this item, and were impressed with the fact that independent of any other consideration immediate action was required in view of the nearness of the time when this conference is to be held. It is to meet six days from to-day, and if we are to have representation there at all it is impossible to take up and consider the subject either by way of a special bill or joint resolution. It must pass now or it will be ineffectual. The importance of the legislation seems to me to be obvious to any and every friend of aviation. The art is in some degree in its infancy. It certainly is in the active stages of development.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says the art of aircraft is in its infancy, and I thoroughly agree with that statement. Does the Senator think that with an art of this kind in its infancy to authorize an international commission to standardize parts will be of any good effect? Will it not have the effect of preventing improvements rather than aiding in securing improvements?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think the meeting of such a commission to consider the subject of standardizing parts is at all inappropriate, because there are many parts which can now be standardized, particularly as regards the machine part of an airplane. But, Mr. President, the fact that it may be undesirable to standardize to any very great extent is not an argument against but an argument for our participation in the conference.

By meeting and the interchange of minds and of opinions, by comparison of the various items involved in the construction of aircraft, we can best determine—it is the only way in which we can determine—the question of standardization or of nonstandardization. But the interchange of ideas, of views, the opportunities afforded by the examination of the many devices and the many improvements that have been made or that are contemplated, some of which may be practical and some not so, all these things require participation by this Nation with the other countries engaged in this great work if we expect to continue to develop aircraft in America.

Of course if we are to stop, if we are to pursue the same course that we followed after the airplane was invented, if we are to sit supinely by and let other nations take our ideas and inventions and expand and develop and apply them to their own uses and needs without participation, we ought to know it. If that is to be the policy of this country, the amendment is useless. If, on the other hand, we are seriously minded and appreciate as we should the tremendous need of complete information upon the subject, then our participation in the meetings is not only highly desirable but absolutely essential. Confronted with such a condition, with only a few days in which to legislate, if we are to legislate at all, I regret far more poignantly than I am able to express the interposition of the point of order. I think it is unfortunate. I think the Senator from Tennessee is, unintentionally, of course, and with the best of motives, putting a very serious obstacle in the way of our concurrent participation in the advancement of this great art.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when this bill was before the Senate it was quite different from what it is now. As I recall it, though I have not the original bill before me, it gave our delegates authority to agree for the United States upon the standardization of airplane parts. To my mind a more dangerous measure could hardly be imagined at this time in the art of aircraft. As shown by my every vote since I have been in either House of Congress, I take it no one is more in favor of the development of aircraft than I have been and than I am now. I am for the largest appropriation; but I believe that this will smother the development of the art, and I want to state why.

Suppose this commission goes over to England. They will hold a meeting in London in a few days. Suppose it agrees for the United States, for instance, that we will take the Liberty engine and standardize it. Let it take any particular part, for instance. If you standardize that part, what effect will it have? Those engaged in manufacturing the standardized parts will fare exceedingly well at the hands of the commission. Those not engaged, those who do not manufacture the standardized parts, will have a very difficult time disposing of their manufactured product. I think it ought to be absolutely free; I do not think there ought to be any governmental control or attempted control of the manufacture of these parts. We need every improvement in aircraft that we can get. We want no thwarting of inventive genius. What we need is to give every man who has any idea, whether it is indorsed by this standardization commission or not, an opportunity to present that idea to the Government or to the people of any country and have it adopted if it is better than the standardized idea.

The standardization of parts—and that, as I understand, is the purpose of the legislation—is sought. The purpose of the legislation is to form an international committee for the standardization of parts of airplanes. I think it would have a decidedly serious effect. Believing that, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have talked with some of the best engineers and scientists in the country, fliers of the Army, and others, and the only person who regards this provision as dangerous is the Senator from Tennessee. I do not know where he gets the idea. Everybody who takes an interest in the air game, so called, is exceedingly anxious for us to have our delegation in London, with the others. They do not seem to be very afraid of contact with them.

There is nothing whatsoever in the proposal which would compel the manufacturers to adopt the same standard of manufacture. The principal object of a constructive character is to come to a standardization of the definitions of terms, and the standardization of the method of making tests of strength—tensile strength, such as the dimensions in the forms of tensile test bars—and all the scientific things which are mostly Greek to me but in which scientists take tremendous interest. They want to have a standardization of terms and the methods of making tests, so that if a machine is tested in England under a certain system of testing for strength or speed the American manufacturer will know what that means. The English system of testing will then be understood by our people. Then there are the other tests—the heated treatment for ultimate strength, for elongation, and for yielding points. I do not know what all the terms mean, but these people are exceedingly anxious that they shall be standardized.

There is no bugaboo in this thing. The Senator from Tennessee can see in it a great horrid danger that will choke off aircraft development in the United States. Every aircraft man that I have seen or talked to wants this commission. The responsibility is with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the position of the Senator from Tennessee is that it will not be a good thing for the United States. He does not believe in the standardization internationally of aircraft parts and equipment. I believe we have more to receive from England and France, who have made a study of this art and whose development of it has gone further than ours, than we have to give them.

The argument has been made here by the Senator, and he has made a point of order. Let us vote on it. Let us leave it to the Senate to decide. Do not take that advantage, in view of the argument that has been made, but let us vote as to whether the Senate wishes this legislation or not. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will not withdraw his point of order?

Mr. McKELLAR. If I had thought it was unimportant, I never would have made it. I never have made a point of order

unless I believed it to be important. I think this is important. I do not agree with the Senator at all, and, feeling that way, I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee makes the point of order that the pending provision is legislation upon a general appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 2, to insert:

CHAPTER VI.

Transfer of ammunition: That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to turn over on request from other executive departments of the Government, in his discretion, from time to time, without charge therefor, such ammunition, explosives, and other ammunition components as may prove to be or shall become surplus or unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department and as shall be suitable for use in the proper activities of other executive departments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 12, to insert:

Col. William A. Simpson: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Col. William A. Simpson, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 18, to insert:

Maj. H. W. Daley: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Maj. H. W. Daley, National Army, to the position and rank of major on the retired list.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if these promotions were recommended by the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Some are, and upon two or three of them the War Department has not been heard from. Members of the committee felt that they had sufficient information of their own to justify the insertion of these items. The matter of Col. Simpson was passed on by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs at least on two occasions, and the Senate has passed a separate bill at least once, and I think twice, of exactly this character. The Secretary of War has certainly indicated his approval of the promotion of Col. Simpson on the retired list.

In the case of Capt. Hand, at the bottom of page 83, I received a letter from the Secretary of War urging this treatment of Capt. Hand, who, incidentally, now is a major, and who, if this legislation is adopted, will become a lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army on the active list. The case of Maj. Daley was brought to my attention by Maj. Gen. Hugh Scott. This man Daley has been a packer in the Regular Army for 50 years. Gen. Scott writes me that he has served all the way from the British border down to Mexico. He served under Gen. Crook as chief packer with a mule train. He served in the Cuban campaign and in the Philippines, and, although at an advanced age, the War Department commissioned him as a major in the emergency army a year and a half ago to teach this new army how to throw the diamond hitch. He served his Government and country for 50 years, but never as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army. This is to put him on the retired list of the Regular Army with the grade of major. He is a picturesque, splendid old character, who is probably the world's greatest authority on packing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 23, to insert:

Capt. Daniel W. Hand: That the name of Daniel W. Hand, now captain of Field Artillery, be placed on the lineal list of officers of Field Artillery in the position he would have occupied if he had not suffered the loss of rank announced in General Orders, No. 156, War Department, August 8, 1910; and the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Capt. Hand, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the grade which such restored position on the lineal list requires, to be an additional number in the grade until absorbed and no longer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 9, to insert:

Capt. Frank Barber: That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Barber, a first lieutenant of the Dorset Regiment of Infantry of the British Army, who lost the sight of both eyes and became totally blind by reason of a premature explosion on February 14, 1918, while acting as an instructor of United States troops at Camp Wheeler, Ga., as compensation for disability resulting therefrom, such sums of money as by the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, is provided to be paid as compensation for disability to an injured person who has lost both eyes or become totally blind from causes occurring in the line of duty in the service of the United States; and such compensation shall be payable and be paid as of and from the 14th day of February, 1918, and under and according to the terms, conditions, and basis of computation in said act provided, and such sum shall be in full of all claims, legal or equitable, of the said Frank Barber, his heirs, representatives, or assigns

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move, in line 10, page 84, that the word "Captain" be stricken out and the word "Lieutenant" inserted. The officer is a lieutenant.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 7, to insert:

Capt. Leonard F. Matlack: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Capt. Leonard F. Matlack, now serving with the Eighth Cavalry, to the position and rank of captain on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 13, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Col. Jesse McI. Carter: The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Col. Jesse McI. Carter, Cavalry, United States Army, the sum of $352.23, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on page 85, line 14, I move that the word "colonel" be stricken out and the words "major general" inserted, so as to read: "Maj. Gen. Jesse McI. Carter."

Mr. President, this is a very just claim, which has been withheld from Gen. Carter for several years. The circumstances are so peculiarly inequitable and undeserved that I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD a memorandum of the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave to do so will be granted.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1918.

Memorandum with respect to H. R. 9044.

In 1912 I was ordered to proceed to Europe as member of a board of officers for the purpose of studying the organization, training, and equipment of the cavalry of various States in Europe, and was appointed disbursing officer and quartermaster for the board, which was composed of myself and three other officers.

Before leaving I was supplied with $1,000 from the fund "Contingencies of the Army, 1913," which fund, in the language of the appropriation act, was "to be expended under the immediate orders of the Secretary of War," "for all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for, and embracing all branches of the military service." I was instructed by the Secretary of War to expend this fund for the procurement of information, in payment for passports and viséing same, in tips to orderlies and horse holders, and in payment for entertainment of foreign officers in return for like courtesies extended by them. I limited expenditures of this sum to the items above named. I found that it was usual and customary and was expected that when orderlies and horse holders were detailed to attend the board at maneuvers or exercises a monetary remuneration should be made to the men so detailed. I ascertained in each case what the customary fee was and paid that and no more. I paid the State Department of the United States for passports for members of the board, and when it was necessary had these passports viséed in Europe and paid the authorized fee therefor. We were entertained as guests of foreign officers a number of times and returned such entertainment at our own expense. On one occasion we entertained several officers of the French Army at dinner in return for a like courtesy on their part, and I paid from the contingency fund the cost of the dinner for the French officers, not including the cost of the dinner for members of the board. To the best of my recollection, this amounted to approximately $21.

The board was in Europe more than three months and visited Russia, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and England and made an exhaustive study of the subject which it was ordered to study, and on its return submitted a report, accompanied by a system of drill regulations, which has revolutionized the training of cavalry in the United States.

I expended but $352.23 of the $1,000 "Contingencies of the Army" allotted to the board, and turned in the remainder to the United States Treasury. The note accompanying the estimate of the Quartermaster General, which states that the disallowance arose as a result of expenditure for transportation of excess baggage of officers, cab and carriage hire, tips, and gratuities to hotel servants, etc., is in error, as an examination of my accounts in the office of the Auditor for the War Department will show. No part of the funds allotted to me from "Contingencies of the Army" were expended for any of these purposes. No reimbursement to the members of the board for "tips and gratuities to hotel servants" was asked for and none was made.

I expended the amount ($352.23) in the manner directed and for the procurement of information of value to the Government, and for which the board had been sent to Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 85, after line 19, to insert:

Capt. J. C. Garrett: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, J. C. Garrett, formerly a captain of Cavalry, to take rank as if he had remained continuously in the service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 86, to insert:

Col. Samuel R. Jones: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Col. Samuel R. Jones, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 6, to insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross such medical and surgical supplies and supplementary foodstuffs now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces, to be used by said American Red Cross as it shall determine to relieve and supply the pressing needs of the peoples of countries involved in the late war. The Secretary of War shall prescribe regulations and conditions for the selection and delivery of said supplies and foodstuffs to the American Red Cross for the purposes aforesaid.

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. ASHURST, and Mr. LENROOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee first addressed the Chair, and he is therefore recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice the language of the amendment reads:

But which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces, to be used by said American Red Cross as it shall determine to relieve and supply the pressing needs of the peoples of countries involved in the late war.

Is it the purpose to furnish the people of Germany, Austria, and Turkey with these supplies?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The purpose, Mr. President, which I gathered from a long conversation with the director of the American Red Cross, Dr. Livingston Farrand, was to distribute these supplies in Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Jugo-Slavia, old Serbia, Greece, and Poland.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think this distribution ought to be confined at best, if it is to go in this bill at all, to those who were allied with us in the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is pretty difficult to distinguish between friend and foe, ally or opponent, when you get into Czechoslovakia, into Austria, or into Hungary, as the races are so intermingled there and the nationalities so mixed up. Some of them bitterly hated the Austrian Government and some were devoted to it. It is going to be pretty difficult to say that the man who supported the Austrian Government in the late war should not have bandages or absorbent cotton given to him by anybody against whom he fought, and that the man next door, who is against the Austrian Government, may have bandages and absorbent cotton.

This proposal arose from this state of affairs, which may interest the Senate: The American Expeditionary Force is supposed to have on hand a surplus not needed by the Army in France or in occupied Germany, a large quantity of medical supplies and supplementary foodstuffs. By that I mean condensed milk, cocoa, dietary food, such as are used in hospitals and are given to convalescents, outside of the Army ration, so called. It is estimated that something under $100,000,000 worth of these supplies are on hand in the Medical Corps in France. The statement is made that they could not be sold for much more than 10 cents on the dollar. The further statement is made that the British Government and the French Government are seriously considering, in fact they are offering to hand over to their respective Red Cross societies, their surplus of hospital supplies which have been accumulated by their armies in France. This suggestion is that we do the same thing.

There can be no question about the statement, I believe, that what is most needed in Central and Eastern Europe are medical supplies and dietary food. The representatives of the American Red Cross, who have traveled all through those countries during the negotiations now going on at Paris, report that those people are stripped absolutely bare of drugs, stripped absolutely bare of medicines and surgical supplies of one kind or another; that if a little child falls sick, or even if an adult falls sick, there is no proper diet, there is no food in all of those countries to feed him; and this method appealed to the committee as a good disposition to be made of the surplus supplies now held by our medical department in France which are not needed by our Army, especially in view of the fact that to bring them back here and to attempt to sell them would probably cost as much as we should get out of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator accept an amendment in line 9, page 86, so that it would read: "and supplementary or dietary foods"; and after the word "now," where it first occurs in line 10, to insert "in the Medical Corps of the Army," instead of "in Europe"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The second amendment to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Tennessee is quite unnecessary, even from his own point of view, for the language now reads:

Such medical and surgical supplies and supplementary foodstuffs now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces.

Mr. McKELLAR. The purpose of my suggestion is this: I can see the very great force in the Senator's argument that surgical supplies and dietary foodstuffs such as he has mentioned might be given to these needy people; that is a humane proposition, and I think probably we should agree to that; but I do not know that we ought to go so far as to supply them to our enemies, though I think we might do that. I do not think, however, we ought to give the Secretary of War the right, by means of the Red Cross, to furnish foodstuffs generally.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I accept the amendment of the Senator substituting the word "dietary" for the word "supplementary," if that is what the Senator desires.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the words "supplementary foodstuffs" were represented to the committee as the term used to comprise the class of nutritive foods needed in hospitals and for convalescents. The word "dietary" might be too broad and include the needed supplementary foodstuffs; I think it would be better to retain the word which in common parlance and in the medical world is used to comprise that sort of foodstuffs as distinguished from ordinary foodstuffs. All foodstuffs in a sense are dietary, but those which accompanied the American Expeditionary Forces as supplementary foodstuffs are technically designed for hospitals and for convalescents. Instead of improving the phraseology, I think the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will have, rather, a tendency in the other direction.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator if he does not think this will arrange it—we all have one purpose; we do not want to feed those people through the Red Cross——

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's purpose is obvious and desirable, but I am afraid that his phraseology will defeat his purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator will not this phraseology do: Leave out the word "foodstuffs" and insert the words "not suitable for general consumption"?

Mr. THOMAS. I myself have no objection to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should think that would cover it.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. President, a word as to the amendment of the committee. One of the inevitable scourges of war, especially among a people whose food supplies have been denuded, is typhus. Plague follows war in defeated countries under usual post-war conditions. Cholera has appeared in a number of the countries that were engaged in this war, principally in the Balkans. Some say it is a precursor of typhus, and typhus is one of the most contagious and deadly of all human afflictions. Unless it is restrained and restricted, it wipes populations from the earth; it obliterates them. There is nothing that can stay the blight of typhus except nutritive foods containing starch, such as potatoes and kindred vegetables, except medical supplies, which are equally desirable.

The representatives of the Red Cross represented to the committee a most terrible and deplorable prevalent condition in many of the countries in eastern and southeastern Europe which had been engaged in this unfortunate war. Unless they can be rescued from the overhanging threat of national obliteration, they must depend upon the Red Cross, and the Red Cross in turn must depend upon those who support it for the needful things which are essential to combat and to destroy this dread disease.

The absence of foodstuffs, the inability of the people to obtain requisite nutrition are also fruitful sources of disease of all kinds, and especially among little children, whose needs are peculiarly appealing to all, as they are perhaps more insistent than those of any other class of the population. They are in the growing stage; they are progressing from childhood and infancy into maturity, and the nutrition which their bodily requirements demand and insist upon can only be satisfied by a good, healthy nutritive food. Mr. Hoover is now attending to that part of the problem. He certainly should be, in view of the appropriation which was made some time ago.

Mr. KING. I was just about to ask the Senator, Mr. President, whether there was any evidence as to what had been done with the appropriation of $100,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS. The Red Cross representatives, of course, had no information as to that, or, if they did, they did not disclose it to us. Their purpose was to secure a supply of medicines, surgical instruments and supplies, and nutritive foods designed for the Army in France, but no longer necessary, and which could not be disposed of for anything like cost to the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield, would not the foodstuffs referred to come under the head of "medical and surgical supplies"?

Mr. THOMAS. No; they do not. In a sense they are medical supplies, of course, but, if I may use a common expression, they are known to the trade as "supplementary foodstuffs." It is under that head that hospital supplies of that kind are purchased and secured. The phraseology of the section is designed

to meet existing conditions and to define what was intended as well as possible by the use of appropriate language.

Mr. KING. Do the words "supplementary foodstuffs" have a definite meaning?

Mr. THOMAS. "Supplementary foodstuffs" have a technical meaning in connection with our supplies in France, as I am informed.

I perhaps, Mr. President, can appreciate the importance, the supreme importance, of the need of medical supplies in a condition like this. The last year of the Civil War in the South was one affording in some degree parallel conditions. I was there at that time and came in daily contact as a boy with the terrible consequences of the absence of an adequate medical supply. We had no anesthetics; all amputations had to be made without them. We had no bandages except cotton, and they were serviceable hardly half the time. We had no antiseptics of any sort; in fact, except for here and there a fugitive supply of quinine, and salable all the way from $250 to $300 in gold per ounce, we had practically nothing to meet the ravages of an indigenous disease, the ague. I remember vividly and poignantly the supreme endurance and the awful suffering of our own people, exposed in some degree to these conditions, and I confess that I sympathize deeply with countries—my heart even goes out to enemy countries—whose people are confronted, as some of them now must be, with these awful conditions. Under the circumstances, I deem it our overpowering duty to permit the Red Cross to obtain such of these supplies as are necessary to meet these terrible conditions and overcome them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to amend in line 7, on page 86, by striking out the words "and directed"; in line 9, after the word "supplementary," by inserting the words "and dietary"; and before the word "now," at the beginning of line 10, by inserting the words "used in the treatment of the sick and injured." I ask the Secretary to read the provision as it will appear if thus amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. If amended as suggested by Mr. McKELLAR, the paragraph will read as follows:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross such medical and surgical supplies and supplementary and dietary foodstuffs used in the treatment of the sick and injured now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces—

And so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. I offer an amendment, which I hope will be accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it an amendment to the pending committee amendment?

Mr. MOSES. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 86, line 11, after the word "Forces," it is proposed to insert "or available for use in military hospitals in the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Secretary read that amendment in conjunction with the words reported by the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. After the words "American Expeditionary Forces," it is proposed to insert the words "or available for use in military hospitals in the United States."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is doubtful what the term "available" would mean in this particular instance. How anything in France could be regarded as being "available" I do not know, although, of course, in one sense everything is available.

Mr. MOSES. Then I ask permission to change the amendment by striking out the word "available" and inserting "needed."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire as modified to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will now state the first committee amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over is on page 17.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as we are now going back to take up the amendments that we left uncompleted yesterday and last night, and as the consideration of this bill began with the discussion of the proposed committee amendment, on line 16, page 2, against which a point of order was raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I desire now, in accordance with the notice which I gave yesterday, to move to suspend the rules in order that that amendment may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York to suspend the rules in order that he may present the amendment referred to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays will have to be called, as a two-thirds vote is required. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). May I inquire if the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. KNOX. I withhold my vote, having a pair with that Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I inquire if the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARDING. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], but on this question I am at liberty to vote. I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. NEW. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] on official business.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connnecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

The yeas and nays resulted as follows:

YEAS—44.

Ashurst	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Henderson	New	Smith, S. C.
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Spencer
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Fletcher	Kellogg	Page	Sutherland
Frelinghuysen	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Gay	Keyes	Reed	Wadsworth
Gerry	Kirby	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Hale	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Harding	McCormick	Simmons	Watson

NAYS—17.

Capper	La Follette	Nugent	Williams
Dial	Lenroot	Shields	Wolcott
France	McKellar	Swanson	
Kenyon	Nelson	Trammell	
King	Norris	Walsh, Mont.	

NOT VOTING—35.

Ball	Dillingham	McCumber	Poindexter
Bankhead	Edge	McLean	Pomerene
Borah	Fernald	Martin	Sherman
Brandegee	Gore	Myers	Smith, Md.
Calder	Gronna	Owen	Smoot
Colt	Hitchcock	Penrose	Stanley
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Phelan	Townsend
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phipps	Underwood
Curtis	Knox	Pittman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the question of suspending the rules the yeas are 44 and the nays are 17. So the rule is suspended to enable the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to introduce the amendment which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after the numerals "$1,000,000" at the end of line 15, on page 2, the following:

Provided, That the restrictions concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking out, in lines 16 and 17, the words "personal services and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the proposed amendment it is proposed to strike out the words "personal services and."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if this amendment should be adopted it would permit allowing a greater per diem than is now permitted under the general law, but all restrictions as to personal services would still remain.

In the discussion that was had of this proviso yesterday it was assumed that the only restriction in the law that would affect personal services was that of salary, but I am not at all sure but that if this language "personal services" remains in the proviso it will repeal many other provisions of law relating to personal services. One of them familiar to us all is that no one representing the Government shall have a personal interest in a contract that he makes with himself as agent of the Government. Here we have over $2,000,000,000 worth of property to be sold by this sales organization, and we can not be too careful in this, which, as the chairman of the committee said yesterday, is the greatest sales campaign ever conducted in America. We can not afford to repeal any law safeguarding the interests of the Government with relation to personal services upon the part of any of the men who shall form a part of this sales organization.

If the Senate desires to do that—if the Senate desires to take its chances and say that any laws that we have prohibiting a man as agent of the Government from making a contract with himself as an individual shall be set aside, well and good, but before the Senate adopts this amendment it ought to realize that that may at least be the effect unless the amendment that I have proposed is adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I should be as strenuously opposed as the Senator from Wisconsin to the repeal of any portion of the statutes which forbids the practices referred to by him. I regret that my knowledge of law and the statutes is not more complete, but I venture to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators to this language on page 2, commencing on line 4: "for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department."

My understanding is that under that language the only people that the War Department can employ and pay salaries to are translators, and that all other personal services are excluded from the salary-drawing class. It says, very distinctly, "and exclusive of all other personal services." Now, the phrase "personal services" used in the proviso on line 16 is but a repetition of the phrase "personal services" used on line 6, and refers to the same thing. I was wondering, therefore, if we would not accomplish the very thing the Senator from Wisconsin desires if we should retain the words "personal services" in the proviso and insert immediately thereafter the words "hereinbefore referred to," which would surely tie it close to the language on line 6, because, as the contingencies item is drafted from line 2 to line 15, no man except a translator can get a salary under the contingencies item in the meeting of any emergency. Now, it is going to be absolutely essential to pay some kind of salaries, and I believe pretty generous salaries, to the men who are going to sell these goods; and those words "personal services" in the proviso, in my humble judgment, refer back to the words "personal services" in line 6. I do not believe that will repeal the law to which the Senator refers. If it does, I shall never, of course, stand for it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question. I had supposed, and certainly understood yesterday, that the very purpose and necessity which the chairman stated existed for suspending the rules in order to secure this proviso was that this sales organization could not go on unless we had the proviso, because of the limitations of the law with reference to salaries.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, Mr. President, this is the first time it has ever been attempted to cover this Director of Sales' office under the term "Contingencies of the Army."

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but they are personal services in the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but they are being paid to-day, as I understand, from emergency appropriations which would authorize the payment of emergency salaries. That authority expires July 1.

Mr. LENROOT. But if their services are not included in the language in lines 5 and 6, to which the Senator has now referred, how are they benefited by this proviso?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Because they are exempted from this language of the "Contingencies of the Army" item by this very proviso. That is the purpose of the proviso. It is to exempt them from that exclusion from the salary-drawing group. To-day the only salary-drawing people under "Contingencies of the Army" are the translators. Now, I want to make this thing just as safe as the Senator from Wisconsin does.

Mr. LENROOT. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I can not at all agree with him in his construction of the proviso, that it would let in some one with reference to the personal service itself that the original language would exclude. That can not be so. All the proviso would mean would be that as to those who are within the text, other restrictions of law should not apply to them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the only persons within the text are those carrying out existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

Mr. LENROOT. If that is true, then this proviso does not at all accomplish what the chairman expected it would accomplish.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not agree with the Senator. It specifically exempts from that exclusion the men who are to sell these goods.

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It says:

That the restrictions concerning personal services—

And the restrictions are recited on lines 5 and 6 above—

and the amount allowable for per diem allowance—

And that is recited on lines 12 and 13—

shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

It exempts the war-supply administrators from the exclusions and restrictions of the language above.

Mr. LENROOT. What does the Senator suggest?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suggest that we retain the words "personal services," but insert immediately thereafter "hereinabove referred to," so that it will tie it securely to the phrase "personal services."

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator will insert that after the word "restrictions," so as to read "that the restrictions hereinabove referred to," it would mean the same thing.

Mr. WADSWORTH. "Hereinabove recited."

Mr. LENROOT. "Hereinabove recited." I am willing, then, to withdraw my amendment, and move in lieu of it, in line 16, after the word "restrictions," to insert "hereinabove recited."

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, after the word "restrictions," it is proposed to insert the words "hereinabove recited."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. After the word "supplies," I move to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and these words:

Provided further, That not more than one salary exceeding $5,000 per year shall be paid out of the foregoing appropriation, and that one salary shall not exceed the sum of $15,000 per year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my instinct is against the amendment. I know there is a prejudice against large salaries, and I can understand that it may have some support; but I feel very deeply that you can not get this job done unless you trust

somebody to do it, and trust the War Department—we have got to trust them anyway—to pay the salaries that will get the service. That is the whole question.

I shall not demand the yeas and nays on the amendment. I ask for a rising vote, Mr. President.

Mr. FRANCE. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "supplies," in the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of $12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department, or to any officer of the Army below the rank of major general.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss this amendment at length. It is offered for the purpose of preventing the payment of excessive salaries in the War Department. It is rumored that one employee of the War Department is now receiving a salary of $25,000 a year. I consider that salary to be wholly unreasonable. When we consider that the general in charge of all our forces is receiving altogether, including commutation of quarters, only $13,000 a year and a trifle over—$13,235—that a lieutenant general receives only $11,960, that a major general receives only $10,652, and that a brigadier general receives only $8,271, it seems to me clearly unnecessary to pay any employees of the War Department a salary of $25,000. It seems to me that for a salary of $12,000 it should be possible to find in the Republic some man who would be willing to serve the Government ably, efficiently, and unselfishly in this most important capacity.

I hope the Senate will grant my request for a roll call upon this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays upon it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken let me suggest that the latter part of the amendment is unnecessary. An officer of the United States Army, no matter to what duty he is assigned, has a fixed salary; and, as a consequence, his salary could not be increased or diminished were he assigned to the work of disposing of these supplies. It is fixed, and depend not upon the nature of his services but upon his rank.

Mr. FRANCE. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that. I am aware of that fact. However, if the language is not necessary, I do not think it weakens the amendment at all. If the Senator desires to offer an amendment to the amendment——

Mr. THOMAS. The effect of it might be, if adopted, to permit the appointment of a major general at $12,000, which would be very much more pay than he gets under the law.

Mr. FRANCE. It does not impress me that the amendment as drawn would have that effect. The purpose of the amendment is very clear, and I think its effect, if it should be adopted, would be very definite.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the following words at the end:

or to any officer of the Army below the rank of major general—

So the amendment will read:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of $12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department.

Mr. FRANCE. I accept that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposer of the amendment accepts it. The question is on the amendment to the amendment as modified.

Mr. FRANCE. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to say a word, and but a word, on this amendment.

I do not want to appear in antagonism to the wishes of the chairman of the committee; but it does seem to me that Congress ought to retain some control over the amount of money that is to be paid these men who shall sell the materials that are on hand. I have not any knowledge of anything in relation to this business that leads me to the conclusion that it is necessary to have any superhuman talent employed.

I voted to suspend the rules because I thought $4 a day was a ridiculously low limitation, but I am not in favor of taking off the limitation entirely; and it seems to me that $12,000 a year—a salary that is almost twice as great as that paid to a Senator or a Congressman—ought to get us the kind of talent that will know how to dispose of these goods. This service is not like that required in organizing some great business, building some great railroad, or laying out a plan which involves the establishment of a great series of banks. It is simply a question of disposing of these goods. We ought to have good men to do it. You can get plenty of good men in the United States for $12,000 a year. I think some limitation ought to be imposed, and I am led to insist upon this, because at some hearings we have had in the past it has been developed that one man, at least, got $25,000 a year. Candidly and frankly, speaking of him with all the kindness in the world, I do not think he was worth $25,000 a century.

I do not want to create sinecures and fat jobs. Nobody else wants to do it. At the same time, I do not believe in a niggardly policy that puts the stipend down so low that men of good talents can not afford to take it. But $1,000 a month, $12,000 per annum, will get us as good men as we need. I do not think the best salesmen in the United States get much more than that.

I do not think it ought to be insisted that we should have excessive salaries paid here. If I had had any idea that any such request would be made, for one I would not have voted to set aside the rules.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, possibly the Senator from Missouri is right that $25,000 a year is too much to pay in salary to any man administering an organization of this kind; but I want the Senator to understand the situation.

Mr. Hare was requested by Mr. Crowell, the Assistant Secretary of War, to become the head of the sales organization. When the armistice was signed the question of the sale of the great mass of material that was in the possession of the Government was an important problem. Mr. Hare had formed an organization through camp activities, and Mr. Crowell asked him to head this organization. He wanted to go home. He lives in another section of the country. He has a family. He can go back to private life and earn more than Mr. Crowell offered him, but Mr. Crowell asked him to stay and offered him $25,000 a year. He had formed a sales organization for this material, which is scattered all over the country, in every locality where it was located; and in order to get business men to make the sales of this material he had to pay more than the limit. That is one of the reasons for this amendment. He wants to pay $4,000 and $5,000 for some of these men who are in the sales organization.

Mr. Hare has charge of $2,500,000,000 worth of property belonging to the Government. It consists of ordnance supplies; it consists of the raw materials, such as wool, copper, and so on. He sold all his copper. He sold his copper at the market price at the time—not what the Government paid, but at the market price of 16 cents. He sold a large portion of the wool in his possession, and he told me to-day that he had saved $5,000,000 over the amount the Army had fixed for the sale of certain of this material in the advance sales at the advance prices that had been procured through his sales agency. The organization is completed. This man has been selected by the Secretary of War. I do not know whether it is good policy to let him go now and employ another man at $12,000. It seems to me it is good business to keep him there after he has developed this organization. It may be poor policy to pay any man $25,000 a year, but if you disrupt that organization now, with the large amount of materials and supplies that are apt to deteriorate, food supplies, it seems to me that you are going to lose more than if you paid $25,000 and let him continue in control.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. REED. The Senator states that this gentleman sold the copper at the market price. Does he really regard that as a phenomenal performance?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; I do not.

Mr. REED. And he sold the wool at the market price.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I consider that a very good transaction.

Mr. REED. Wool and copper are about as staple as gold or silver to-day, and if they have a market price I think almost anybody could sell them at the market price. When I was a country boy 12 years old I used to drive a load of corn to town and I always got the market price. They never offered me anything else.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not acquainted with Mr. Hare. I never spoke to him in my life. I never saw him except on the occasion of the consideration of this bill by the subcommittee. He impressed me as an unusually capable business man. I do not believe in extraordinary salaries nor in high prices where they can be avoided. I have tried to establish some element of frugality and economy in legislation in this

body, my efforts, however, up to this time being in inverse proportion to my success.

This is not, however, an ordinary situation. The cost price of the surplus material which the Government owns and which accumulated before the end of the war does not convey a very intelligible idea of the magnitude of the surplus nor of the problems which are involved in disposing of it. It is one which, in my judgment, will tax the highest capacity of the best business man in the world. I wish some one or more of our very prominent business men who have made phenomenal success in their own lines would volunteer their services to the Government and take this job and dispose of it. I can conceive of no higher test of the patriotism of a man of influence and ability than that. But I am not at all hopeful that any such action will occur.

Some of the things which this organization must do and which the head of the organization must require readily occur to any thinking man upon a few moments' reflection. These goods are valued not by the hundred thousand, nor by the million, nor by the tens of millions, nor by the hundreds of millions. They are valued by the billion, and they comprise almost every known item of merchandise. For the effectual prosecution of the war the Government entered every market it could reach, and became the sole customer, regardless of price, for every material entering into the industries of man, and upon the assumption that the war would last indefinitely. Had it not done so, it would have failed in its duty to the United States, to the people, and to our Allies. The abrupt termination of the war left the Government precisely in the situation of a great merchant suddenly confronted with a catastrophe, destroying all demand for his enormous stock of merchandise, with the difference that the Government can recoup its losses through taxation, while the merchant is helpless and bankrupt.

Now, Mr. President, these goods must not only be disposed of but they must be disposed of in an orderly, systematic, and scientific way; otherwise markets will be very seriously disturbed, business men, manufacturers, and producers, including farmers, may be ruined, and disaster result from a failure to understand the needs and the methods of disposition. The Government to-day has 300,000,000 pounds of carpet wool on hand. The wool is valuable and available only by mingling and mixing it with other forms of wool for that particular purpose. Until the next wool crop comes on this wool can only be sold at an enormous sacrifice.

Certainly we do not want that; but what is worse, it would, if thrown on the market, put such a quietus upon the activities of the producers of that class of wool that many of them in all probability would be forced into bankruptcy. However, the wool market is more active than many others. Take the matter of canned goods, if you please, or the disposition of zinc or of lead. The price of zinc at present is so low that half the mines in my State are closed. They have no market. If the Government throws a vast supply of zinc upon the market, the result would be in all probability to shut them all down, throwing thousands of men out of employment, temporarily at least, and indirectly disturbing the stability of other markets.

All these things require at the head of the organization some business genius familiar with them who has had experience with them and who can make his sales accordingly. It is quite true, as the Senator from Missouri says, that anybody can get the market price. The young boy who drives a wagon to market from his father's farm or the man who has large quantities or small quantities of material can always get the market price, but if hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of a particular commodity asks for the market price it must take what can be offered, which means the destruction of the market price for the time being.

Then, Mr. President, there is the question of preservation. To dispose of two and a half billion dollars' worth of goods requires the storage of a great portion of them for a considerable time. Some goods can be stored one way and under one set of conditions that are not at all desirable for others, and with storage goes guarding and preservation. There is no business combination, gigantic as some of them are, that approaches this particular situation. It is the biggest job that any man or set of men ever undertook.

If I were on trial for my life, I might come, I probably would come, to the Senate of the United States for counsel. I know of nobody to whom I would more readily apply under those circumstances than my friend from Missouri [Mr. REED]; but I would not employ him because of his experience in the United States Senate or because of his political belief or because of his experiences in statesmanship; I would go to him because he is a trained, experienced veteran lawyer, capable of serving me in that very exigent situation, because in all probability he would save me if I could be saved, and I would not expect him to take the job upon a Senator's salary.

Mr. REED. I would not charge the Senator a cent. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is very generous. I would not ask that. But that being the case, let me substitute some one in my place—Mr. Hoover, for instance. [Laughter.] I am satisfied that my friend from Missouri, under those circumstances, would insist upon charging something more than $12,000, and he would earn it.

Mr. REED. I admit I would have to be paid for mental anguish. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. The same would be true if I substituted some other person who did not enjoy the friendship and intimate companionship of the Senator from Missouri.

I do not believe that a man, I do not care how good a salesman he is, who is dependent upon his time for a living and who can make $12,000 a year in private life is the man to handle this situation. He may be. There are plenty of men of independent fortune who can do it for a nominal salary, and who would probably be glad to do it for a nominal salary, if we could find them. But the department is against a serious situation, and I greatly fear that unless it is properly handled the losses to the Government will be prodigious. If that should be the case, then I fear the very gentlemen who are now putting this restriction upon its powers will be the loudest in their denunciation of the department for its inefficient, unbusinesslike, and expensive methods of administration. Theirs is the responsibility; but it is ours, Mr. President, to give them the opportunity to discharge that responsibility commensurate with its magnitude, and its magnitude is almost inconceivable.

I shall therefore be compelled to vote against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PHELAN. Before the Senator sits down, permit me to say that I am not acquainted with the sales agent nor his methods, but I desire to know if under the statute he is invested with discretion that he may sell or not sell as he sees fit with knowledge of the market and business conditions.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think that he has unlimited discretion. I think he ought to have some discretion.

Mr. PHELAN. If he has discretion of course it would make his services more valuable to the Government and the salary ought to be adequate.

Mr. THOMAS. It is inconceivable that a man can occupy that position and discharge it with any sort of efficiency without being invested with considerable discretion.

Mr. PHELAN. Do you know that he has to consult anybody?

Mr. THOMAS. He is under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. PHELAN. He sells then with the approval of the Secretary of War?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; he must. He is not independent of the department.

Mr. PHELAN. What is the period of his employment?

Mr. THOMAS. It is indefinite. It must be, in the nature of things.

Mr. PHELAN. It is safe to presume the employment would not last over the period of one year?

Mr. THOMAS. Except that, if I am correctly informed, the present organization will not be continued beyond the expiration of the present fiscal year without this legislation. I think it will take longer than a year myself.

Mr. PHELAN. Then it will be a matter for the judgment of the legislative body at the expiration of the fiscal year whether they should renew the salary?

Mr. THOMAS. It is always within the power of Congress to enact such new legislation as it may desire.

Mr. PHELAN. What we are doing now is to practically establish the salary for one year at $25,000.

Mr. THOMAS. What we are proposing is to enable this organization to function in a business way and with as little loss to the Government as possible.

Mr. PHELAN. I am in sympathy with the Senator's remarks. I was trying to find some justification. I believe if he sells $2,500,000,000 worth of property, is invested with the discretion, with an employment running over a period of probably one year, $25,000 is not too much.

Mr. THOMAS. If my friend could get $500,000 a year he would have to live 5,000 years before he would be worth $2,500,000,000; that gives a faint idea of the magnitude of the task involved.

Mr. PHELAN. All salaries are based in large affairs upon the responsibilities and upon the amount involved.

Mr. THOMAS. And the magnitude of the problems that attend the discharge of the duties.

Mr. PHELAN. And the necessity for strict fidelity in the discharge of the trust.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; if a man connected with the Government betrays his trust in any way he ought to be punished; and there are laws which will punish him if they are enforced.

Mr. PHELAN. It does not conduce to strict fidelity in the discharge of a trust to impress a man into service at an inadequate salary.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not think so.

Mr. PHELAN. I saw at Camp Mills, in Texas, the other day acres of automobiles which ought to be in use. If he threw those automobiles upon the market, it would be detrimental to the legitimate business of manufacture and sale of automobiles. So there is where he has to study how to dispose of automobiles.

Mr. THOMAS. He could put thousands of men out of employment. They have to be disposed of in such a way as to interfere as litttle as possible with conditions.

Mr. REED. Pardon a suggestion. It might permit thousands and thousands of people to have automobiles at something besides robber prices. It might break up the automobile trust temporarily.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, pursuing the analogy a little further, does not the Senator know that practically all automobile companies are several months behind in deliveries and that you can not buy an automobile now, to be furnished from the factory, that can be delivered within less than three months?

Mr. THOMAS. I know that the prices are high.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not talking about prices. You can not secure delivery at all within three months from most of the automobile companies.

Mr. THOMAS. I know prices are very high, and it is due to the fact that the demand is in excess of the supply. I also know that many of these Government automobiles have been by legislation turned over to the Agricultural Department. How many I do not know. I am quite sure that many of them could be sold, and it would operate to reduce prices, and they ought to be sold if that is the case. But, of course, that is one line of investment which the Government made during the war, the solution of which now confronts us.

Mr. PHELAN. There is nothing to prevent the sale of the automobiles. I merely cited that as an example of the stupendous and delicate character of the task.

Mr. THOMAS. On the contrary, they must be sold, except where they are turned over to the Department of Agriculture or other departments. The same is true of trucks, hundreds of which have been placed at the disposal of the highway commissions of the different States, and will so be in use.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to a statement made the other day by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] in reference to Mr. Hare, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Colorado to it.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not wedded to Mr. Hare. I do not think he ought to be kept in the position if he is inefficient.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is a statement made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said, among other things, in speaking of this amendment:

> The director of sales is Mr. C. W. Hare, appointed by the Secretary of War, who has been urged to leave his business to undertake this work and employment.

The Senator from Kansas interrupted a moment or two later and said:

> Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator from New York if this item includes the disposition of aeroplanes?
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.
>
> Mr. CURTIS. I am told—I do not know whether or not there is anything in it—that aeroplanes which have cost the Government $20,000,000 have been sold back to the same firms which manufactured them for about $2,000,000. I am also told that machines that cost this Government from $6,000 to $8,000 are being sold back to the companies from which they were purchased at $800. I am further told—and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] was present on the day before yesterday when the statement was made—that there are a number of individuals who are ready to pay more for those machines than the Government is getting for them.
>
> If that is true, there ought to be some amendment provided for in the bill requiring the Government to sell those machines where we can get the best bids for them. It is neither right nor fair to the Government that machines costing $20,000,000 shall be sold back to the manufacturers for $2,000,000. I do not care who attempts to defend it, it is not defendable.

After some little colloquy, which need not for the present be read, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to what Mr. CURTIS further said:

> Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman who called upon the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] and myself—or rather he called upon me, and I introduced him to the Senator from Indiana because that Senator was on the committee and the chairman was absent—stated that he and others had tried to bid upon these machines, but that they were not given an opportunity to do so; in fact, that their bids were refused. He said the same course was being pursued with reference to the machines that were now on hand; that they were trying to get the War Department to let individuals bid on these machines; and he stated to the Senator from Indiana and to me that he was ready to bid more than was being bid by the Curtiss Co.

I take it, in view of that testimony and in view of this further testimony, that before a committee of the Senate, before the Public Lands Committee, as I understand it, Mr. Hare was asked what salary he was getting, and he stated that he was getting a salary from the Government of $4,000——

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. At the same time he was drawing a salary from the United Gas & Improvement Co. of $15,000. That was the statement as to his salary. As I understand it, he came before the committee and said he was getting a salary of $15,000 and other perquisites that amounted to $14,000, making $29,000 instead of $15,000 that he testified to in the first instance.

Mr. THOMAS. Before what committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Committee on Military Affairs. These are reasons why I think there should be some restriction. In the first place, I think this amendment should have gone out, and I want to reserve the right to have a separate vote on it in the Senate. In the next plaee, I think at all events we should limit the salaries that are to be paid out under this lump-sum appropriation.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. I simply want to say, in fairness to Mr. Hare, that he had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the sale of these airplanes to the Curtiss Co. Not only that, but he disapproves of it and deprecates the fact that they were sold at that figure. That is the fact about that matter. He had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Indiana be kind enough to inform us who is responsible for the sale, if he knows?

Mr. NEW. Those airplanes were sold by the War Department pursuant to an idea and policy that it has, but with which I am not at all sure that I agree. They were sold by the authority, at least, of the Secretary of War. The facts to which the Senator from Kansas referred are simply these: A number of cases have arisen where young men who have served in the Army during the war and are now discharged have sought and tried to buy one or more planes, in each case, however, limited to a very small number. I think in one case an aviator wanted to buy 10. The department has felt that it is not good policy to sell such individuals airplanes, and it did negotiate to sell them back to the Curtiss Co. As I have said, I am not indorsing that, I am not approving it at all, but am simply stating the facts. But Mr. Hare was not only not responsible for that, but had nothing to do with it.

The idea that the department advanced was that they did not want to enter into the retail sale of airplanes; that by doing that they could not very well sell in one case and not sell in another; that it would put them squarely into the retail airplane trade, and through promiscuous selling planes might fall into the hands of people who are not qualified to use them; that accidents might happen as the result of sales to people who are not competent to fly the machines; that in unskilled hands they would be dangerous both to the aviator and to the public. So they considered it best to sell directly back to the Curtiss Co. and let them be responsible for the disposition of the machines; and, as the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] reminds me, most of the planes are not in condition to be sold; nearly all of them require more or less repairs to be made. In that shape they were sold back to the Curtiss people, who can repair them and then sell them on their own account. That is the explanation of this policy.

Mr. REED Mr. President, I desired to ask the Senator from Indiana a question before he took his seat. The question we are discussing is rather aside from the amendment, and I do not want to prolong the debate; but I want to ask the Senator if he knows who originated the brilliant idea that the man who sells a machine must see to it that the man who buys it is qualified to handle it?

Mr. NEW. I do not know, Mr. President. I am simply stating the story of this as it comes to me from officers who are connected with the War Department as a statement of their reasons.

Mr. REED. If that be true, I think all the men who have sold mowing machines and reapers in this country have been very derelict in their duty, or the Government has been in not

taking those machines over, for there has been many a finger sacrificed by a boy who did not know enough to run such machines. I think it an absurd reason, and I say now just this word in passing: It will be very hard to justify the sale back to a factory of something it produced at one-tenth of the amount it exacted from the Government. Whoever has done that, I think, will have some explanations to make. I had no idea until this matter came up a few minutes ago that the transaction had taken place, and when I asked the question I had no conception of who might or might not be responsible for it.

The people of the United States have paid for this war, and they have paid willingly and generously; they were willing not only to expend all the money that was necessary to win the war, but they were willing to overlook excessive prices that might have been charged or paid at a time when the work had to be accomplished under emergency conditions, and where the risk was great not only to the manufacturer but to the Government itself; but the people of the United States will look with disfavor of the gravest kind upon any attempt now to plunder the Government or to speculate to the Government's disadvantage.

I believe there is much of wisdom and right in what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] said when he stated that vast quantities of raw materials or manufactured materials should not be suddenly thrown upon the market to break the market. Upon the other hand, such materials should not be held back for the purpose of sustaining the market at a fictitious point or for the purpose of enabling manufacturers to continue to reap exorbitant profits and to profiteer after the war is over.

The illustration of the automobile is a good one. I know an unfortunate individual who had to buy an automobile only a few days ago. He paid over 50 per cent beyond the price that was charged about two and one-half years ago. When he went to get the machine he found he could not get one in New York at all unless he waited until October. Then he had to register, getting his number or taking his chances in numerical order. He afterwards learned of an automobile that could be "caught on the fly," and he bought it before it was unloaded from the train. With the market in that shape there is no justification for not selling to the people of the United States these automobiles, not to the extent of breaking the market, but to the extent of satisfying the wants of the people and meeting the demand, as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PHELAN. Does not the Senator think that that ought to be the policy of the Government sales agent, if he is a fit agent?

Mr. REED. I am discussing another question, but I will say to the Senator from California that that ought to be the policy of the agent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. Just let me conclude in a moment. That policy ought to be pursued with all of these materials. I am told there is a large amount of meat products on hand. Those meat products ought to be sold to the people of the United States, not to break the market but to ease the situation. The market of the United States ought to be relieved. I intend to have something to say about this in a few days, but not now further than to make this suggestion: I heard of an instance the other day of the proprietor of some large ships who wanted to take on a cargo of wheat. The wheat was needed in Europe; there was a market for it in Europe; there was a manifest surplus here; and yet he was refused permission to load those vessels with wheat. In the meantime our Government has guaranteed the price of wheat, and, of course, it will pay that price, because the Government is in the habit of keeping its obligations; but if there is a market abroad that will absorb the wheat, if there is a surplus, and if there are bottoms ready to haul it, it seems a strange policy that would deny the privilege of shipping.

I think—and with this observation I will take my seat and apologize for having consumed this much time on the bill—that the time has come when the markets of the United States ought to be released, at least the policy ought to be inaugurated beginning the release of these markets. Possibly it can not all be done at once. It is said that this gentleman is here, that that is his business, but I still go back to the proposition and say that I think we can get a man for $12,000 a year perfectly capable and perfectly competent to transact this business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there will be a recess taken until 8 o'clock this evening; but it is necessary to have a short executive session in the meantime, and I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The Senate resumes the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Chamberlain	Harrison	New	Sterling
Curtis	Kellogg	Newberry	Swanson
Dillingham	Kenyon	Nugent	Wadsworth
Edge	Keyes	Overman	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Lenroot	Smith, Ariz.	
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Smoot	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CAPPER, Mr. GERRY, Mr. HARDING, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

Mr. HARRIS entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. WATSON, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. GAY, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. PHELAN, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of some inquiries that were made this afternoon as to how this particular bureau of the Government was being run, I wish to read, for the information of the Senate, a short article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, as follows:

BIDS FOR ARMY FOOD TOO LOW—WAR DEPARTMENT WILL PROBABLY SEEK NEW ONES IN SMALLER LOTS.

Bids which were opened Friday for surplus Army meat and vegetables are almost certain to be rejected, it is intimated at the War Department.

When bids for the 142,000,000 pounds of bacon and canned meat and 5,500,000 cases of canned vegetables were opened in 13 Army supply zone centers, they were found to be restricted largely to packers and big dealers.

The War Department, after its announcement that the goods would be sold abroad was withdrawn, offered to permit State and municipal penal, charitable, and educational institutions to bid for the supplies. But as the minimum quantity to be sold was a carload lot of one commodity, few institutions were able to bid.

At Chicago there were but 11 bids for the millions of pounds in that zone. These were from packers principally. One packer bid for the entire supply of bacon. Similar experiences were reported throughout the country.

Secretary of War Baker said that bids would be rejected if they were found unsatisfactory. Officers in the office of the War Department director of sales said early reports on the bids were enough to show they would be unsatisfactory.

Secretary Baker indicated that if new bids are asked, the requirement that forces bidders to quote prices on a 30,000-pound minimum will be removed.

Prices of most bids have been most disappointing to Army officials. Though there has been no reduction in prices of meat, either to dealers or to the public, since the armistice was signed, meat that cost the Government as much as 40 cents a pound would bring, if the present

bids were accepted, only from 20 to 25 cents a pound. Retail prices to-day for similar supplies range from 65 to 80 cents a pound.

If the War Department has to ask for new bids, Secretary Baker indicated that dealers closer to the public than those who quoted prices last time will be reached.

I am glad to hear that Secretary Baker is at last waking up to the necessity of getting value for the Government's property.

In the same connection I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article from the Baltimore Sun of June 24, as follows:

FOOD STILL GOING UP—PRICES NEARLY AS HIGH AS MAXIMUM WAR SCALE—FEW ARTICLES ARE CHEAPER—COST OF 22 COMMODITIES HAS RISEN 98 PER CENT DURING LAST FOUR YEARS.

WASHINGTON, *June 23.*

And still the price of food goes up. For 22 selected items the retail price in May, 1919, declares a statement issued from the Department of Labor to-day, was 2 per cent higher than in April, 1919; 17 per cent higher than May, 1918; and 92 per cent higher than May, 1913.

May I interpolate here that while prices are so high this branch of the department, to the head of which it is proposed to pay $25,000 a year, has put out proposals that no one substantially but the packers can bid on because bids are required on at least 30,000-pound lots. Penal institutions in the States can not bid on this food because the quantity is too large. Other institutions of a like kind, charitable institutions, can not bid on it because the quantity is too large. The only people that can bid on it, under the rules laid down by the department, are the packers; and the packers are only offering a little more than one-half what the food is selling for at wholesale on the market.

But I proceed:

It is estimated that the average price of food is now within approximately 1 per cent of what it was in December, 1918, when it reached its highest point.

Out of 41 articles for which prices are received by the Bureau of Labor Statistics each month from retail dealers, 26 advanced in price in May, as compared with April of this year. These same 26 articles advanced in April over the preceding months with these exceptions: Bacon, butter, lamb, oranges, and plate beef increased in April, but decreased in May; evaporated milk, nut margarine, corn flakes, raisins, and tea decreased in April, but increased in May; and bread, canned peas, rice, and sugar have remained the same since March.

But the chief of this bureau—the only man who can be found in the United States to put these goods on the market, as it appears—says that they must not be sold so that the people can get the benefit of them, but they must be put on the market so that only the packers can buy them, and the packers will pay only a little over 50 per cent. No wonder the Secretary of War interposed and stopped the business and required new bids!

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the last statement of the Senator is somewhat inaccurate. Mr. Hare himself decided not to accept the bids. The Secretary of War did not interpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from an article a few moments ago——

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator must not believe everything he reads in articles.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe everything I read in articles.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask, then, if it was also Mr. Hare who restricted the bids to sales in carload lots?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a very apt question at this time, and I refer it to the chairman of the committee, if he will answer it. Did Mr. Hare provide that there should be sales in carload lots only?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am sure I do not know whether he did or not, whether the Secretary of War or the Quartermaster General or Mr. Hare made the original suggestion; but I offer this suggestion: If these enormous supplies of goods are to be sold as the retailer sells them, case by case, the Senate might as well make up its mind that it will have to appropriate, instead of $900,000, something like 10 or 15 million dollars to provide for the Government going into the retail business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment. You will lose a great deal more from your net cost in that way than if you can manage to sell them by carload lots.

It is a strange thing to me that the public does not take advantage of the opportunity to buy even in carload lots, because there is nothing to prevent 10 or 12 consumers joining together and buying a carload; but you can well imagine the enormous expense and the enormous labor it would involve for the Government to establish retail stores, and deal this stuff out piece by piece. It would be tremendous.

The truth of the matter is, in one respect, in relation to the canned meats, that they are the kind of canned meats that the public is not buying to-day anyway. The public is not living on canned roast beef.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about bacon? Surely bacon is as salable as wool, or copper, or any other commodity.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no information on bacon. I am speaking of canned meats. As I understand, as I said before, these goods are all packed as they were packed originally for export. They were put up to be shipped abroad for our Army. They are not packed in such a way that a retail grocer can readily take them and put them on his shelves. The invitations for the bids were sent to 40,000 different retail grocers and retail butchers, everybody in the trade as well as the institutions to which the Senator refers. The department, of course, is gravely disappointed that it can not get them to bid on them except at something less than one-half of the original cost.

Mr. McKELLAR. What else could be expected?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, you have that alternative. Either you must build up an enormous retail machine, an organization, and sell this stuff out in dozens and dozens of places, case by case, or else you must try to dispose of it more cheaply by carload lots. I can not see that anybody has been criminally negligent about it. It is the first experiment in endeavoring to sell these canned meats by carload lots. It seems to me that eventually the public will become wise to the fact that 10 or 12 men or 15 or 20 men can club together and buy a carload and divide it amongst themselves; or half a dozen grocers can get together and buy one carload. Of course the public and the trade have to be educated to this; but I do not think either the Secretary of War or the director of sales is particularly to blame for the refusal of the public to purchase the goods.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have a very different notion about it. I think it would be very much better for the Government to put this bacon and canned meat on the market in reasonable lots, where wholesalers could buy and where it would not go into the hands of the packers, who are interested in buying as cheaply as they can, and, of course, selling at the best price.

Here is a staple article, bacon, almost like money itself, selling at retail at enormous prices; and here is the Government director of sales, to whom it is proposed to pay $25,000 a year because he is the only man in the country fitted for it, who proposes to sell on terms on which only the packers, apparently, can buy. Will that do the country any good? Will the people of this country get their meat any cheaper?

I say that if there were nothing else apparent, this would be sufficient reason for this body to rescind the action that it took this morning; and surely, with these facts before us, we ought to agree to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland and put restrictions about the matter. I do not believe that this food should be sold at retail; but if we have the right kind of man, that is looking after the Government's interests and looking after the people's interests, and not arranging these matters so that only the packers can buy, it will be better for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who, I see, is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARDING. I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. FALL. I understand that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], who is unavoidably detained. I understand that he would vote the same way that I have voted, so I will let my vote stand.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the absence on official business of my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I understand that he is paired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The Chair announces that he has a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], which he transfers to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and allows his vote in the negative to stand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] are necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Borah	Kellogg	McCormick	Reed
Capper	Kenyon	McKellar	Sheppard
Curtis	Keyes	McNary	Stanley
France	King	Moses	Trammell
Gay	Knox	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Harding	La Follette	Overman	Wolcott
Harrison	Lenroot	Pomerene	

NAYS—22.

Ashurst	Hale	Phelan	Wadsworth
Brandegee	Harris	Phipps	Warren
Chamberlain	Henderson	Smith, Ariz.	Watson
Edge	Kirby	Spencer	Williams
Elkins	New	Sutherland	
Frelinghuysen	Newberry	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—47.

Ball	Gerry	Martin	Shields
Bankhead	Gore	Myers	Simmons
Beckham	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Md.
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Sterling
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Swanson
Dillingham	Kendrick	Poindexter	Townsend
Fall	Lodge	Ransdell	Underwood
Fernald	McCumber	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	McLean	Sherman	

So Mr. FRANCE's amendment to the amendment of Mr. WADSWORTH was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to give notice that when the bill comes into the Senate I shall reserve the right to take another vote upon the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 17 strike out lines 17 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

That not to exceed $5,000,000 of the unexpended balances on June 30, 1919, of the appropriations "Registration and selection for military service, fiscal year 1919," contained in the Army appropriation act for 1919, approved July 9, 1918, and the deficiency appropriation act for 1919, approved November 4, 1918, are reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920, for all expenses necessary for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft under the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, including the employment of the necessary clerical and other help for duty in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army in connection with the arrangement, operation, and maintenance of the files of those records: *Provided*, That such part of this appropriation as may be necessary shall be available for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be disbursed by such officer as may be designated by the Secretary of War for the purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. In line 22, page 17, I move to strike out "$5,000,000" and substitute therefor "$3,500,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely satisfactory, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement by Gen. Harris. It explains fully why this reduction should be made.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. M'KELLAR.

I called Gen. Harris over the phone, and he said that the records from the Judge Advocate General's Office fill a building the size of the State, War, and Navy Building three times over. That the records are now in the buildings at Washington Barracks; that he should have an organization having for its purpose the rearranging and reclassification of these records.

There are 500,000 men under indictment in the Department of Justice. The papers concerning these men are, of course, in these files.

There are 200,000 men under indictment by the military forces for military offenses, and a large number of these men are confined, and must be so confined until these records are opened up and classified and the information furnished to them.

He expects to have a separate division in charge of these records. He estimates that it will take 2,000 clerks for one year to classify and rearrange these records, and that it will take 1,000 clerks one year to furnish to the various adjutants general of the States memoranda with reference to men from such States or information concerning them.

He believes that an appropriation of $3,500,000 will do this work. After this year it will only take a few clerks to keep these records in condition and furnish reports as to them.

The 3,000 clerks will not average as much as $1,440 and probably not more than $1,200, but it will take $100,000 or more to purchase the necessary files and cases. Incidentally these should be secured from other departments of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to call up the amendment that was passed over, on page 52, line 6, under the heading "Rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 52, line 6, strike out "$90,000" and insert "$75,000."

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any objection to the amendment inserting $75,000 for $90,000, and after that amendment is agreed to I desire to amend the item by offering an amendment to the paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. After the words "fiscal year 1920" I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the numerals "1920, $75,000," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

Mr. SMOOT. I will simply say to the Senate that the Public Buildings Commission has this day made their first assignment of space in Government-owned buildings in the District of Columbia. There will be other changes, no doubt, in the future, and this amendment is absolutely necessary because of the fact that up to the present time we will be compelled to rent what is known as the Lemon Building. That building rents for $10,000 per annum. It may be that we can give the employees of the Government who are in that building a space in Government buildings hereafter. If so, this will not be available for paying rent for the building.

The balance of the appropriation is for storage space, and I want to say in passing that the Government of the United States is very short of storage space to-day, and we can not get away from renting space for storage in the District—at least until some future provision is made for the purpose of erecting buildings for storage purposes.

For that reason I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator whether the amendment is to follow the appropriation of $75,000?

Mr. SMOOT. It will follow the appropriation of $75,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. On page 52, under the subhead "Rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps," the clause reads:

For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for military purposes during the fiscal year 1920, $75,000.

The Senator from Utah proposes the following amendment to the amendment:

Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the public buildings commission in Government-owned buildings.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to offer one other amendment, because it may be that I can not be here in the morning, as the subcommittee on the sundry civil appropriation bill meets at 10 o'clock, and I think the committee desires to get the bill marked up to-morrow.

I move to strike out, on page 72, beginning with line 8, down to and including the word "appropriations," in line 15, the following words:

That hereafter printing, binding, and blank books required for use outside of the District of Columbia in connection with the support of the Army and the National Guard may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when in the opinion of the Secretary of War such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally, the cost thereof to be paid from the proper appropriations.

I will state the reason for the amendment. The War Department thought section 11 of public act No. 314, which amends the printing laws, prevented the publication by the War Department of any document or printed matter of any kind in the Canal Zone, in the Philippine Islands, and in Guam. But, Mr. President, I wish to say that that is not the case. Just the other day the Joint Committee on Printing at a meeting authorized that "all printing, binding, and blank-book work required to be done in and for the exclusive use of any Government service in Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Panama Canal, Porto Rico, Philippines, the Virgin Islands, or in any other place outside of the United States, may be done elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office." With that order issued by the Joint Committee on Printing, it is useless to have this paragraph in the bill, and I move that these lines be stricken out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah moves that beginning with line 8 and ending with the word "appropriations," in line 15 on page 72, the matter stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call attention to the proviso on page 34——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I beg the Senator's pardon, but do I understand that the pay of the Army amendment has been adopted, commencing on page 18, at the bottom of the page?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it has not. I am just calling the attention of the Chair to the fact that it has not been agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thought the Senator said page 34. It begins on page 18.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is where the particular item I want to call attention to is to be found. All relating to the pay of the Army was passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. The committee amendment is found on page 18, beginning with line 24, to and including line 17 on page 34, the proposition being to strike out and insert provisions for pay of the Army——

Mr. McKELLAR. I move to strike out the proviso in line 13 on page 34, beginning with the word "*Provided*," and including lines 14, 15, 16, and 17. That proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That any part of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 that is not required for the service of that fiscal year may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. President, I have looked through the hearings and I find there is no memorandum of any kind, or if there is such a memorandum I have been unable to find it, and I am informed by the chairman of the committee that there is no memorandum in the hearings on this proposition. I find also that the specific pay of the Army is stated opposite each one of the items and that this proviso apparently adds $100,000,000, that being the sum estimated by the chairman of the committee to be added to the pay of the Army.

If it is subject to a point of order—and I am not sufficiently well versed in parliamentary law to say whether it is—I desire to make a point of order against it. If it is not subject to a point of order, I want to insist upon my motion to amend. I think it ought to be stricken out for the reason that it reappropriates an indefinite sum, which is always bad legislation. What we ought to do is to appropriate for this year and let the money be turned back into the Treasury under the law. Let us appropriate what is necessary under the bill. There is no item to which this corresponds in any way, and it ought to go out of the bill. It has no place in the bill, and it ought to go out. I hope if it is subject to a point of order, the Chair will so rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I ask for the yeas and nays on the question whether the proviso shall remain.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I explained at some length to the Senate last night the meaning and effect of this proviso, and I do not intend to detain the Senate on it now. If the proviso is stricken out I have the figures already to add $100,000,000 to certain items in the pay accounts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator agree that it may go out and let those figures be added?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I can not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the vote is taken, I move the following amendment to the committee amendment: In the part of the appropriation for pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919, after the figures "1919," on page 34, line 15, I move to insert the words "not exceeding $100,000,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will accept that in behalf of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 46, line 22, under the heading "Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, etc.," where the committee proposes to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been unable to find in the hearings, in the short time we have had the hearings before us in print, anything about Cavalry horses. May I ask the chairman of the committee who testified and what was said about the need of horses? Is there anything about it in the published hearings?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; the testimony of Col. Hanney, of the Quartermaster Corps, who was brought before the committee by Gen. Lord, goes into it at some length.

I think I can give in a very few sentences the horse situation. One hundred sixty-two thousand seven hundred and twenty-two animals were sold after the armistice was declared, and principally during January, February, and March, 1919, owing to their being of no immediate use during the demobilization period and until another army had been recruited to cover the country's needs. These animals brought an average price of $113.48 per head as contrasted with the assertion which was made here last night that they averaged $90 per head. One hundred and thirteen dollars per head, horses and mules included. They cost the Government approximately $185 per head. Had they been retained in service it would have cost $98.83 per head to have foraged these animals, exclusive of labor, for the past six months. It ought to be remembered that these animals were in auxiliary remount stations. If the Government now buys animals at an average price of $190 per head there will therefore be a saving of about $22.31 per head for forage alone, and the service will secure younger animals.

Mr. President, here is the present situation about the horses on hand and the net requirements, divided into classes:

Horses for remounts, total requirement, 1,000; none on hand, net requirements, 1,000. This is based, I may say, upon an army of 400,000 men. Unit cost, $150. Total cost, $150,000. This estimate was made by the purchasing officer at Kansas City, Mo.

Horses for officers entitled to public mounts: Total requirements, 7,982; number on hand, 3,168; net requirements, 4,814; unit cost, $190; total cost, $914,660. That estimate was reached after conference by the War Department with the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Agricultural Department.

Horses for Cavalry to equip one Cavalry division and one regiment of Cavalry with each combat Infantry division: Total requirements, 31,833; number on hand, 12,796; net requirements, 19,037; unit cost, $190.

Pack horses for Cavalry: Total requirements, 900; number on hand, none; net requirements, 900; unit cost, $150; total cost of horses needed for Cavalry, $3,754,120.

Horses for Artillery: Total requirements, 25,614; number on hand, 15,829; net requirements, 9,785; unit cost, $190; total cost, $1,864,280.

Horses for Signal Corps: Total requirements, 573; number on hand, 275; net requirements, 298; unit cost, $190; total cost, $56,620.

Horses for Engineers: Total requirements, 2,611; number on hand, 1,403; net requirements, 1,208; unit cost, $190; total cost, $229,520.

Horses for Infantry, mounted: Total requirements, 7,747; on hand, 3,454; net requirements, 4,293; unit cost, $190; total cost, $815,670.

Horses for Hospital Corps: Total requirements, 132; number on hand, 52; net requirements, 80; unit cost, $190; total cost, $15,200.

Reserved for purchase of private mounts, $5,000 worth.

Expenses incident to purchase—that is, traveling expenses of the remount officers who travel about making these purchases and their clerks and veterinarians who accompany them, the clerks to keep the records of the purchases and the veterinarians to examine the horses. That item is $145,522.

Horses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, to be used in the six weeks' summer encampments which are provided under the national defense act of 1916; total amount needed, $231,040.

Therefore, the total requirements are 79,912 horses; number on hand, 36,977; the net requirements are 42,935, at a total cost of $8,181,632; and the committee gives them $5,000,000, $3,181,632 less than they ask.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the amount of that item with reference to the cost and expense of procuring the animals, the cost of the veterinarians and the officers and the clerks?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The sum of $145,522.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator when did that appear in the hearings?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This did not appear in the hearings. I sent for this table in order to have it in succinct form. These figures, in rambling testimony and in conversation between the officers and members of the committee, were in large part given to us, but they were not given to us in such form that they could be presented as one table. I ask that this table be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Appropriation—Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers.

[Estimate for horses fiscal year 1920—For Army of 400,000 men.]

Kind and use for which required.	Total requirements.	On hand.	Net requirements.	Unit cost.	Total cost.	Remarks.
Horses for remounts. Three-year-old horses which have been bred under agreement with the Department of Agriculture.	1,000	.....	1,000	$150.00	$150,000.00	Estimated cost for year 1920 (purchasing officer, Kansas City, Mo.).
Horses for officers entitled to public mounts	7,982	3,168	4,814	190.00	914,660.00	Conference with Bureau of Animal Industry.
Horses for Cavalry. One Cavalry division and one regiment of Cavalry with each combat division.	31,833	12,796	19,037	190.00	3,754,120.00	By Remount Division.
Horses, pack, for Cavalry	900	.....	900	150.00		No estimate has been made for maintenance.
Horses for Artillery	25,614	15,829	9,785	190.00	1,864,280.00	
Horses for Signal Corps	573	275	298	190.00	56,620.00	
Horses for Engineers	2,611	1,403	1,208	190.00	229,520.00	
Horses for Infantry, mounted	7,747	3,454	4,293	190.00	815,670.00	
Horses for Hospital Corps	132	52	80	190.00	15,200.00	
Reserved for purchase of private mounts	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,000.00	
Expenses incident to purchase	.....	.....	.....	.....	145,522.00	
Horses for R. O. T. C.	1,520	.....	1,520	190.00	231,040.00	
Total	79,912	36,977	42,935	.....	8,181,632.00	

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in reference to the horse situation, I desire to read from the hearings. I read from page 189, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. The House gave you $1,000,000?
Col. HANNAY. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. You asked for $10,000,000?
Col. HANNAY. We asked for $10,000,000.
The CHAIRMAN. Do you know upon what theory they placed it at $1,000,000?
Col. HANNAY. I do not; no, sir. These figures were based on the equipment of 21 peace-strength divisions, or an Army averaging 509,000 men.

I now read from quite a distinguished authority:

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to know if any officer can give us the information, how many horses we now own in the United States that have not been sold, and how many mules, and how many pack mules?
Col. WOOD. We can put that in the record.
Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. It seems foolish to purchase horses if at the present time we own horses and are not retaining them.

A statement that I indorse, by the way—

Col. WOOD. The point, Mr. Chairman, is this: That there would not be enough for an army of 509,000 men. This was figured up by Col. Hardeman, who is in charge of remounts and has been in charge of remounts for some time, and he figured in the same way that we have in other things for this organization.
Col. HANNAY. I can give you the entire figures. I have them here. For instance, for horses for Cavalry, the stock on hand is 12,796.
Senator THOMAS. You mean in America or on both sides?
Col. HANNAY. That is in America.
Col. WOOD. At what date?
Col. HANNAY. February 28–March 1. The total requirements are 23,797 riding horses and 1,200 pack horses, at the estimated cost of $190 for riding horses and $150 for pack, which makes $4,701,430 for horses. I can give you any of the items on which this is based, showing the number on hand; horses for officers entitled to public mounts, the number on hand is 3,168 and the requirement is 6,017. Unit cost, $190, making $1,143,230.
Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not think this needs to be taken down. In the House hearings Col. Hardeman testified on this subject.

I want to call the attention of the Senate especially to this testimony of Col. Hardeman, the one who is at the head of the remount station, and the other appears to be the chief horseman:

(Senator FRELINGHUYSEN here read from page 73 of the House hearings as follows:)

Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir. We are estimating for the purchase of draft animals for the Regular Army, $4,604,500.

It seems that it was not considerably less, but relatively somewhat less.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Those are draft animals.
Mr. McKELLAR. They are draft animals.
Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely different.

The CHAIRMAN. For the purchase.
Col. HARDEMAN. Purchase; yes, sir. For the purchase of pack animals, $503,370, a total for the Regular Army of $5,107,870. For the National Guard pack animals, $126,420.
The CHAIRMAN. It is contended that you have a great number of animals on hand that could be utilized for these purposes?
Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Then what is the need for the purchase of a large number of additional animals?
Col. HARDEMAN. We have sold a great many, in order to save forage—the upkeep. We have sold altogether 162,800 animals.
The CHAIRMAN. How many animals have you on hand now?
Col. HARDEMAN. On the 1st of July we expect to have 83,000 and some hundreds.

Naturally, with 83,000 and some hundreds of animals on the 1st of July it is not incumbent upon this Congress to appropriate $5,000,000 for the purchase of horses, in my judgment, and I hope the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New York to say last night that on the war strength of 400,000 men which we are providing for in this bill, about the 30th of September the Army would be reduced to 209,000. Was that the number?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be reduced to 322,000 men.

Mr. HARRISON. To 322,000; but if it was reduced to what the House provided, it would be two hundred and some odd thousand, would it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be 195,000.

Mr. HARRISON. And that it would go down more than that a little later on?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it would stay at 195,000 for the last nine months of the fiscal year.

Mr. HARRISON. I see; it would be three hundred and some odd thousand, then, about the 30th of September. If the Senator from Tennessee had proceeded further in the testimony of

Col. Hardeman he would have found this statement in the hearings before the House committee:

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you propose to purchase?
Col. HARDEMAN. We propose to purchase 36,214 riding horses; 14,212 draft horses; 1,200 pack horses; 18,418 draft mules; and 2,397 pack mules for the Regular Army.
The CHAIRMAN. That is about half the number you sold?
Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir; about half.
The CHAIRMAN. You have sold 162,000, I understood you to say?
Col. HARDEMAN. 162,280.
The CHAIRMAN. That is what I understood; and while I did not take the exact figures that you gave as to purchases, I had made a vague estimate of between 70,000 and 80,000, probably not that many, that you expect to purchase.
Mr. DENT. Let him give those figures again.
Col. HARDEMAN. We propose to purchase 36,214 riding horses, 14,212 draft horses, 1,200 pack horses, 18,418 draft mules, and 2,397 pack and riding mules.
The CHAIRMAN. That is 72,000 animals, in round numbers?
Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir.
Mr. CRAGO. That estimate is based on a supposed Army of 500,000 men, is it?
Col. HARDEMAN. Five hundred thousand men; yes, sir.
Mr. CRAGO. Suppose the Army is left at 200,000 or 250,000; you would have all the mounts you needed, would you not?
Col. HARDEMAN. We would have approximately the number we need now; yes, sir.
Mr. CRAGO. And unless we increase the Regular Army to 500,000 you would not need these horses?
Col. HARDEMAN. That is based on 4 combat divisions at war strength, 16 at peace strength, and a Cavalry division.
The CHAIRMAN. How are you off for Cavalry horses?
Col. HARDEMAN. We have sufficient for present needs. We have sufficient of all classes of animals for present needs.

* * * * * * *

Mr. WISE. How about the horses?
Col. HARDEMAN. The horses averaged a little less than $90, and they will cost about $190 apiece to buy them back.
Mr. WISE. So that both the mules and the horses will cost you, on the average, about $100 more than you sold them for?

So it would seem, Mr. President, since we saw fit to sell 162,000 of these animals in this country during the first part of this year, and since we shall have, as stated by the Senator from Tennessee—about how many was it—70,000 on the 1st of July?

Mr. McKELLAR. We shall have eighty-three thousand and some hundreds.

Mr. HARRISON. We shall have 83,000 on the 1st of July; and therefore it seems to me very improper and unwise for us to proceed to make an appropriation at the same time to buy back horses on which we are losing $100 apiece. I think the other House was most liberal in providing for an appropriation of $1,000,000, and that we ought to repudiate the action of the Senate committee and to stand by the House in this matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course the Senate will be master of the situation. I desire to make one or two observations on the situation in connection with the assertion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that we have lost money by selling these horses. As a matter of fact, we have saved $22.31 a head by doing so. Their cost in forage alone for six months would have been $98, and that does not include the labor in taking care of them.

Mr. HARRISON. But if the Senator from New York will permit me——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just one moment. They were not sold at $100 loss. The average cost was $185, and they were sold at an average of $113.

Mr. HARRISON. I got the figures I have stated from Col. Hardeman's testimony.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was the official statement of the War Department which I read into the RECORD a moment ago.

I will read just a portion of it again in order to straighten this matter out:

These animals—

The 162,000 that were sold—

Brought an average price of $113.48 per head—

And incidentally we can make up our minds that they sold the poorest horses they had.

They cost the Government approximately $185 per head. Had they been retained in service it would have cost $98.83 per head to have foraged these animals, exclusive of labor, for the past six months. Now, if the Government buys animals at an average price of $190, there will therefore be a saving of $22.31 per head for forage alone.

So we are not losing money. Had we kept these 162,000 horses, "eating their heads off" for six months, every one of them would have cost us $98.83 more. We would have had the horses to-day, it is true, but by selling them in January and rebuying in July we saved just that amount of money. It all seems simple to me.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator two questions, with his permission: Is not that apparent discrepancy to be accounted for because of the fact that the mules which were sold—and I gathered from what the Senator said that mules were also sold—brought a price greatly in excess of $113, whereas the horses sold practically for $90 each, according to the testimony of the officer to whom the Senator from Mississippi referred?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The average price is on the horses and mules combined. I regret to say that I have not yet presented to the Senate the estimate for mules that are to be purchased. They want $4,000,000 for that.

Mr. KING. In addition to $5,000,000 for horses?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Ten million dollars for horses. The committee has only given them $5,000,000 altogether, instead of the one million appropriated by the House. This estimate is based on an Army of 400,000 men, and not on an Army of 500,000.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether the sales have continued down until this time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the sales have ceased.

Mr. KING. How long since have they ceased?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know the date, but they ceased some time ago. Of course, the Senator will understand that there are always a few horses being sold—worn-out horses and cripples.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee this question: By October 1 it is proposed to have the Army reduced to 322,000 or 323,000 men. This estimate was based originally on an Army of 509,000 men, but we can not use horses except on the basis of an Army of 322,000 men or an Army of less than that. There is no reason for basing this estimate on an Army of 400,000 men, because we know that by the time we buy these horses we will not have an Army of that size, and the result will be that we will overstock ourselves with horses, even assuming that 83,000 are not now on hand; but there are 83,000 on hand, or will be on the 1st of July, which will be an ample number for an Army of 322,000 men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate any longer about this matter, but 83,000 horses will not be ample for an Army of 322,000 men. The situation is this: The department asked for $10,000,000 for horses for an Army of 500,000 men. We cut it squarely in two, to make them "get down to hard scrapple," to compel them to buy horses just as cheaply as possible, and buy just as few as possible, and, incidentally, to take as good care of them as possible, so as to prolong their lives. Now, if we should reduce the appropriation below $5,000,000, it is easily to be seen that there will not be enough horses, and the department will come here with a deficiency item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Eighty-three thousand horses for an army of 322,000 men would mean a horse for every fourth man. As I understand the organization of the Army, it does not require a horse for every fourth man in the Army. I am quite sure the Senator must be mistaken about that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator forgets that mules are included in this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am including the mules.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It takes 7,000 animals to provide for one division of Infantry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can advise us of any reason put forth by the House or by the committee of the House for fixing the figure originally at $1,000,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I can not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Chair hold that the yeas and nays have not been granted? I asked for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee asks for the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. KIRBY and Mr. WADSWORTH demanded a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs that was passed over was, on page 48, line 20, in the total for

barracks and quarters, to strike out "$2,000,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "$18,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York has made an explanation with regard to this item I shall not ask him to do so again; but if he did I was not in the Chamber when the explanation was tendered. It does seem to me that with the large number of buildings that have been constructed during the war, with the large number of cantonments and other posts and places for the housing of the Army there ought to be sufficient quarters now without expending this large sum for the purposes indicated in this paragraph. It seems that a jump from $2,000,000 to $18,000,000 is entirely too much in view of the apparent lack of necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike to be so much of an objector, but I wish to read this amendment, or parts of it. It is for barracks and quarters. If the American Army has not got barracks and quarters enough now, there never will be a time when we will not be called upon to spend enormous amounts of money for barracks and quarters. This provision reads:

For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery—

Surely we do not want to authorize the construction of these buildings for the purposes indicated. We have spent hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars for cantonments and quarters for men and horses. We surely do not need any additional ones, and yet we are raising the House appropriation of $2,000,000 to $18,000,000, in part for such purposes as I have indicated. I read further from this provision:

for construction of reclamation plants; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees—

We have just passed an immense appropriation for the hiring of employees; we have already provided for the hiring and pay of 101,000 civilian employees. But I proceed—

for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for noncommissioned officers and enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty.

Every line that I have read up to date in this provision is for war purposes. Now listen to this. We are appropriating $18,000,000 now, or it is proposed to do so, for what purpose? For ground for cantonments. Is it possible that we have not enough cantonments in this country for an Army of 322,000 men, when we have had enough during the past year for an Army of 3,700,000? Is it possible that we will permit this amendment to go through for such a purpose? Are we going to spend the public money in any such way as this?

But listen; I have not finished:

For grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits.

That we have already appropriated for.

Mr. President, I have read this proposed amendment for the purpose of showing that it is solely for war purposes. If we adopt this amendment, we are appropriating $18,000,000 for these war purposes in time of peace.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. What was the testimony favoring this expenditure in the committee hearings?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been unable to find the testimony that asks for it.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator is not influenced by the phenomenal success of his townsman, I believe, Sergt. York, in dispatching the enemy with what might be regarded as inadequate equipment?

Mr. McKELLAR. If we had a few more like my friend, Mr. York, of Tennessee, there would not be any Germans; but Mr. York has gone back to the peaceful pursuits of life, like the other soldiers ought to go after the war is over. We ought not to have such appropriations. These are appropriations purely for war purposes; and I want the Senate to know just exactly what they are voting for. They are voting for the purchase of camp sites, for the building of cantonments, and the building of all kinds of public buildings for war purposes. These are the purposes to which this money is to be applied.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I should like to ask him if the evidence before either the Senate committee or the House committee does not show that there are cantonments now in excess of the needs of the Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator and to the Senate that we had cantonments that would properly house in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 men, and we are abandoning the cantonments and camps every day; and yet, under this provision in the bill, it is proposed to devote $18,000,000 to the purposes I have read.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that the Government owned a large number of forts and military posts before we entered the war which would house and properly care for two or three hundred thousand soldiers?

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite a large number; I can not give the exact figures, but a very large number; and the idea of appropriating money for cantonments is to my mind absurd and ridiculous.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator if it is not rather incongruous to ask for money for cantonments under the head of barracks and quarters, in view of the fact that some pages in advance an appropriation is sought for the repair of cantonments?

Mr. McKELLAR. I can not say positively. My recollection about this provision is that it has appeared in the appropriation bills since the war began. It is a war provision; it is not a peace-time provision at all, and it has no place whatsoever in this bill. It could be all stricken out, and it ought to be all stricken out. For some reason the House left it at $2,000,000, which is entirely too much. There ought not to be anything appropriated under this provision. It is a war-time provision, pure and simple, and not a peace-time provision; and yet the Senate committee has raised it to $18,000,000.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator if many of the items that seem to be embraced within the amendment now under consideration are not contained in the amendment commencing on page 26 and ending on page 34? That is to say, I desire to ask if, in the amendment covering so many pages, ample provision is not made for many of the items referred to in the amendment now under consideration?

Mr. McKELLAR. Apparently so. We have already appropriated money for the 101,000 civilian employees, and this provides for the hire of employees, and I think there is confusion existing here.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, let me ask the chairman of the committee if he will not consent to striking out, on line 24, page 47, the phrase "for hire of employees"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; if you do that, you will have to keep soldiers in the service.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is in charge of the bill. He has made an investigation and feels that that phrase is necessary?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is one of the most important phrases in the entire paragraph.

Mr. ASHURST. The statement has just been made that in another part of the bill an appropriation has been made for the hire of employees.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under another department of the War Department; not under this one.

Mr. ASHURST. That is what I wanted to know—under another department; and this is to pay for the hire of the employees who are to care for and maintain and prepare these buildings? That explains why that phrase is there?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

The Senator from Tennessee has asserted with great emphasis that this is a war appropriation. I venture the assertion that his statement is inaccurate. This is a peace-time appropriation, resulting, however, from the building of great cantonments and quarters and barracks to house the troops during the war.

I want now to read from the testimony of Gen. Marshall, which will be found on page 197 of the Senate hearings. I read this because the Senator from Tennessee has laid emphasis on the assertion that this is for building camps and cantonments.

Mr. McKELLAR. It says so on its face.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the Senator has left the impression that all the $18,000,000 is to be spent for building. Now, let us see what the truth is:

Gen. MARSHALL. Before considering the estimates submitted by the Construction Division I want first to firmly impress upon you that these items are not for new construction or for finishing camps or cantonments. The items in my estimate are for maintenance and operation for an Army for the coming fiscal year, which it has been estimated will average for the year 500,000. No new construction of any size or importance is contemplated.

I may add here that I have a list of the specific items of new construction that are called for in this estimate. I can put that list into the hearing, if you so desire. That is a list of the specific things that will be constructed, as now before the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it will be wise for you to put that in.

Then follows a list of items varying in amount, as I glance over it, from $900 in one place up to $108,000 in McIntosh, Tenn., for barracks buildings for troops that are living along the border and have had to live under canvas for three or four years. The total of new construction estimated for under this item is $1,232,000. There are miscellaneous items. I see here a saddler shop, frame stables, insulated warehouse for ice, gasoline filling station, fireproof oil-storage house, varying amounts, types of that kind, corrals for horses, and so forth; not at all in the sense of building a new cantonment or building a new camp; miscellaneous new construction in existing camps.

Then he continues:

Gen. MARSHALL. Whereas in a year and a half the Construction Division built works totaling a cost of over a billion dollars, three times the cost of the Panama Canal, at a time when there was a shortage of labor and materials and a congestion of transportation facilities unparalleled in the world's history, the principal work of the division now is maintenance and operation of the roads, buildings, and public utilities such as light, heat, power, water, sewage disposal, etc., at 46 camps and cantonments, 51 hospitals, 66 border stations, 25 supply depots and terminals, and 171 regular military posts, a total of 359 military establishments.

This testimony was all at the disposal of the Senator from Tennessee. It is not for new construction, except in that comparatively small item. The estimate was for $23,906,205, divided as follows: Maintenance, $13,333,973; extraordinary repairs, $7,208,500; purchase—that is, of materials to make the repairs—$590,550; new construction, $2,773,000.

Now, of course, the amount is staggering. The committee was staggered when confronted with this situation; but these Army posts, these hospitals, these storage warehouses, these great cantonments which the Government owns, must be kept in a state of repair or they will go to pieces, and in one or two years you will lose the entire estimate made by Gen. Marshall for maintenance. It is one of the aftermaths of this war. It is up to the Senate to decide. Are these buildings to be allowed to have their roofs go to pieces, the posts and foundations under them go to pieces, water pipes go to leaking and ruining them on the inside, or are they to be kept in reasonable repair?

Gen. Marshall asked for $23,000,000 and the committee cut him down to $18,000,000. I do not understand myself how the House arrived at the figure of $2,000,000. If only $2,000,000 is appropriated, I say with all solemnity that within two months they will be forced to come to us for a deficiency item or Government property worth hundreds of millions of dollars will commence to perish.

That is the situation that is confronting us. We have carved Gen. Marshall out of $5,000,000 worth of this maintenance. He can not buy any new land. He can not build any new cantonments. He can not buy any new camp sites. He can not build any new camps. I am perfectly willing that the language which the Senator from Tennessee has emphasized, and which is the only language in the item that he has emphasized, shall be stricken from the paragraph. It is old language, inherited from former appropriation bills; but if you cut it down to $2,000,000 you will destroy twenty times that amount in Government property.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will.

Mr. KING. The Senator indicated, as I recall his statement, that there were over 300 of these camps.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are 359 places where troops and officers and supplies are quartered or stored.

Mr. KING. Is it the purpose of the Government to make a sale of some of those camps and cantonments?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Eventually, when the storehouses are emptied. They are all chuck full now. Eventually the cantonments which the Government has purchased, or has gone far on the road toward completing—the purchase of the land under 16 of the National Army cantonments has been discussed already in the Senate. Those cantonments cost between $10,000,000 and $16,000,000 apiece, the buildings alone. The electric-lighting plants, the laundries, the water-supply systems, the sewage-disposal systems, all owned by the Government were put in at great cost, averaging, as I said, between ten and sixteen million dollars per cantonment. Now, you have got to keep that in repair; you have got to keep the water pressure on, whether the cantonment is occupied or not; you have got to keep the water pressure on in order to reduce the fire hazard. You have got to keep the electric-light plant going, so that the electric lights around the streets shall be burning at night, to reduce the fire hazard. You have got to do certain cleaning and repairing in all those buildings from time to time. That is largely taken care of under this item, which the committee, as I have already indicated, has reduced by $5,000,000.

Mr. KING. Has not the War Department outlined some program which contemplates the early disposition of all of these camps and cantonments and buildings?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it has not outlined any program for the disposition of the 16 National Army cantonments, because the Congress as yet has outlined no program for a permanent reorganization of the Army.

Mr. KING. Do I understand that the War Department is proceeding upon the theory that there will be a retention by the Government of these 350-odd camps, cantonments, posts, and so forth, and is not adopting any program for the purpose of making a disposition of any of them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The War Department can not very well make a program for the disposition of all of the Army posts in the United States until it knows what the Congress is going to do with the Army in the way of permanent legislation. Would the Senator say that Fort Myer should be sold? That is one of them.

Mr. KING. I have not sufficient information to venture an opinion upon that point.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is it.

Mr. KING. But it seems to me that the committee, or the War Department, or some one charged with the responsibility, ought to formulate a plan and present it for consideration here, so that somebody may act intelligently. Certainly, the Congress can not escape liability, or excuse itself for nonaction, if it does not confer the authority upon the War Department to act; and the War Department, if it has not authority, ought to suggest to the Congress some policy which the Congress ought to adopt with reference to a disposition of the property.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I alluded to that question very briefly last night, about the permanent reorganization of the Army. I myself hope that within the next 8 or 10 months the Congress of the United States will pass permanent legislation reorganizing the Army of the United States, and establishing a definite and fixed military policy. I, for one, have opposed doing that up to this time because before that is done I should like the Congress of the United States to be properly informed as to what the best military policy of this country must be in the future; and I do not think we can get the last scrap of information to enable us to legislate on such a very important topic until the entire American Expeditionary Force comes home, and until we have a chance to talk to all of those officers, from Gen. Pershing down, who are capable of giving us information. I hope the time will shortly come when we will establish a military policy for the country; and when we do so, then we can tell what shall occur with the Army posts and the cantonments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we have just received the glad news from Europe that Germany after all her travail and suffering is going to sign the treaty of peace. With the treaty, together with the covenant, peace amongst the nations of the earth is about to come to America. If we can not go back to a peace basis in our expenditures, what is the particular use of peace at all?

The Senator tells me that we need so many millions of dollars to maintain certain things. What is the use of maintaining things that we do not need to maintain? What is the sense in keeping up all these cantonments and everything else on a war basis when we are going, as we hope to God we are, to a peace basis pretty soon? Have we fought the war merely for the purpose of keeping on a war basis or have we fought the war for the purpose of putting an end to war as far as we knew how and getting back to the old basis of the English-speaking race in Europe and here in America, when we confess ourselves unready for war but are willing at all times to meet it if ever it shall come with every nerve that we have. Even if there were no covenant of peace, even if there were no peace treaty, we would be as well prepared for war to-day as we were in 1917, and we were well enough prepared then to make America feared and to make Germany succumb. We have made it a principle of the race in the old country and here for all time in the past, and I hope for all time in the future, that we shall not constantly burden the people with taxes permanently in order to be ready for war whenever war should break out, but that when war should break out we would spur ourselves to the very utmost to meet it with the energy of a great people and the intensity of a great struggling folk called to the struggle by patriotism and by a love of liberty and by a love of civilization.

Why does the Senator talk to us about keeping up these cantonments? What is the necessity of keeping them up? I noticed a moment ago that the Senator made a very shrewd remark. The Government had made a lot of money by disposing of a lot of horses and mules. Any army that wants to be effec-

tive will be engaged all the time in selling horses and mules and buying more horses and mules. If an army has not sense enough to do that, they have not the sense of a one-mule farmer, because as the old mule or the old horse gives out you want to dispose of him and buy another one fit for the business. Why not do the same thing with the cantonments? What use have you for them? Are you going to keep this Nation upon a war footing?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator undoubtedly understands that the cantonments are now being used for the demobilization of the troops. They must be maintained in repair while that is being done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, Mr. President, I understand that for the temporary purpose of demobilization some of the cantonments must be maintained, perhaps most of them, but that is a mere temporary purpose, and there is no reason under the sun to take account of that affair as a permanent business. We certainly will not need them beyond six months, unless Germany defies the world again, and if she does we will need war emergency appropriations and 2,000,000 men in the field. If Germany does not defy the world again, we will need about a quarter of a million men.

Mr. President, I believe that as an end of this great gigantic struggle we ought to agree that no country in the world shall keep more than a quarter million of men under the standard ready for war. The smallest nation, like Switzerland or Belgium, could do that; Serbia could do it. That would keep the strongest nation from overrushing them over night, murdering them while they were asleep, as Germany did Belgium.

If I thought that we had fought this war for the purpose of keeping America upon a basis of compulsory military service and upon a war basis, I would almost regret that we had ever entered into it at all. We fought this war to end war as well as we knew how. America's chivalry went to France for the purpose of saying to Germany you can not overrun Belgium and overrun France just because they are weaker than you are. We stand here in our might which we propose to make God's right, and we made it God's right because it was His right before we started in. It was the right of civilization and of peace and of harmony and of world accord. We made it all that because after all right can not be supported except by some sort of might somewhere, and we supported it. Why should we not quit this foolishness since it is over? We can understand fully why you are bound to lose money on horses and mules, selling old ones and buying new ones, but I can not understand for the life of me why we should keep on forever losing money on cantonments that are unnecessary for any warlike purpose.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, as I understand the situation there are 16 cantonments valued at $209,000,000. There are necessary repairs to keep them in shape. Many of these cantonments are now occupied. The estimate for extraordinary repairs was $14,000,000. The War Department cut it in half and made it $7,000,000. Let me state what are the repairs: I think there are 570,000 linear feet of roofing to replace damaged roofing. There are concrete posts under many of the buildings. Many of the camps were built hastily and the wooden posts have rotted out. There are screens for the cantonments that are now occupied by the soldiers. There are other repairs, repairs to the water systems and the fire department. Seven million dollars is 3½ per cent of $200,000,000, and it seems reasonable if these camps are to be kept in order that that expenditure should be made. Possibly they may be utilized even with an Army of 250,000 men.

The problem before the committee was, Shall we make the expenditure and save these cantonments and keep them in order, or shall we allow them to become wrecks and get rid of those wrecks at practically 5 or 6 per cent of their original cost? The National Guard encampments, of which there were, I think, 17, cost $16,000,000. Of course, they did not have these large buildings; only the headquarters were permanent buildings. They were practically tents and flooring, but there were $16,000,000 worth of National Guard camps that were sold for $509,000. Those were wrecks, and that is what the War Department recovered.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that we will not need all these cantonments, but we will need a certain number. We can dispose of them, however, better if we keep them in repair temporarily until we or the War Department determines what the policy shall be. It is impossible for them to declare a policy at this time. They have demobilized 2,500,000 men from these cantonments. Many of them are now occupied, and while they are engaged in the burden of demobilizing this great Army, it is impossible for them to determine what the future policy is going to be and how large an Army we shall have.

So the question before the committee and the question before the Senate is, Are you willing to pay 3½ per cent to repair these cantonments so that they will be in better shape for sale or for disposal?

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator and I are both plain farmers, or at least I am. Suppose I built a barn that I did not need. Suppose I put up a cotton warehouse that I had no use for. Would I go to the foolish expense of keeping it in repair forever rather than cast it into the scrap heap? Suppose I was a manufacturer and that my machinery was out of date and new machinery was taking its place, what would I wisely do with the old machinery itself? I would put it in the scrap heap and sell it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We will take the barn first.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Take both.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If you were going to sell the barn, you would see that the roof was kept on it, so that you could sell it as a barn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would see that it was torn down and the lumber was sold upon the market; but I would see that the roof was taken off with the shingles, as well as the sideboards, before I would sell it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would you take the roof off before you took the hay out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I think I would take it all down at the same time, like the "deacon's one-horse shay"; but I would sell it and I would not be foolish enough to keep the fool thing there forever.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, as has been stated a number of times, when the full committee acted upon this bill the testimony taken before the subcommittee was not then available. It has only been available since this morning.

With reference to this item, it appears from the testimony that this maintenance item of some $12,000,000 is composed of two items—in round numbers, $3,000,000 for the pay of civilian employees and the balance for maintenance or upkeep of all of the cantonments and Army posts in the country.

The War Department acted very properly, in my judgment, in making these estimates, because the War Department could not assume the abandonment of any one of them. What is to be done in that respect will be for Congress to determine. But this item of $10,000,000 for maintenance contemplates keeping up throughout the entire year every one of the 359 cantonments. I understand one-half of them are to be maintained for occupancy; the other half to be maintained, but not for occupancy. It ought to be assumed that Congress is not going to permit this year to go by without either determining or authorizing the War Department to determine upon the abandonment of at least one-half of these camps.

Mr. KING. Two-thirds.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Utah says two-thirds. Yes; two-thirds. The abandonment of two-thirds of these camps will yet suffice for the largest possible Army that a permanent military policy will require when adopted by Congress.

It is true that we must assume until the 1st of September that the present occupancy must continue until demobilization is completed, but by that time either Congress ought to determine upon the abandonment of a large number of these camps or instruct the War Department to do so; and if that is true, not more than one-half probably of the estimate for maintenance will be required.

I desire to move to amend the committee amendment in line 20 by striking out "$18,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000." I am sure that that will be ample for maintaining these camps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 48, line 20, strike out "$18,000,000" and in lieu insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I shall not object to that amendment, as I can see the temper of the Senate on this matter. I only hope it does not have this effect, a thing about which I am deeply concerned: A very considerable proportion of this estimate, which we have already cut $5,000,000, is for pay of civilian employees who do the repairing at the cantonments and Army posts. They have taken on an increasing number of those men in order to let drafted soldiers out of the Army. I do not want those drafted men kept in the Army to do the work of maintaining these places in repair. One of the largest items that the construction division has to contend

with is the matter of pay of civilian employees to take the places of soldiers. I believe the Senate wants the soldiers discharged. I am going to consent to this reduction to $15,000,000; but if it is shown later, after this bill becomes a law, that as a result of it soldiers are being kept in the service in order to reduce this expenditure by the War Department, I shall join, for I think I shall not be alone, in asking that a deficiency item be appropriated in order to take care of this work.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to state that the full estimate of the department for civilian employees to keep up these cantonments is $3,000,000. I meant to say, which I omitted to say, that the committee in reporting the bill at the last session, which was not reached, proposed only $14,000,000 where the committee now proposes $18,000,000 and where my amendment will leave it at $15,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is fair to say that when the committee reported it at the last session the War Department had not purchased the cantonment sites. I find myself here defending this administration under constant attack by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber. The committee did not buy these cantonments. The War Department has proceeded to purchase the land. The committee is faced with the proposal whether or not we shall allow the buildings on the land to go to pieces altogether. We did not even make the estimates.

The department, having acquired the property under this administration without consulting the Congress and under emergency appropriations made during the war, comes now to us and says, "Having acquired this property you do not want us to let it go to pieces, do you?" And the Committee on Military Affairs said, "No; we do not." That is the only responsibility we have in this matter. We did not acquire this property. We did not put up these buildings. But we do think that the property having been acquired, the buildings having been put up by the taxpayers of the United States, they should be maintained in a state of repair until, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, they can be sold. That is the only thought in the minds of this committee. I accept the reduction suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield for just a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand, but does the Senator think if a camp is to be abandoned and is not occupied, it will sell for one dollar more because it is maintained and kept in repair?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will certainly sell for more than if it were burned down by fire.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, certainly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin I will say that I understand that a large number of these buildings are being used for storage purposes——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Many of them are being so used.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. And that it is absolutely necessary to repair the roofs and to put concrete posts under them. If I remember correctly, the estimate of the War Department was $31,000,000, and the House, I think, gave them $23,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. It gave them $2,000,000. They asked for $23,000,000, but your committee——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. They asked for $23,000,000 and we give them $18,000,000. In the last Congress, when we gave them $14,000,000, I hardly think the survey and inspection of the cantonments had been made and an estimate made for their repair. Therefore when they found it was necessary to repair these buildings, which were temporary, they made that estimate for the repairs and included it in the bill in these estimates. The estimates were $14,000,000 and the estimates were cut right in half and appropriation was made of $7,000,000 for repairs.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I say just this much, rather in support of the chairman of the committee, on this question of the cantonments? These cantonments had to be had; we needed them at the time. We had to put buildings on them; we had to put water there; we had to put lights there; we had to build streets and roads. That was a necessary expense, to which we had to go in order to train our men and properly equip them for the war.

Many of these buildings are valuable buildings; they are large and well constructed, and they have expensive and some of the very best material in them.

Now, it is a question whether we are going to let them go to waste, and besides the expense of removing them, which in itself would cost more than would be required to pay for the land and get an absolute title to it. We have either got to remove these buildings and put the property back in the same condition in which it was before the cantonments were established there, which would be an enormous expense to the Government, or we must go on and complete the ownership of the property and keep it up until we can dispose of it. In some instances rent of the property would be more than it would be necessary to pay in order to buy it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will remember that only yesterday we had before us the proposition of the acquirement of the Curtiss plant at Buffalo, where the buildings erected by the Government were appraised at 7½ per cent of their cost, while these estimates for maintenance amount to 6½ per cent a year—within 1 per cent of what the Government buildings were appraised for at Buffalo for the entire plant.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, that depends a great deal upon the character of the building. I can understand as to an aviation plant, for instance, that the buildings may be pure shells, with nothing complete about them to make them fit to be occupied. They may be only fit to be used for a certain purpose, frames merely, with a roof over them. In such cases, of course, the value is almost nothing, because the expense of tearing them down and taking them away would consume the entire value of the building. In such an instance 7½ per cent might be enough. There are, however, instances where these buildings are substantial buildings which can be utilized and the property sold off in lots. Often the cantonments are conveniently located to a town and have communication with a city, with good roads leading to them, and the property can be maintained and eventually the Government may reimburse itself very largely for its expenditure.

I want to say further that it is a mistake, in my judgment, for Senators to assume here with reference to these various items that the representatives of the War Department either do not comprehend what they need or else that they are purposely misleading the committee. That is unfair. Those men do know what they want, and they know absolutely what the necessities are. We ought, at least, to give them credit for good faith. Do not assume here upon every item that comes up that the representatives of the Government are attempting in some way or other to put their hands into the Treasury and get something that ought not to be taken from the Treasury.

Then, in the next place, it is a mistake to assume that the committee does not understand these items and has not given careful attention to the statements with reference to every one of them and due consideration of the merits of each one of them. The subcommittee which was appointed on this bill worked day and night, they worked laboriously and earnestly, and went through every word and every letter and every item of this bill. They know what they have recommended here and why they have recommended it. After the subcommittee finished the bill they reported it to the full committee, and the full committee sat day and night and went over every item of the bill. It is not proper, therefore, to assume here that these items are offered simply offhand, without full comprehension of their meaning and of the merits back of them. These items have been looked into by the committee, who know perfectly well what they mean and why they are here, and they are recommended by the committee upon their merits.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am through.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Florida a question. Of course the Senator understands that the War Department, as a department, have made no recommendation about these cantonments; they have offered no policy about them. So far as the department has done anything at all, it is merely preserving the status quo. As a matter of fact, it is not the duty of the department to outline a policy. It is the duty of Congress to outline a policy. Of course, if we desire a recommendation from the Secretary of War, I have no doubt he will give it; but the discussion of these items is not any criticism of the Secretary of War, for he has made no recommendation in reference to the subject at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. As to any policy relative to this matter, Mr. President, we have all agreed, and we perfectly understand, that we are not now in a position to fix a definite policy with reference to the Military Establishment of the country for the future.

Mr. McKELLAR. Therefore the matter is entirely open.

Mr. FLETCHER. The only thing we can do now is to take care of the present situation, at least until matters clear up and until we can better judge of what our permanent policy should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McKELLAR. Making the appropriation $15,000,000 instead of $18,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understood the chairman of the committee was willing to accept the amendment, and nobody raised any objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated I would accept it, and I expressed my feelings on the subject. I stated I would accept the reduction, but I have no authority to do so for the committee or for the Senate. It is but fair to say that some of my colleagues on the committee, who have studied this matter exceedingly hard, disagree with me in my acceptance of this reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to offer an amendment perfecting the provision for which $15,000,000 is now appropriated. I move to strike out on page 48—and I think the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment—in lines 8, 9, 10, and 11, the words "for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes."

I think those words should go out, and I move to strike them out.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think they ought to go ouf.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the pending amendment should be disposed of before the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be; I do not know the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point made by the Senator from Wisconsin is well taken. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended on motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, I move to strike out the language to which I have referred, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the chairman of the committee can not accept the amendment in that form. I call the attention of the Presiding Officer to the fact that we are proceeding with the consideration of the bill under an order that committee amendments shall first be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to hold that, according to the agreement under which the Senate is now operating, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is not at this time in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I will offer it later.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 53, in the item under the subhead "Rifle ranges for civilian instruction," in line 15, to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$100,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 64, line 11, in the total for ordnance stores and ammunition, to strike out "$200,000" and to insert "$1,600,000."

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, that is the amendment to which I called attention yesterday. The War Department has recommended $150,000 for this purpose. We have on hand already 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition of this kind. This plant or factory, if it is continued to be operated at its full capacity, will make 250,000 rounds of this kind of ammunition every day. Having as much ammunition of the kind on hand as we do have, why should we spend $1,600,000 a year manufacturing ammunition that can not possibly be used?

Here is a place where we could exercise some sound discretion and save the Government a little money. Why should we have 250,000 rounds of ammunition manufactured daily when we have on hand 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition, which could not be shot in a whole year with 4,000,000 on the field of battle? The War Department only recommended $150,000. The House made an appropriation of $200,000, and I do not believe we ought to increase it to $1,600,000 under the circumstances I have mentioned.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know why it was raised and at whose instance it was raised?

Mr. KIRBY. It was raised because they have an efficient corps of operatives at this particular factory, and a great many of them would necessarily be required to seek employment at some other place if we should not continue to operate the factory at full capacity. That is the only reason for the increase of this appropriation, as I understand.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KNOX. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. KIRBY. I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, as the matter has been presented by the Senator from Arkansas it looks as if there were scarcely an answer to his statement, but I think there is. We have got to look at this matter in a very much broader way than it has been presented by the Senator from Arkansas.

The War Department estimated some $3,300,000 for this item, and last spring the committee, in the bill which was not brought before the Senate or was not passed, recommended $2,000,000 for this item. The Frankford Arsenal is one of the unique institutions of this country. It is one of the oldest establishments or instrumentalities in our national defense. It was founded more than 100 years ago and has been the nucleus from which all the arsenals of the country, both permanent and temporary, have sprung. There is a settlement of working men and women residing at Frankford whose fathers and grandfathers worked there before them and who have acquired their own homes. They are an institution. During this war it was from the Frankford Arsenal that the trained and skilled mechanics were sent into the new munitions factories of the country that enabled us to turn out the enormous amount of ammunition which was sent abroad to carry on the war.

Mr. President, we were told in the committee that the $200,000 recommended by the House was upon the theory that these men should be dismissed, that that settlement should be broken up, and that nucleus of fine mechanics upon which the country can draw in the future should be dispersed. The testimony before the committee showed that 90 per cent of these people were American-born citizens and that the great majority of them own their own homes.

I think, Mr. President, that we all recognize that these great institutions and instrumentalities of war are not profit-making concerns. We build battleships that never engage in naval conflict; we build great guns that never fire a shot at an enemy; we manufacture powder that deteriorates and is never utilized. This institution, like every other worthy, well-established institution, is supported, as I say this one is, by American mechanics, who have constituted a great nucleus, is practically a college of technical men and technical women, and ought to be maintained.

The War Department, as I have stated, estimated for over $3,000,000. We are not asking that this institution should be maintained at its full capacity, where they can employ some 2,400 men. We have put this at $1,600,000, which was the peace basis upon which it stood before war was declared. I hope the amendment of the committee will prevail.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator indicate the amount of the appropriations for this institution from year to year, say, during the 10 years preceding our entrance into the war?

Mr. KNOX. Immediately preceding the war it was about $1,600,000. The committee had agreed to allow $2,000,000, but the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] asked the question of one of the foremen of the arsenal, and he said that immediately preceding the war the appropriation was about $1,600,000. Furthermore, I have a letter here, which I think I ought to read, as indicating the uses of the munitions that are manufactured there. There are many uses for small-arms ammunition. The letter has reference to the remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas last evening, and is as follows:

COMMITTEE OF EMPLOYEES,
FRANKFORD ARSENAL,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1919.

Hon. PHILANDER C. KNOX.

DEAR SENATOR: When the Army appropriation bill was being considered in the Senate last night Senator KIRBY made a statement that he understood that the appropriation of $1,600,000 recommended by the Senate committee would keep Frankford Arsenal running at its full capacity of 250,000 cartridges per day. This would amount to 75,000,000 cartridges in the year.

Senator KIRBY is under the wrong impression in this matter. The cost of cartridges during the war was $47.60 per thousand, but on account of the reduction of the hours of work to eight per day, doing away with overtime and night work, has probably reduced the cost to about $40 per thousand. If we were to produce 250,000 cartridges per day, or a total of 75,000,000 (300 days at 250,000 per day), it would require an apropriation of $3,000,000.

Of the appropriation of $1,600,000 recommended, at least $400,000 will be used on experimental work in developing the new 50-caliber antitank gun cartridge and new gallery practice cartridge, incendiary and armor-piercing cartridges. About $50,000 will be used for burials at the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, for firing the morning and evening guns at military post, etc. This leaves available for straight manufacture of small-arm cartridges $1,150,000. This amount would enable us to produce 28,750,000 cartridges in the year, or 96,000 cartridges per day, or a little more than one-third of our capacity.

A production of 96,000 cartridges per day will only permit us to a bare skeleton organization. We will have to reduce our force greatly, while the appropriation of $200,000 will wipe it out entirely.

I understand that the War Department's program calls for the firing of 223,000 rounds per year in target practice, and if we only manufacture 28,750,000 there will be a reduction of the amount on hand of 194,000,000 rounds per year, and it would only be about three years until the amount of cartridges on hand would be reduced to the minimum reserve desired, and then we would have to greatly increase our force and produce each year an amount to equal the amount fired by the Army, or 223,000,000 rounds per year.

COMMITTEE.

This letter was written to me by the superintendent of the arsenal.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, may I ask a question? Is it the idea to establish this plant as a permanency, or just to take care of the plant and its business for a year?

Mr. KNOX. It was established as a permanency over 100 years ago. The question now is as to whether we will abandon it.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The question is whether the Government will continue to assist in maintaining this plant?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir.

Mr. TRAMMELL. And the War Department did not recommend an appropriation exceeding $150,000 per annum.

Mr. KNOX. The War Department recommended an appropriation of over $3,000,000.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I did not so understand from the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], who made a statement with regard to it.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to have the chairman of the committee make the statement that he made to the committee the other evening on this proposition, about the $150,000 that the War Department suggested.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I regret that I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. KIRBY. I understood the chairman of the committee to say the other evening, in the committee, that the $150,000 had been thought sufficient by the War Department; that it had not recommended the $2,000,000; that the House had left it at $200,000; and that we had 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition already on hand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Chief of Ordnance, Gen. Williams, appeared before the committee, and, in going over the ordnance items—which at that time in the House bill provided for $200,000 under this heading—stated that he would not ask an increase over the $200,000, so that the committee left it at that amount for the time being. Then this matter of the total abandonment of cartridge manufacture at the Frankford Arsenal was brought to our attention by the superintendent of the plant, and I took the liberty of calling Gen. Williams on the telephone and asking him what the effect would be of limiting the appropriation to $200,000, and he said it would result in the discharge of most of the workmen; that they had been reduced at the present time to something like 600 men, which was the peace-time strength; that it would take $2,000,000 to support 600 men in the arsenal and keep them at work. The committee in full session, with a large percentage of the members present, reconsidered the matter of the $200,000 appropriation, and agreed to make it $1,600,000 in order to keep these workmen together. The last peace-time appropriation was $2,000,000. We reduced it again to $1,600,000. That will not keep 600 men, the original peace-time strength. It will reduce the force to something like 400 men, or perhaps 500.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question? Has this establishment been owned and maintained by the Government for the 100 years indicated by the Senator?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has. It is the original cartridge factory of the Government.

Mr. KING. And what was the appropriation for, say, the 10 years preceding the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not the figures in my mind; but the peace-time appropriation for several years before our entrance into the war with Germany averaged something between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000 annually.

Mr. KING. Will not the cessation of the war and the proclamation of peace call for a reduction in the force in many of the arsenals and Government plants devoted to war purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This figure of $1,600,000 represents a reduction of $400,000 from the appropriation of 1916. It is merely a question of policy, Senators. It can be contended that we do not actually need the cartridges that will be turned out by these four or five hundred men; but do we need those men, or, rather, will we need them at some future period? The committee decided to keep the men together, or this little nucleus.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, when this matter was brought to the attention of the committee it recalled to my mind the fact that the workmen of the Frankford Arsenal are men of family, with homes of their own, a fact which had not been brought to my attention some years ago in connection with an amendment to an Army bill which has since then been in all Army bills, and which the Senate voted to retain in this one to-day. The fact is that it is one of the few remaining old-fashioned institutions in America around which a settled and typical American community have gathered and grown, and passed their lives, and transmitted their calling to their children. We have altogether too few of such communities in modern America; and the few that we retain should be preserved, in my judgment, even though it requires an appropriation of money too large for the immediate needs of the work of that community at a given time.

The Frankford Arsenal is one of the old, standard institutions of our Military Establishment. This war has demonstrated the tremendous importance of such a community and brought home to us its value, its almost priceless value, in times of crisis, because had not it been for this and one or two similar typical communities we would have been hard put to it for skilled workmen for the construction of the munitions so sorely needed. From Frankford Arsenal came the men whom the Government distributed to other similar institutions coming into existence with the crisis of the war, whose skill and experience were transmitted to other workmen, thereby enabling them to serve the country in its hour of need, with the result that when the war came to a close we were able—and it was a comparatively short time after we had entered the war—to supply an expeditionary force of 2,000,000, and for training purposes a force almost as large within our own country, and supply them with small arms and with munitions. It is possible that we might have solved this tremendous problem notwithstanding and in the absence of communities like this, but it certainly would have required a longer time, and the intricacies of the problem would have been measurably increased.

The problem, to my mind, is this: Shall we make a larger appropriation than is absolutely essential for the needs of Frankford Arsenal, and preserve that community of homes, that assemblage of workingmen skilled in arts that are peculiarly essential in times of war, or shall we permit it virtually to disappear, the workmen being compelled to seek elsewhere the needed employment for taking care of themselves and their families, or shall we continue a policy which has been demonstrated to be so valuable?

One of the sinister tendencies of modern times is the decreasing influence of family life; the tendency of workmen, and particularly in the crowded communities, to remain in one place for a comparatively short time, and then go to some other place; to become wanderers, so to speak; to have no fixed anchorage in the soil; and, of course, that means a tendency to avoid the responsibilities and the cares and the struggles of wedded life. It weakens the hold of the family tie upon the younger generation. I believe that many of our troubles are due to that fact. I believe that if the old-fashioned discipline of the old-fashioned family were enforced against the younger generation, instead of permitting them to grow up comparatively without restraint, there would be less of socialism and anarchy and Bolshevism in the United States.

I believe we should encourage, so far as possible, the permanence and continuation of typical American communities of middle-class workingmen, skilled in their arts, like that which so distinguishes Frankford, Pa.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, the specious argument and the special pleading by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Pennsylvania confirm the opinion that there is no necessity whatever for this appropriation beyond $200,000, the amount that the Chief of Ordnance said was all that was necessary.

It seems to me such a peculiar idea that we should, at the expense of the Government, maintain 600 families yonder in Pennsylvania, when the product made by the work of these men is not necessary. Would the Senator insist that the church house is built for the preacher? Would he insist that the courthouse is built for the judge? Would he insist that the Capitol is built for the President? Would he insist that the arsenal was built to give 600 men employment? No; it was built for the benefit of the Government, and to supply a need that was thought to exist.

The Senator says that family life ought to be encouraged. That is probably true. Is the Senator able to tell us whether the

men and their families around this arsenal have more children to the family than they have anywhere else in the United States; that the Government is being benefited in that way?

Here is a plain, straight up-and-down proposition. The Chief of Ordnance says that he does not need more than $200,000 for the Frankford Arsenal. The Chief of Ordnance says that the reason why he does not need any more than $200,000 is that the war is practically over, and there are 1,700,000,000 rounds of this kind of ammunition on hand. Ammunition deteriorates. In four or five years it is worthless. This ammunition could not possibly be used up, if the 4,000,000 men in the Army were on the battle field and fighting, in a whole year.

Now, why should we waste the material that will be put into this other fixed ammunition and manufactured in order to give 600 families employment of this kind? It ought not to be done. If they are such experts that the Government must have their services, let them be commissioned and put into the service and maintained as experts upon a salary. That would be the reasonable way to proceed about it. This fourteen hundred thousand dollars ought not to be expended here under these conditions.

I insist that the amendment be not adopted and that the amount be left standing at $200,000, which will be sufficient to meet the needs of the Government.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, only one word more. I do not want the Senate to be under the impression that the War Department has made any such representation as that the arsenal can be maintained on an appropriation of $200,000. An appropriation of $200,000 contemplates the disbanding of that entire organization, and is only the amount that will take care of the buildings and keep the watchmen about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the committee.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over, and the last amendment of the committee passed over, is on page 65, line 5, under the heading "Manufacture of arms":

For manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories.

In line 5 the committee propose to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, last night I assured the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that I would communicate with the Ordnance Department to ascertain from them what the effect of this reduction would be upon the arsenals which manufacture the Springfield rifle. I have here a letter addressed to me by Gen. C. C. Williams, the Chief of Ordnance. I think perhaps the quickest way is to ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
June 24, 1919.

Hon. JAMES L. WADSWORTH,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Subject: Appropriation, "Manufacture of arms."

1. Referring to the reduction of the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" from $1,000,000 to $500,000, the following is submitted:

In accordance with the present program, the only rifle which will be in the hands of troops during peace time, or which will be in active use in connection with training activities, will be the United States rifle, model of 1903 (Springfield rifle). Including the number of these rifles on hand at the beginning of the war there have been manufactured to date a total of 1,020,425. A large number of these rifles were sent to France and were used in combat and in the intensive training of troops. It is estimated that of the total number manufactured there remains approximately 800,000. In order to equip an army of 500,000 men there will be required approximately 350,000 rifles, which includes a small allowance for the National Guard. It is estimated that there will be issued 100,000 of these rifles to civilian rifle clubs, 75,000 to the Marine Corps, and 50,000 to the Navy. This makes a total of 575,000 Springfield rifles to be issued, leaving approximately 225,000 to cover the number of rifles in shipment, in storage, undergoing repairs, etc. The maximum life of one of these rifles under the conditions obtained in time of peace is less than 10 years. If it is assumed that the life of the rifle is 10 years, and the number now available (800,000) is maintained intact, it will be seen that one-tenth of the rifles in actual service (575,000) should be replaced annually. In other words, it is believed that provision should be made for the manufacture of 57,500 rifles each year, or an average of 192 rifles per day.

If the authorized strength of the peace Army is reduced below 500,000, there will be, of course, a corresponding reduction in the number of rifles required for the peace Army.

In addition to producing rifles in order to replace those worn out in service, it is thought that another and vastly more important reason for continuing the manufacture of this arm on a small scale is to enable the Government to keep together a small organization which is capable of being expanded in case of emergency in order to provide for the increased production of rifles which will then be demanded and in order to keep alive the art of making this type of military weapon. For this purpose it is considered that the production should be 100 rifles per day of eight hours.

Springfield Armory is now working on orders placed during the war, and there remains undelivered on these orders approximately 100,000 rifles. The funds for the completion of these rifles remain available until July 1, 1920, and it is proposed to continue Springfield Armory at its present rate of production (300 rifles per day) with those funds until that date. Inasmuch as the funds granted under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" continues for two years, such money as becomes available under the bill at present under consideration will be available until July 1, 1921, and if the amount is great enough it is proposed to use it in experimental work during the year 1919–20 and for the continuing of the manufacture at Springfield Armory during 1920 and 1921.

It is the firm opinion of this department that the minimum manufacturing program which should be considered for Springfield Armory is 100 rifles per day of eight hours. The price of the Springfield rifle under existing conditions is approximately $30, and in order to continue the manufacture of the Springfield rifle for a year (300 days), $900,000 will therefore be required. If $1,000,000 be granted under the present bill and $900,000 be spent in the manufacture of rifles at the rate of 100 per day, there will remain $100,000 available for all experimental work on rifles and appendages thereof, and for maintenance and repair and the expense incident to the issue of these weapons. It is believed, however, that $1,000,000 will enable the Ordnance Department to institute a fairly satisfactory program relative to small arms.

In case only $500,000 is appropriated under the appropriation, the number of rifles which it will be permissible to manufacture per day will be too small to economically produce, and will not enable us to maintain what is considered to be the minimum organization which should be maintained as a nucleus for future quantity production, should such production become necessary.

2. In view of the above it is urgently recommended that the question of increasing the amount under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" from $500,000 to $1,000,000 be given the most serious consideration.

Respectfully,
C. C. WILLIAMS,
Major General, United States Army,
Chief of Ordnance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if, in view of this letter, the action of the Senate just now upon the matter which we have voted upon, and the speeches made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], he is not willing to allow the amount, $1,000,000, named by the House, to stand?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not feel authorized, of course, to reverse the action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by consenting to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then all I want to say, Mr. President, is that while the Committee on Military Affairs have recommended an increase of 800 per cent against the recommendation of the Chief of Ordnance for the purpose of manufacturing ammunition, in the case of small arms they have on the contrary recommended a reduction of 50 per cent, notwithstanding that the Chief of Ordnance recommends that the amount should be $1,000,000 instead of $500,000, and notwithstanding the fact that two of the leading members of that committee have urged an increased appropriation in the case of the manufacture of ammunition because its reduction may drive men out of employment and destroy Government plants. I do not see how, if the Senate desires to be consistent, it can take any other position than to allow the amount named by the House to stand, namely, $1,000,000.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I may not have clearly apprehended the meaning of the letter which has just been read, but as I interpret the letter it meant that there were available now under existing appropriations and under existing law sufficient sums to construct 100,000 rifles. So this appropriation would not be necessary because the appropriation heretofore made would run the arsenal at full capacity, and there is a contract, as I understand the letter, still outstanding which calls for one or two hundred rifles per day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Three hundred.

Mr. KING. Three hundred per day, the Senator from New York indicates.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator read the last paragraph of the letter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have it right here. The situation is somewhat different from that at the Frankford Arsenal. That portion of the letter reads as follows:

Springfield Armory is now working on orders placed before the war, and there remains undelivered on these orders approximately 100,000 rifles. The funds for the completion of these rifles remain available until July 1, 1920, and it is proposed to continue Springfield Armory at its present rate of production—300 rifles per day—with these funds until that date.

Mr. KING. That is, a year from now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; a year from now.

Inasmuch as the funds granted under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" continues for two years, such money as becomes available under the bill at present under consideration will be available until July 1, 1921.

Let me suggest to the Senator——

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator please finish reading the sentence?

Mr. WADSWORTH (reading)—

And if the amount is great enough it is proposed to use it in experimental work during the year 1919–20.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask the Senator to read the last paragraph of the letter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; the last paragraph, of course, recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000, but that is on the theory that the $500,000 that is to be appropriated as suggested by the Military Committee will be the only appropriation available for the next two years. It is good for two years when appropriated under this heading.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I ask the Senator to read the last paragraph of the letter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

In view of the above it is urgently recommended that the question of increasing the amount under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" from $500,000 to $1,000,000 be given the most serious consideration.

That is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So the last paragraph calls attention to its being at least a serious matter to reduce the amount.

Mr. WADSWORTH. To a serious situation two years ahead and subsequent to July 1, 1920. There is no serious situation this coming year.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a letter which I have received containing the facts regarding the situation in the manufacture of small arms.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1919.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to an urgent appeal received at my office from the employees at the Springfield Armory, I take this opportunity of inviting your attention to the small appropriation contained in the pending Army appropriation bill for the production of small arms at the Springfield Armory.

At the present time there are employed at the Springfield Armory approximately 2,400 men. With this force, assuming the average cost of each rifle is $30, the amount of $1,000,000 carried in the bill will keep the force employed only four months of the year, unless two-thirds of these employees are to be thrown out of employment.

The item referred to is in the pending Army appropriation bill (H. R. 5227), on page 47, under the heading "Manufacture of arms." This same item was $2,500,000 in the Army appropriation act which failed to pass at the close of last Congress, both as it was passed from the House and as reported from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs (see H. R. 15835, pp. 54 and 48 of the two prints of the bill as referred to the Senate committee and as reported from that committee, respectively).

This item ought to at least be $3,000,000 in order to maintain the present force which is below the prewar basis. However, if the $2,500,000 contemplated to be appropriated for this purpose last Congress is restored, it may meet the situation.

Owing to the depreciation, as well as other wastes, which naturally will take place with our present national supply of small arms, it is felt that this supply should be replenished continuously in order to at least maintain a supply of rifles equal to that now existing. The Springfield Armory is the Government's principal small arms establishment and it is felt that every important article of warfare should be manufactured by the Government in such quantities as to retain an organization and force of workmen of sufficient size to meet any expansion which might be necessary in production in case of new hostilities arising.

Once the workmen are scattered around the country in other industries, it would be a difficult task to reassemble them for war production. This at least was the experience during the period of the war. It is also an unnecessary hardship to place upon workmen to require them to move about the country seeking employment and using up their meager savings if perchance this economy is only a temporary one.

Trusting it will be possible for you to secure the restoration of this appropriation, and assuring you that your efforts will be highly appreciated by the workmen concerned, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,
M. P. ALIFAS,
President District No. 44,
International Association of Machinists.

The only sum requested is $1,000,000, and an appropriation of $1,000,000 means a very substantial reduction in the working force. The point I want to make is this: If the reason for increasing the appropriation in the last item was to avoid destroying Government plants, if it was to avoid driving out of employment the employees, if it was done in order not to scatter them away from their homes and their residences of years, the same argument applies to a plant in Springfield as much as it does to a plant in Pennsylvania, and there ought not to be any discrimination made if that is the policy. If they are going to close up these plants and drive these old and experienced employees out, well and good; but, Mr. President, in the manufacture of munitions let us not discriminate between plants located in one part of the country and those in another part of the country.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. With pleasure.

Mr. KING. I think if the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts were predicated on facts as they have been developed it would perhaps be invulnerable, but if the Senator will pardon me I will call attention again to the letter and to the interpretation which I place upon it. The appropriation which has been heretofore made and which has not been expended contemplates the operation of the factory now under discussion at its full capacity, to wit, the production of 300 arms per day during all of next year—that is, until the 30th day of June, 1920. The appropriation which is carried by this bill would be in addition to that, or at any rate it would not become available until the appropriation which is now in existence had been exhausted. The factory will continue to operate, producing 300 guns per day, and this $500,000, if it were stricken from the bill entirely, would not affect the operation of the factory one particle. It would not call for the discharge of a single man between now and the 30th day of June, 1920.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If you can give me an assurance of that, I will drop this matter and not only not ask that $1,000,000 be appropriated but not ask that even $500,000 be appropriated. If you can assure me that that plant is going to operate the same as it has in the past and that every man will be employed, then we are wasting time in appropriating $500,000.

Mr. KING. I think that is right, and I think the letter carries that assurance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not so interpret it. I take the statement of the Chief of Ordnance in the letter that it will be a serious matter should this amount be reduced from $1,000,000 to $500,000. Those are his very words. The House fixed the amount of $1,000,000, and the Senate committee reduced it to $500,000. When the House in the matter of appropriations for munitions appropriated $200,000 the Senate committee increased it to $1,600,000, and we have to-day had two members of the committee who have spoken in favor of the increase. I think we ought to have the same policy in regard to all these plants.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that the letter distinctly shows that the funds are at present available to keep this plant in operation until the 30th of next June? You do not need any further appropriation, because the appropriation has already been made and the funds set aside, and they are available for that purpose. I am not out of sympathy with the Senator's position, and I do not know but I shall vote in favor of his proposition, but eventually he is going to get this money. There is no question but that the plant is going to need it sometime, and if you want to get it in advance you can do it. That is really the only basis for the claim, however, because with what is now available and this $500,000 you have money to keep the plant going for the full period with all its force.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As a member of the committee, can the Senator inform me whether, having already appriated $500,000 that is not going to be used during the current year, there is enough money appropriated already to use for that factory? Do you make that assertion? If you do, why is there any money asked for here at all, if there is already money on hand and contracts made to keep every employee at work?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no reason for it unless you want to make contracts in advance or to do some work for experimental purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why has the Chief of Ordnance made the request and told you it is a serious matter? I have information from the armory at Springfield as to what is going to happen—that there will not be work for four months for the 2,500 men employed in the armory if the amount asked, $1,000,000, is not given but $500,000 instead. It is a very serious matter. The thing I insist upon is the same policy regarding all these plants. I want the people in Springfield and the people in Pittsfield and the people in Pennsylvania and Ohio to know that the Senate is closing up all these factories and driving people out of employment; that we have enough munitions and small arms on hand; and not discriminate between factories located in different parts of the country, and have one policy in regard to ammunition and another policy in regard to small arms.

I do not know anything better to say on this matter than the speeches of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], who pointed out to us how their communities would be depleted of population if they did not have the appropriation raised from $200,000 to $1,600,000. I do not want to press the matter on personal grounds in any way. I am not interested in it, except to have a well-defined policy and purpose.

I do not want any discrimination. I do not want any favoritism. I do not want the Senate to lay itself open to the suggestion that whenever there happens to be a member of the committee from the section affected there is no difficulty about an increase in the amount, but in the case of localities from which no member of the committee has come a decrease is provided.

I repeat, the House has made this sum $1,000,000. The committee on the part of the Senate has reduced it to $500,000. In the matter of munitions, the House fixed the amount at $200,000 and the Senate increased it to $1,600,000, and there has been no satisfactory explanation.

I hope the Senate will vote down the committee amendment and allow the amount to stand as passed by the House.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee this question: What has become of all of the rifles that we procured to arm our soldiers with in this war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The letter read by the Secretary a few moments ago gives a very full account of the rifle situation. In general words, the situation is that we have about 3,000,000 rifles on hand, including the American Enfield that we started to manufacture after we went into the war, and the American Springfield. The American Springfield is regarded as the superior weapon, and in the future the active Army of the United States, I understand, is to be equipped with the American Springfield.

Mr. REED. There are 3,000,0000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are about 1,000,000 American Springfield and 2,000,000 American Enfield, as I understand the letter which has been read into the RECORD. I may be a little inaccurate as to the general situation.

Mr. REED. The statement made by the chairman of the committee puts this question in a little different form than I had felt justified in assuming. One thing is absolutely certain, in my opinion, and that is that it is a policy of unwisdom for America ever to allow herself to be again confronted with a war without having on hand a gun to put into the hands of every soldier. This much can be said for a rifle, that, eliminating the question of obsolescence due to improved arms, a rifle can be put away and be as good 10 years after it is made as the day it is made. It costs very little to store it. I hope the day will never come when we will again find the recruits of an American Army drilling with broomsticks or guns whittled out of boards.

So far as I am concerned, I propose to vote whenever I have the opportunity for enough cannon so that if we have a war our soldiers will have cannon to protect them, and for enough rifles to put into the hands of American citizens to protect themselves, and for enough of that kind of ammunition that does not become useless with which to load these guns.

I am not prepared to say whether $500,000 or $1,000,000 is necessary in this instance. I do not believe in appropriating a dollar merely for the purpose of keeping plants running and labor employed, except that a Government plant ought to be run in a condition so that experts enough can be kept constantly on hand. I do not believe in voting this money to keep labor employed, because there is enough other work for labor in the country to keep it employed. It is utterly useless to deny that proposition. Some people are denying it; but if you wish to test it go out and try to hire 10 or a dozen men to work to-day in any part of this country. Even, however, if there were a shortage of labor, we would gain very little by taxing that part of labor which is employed in order to make something that is useless. The only excuse for employing labor is to employ it to produce something that is necessary.

Now, I wish to say to the chairman of the committee that it seems to me when the department asks for an appropriation and presents as its reason for it a desire to keep a plant running so that the experts can be kept there, so that they can make proper experiments, a thing vitally essential, I think we had better not pare the appropriation.

The thing that made Germany almost invincible and made her almost the conqueror of the world was the fact that she spent money in experiments. The man who believe that war will never come again to this world ought to be incarcerated in an asylum for the feeble-minded. It will come, and it will come all the quicker and all the surer to the nation that is unprepared.

This war has demonstrated that American soldiers can be put on the battle field very quickly and that the old theory that it took three years to make a soldier is not true, but it also has demonstrated the fact that the Nation that has arms of the latest and most improved pattern and has them stored away so that it can arm its citizens is in a good position to defend itself. I hope the United States will never again make war beyond her own borders, but if the United States ever has occasion to defend her borders I hope that the enemy making the attack will be compelled to face batteries of cannon such as the world has never seen massed before and that she will find an entire population with guns in their hands. I do not believe it is wise to save $500,000 in the manufacture of small arms.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts desire a division?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was in hope that the Senator from New York would agree that the amount should be retained as agreed to by the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have explained to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have not the authority to reverse the action of the committee in writing an item upward.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think I heard the chairman accept some other similar suggestions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They were reductions.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In view of the speeches of two of the members of the committee, who evidently have changed their views, I thought perhaps the Senator from New York might change his.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I really do not feel at liberty to do so. Does the Senator desire a division? My eye is on the clock. It is 11.25; this is the last committee amendment to this bill, and if we can dispose of it to-night then I think we can dispose of three or four individual amendments, copies of which I have already seen, and which I think I am justified in accepting on the part of the committee, pass the bill, and not bother the Senate again at this session.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for a division.

On a division, there being a tie vote, the Chair declared the amendment lost.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand that the committee amendment is lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote being a tie, the committee amendment is rejected, and the original million dollar appropriation stands. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, a new paragraph, as follows:

That the office of General of the Armies of the United States is hereby revived, and the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to said office a general officer of the Army who, on foreign soil and during the present war, has been especially distinguished in the higher command of military forces of the United States; and the officer appointed under the foregoing authorization shall have the pay prescribed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, and such allowances as the President shall deem appropriate: *Provided*, That no more than one appointment to office shall be made under said authorization.

Mr. KING. I raise the point of order against the amendment that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I presume a point of order will lie against the amendment; but I hope the Senator will not make a point of order against it. It only applies to one man in the Army, and that man is the general who commanded the American forces in France. There have only been four, or possibly five, men who have occupied that rank in the history of the United States. They were Washington, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan, and not one of those distinguished officers ever commanded as large an army as did Gen. Pershing—with what success the American people and our allies in this war understand. I think the amendment ought to be agreed to by the Senate and added to this bill by a unanimous vote. That is all I care to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. NEW. I offer an amendment to add a new section to chapter 2, on page 76. I will state that the amendment is intended to cover the case of the Chicago refrigerator plant, a question which was fully discussed here this afternoon, I believe. I understand that the amendment is acceptable to those who objected to the original amendment as it was found in the bill. I will ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The SECRETARY. On page 76, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized, through the Secretary of War, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by the Secretary of War, to dispose of the United States Army cold-storage plant in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, with machinery and equipment therein contained, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, and to accept in part payment therefor a warehouse adjacent to the Army general supply depot in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, containing approximately 650,000 square feet of storage space, together with the land comprising the site of same: *Provided further*, That such exchange shall be effected without expenditure for this purpose by the United States, except necessary costs of conveyancing, not exceeding $500, hereby appropriated for this purpose. The President, through the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized to execute and deliver, in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf, any and

all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effect such sale or exchange.

SEC. 4. That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of any such sale or exchange shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of "Miscellaneous receipts," and a full report of the same shall be submitted to Congress.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word about this proposed amendment. It will be observed that it limits the power of exchange to the one plant, which is a refrigerating plant, built by the Government about one year ago, at a cost, as I remember, of about $3,300,000. The Government has the opportunity to make that exchange now for a much needed storage warehouse and to get a bonus of several hundred thousand dollars. The Government does not need the refrigerator plant any longer, but does very much need the other plant. Failing to make the exchange, it would have to purchase the additional storage facilities.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not disposed to question the merit of the amendment, but I rise to inquire of the chairman of the committee how much longer he expects the Senate to remain in session.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had hoped that the individual amendments would not give rise to debate. They have been passed about, and everybody has agreed upon them, so far as I can understand. I hoped that they would be adopted without any question, but, if this amendment is going to give rise to debate, I shall move a recess.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not going to debate the amendment, but there are a number of other amendments to be offered, and I confess I am getting pretty tired. We have been in session since 12 o'clock.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate stand in recess until to-morrow morning at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., Tuesday, June 24, 1919) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 25, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William E. Gonzales, of South Carolina, to be ambassador extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Peru.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Boaz W. Long, of New Mexico, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Cuba.

Benton McMillin, of Tennessee, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Guatemala.

UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE.

Frank L. Polk, of New York, to be Undersecretary of State.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Frank K. Nebeker, of Utah, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Francis J. Kearful, resigned.

MEMBER OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Robert L. Faris, of Missouri, for appointment as a member of the Mississippi River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a 'Mississippi River Commission' for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," vice Homer P. Ritter, deceased.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Arthur Joachims, of California, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Payson A. Perrin, of Massachusetts, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Paul V. Lane, of California, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Roland D. Horne, of Massachusetts, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

George H. Durgin, of New Hampshire, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Charles K. Green, of California, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

To be major general.

Brig. Gen. George W. Burr, United States Army, from March 5, 1919.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

George R. Rogers, late cadet, United States Military Academy (since retired from active service), to be second lieutenant with rank from March 19, 1919.

INFANTRY.

Cadet Julius Lynch Piland to be second lieutenant with rank from November 1, 1918.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from March 5, 1919.

First Lieut. Earl Hazelton Hare, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Robert Effinger Cumming, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Thomas Matthew Calladine, jr., Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. William Davis Gill, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Harvey David Thornburg, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Charles Smith Moss, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Irwin Bradfield Smock, Medical Reserve Corps.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Cadet Milo Benson Barragan to be second lieutenant with rank from June 12, 1918.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant surgeons general with rank of brigadier general.

Col. Walter D. McCaw, Medical Corps, from March 5, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Robert E. Noble, Medical Corps, from March 5, 1919.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Jerome P. Bowes, jr., Field Artillery, Officers' Reserve Corps, to be second lieutenant with rank from October 26, 1917.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Thomas Garlot Hannon, Officers' Reserve Corps, to be second lieutenant with rank from October 26, 1917.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS BY PROMOTION, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Simon Medine, Corps of Engineers, from October 23, 1918.
First Lieut. Samuel L. Kuhn, Corps of Engineers, from October 26, 1918.
First Lieut. Roy M. McCutchen, Corps of Engineers, from December 29, 1918.
First Lieut. William Lohmeyer, jr., Corps of Engineers, from January 7, 1919.
First Lieut. William A. Clark, Corps of Engineers, from January 15, 1919.
First Lieut. Aubrey H. Bond, Corps of Engineers, from February 7, 1919.
First Lieut. Hubert W. Collins, Corps of Engineers, from March 16, 1919.
First Lieut. Maurice P. Van Buren, Corps of Engineers, from April 6, 1919.
First Lieut. Frederick S. H. Smith, Corps of Engineers, from April 13, 1919.
First Lieut. Frank B. Hastie, Corps of Engineers, from April 16, 1919.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Paul W. Rutledge, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 3, 1918.
Second Lieut. Alvin C. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 8, 1918.
Second Lieut. James C. Corliss, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 8, 1918.
Second Lieut. Robert T. Chaplin, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 11, 1918.
Second Lieut. Chester B. McCoid, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 15, 1918.
Second Lieut. Robert G. Rhett, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 21, 1918.

Second Lieut. James K. Morris, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 23, 1918.
Second Lieut. Charles E. Bates, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 26, 1918.
Second Lieut. Marshall L. Gosserand, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 29, 1918.
Second Lieut. Winthrop M. Allen, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 29, 1918.
Second Lieut. St. John Waddell, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from January 5, 1919.
Second Lieut. Cary B. Easley, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.
Second Lieut. Nicholas B. O'Connell, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.
Second Lieut. Oscar D. McNeely, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.
Second Lieut. Abraham R. Ginsburg, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.
Second Lieut. Vincent K. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.
Second Lieut. Charles L. Ordeman, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 10, 1919.
Second Lieut. Ramon Conroy, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 10, 1919.
Second Lieut. Thomas J. Betts, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Morris C. Handwerk, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Charles Cobb, 3d Coast Artillery Corps, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Benjamin F. Harmon, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Ralph A. Densmore, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 14, 1919.
Second Lieut. Charles C. Bell, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from January 15, 1919.
Second Lieut. Charles W. Lawrance, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 16, 1919.
Second Lieut. David W. Burgeon, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 18, 1919.
Second Lieut. Raymond B. Bottom, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. Farrant L. Turner, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 26, 1919.
Second Lieut. Henry T. Morrison, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 29, 1919.
Second Lieut. Leonard R. Crews, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 2, 1919.
Second Lieut. Harold M. Jobes, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 6, 1919.
Second Lieut. Thomas J. Delaney, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 8, 1919.
Second Lieut. William F. Cassedy, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from February 9, 1919.
Second Lieut. John W. Loveland, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Webster H. Waren, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 14, 1919.
Second Lieut. Evan H. Benoy, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 16, 1919.
Second Lieut. John B. Bethea, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from February 18, 1919.
Second Lieut. Charles W. Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 19, 1919.
Second Lieut. Hugh N. Herrick, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 19, 1919.
Second Lieut. Harry L. Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 1, 1919.
Second Lieut. Robert Mochrie, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 4, 1919.
Second Lieut. Albert B. Ede, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 5, 1919.
Second Lieut. Donald W. Tyrrell, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 5, 1919.
Second Lieut. Everett M. Barton, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 6, 1919.
Second Lieut. Waren S. Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 7, 1919.
Second Lieut. William W. Wertz, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 7, 1919.
Second Lieut. Evans R. Crowell, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 13, 1919.
Second Lieut. Simon L. Bear, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 20, 1919.
Second Lieut. James C. Bates, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. William A. West, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from March 29, 1919.
Second Lieut. Louis H. Thompson, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 2, 1919.
Second Lieut. Albert Bonds, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 2, 1919.
Second Lieut. Thomas W. Conrad, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 6, 1919.
Second Lieut. Frederick W. Hoorn, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 6, 1919.
Second Lieut. Joseph C. Stephens, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 19, 1919.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John Van H. Challiss, Field Artillery, from November 10, 1918.
Second Lieut. Junius S. Roberts, Field Artillery, from December 6, 1918.
Second Lieut. Frederic W. W. Graham, jr., Field Artillery, from December 6, 1918.
Second Lieut. Joseph R. Estabrook, Field Artillery, from December 7, 1918.
Second Lieut. Harold D. Finley, Field Artillery, from December 10, 1918.
Second Lieut. Leo J. Vogel, Field Artillery, from December 17, 1918.
Second Lieut. James P. Kelly, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Richard B. von Maur, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Harold T. Deeds, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Millard L. Hamaker, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. John B. Fidlar, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Wilbur B. Sumner, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. William E. Corkill, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Charles D. Brown, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Lester M. Kilgarif, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Henry W. Krotzer, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Robert L. Randol, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Douglas I. Crane, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Harry N. Blue, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Frederic H. Timmerman, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. James H. McHenry, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Gurney L. Smith, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. John M. Franklin, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. George S. Goodspeed, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Amos E. Carmichael, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Raymond H. Seagle, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. John V. Anderson, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Walter Rompel, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Winfred C. Green, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Marion I. Voorhes, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Algernon S. Coleman, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Robert F. La Barron, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Edgar G. Crossman, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. James H. Boyd, Field Artillery, from January 24, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph K. Learnard, Field Artillery, from January 25. 1919.
Second Lieut. Pitt F. Carl, jr., Field Artillery, from January 28, 1919.
Second Lieut. David W. Potter, Field Artillery, from February 3, 1919.
Second Lieut. John H. Gardner, jr., Field Artillery, from February 3, 1919.
Second Lieut. Earl C. Ewert, Field Artillery, from February 3, 1919.
Second Lieut. Donald D. Demarest, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Ralph W. Hahn, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Orrin P. Kilbourn, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. John T. Clancy, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Winthrop W. Leach, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. John W. O'Harrow, jr., Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. James B. Dick, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Dan C. Kenan, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Joseph A. Martz, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Andrew S. Messick, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Lee B. Goff, jr., Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Kenneth S. Wallace, Field Artillery, from February 15, 1919.
Second Lieut. Ralph Heatherington, Field Artillery, from February 15, 1919.
Second Lieut. Eugene B. Ripley, jr., Field Artillery, from February 19, 1919.
Second Lieut. Thornton Davis, Field Artillery, from February 19, 1919.
Second Lieut. Frederick M. Williams, Field Artillery, from February 26, 1919.
Second Lieut. William E. Farthing, Field Artillery, from February 26, 1919.
Second Lieut. John C. Butner, jr., Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.
Second Lieut. William B. Bowles, jr., Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.
Second Lieut. Edward Cummings, Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.
Second Lieut. Eugene Weston, jr., Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.
Second Lieut. Edward S. Ott, Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.
Second Lieut. Richard D. Roquemore, Field Artillery, from March 8, 1919.
Second Lieut. Ralph B. Bagby, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. Melvin L. McCreary, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. John S. Brown, jr., Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. Eugene M. Re Qua, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. Herman H. F. Gossett, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. Murray M. Montgomery, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. Roderick J. McIntosh, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.
Second Lieut. Lester J. Whitlock, Field Artillery, from March 26, 1919.
Second Lieut. Hinton F. Longino, Field Artillery, from March 30, 1919.
Second Lieut. Frederick H. Black, Field Artillery, from April 3, 1919.
Second Lieut. William B. Cobb, Field Artillery, from April 3, 1919.
Second Lieut. Angelus T. Burch, Field Artillery, from April 5, 1919.
Second Lieut. Chisholm Garland, Field Artillery, from April 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Harvey Edward, Field Artillery, from April 13, 1919.
Second Lieut. George P. Hays, Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.
Second Lieut. George W. Cassell, Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.
Second Lieut. Ralph J. Canine, Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.
Second Lieut. William L. Baily, jr., Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.
Second Lieut. Donald A. Carson, Field Artillery, from April 19, 1919.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Wingate Battle, Cavalry, from November 15, 1918.
Second Lieut. Harold B. Wharfield, Cavalry, from November 15, 1918.
Second Lieut. Wade C. Gatchell, Cavalry, from November 15, 1918.
Second Lieut. Norman D. Twichell, Cavalry, from November 23, 1918.
Second Lieut. Andrew J. Wynne, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.
Second Lieut. Howard C. Wiener, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.
Second Lieut. Walter F. Goodman, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.
Second Lieut. Thomas M. Benson, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.
Second Lieut. Lucian K. Truscott, jr., Cavalry, from December 10, 1918.
Second Lieut. Ralph E. Alstead, Cavalry, from December 13, 1918.
Second Lieut. James H. Akerman, Cavalry, from December 19, 1918.
Second Lieut. Raymond T. Connell, Cavalry, from December 21, 1918.
Second Lieut. James N. W. McClure, Cavalry, from December 25, 1918.
Second Lieut. Gabriel R. Mead, Cavalry, from December 28, 1918.
Second Lieut. David McK. Wilson, Cavalry, from January 9, 1919.
Second Lieut. Leonard M. Mertz, Cavalry, from January 10, 1919.
Second Lieut. Ernest A. Williams, Cavalry, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Slocum Kingsbury, Cavalry, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. George H. Millholland, Cavalry, from January 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Gardiner S. Platt, Cavalry, from January 18, 1919.
Second Lieut. Donald R. Dunkle, Cavalry, from January 18, 1919.
Second Lieut. Chester E. Davis, Cavalry, from January 20, 1919.
Second Lieut. Holmes G. Paullin, Cavalry, from January 23, 1919.
Second Lieut. John H. Irving, Cavalry, from January 24, 1919.
Second Lieut. Evan D. Cameron, jr., Cavalry, from January 25, 1919.
Second Lieut. William F. McLaughlin, Cavalry, from February 4, 1919.
Second Lieut. Glenn S. Finley, Cavalry, from February 14, 1919.
Second Lieut. Manly F. Meador, Cavalry, from February 17, 1919.
Second Lieut. Stephen W. Davis, Cavalry, from February 18, 1919.
Second Lieut. Clarence B. Werts, Cavalry, from February 18, 1919.
Second Lieut. Charles H. Unger, Cavalry, from February 19, 1919.
Second Lieut. William D. Tabor, Cavalry, from February 19, 1919.
Second Lieut. Edward M. Fickett, Cavalry, from February 20, 1919.
Second Lieut. James C. Van Ingen, Cavalry, from March 3, 1919.
Second Lieut. Callie H. Palmer, Cavalry, from March 11, 1919.
Second Lieut. Charles R. Chase, Cavalry, from March 12, 1919.
Second Lieut. Thomas F. Mishou, jr., Cavalry, from March 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Robert B. Jackson, Cavalry, from March 15, 1919.
Second Lieut. Christopher C. Strawn, Cavalry, from March 25, 1919.
Second Lieut. John R. Breitinger, Cavalry, from March 26, 1919.
Second Lieut. Alfred J. de Lorimer, Cavalry, from March 28, 1919.
Second Lieut. William O. Coleman, Cavalry, from April 5, 1919.
Second Lieut. Herbert R. Sargeant, Cavalry, from April 6, 1919.
Second Lieut. John E. Ketchum, Cavalry, from April 15, 1919.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Harold M. McClelland, Infantry, to be first lieutenant with rank from August 8, 1917.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Seely B. Fahey, from October 8, 1918.
First Lieut. Philip S. Wood, from October 8, 1918.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Eugene M. Frederick, from October 5, 1918.
Second Lieut. Cassius H. Styles, from October 8, 1918.
Second Lieut. Frederick J. Slackford, from October 9, 1918.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Henry M. Morrow, Judge Advocate, to be colonel from December 9, 1918.
Maj. James J. Mayes, Judge Advocate, to be lieutenant colonel from December 9, 1918.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels with rank from January 27, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Clarence C. Williams (Chief of Ordnance).
Lieut. Col. Samuel Hof, Ordnance Department.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Maj. Lewis H. Rand, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant colonel from February 7, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. Clarence L. Sturdevant, Corps of Engineers, from February 7, 1919.
Capt. Earl J. Atkisson, Corps of Engineers, from April 16, 1919.
Capt. Richard T. Coiner, Corps of Engineers, from May 1, 1919.
First Lieut. Llewellyn B. Griffith, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from October 21, 1918.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. William Chamberlaine, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Gordon G. Heiner, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 21, 1919.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas E. Merrill, Field Artillery, to be colonel, from January 31, 1919.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Edward T. Donnelly, Field Artillery, from January 5, 1919.
Maj. George M. Brooke, Field Artillery, from January 31, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. Charles J. Ferris, Field Artillery, from January 5, 1919.
Capt. William Bryden, Field Artillery, from January 31, 1919.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Theodore W. Wrenn, Field Artillery, from November 10, 1918.
First Lieut. Harold W. Rehm, Field Artillery, from January 26, 1919.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be majors, with rank from November 2, 1918.

Capt. Walter S. Grant, Cavalry (General Staff Corps).
Capt. Charles M. Wesson, Cavalry (Ordnance Department).
Capt. Morton C. Mumma, Cavalry.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Ion C. Holm, Cavalry, with rank from December 19, 1918.
First Lieut. Robert C. Candee, Cavalry, with rank from January 11, 1919.
First Lieut. Joseph L. Philips, Cavalry, with rank from January 18, 1919.
First Lieut. Kenneth McCatty, Cavalry, with rank from January 24, 1919.
First Lieut. Joseph W. Geer, Cavalry, with rank from February 4, 1919.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Paul A. Wolf, from December 31, 1918.
Lieut. Col. George D. Moore (Inspector General's Department), from January 2, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Willis Uline, from January 2, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Charles C. Clark, from January 4, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Vernon A. Caldwell, from January 8, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Edmund L. Butts (subject to examination required by law), from January 9, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Henry J. Hunt (subject to examination required by law), from February 2, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Truman O. Murphy (The Adjutant General's Department), from February 2, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Ross L. Bush, from February 2, 1919.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Hugh D. Wise, from October 8, 1918.
Maj. Pegram Whitworth, from October 8, 1918.
Maj. James A. Moss, from November 2, 1918.
Maj. Ulysses G. Worrilow (since retired from active service), from January 2, 1919.
Maj. Frank J. Morrow (General Staff), from January 4, 1919.
Maj. Henry C. Clement, jr. (subject to examination required by law), from January 4, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. Alvin C. Voris, from October 8, 1918.
Capt. Fred L. Davidson, from October 8, 1918.
Capt. George E. Kumpe, from November 2, 1918.
Capt. Milo C. Corey, from December 19, 1918.
Capt. Arthur M. Ferguson, from December 19, 1918.
Capt. De Witt W. Chamberlin (Quartermaster Corps), from January 4, 1919.
Capt. Walter H. Johnson (General Staff), from January 4, 1919.
Capt. Robert G. Rutherford, jr., from January 4, 1919.
First. Lieut. Harvey C. Kearney, to be captain, from October 9, 1918.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Louis T. Hess, Medical Corps, from August 30, 1918.
Lieut. Col. Christopher C. Collins, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1918.
Lieut. Col. Benjamin J. Edger, jr., Medical Corps, from November 11, 1918.
Lieut. Col. Samuel M. Waterhouse, Medical Corps, from December 3, 1918.
Lieut. Col. Eugene H. Hartnett, Medical Corps, from March 8, 1919.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Leartus J. Owen, Medical Corps, from December 3, 1918.
Maj. Robert M. Culler, Medical Corps, from March 1, 1919.
Maj. Frank W. Weed, Medical Corps, from March 8, 1919.
Maj. William A. Wickline, Medical Corps, from March 12, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. William M. Archer, jr., Medical Corps, from September 18, 1918.
Capt. Henry F. Philips, Medical Corps, from September 18, 1918.
Capt. Nicholson F. Curtis, Medical Corps, October 9, 1918.
Capt. John S. C. Fielden, jr., Medical Corps, from November 8, 1918.
Capt. John M. Hewitt, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Claude W. Cummings, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. James M. Troutt, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Alan DeF. Smith, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Frank M. Ende, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Samuel A. White, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Albert W. Greenwell, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. Francis M. Fitts, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Eric A. Fennel, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Paul E. McNabb, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Harvey E. Webb, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. George F. Aycock, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Henry W. Grady, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Philip J. Lukens, jr., Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Norman McL. Scott, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Marion R. Mobley, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
Capt. Frederick K. Herpel, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

To be captains with rank from November 24, 1918.

First Lieut. Horace S. Villars, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Allen D. Lazenby, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Patrick F. McGuire, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. James W. McClaran, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Louis F. Boyd, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Tom S. Mebane, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Edmund B. Spaeth, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Philip L. Coulter, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. James B. Montgomery, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Percy E. Duggins, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Brown S. McClintic, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Henry K. B. Hufford, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph G. Fernbach, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Howard H. Dignan, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Charles W. Sale, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Robert H. Lowry, jr., Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Hertel P. Makel, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Ward S. Wells, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Seymour C. Schwartz, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Burgh S. Burnet, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Karl F. Kesmodel, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Ross Golden, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Curtis D. Pillsbury, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Nelson A. Myll, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John R. De Velling, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Roy L. Scott, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. William W. Southard, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. George H. Dorsey, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Laurent L. La Roche, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Henry C. Dooling, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Frank S. Matlack, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Cleon J. Gentzkow, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. James P. Crawford, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Robert A. Hale, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Allen R. Howard, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Benjamin B. Rowley, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Henry C. Bradford, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Henry H. Towler, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Oral B. Bolibaugh, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph R. Jones, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Harold E. Clark, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law.)
First Lieut. Roland A. Davison, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Haskett L. Conner, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Edward B. Macon, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Percy J. Carroll, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Virginius Minervini, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. James V. Falisi, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William D. Petit, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Glenn H. Reams, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Jay DeP. Mingos, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Allan W. Dawson, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John W. McKeever, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Ottis L. Graham, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Edwin H. Roberts, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Arthur M. Bacon, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John J. Moore, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Anthony J. Vadala, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Maurice S. Weaver, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John M. Stanley, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Arthur H. Nylen, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Myron P. Rudolph, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Noble DuB. McCormack, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Charles E. Sima, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Bascom H. Palmer, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Harold D. Rogers, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John R. Hall, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Arthur R. Gaines, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William L. Starnes, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William A. Boyle, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Manton L. Shelby, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Paul H. Streit, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John E. Robinson, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Lewis E. J. Browne, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Ernest K. Stratton, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. James A. Orbison, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Paul M. N. Kyle, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William C. Whitmore, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Albert B. Pavy, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Francis E. Evans, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Charles E. Brenn, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Francis T. Duffy, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Leonard W. Weaver, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Louie Felger, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Leo S. Trask, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Raymond A. Tomassene, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Lowyd W. Ballantyne, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Otto R. Brown, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Charles E. Yoho, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Cornelius A. Denehy, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph P. Madigan, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Robert K. Simpson, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Patrick S. Madigan, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Frederick B. Little, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Chester A. Stayton, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Herbert W. Rogers, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John R. Evers, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Ralph E. Curti, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Daniel C. Hankey, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Frederick A. Blesse, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Charles C. Dickey, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. George B. Fletcher, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Walter H. Mytinger, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John J. Carden, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Henry E. Fraser, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John R. Whisenant, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Harold H. Golding, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Harry P. Shugerman, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William C. Pollock, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William W. McCaw, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Edward H. Tonolla, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Earle D. Quinnell, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Harold O. Brown, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Douglas H. Mebane, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Paul B. Johnson, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Irving K. Lovett, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Montreville A. St. Peter, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Frank McA. Moose, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Percy K. Telford, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Benjamin F. Pence, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Wayne R. Beardsley, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Warren Stirling, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Don G. Hilldrup, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Richard S. Magee, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William A. Smith, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Frank W. Pinger, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Ivy A. Pelzman, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Edward S. Murphy, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Richard E. Werlich, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Herbert R. Stolz, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Louis de K. Belden, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Andrew W. Smith, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Willard S. Howard, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Philip P. Green, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William H. Barrow, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Gordon F. Willey, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Frank A. Plum, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Charles R. Irving, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. William W. Jones, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Charles C. Hawke, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Noland M. Canter, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Pierre N. Charbonnet, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. James C. Kimbrough, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Meredith R. Johnston, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Merril K. Lindsay, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. William D. Middleton, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Leon H. Cornwall, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Read B. Harding, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. James W. Duckworth, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Bradford Massey, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Edgar H. Howell, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. George W. Snyder, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Paul S. Wagner, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. John A. P. Millet, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph D. Foley, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Lewis A. Newfield, Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Thomas M. Leahy, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
First Lieut. Louis A. LaGarde, jr., Medical Corps.
First Lieut. Edward L. Moore, Medical Corps.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains with rank from July 13, 1918.

First Lieut. Samuel J. Rohde, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Leroy P. Hartley, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Frederick C. Daniels, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Nathan C. Pickles, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Robert L. Lowry, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Oliver J. Christiansen, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Timothy Harden, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Lawrence K. Anderson, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Timothy F. Leary, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. William C. Webb, jr., Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Edward C. Alley, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Clinton R. Boone, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. David I. Edwards, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Orville A. Grove, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Roy M. Kisner, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Edward A. Thorne, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Lynn H. Tingay, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Claude R. Hollister, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Marhl H. Welch, Dental Corps.

To be captains with rank from October 4, 1918.

First Lieut. Walter D. Vail, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Richard K. Thompson, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Leslie S. Harlan, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Neil J. McCollum, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Clement J. Gaynor, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Walter A. Rose, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Melvin R. Eiche, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. George Krakow, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Eugene A. Smith, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Jerome L. Fritsche, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Clarence J. Wright, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Milton A. Price, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. William H. Hoblitzell, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Francis M. Tench, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Alvin E. Anthony, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. William J. R. Akeroyd, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Fletcher D. Rhodes, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. William D. Caldwell, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Lewis W. Maly, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Arthur T. Burchill, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Glover Johns, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Frederick W. Herms, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Harold J. Parker, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Leslie D. Baskin, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Curtis W. Hallam, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. James E. Dean, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Henry L. Hogan, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. John C. Campbell, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Leland S. Wilson, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Benjamin H. Dean, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Dell S. Gray, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. William B. Stewart, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Julius L. Bischof, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Charles H. Brummell, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. John A. Rowe, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. William T. Williams, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Hooker O. Lindsey, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Alvin D. Dannheiser, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. James R. Conner, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Robert L. Strickland, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Roy R. Newman, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Boyd L. Smith, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Avery G. Holmes, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. George R. Kennebeck, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Alexander M. Smith, jr., Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Horace R. Finley, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Cecil R. Hays, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Roy C. Starr, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Harold S. Embree, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Charles L. Andrews, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Byram S. Purviance, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph L. Boyd, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph L. Rahm, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Clarence R. Jacobson, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Norman M. Mackenzie, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Richard F. Thompson, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Henry H. Collins, Dental Corps.
First Lieut. Adrian C. Ragan, Dental Corps.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Eugene G. Miller, Coast Artillery Corps, to be second lieutenant in the Field Artillery, with rank from November 1, 1918.

COAST ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Richard A. Ericson, Field Artillery, to be second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from November 1, 1918.

TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Kelton L. Pepper, United States Army, retired, to be captain with rank from July 1, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF MINT.

William A. Burns to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Thomas G. Haight to be United States circuit judge, third circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

James Clifton Wilson to be United States district judge, northern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *June 24, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit our Heavenly Father, we bless Thee for the high and glorious aspirations which leap like angels from the temples of our hearts, beckoning us ever onward to the higher ideals of manhood. Increase our faith and confidence in Thee and in our own ability, assured that if we work and faint not, we shall reap the rewards of a faithful life, through the promises of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A DELEGATE.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Delegate from Hawaii, Mr. KALANIANAOLE, is present and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. KALANIANAOLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute, to lay the foundation for a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Water Power Committee, created by a resolution early in this session, authorized a unanimous report upon the joint water-power bill that was reported to the last Congress. There is necessity for prompt action on water-power legislation, due to the long delay in passing any bill. I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the approval of the Journal and the transaction of business on the Speaker's table, the water-power bill be taken up for consideration, not to interfere with conference reports or other privileged matters.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted with Judge SIMS, the ranking Democrat on that committee?

Mr. ESCH. I have, and with other Members. It was the unanimous request of the committee that I make this request.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I will state that I made the motion myself that the chairman resort to all parliamentary methods to obtain this consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report on House resolution 79, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 79.

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills be authorized to appoint an assistant clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $6 per diem during the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

With the following committee amendment:

After the word "House," in line 6 of the resolution, strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "payment to commence from date such clerk entered upon his duties."

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution that has been offered for the Committee on Enrolled Bills. It has been usual to give that committee an assistant clerk, and last session we made it an allowance at the end of the session.

Mr. GARNER. This is the customary resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. IRELAND. It has been offered each session.

Mr. GARNER. At the same time of the session that this is being offered now?

Mr. IRELAND. It was at the last session. I could not say beyond that. I think the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO], the former chairman of that committee, will verify that statement.

Mr. LAZARO. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MILEAGE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up House resolution 113, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

House resolution 113.

Resolved, That the Committee on Mileage be, and is hereby, authorized to hire a clerk for the said committee for a period of two months during the first and second sessions of the Sixty-sixth Congress, compensation of the said clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives at the rate of $125 per month.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "two months" and insert "one month."

Line 3, strike out the words "the first and second sessions" and insert the words "each session."

So that the amended resolution will read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mileage be, and is hereby, authorized to hire a clerk for the said committee for a period of one month during each session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, compensation of the said clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, at the rate of $125 per month.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does anyone know whether we are going to have more than one session of this Congress or not?

Mr. IRELAND. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that if we do not, this would not obtain for any other than the one session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely asked for information.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not satisfy the gentleman, as that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. IRELAND. The Lord Almighty only can tell.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity for the Committee on Mileage having a clerk for a month at the beginning of the second and third sessions of this Congress, if there are to be such sessions? The mileage is paid at the beginning of the first session.

Mr. IRELAND. Is it not paid at the beginning of each session and was it not in the last Congress?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, but what is the necessity for having a clerk to pay mileage for the two following sessions of Congress, when the return is made when we first attend?

Mr. IRELAND. I can only tell the gentleman what we found has been the practice in the past, that a lump sum, I think of $500, has been appropriated for the hiring of a clerk for the Mileage Committee.

Mr. WALSH. Is this the practice followed by the majority in the Sixty-fifth Congress?

Mr. IRELAND. No, sir. The original resolution cut that in half and the committee without any solicitation from the chairman of the Mileage Committee gave it to him for each session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MRS. MARY C. ADAMS.

Mr. IRELAND. I have one other, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 82.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Mrs. Mary C. Adams (widow of Capt. T. D. Adams, a Union soldier) as attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-sixth Congress, at the rate of $100 per month, beginning on the 19th day of May, 1919, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out, beginning in line 2, the language "Mrs. Mary C. Adams (widow of Capt. T. D. Adams, a Union soldier) as" and insert before the word "attendant" the word "an," so that as amended the resolution will read:

"*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint an attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-sixth Congress, at the rate of $100 per month, beginning on the 19th day of May, 1919, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan, in accordance with the order of business adopted yesterday, moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District business.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, pending that I would like to see if we can agree upon time for general debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. How much time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MAPES. I have requests on this side for what will take about an hour and a half, perhaps longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman suggest three hours—an hour and a half to a side?

Mr. MAPES. Could the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me a few minutes if we divide the time equally and take three hours?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If we do not use it, I would; but the gentleman had better ask for enough time, and if it is not used it can be turned back.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for general debate be limited to three hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, half to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Kentucky. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for the purpose of putting a question, upon what bill is this general debate to be?

Mr. MAPES. There are five bills on the calendar, and debate will be general debate on all of them.

Mr. GARD. Which one does the gentleman contemplate bringing up first?

Mr. MAPES. There are four little bills which will be brought up, one introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] to put the patrol drivers into the metropolitan police department, and that will be brought up first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District business, with Mr. TREADWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District business.

INCORPORATING PATROL DRIVERS IN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill H. R. 3624, a bill incorporating the patrol drivers in the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3624) incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia are hereby declared to be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, general debate is limited to three hours. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. [Applause.]

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman [applause], in view of the very cordial greeting which has come from the Democratic side of the House as well as the Republican side, I crave your gracious and forgiving indulgence while I indulge in a little personal history by way of preliminary. I was born in Illinois in 1860, but my father was born in Kentucky, in old Kentucky [applause], born in Warsaw, in Gallatin County, in 1818, the year of the birth of Illinois. My mother was born in Lexington, the hub of the beautiful blue-grass region. [Applause.] Both of her parents and both of my father's parents, in other words, all four of my grandparents, were born in the Old Dominion [applause], and there is a host of cousins now near Bowling Green, in Caroline, in Car'line County, old Car'line County, in the forks of the Mattaponi, and just about 110 years ago yesterday my father's father married his sweet cousin and put her on a pillion behind him and rode through the Cumberland Gap into that country when Kentucky was the dark and bloody ground, head erect, eye alight, soul aloft, afraid neither of God, man, nor devil—well, afraid of God, that is all, but not of any two-legged thing that walked this world of ours or any mortal man. My grandfather's grandfather's name was Michael, a Virginia Irishman, an Irish Virginian, and nobody trod on the tail of his coat at all, at all. [Applause.] Fifty years ago, when all families like mine were divided, five of my name laid down their lives for the Stars and Bars and five for the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.] And on my side it reads, "Union soldier, killed at Shiloh; Union soldier, killed at Donelson; Union soldier, killed at Vicksburg," and on my cousins' side it reads, "Confederate soldier, killed at Malvern Hill; Confederate soldier, killed at Spottsylvania; Confederate soldier, killed in the Wilderness." Of this Illinois-Kentucky-Virginia and Irish strain, thank God, I come.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a card which I have received through the United States mail, which card, in my humble opinion, is a challenge and an insult not only to myself but to every Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress. I will read this card; it reads as follows:

AURORA, ILL., *June 18, 1919.*

Hon. RICHARD YATES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The United States Supreme Court will determine whether the eighteenth amendment is legally a part of the Constitution of the United States.

Why should you be called upon to accept responsibility for a bill to enforce that amendment until it has been passed upon by the body whose function and duty it is to decide upon the constitutional legality of a measure so vital to the interests of 100,000,000 people?

I shall be sternly and irrevocably opposed to you or any other Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress who votes in favor of any bill providing for the enforcement of this amendment. Furthermore I demand, as one of your constituents, that you use every effort in your power to repeal on or before June 30 the so-called Sheppard amendment to the Agricultural bill.

Very truly, yours,

BISHOP HOTEL BAR.

I have already received five decks of these cards. [Laughter.] I have one here from a brewing company, the Best Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Ruehl Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Fred Sehring Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Brand Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Wacker & Birk Brewing Co.; one from the Home Brewery, Elston Avenue, Chicago; the Meyer Brewing Co., of Bloomington, Ill.; one from the Mascoutah Brewing Co., Mascoutah; the R. Stecher Brewing Co., of Murphysboro; and the Cairo Brewing Co., of Cairo, Ill.; the Halliday Hotel, of Cairo; the Bradford Hotel, of Bradford; the Taylor House, of Havana; the Ayers Hotel, of Harvard; and the Columbia Hotel, of Aurora. By every incoming mail I receive a new deck; yesterday's mail brought me such a card as this from men named as follows: Lauff, Batz, Kohn, Weiss, Stump, Schuck, Berthold, Meyer, Laadt, Bremer, Kessler, Nolte, Borgman, Wiegand, Hagemann, Altzeiger, Bramdoletter, Lauritzan, and Ladenberger. [Laughter.]

I have not seen such a list until I saw in this morning's paper that by a majority of 237 to 137 Haniel von Heimhausen is signing the treaty of peace. [Laughter and applause.] And Haniel von Heimhausen did not sign the treaty of peace until ex-Finance Minister Schiffer and Gustave Bauer and Adolph Greber and Count von Pozadowsky-Wehner had delivered bitter speeches.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, when I call the ignoble roll of these anti-Constitution men, these bulldozing correspondents of mine, I do not mean to criticize loyal men bearing German names. I know that thousands upon thousands of men in Illinois are descended from such men as Franz Siegel and Carl Schurz and Osterhaus and Rosecrans and Heintzelmann and Turchin and Knobeldorff and Schneider and Koerner and Hecker and a host of other men who in Prussia in 1848 fought a tyrant king and came to America for liberty and fought and died in America for liberty. Oh, the men on that glorious roll would never have ordered me to nullify the Constitution. I can not imagine Francis A. Hoffmann, my father's lieutenant governor, calling on me to violate the Constitution!

I presume a thousand more cards are on their way, and I know that some Members of this Congress have already received some cards of this brand. I know my friend MADDEN has received a few. Not only is this an elevating and uplifting card, but it is an interesting and instructive card. This threat against an American Congress by the brewers and barrooms of Illinois is not the voluntary act of individual citizens voicing the citizen's opinion for the purpose of enlightening his Representative in Congress; it is the result of the organized propaganda, which seeks to set at naught the Constitution of our blood-bought country and seeks the overthrow of its form of government; an organized propaganda, so well organized that it can afford to pay for the wholesale printing of threats against the Congress of America. This card is printed on both sides.

Mr. SIMS. Is not the address also printed?

Mr. YATES. Yes, sir. It is printed on the back, and it is printed on the front. Not only is the fearful and affrighting message which it bears to us Congressmen printed on the back, but the front page of this card, containing my address, has been also run through the printing press. My name and address appear in large type, much larger than any typewriter can produce, and it is manifest that the number of cards sent and to be sent to me is to be so large that to write or typewrite my name would be burdensome, and accordingly, for the first time in my life, I am honored by having the undivided and absorbed attention of a printing press, paid for by the check book of the brewers and the barrooms. I have heard that Ben Franklin once said, "A drop of ink makes a million think." Franklin was right; but the barrooms go him one better. They evidently think that, with enough ink, they can make a million drink and Congress shrink. [Laughter and applause.]

At any rate, a real printing press has devoted itself for some time to the pleasing task of printing my name and address on these cards, of which I have hundreds, so that the appearance is as follows:

HON. RICHARD YATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

This extremely fascinating and complimentary card refers to the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, and then goes on to say:

I shall be sternly and irrevocably opposed to you, or any other Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress, who votes in favor of any bill providing for the enforcement of this amendment.

It is somewhat refreshing to an old, hardened, confirmed campaigner to be threatened with the "frightfulness" of oppo-

sition. For myself, and I think I voice the sentiment of every man in this House, I care little that the Bishop Hotel bar, of Aurora, Ill., will oppose me, not only "sternly" but "irrevocably." [Applause.] It is a safe bet that the Bishop Hotel bar never, never did vote for me. [Laughter.] I fondly hope that it never did, and I fervently pray that it never will. Opposition! Why, every Member of Congress thrives upon opposition. It is the breath of life to every public servant in America who has any red blood in his veins. I venture to say that every Member of this House welcomes opposition. For myself I am not easily frightened; the threat of defeat is not alarming. The specter of defeat does not unnerve me. Kipling says that both triumph and disaster are impostors; neither is what it pretends to be. I have met defeat so often that its appearance does not disturb me. Its appearance on the horizon rather fascinates. Roosevelt said:

> The reason why men love war and politics is that they are the greatest games that there are; there is the gamble, the game, the uncertainty welcome to every man not a weakling or a mollycoddle. It was Abraham Lincoln who once said: "And if I should be defeated I am too familiar with disappointment to be distressed by it."

I myself, Mr. Chairman, have run for city, county, Federal, and States office, always opposed, never unopposed. I was soundly and roundly thrashed in Illinois, away back in 1892 for Congressman at Large, by a great Democrat, Gen. John C. Black, the year Gov. Altgeld carried Illinois, 27 years ago; I was elected judge of my county, a strong Democratic county, the very next year; rode every rod of every road, got out in the mud, lifted up the gate, fought off the dogs, called on the voter and his wife, and carried the county. [Laughter.] I have fought the best steel in the bravest and most unterrified fighting Democracy of my county, district, and State. Yet this barroom thinks it can scare you and me. In 1918, last year, two of the most capable and eloquent champions who ever led the Democratic cohorts of Illinois were pitted against me. My majority was 142,000, and every man in Illinois knew exactly how I would vote on this question, for I have never lied to our beloved people. Yet this Aurora bartender has been led to believe that he and the brewers can silence me—and you. These Illinois brewers and bars have figured it out they can fill me with fear. The cemeteries of Illinois are full of the foes of my tribe and of men who, like me, hail not only from Illinois but Kentucky and Virginia and Ireland. Such men are hard to kill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. YATES. However, the absurdity of these people, sitting in their dark back rooms, running their printing presses, trying to frighten such men as you and I, my colleagues, is excelled and overshadowed by a thing which is not ridiculous; it is a thing which is outrageous, insolent, arrogant, disloyal, and an act of treason. [Applause.]

What is it these conspirators, who send these cards broadcast to be signed and mailed by their dupes, what is it they make their deluded followers do and demand? What is it they would punish you and me and every Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress for? They propose to punish us for enforcing the Constitution.

We have such a thing as the Constitution of the United States. We have this eighteenth amendment, proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the Sixty-fifth Congress on the 17th of December, 1918, and declared in a proclamation by the Secretary of State, dated January 29, 1919, to have been ratified by the legislatures of 36 of the 48 States. This amendment is now part and parcel of the organic, fundamental law of the land, higher than any statutes or all statutes. I insist that this eighteenth amendment to the American Constitution is as much a part of the Constitution as any other part of that immortal instrument. And when any man, rich or poor, big or little, strong or weak, asks me and you not to enforce this amendment he asks you and me to ignore and defy and nullify the Constitution. When he does that he is the public enemy [applause], the enemy of all the Constitution stands for, of all the great Washington warred for, of all the great Lincoln died for.

These men seem to think this is a small thing to ask—merely to ask that I nullify the Constitution and stultify myself. But it is not a small thing. A million men have died, and a million women have agonized, that our country might be the beacon light of liberty and the last hope of humanity; and we here today on this floor are the expression of the potentiality of that hope and purpose. We can not escape our duty, we can not nullify the Constitution and stultify ourselves, and at the same time be true to the men and women who from Bunker Hill to San Juan Hill, and from San Juan Hill to the Belleau Wood and the Meuse-Argonne, have written the name of American valor and freedom so high that kings and emperors and sultans and czars and mikados will keep off of us for a hundred years.

And, gentlemen, I think we ought to recall to ourselves more often than we do that we here on this floor are the representatives of the last hope of humanity. And I want you to pardon another personal allusion.

Three days before he died my father said to me, "I have served eight years in the Legislature of Illinois and four years as governor, six years as United States Senator, and four years in the lower House." Then he said, "My son"—and I remember it, because in three days he was dead—"My son, I want you to grow up and serve the American Republic, and to remember always that the ideal public service for an American is in the House of Representatives, the American House of Commons." [Applause.]

He came here first in 1850, traveling by stage to the Illinois River, and then by boat to St. Louis, and another to Cairo, and another to Pittsburgh, and thence by stage to Washington. He was the "lone-star Whig from Illinois." And after 69 years I, by 142,000 majority of my people and his people, have come here. And I would rather hold a seat in this House than in any body on earth. [Applause.]

The bartenders and brewers of Illinois are telling me what to do and telling you what to do. The fact is that this postal card and the conspiracy which conceived and inspired its cowardly threat is, as I have already said, and as I want to repeat, an impertinent, insolent, arrogant, disloyal, traitorous thing, instigated by the devil, sprung straight up from hell. I am the Representative at Large, not the representative at small, of this postal-card writer, and I want all the people of my great district—for my district is the most magnificent district in America, the whole magnificent State of Illinois—to know the kind of threat being sent to us Representatives. Against this threat of bartenders and brewers I pit my official oath. The ideal public service for an American is service in this House, the American House of Commons. I would rather have a seat here than in any body on earth, and I will keep its high and mighty official oath in spite of all the bartenders of or in America. So help me God. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had four minutes remaining to him of the time allotted to him by the two gentlemen.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. There are on the calendar five District bills. The general debate is limited to three hours. Can we not now take up a bill under the five-minute rule and reserve the balance of general debate, and go on and finish the general debate later?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman inquires if this bill can now be read for amendment under the five-minute rule?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; and then, reserving our general debate, go on with it afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks if general debate can be resumed afterwards?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House there are three hours of general debate on the five bills. The Chair will state that, unless objection is made, this bill can be laid aside and the others taken up in due course, with the time remaining for general debate in addition.

Mr. MAPES. I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia are hereby declared to be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. It was introduced and passed in the last Congress without a dissenting vote, but the Senate failed to pass it on account of the congestion of business there at the end of the session.

It provides for correcting the apparent injustice done to the patrol drivers here in the city of Washington and simply classifies them as patrolmen, so that they can become beneficiaries, if they so choose, under the pension act that was passed two

or three years ago applying to members of the police force. At that time the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia were not aware that the patrol drivers were not under that act the same as the patrolmen, and now the members of the committee are desirous of correcting that mistake.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman states that it is the purpose of this legislation to make the patrol drivers part of the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia. I desire to direct the attention of the gentleman to the somewhat peculiar language that is used in this act:

That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers * * * are hereby declared to be members—

And so forth. It seems to me that the language could be very much simplified by saying that "Hereafter the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department shall be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia." The language which has been used, while it might convey the same impression, is unnecessarily cumbrous. You say, "From and after the passage of this act 'they' are hereby declared to be," and so forth. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment stating that "Hereafter the patrol drivers shall be members of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia"?

Mr. WHEELER. I can not see any difference.

Mr. WALSH. That is what you want to do?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. There is no need of declaring that "from and after the passage of this act" they are declared to be something.

Mr. WHEELER. I see no objection to the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. I have no objection to the gentleman's bill, provided it is understood that these men who are declared to be members of the police department shall, before they shall enjoy the benefits of certain insurance which the policemen have, stand the same sort of examination that the policemen undergo. You will understand there is a difference between the tests; and I suppose, of course, the gentleman understands that the rules for admission to this service will be the same rules as apply to admission to the police department?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the gentleman that some of these patrol drivers have been in the service for 23, 24, and 25 years, and nearly all of them have been in the service for 15 years. They could have stood the physical tests when they first entered this department, but could not now.

Mr. SISSON. I am sure they could not, so far as the age test and other things are concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. Physical tests.

Mr. SISSON. Yes; physical tests, perhaps. I am not so much interested in those who are now in the service as in those who are to come into the service hereafter. I am interested in seeing that the same regulations should apply in the future to the admission of patrol drivers as those entering the police force.

Mr. WHEELER. The patrol driver, if classified as a patrolman, would necessarily have to take the same physical and mental examination as a policeman.

Mr. SISSON. Of course, that need not necessarily follow. They might make some regulation as to the height, size, and physical capacity of a patrolman which would not necessarily apply to a driver.

Mr. WHEELER. An applicant must take an examination now, the same as a patrolman.

Mr. SISSON. I did not understand that to be true.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Line 3 strike out the words "from and after the passage of this act" and insert the word "hereafter," and in line 5 strike out the words "are hereby declared to" and insert "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this is simply to correct the language in accordance with the suggestion I made to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER]. It accomplishes the purposes which he states this measure was intended to accomplish and puts it into language of which there can be no doubt, and which is a little less cumbersome.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. GARD. I am interested in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and also in the text of the bill. Is it the purpose to transfer these patrol drivers to the police department?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. GARD. It says now they "are hereafter declared to be members of the Metropolitan police force." Does that mean that they get on the police force without passing an examination or complying with any of the regulations governing the present police force?

Mr. WHEELER. They have to comply with them now.

Mr. GARD. Their status now is that of chauffeur.

Mr. WHEELER. They are sworn in to do police duty when called upon in time of trouble, and when they reach that point or that place they are called upon to make arrests the same as regular policemen, and to-day they have just two shifts, while the regular patrolmen have three shifts. They work 10 or 12 hours a day.

Mr. GARD. I am not in opposition to the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. It will rest with the superintendent of police whether he will transfer any of these drivers to be regular patrolmen or not. I imagine that on account of their experience and skill as patrol drivers he will keep them exactly where they are now, and the only object of this bill is to put them in a position where they can come in under this pension provision if they so elect.

Mr. GARD. The object is twofold, to give them shorter hours and give them an opportunity for taking out insurance.

Mr. WHEELER. Not necessarily shorter hours.

Mr. GARD. What I want to know is whether this act covers the patrol drivers into the police force automatically, and what the provision will be for the future. Suppose a patrol driver resigns and his place must be filled. How must it be filled in the future?

Mr. WHEELER. By the applicant taking an examination. If he is appointed as a patrol driver, the superintendent of police can tell the station captain that he must work the same as the other patrol drivers, 10 or 12 hours, or whatever his hours of duty may be.

Mr. GARD. Would it not meet the purpose of the bill if you strike out the phrase "in the employment of the Metropolitan police department," and provide that "hereafter the patrol drivers of the District of Columbia," and so forth?

Mr. WALSH. That would include the patrol drivers driving ambulances in the health department.

Mr. WHEELER. The superintendent of police can detail any patrolman for any duty, for 10, 12, or 24 hours if he desires to do so, and he can detail these 23 patrol drivers exactly where they are to-day, and they will perform exactly the same service and for the same number of hours.

Mr. WALSH. At the suggestion of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. REED] I desire to modify my amendment by including in the language stricken out in line 3 the word "the" before "patrol drivers."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts will be incorporated in his amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. May we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be reported again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Line 3, page 1, strike out the words "from and after the passage of this act" and insert the word "hereafter," and in line 5 strike out the words "are hereby declared to" and insert the word "shall."

So that as amended the bill will read:

That hereafter patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia shall be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GARD. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts by striking out in addition thereto the words "in the employment" appearing in line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARD moves to amend by striking out, in line 4, the words "in the employment."

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GARD. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify the section so as to make it a more readable legislative section. Then it will read:

That hereafter the patrol drivers of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia shall be members of the Metropolitan department force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALMON. Does that change the meaning of it in any way?

Mr. MAPES. I doubt whether the amendment does anything to the bill one way or the other, but I have no objection to it.

Mr. SISSON. As the bill now reads, it might be construed that this simply covers those who are now in the service, and will not apply to those who may be in the service in the future.

Mr. WALSH. No; it says "hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, the bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

WATER SUPPLY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] calls up H. R. 1713, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN], but in his absence I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to address myself to the provisions of the bill now under consideration, but to avail myself of the privilege of devoting my entire time to general debate.

I desire to address myself particularly to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, first to that provision of it which relates to the "half-and-half" plan of paying the expenses of the District of Columbia. I also desire to address myself to what is know as the rent amendment which the Senate has placed upon the bill.

Whenever the question of the "half-and-half" has been up in previous Congresses a great deal of time has been consumed in addresses made upon that subject. Strange to say, this time that subject so far has not been debated at all. There are more than 100 new Members in this House, who, I take it for granted, know little or nothing of the question. When the District of Columbia appropriation bill does come up, only 35 minutes have been set aside for general debate. It appears unmistakably that there is a disposition somewhere to throttle the discussion of this question and leave but one side of it presented—that side presented by the local press.

I do not believe that those who have not had ample time in which to study this question can vote with any degree of enlightenment without knowing at least something of it, and I do not believe many Members of this House have had an opportunity to learn much of it. Therefore I hope I may be pardoned for going into that subject in a short and concise way.

Formerly there were three municipalities in the District of Columbia; one the city of Washington, another the city of Georgetown, and the other the county of Washington. By act of Congress, February 21, 1871, these three municipalities were merged into one—the District of Columbia. Since that time there has been but one municipality here. By the act of February 21, 1871, a new form of government was established for the District of Columbia. There was a local legislature and a governor. During the three years that form of government was in existence the District of Columbia was run into debt to the extent of about $52,000,000. There was no hope that that debt could be paid and the city further improved, as it should be, without levying an enormous tax on the people of the District.

Therefore, in 1878, the United States Government stepped in and said, We will pay one half of the expenses of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia will pay the other half. That, of course, was intended to run only so long as the emergency might require.

The act of 1878 established what is now called the "half-and-half." It has been running from 1878 until now. It is now proposed to repeal it in the alleged offensive legislative way of placing a repeal rider on an appropriation bill. That manner of repeal, according to the local press, is most offensive, most unfair, most injurious, and ought not to be tolerated.

By the act of 1878, which created the "half-and-half" plan, the rate of taxation in the District of Columbia was $2.50 on the hundred dollars. That was repealed by a rider on an appropriation bill, and the rate reduced to $1.50 on the hundred.

Later, by a rider on an appropriation bill, it was provided that real estate, for the purposes of taxation, should not be valued at less than two-thirds of its real value, and since then the two-thirds rate has been adopted, and the assessor has stated in his testimony before the District of Columbia Committee on several occasions that that is the plan. Therefore, when you value property at only two-thirds of its value, and tax it at $1.50 a hundred, you tax it practically and effectively at only a dollar rate.

Now, by two riders on appropriation bills the rate of taxation has been reduced from $2.50 a hundred to $1 a hundred. Then, again by a rider on an appropriation bill, just as is proposed now to be done, the tax was taken off of jewelry for the benefit of the rich in the District of Columbia.

Then, again by a rider on an appropriation bill, the tax was taken off of intangible property.

You can search the archives and the Library of Congress, among the papers of the local press, and you will not find one word of protest against doing those things by riders on appropriation bills.

Prohibition has been brought about for the District of Columbia by placing a rider on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I can go on and recite for the next hour various and sundry instances where legislation for the benefit of the taxpayer in the District of Columbia has been had by riders on appropriation bills. And there has been no complaint.

But now, when you come to do something for the taxpayers of the States in this Union, up goes the hue and cry that it is to be done in a monstrous manner by a rider on an appropriation bill. That protest is untenable and no heed should be given it.

The real estate people control all legislation that relates to the District of Columbia. I cited an instance a few years ago where a woman living near the end of Chain Bridge had a horse, a cart, and a cow, and upon these pieces of property she was taxed at the rate of $1.50 a hundred, because personal property is taxed in the District of Columbia at that rate. Yet at that time the person who owned millions of intangible personal property paid no tax.

I cite another instance, and it was this: That a tenant in the house of his landlord paid a tax at the rate of $1.50 a hundred on his belongings, while the owner of the real estate paid only a dollar a hundred; and that condition exists here to-day. Is that right? But it must be borne in mind, you must not be deceived by the oft-made assertion that the rider which is now on the District of Columbia appropriation bill undertakes to increase taxes in the District of Columbia, for it does no such thing. The rate of taxation upon real estate is left just the same—$1.50 upon three-thirds and $1 upon two-thirds. There is now no proposition, nor has there been one, to change the rate of taxation, notwithstanding that Judge Prouty, the eminent jurist who represented an Iowa district in the Halls of Congress, stood here one day and read a list of 40 cities—20 immediately above in population of the District of Columbia, and 20 immediately below the population of the District of Columbia, and each and everyone of the 40 cities paid a greater tax than is levied on property in the District of Columbia.

Mr. YATES. Would it disturb the gentleman to ask him a question at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What does the District of Columbia cost the Nation altogether?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The present appropriation bill, with the appropriations for the District of Columbia carried in other bills, amounts to about $16,000,000 a year. Under the "half-and-half" plan, the States bear half of that and the District of Columbia bears the other half.

As I was saying, Judge Prouty produced that list here, and its accuracy stands to-day unchallenged. Some gentlemen were here at the time from the State of Indiana who were voting in favor of the continuance of the "half-and-half" plan. I then

wrote to a number of cities in the State of Indiana, and found that they were paying not a dollar rate, but that many of them were paying as much as $10 on the hundred. As soon as they saw that, and the names of the towns and cities that were paying it, most of them changed their votes.

Mr. OGDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. OGDEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that tangible personal property is not subject to taxation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I said that intangible personal property at that time was not subject to taxation.

Mr. OGDEN. And it is now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. About two years ago intangible personal property was made taxable at the rate of three mills, I believe, according to my recollection.

Mr. OGDEN. Is it the gentleman's contention that there ought to be a correction in that regard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I was not discussing that at all. Judge Prouty's demonstration, demonstrated by naming the 40 cities nearest in population to the District of Columbia, showed that the District of Columbia paid a smaller rate in taxation than any of them. Take, for instance, the city of Louisville, from which my colleague comes. His constituents pay a city tax, also a county tax, and a State tax; and they also pay a tax for the pensions of the school-teachers, a tax for the benefit of the police pension fund, and also a bridge tax, if I am correctly advised, and a road tax. The taxpayers of the District of Columbia pay but one tax. When you add up the various taxes paid by the taxpayers of the city of Louisville, the metropolis of the State from which I come, it amounts to more than $3 on the hundred, and yet these people are complaining because they are compelled to pay $1 on the hundred. There is no disposition to disturb that.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. How about the real estate valuations in the District? Is the property valued at its full value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I venture the opinion that the gentleman can buy very few pieces of property in the District of Columbia according even to the three-thirds valuation that the assessors first place upon them.

Mr. KEARNS. Is it a supposition that the property is assessed at three-thirds or two-thirds of its value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The supposition is that they value each piece of real estate at its full value, and then take two-thirds of that for taxable purposes.

Mr. KEARNS. In most States real estate is taxed at full value.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is not so here, and the assessor will tell you, if you call him up, that he assesses it for taxable purposes at a two-thirds value. When I said a moment ago that the gentleman would be able to buy very few pieces of property in the District of Columbia at the valuation put on by the assessor that statement must be qualified by an example shown a few years ago, when the District of Columbia was inquiring into the methods of assessment in the District. At that time it was found that in the tax book relating to property lying in the fashionable northwest the figures on the assessor's books had had a pen run through them and immediately above a smaller figure written until $10,000,000 of taxable property were lifted by that process; and then, if you turn to the poorer section of the city, the southeast, the part of the District where the humble homes of the working classes of the District are, it was found that those $10,000,000 were placed on that by again erasing the figures and writing immediately above them larger figures.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Has the gentleman any information as to what authority or influence appoints the assessors?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that a good many years ago, by a rider on an appropriation bill, the assessor and, I think, two of the assistant assessors, were made the excise board, the board to pass upon liquor licenses in the District of Columbia, and there went with that a provision that they should not be removed except for serious cause, alleged and proven.

Mr. LAYTON. The gentleman, I think, has not answered my question. Who appoints them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia appoint them.

Mr. LAYTON. Are there any facts available as to whether the two-thirds of the assessment upon real estate in the city represents the actual three-thirds of its value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; it shows just the reverse. On one occasion I heard the assessor himself testify that he construed the law to mean that he could not assess it at more than two-thirds of its actual value.

Mr. LAYTON. I mean, do they hold the actual value in mind when they apply the two-thirds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. They are supposed to, and I believe they do.

Mr. FOSTER. And who appoints the commissioners?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The President of the United States appoints two civilian commissioners of the District Commissioners, who must reside in the District of Columbia. The third is an Army officer, who must have the rank of major. He is the head of the engineer department, which lays out roads and highways, bridges and sewers, and things of that character.

A few years ago, when the appropriation for the District of Columbia was about $13,000,000 I divided that, pro rata, among the people of the United States, and then by that process ascertained what each State was paying. That at that time was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have several copies of that over at my office, and if any gentleman wishes to see what his State was paying when the appropriation was $13,000,000 I will be very glad to furnish a copy of it. As I was saying a few minutes ago when interrupted, it was established by Judge Prouty that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia were paying a smaller tax than any other municipality in all the country comparable in size with the District of Columbia. Then the advocates of the "half and half" in the District of Columbia answered and said that while that might be true they were paying a greater per capita tax. That means nothing. Property and not persons is taxed. If John D. Rockefeller lived here and all of his property was assessed here, can not you see that the per capita tax would go up and up? A dozen men could pay large taxes and a hundred thousand pay no tax, and yet the per capita would be large, but the rate would be just the same. That is the fallacy upon which they are undertaking to base the statement that they are heavily taxed in the District of Columbia. Why, one of the papers recently said that the District of Columbia paid more income tax than the State of Kentucky. That is true. I am sorry of it. I am sorry that Kentucky is so poor. I am sorry that Kentucky, poor as she is, is called upon to pay half the taxes for the rich men of the District of Columbia. A dentist is employed for the school children here, and it is in this appropriation bill which comes up to-morrow—to plug the teeth of the school children with gold or what not. The children down in Kentucky and in every State of this Union have their pennies taken from their pockets to help pay that. Nurses are employed at the schools, and the nurses in Kentucky and in every State in this land are taxed to help pay those nurses. Schoolbooks are bought for the children of the millionaire here, and the school children in Kentucky and in every State of this Union are taxed to pay for them. Only recently my clerk received a communication from one of the big real estate concerns of this town wanting to sell her a piece of property here, and made the statement that the purchase should be made because the United States Government would pay half the tax for her. The plan as proposed in the rider that is on the appropriation bill is this, and it must not be misunderstood, that property in the District of Columbia should be taxed at a fair rate. Let that rate bring much or little, but when it has been collected let it be expended, all of it, and then whatever else ought to be appropriated for the purpose of making this the greatest and most beautiful city upon the earth should be contributed by the United States Government. In the rider upon the appropriation bill, however, is a limitation that the amount contributed by the United States shall be less than one-half of the total appropriation.

That had to be in the amendment, in the rider if you choose to call it that, else the Chair, in presiding over that bill, would have ruled it out of order on a point of order made.

There is in the District of Columbia an organization which, I believe, is called the Real Estate Brokers' Association, and the real estate brokers from other parts of the country are now, or at least yesterday or the day before were, the guests of this local organization. I find in the Washington Post to-day this article which I hold in my hand, a part of which I will read. I clipped it from the Washington Post less than an hour ago. I read:

Mr. Ackley was replying to an address of welcome by Charles Fairfax, president of the local association, on behalf of the visitors, who were en route to the annual convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards at Atlantic City. He said that the out-of-town realtors were pleased with everything in Washington except the prices charged in restaurants.

"When we come back to Washington again," he said, "please have the restaurateurs show a little mercy on our pocketbooks." The speaker suggested that the Washington real estate men could decrease their deficits by making Members of Congress pay higher rents. "Go as far as you like," he added, "with raising rents of Congressmen."

Yet you are called upon, when real estate people from outside come here and advise the local real estate people to raise rents on Congressmen, to retaliate for that by voting in favor of having their constituents dig down into their pockets to pay half of their taxes.

Last session I read a letter from the treasurer or financial agent of the local real estate organization, saying that the out-of-town realtors had contributed to the fund with which they were seeking to pass legislation affecting rents. Mr. Worthington—I forget his initials now—is the man who wrote the letter. I am sorry I did not bring it over to-day, but I did not know I was going to have the opportunity to make this address on this occasion.

I sincerely trust that the conferees who will have charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill will write a proper amendment as a substitute for the no-account thing which now appears as a rider upon that bill. I hope they will take the time to go into the subject carefully and thoroughly, doing injustice to nobody, but justice to the oppressed, and in this town their name is legion.

In one week here, according to the records kept by Capt. Peyser, about 1,100 persons came in to do war work and nearly a thousand of them were compelled to leave. That thing kept up. They called it "the turnover," I believe. More than 80 per cent of those that came had to leave. And that went on, not that week alone, nor that month alone, but it has gone on from then until now. The salaries that you gave them will not support them. If you increase their salaries, the profiteers take it away from them a minute and a half after they get it.

Who has paid the expense of bringing these thousands and thousands of clerks here and then paying their way back? The taxpayers of this Nation have paid it. The beneficiaries of it are the landlords of the town, and yet you are called upon to pay half of their taxes, and they want it done without having the subject discussed; and it would not have been discussed and there would have been no opportunity to discuss it except for the general debate on this bill which is now before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield that time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky lacked eight minutes of using an hour himself. He had one hour and a half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we are on the water bill, I want to call the attention of the House to the present law and the present water rate in this District, and I am really sorry that more Members are not here so that they may learn something about the District of Columbia affairs. I shall not read all of the report of the engineer commissioner in reference to this matter. The minimum charge to each premise allows the use of 7,500 cubic feet of water per annum, which is 56,000 and some odd gallons of water.

In other words, the ordinary householder in Washington rarely has to pay more than the minimum rate. If you will investigate the water rates throughout the United States, you will find that in many cities the householder will pay nearly as much per month as it paid in the District of Columbia per year, because 56,000 gallons a year are about what the average family will use, certainly unless the laundering is done on the premises.

Therefore the water rates in the District of Columbia are not only lower, but very much lower, than the water rates in any other city in the world. In the smaller towns of 25,000, 30,000, 40,000, or 50,000 the water rates will range all the way from $2.50 a month to $4 or $5 a month. In my little town I pay between $50 and $60 a year for water, but the smaller cities have to pay a proportionately higher rate. It is doubtful whether you will find a city in the country where the ordinary user of water will not pay at least $24 a year or something like $2 a month for water. Yet in the District of Columbia they pay this low water rate.

How is that brought about, do you say? I do not want the District of Columbia to pay to the Federal Government one cent of profit because the waterworks belong to the Federal Government.

When Jefferson Davis was Secretary of War they had a great deal of sickness in Washington, and at that time the buildings and grounds of the Capitol were under the Secretary of War. That was before the creation of the office of Superintendent of the Capitol. Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, recommended to Congress that the water system be built by the Federal Government. The District of Columbia then had less than 40,000 people. A bridge was built across Cabin John Creek on which to carry the water mains, and the name of Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, was carved upon the bridge. You will remember that during the Civil War the Federal soldiers who were guarding that bridge chiseled off the name of Jefferson Davis, and that Theodore Roosevelt, when he was President, had the name of Jefferson Davis restored to its place on the keystone of the bridge. I call your attention to that solely to remind you that for a number of years after it was built the water plant of Washington was operated by the War Department and the people of the District of Columbia were permitted to use the water at such rates as the War Department might fix.

Now, in the Senate they have asked that the $400,000 used for the extension of water mains be increased to $450,000, and they are complaining now that the revenues of the water department of the District of Columbia will not pay the expenses, because they have had to increase the wages of their labor, and coal, which is a considerable item in the running of the pumping system, has increased 100 per cent in value. Notwithstanding that fact, the District Commissioners have declined to make any increase in the water rates in the District of Columbia. I do not know whether it is because they fear the public or not; but in every other city in the world when the water companies owned by the city or privately operated companies do not pay expenses the water rates have to be increased. But in the District of Columbia they have the Federal Treasury out of which the District lives. Notwithstanding the fact that they have in the District of Columbia as good water as there is in the world, a magnificent plant built absolutely by the Federal Government, the whole original investment paid for out of the Federal Treasury, yet the District Commissioners have declined to raise the water rates one cent, and now they are asking in the District bill that meters be put upon all the Government buildings and that the District Commissioners be authorized to charge the Government for the water that comes out of its own plant, when the Federal Government built it for its own use and, as a matter of grace, permitted the District people to use it. Now, I know that my colleagues on the committee know very well that I would not have a man in the District of Columbia pay more than a fair and just rate.

So I ask our conferees, when they consider this matter, that they go into it carefully and, instead of increasing the charge upon the Treasury of the United States, that they put a small increase on the water rates in the District of Columbia and let the operation of this plant pay its own expenses. It would be an interesting thing to go into the original cost out of the Treasury of this water system. But this is one of those peculiar bills in which we are not particularly interested as a matter at large. When it comes to the ordinary citizen of the United States, his contribution is small, but Congress ought to look to this matter.

I will say here by way of parenthesis, my friends, that service on the District of Columbia appropriation bill has always been wished upon me. I have always gotten from under it whenever I could honorably. When I was first asked to go upon this subcommittee I rebelled. For two or three weeks my friend, Mr. Fitzgerald, who was then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, labored with me to induce me to go upon that subcommittee. I went upon it under protest, but having gone upon it I have tried to do my duty, and when I see these things that I do not believe are just and right I bring them to your attention. I give you the facts as they appear to me, because I believe it is my duty to do it.

Now, of all the broad leagues of land over which our flag floats, the District of Columbia is the only spot set apart as the seat of the Federal Government. When the fathers of the Republic conceived the idea of locating the capital and having the activities of the Federal Government on a small district that Congress alone should control they were wise. My regret is that they did not have the experience then that we have now. When the Canal Zone was established there were certain profiteering real estate men who wanted to get control of that and to have a local government there.

But Col. Goethals, to his credit be it told, said "No; we bought that zone to build a canal, and it ought to be operated

by the Federal Government for the purposes of the canal and for those purposes alone."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentlemen yield me a little more time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am sorry, but every minute is promised.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield me a little more time?

Mr. MAPES. I have promised more than I have, but I will yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. SISSON. There are so many of these things that are of interest that I can not complete my statement which I intended to make; but it is my judgment that if Congress had bought for the Federal Government all the land in the District of Columbia, which it could have done for a song at that time, and if it had run this District as a governmental seat and kept out of it those men who invest their money here and expect to make profit out of the Treasury, it would have been an ideal system.

But let us not lose sight in legislation of the fact that the purpose of our fathers in establishing this Government was that Congress could control it absolutely as the seat of government and not be interfered with by the local government.

After it had been run a while opportunities for our old friends, the real estate people, people who loved to live close to the Capital, the Capital commenced to be built up, and now the only source of profit here, and it ought to be the only source of profit, if you let people live here, comes out of the Federal Treasury. Every real estate man, the banks, everybody who lives here, primarily, the money comes out of the Federal Treasury to keep the city up.

Therefore we have got into this atmosphere, where men selling their goods, the grocer, the men dealing in clothing, the men renting real estate, it is necessary that they shall get enormous appropriations out of the Treasury, so the whole business organization in the District of Columbia is looking to the idea of getting every dollar they can out of the Treasury, because in that way only can they increase their profits and increase, as they say, the beauty of the Capital City. It is not so much the aesthetic side, however, as the profit side of it that they are interested in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] for his courtesy in yielding the floor to me for a brief statement.

While I voted in favor of every motion designed to limit or reduce the appropriation for clerk hire for Members of Congress contained in the joint resolution which we have just passed, it is quite possible that the amount appropriated may all be needed during this year. While the Army is being demobilized and while the soldiers are getting their insurance looked after, and obtaining bonds which they paid for during the period of their service, and many other things occasioned by the World War, there will be need of much extra clerk hire. One good thing about the clerk-hire resolution is that it only applies to the year beginning July 1. My belief is that at the end of the fiscal year the amount of correspondence and activity at the departments of the Government will be substantially reduced. For that reason I think we should prepare and enact a permanent law which will provide a reasonable amount for clerk hire, which need not be greater than the amount carried in the regular appropriation less the amount of the bonus. In other words, the amount added for the bonus this year may be deducted from the amount provided by law to be paid in the future. This will still leave a fair allowance for clerk hire for each Member, which ought to be satisfactory. It will furnish a commendable example of economy to the heads of the various departments of the Government. To my mind it is the only consistent thing we can do; that is, while insisting upon economy upon the part of department officials to practice it ourselves. I am going to urge this view upon the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and I hope other Members will do the same in the interest of economy in public expenditures.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN].

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the bill, H. R. 1713, now pending before the House provides that the Secretary of War be authorized and directed to appoint a commission of five members to make full investigation of the sources of water supply from rivers and streams in the proximity of the city of Washington, with the view of increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia.

Five engineers are to be appointed, three from the Engineering Corps of the United States Army, one from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and one from the engineering department of the District of Columbia.

This commission are to report their findings and recommendations to the Secretary of War at the earliest practicable time, with information as to the sources of supply, estimates of the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water sufficient to augment the present water supply of the District of Columbia.

The bill provides for an appropriation of $15,000 to carry out this work.

As has been repeatedly set forth in the local press, the consumption of water in the District of Columbia has been equal to and has many times exceeded the safe maximum carrying capacity of the existing conduits. During the heated term of last year more than 70,000,000 gallons of water were consumed in a single day, and the estimated safe daily capacity is about 65,000,000 gallons.

I desire to read at this point an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of June 8 in reference to the necessity of providing an additional source of supply:

THE WATER-SUPPLY PROBLEM.

In the matter of the water supply of the District there is no better-informed authority than Gen. W. M. Black, Chief Engineer of the Army, who was at one time engineer commissioner and has had direct and close acquaintance with the situation for years. Gen. Black, in a statement printed in another part of the Star to-day, says that there is urgent need of additional facilities for the supplying of Washington with water and that work on this extension should be promptly started. But Gen. Black holds that such remedies as that of pumping additional water into the reservoirs from the river below Great Falls will not meet the case and will serve only as an emergency palliative. The real need is for an additional conduit. To pump more water into the Dalecarlia Reservoir means to put a heavier burden upon the single line now existing.

The Dalecarlia project has two merits—cheapness and speed of execution. It can not be regarded as a solution of the water-supply problem. Its proposal has had the good effect of drawing attention sharply to the case and possibly it will result in a speeding of congressional action to the end of quick decision upon a definite plan of water extension.

Always, as Gen. Black says, the question of the wholesomeness of the water to be supplied to the people of Washington stands paramount. Secondly comes the question of sufficiency. Where can more water be obtained? The Great Falls can be dammed higher and more water impounded, or somewhere farther north in Maryland a wholesome supply can be found for distribution both to the local community and perhaps to some consumers in Maryland. There should be no delay while the relative merits of these two plans are considered. The urgent need is for more conduit lines here. For in any case the Great Falls supply will remain the stable resource of the District for a long period, even if another project is developed drawing a supplemental supply from a more distant source. And, furthermore, a second conduit is necessary to permit repairs and cleaning, which now are impossible with the single conduit in constant use.

This summer should witness action by Congress appropriating a large sum, not for further survey, for there have been surveys enough, but for immediate work on a new conduit. Whether Great Falls dam is raised or pumps are installed at Dalecarlia, more conduit capacity is a necessity. Washington will continue to grow and not even the most drastic water economies will bring the total consumption down to the point of safety of margin. It takes a long time to build a conduit. Work should be started on one this year.

There have been a number of investigations made of the territory in the proximity of the District, and an elaborate report was submitted to Congress in 1912 by Col. W. C. Langfitt dealing with the various projects for increasing the supply and also with the question of developing the water power at Great Falls for supplying light and power.

Since that time there have been a number of developments. Mr. Robert B. Morse has submitted a plan for securing an additional supply from the Patuxent River and utilizing both the Middle Patuxent and Little Patuxent as a source of supply as well as the Patuxent proper. In his report Mr. Morse outlines a plan somewhat different from the plan submitted by Col. Langfitt, in that the water is to be brought in a conduit to an open cut and not through a tunnel. This water is to be brought into the District by gravity, and it will eliminate the pumping of 20,000,000 gallons per day to the first high level.

The drainage areas of the three Patuxent valleys are shown in the report to be very sparsely settled. There are no villages of any size upon the whole area of 320 square miles which would be used. No railroad or electric line is within the area and most of it is far from any mail line of travel.

In addition to this report there has been submitted by Mr. Asa Phillips, sanitary engineer of the District, a plan for increasing the supply by means of pumping water into the Dalecarlia Reservoir, which would double the existing supply now available.

The provisions of this bill were submitted to Maj. Gen. W. M. Black, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and I desire to

insert his letter written to me under date of July 5, 1918, in reference to a similar bill, H. R. 12549:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1918.

Hon. F. N. ZIHLMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, relative to H. R. 12549, to create a commission and appropriate funds for investigating sources of water supply for the District of Columbia.

As you know, this question has been studied several times during the past decade, and three methods of augmenting the supply have been seriously considered: (1) A new aqueduct from Great Falls paralleling the present aqueduct; (2) a storage reservoir on the Patuxent River, with an aqueduct to the District; and (3) a combined water supply and water-power development in the Potomac River near Great Falls. In 1913 recommendation was made to Congress (H. R. 1400, 62d Cong., 2d sess.) that the combined power and water-supply project be undertaken, or if increased water supply only were to be considered, that the parallel aqueduct from Great Falls be constructed, but no action has been taken on any of these recommendations.

In the meantime some additional information regarding the Patuxent River as a source of supply has been received and a board has been organized, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, to discuss the feasibility and advisability of undertaking the development of the water-power project at Great Falls. In view of these facts, it would seem advisable to have the entire subject thoroughly investigated by a commission authorized by Congress in order that that body may have before it as a basis of early action for the increase of water supply a well-considered recommendation embodying the results of previous investigations as well as a careful study of present conditions.

The bill H. R. 12549 will probably provide satisfactorily for the necessary investigations, but it may be that the following revision, which is suggested for your consideration will make the measure a little more specific:

Change from the last three words at the end of line 8, page 1, to the period in line 10, page 2, to read as follows: "whose duty it shall be to make, under the direction of the Secretary of War, a full investigation of practicable sources of water supply in the District of Columbia, or within a reasonable distance from said District, with the view of increasing its water supply, and to report to the Secretary of War, with their recommendations, at the earliest practicable time, a project or projects for augmenting said supply, commensurate with the present and future needs of said District; also of the Federal military and other reservations contiguous to said District, and also of the territory embraced within the jurisdiction of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission; the said report to be accompanied by estimates of the probable cost of such project or projects, and by maps, dates, and information sufficient to give a clear understanding of what is available and what the said commission recommends.

Very respectfully,
W. M. BLACK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

I desire also to insert a letter from Brig. Gen. John G. D. Knight, late Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, under date of June 27, 1918:

ENGINEER COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, June 27, 1918.

Hon. FREDERICK N. ZIHLMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I note with interest that you have introduced a bill to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia. I, for one, thank you for action which I trust may receive timely support.

It is necessary to reiterate the warnings of those whose duty it has been and is to supply and distribute water for the District of Columbia. To these has been added that of our President while saving for the community the water supply of the White House fountains.

For many years, with selfish ends, attention has been invited to the need of an increased water supply. Now we find ourselves part of a community not limited by District lines, and alive not only to our own needs but also to those of the garrison across the Potomac.

I earnestly hope relief may forestall calamity.

Very respectfully,
JOHN G. D. KNIGHT,
Brigadier General, United States Army, retired,
Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia.

In the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, authority is given to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into a contract to furnish water to territory adjacent to the District of Columbia at rates to be based on the actual cost to the United States and the District, including an interest charge of 4 per cent per annum, and a suitable allowance for depreciation.

The interests of the District are safeguarded by provision limiting the amount so furnished to 3,000,000 gallons per day, and providing that that amount of water could be spared without jeopardizing the interests of the United States or the District of Columbia.

It is manifest that it will be impossible to carry out the terms of that act or to furnish water to the military camps and reservations in the vicinity of Washington unless the present supply is augmented either by the plan suggested by Mr. Phillips or the building of an additional conduit parallel with the present conduit, or utilizing the Patuxent River valleys.

The latter would furnish water from a very sparsely settled area and provide a much softer grade of water, which would materially decrease the filtering cost. This bill merely provides that the commission shall investigate these sources and make a recommendation to the Secretary of War, which report shall be submitted to Congress by him.

As so forcefully set out in the editorial I have just read, work should commence on this project in the immediate future, and it is hoped that plans can be submitted which will enable the commission to report in ample time to allow the surveys to be made during the coming winter season.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state what is the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is a board created by an act of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, recognized by the Federal authorities in the District appropriation bill of 1918, whereby the District Commissioners were authorized to enter into negotiations and contracts with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for the purpose of supplying water, provided it does not jeopardize the water supply of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. It has no jurisdiction within the District.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No jurisdiction within the District, except that it is given authority by the State of Maryland and that authority has been recognized by the Federal Congress in the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. WALSH. Might I ask the gentleman one further question. He says "one from the engineer department of the District of Columbia," who is to be appointed on this commission. Does that mean one of the engineers of the District?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. One of the engineer corps of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. The engineer corps, that is simply a member of the commission who is the engineer?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I understand they are civil engineers connected with the District of Columbia government. Within the past two weeks one of these engineers had made quite an exhaustive study of the subject and made recommendations as to the fesibility and practicability of getting a water supply at a very nominal cost.

Mr. WALSH. I was wondering why the member of this commission from the District should not be the engineer commissioner himself, instead of permitting the Secretary of War to select some other member of the corps. It seemed to me, as this so vitally affects the District of Columbia, the engineer commissioner might well be chosen to be a member of this special board.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I had an interview with the resident engineer commissioner about this bill. I submitted it to him, and he at first stated that sufficient investigation had been made on the project, that he himself had made an investigation some years ago. I laid before him additional data and plans that have been brought out since investigation was made, and after studying these plans and the letter submitted by Mr. Robert B. Morse, civil engineer, Col. Kutz, the present resident engineer commissioner, came before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, both last year and this year, and recommended the exact language of this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Gen. Knight is not the engineer commissioner now.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Gen. Knight, who died a few days ago, wrote a letter urging the passage of this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Has his successor been appointed?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. His successor, Col. Kutz, who was succeeded by Gen. Knight, resumed his duties as resident engineer commissioner immediately on his return from abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a commission of five members, three of whom shall be selected from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and one from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and one from the engineering department of the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to make full investigation of the sources of water supply from rivers and streams in the proximity of the city of Washington, with the view to increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia, and to report their findings and recommendations to the Secretary of War at the earliest practicable time, said report to be accompanied by data and other information as to such sources of supply, together with estimates of the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water sufficient to augument the present water supply of the District of Columbia commensurate with present and future needs, including the territory embraced within the jurisdiction of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and Federal military reservations contiguous to the District of Columbia. Such report shall be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War with his recommendation. And for the purposes herein authorized there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by and under the direction of said commission upon vouchers to be approved by the Secretary of War, and a detailed statement thereof shall accompany the commission's report.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the spelling of the word "augment," in line 7, on page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WALSH: Page 1, line 7, after the word "and," strike out the words "from the engineering department" and insert "the engineer commissioner."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, although the Secretary of War will select three members of this commission from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, yet it would seem that on a project to be investigated as important as this the engineer commissioner of the District, who has intimate knowledge of the needs of the District of Columbia and who is in close touch with the operations of the War Department, ought to be a member of this particular board rather than that we should permit the Secretary of War to appoint one of his subordinates to that position. Under the language of the bill, three engineers will be appointed from the Army. Of course, the engineer commissioner of the District is of the Engineer Corps of the Army. One would be appointed from the suburban sanitary commission, which is a commission under the jurisdiction of the State of Maryland. Then the Secretary may appoint, not the engineer commissioner, who is responsible for the engineering problems and their solution in the District, but one of his subordinates. Unless there is some serious objection to it, I think it would be better to put the engineer commissioner on the board, who will probably have to do with carrying out this program of increasing the supply after the plan has been agreed upon and authority has been received from Congress to go ahead. I offer the amendment in line with the suggestion made a moment ago in the question that I asked the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN]. I understand the language of the bill is satisfactory to the engineer commissioner; but we must remember that we are not legislating here to satisfy the engineer commissioner but to satisfy the needs of the District, and that it is within our prerogatives to include him upon this commission.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Has the gentleman followed this situation: The engineer commissioner of the District of Columbia is a very busy man. Every day he is looking after the duties of his office, supervising the building of streets, enlarging of the water mains, supervising the erection of buildings, and he is extremely busy.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I have thought of that; but he has plenty of assistants to do that, and I think that his assistants would be more competent to supervise these municipal improvements than, perhaps, they would be to sit as a member of this commission, which is to consider a very comprehensive plan, than to be member of a board whose personnel may be such that the assistant might not have the experience and qualifications required that the engineer commissioner himself would.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The bill authorizes the Secretary of War to appoint three members from the Corps of Engineers of the Army, and, of course, the Engineer Commissioner is detailed from the Army, so that the gentleman's amendment would give the Secretary of War or the engineering force of the Army four members out of five. Does not the gentleman think it would be well to have some one who is perhaps permanently connected with the engineering department of the District rather than an officer detailed from the Army to represent more particularly the District end of it?

Mr. WALSH. The question that arose in my mind was giving authority to select a subordinate of the Engineer Commissioner to pass upon and recommend plans for improving and extending the water supply of the District, so that he might be able to say to his superior, the Engineer Commissioner, "This is what I think about it, provided the others agree with me."

Mr. MAPES. There may be subordinate officers who would have more knowledge of this particular subject and be better qualified to serve on this particular board than the Engineer Commissioner himself.

Mr. WALSH. I doubt that very greatly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I call the committee's attention to this feature of the bill, that it is not intended solely for the purpose of supplying water to the District of Columbia proper, but there are certain areas outside of the District that desire to make arrangements so that they may get their water from the District, thereby taxing the supply of the District of Columbia beyond the capacity which the District of Columbia itself could properly demand. I do understand that the growth of the city has been such that there is some uneasiness expressed, whether real or not—it may be more a fear than a real trouble—that the supply of water is not equal to what it should be for fire protection of the District proper.

My own judgment is that we ought not to embark upon any plan to endeavor to supply from the Federal plant any of the communities outside of the District of Columbia. That matter has been before the Committee on Appropriations on several occasions. As certain communities in Maryland contiguous to the District of Columbia continue to increase in population that demand would be greater. Now, in order that they may get water they will find it, of course, infinitely cheaper to take their water at the very cheap Washington rate than it would be to establish a plant of their own. Now, you will find that a large amount of the influence behind this bill is prompted by that fact. I do not undertake to say there is anything improper about it, but personally I do not believe that Congress ought to undertake to expend money out of the Federal Treasury in extending its plant to supply water for anybody except the District of Columbia, which is absolutely under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

One clause here would indicate that in addition to these communities it was also intended to supply certain military activities. I presume, of course, that refers to Fort Myer and other communities like that. That might perhaps be cheaper for Fort Myer probably to take water across the river and get it from this plant, but what I am afraid of is that you will by this bill establish a precedent, and as communities begin to build up around the District of Columbia that each of these local separate incorporated towns and cities will want to attach themselves to the Federal plant for the purpose of getting water at a rate at which perhaps they could not get water otherwise.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will yield.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, I am sure the gentleman appreciates that this is not putting into effect any such plant as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. SISSON. I realize that fully.

Mr. WALSH. It is only an investigation, and it has to be passed upon by the Congress later.

Mr. SISSON. My reason for calling attention at this time is for the purpose of letting the RECORD show what we are likely to meet, in order that Congress should be put upon notice when they pass this bill, if they do pass it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. As I stated a few moments ago I do not see the necessity for this amendment. The language of this bill providing for the appointment of a member of the engineering force of the District of Columbia was passed upon not only by the present resident Engineer Commissioner, but by his predecessor in office, Gen. Knight, and it seems to me in view of the fact that the Engineer Corps of the Army will have three engineers upon this commission if it is created by act of Congress it would be advisable that one if not more than one of the members of the commission should be a civilian engineer and that the Army is adequately represented. The duties and responsibilities of the Engineer Commissioner are sufficiently onerous to demand all of his time and talents, and no good purpose can be served by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Now, in reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] I may say there has been an effort in the past to supply water to the territory adjacent to the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, and that need has been recognized and met by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. That committee has recognized that fact, and in the bill providing for the appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, was specified ways and means whereby this could be accomplished upon the payment of the actual cost of delivering the water, including an interest charge at 4 per centum per annum and a suitable allowance for depreciation, this matter having been acted upon by the committee of which the gentleman from Mississippi was a member, and probably was chairman of, and that subcommittee having this matter in charge. This has all been gone into and acted upon by both the House and Senate, and I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment. In line 14, page 2, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

Mr. MAPES. The committee will accept that amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get two minutes. I want to state to my friend from Maryland that while this item has been carried permitting certain citizens of Maryland to use the water company my friend realizes that it went on in the Senate, and my friend also realizes the influence in the Senate and the particular Senator who happens to be chairman of that subcommittee and the insistence with which it was pressed, that in order to get legislation it was necessary to be held up to some extent, but I will say it never went on in the House or with the approbation of the House or with the approbation of the subcommittee or with the approbation of the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be temporarily laid aside, and when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union arises that the bill be reported with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the bill was laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

PROTECTION OF GAME, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill H. R. 1199, a bill to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. WALSH. I object. I think, as it is a short bill, it should be read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. TEMPLE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 552) to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

PROTECTION OF GAME, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful, within the District of Columbia, for any person at any time to buy, sell, or expose for sale, or to have in possession for the purpose of selling, any game bird. For the purpose of this act the following shall be considered game birds: The anatidae, or waterfowl, including brant, wild ducks, geese, and swan; gruidae, or cranes, including little brown, sandhill, and whooping cranes; rallidae, or rails, including coots, gallinules, and sora, or other rails; limicolae, or shore birds, including avocets, curlew, dowitchers, godwits, knots, oyster catchers, phalaropes, plover, sandpipers, snipe, stilts, surf birds, turnstones, willet, woodcock, and yellow legs; columbidae, or pigeons, including doves and wild pigeons; gallinae, or grouse, including wild turkey, pinnated grouse, ruffed grouse, or any kind of grouse, and quail; reedbirds, or ricebirds; marsh blackbirds.

SEC. 2. That nothing herein contained shall prevent the right of any person to take or kill any of the wild fowls or birds in section 1 of this act mentioned when the same shall be so taken or killed by virtue of the authority of a license duly issued by the proper authorities of said District of Columbia for scientific purposes.

That any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall be fined not less than $25 nor more than $100, or be imprisoned for not more than one month, or both so fined and imprisoned: *Provided*, That each bird mentioned in this act so had in possession, bought, sold, exposed for sale, or had in possession for the purpose of sale shall constitute a separate offense.

SEC. 3. That nothing in this act shall prevent the sale at any time of Hungarian dark-necked pheasants, ring-necked pheasants, Mongolian pheasants, or mallard ducks when the same shall have been raised in captivity; of the sale of game birds alive for propagating purposes: *Provided*, That the same is done under such requirements as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a few suggestions regarding a national budget, and in doing so I will say that I hoped during this session to give this subject the time and effort it deserves, but having been unexpectedly drafted several days ago by the Speaker's appointment into the House War Department investigation, I can only offer a few observations and express hope that the tremendous importance of the national budget problem will be understood and its enactment will be urged vigorously by my colleagues. We must not delude ourselves through press reports into believing that an effective budget law is in sight. In my judgment, the struggle has hardly begun, the obstacles are many, and the effort to get a comprehensive measure instead of a weak compromise makeshift will challenge the best efforts of those who desire a real budget system.

Congress is constantly assailed in the press and by reputable business organizations throughout the country for extravagance and wasted time. Mistakes are sometimes excusable, but we can not remain blind to merited criticism for extravagance and wasted time that result from premeditation or without excuse. In no legislative body in the world is time of greater value than here—time for consideration of national legislative policies, time for over 400 Members to express individual judgment based upon public sentiment they represent, time for legislative investigations of administrative weakness that give publicity and invite penalties for evils found in all administrations as long as government prevails, and time intelligently to legislate.

Every student of the subject knows that our Government's legislative financial policy invites waste of both public money and public time. Ours is the only Government in the world without a businesslike budget system, and the only reason this Government was not adjudged bankrupt long ago is because of our ability and readiness to tax to the limit and to negotiate loans now quoted below par, which future generations are pledged to pay.

ENORMOUS INCREASE IN APROPRIATIONS DEMANDS A NATIONAL BUDGET.

Apart from the enormous increase in appropriations annually, reaching over 400 per cent in four years, and an increase in our bonded indebtedness of several thousand per cent within the same four years, we have contracted extravagant legislative habits with these lavish expenditures. Every locality and every special interest that can bring itself within a constantly broadening rule of Government aid is now on the job. The doors are thrown open wider than ever before to Federal aid, and all opposition, constitutional or otherwise, is swept aside whenever a breach can be made in the Federal vaults. Worthy and unworthy projects knock at the Treasury doors, hand in hand asking for help. Congress tries to recognize the rapidly increasing claims of many committees with varied interests and at the same time to press down the brakes, but the good and bad alike are linked together with bonds of mutual interest.

River and harbor improvements anywhere and everywhere, creeks, rills, and rivulets, good, bad, and indifferent, are bunched in the same bill. Public buildings for village crossroads persistently ask for money. Irrigation ditches to cost hundreds of millions of dollars to meet demands of land bone-dry communities; flood-control contributions from the Treasury to reclaim hundreds of millions of acres of private lands that still remain in the wet column; drainage schemes which go joyfully on with extravagant irrigation projects; water powers to make nitrates, fertilizer, and incidentally to make millions of dollars for their promoters; highways that reach from wherefore to whence; Army cantonments that have removed the blue-sky limit on real estate purchases and beat Ruth Law's altitude record; new arsenals that turn out trainloads of munitions soon to be obsolete; aviation contracts that smell to heaven; Hog Island shipyards that were properly christened in wine, water, and waste; and scores of other activities directly financed or indirectly receiving help from the Federal Treasury in times of war and peace; millions for armies of idle employees, employees engaged in useless surveys and interminable researches, gathering carloads of valueless statistics, and peregrinations from Maine to Mexico and Alabama to Alaska, pursuant to instructions from new and old bureaus of the Government; bulletins, pamphlets, and publications sufficient to cover the State of Texas, only a small part of which are read and not 1 per cent digested—these "activities," as they are called, have increased beyond all estimates within recent years.

No responsibility is fixed, because the different bureaus all work independently on the principle of grab jurisdiction and get all you can while you are getting. That is only a partial list of comparatively new fields of Government activities now engaged in helping individuals and localities which are financed

by direct taxes, including 2 cents per dish on ice cream. Knocking at the doors of Congress every session for increasing appropriations, these activities now reach tremendous proportions. How do we meet them? How does Congress provide? How does it function?

PRESENT PATCHWORK APPROPRIATION BILLS AND METHODS.

Mr. Chairman, a dozen or more appropriation committees of the House annually grind out patchwork appropriation bills without relation to each other, without knowledge of the aggregate amount to be appropriated, without definite knowledge of sources of revenue to supply the money, with slight knowledge of the comparative needs of bureaus, and frequently by bills that mean indefensible legislative compromises. Members of committees are generally selected because they are interested in the development of some particular department or bureau or locality project. Few men would consent to serve on the River and Harbor, Public Buildings, Public Lands, or other committees that may be named, excepting for the fact that they are primarily interested in some local "improvement," and large appropriations for hundreds of items are the price of the compromise bill. The papers back home, boards of trade, and influential committees advise their Representative or Senator that he is expected to bring home the bacon, and the price of failure in more than one case in this day and generation means political defeat. These potent influences are with Congress to-day in its appropriation bills. What unbiased judgment can be given by committee members under such conditions?

No other country in the world would endure this absurd and wasteful system that grows more menacing to the Federal Treasury every session. Ours, the most enlightened country, as we profess to believe, is the most backward and most unbusinesslike in its financial legislative methods. Individually, men in Congress to-day are as able, honest, and upright as any of their predecessors in past years, and arguments against extravagances and wasted time appeal to the average Representative, but we are confronted with long-established practice that places over 200 Members of the House on appropriation committees, on committees that enjoy influence and honors among those who come before them as suppliants for appropriations—honors as precious as are earrings to the statesmen of Timbuctoo.

Chairmen who are pictured and featured in the press, who enjoy especial privileges because of seniority, naturally will oppose changes in the present order of things, and this opposition must be overcome by argument and convincing proof that existing conditions can exist no longer. Every civilized country in the world has some form of budget system excepting the United States. Here irresponsibility has built up vicious unbusinesslike methods which I have briefly described.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to know how the budget system will help these matters.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will wait a few moments I will explain it to him. He is doing as Members of this House frequently do, interrupting a preliminary statement before it can be made.

Your party is pledged in this matter, and your President and mine has said you want it. You ask me how a budget system will help matters. Gentlemen should inform themselves on such matters. But if not I will offer a few suggestions.

ALL POLITICAL PARTIES DEMAND A NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic, Progressive, and Republican party platforms have all demanded the enactment of a budget system. None has yet been seriously considered by the American Congress, while proposed "investigations" postone definite action for years to come unless public sentiment and congressional responsibility can be aroused to the situation. There is no pride in discovery of the necessity for budget legislation, nor for bills or resolutions proposed by Senators or Representatives. Let the credit go wherever it may. What the country wants is action and early action, and I offer these remarks to that end. Delay has been sought on every pretext since ex-President Taft started the agitation many years ago, and so-called budget bills that seek further delay are among the most dangerous methods of avoiding the issue.

The plan for a comprehensive budget system is not hard to understand, although details may require careful consideration, and the fact that every country in the world excepting our own has a budget system is answer to all questions of policy.

Let me first briefly describe present legislative methods and how they will be improved under a budget plan. For years the different departments of Government have submitted to the Speaker annually an estimate of proposed expenditures for the next fiscal year. These estimates are frequently double the amount that the bureau or department expects to get or does get. When received, the department estimates are assigned by the Speaker to 14 different appropriation committees of the House. These committees organize and then call before them the heads of departments and bureaus directly affected by the bill to be prepared by the particular committee. Hearings are had by every committee, generally reaching hundreds of printed pages, with many thousands of pages of printed Appropriation Committee hearings in the aggregate. No individual Representative could intelligently read one-tenth part of the total hearings, if he had any desire to do so; and as a matter of procedure, only a handful of members can be kept in attendance in the committee, while efforts to preserve committee quorums are notoriously hopeless. Dry details of appropriations are not inviting to the average Representative. Finally, the chairman of the committee proceeds to prepare a bill for expenditures for that particular department or bureau for the next fiscal year. Sometimes the chairman is aided by employees of the department, with such other assistance as can be had. Committee members may help, but from the very nature of the work, which is frequently technical and always drudgery, the course of preparation is as indicated. The legislative appropriation ship is thus launched and started on its career without sails or rudder.

OMNIBUS BILL PORK BARRELS MUST END.

If the bill affects particular localities, like the River and Harbor Committee bill, liberal appropriations in amount and distribution are sought to be equitably scattered, with the aid of bureau chiefs, who soon ascertain the custom and reasons for the custom, until, "irrespective of partisanship," enough votes are equitably distributed to pass the bill. The Public Building Committee bill, that only carries authorizations, is probably the most scientifically constructed pork barrel that ever comes before Congress, and therefore is the easiest to identify. It carries one or more buildings or sites for a safe majority of the Members to insure its passage. Generally all the way from 200 to 300 districts will be found to have been provided for in this bill. One is now pending before the committee that may come out of hiding, like a German submarine, trying to torpedo the Federal Treasury.

If submitted separately instead of in omnibus measures, not one-half of the items would get to first base; but in unity there is legislative strength.

After the appropriation bills are reported to the House, numbering from a dozen to 15 or more every session, the fight for recognition on the floor of the House then occurs, and thereafter for months the attention of the House is occupied with these patchwork, loosely prepared, and hurriedly thrown together bills carrying in the aggregate many billions of dollars. When the dozen or more bills get before the House, ordinarily covering a period of 10 to 15 weeks or more for discussion, it becomes difficult to keep a quorum of 100 Members present in the House. Frequently the number in attendance is less than a score, or under 5 per cent of the House membership. Other committee hearings, other official duties, and primarily lack of interest in interminable appropriation details and in discussion of subjects foreign to the bill before the House explains the situation.

Proposed amendments offered by Members to strike out or reduce items will fail nine times out of ten, because the committee is bound by an unwritten rule to stand together on every item in the bill, and the familiar appeal to "stand by the committee" is a continuous slogan. No matter how bad the item or amount, when once reported it goes through. Efforts to increase amounts on particular items sometimes succeed when the mover of an amendment interested in some particular project or item gets his friends on the floor when the committee is caught napping. If he fails in his effort to increase or insert in the House, true to form, he takes his amendment and grievance to his Senator, where the result is brought about in committee or on the floor of the upper House and is put through in conference. It is a legislative burlesque with statesmanship accompaniment.

LEGISLATIVE FOLLY IN DEALING WITH FINANCIAL PROBLEMS.

Mr. Chairman, during the passage of the $800,000,000 military bill this month, when many items of the bill were subjected to severe criticism, the 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee, the Interstate Commerce Committee, and different appropriation committees, including over 200 Members, were in practically continuous committee sessions. Little more than a corporal's guard at times was on hand in the House to consider an Army bill that was admittedly cut over $300,000,000 from the same bill passed by the House four months before and then killed in the Senate. Lump-sum items of practically $100,000,000 each appeared in the military bill, covering

scores of miscellaneous purposes, important and unimportant in character. In a bill cut from $1,117,000,000 to $809,000,000 and carrying many doubtful items which had been attacked in the preceding session, only a small minority of the House was kept in attendance. That is substantially the history of legislative consideration of every appropriation bill, big and little. When the same bill gets to the Senate a little matter of seventy or eighty million dollars is reinstated just to show where real authority rests.

Every Member is cognizant of the facts, but under the present lack of any system he is powerless to act.

Let me give a few examples of legislative folly within the past few days that speak for themselves. It is a matter of recent history that eight appropriation bills, after many months' consideration last year in the House, were passed to the Senate, where they failed in the legislative discard last session. Then they aggregated over $3,000,000,000. Again hearings were held this session on these same eight bills; again they were prepared and reported; and again attacked and defended on the floor in a series of attempts at economy—largely for political effect, it was claimed. I say "attempts" advisedly, because any attempt to prepare or consider an appropriation bill in the usual way is unbusinesslike, wasteful, and a legislative farce.

SURREPTITIOUS STATESMANSHIP ON A $12,000 SIRUP ITEM.

Take the Agricultural bill for illustration, which, after having been passed by the House and killed by the Senate last session, was again hastily prepared this session and again reported to the House carrying $32,000,000, a reduction of several million from the amount recommended by the senatorial committee last session. This bill had to be passed by Congress before the 1st day of July, 1919, or the Agricultural Department would be stranded. About 30 legislative days remained when debate was begun in the House on this Agricultural bill on May 27, and debate on the bill ended on June 4, or 8 days, including 5 legislative working days. One amendment to reduce a $12,000 sirup item to $5,000 was vigorously debated and developed much latent statesmanship, until finally Majority Leader MONDELL was obliged to lecture the House for its unbusinesslike, dilatory tactics. Hundreds of other items were discussed in the 5 days' debate on the Agricultural bill. At that rate of progress of 5 days for a $32,000,000 bill, the military bill, carrying $800,000,000, or the naval bill, carrying $600,000,000, would consume about 80 out of the 25 remaining days prior to July 1, or 80 days out of 25, with other bills to follow. This absurd situation was complicated by the further fact that other matters sometimes have the right of way. After such conditions were untangled, the Senate also had to give intelligent consideration to all of these same bills. Folly? It is worse than folly; it is downright incompetency, for which we are accountable, and both branches of Congress must accept their full share of responsibility. This is done regularly under a plea of confession and avoidance.

With several billion dollars in appropriations hanging fire, the Agricultural bill carrying less than 1 per cent of the total to be appropriated was given one-sixth of the legislative time remaining for discussion in the House, and then it went to the Senate. That policy can not find an apologist in Congress, and yet when the District of Columbia appropriation bill followed, on June 4, it carried less than $15,000,000, or one-half of 1 per cent of the total appropriations to be passed in the remaining 25 legislative days left to the House and Senate. The District bill took four more legislative days of the precious time remaining before the end of the fiscal year, while the great military and naval bills, carrying $1,319,000,000, and containing many hundreds of items, received less than a week's consideration.

Let me call attention to other evidence of our display of collective legislative wisdom and business methods. Congress is required by present practices to give nearly 10 per cent of its legislative time to the District of Columbia. "District day" occupies the center of the stage, like a turbulent town meeting, once or twice every month, and the appropriation bills and other District legislation, like the poor, are ever with us. A city of the size of Milwaukee or Cleveland is constantly figuring in the center of the ring. Washington papers feature in pictures and laudatory articles those who favor a so-called half-and-half taxing scheme, inaugurated about the time the tables were handed down to Moses on the mount. Annually, semiannually, and even by-weekly this momentous problem comes before Congress. Girded to the loins for battle, the antagonists on the half-and-half District tax, backed by the Washington press, little and big, struggle in Titan conflict on this momentous tax question for Washington.

SIXTEEN MEMBERS PRESENT DURING AN APPROPRIATION-BILL DEBATE.

What matters whether military, naval, railroad, or other appropriation bills pass, so long as half and half retains its grip. Champions are crowned with laurel wreaths, while Goliath Philistines are roasted and toasted and slingshotted into temporary oblivion as both ends of the Capitol become a sewing circle debating society with the half-and-half tax a bone of contention on which to sharpen teeth of able statesmen. For many precious minutes on the District appropriation bill the House discussed the salary of one Beeler and his assistant, who tried to untangle the local street car snarl. Explanations were demanded and given time after time. At the close of the first day's debate in the House on the District bill, Judge GARD, of Ohio, said to the Chair, "There are hardly 20 people in the Hall, and I move that the committee do now rise." In other words, out of 435 Members less than 5 per cent would stay to listen to the discussion. A vote on an item at that time showed 6 ayes and 10 noes, or 16 men, good and true, were present. That was all that could be mustered at a time when several billions of dollars in appropriation bills were waiting passage, with less than 25 legislative days remaining in which the Senate and House must enact all these appropriation bills into law.

I have given some side lights on two or three bills that have been taking up the time of Congress under the present system or lack of system. Is it any wonder that waste of time and money is incalculable under this childish, absurd practice, that would merit a schoolmaster's castigation if infants in the primary department were guilty of like conduct? How much longer will kindergarten customs govern Congress?

I believe I have fairly described some things for which intelligent men—statesmen, Congressmen—for the last half century have been to blame. No responsibility for bills, no limit to appropriations, no relation to revenues, no intelligent or businesslike way of handling the legislative financial interests of the greatest Government in the world. Such inefficiency in a large part will be remedied by the adoption of a real budget system.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I always yield to our distinguished ex-Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the gentleman any remedies to suggest by which Members can be kept here?

Mr. FREAR. I am going to divert for a moment, if permitted. By the adoption of a budget system we can keep Members here, because we will save at least two months of legislative work every year by the adoption of such a system. Members will remain in attendance when important matters are considered. We are here to-day, presenting the most ridiculous spectacle in the world. We are here with the District of Columbia appropriation simply acting as a board of aldermen. That work ought to be taken from the floor of the House, and then 30 days will be sufficient time to give to the consideration of an annual budget.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman has never answered the question that I asked him. It was if he had any suggestion to make about how to keep Members in attendance here?

Mr. FREAR. I suggested to the distinguished ex-Speaker, and I tried to make it as clear as possible, that it will be helped by the adoption of a budget system. Members will not come and listen to the kind of discussion we have had in the last two hours on this floor. They have more important business to perform elsewhere.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How would a budget system induce men to come here to-day and listen to this debate about the water question and things of that kind?

Mr. FREAR. It would take away all the appropriation detail matters and give time for questions of national importance. Now, if the gentleman from Missouri will pardon me, there is no other way, in my judgment, whereby you can do it. Its adoption is a proper thing not only in the saving of time, but in removing many present criticisms that are justly lodged against Congress.

PRACTICAL FEATURES OF A REAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

What is a national budget system? I will not attempt to discuss the subject technically, because, while the general plan is simple and easily understood, matters of technical detail or ramifications of the system are not important to consider. Congress has neither the time, training, nor desire to master such details. Briefly, an efficient budget system includes, first, a businesslike preparation of estimates of expenditures by the President or the administration acting through the Secretary of the Treasury or other agency. As the administration spends the money, it should know what money is claimed to be needed.

This statement of departmental estimates carefully prepared by one who will be held responsible for all the items and the total amount contained in the preliminary budget should be in lieu of the unrelated estimates now furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury under the several acts of 1884, 1901, and 1906, at which latter date President Taft tried to make a beginning, but failed.

When an intelligent report has been carefully compiled by the administration the budget reaches the next step. Second, the administration budget should be placed in the hands of an auditor general, comptroller, or other agent of Congress, *appointed by Congress, and acting independent of the administration.* This official, with whatever technical aids and clerical help may be required, will make a complete analysis of the budget, comparing its items with prior bills, cutting down wherever practicable to do so, and making a complete audit or accounting on behalf of Congress, which he represents, a duty now imperfectly performed by nonexpert Congressmen year after year. This report will be presented to Congress in the early days of the session, having been prepared in advance by competent experts. Thereafter comes the last and most important step of all.

Third and last, the auditor general's report having been audited on behalf of Congress by expert accountants reaches the stage for legislative action, and is referred to a budget committee, preferably a joint committee of the two Houses. This committee takes up the auditor's report and gives whatever hearings may be found necessary. The bill or budget is jointly considered throughout by the single joint budget committee, and then it is reported to the respective Houses of Congress for passage, but first by the House. The bill then is passed by both Houses.

Mr. Chairman, this budget procedure should be hedged about so that increases in items of appropriations can be made in committee only by two-thirds vote and no increase shall be in order by an individual Member on the floor. The administration's budget and congressional action then become matters of record responsibility. Congress must appropriate for actual needs or be held justly and politically responsible. Emergency appropriations can be similarly checked, but practically all unnecessary waste in time and money will be eliminated by this plan, according to the experience of other countries, and *any real budget system must have only one budget committee.*

BUSINESS METHODS SHOULD SUPPLANT INDEFENSIBLE PRACTICES.

This general plan for budget legislation, with some modifications, is adopted by other countries where an effective system is in use. It is the only way to prevent many of the evils now existing, and for that reason possibly it will meet opposition in both House and Senate from those whose present position of influence, power, and prestige on appropriation committees would be radically affected or possibly end. It would prevent river and harbor pork barrels, because the River and Harbor Committee could not prepare bills or insert items other than those presented by the administration. It would effectually squelch the public-building pork-barrel scandal because necessity and not legislative pull would determine what waterways would be improved and what buildings erected. Bucolic statesmen who sometimes have charge of such measures may fume and storm at this "surrender" of legislative perquisites, but men who desire to do public business on business principles will welcome the reform.

From such sources as thrive on political pull, opposition will come to any radical change, and no man will discount the strength of that opposition at both ends of the Capitol, but, like an aching tooth, present practices must be plucked out and an efficient substitute provided. The budget will meet every requirement. It does meet such needs in all other countries of the world, and that is a safe test, whereas ours fails in all important essentials.

Let me briefly discuss plans now before Congress, introduced at this session, and in doing so I call attention to the fact that a familiar method of preventing legislative reform is to introduce measures that emasculate the substantive features of a proposed reform, and yet pretend to favor it. Oftentimes this is unconsciously aided by those unfamiliar with the ends to be reached or with the general subject.

THE LONG FIGHT FOR A NATIONAL BUDGET MUST SUCCEED.

The experience of other countries has brought the budget system into pronounced favor. For years it has been urged in this country; bills have been introduced, resolutions asking for its adoption have been offered, and advocates of the budget have been urging it upon Congress in both House and Senate. I make no pretense to especial activity, but realizing that the best argument in favor of a budget would be to expose present inefficient extravagant methods, I have to the best of my ability since my first election to Congress openly opposed several pernicious bills that have made congressional legislative methods a by-word and a joke. In 1914 I opposed the river and harbor bill for several days on the floor of the House, exposing its waste and fraud as I viewed it. That bill was killed in the Senate. Every such bill offered since that time has been exposed, and a position on the committee for several years did not effect my course. Members of the River and Harbor Committee and of the House have stated that a decided improvement in bills has resulted, but I am frank to say that no bill prepared as such bills are prepared can ever bear any semblance to a bill based on governmental necessities.

Opposition to the public-building extravagance is known to many Members and has been frequently expressed in debate. No omnibus bill has passed the House during the six years I have been a Member of this body, although it has been a constant Barkis. I take no special credit for that result, but, supported by leading members of the Democratic administration and by many members of my own party, I have tried on the floor and elsewhere to stop the notorious pork-barrel practice that is a stench in the nostrils of the American public.

This was all preliminary to active work on a budget plan, which, to my mind, is the only effective way of ending such objectionable legislative practices. Over a year and a half ago I spoke for a budget bill in the House and introduced resolutions urging its passage. Ever since that date I have urged it, as have other Members of the House and Senate, in season and out. Three measures are before Congress at this time that should receive your consideration. Those introduced by myself are House joint resolution 83, introduced May 30; House bill 4061, introduced May 30; House bill 3738, introduced May 28; and one or two other minor bills. House joint resolution 83 and bills 4061 and 3738 are all that directly affect the plan I submit. Other bills are designed to take from the Treasury Department governmental activities that should be undertaken by other departments and in order that the Treasury Department may be free to take over many important duties that would come to it under a budget system.

Bill No. 4061 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall gather together all departmental estimates and make them into a tentative budget, which he shall furnish the President by November 15 of each year. No resolution or bill can compel specific action by the President, but every President will hail the chance to present in a businesslike manner the facts which he is unable to properly place before Congress under existing methods. Bill No. 3738 provides for an auditor general, who, acting as an employee of Congress, takes over certain duties now performed by the Treasury Department and, in addition, proceeds to audit, improve, and, where possible, reduce the estimates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury. In order to remove him and his corps of assistants from the control or influence of the administration he is to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, in concert with the majority and minority leaders of the House. The budget is to reach this auditor general and his corps of assistants by November 15 every year, and by January 15 he is required to present it to the House.

THE MOST IMPORTANT LINK IS A SINGLE-BUDGET COMMITTEE.

House joint resolution 83, which is the most important link in the budget plan, provides for a change of rules in House and Senate, so that, instead of a score of committees in the two Houses wasting months of legislative time, overlapping each other's duties and jurisdiction, with enormous financial waste, House joint resolution 83 provides one joint budget committee of both Houses will receive the budget reported by the auditor general and, after such hearings as may be necessary, held in joint committee session, will report the approved budget to the House and Senate for discussion. So far as practicable, the plan is hedged about by simple, direct methods for protecting the Federal Treasury from existing waste and insures a large saving of legislative time and of money.

The resolution and bills were prepared by me, but taken from other measures offered in the past, with such changes as might be desirable. No pride of authorship exists, nor are these bills or the resolution urged in the precise form presented, but any plan that fails to give Congress a complete control over the auditor general's appointment and activities and that fails to place in the hands of one committee the entire control of the budget will fail to give needed relief.

THREE BUDGET PLANS THAT HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to state the distinction between this plan described and the so-called McCormick plan introduced by Senator McCORMICK in the Senate, and the Good bill, H. R. 1201, introduced by Representative GOOD in the House.

Senator McCORMICK has secured action by the Senate Rules Committee, creating a special Senate committee to "investi-

gate" a budget system. The Senate may be in advance of the House, notwithstanding the House is the body in which all revenue bills and appropriation bills originate, and we should not be backward in advancing this reform. In my judgment, if the McCormick resolution and accompanying bills introduced last session become law, the American Congress will have a strong, efficient budget system. I suspect we have both received aid and inspiration from the same source, from Mr. Collins, an expert accountant and clear thinker, whose work on the budget is a masterpiece of concise argument.

The McCormick resolution, submitted in House Document No. 1006, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, provides for a committee of 40 members, which, for the sake of securing a legislative center rush to put through the resolution, is a good move. House joint resolution 83, which I introduced, provides for a joint committee of both Houses, made up of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, consisting of about the same number. This latter plan was proposed because for 76 years the Ways and Means Committee was the budget committee of the House, and since the organization of Congress it has been the committee charged with the duty of raising revenues. This duty, when performed by a budget committee, should be combined with that of passing upon appropriations and expenditures. In addition to these reasons, I believed hearings on present bills might proceed more expeditiously; but I am free to say that whether that committee or a special committee is selected, it will be hailed by every advocate of legislative economy as a great improvement over the present system.

The provision in my resolution for joint hearings, joint consideration, and simultaneous report to the House and Senate is a matter of detail that could be provided in any change of rules. In the matter of audit on the part of Congress and in the original preparation of the budget by the Treasury Department the two plans are much alike, doubtless arising from the same source of budget aid furnished Congress.

The Good bill is the only other measure that seems to have received special notice, and it is probable that Representative GOOD would not insist on limiting his plan to the powers contained in his bill. Otherwise it would only be a makeshift and fail in the vital elements that should compose a budget system. House bill No. 1201, known as the Good bill, suggests a different method of collecting department data and presenting estimates, but provides effectively for the preparation of an administration budget. From that point, however, the plans differ, and the Good bill directs the President to appoint an auditor or comptroller to examine the administration bills as the agent of Congress. The weakness of this procedure in a matter of such momentous importance requires no discussion when compared to a plan that requires the Speaker and majority and minority budget, audited by an official appointed by the President, to be divided among the 14 appropriation committees without any limit as to appropriations and no further semblance to a real budget plan. In other words, the bill is a budget bill only in leaders to appoint, as provided in the McCormick bill and in bill No. 3738.

CONTINUED "INVESTIGATIONS" BURIED BUDGET LEGISLATION FOR 10 YEARS.

The most needful link in an effective budget, a single budget, or appropriation committee is absent in the Good bill, which preserves the present House rules and leaves the administration budget, *audited by an official appointed by the President, to be divided among the 14 appropriation committees without any limit as to appropriations and no further semblance to a real budget plan.* In other words, the bill is a budget bill only in name. A provision is inserted that a committee will be appointed to "investigate" what further legislation is needed. After many years of budgetry agitation, adoption by every party in a pledge for a budget reform, and after over two years' delay since the last national platforms were adopted, no more effective method of burying a budget system could be devised than to now provide for an "investigating" committee. The Republican Party can not go before the people with any such plan and call it a fulfillment of a specific pledge. I do not assume that is the purpose of this bill, which preserves intact all the present appropriation committees, but its effect is to delay or destroy early budget legislation.

Our Democratic friends ignored their platform pledge and also the request of the President for a single appropriation committee. Passage of the Good bill would mean nothing tangible and preserve the evils of which we stand convicted by our own record. Mr. SHERLEY, former chairman of the Appropriation Committee, declared that the budget was opposed in the House by 200 specific objections and every reason was a membership on one of the 14 appropriation committees. We must overcome those 200 odd arguments by convincing Members that it is the right thing, the honest thing, to do; the square thing with the country and with our constituents; and that any man who can make good on an appropriation committee that deals in dry details can do better legislative service for his country and receive commendation from his constituents when giving his energies to great national problems, which he will be permitted to do if appropriation committee drudgery is turned over to expert auditor accountants. Then the only function of appropriation committees, apart from the budget committee, will lie in legislative policies for the department represented.

Mr. Chairman, in these few remarks I have spoken with some frankness about present inefficient, wasteful, and scandalous methods of legislating on financial matters of the Federal Government. Members will realize that great moderation has been shown in the terms used and that any private business would be ruined in short order by methods we practice here. Many Senators and Representatives in past and present years have referred to some of our legislation in specific terms of "stealing," "looting the Treasury," and "criminal waste." These men have vainly talked against practices that are nearly as bad to-day as they have been in the past, and the last river and harbor bill, carrying scores of vicious, extravagant projects, with some items of war necessity, and the indefensible public-building pork barrel promised to be introduced in a few days, are testimonials to such bad practices.

RECRIMINATION ON EXTRAVAGANCE WOULD CEASE WITH A BUDGET.

For six years the Republican side of the aisle has vigorously charged the Democrats with extravagance, waste, and taking the "blood of the people" for their toll. To this our Democratic friends have retorted, "Republicans are just as bad, and are equally responsible for the preparation and passage of appropriation bills that measure expenditures." Unprejudiced minds must admit both are on trial, and until a thorough, genuine budget system is adopted it will continue to be a case of the pot calling the kettle black. On different occasions I have stated emphatically that individually and collectively congressional standards are higher to-day than ever before, due in part, I believe, to direct primaries that bring direct responsibilities, while temptations of old, offered through powerful lobbies, easy money, and direct methods have disappeared. Not only are standards higher, but in private and public dealings in Congress to-day, whatever may be the popular conception, men are known to their colleagues to be honest and high-principled.

Possibly no Member of this body has spoken more frankly in the recent past against congressional extravagance, or more vigorously denounced specific legislation, than I have done; but my high regard for this great body, individually and collectively, caused me to resent security-league calumny and to demand that we vindicate ourselves and disclose the hypocrisy of those whose bigotry, ignorance, and malice caused them to regard their own kind as supermen, whereas they were only types of the egotistical ass that does not understand people in general. Congress is made up of able men in close touch with their fellow men, and, I believe, is representative of the best elements of citizenship throughout the country, but Congress, individually and collectively, will not respond to public sentiment or throw off inefficient, unbusinesslike ways, wherever political prestige is to be sacrificed, excepting through an upheaval that rarely occurs.

To the hundreds of business and commercial organizations throughout the country, and the powerful press agencies that have voiced a demand for better government legislation through the adoption of an effective budget system, I will say frankly you are no nearer the mark than before you started, excepting for public education that has resulted.

CONGRESS MUST KEEP PLEDGES MADE BY ITS PLATFORMS AND LEADERS.

President Taft was enthusiastic about overturning present wasteful conditions, but a decade has passed without any appearance of budget reform for which he worked. President Wilson made a direct appeal from the Clerk's desk of the House two years ago for a single appropriation committee, but not one move has been made by Democrats or Republicans to bring about that single needed reform. All the political parties in their national platforms have demanded genuine budget legislation, but not one move has occurred to secure specific reform, excepting individual efforts to that end. Any real move will encounter blind switches and legislative sidetracks by way of further "investigations." Congress does not care for all the resolutions and petitions in Christendom, whether issued by commercial or other organizations, because Congress has heard that men have innocently signed petitions to hang themselves, and Congress ordinarily responds only to direct action.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat how a budget plan works.

After the preparation of the budget is made by the administration, no matter what party it may belong to, a full statement will show what the probable expenditures of the Government will be for the next fiscal year. That is provided for in one of the bills I have introduced and which I shall attach to my remarks. Other Members have introduced similar bills. A second bill I have introduced provides for the appointment of an auditor general or accountant, and with his force of men he will take this administration statement, the same as is done in other governments, and he will go over the various items of the budget, make comparisons with the preceding year, and reduce items wherever practicable—work that is done to-day by the average Member of Congress. We are not fitted for the work. We have neither the time nor training to give to it. That ought to be looked after by technical gentlemen, accountants, experts acting for Congress, men who can make the comparisons. And then the budget goes to the budget committee of both House and Senate. That ought to be presented at the beginning of the session.

I have introduced a resolution in this case to have a budget committee composed of Members of both Houses, who will jointly and at the same time consider the auditor general's report. After they have made their examinations and changes and reported to the House, no Member on the floor of this House will have the right to increase the appropriation. This budget committee presents the budget, and its consideration ought not to take over 30 days, compared with several months under present methods, that is the heart of a real budget plan.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I want to consider this proposition, and I want to put my statement before you briefly, if I may. Otherwise I would gladly yield.

When we have passed upon the budget bill the Senate and the House are nearly agreed as to the items, although it goes through the House first, according to the resolution I have introduced.

The budget committee has the preparation of the revenues and the expenditures of the revenues of the Government. That is the proper place for its consideration, the same as in other governments. Every government on the face of the earth has a budget system except ours, and in no other government is there so much carelessness and so much looseness in regard to appropriations. I do not say this is the only practical budget system, but I say that any good budget system that contains the propositions I have mentioned will prove a great improvement over our present system. Of course, you will have to do away with your 14 appropriating committees, having control over 14 to 20 appropriation bills. That is a first and a hard proposal to accept.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take up the gentleman's time——

Mr. FREAR. I do not feel that I have the right to refuse to yield to the distinguished ex-Speaker.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will get some more time, but this is one of the most important questions that have been discussed since I have been here. Has the gentleman ever figured on these 14 appropriation bills coming from 7 appropriating committees? There are 21 Members on each committee and 7 times 21 is 147. You have 147 Members against you to start with.

Mr. FREAR. I appreciate that, and it is a far larger number than you have stated. The gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, when chairman of Appropriation Committee, said to me, "You will have over 200 against you to start with." But we are going to make the fight through public sentiment, and we must convince our own membership it is right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not opposed to it. I am just suggesting to you the futility of talking about it.

Mr. FREAR. We have never got anywhere on anything on earth that we have not talked about. I know that the distinguished ex-Speaker, with all the power that he possesses, must be in sympathy with the proposition of saving time and saving money, and——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, of course, and I am in sympathy with getting up some kind of a scheme to induce Members to come here and attend to business.

Mr. FREAR. When we adopt a budget system, which I believe will come in several years, although the newspapers are claiming that it will be indorsed at this session, then we will have Members attend these sessions. I realize the great obstacles that the ex-Speaker has mentioned, and I know the opposition to the project, and what is true here is true with respect to the body at the other end of the Capitol, and Senators are more jealous of their rights, their powers, and perquisites than are the Members of this body. But it has got to come.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is there no chance now?

Mr. FREAR. Because there are over 200 members of committees having appropriating power who do not want to lose their prestige. I have sat on one of these committees, and I know what it means, but they must come to it. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced three bills, or rather one resolution and two bills, which I offered, and, as I show in my resolution, I have selected the Committee on Ways and Means as the one committee of the House to represent the budget. I do not care whether you appoint an independent committee or not. There is not a Member of this House—I do not care who he is—who can not render more valuable service to his country and to his constituents by working on important general legislation than by sitting on an appropriating committee and trying to do detail work such as we try to do for months at a time and in an inefficient manner.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. Certainly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Under our Constitution, with a Senate that changes one-third of its membership every two years, and with a House that changes every two years, how in the world can you have a budget governing the whole public service and get anything out of it? As I understand it, in Great Britain, when their budget is turned down, they go to the people at an election. You can not do that here. I suppose that is also so in France, and I suppose it is so in Italy.

Mr. FREAR. If the distinguished Republican ex-Speaker, to whom we all listen with profound respect, as we also listen to ex-Speaker CLARK, and with all due deference to their views, because we learn so much from them, will reflect a moment he will realize that when the Republican Party challenges the record of the Democratic administration or when the Democratic Party challenges the record of a Republican administration we must stand on our record, on the moneys we demand and are voted, and if a Republican Congress does not give a Democratic administration a sufficient amount of money to properly run the Government, the public at large will not retain us in the service, but will turn us out. That is our responsibility. In other countries to which reference has been made they oust the ministry. Here we can not do that. It will take time to make necessary changes, but fundamentally the same principle is at the bottom of it. Under this resolution that I have proposed and under the two bills that are proposed we would have the same situation as exists in Great Britain, where an enormous amount of time and an enormous amount of money is saved compared with our lack of system.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman desired to be notified before his time had expired.

Mr. FREAR. I realize, as both distinguished ex-Speakers have said, that it is hard to attempt to outline in brief time the importance of this subject, but I am going to insert the bills, resolution, and other data, and if you will do me the honor to read them you will find a way pointed out, and you will find I have outlined not only the faults of the present system, but the object to be attained by a new real budget plan.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes. If he can devise a way to get a budget, I would like to hear of it. I am not opposed to the budget. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Not to be taken out of the time agreed upon?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; not to be taken out of the time agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] be allowed to proceed 10 minutes more, the time not to be taken out of the time agreed upon.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, can that be done when the time has been fixed by the House?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has been done a thousand times.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair considers it can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order that the Committee of the Whole House has no authority to increase the time that has been fixed in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is well taken. If unanimous consent is granted, the Chair would consider that it could be done. But the rules specifically provide otherwise, so that the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. FREAR. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that this is not offered as a motion before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been presented, but the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] made the request, and the Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Missouri if he so desires.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wanted it put, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri requests unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] be extended 10 minutes, the same not to be taken from the time as agreed upon for general debate. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think that is an extremely bad precedent for us to set, and I very much regret to say that I feel compelled to object. I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin has made a study of the matter, but——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. FREAR. I appreciate the force of the objection and also the generous purpose of the mover of the motion.

I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is the most important question before the House in regard to our legislative action. I feel I can give but little time to it. My work in the war-expenditures investigation is marked out, as I said at the outset, and I hope others will undertake the work I began several years ago in company with others to secure a real budget system. I must hurry, for my time is limited.

IF WE FAIL TO GIVE THE COUNTRY A BUDGET SYSTEM ANOTHER CONGRESS WILL KEEP THE PLEDGE.

Mr. Chairman, some economies have been had through exposures of bills on the floor, but unless it is to be a matter of hope and promise early reform can only be reached by active efforts to secure individual pledges from the most conservative, holdfast body in the world—the American Congress. Self-interest is an argument that reaches close to men in public life. The best way to remove self-interest here and political interest of those whose first love is an appropriation committeeship and prestige in effecting direct action on the Public Treasury is by self-interest in conditions back home. Home constituencies and the country at large must emphasize the fact that the country will no longer tolerate delay or congressional inaction. A real budget will come when Congress is convinced that if it does not give the reform another Congress will be returned that will.

Practical results will be secured by practical means, and a budget system will be had when public sentiment demands the reform.

Briefly, by way of summary, I have attempted to describe, first, the many influences that surround Congress seeking aid and tending to create legislative waste and extravagance in a monetary way.

Second. The absurd and unbusinesslike spectacle presented in handling administrative expenditures through 20 different appropriation committees of Congress, all of which hold separate hearings and pretend to prepare bills and make investigations that can be properly performed only by administration sources, then examined by experts on behalf of Congress, and finally by a single congressional committee that would have matters of financial policy rather than details to consider.

Third. I have given the general effect of an efficient budgetry plan, its purposes, and brief mention of several measures now before Congress.

In conclusion. I repeat what was said at the outset, a comprehensive budget would, in my judgment, save to the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars annually without injuring or affecting adversely a single legitimate public interest. It would save many weeks' time in the aggregate to Members who now fritter away months of valuable hours in the discussion of appropriation bills in committee and in Congress—time that could be used to better advantage by every Member in the consideration of important legislative problems, and would shorten sessions proportionately if we act with judgment.

In other words, it would be a blessing to the individual Member, to the taxpayers who pay the bills, and, last and most important, to the country.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say this is a work that we ought to finish, and individual Members ought to study the whole proposition to bring it about, because, as I said at the outset, every political party has demanded it in its platform. We are pledged to enact it into law. Every country on the face of the globe has a budget system to-day except the United States. We know that it will save weeks and months of legislative time every year. We know it will save probably hundreds of millions of dollars every year if it can be adopted, and we must agree upon it. The obstacles against it consist of the honorary positions that are occupied by men at both ends of the Capitol, high positions which they honestly treasure. Those positions are a matter of personal pride with them. But if we want to save all this time and money to the people, if we want to become more efficient in our methods of legislation, it is our duty to pass a national budget system. [Applause.]

I am presenting brief data in connection with my remarks that are related to the general subject:

Appropriation bills passed by the House at session ended Mar. 4, 1919, for the fiscal year 1920.

No.	Title of bill.[1]	Passed House.[1]	Approved.[1]	Total appropriation.[2]
1	District of Columbia	Dec. 11, 1918		$14,091,701.00
2	Post Office	Dec. 18, 1918	Feb. 23, 1919	311,466,149.00
3	Rivers and harbors	Jan. 11, 1919	Mar. 2, 1919	11,178,164.00
4	Legislative	Jan. 18, 1919	Mar. 1, 1919	97,940,411.77
5	Diplomatic and Consular	Jan. 22, 1919	Mar. 4, 1919	9,841,661.67
6	Indian	Jan. 23, 1919		11,066,397.01
7	Agriculture	Feb. 1, 1919		11,671,022.00
8	Second deficiency for 1919	Jan. 29, 1919	Feb. 25, 1919	292,714,084.71
9	Pensions	Feb. 1, 1919	do	215,030,000.00
10	Military Academy	Feb. 4, 1919	Mar. 4, 1919	2,277,932.20
11	Navy	Feb. 11, 1919		720,793,000.33
12	Army	Feb. 18, 1919		1,070,523,088.56
13	Fortifications	Feb. 19, 1919	Mar. 3, 1919	11,214,291.00
14	Railroads	Feb. 21, 1919		750,000,000.00
15	Sundry civil	Feb. 28, 1919		851,171,849.25
16	General deficiency	do		26,937,265.03
	Total amount of appropriation bills passed by House			4,670,129,437.55

[1] Monthly compilations of the war Congress, Apr. 1, 1919, p. 206.
[2] The Chronicle, Apr. 5, 1919, p. 1345.

Note: This table does not include:

1. Appropriations in miscellaneous acts	$1,117,713,436.47
2. Permanent annual and indefinite appropriations (estimated)	2,074,286,880.00
3. Appropriation to meet deficiency in Quartermaster Corps	829,375,295.10
4. Additional expenditures to discharge war contracts (estimated)	1,500,000,000,00
Grand total	10,191,505,049.12

By way of illustration the total appropriation for 1916–17, prior to the war, is of special interest. Also the time consumed by the several bills in different appropriation committees which were reported throughout the session to the House, beginning with January 29 and ending in August.

The total annual appropriation for the year 1916–17, prior to our entrance into the war, reached about $1,626,000,000, of which amount $84,290,000 were appropriated by miscellaneous acts, including private acts for relief of individuals, and 14 general appropriation bills were strung along throughout the session, as follows: The Indian bill, reported January 29; the Post Office bill, January 31; the river and harbor bill, February 24; the legislative, executive, and judicial bill on the same day; two other bills reported in March, one in April, four in May, one in June, and two in August. In addition there were five urgent deficiency bills and two resolutions extending appropriations until bills could be passed.

Total appropriations for the fiscal years 1914, 1915, and 1918.

[Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1917, p. 652.]

Fiscal year—	
1914	$684,757,270.26
1915	674,497,625.16
1918	18,881,940,243.79

Total number of appropriation bills passed by Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918.

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 14, 1917, p. 7807.]

Regular acts	13
Deficiency acts	2
Miscellaneous acts	3
Total	18

Appropriation bills failing to pass the Senate prior to Mar. 4, 1919.[1]

No.	Title of bill.	Total appropriation.[2]
1	District of Columbia	$14,093,701.00
2	Indian	11,066,397.03
3	Agriculture	31,673,022.00
4	Navy	720,793,000.33
5	Army	1,070,529,088.56
6	Railroads	750,000,000.00
7	Sundry civil	851,171,849.25
8	General deficiency	26,937,265.03
	Total	[3] 3,476,264,523.20

[1] Monthly Compilations of the War Congress, Apr. 1, 1919, p. 203.
[2] The Chronicle, Apr. 5, 1919, p. 1345.
[3] These eight bills have again passed the House at $2,199,000,000.

Total gross debt of the United States, May 31, 1919, $25,921,151,273; no deduction on account of obligations of foreign governments. Source: Journal of Commerce, New York, June 4, 1919, page 9.

The following extracts taken from my speech in the House of December 14, 1917, on the same subject of budget legislation are added because of the data therein contained:

The following countries have a budget system: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxemburg, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Spain, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The only great nation excepted from the foregoing list, a democracy that vaingloriously challenges the admiration of the world for its form of government, is the United States.

* * * * * * *

President Wilson's advice that has been ignored is also submitted at this point.

"It will be impossible to deal in any but a very wasteful and extravagant fashion with the enormous appropriations of the public moneys which must continue to be made, if the war is to be properly sustained, unless the House will consent to return to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication as much as possible avoided."—(President Wilson's address to Congress, Dec. 4, 1917.)

* * * * * * *

PARTY PLATFORMS DEMAND A BUDGET SYSTEM.

The Democratic Party has demanded a change and pledged every member of the majority party to that change when in its platform in St. Louis in 1916 it declared:

"We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government, and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step toward a budget system."

President Wilson vainly demands a fulfillment of that pledge.

* * * * * * *

A REPUBLICAN PLATFORM PLEDGE IN 1916.

The Republicans were pledged at Chicago in 1916, at their last national convention, in the following words:

"The increasing cost of the National Government and the need for the greatest economy of its resources in order to meet the growing demands of the people for Government service call for the severest condemnation of the wasteful appropriations of this Democratic administration, of its shameless raids on the Treasury, and of its opposition to and rejection of President Taft's oft-repeated proposals and earnest efforts to secure economy and efficiency through the establishment of a simple, businesslike budget system, to which we pledge our support and which we hold to be necessary to effect any real reform in the administration of national finances."

* * * * * * *

In a clear, comprehensive work on the budget system, Collins says:

"Turning to Congress we face a situation without parallel in the world. Here we can not speak of a budget, but of separate and independent bills drawing on the Treasury. These bills are prepared by about 14 independent committees of the House and 15 of the Senate—29 separate committees, each working independently of each other and of the executive branch of the Government. Ten of these House committees and 8 Senate committees report out all of the bills carrying appropriations, but the other 11 (4 in the House and 7 in the Senate) report out measures for pensions, public buildings, and other things carrying demands on the Treasury, which are met by bills from one of the other committees. * * * In the United States—but nowhere else—the legislative branch of the Government actually prepares in detail every financial measure introduced."

Ford, on "The cost of our National Government," describing another ailment evidenced in public discussions as to responsibility, says:

"Congress habitually disclaims responsibility for the results of the methods it employs. Responsibility is shifted from the House to the Senate or from Congress to the Executive, or even to the mass of the people. * * *

"While Congress is fond of viewing with alarm the increase in the cost of Government, it keeps augmenting it by continual efforts to extend congressional patronage by means of appropriations."

* * * * * * *

Again Mr. Ford says, page 34:

"The true seat of constitutional defect is not in the Senate but in the House. The supremacy of the Senate, now so conspicuous in politics, is a result of the weakness and incompetence of the House. * * * If it is true, as has been frequently alleged in the House, that the Senate pads appropriation bills at its own will and pleasure, practicing what Mr. CANNON describes as blackmail, the charge implies confession of failure on the part of the House to uphold its constitutional authority. It follows that the true way to reform the Senate is to reform the House."

* * * * * * *

Ex-Speaker Reed, in an article contributed to the magazines in 1897, said:

"It is true we have at present irresponsible government, so divided that nobody can tell who is to blame. Government by committees and of two Houses entirely independent of each other produces some fearful and wonderful results."

That was the opinion of an ex-Speaker of this House 20 years ago, before conditions had reached their present proportions and notoriety.

* * * * * * *

A great student of finance and public affairs, Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations Committee, declared:

"I have repeatedly urged that all the appropriation bills be consolidated in one committee. When I had no thought of quitting this body I made the statement I would willingly retire as head of the Committee on Appropriations and from the committee to bring about this reform. * * * I am glad the President has made this recommendation. I believe it the most important reform that the House can adopt. * * *"

No higher authority can be quoted than Mr. Fitzgerald, who resigned from this body.

This is the committee of which Mr. GOOD is chairman.

* * * * * * *

REPUBLICAN AUTHORITY ON COMMITTEE EXTRAVAGANCES.

James A. Tawney, ex-chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, in 1909 gave a public statement on this general subject wherein he says:

"The difficulty in practice which the Committee on Appropriations has in keeping appropriations within the estimated revenues arises from the fact that when the several committees which have jurisdiction over the appropriations for a particular department * * * appropriate for expenditures out in the districts and States represented by Members of the House and Senate, the departments for which the appropriations are made can always rely upon the Representatives and Senators in whose districts and States these appropriations are to be expended to support almost any demand they make."

In plain English, both Senators and Representatives in order to get their share of State or district "pork" are charged by the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee with a willingness to support "almost any demand," providing they get their share in the log-rolling game. Mr. Tawney is in harmony with Mr. Fitzgerald, who condemn "Treasury looters." Tawney, ex-Speaker Reed, ex-President Taft, and other Republican authorities condemn the present system.

* * * * * * *

A proposed real national budget system covered by two bills and one resolution is herewith submitted:

A bill (H. R. 4061) to provide for departmental budget estimates, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, on or before the 15th day of November of each year, submit to the President the following information: A revised statement in summary and in detail of the estimates of expenditures of the various branches of the Government, the said revision of the estimates being hereafter provided for; a statement giving the estimated revenues of the Government for the fiscal year to which the estimates of expenditures relate, and if the estimated expenditures shall exceed the estimated revenue he shall also submit therewith recommendations for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate legislation to meet the deficiency; in like manner he shall also submit to the President from time to time such supplemental, deficiency, or other estimates as may be necessary to meet the needs of the Government.

SEC. 2. That in order that the said estimates of expenditures shall represent the actual financial needs of the Government it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, before submitting them to the President to revise, to consolidate, to unify, to coordinate, to reduce, to diminish, or otherwise to change any item or items in the regular annual estimates, or in any deficiency, supplemental, or other estimates of expenditures for the various branches of the Government in such a manner as may be necessary to effect economies and to prevent waste, extravagance, loss, duplication, and the like.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make such changes in the form of said estimates as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. That in order to provide the administrative organization for the operation of the provisions of this act there is hereby created in the Treasury Department a bureau to be known as the budget bureau, which shall be composed of one director and two assistant directors, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, and such other persons as are hereinafter provided for.

SEC. 5. That the director shall receive a salary of $10,000 per annum, and the assistant directors shall each receive a salary of $7,500 per annum. The director shall employ and fix the compensation of such attorneys, accountants, special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees as he may find necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and as may be appropriated for by Congress: *Provided*, That not more than 10 persons shall be employed hereunder at a salary in excess of $3,000 per annum and not to exceed $5,000 per annum for any such person. All employees of the budget bureau, with the exception of those receiving a salary in excess of $3,000 per annum, shall be appointed from a list of eligibles to be supplied by the Civil Service Commission and in accordance with the civil-service law.

SEC. 6. That the budget bureau shall have and perform all of the powers and duties now held and performed by the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants of the Treasury Department, in so far as they relate to the estimates of expenditures hereinbefore referred to, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make such reorganization of said division as may be necessary to accomplish this purpose.

SEC. 7. That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of $125,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the budget bureau, including the payment of salaries herein authorized.

SEC. 8. That the submission of the estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury as herein provided shall be in lieu of his presentation of the Book of Estimates to Congress, as now provided by law.

SEC. 9. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 10. That this act may be cited for all purposes as the estimates revision act, 1919.

SEC. 11. That this act shall take effect at the beginning of the fiscal year 1919.

—

A bill (H. R. 3738) to provide for an auditor general to act on behalf of Congress, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the offices of auditor general, assistant auditor general, and solicitor of the audit office of the United States are hereby created. The auditor general shall be appointed by a committee to be composed of the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives; he shall hold office during good behavior, subject, however, to removal therefrom for cause by a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives; he shall receive a salary of $12,000 per annum. The assistant auditor general and the solicitor of the audit office shall be appointed in the same manner as the auditor general, shall each receive a salary of $7,500 per annum, and may be removed from office for cause by the committee appointing them.

SEC. 2. That on the death, resignation, or other vacancy in the office of the auditor general or of the assistant auditor general, or of the solicitor, his successor shall be appointed in the manner as prescribed above for the original appointment.

SEC. 3. That anything which under the authority of this act is directed to be done by the auditor general may, in his absence, be done by the assistant auditor general, except the certifying and reporting on the departmental accounts for the House of Representatives. The solicitor of the audit office shall be the legal adviser of the auditor general.

SEC. 4. That after the consolidation of the audit forces hereinafter provided for has been effected, the Comptroller of the Treasury shall forthwith be divested of all of his functions relating to the audit of the departmental accounts, and the existing audit offices for the departmental accounts, namely: Auditor for the Treasury Department and all bureaus and offices thereunder; Auditor for the War Department and business under it; Auditor for the Navy Department; Auditor for the Interior Department; Auditor for the Post Office Department; and Auditor for the State Department, and all other branches of the public service not included in the above shall be forthwith abolished.

SEC. 5. That immediately after his appointment the auditor general shall proceed to consolidate and reorganize the audit work of the offices of the above-mentioned auditors and that of the Comptroller of the Treasury, in so far as it relates to the audit of the departmental accounts into one office, to be known as the audit office, of which he shall be the head and for the work of which he shall be accountable to Congress.

SEC. 6. That after the above-mentioned consolidation and reorganization shall have been effected all subsequent appointments in the audit office of officers, clerks, and other persons, except as hereinbefore provided, shall be made under the ordinary rules and regulations of the classified civil service: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this section shall not apply to temporary appointments made by the auditor general for a period of less than six months, but such temporary appointees shall not be eligible to reappointment except under the civil-service rules as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 7. That the auditor general shall have full power to make from time to time orders and rules for the conduct of the internal business of the audit office and to promote, suspend, or discharge any of the officers, clerks, or others employed therein, except as hereinbefore provided: *Provided, however,* That such promotion, suspension, or discharge shall be made upon considerations of efficiency only.

SEC. 8. That each executive department of the Government shall prepare and transmit through the Treasury Department to the auditor general for examination not later than the 30th day of November of each year an account of every expenditure of public moneys made by said departments for the fiscal year ending on the preceding 30th day of June; such accounts shall be submitted in such form and manner as may be determined by the auditor general with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be known as the departmental accounts.

SEC. 9. That every departmental account shall be examined by the auditor general on behalf of the House of Representatives, and such examination shall determine whether the payments which are charged in the accounts to the sums appropriated are supported by vouchers or proofs of payment, and whether the money expended has been applied to the purpose or purposes for which such appropriation was intended to provide.

SEC. 10. That in order that such examination may, as far as possible, proceed pari passu with the cash transactions of the several accounting offices of the executive departments, the auditor general shall have free access, at all convenient times, to the books of account and other documents relating to the accounts of such departments, and may require the several departments concerned to furnish him from time to time or at regular periods with accounts of the cash transactions of such departments, respectively, up to such times or periods.

SEC. 11. That on the 15th day of each January the auditor general shall lay before the House of Representatives the departmental accounts for the preceding fiscal year as certified and reported upon by him, and in which he shall call the attention of the House of Representatives to every case in which it may appear to him that an expenditure has exceeded the appropriation; or that money received by a department from other sources than the appropriations for the year to which the accounts relate has not been applied or accounted for according to law; or that a sum charged against an appropriation is not supported by proof of payment; or that a payment so charged did not occur within the period of the account or was for any reason not properly chargeable against the appropriation in question; and he shall further call the attention of the House of Representatives to such other facts or information which may show any irregularity in the accounts, whether of loss, waste, fraud, extravagance, or incompetence, which may appear on the face of the accounts as compared with the appropriations, or which may be revealed by the papers on file in the departments.

SEC. 12. That upon the receipt of the appropriation accounts by the House of Representatives they shall forthwith be referred to a joint budget committee to be created for that purpose, which committee shall, after examining the accounts with the report of the auditor general thereon, after the manner to be prescribed by the House, make a report to the House, making such comment and such recommendations as it may see fit.

SEC. 13. That upon the adoption of said committee report by the House of Representatives it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit the recommendations therein contained to the department or office concerned; and, further, it shall be his duty to see that such recommendations are put into effect: *Provided, however,* That where objections are made to the recommendations by the department or office concerned it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to lay before said committee at its next regular meeting, for their consideration, the said recommendation and the reasons for not putting it into effect.

SEC. 14. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 15. That this act may be cited for all purposes as the independent audit act, 1919.

—

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) to provide for a joint budget committee, composed of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and Finance Committee of the Senate.

Resolved, etc., That the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate shall be a joint budget committee of Congress on and after December 1, 1920.

SEC. 2. That upon receipt by the House of the regular annual or any supplemental deficiency or other estimates of expenditures for the various branches of Government and suggestions for new revenue legislation to meet them from the President of the United States, with his recommendations for their enactment into law, they shall forthwith be referred to the joint budget committee, which committee shall have jurisdiction within the limits hereinafter provided over both revenue and appropriations and no other committee of the House or Senate shall thereafter report any bills carrying appropriations or providing revenue for the Government.

SEC. 3. That the said joint budget committee may call before it such executive officers as it may see fit to examine in connection with the said estimate.

SEC. 4. That said joint budget committee may propose amendments to said estimates by way of reducing the amounts of any item or items of proposed expenditure therein stated, but said joint budget committtee shall not have the power to propose any joint amendment which shall have for its effect the increasing of any item or items of the said estimates or of adding new items unless such increase or new items shall be requested by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the authority of the President: *Provided, however,* That said joint budget committee may by a two-thirds vote add new items or increase items in the said estimates.

SEC. 5. That such budget bill, with estimates of expenditures and revenue legislation to meet them embraced in a single bill, may be reported simultaneously to the House by the Ways and Means Committee and to the Senate by the Finance Committee and thereupon may be given consideration in either House, but the bill shall first be passed by the House of Representatives and thereafter by the Senate, with such amendments as may be added thereto.

SEC. 6. That it shall not be in order for any Member of the House to offer any amendment increasing any item or items in the said budget bill except that it be to restore an item or items in the estimates as they were regularly submitted by the President.

SEC. 7. That for the purpose of giving the House immediate and direct information as to the said estimates and of offering explanations in regard to the proposed expenditures of the said budget bill, the heads of the several executive departments may be required to appear in the House and Senate during the time said bill is under consideration to answer questions relating to the provisions of said bill.

SEC. 8. That all rules or parts of rules of the Senate or House in conflict with the provisions of this resolution are hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. This resolution shall take effect on and after the 1st day of December, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That nothing herein contained shall prevent the right of any person to take or kill any of the wild fowls or birds in section 1 of this act mentioned when the same shall be so taken or killed by virtue of the authority of a license duly issued by the proper authorities of said District of Columbia for scientific purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 10, strike out the words "of the wild fowls or birds in section 1 of this act mentioned" and insert in lieu thereof the words "game birds herein defined."

Mr. WALSH. This is simply to clarify the language and avoid repetition. They have defined what game birds shall be, by setting forth these various classifications, and it would seem to be clearer if, instead of picking out some of the classes mentioned in the definition, we say "game birds herein defined." It would seem to me that that would serve to clarify the section to which the amendment is offered.

Mr. GOULD. The amendment is satisfactory to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall be fined not less than $25 nor more than $100, or be imprisoned for not more than one month, or both so fined and imprisoned: *Provided,* That each bird mentioned in this act so had in possession, bought, sold, exposed for sale, or had in possession for the purpose of sale shall constitute a separate offense.

Mr. WALSH. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 16, strike out the words "less than $25 nor."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of eliminating the minimum penalty. In the imprisonment provision there is no minimum mentioned, and I think it has come to be the recognized practice of Congress in fixing penalties for violations of laws which we enact to provide simply the maximum penalty and not a minimum penalty. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That nothing in this act shall prevent the sale at any time of Hungarian dark-necked pheasants, ring-necked pheasants, Mongolian pheasants, or mallard ducks when the same shall have been raised in captivity; of the sale of game birds alive for propagating purposes: *Provided,* That the same is done under such requirements as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining some information. What is meant by the proviso that "the same is done under such requirements as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia"? Does that mean that the sale is made under the requirements or that they have been raised under the requirements?

Mr. GOULD. I should think it might mean either. If I understand it, in various States the Agricultural Department

frequently has some rule defining the statute, and I assume that would be the procedure to be followed here.

Mr. WALSH. It would seem to me that the language ought to be "provided that the same have been sold or raised under such requirements as may be prescribed by the commissioners," and I move to strike out the words "is done" and insert "have been sold or raised."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALSH moves to amend, page 3, line 2, by striking out the words "is done" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "have been sold or raised."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question being taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SISSON) there were—ayes 19, noes 16.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of this measure if there should not be a comma instead of a semicolon in line 25, page 2? I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may substitute a comma for the semicolon in line 25, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the change.

There was no objection.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, the bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside, to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up H. R. 5032, to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan calls up H. R. 5032, which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, incorporated by act of Congress approved March 16, 1896, is hereby authorized and empowered on the petition of the vestry of any parish or separate congregation to give the same right to women to vote and hold office as is now conferred upon men by existing law.

Mr. MAPES. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, it must be admitted that what I shall say has no connection with the bill just read, but in accordance with the time-honored privileges of general debate I shall consume the brief time allowed me in saying a few words concerning America's part in the strictly military activities of the war.

Surviving soldiers of the Civil War and the historians of that war as well have not yet finished the task of fixing the credit due for certain campaigns and the advances made during those campaigns. If that be so in the case of such a war as the Civil War, where only a single country divided against itself is a participant, it will probably be much more difficult in the case of the present great war which has had so many different countries engaged in it that it is not easy to count them. Therefore, in the interest of accuracy and for the possible benefit of the future historian, I hope, I wish to submit a word at this time as my little contribution toward making clear just what the Americans have done in this war, and especially in the last campaign of the war.

We are sometimes called by the people of foreign countries a Nation of braggarts and boasters. Already we see a tendency on the part of some of our foreign friends to say that the Americans are claiming too much credit for the outcome of the war. As a matter of fact, the plain, unvarnished truth as to what Americans did in this war is praise enough for us. All we need do is to establish the truth, and that will be praise sufficient.

The great battles of the world are always a subject of unfailing interest. The battle of Gettysburg in our own Civil War is considered a decisive battle. It was undoubtedly the turning point in the war. The field on which it was fought is familiar to many Americans who have gone there and from an advantageous location have looked over the entire battle field.

Waterloo is considered unquestionably one of the great battles of the world. A few weeks ago I stood at the top of the Belgian monument on that field and looked out over the fields, farms, villages, and other objects familiar in the many books of military history describing that great battle. From that one vantage point I could see them all—the familiar Hougomont farm to the southwest, the little chapel off to the east where Blucher came in, and even in the distance one could see the village where Grouchy was too far away to reach the battle in time. That was before the day of motor trucks. With our present means of transportation he would have been able to reach the scene in ample time to take part in the battle.

Compare the battles I have mentioned with the great battle that began on September 26, 1918, and ended on the 11th of November, 1918. The battle field of the campaign of which I speak instead of being visible from one point extends from the North Sea to Switzerland, while the active front along which the attack was made reached from the Moselle River all the way to the North Sea.

I have brought here a map which shows all the ground gained by American troops in all the battles of the war. The ground gained is indicated in each case by the criss-cross marks. Observe along the entire front that wherever the Americans have advanced the line at any place you will see the criss-cross marks.

First a few words as to American participation leading up to the final campaign of the war.

The first serious encounter reported that resulted in a considerable casualty list in an American division was the local attack by the Germans at Seichprey on April 20, 1918. The Twenty-sixth Yankee Division was the objective. It was probably intended by the enemy to try out the mettle of the National Guard troops. Cantigny was the first battle in which the American themselves made a real attack. This took place on the 28th of May in the Montdidier sector. Our regulars went forward like seasoned shock troops, made the attack, and gained some 1,600 yards. It was only a local attack, but the way it was planned and executed, resulting in a complete victory, did much to establish the prestige of American soldiers as fighting men.

In both of the operations I have mentioned, our troops were brigaded with French troops or fought alongside of French troops. All through the war some of our troops were brigaded with the troops of the French or the British. It was not until the affair at the St. Mihiel salient, in September, that we had a real American operation conducted by an American Army under American high command. There was some objection to our having an American Army at all. It was advocated by leading Allied officers that we should not attempt to organize a complete American Army, but that we should simply mix in the American troops with the others. If we had done that it is altogether probable that we should never have heard of any American activity to the extent of winning victories.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman says that the St. Mihiel was our first purely American attack. I would like to ask the gentleman if, on the 18th of July at Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood, it was not a distinctly American Army that made the counter advance?

Mr. TILSON. No; not in either case. To the west of Chateau-Thierry on the night of June 5-6——

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I am talking about July 18.

Mr. TILSON. First, however, as to Belleau Wood, the Second Division arrived at Lucy on the night of June 5, found its place in line, and went in. The place was opposite Belleau Wood and the fighting in this wood was done by Americans, but the division was in the French Army.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Under the command of French officers, but it was an American attack.

Mr. TILSON. The attack was really made by the Americans, but under French officers. It was the same way at Soissons, to which the gentleman referred a moment ago. It is generally conceded that the turning battle of the war was southwest of Soissons on July 18. There the attack was made by the First American Division on the left, the Second American Division on the right, with the First Moroccan Division sandwiched in between them, and all under French officers. Gen. Mangin was in command of the Tenth French Army, containing our two divisions.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I was there at the front at that time—at the time the boys made the counterattack when they drove them back on August 4—and I did not see any French soldiers at all. The only French I saw were French generals in command of American soldiers. The American soldiers drove them back in Belleau Wood and Chateau-Thierry, and all through that salient, and the French did not have anything to do with it except to command.

Mr. TILSON. The entire story is told here on this map. I have striven to be accurate and to convey accurate information on the map, so that you can see at a glance every point at which American forces participated. The elimination of the Marne salient was due in large measure to American troops.

Before leaving the Marne salient I wish to call attention to the broad strips with criss-cross markings, indicating gains by

the several American divisions. Southwest of Soissons the first strip represents the advance by the First American Division, the next by the Second American Division, a little farther south the Fourth Division, and here near the southwest corner of the salient I point with pride to the strip—and it is a large one—credited to the Twenty-sixth or Yankee Division. Then, to the east and northeast, are the strips of territory credited to other divisions.

Lest I forget it later on, while the Meuse-Argonne campaign was going on under an American Army, there was also an American division fighting here to the west of the Argonne Forest. You see this narrow strip indicates where it gained through that hard territory. At the same time we had four divisions further north on the line. The New York Division and the Thirtieth Division from Tennessee, South and North Carolina, were at this point on the map with the British, and there were two more divisions sent up to the extreme north, the Ninety-first and the Thirty-seventh.

As I have indicated, the first purely American fight, conducted entirely as an American campaign, was the St. Mihiel salient. There were some French in that, but they were under American command. The American high command had entire charge at the St. Mihiel salient. You will see here that the French troops were placed at the bulge of the salient, and that the Americans were placed at the shoulders of the salient, where the attack was to be made. The attack was made on the night of the 12th of September, by the Twenty-sixth or Yankee Division, and a French division on the west face of the salient, and by a number of other American divisions, beginning with the first division of Regulars, on the southern face of the salient.

Here is a map showing the gains made by different divisions on successive days. As you will observe the Yankee division strip here is quite an extensive one. As my time is very limited, I must hurry on to the battle of which I meant to speak in detail when I began, the great Meuse-Argonne campaign. We have not heard so much about this campaign, simply because it came so shortly before the armistice. Such great things happened so immediately after it that the papers took up the other things and neglected to dilate upon the details of that great campaign. To gain an idea of its magnitude it must be remembered that the casualties in that one single campaign were 120,000 men, and that more than half of all the deaths of Americans in battle during the war were in this campaign. I am speaking of the American activities alone.

We shall lose the relative importance of this great campaign if we do not keep in mind the fact that it is larger than all of the others put together. In fact, it is so large that it is almost impossible for us to visualize it. As indicated on the map, the American sector lay here between the Moselle River and the western edge of the Argonne Forest—that is, including the Argonne Forest, the Aire Valley, and the heights of the Meuse. The ultimate objective was, of course, the Sedan-Mezieres Railroad and the highway through these places. I have it presented here on another map, so that you may see the importance of this railroad and highway. You will see on this map that there is a four-track railroad running through Sedan and Mezieres.

I wish to call your particular attention to the geography and topography of the country just for a moment to show the importance of these great lines of communication. If you will measure from Sedan to the border of Holland, which is here on the map, you will see that it is less than 100 miles as the crow flies, whereas following the western front line to the sea it would be three times that distance. The territory between Sedan and the Holland border west of Aix la Chappelle is occupied by what is called the Ardennes, which is a mountainous country, with sharp ridges and ravines and largely covered with forest. The ridges and ravines run generally north and south, with no railroads across them, and very few highways that run east and west. Those that do so run have to cross sharp hills and valleys at a considerable grade. There is therefore no line of communications capable of supplying an army from Germany except one double-track railroad running through Aix la Chappelle and Liege. From the Holland border to Sedan there is but the one double-track railroad, and it would be well nigh impossible to supply an army the size of that occupying the western front by that one single line. It was therefore necessary to use this great four-tracked trunk line, this great thoroughfare through Sedan.

If this could be broken, the enemy must withdraw from northern France and Belgium. So the objective of this campaign of the Meuse-Argonne was the great railroad and highway at Sedan or some point near there.

The intervening territory lent itself to defense. On the left, included within the American sector, was the great Argonne Forest. In many places it is a jungle of underbrush, steep ravines, and sharp ridges, very difficult to traverse when not in the presence of an enemy. There are numerous very strong positions, especially for machine-gun nests. Then there is the Aire Valley, with lateral ridges running across it, which lent themselves admirably to defense and were utilized for that purpose to the limit by the enemy. Then there were the heights of the Meuse, the hills bordering the left or west bank of the Meuse, extending down by Verdun and northward toward Sedan.

The battle line had been practically stabilized near Avocourt, Vanquois Hill, and a number of other places along the line whose names became familiar during four years, and the whole territory back of it on the German side was filled with prepared defensive positions, while all of the roads and everything else useful were destroyed as the enemy withdrew over it, so that it was almost a trackless waste over which our troops had to advance.

The general attack was begun, as we know, on September 26, and the advance proceeded for a time without much delay, except at one place, in front of Montfaucon, where it required a day or two. It proceeded by means that had been frequently used before, but never quite so successfully as in this offensive. I refer to what is known as a rolling barrage. In the early part of the war when an attack was contemplated, a barrage was planned and laid down from guns in place. Their range could be extended from short range to extreme range of the longest range gun.

When it became necessary to move the barrage farther forward it was generally found very difficult or impossible to do so. The consequence was that there were very few advances longer than the extreme range of a large fieldpiece. When this campaign was planned it was determined that the barrage should be carried along. When the Infantry advanced to the limit of the barrage the guns in the rear were to be moved forward and through the guns nearer the front, so as to take up another position in the front and continue to carry the barrage forward.

I went over the Meuse-Argonne territory. I did not traverse it all, but went diagonally across it with many zigzags, a territory roughly 20 miles by 20 miles—say, 400 square miles. In going over the ground I looked at the effect of the artillery, being very much interested to see the effect of the ammunition. As you all know, I have been considerably interested in ammunition. I did not see any place over which that barrage rolled, as big as this hall, that did not have a shell hole in it.

When the barrage moved it carried with it such destruction and death that it was impossible for any man to put his head above ground to fire upon the attacking troops, and, after all, that is the purpose of artillery fire. It is not necessary to kill the other fellow, but it is imperative to keep him underground and keep his head down so that he can not kill you. The table of the barrage as shown on this chart is a most interesting one. Any Member can examine it who desires to do so. It is all here showing exactly the spots on which the "big fellows," the large shells, should fall, the territory to be covered by the 75's and the 155's, the territory to be covered by the howitzers, and the territory to be covered by the long guns. It is all laid down here——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. Could I have three or four minutes?

Mr. MAPES. I will yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. About how many of those guns were used in the barrage to which the gentleman has referred, the rolling barrage, in that particular fight?

Mr. TILSON. I think there were about 3,000 guns used in this particular attack. The gentleman understands that the guns may not all be firing at once, but may be used one after another and brought up one battery through another. The barrage of which I saw the effects was produced by a number of guns much greater than the organization tables call for, because all the artillery that belonged to each division was in line, and in addition all the artillery that belonged to such divisions as had been broken up for replacement of troops, together with all the other artillery that could be had from the French or anybody else, so that the artillery was probably double what any table of organization might call for. After all, the artillery is the man saver——

Mr. STEVENSON. Did not they practically have two lines of artillery?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know in how many lines the guns were placed.

Mr. STEVENSON. So that one line was moving up through another line.

Mr. TILSON. Probably so. I have just said it was probably double the amount of artillery that the organization tables call for. You must keep this in mind.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. They had several lines of artillery, the 77's, the 3-inch, were up within a mile and a half of the front.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means the 75's. The 77 is a German gun.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Then it run back 8 or 10 miles.

Mr. TILSON. The line occupied by a force may be 10 miles deep. A line may be any number of miles in length and also in depth, because they do not dig one trench and depend upon that, but dig trench after trench and position after position, and all of these are the line. The guns are not arranged on one line with another back of that, but they are placed in such selected artillery positions as can be found, and may be in all sorts of zigzag and échelon positions where they can be advantageously arranged.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will permit, the line of artillery is the amount of the carriage of the shell; that is, the 77's will carry about a mile and a half or 2 miles, and then they run back until the shell will carry 8 or 10 miles.

Mr. TILSON. The 75's will carry a great deal farther than a mile and a half.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. That is the effective distance, I understand, they use them.

Mr. TILSON. They will place one battery of 75's at a mile and a half and use one angle of fire, and another at 3 miles and use another angle of fire. Some of them are moved right up close to the infantry in order to see quickly what is happening.

The amount of artillery used determines very largely how much you can save your infantry. After all, gentlemen, get it clearly in mind, as an artilleryman or a man of any other branch of the service will tell you, that the infantry is the army, that the infantry is the final decisive factor, and that all the others are simply assistants; that the infantry is the army and all the rest are auxiliaries. The Chief of Artillery expressed himself so as we crossed the sea together a short time ago. As my time is going so that I shall not be able to finish, I hope that I may have unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. The advance of which I have been speaking began near Avocourt and led up to and over Montfaucon. This is a mountain from whose height you can see all over the country. The Crown Prince had his post of command here, which, by the way, is the nearest he got to Verdun. From this height he could look through his periscope from a safe place underground. I saw his sleeping chamber in the basement constructed out of concrete 4 feet thick, where he took unusual precaution to preserve his useless life. This hill being one of the first objectives, one of the soldiers composed a little poem concerning it, entitled "The Road to Montfaucon."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TILSON. Can I have just one minute in order to read the poem?

Mr. MAPES. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. TILSON. In the poem some one is supposed to ask an M. P. the way from Avocourt to Montfaucon.

THE ROAD TO MONTFAUCON.

M. P., the road from Avocourt
That leads to Montfaucon?
The road, sir, black with mules and carts
And brown with men a-marching on—
The Romagne woods that lie beyond
The ruined heights of Montfaucon.

North over reclaimed no man's land,
The martyred roadway leads,
Quick with forward-moving hosts
And quick with valiant deeds
Avenging Rheims, Liege, and Lille,
And outraged gods and creeds.

There lies the road from Avocourt
That leads to Montfaucon
Past sniper and machine-gun nests,
By steel and thermite cleansed. They're gone—
And there in thund'rous echelon
The ruined heights of Montfaucon.

[Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I take this opportunity to make reply to some remarks addressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] in the Chamber on Saturday, in which I think he very unwarrantedly and unfairly made an attack on the Attorney General, Mr. Gregory, who vacated that office on the 4th day of March. If you will turn to the RECORD, you will see that while the Committee of the Whole was considering the sundry civil bill, and while it had under consideration at the immediate moment items in the bill with reference to the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] took occasion to make remarks something of this tenor:

I do not want to make a political speech, but I want to say that there are some things that I believe I ought to call to the attention of this House.

And then, further along, he said:

But I want to direct your attention to this fact, that we are reaping the crop the seed of which we have sown. I want to direct your attention to the fact that certain organizations, one of them known as the I. W. W., and other anarchistic societies during the progress of the Great War, now ended, not only threatened to destroy but actually attempted to destroy the food products of this country.

He goes on at great length along that line, and then he says:

Yet I have not heard that any of these people were convicted as traitors to this country, which their acts proved them to be. Is it possible that the millions of dollars that we have given to the Attorney General's department for the prosecution of crime have been expended without results, and that the Department of Justice has winked at these things and allowed them to go on, thereby encouraging this anarchism?

And then he says:

I do not make the charge that there has been any winking at them; but, in my judgment, every one of those men were traitors and should have been lined up before a firing squad next morning and disposed of summarily. But I have heard of no such action being taken.

Further commenting on the Attorney General, he says in conclusion:

Some people are now seeking to throw aspersions upon the labor organizations simply because these anarchists and traitors happened to be members of these unions. It was the duty of the Department of Justice to ascertain who those men were and to weed them out and punish them.

At that point I undertook to get the gentleman to yield, and he declined. He said further:

I sincerely hope and trust that Attorney General Palmer, in whom I have the utmost confidence, will succeed in stamping out this evil from the country. But, oh, how much better it would have been had his predecessor in office succeeded in putting out the fire when it first started. Had he done so, we would not now find ourselves in the condition we are in.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] is present. I took the liberty to invite him here in view of the fact that I was going to address my remarks largely to his own language. I want to say that the charge the gentleman from Pennsylvania made on last Saturday either arose through the grossest ignorance or it was made for a purely partisan and political purpose, without proper investigation of the facts.

It can hardly be conceived that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be absolutely ignorant of the workings of a great department of this Government when his duty as a Representative here should be to know something of the functions of the departments of the Government, and yet he stood on the floor of this House on last Saturday, when the gentleman against whom he inveighed is no longer an official of the Government and has not the privilege of this floor to defend or speak for himself, and made, in an insinuating and underhand method, a very severe attack on the former Attorney General of the United States.

I have known Gen. Gregory for the past 20 years. I knew him as a private citizen and as a public official, and I assert that a more faithful or patriotic Attorney General never sat as a member of the Cabinet.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that he has never heard of any of the people whom he denounced being prosecuted. If he were as diligent in seeking the facts as he is in making unwarranted and ungrounded charges, he could in five minutes have procured the report of the Attorney General of the United States, which is replete with accounts of successful prosecutions of I. W. W.'s and prosecutions for violations of the espionage law, which, by the way, became the law without the vote of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will.

Mr. KREIDER. I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that I did not say that there were no prosecutions, but that, to my knowledge, there had been no convictions for

offenses that were flagrant in time of war. Did you find there were any of the I. W. W.'s executed, which is the penalty prescribed for traitors in time of war?

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman is dodging the question. He said nobody had been convicted for violating these laws and hindering the Government in time of war. He says now he has heard of nobody being hung. It is not the fault of the Attorney General that the Congress did not provide the death penalty in each case.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman tell what the penalties are for those who were convicted for treason in time of war?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not here to educate the gentleman. The gentleman did make the charge that none of the parties had been convicted. It is not the fault of the Attorney General that Congress did not provide death penalties for all violations. There are degrees in crime and necessarily variations in punishment. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not even vote for the espionage law, but voted, as I recall it now, against it, and I think the RECORD will bear me out.

Now, just for the gentleman's information I want to call his attention to page 48 of the report of the Attorney General for the year ending July 1, 1918, and in the report, beginning on that page, he will find a long list of 34 separate prosecution of cases for violation of the espionage act. Many of these cases involve trial of not only one defendant but a great number of defendants, and in one case of the number, the Haywood prosecution, there were 99 defendants, that were convicted and sentenced to prison. In the case of the prosecution of German plots for violation of law before the war, the record shows there were prosecutions obtained in the Von Rintelen case and others of that character. Under the sabotage law, the report shows, successful prosecutions were made.

Any gentleman who wants to be fair can, by consulting the report of the Attorney General, find that not only one but hundreds of persons who violated legislation passed by the last Congress to aid in the prosecution of the war were prosecuted and a large majority convicted.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania decries anarchy and Bolshevism, while indulging in his intemperate and extravagant statement. I want to say that if there is one thing that brings those evils into being it is for gentlemen in this House, or elsewhere, for that matter, to call the attention of the public to and to make unfounded charges that men who are charged with the responsibility for enforcing the law are not doing their duty. If there is one thing that will encourage Bolshevism, it is the preaching of the false doctrine that those who occupy high place and high responsibility are recreant to their trust and are unfaithful to the public. [Applause.]

And yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in view of this record, to which he has had access all the time, I repeat, either willfully or maliciously for simply a partisan, mean, unworthy purpose, or through the densest ignorance of the activities of his own Government, gets on the floor here and attacks a citizen of this Republic who has striven to discharge his duty. While I hold no brief for the ex-Attorney General, I propose that whenever, either from this side or the other side, he may be unjustly attacked I shall expose the falsity of the charges.

Allow me to call to the attention of the House the following excerpt from the report of the Attorney General for the year 1918 appearing on pages 46 to 56 of the report with reference to some of the cases involving charges of violation of the selective-service act or the espionage act or the sabotage act.

SELECTIVE-SERVICE ACT.

Amongst the cases were:

(1) United States *v.* Louis C. Fraina, Edward R. Cheyney, southern district of New York: Defendant Fraina was a leading publicist of the most radical and revolutionary type of class-war doctrine. He and Cheyney, at a meeting of a "league of conscientious objectors," and in speeches and circulars, advanced the principle of conscientious objection to participation in the war, not on religious grounds, but on the principle that the working classes had no interest in the war, of which they could be only victims. They were convicted of conspiracy to bring about violations of the selective-service act. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(2) The United States *v.* Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, southern district of New York (245 U. S., 474): The defendants are the well-known anarchist leaders. They were charged with a conspiracy to bring about a failure to register, under the selective-service law, on the part of many persons liable to such registration. They organized a "no conscription league," and in speeches and publications attacked the draft law and urged young men subject to the draft to refuse to register. They were convicted, and the judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

(3) United States *v.* Hulett M. Wells et al., western district of Washington: The defendants were prominent labor leaders of the radical wing of the labor movement on the Pacific coast. While the selective-service act was pending and before it was passed they prepared a no-conscription circular bitterly attacking the principles of conscription and advocating resistance to any draft law that might be passed. Meetings were arranged for the adoption of the circular and for arrangements to distribute it. Defendants were convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(4) United States *v.* Edwin Firth et al., southern district of West Virginia: Defendants prepared, published, and distributed a printed circular under the alleged auspices of an alleged "Workmen's Council of Defense," advocating opposition to the enforcement of the selective-service act. They were convicted, and the conviction was affirmed in the circuit court of appeals of the fourth circuit.

(5) United States *v.* C. E. Ruthenberg, et al., northern district of Ohio (245 U. S., 480): The defendants were socialist political leaders in Cleveland, and before large audiences at public meetings, which included men subject to the draft, they attacked the draft law and urged resistance thereto. It was shown that they succeeded in influencing at least one man against registration. They were indicted under section 332 of the Penal Code for counseling and inducing him to violate the law, were convicted, and the judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

(6) United States *v.* Will Orear et al., eastern district of Texas: The defendants organized or participated in a movement to offer armed resistance to the enforcement of the selective-service act. They formed a so-called league, which included as members men subject to the draft. Meetings were held, at which plans were laid and members bound themselves to resist the draft to the last ditch. Arms and ammunition were procured and hidden ready for use. Twenty-nine persons were indicted, representing various degrees of criminality and willfulness. Twenty-four were convicted.

(7) United States *v.* Sam and Lee Edwards, eastern district of Virginia: The defendants, father and son, in their strenuous endeavors to get the son exempted from military service, went so far as to physically assault a member of the local board. They were tried and convicted on the charge of conspiracy to prevent by force and intimidation a Federal officer from performing his official duties. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(8) United States *v.* Walter M. Reeder et al., western district of Oklahoma: The defendants were organizers of a "Universal Union," a sort of branch I. W. W., formed for the immediate purpose of resisting the draft by force and the ultimate purpose of a forcible revolution with seizure of public utilities and basic industries. Its plan included an elaborate organization modeled on an army. While its plans were large, they were nipped in the bud by arrests, prosecutions, and convictions.

ESPIONAGE ACT.

The espionage act contains numerous provisions relating to espionage, exports, protection of harbors and vessels, and many other subjects. The provisions of the act which have given rise to most of the cases, however, are those contained in section 3, Title I, which, for the period from the passage of the act on June 15, 1917, to May 16, 1918, read as follows:

"Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies and whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or shall willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or of the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both."

On May 16, 1918, there were added, by amendment, numerous provisions against various types of disloyal utterances.

The number of cases brought under the section exceeds the number of those brought under any other of the war laws, except the selective-service act. While the selective-service act may be the more important of these laws, the espionage act has given rise to the most difficult problems, and the cases under it have been especially important. To give a true picture of the work of the department in the administration of this act, the account thereof should contain some reference to the thousands of cases brought to its attention in which prosecution was not instituted, as well as those in which prosecution was begun.

In practically every case under this act the question of free speech or of political or religious liberty was involved, so that, from that point of view, every case was of importance and worthy of specific mention. The following list constitutes, therefore, but a small selection of the important cases, which are enumerated either because of the prominence of the defendant or because the case involved some extensive and dangerous type of propaganda, or because the case arose historically at an important stage of the development of the interpretation of the act. Each of these cases involved a charge of one or more of the three types of offenses specified in the above-quoted language of section 3, and, therefore, for the sake of abbreviation and avoidance of repetition, the particular nature of the charge will not be further mentioned. Some of the cases were for conspiracy to commit one or more of the three classes of offenses.

(1) United States *v.* Emanuel Baltzer et al., district of South Dakota: Twenty-seven substantial farmers of German extraction formed, after our entrance into the war, a German Socialist society and sent to the governor of South Dakota a so-called petition, in which they objected to the quotas under the draft law assigned to their county, and proceeded further to attack the war as a war instituted by and for the capitalists, and asked the governor to repudiate the war and all war debt. They were convicted. The case is now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. The importance of the case is due particularly to the fact that it was the first notable and prominent case which arose under the espionage act, and the conviction of the defendants was undoubtedly one of the greatest deterrents against the spread of hostile propaganda, and particularly that class of propaganda which advanced and played upon the theme that the war was a capitalists' war, brought by and for the benefit of the big financial interests. The case was also interesting as one involving the right to petition.

(2) United States *v.* Daniel H. Wallace, southern district of Iowa: This was also a case arising early in the war and given great publicity, and thereby had great influence as a deterrent of dangerous propaganda. The defendant, who claimed to have served in the British Army, delivered just at the time when the recruiting service was most active and the administration of the draft was beginning, a sensational speech containing lurid pictures of the horrors of war, bitter attacks on the Allies, particularly Great Britain, and on our entrance into the war and much praise for Germany. He was the author and distributor of a pamphlet containing the same sort of utterances. He was convicted, and later died in the penitentiary.

(3) United States *v.* Frederick Krafft, district of New Jersey (249 Fed. Rep., 919): Defendant was a prominent leader of the Socialist Party in New Jersey. His case was one of the early ones in which the attacks upon the war by the antiwar wing of the Socialist Party was involved. The case also presents an early illustration of spoken, as

distinguished from written, propaganda. The defendant, a prominent citizen and editor, made a speech in a public square before a large audience, which included drafted men, attacking the war and conscription. The court held that the necessary criminal intent might be inferred from the occasion, nature of the audience, and other surrounding circumstances bearing upon the natural and probable effects of the utterances. The defendant was convicted, and the conviction has been sustained by the circuit court of appeals.

(4) United States *v.* Abraham L. Sugarman, district of Minnesota (245 Fed. Rep., 604): Defendant, secretary of the Socialist Party in Minnesota, made a speech advising disobedience to the selective-service act. The case is of particular importance by reason of its involving an early discussion and decision upon the scope of the expression "military and naval forces of the United States." The court held it to include at least all those who had registered under the selective-service act. In other cases some courts held that all persons of military age—that is, 18 to 45 years, inclusive—were included, while other courts restricted the phrase to persons who had been actually inducted into the service. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(5) United States *v.* Clinton H. Pierce et al., northern district of New York (245 Fed. Rep., 878): Defendants distributed a leaflet entitled "The Price We Pay." This leaflet purported to be a campaign document for the Socialist Party, and did contain arguments in favor of voting for that party and its candidates. It contained, however, as a part of such argument violent and bitter attacks upon the war and draft law, picturing the war as a capitalists' war, and being of a tenor to convince the workingmen that this was not their war and they were not called upon to take any part in it. It dwelt upon and overstated the horrors of war. The importance of the case arises from the fact that it helped to put a stop to preparations for the organization on an enormous scale of a very dangerous piece of antiwar propaganda, and defined the limits of political campaigning in which opposition to the war was used. It also decided that the offense may be shown without proof that any particular individual was so influenced by the propaganda as to refuse or abstain from military service. It also gave a broad interpretation to the word "obstruct" in the statute. The defendants were convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(6) United States *v.* Vincente Balbas Capo, district of Porto Rico: Defendant was the editor of a leading anti-American paper in Porto Rico. In this paper he carried articles designed to influence Porto Ricans, particularly those who were not American citizens, against participation in the war. Defendant was convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(7) United States *v.* Louise Olivereau, western district of Washington: Defendant, employed at an I. W. W. hall at Seattle, mailed violent and frank antidraft literature to Seattle registrants. She was convicted.

(8) United States *v.* Charles T. Schenck et al., eastern district of Pennsylvania: The charge was based upon the publication and distribution of a circular attacking the selective-service act as unconstitutional and advising disobedience of its provisions. The defendants were convicted and the case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(9) United States *v.* Kate Richards O'Hare, district of North Dakota: Defendant, formerly international secretary of the Socialist Party for the United States and a leading figure in its antiwar wing, had promoted the passage of the antiwar resolution at the St. Louis meeting of the executive committee of the Socialist Party just preceding the passage of the selective-service act. Thereafter she delivered a number of speeches against this act, going so far as to advocate mass opposition to the draft. She was convicted and the judgment has been affirmed by the circuit court of appeals.

(10) United States *v.* Perley B. Doe, district of Colorado: The defendant wrote and circulated a leaflet attempting to belie the officially announced purposes of the war and to justify the acts of Germany which led to the war. His leaflet contained false statements. He was convicted, and after conviction was inducted into the military service, which service he refused to render and is now a military prisoner. His conviction has been affirmed by the circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit.

(11) United States *v.* Floyd Ramp, district of Oregon: Ramp, an irreconcilable opponent of and agitator against the war, went amongst drafted men who were on their way to the service and by picturing the war as a capitalists' war attempted to move them to insubordination and disloyalty. He was convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(12) United States *v.* S. J. Harper, western district of Louisiana: The defendant was a State senator and prominent politician. He wrote and circulated a pamphlet along the line of the capitalistic nature of the war. He was acquitted.

(13) United States *v.* Clarence H. Waldron, district of Vermont: This was the first important case involving religious antiwar propaganda. Waldron was a minister, who urged upon parishioners of military age the doctrine that participation in the war was contrary to Christianity and that it was their duty as Christians not to render military service. He was convicted and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. The case was the first important one involving the definition of the scope of the constitutional guaranty of religious liberty and its relation to war and undoubtedly acted as an effective deterrent against a very dangerous type of antiwar propaganda.

(14) United States *v.* W. E. Mudd, western district of Washington: The case is interesting because the utterances of the defendant, an I. W. W. organizer, were directed not against participation in the service of the American armies, but against participation of Canadians in the service of the British Army. Defendant was convicted. Pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(15) United States *v.* Rose Pastor Stokes, western district of Missouri: Defendant was a prominent socialist. She insisted that her views against the war be published in a daily newspaper of large circulation, namely, the Kansas City Star. Those views were such as to induce members of the working classes to believe that the war was none of their affair, and that they did not owe loyalty to it. She was convicted and the case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(16) United States *v.* Emil Herman, western district of Washington: The defendant publicly exhibited and displayed where all who passed his place of business could read it, a circular attacking the vocation of a soldier as the lowest and basest of all occupations. This circular was falsely attributed to the famous author Jack London, who not only had not written it, but who, before his death, had publicly repudiated it. The defendant was convicted and the case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(17) United States *v.* Stephen Binder, eastern district of New York: The defendant wrote, sent to the printer, and was preparing to circulate a book entitled "Light and Truth," attacking the causes and purposes of the war as stated by the President and Congress, attributing the war to the basest of material motives and justifying Germany. He was convicted and the circulation of the book prevented.

(18) United States *v.* Joseph F. Rutherford et al., eastern district of New York: This is the best known, most interesting, and most important of the cases involving religious antiwar propaganda. The defendants were the executive leaders of the Russellites, a sect founded by Pastor Russell. Pastor Russell issued a series of books called "Studies of the Scriptures." After his death and after we were in the war the defendants issued a seventh volume of this series, entitled "The Finished Mystery," which, under the guise of being a posthumous work of Pastor Russell, included an attack on the war and an attack on patriotism, which were not written by Pastor Russell and could not have possibly been written by him. They prepared for circulation hundreds of thousands of copies, and would have succeeded but for the promptness of the Government in seizing and suppressing these books. They encouraged and organized on an extensive scale the raising of conscientious objections to the war by men called into the service. They did not restrict this to men who were conscientiously opposed to the war, but sought to create such objection in men who might otherwise be willing to render service to their country. This dangerous propaganda was scotched by the successful prosecution of the leaders before it succeeded in getting much headway. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(19) United States *v.* Amos L. Hitchcock, northern district of Ohio: Defendant was a prominent official of the Socialist Party, representing that party on the board of education of Cleveland. He made frequent speeches calculated to induce the working classes to abstain from participating in the war. He was convicted.

(20) United States *v.* Conrad Kornmann, district of South Dakota: The defendant was the editor of a German-language newspaper at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and president of the South Dakota German-American Alliance. He sent letters and telegrams to officials of that alliance showing, as was charged, a systematic effort to promote a pro-German point of view and pro-German activities amongst the members of the association. He was convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(21) United States *v.* Jacob Frohwerk and Carl Glesser, western district of Missouri: The defendants were the authors of articles in a German-language newspaper, the Missouri Staats Zeitung, of Kansas City. They did not cease their opposition to the war upon our entrance, but continued the type of articles characteristic of that small portion of the German-American press which remained disloyal for a considerable period after our entrance. These articles attacked the genuineness of the motives of the war as expressed by the President and Congress, played up Germany's military successes and the German point of view, attacked the motives of Great Britain, France, and Italy, and inserted in the paper other articles of a similar strain designed to reduce the war enthusiasm of their readers or to sustain their opposition to the war. The case is an interesting example of those against German-language newspapers. Defendants were convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(22) United States *v.* Scott Nearing and the American Socialist Society, southern district of New York: The defendant Nearing was one of the most active agitators against the war, engaged constantly in making speeches or writing pamphlets. Among these pamphlets was one entitled "The Great Madness," written by Nearing and published by the other defendant, the American Socialist Society. This pamphlet purported to describe the manner in which the big financial interests first conceived the scheme of creating a war which would instill patriotic emotions in the American people and thereby divert attention from the wrongs committed by the capitalists themselves, and then proceed to carry their scheme into effect by bringing on the present war. The indictment has been sustained on demurrer and the case is pending in the trial court.

(23) United States *v.* Benedict Prieth et al., district of New Jersey (251 Fed. Rep., 946): The defendants were the owners, publishers, editors, and leading writers of a prominent German-language newspaper of Newark, N. J. This was another leading case, involving a series of articles attacking the motives behind the war and suggesting nonparticipation of the German-Americans. The jury disagreed upon the first trial, and the case is still pending in the trial court. The court's opinion in ruling on the demurrer to the indictment contains an illuminating discussion of the scope of the phrase in the statute "enlistment and recruiting service," which has generally been held to include the whole process of raising the Army, whether by recruiting for volunteers or by draft.

(24) United States *v.* Eugene V. Debs, northern district of Ohio: The defendant was a leading member of the antiwar wing of the Socialist Party. The case arose out of a speech of a deeply pacifist nature, calculated to influence his hearers, a large gathering, which included military eligibles, against belief in the war. As charged by the Government in the three counts of the indictment upon which defendant was found guilty, this address was made for the purpose of causing insubordination and disloyalty in the military and naval forces, obstructing the recruiting and enlistment service, and inciting, provoking, and encouraging resistance to the United States. The indictment originally contained 10 counts, 4 of which were nolled, 2 were withdrawn by the court, and on 1, namely, the charge of by word opposing the cause of the United States in the war, the defendant was acquitted.

(25) United States *v.* Max Eastman et al., southern district of New York: The defendants were the owners, editors, publishers, and contributors of a monthly periodical entitled "The Masses." This paper was not an official Socialist paper and the group of men editing it may be said to belong to the literary, as distinguished from the political, type of Socialist agitators. In the issues of this paper during the first four or five months of the war this magazine, practically from cover to cover, consisted of articles glorifying those who objected to war and resisted military service, and picturing the war as a base conspiracy of the capitalists, and all who participate in the war as nothing better than the abject victims of this conspiracy. The jury disagreed in both the first and second trials.

(26) United States *v.* J. A. Peterson, district of Minnesota: The defendant was a candidate for United States Senator, and in the course of the campaign published an article in a prominent newspaper picturing the war as one in which the lives of young Americans were being sacrificed in order to win territory for the Allies. He was convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(27) United States *v.* Louis B. Nagler, western district of Wisconsin: This is interesting as a clear decision showing that attacks upon the Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., and similar quasi governmental or nongovernmental agencies engaged in the assistance of the military forces, made with intent to obstruct and impede such assistance to the country's forces, fall within the scope of the espionage act. The defendant was convicted.

(28) United States *v.* Jacob O. Bentall, district of Minnesota: The defendant was a prominent member of the Socialist Party, being at the time its candidate for governor of Minnesota. In his campaign literature he sought to avail himself of and increase the antiwar sentiments of his constituents by playing upon the theme that the war was one brought about and prosecuted by and continued for the exclusive benefit of the large financial groups and interests. He was convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(29) United States *v.* C. B. Schoberg, eastern district of Kentucky: Defendant in a conversation with a group of men expressed a preference for the German side of the war. He was indicted under the provisions of the amended section 3, Title I, of the act approved May 16, 1918, and the case is one of the early ones involving the interpretation of that provision of the amendment which prohibits, by word or deed, supporting or favoring the cause of Germany or opposing the cause of the United States. This was the first of a series of cases of the same nature, and the court took the occasion to discuss the question of free speech and its constitutional scope, and held that the constitutional right of free speech does not include the right to express disloyal sentiments. Defendant was convicted.

(30) United States *v.* Theodore B. Pape, southern district of Illinois: Defendant, when called upon by a committee soliciting subscriptions to Liberty bonds, had declined to subscribe and explained his action by telling the committee of his opposition to all wars, including this war, and his unwillingness to do anything which would assist or promote the continuance of the war. The court held that these utterances, made under such circumstances, were plainly not intended to influence the hearers against subscriptions on their part to Liberty bonds or other war participation and, therefore, did not fall within the purpose and intent of the espionage act.

(31) United States *v.* J. A. Miller, district of Colorado: This case arose out of the use by defendant of the typical attack on the war as a capitalists' war for the purpose of obstructing the sale of Liberty bonds. The case is not one of exceptional importance, and this reference to it is made solely as an example of a type of cases quite large in number. The defendant was convicted.

(32) United States *v.* Joseph V. Stilson, Joseph Sukys, et al., eastern district of Pennsylvania: This case grew out of articles in the newspaper Kova, the official organ of the Lithuanian Socialist Federation, and circulars belittling patriotism and military service and seeking to arouse political, as distinguished from religious, conscientious objection to service. Defendants were convicted. The case is interesting and important in that it involved an extreme example of the foreign language antiwar propaganda.

(33) United States *v.* Victor L. Berger, Adolph Germer, J. Louis Engdahl, William F. Kruse, and Irwin St. John Tucker, northern district of Illinois: This case is for a conspiracy to violate section 3, Title I, of the espionage act by means of speeches, leaflets, pamphlets, and other literature attacking the war and conscription. Defendants were high officials of the governing committee of the antiwar wing of the Socialist Party and were active in framing and distributing its antiwar literature. Berger is editor of the Milwaukee Leader, and has been a Member of Congress. Germer is the secretary of the National Socialist Party. They framed and distributed in enormous quantities the proclamation and war program of the party, frankly urging disobedience of the selective-service act; also "The Price We Pay," mentioned in No. (5) above; also various other pamphlets of the same tenor. The case has not been tried.

(34) United States *v.* William D. Haywood et al., northern district of Illinois: This is the well-known case, referred to in the previous annual report, against a group of leaders of the Industrial Workers of the World. They were charged with conspiracies to obstruct and defeat the selective-service act, to violate the espionage act, and to obstruct the execution of other statutes relating to the prosecution of the war. One hundred and sixty-six defendants were included in the original indictment, of whom 51 were dismissed before trial and 16 during the trial, leaving 99 defendants, all of whom were found guilty by the jury on all four counts of the indictment. The Government produced a large amount of documentary evidence which had been obtained by search warrant from the general headquarters of the association, including letters written by the defendants, bulletins issued by general headquarters and industrial unions, pamphlets dealing with various phases of the teachings of the organization, their songbooks, newspapers, and foreign-language papers. One hundred and forty-four witnesses were put on the stand by the Government and 184 by the defendants, of which 84 were defendants themselves. Defendants offered a large amount of documentary evidence tending to show that they were not engaged in the conspiracies charged in the indictment, but solely upon the amelioration of labor conditions. For purposes of sentence, the court divided the convicted defendants into four classes, the members of which were sentenced to confinement in the penitentiary for a year and a day, 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years, respectively. An appeal to the circuit court of appeals is in preparation. The conviction of the defendants, after a trial which they themselves admitted to be fair, will, the department feels, have a beneficial effect in checking the unlawful features of the activities of this organization. Similar cases are pending in several other districts.

Title 12 of the espionage act provides that matter which violates any of the provisions of the statute shall be nonmailable. Acting under the provisions of the postal laws and regulations, the Postmaster General withdrew second-class mailing privileges from publications which he considered had violated section 3 of the act. This gave rise to several important suits, in which the owners or publishers of such publications attacked the rulings of the Postmaster General. The cases necessarily involved an interpretation of section 3 of the act. Amongst these cases were the following:

(1) Masses Publishing Co. *v.* Thomas G. Patten, Postmaster of the City of New York, southern district of New York, and circuit court of appeals, second circuit (244 Fed. Rep., 535, 245 Fed. Rep., 102, 246 Fed. Rep., 24): The publishers of a monthly periodical entitled "The Masses" brought a bill to enjoin the postmaster of the city of New York from treating the August, 1917, issue as nonmailable matter. The character of the articles contained in that issue has been described in the reference to the criminal case which arose out of this and other numbers of the periodical (above No. 25). The district court granted a temporary injunction, which was reversed by the circuit court of appeals. The importance of the case arose not only from the fact that it defined the scope of the discretion of the Post Office Department but also because it was an early and authoritative ruling by an appellate court to the effect that the criminal intent to obstruct the recruiting service or commit other offenses under section 3 may be inferred from the natural and probable effects of the publication and distribution of articles, cartoons, and other published matter.

(2) Jeffersonian Publishing Co. *v.* West, Postmaster, southern district of Georgia (245 Fed. Rep., 585): This was an action for injunction against the second-class mailing privileges from the Jeffersonian, a newspaper published by Tom Watson, which had continuously contained articles attacking the war and conscription. The injunction was refused.

(3) United States of America, ex rel. Milwaukee Social Democrat Publishing Company *v.* Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General, in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia: This was a proceeding in mandamus for a mandatory injunction against the deprivation of second-class mailing privileges in the case of a newspaper, the Milwaukee Leader, of Milwaukee, Wis., largely owned and edited by Victor L. Berger, a Socialist leader and politician. It contained continuously articles decrying the war as capitalistic, questioning the motives of the war, and stirring up anti-British and many other types of feeling against it. The court refused to issue an order of mandamus.

CASES ARISING OUT OF GERMAN PLOTS BEFORE THE WAR.

Some important cases were brought, after our entrance into the war, under section 13 of the Penal Code, arising out of German prewar plots, such as conspiracies to blow up Canadian munition factories and other Canadian war utilities, and such as the conspiracy to stir up sedition in British India. Among these were:

(1) United States *v.* Gustav Jacobsen et al., northern district of Illinois: Defendants, who were German and Hindoos, were charged with setting on foot, providing and preparing the means for a certain military enterprise to be carried on against the territory and dominion of Great Britain beyond the seas. The enterprise had for its object the inciting of armed rebellion in India and the furnishing of arms, ammunition, money, and military training to Indian subjects for carrying on and supporting the rebellion. The defendants were convicted. Pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(2) United States *v.* Albert Kaltschmidt et al., eastern district of Michigan: Defendants were charged with a conspiracy to blow up and injure Canadian munition factories, also railroad bridges of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. used for the transportation of munitions to England and her allies; also similarly the railroad tunnel between Port Huron, Mich., and Sarnia, Canada; also to employ and send into Canada spies to obtain information as to war preparations. Defendants were indicted under section 13 of the Federal Penal Code, and the court held that the above-mentioned acts, which were the object of the conspiracy, would constitute a military enterprise within the meaning of the section. Defendants were also indicted under the Sherman law for conspiracy to interfere with interstate commerce. One case has been tried, resulting in the conviction of five defendants and the acquittal of one. There are other cases still pending.

(3) United States *v.* Franz Bopp, E. H. Von Schack, Ram Chandra, Bagwhan Singh et al., northern district of California: This is the most important and sensational of the Hindu conspiracy cases. The defendants included Germans, Hindus, and Americans. Out of about 100 originally indicted, 4 plead guilty and 30 were tried, of whom 29 were found guilty and 1 was acquitted. The defendants were indicted under sections 37 and 13 of the Federal Penal Code for a conspiracy to set on foot a military enterprise, namely, a Hindu insurrection in India. They formed elaborate plans for sending arms, ammunition, German officers, and Indian revolutionary leaders from this country to India, many details of which, such as the actual purchasing of two vessels and the loading thereon of a cargo of arms and ammunition, were carried out. All of this conspiracy, shown to have been originally instigated by the German Government at Berlin, was financed by the German Government through the German consular officers at San Francisco. The trial covered many weeks and was marked by many dramatic incidents, the most striking of which was the assassination on the last day of the trial of the defendant Ram Chandra, perhaps the leading Hindu revolutionist operating in the United States, by another Hindu defendant, Ram Singh, who, while firing indiscriminately in the courtroom, was in turn killed by the United States marshal.

(4) United States *v.* Franz Von Rintelen et al., southern district of New York: There were two indictments for conspiracies to violate sections 298 and 235 of the penal code. Both charges grew out of acts of the defendants arranging for the destruction of the steamship *Kirk Oswald*, then lying in New York Harbor, which vessel was being loaded for a trans-Atlantic trip. The defendants carried upon the boat and placed in the hold thereof bombs or explosive devices, so arranged as to explode and set fire to the vessel while at sea. Their acts resulted in the starting of a fire on the vessel while at sea, which was, however, discovered and extinguished in time to save the vessel. The defendant, Von Rintelen, is the well-known German agent engaged in bombing plots in this country. The defendants were convicted. The case under section 235 is pending in the circuit court of appeals. Indictments arising out of the same attempt to destroy the *Kirk Oswald* are pending in the district of New Jersey and eastern district of New York, which cases include other defendants in addition to those included in the case in the southern district of New York.

SABOTAGE LAW.

Amongst the notable cases which have arisen under the so-called sabotage act, being act of April 20, 1918, entitled "An act to punish for the willful injury or destruction of war material, and for other purposes," the following may be mentioned:

(1) United States *v.* Homer De Bolt et al., southern district of Ohio: Defendants were charged with an attempt to cause to be made in a defective manner steel railway cars, then in process of manufacture for the use of the United States for war purposes, by advising and attempting to influence one of the workmen at the plant to manipulate a lathe on which another workman was operating so that the material passing through the lathe would be injured and rendered defective. The case involved the important question of law whether advice to and attempts to influence a person to cause a defect in war material would constitute, in law, an "attempt to cause" such war material to be made in a defective manner. The defendants had not succeeded in inducing their fellow workmen to follow their advice. The court, in passing upon a motion for a directed verdict, held that advice of this kind and attempt to influence others to commit the offense were sufficient, as a matter of law, to constitute "an attempt to cause" within the meaning of that act. On the trial the defendants were acquitted.

(2) United States *v.* Lewis Longwell and Hector Bordeau, western district of New York: The defendants, workmen at the Curtiss aeroplane plant, are charged with having concealed cracks in crank casings by hammering or peening so that the defects would not be detected by the Government inspectors. The case is pending.

(3) United States *v.* Richard S. Eastman et al., western district of New York: This case is against a group of foremen and workmen in the Curtiss plant, based upon an alleged attempt to conceal cracks in the tip of propellers of aeroplanes. Some of the defendants have plead guilty; the case is pending as to the others.

The report of the Attorney General referred to only covered the year ending June 30, 1918, but I have before me a memorandum prepared by the Department of Justice on June 12, 1919, which discloses that since the beginning of the war the Department of Justice investigated 50,000 alien-enemy cases and issued warrants for the arrest of 6,300 alien enemies; that it conducted approximately 300,000 investigations of alleged violations of the military-service act, and by reason of its investigations 50,000 delinquents were apprehended and inducted into the service. By the same memorandum it is made to appear that there have been several hundred prosecutions conducted by the Department of Justice for violation of the espionage act and that in the vast majority of these cases convictions have been had and sentences imposed. In addition to the prosecutions mentioned, the department has conducted approximately 200 investigations with reference to charges of fraudulent practices in the matter of war contracts.

All of these activities have been conducted in addition to the normal duties of the department.

Under all of the circumstances the record of Attorney General Gregory in the conduct of the Department of Justice is one that should command the hearty approval of those who desire to see a fair and thorough administration of this high office, and I very much regret that any Member should feel called upon to misrepresent the work of the department in the manner employed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The only real offense which Attorney General Gregory has committed, according to the political standards of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is that he is a Democrat.

It is a high honor to have a seat in this great body—within these four walls is set one of the greatest forums on earth—but a Member who takes advantage of his place here to make unfair and misleading statements regarding any citizen of the Republic tarnishes his own office and lowers the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have just finished a great war and finished it after a glorious fashion. History does not contain a brighter page than that which records the achievements of American arms. Our soldiers met and conquered the descendants of the men who had conquered the Cæsars. Fresh from the factory, the field, and the farm, hurriedly trained, they destroyed the mightiest military machine of all time. By the millions they poured into France and with all the spirit and zeal of the crusader they carried the starry banner half round the world and brought it back covered all over with glory and radiant with victory. [Applause.]

But to equip, to train, to feed, to pay, to transport, and to supply that Army required the expenditure of immense sums of money. Everything was subordinated to the winning of the war in the shortest possible time. Business was changed, commerce was shifted—the channels of trade were varied—and this entire country from border to border united and finished the supreme task. Much money was spent—some of it was wasted. Things had to be done hurriedly. Weeks could not be taken dickering and submitting sealed bids. The big purpose was to get things done. The natural and necessary expense was staggering. But the world has been saved, the Kaiser has been defeated, and the debt must be paid. The question is how and when. With the immense wealth and productivity of this country it could be paid in a short period of time. On the other hand, it could be extended over a long period. I am convinced that it ought to be extended over a period of 40 or 50 years. There are many reasons which lead to this conclusion.

The debt is tremendous. The total gross debt, on the basis of the Treasury Daily Statement of May 31, 1919, is $27,018,346,620.80. The total indebtedness of the United States on March 31, 1917, as appears by the Public Debt Statement of that date, was $1,282,044,346.28. The difference between these two items may be taken as the unpaid war indebtedness of the United States, which is $25,736,302,274.52.

PAYMENT SHOULD BE EXTENDED.

This expenditure was made in a great cause, and judged by the aims and purpose as well as by the triumphant results, was fully justified. [Applause.] However, if the war was worth fighting—and no one will deny that it was—the results of the struggle will inure to the benefit of this country for generations to come. This generation has made enormous sacrifices already. The war cost seas of blood, broken hearts, and billions of treasure. The burden of paying the debt should, therefore, be extended over a long period, and thus the burden be lightened. By arranging this debt over a period of 40 or 50 or 60 years on a sinking-fund basis, the amount could be paid without the heavy hand of taxation being laid unduly on any man or set of men or upon any phase of our business life.

By arranging a sinking-fund basis of payment the proportionate part of principal and interest could be equally divided over a period of years, so that the payment for each year could be exactly the same and the taxation for any one year, when distributed over the vast resources of this country, would be negligible. I find that by making the payment annually and by paying $1,300,981,155 each year, the debt will be entirely paid, principal and interest, in 40 years. It will be paid in 50 years if $1,198,668,422 is paid each year, and it will be paid in 60 years if $1,138,198,410 is paid each year.

A great many have advocated the plan of making further great sacrifices and paying off the entire debt within a very few years. There is no doubt that with the practically unlimited resources of this country this could be done, and we could have the satisfaction within a very few years of having all our war debt discharged. However, to do this would break down the business spirit of the Nation, interfere with our commercial opportunities, and lessen the initiative of practically every business and working man in the United States. To do this would require a heavy tax on every line of industry, a tax on every individual income, with a very low basis of exemption, and in many ways would have the effect of destroying the progress and development of this country.

DEFINITE POLICY SHOULD BE ANNOUNCED.

In order to have the fullest development of the commercial and agricultural opportunities of this country it is necessary to have the various processes of readjustment and development unhampered in so far as practicable. In order to properly conduct the affairs of the country much money and credit are required. If all the phases of active life are to be heavily taxed, those who have money will be disinclined to put it into any line of business, and as a result commerce will stagnate and hard times will inevitably result.

On the other hand, if a definite policy is adopted, with assurance to all the people of this country that the payment of this debt is to be distributed over a long period of time, it will be easy for men who have ambition or enterprise to embark in any line of business or any line of production that may suit their fancy, with assurance that proper credit can be secured and that the necessary money to protect and maintain the business will be forthcoming. Practically every line of activity in the United States, whether it be farming, manufacturing, organizing, or distributing, for its fullest development requires a line of credit. It is manifestly important that this business be encouraged rather than discouraged.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. What is the gentleman's suggestion as to how that assurance could be given? If by Congress, in what way?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Well, I think Congress could do so by resolution; or, if thought preferable, Congress could do so by adopting a policy in the next tax measure of distributing the burden or by calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for an estimate of the payments necessary on a sinking-fund basis to settle the war debt within a certain period of years. If the Congress of the United States shows a disposition to recognize the fact that every man within the borders of this great country is interested in its progress and development the people will know that fact and will act upon any reasonable assurance.

OUR OPPORTUNITIES.

This country has never faced such opportunities for the world's trade as are presented to it to-day. All of its business and commercial opportunities are laid on the sands at our feet. Practically every nation of the world is anxious to have business relationship with this great country. There are business and commercial opportunities in South America that are practically unlimited for the commerce of this country. Those new channels of trade will be rapidly developed.

This country is planning a great merchant marine to carry the products of its fields and factories to other countries. This is a great step forward. What more inspiring sight could be witnessed than a great American merchant marine carrying our products to the ports of the world? What could contribute more to its success than the lifting, in so far as may be, the burdens on products to be carried?

America has had an unusual history. The United States has had 100 years of the richest experience that was ever crowded into a single century. Heretofore she has been more or less sufficient unto herself, but she has developed to that point of production and distribution which require that she have other markets for her vast production. Otherwise her products will stagnate on her hands and prices will get so low as to discourage her people and cause untold losses. If we are not to have cheap cotton, cheap wheat, and other products in proportion, together with low wages for the workers of the country, we must take advantage of the markets of the world. Nothing can do more to materialize the dream of men of vision in this country than the removal of unnecessary burdens. The genius of American organization and the efforts of the American producers made the winning of the war possible. Wherever the results of their efforts were placed alongside those of any other country their surpassing excellence were made manifest.

I have no patience with the demagogue who would destroy the business interests or the productive life of this country. You can not destroy the business life without destroying the market for all of our products and without causing intense suffering and entailing a loss on every man. You can not disassociate poor business and poor prices. Every man in the United States who toils for a living is interested in a steady business development of the country. If it fails he suffers. He is, therefore, vitally interested. More and more it is getting to be the spirit of the American people that every man should do some useful work. Gradually the idea is gaining force that voluntary idleness is unpardonable. Nothing will add more to the growth of this trend of thought and attitude than an enlarged opportunity for every man of ambition and energy.

REGULATION NECESSARY.

I do not advocate and I do not argue that business should be turned loose without restraint. Proper regulation is as vitally necessary as organized government itself. Hence, rules of control and supervision are absolutely essential; and so long as the people retain control of their Government this supervision can be arranged.

By lightening the burden of taxation the exemption can be raised from its now unreasonably low basis, and many disagreeable taxes on the necessities of life can be removed, and the taxes so levied and arranged as to be an appreciable burden on no one and at the same time pay off the debt within a reasonable period. How anyone can have a valid objection to such a system it is impossible to conceive.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Has the gentleman, in estimating the amount of the war debt and in estimating the time necessary to pay it and the tax collections necessary to raise it, taken into account the fact that several billions—I forget how many—of this war debt are owing to us by the allied nations to whom we have advanced it, and that that will come back to us without taxation? Or was the gentleman's estimate of $25,000,000,000 as though we had no credit?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have made the estimate of $25,736,000,000 to cover the total indebtedness. While it is true that the other nations owe us money and will ultimately repay it, I do not believe they will be able to repay us the principal, at any rate, for a long period of time; and I doubt whether it would be wise for us to endeavor to collect too rapidly from those nations, because that would make it necessary for them to ship gold into this country, and we would have an oversupply and they would have an undersupply of gold. The readjustment must be gradual.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. For information, then, does the $25,000,000,000 and some odd hundreds of millions include the money that we advanced to foreign nations?

Mr. JONES of Texas. That includes the money that we advanced to foreign nations.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. So that really our indebtedness is not so great?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Our indebtedness is not quite that much, but I was making an estimate to take care of all our obligations. When they repay us, well and good. People have no objection to their taxes being reduced at any particular time.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. What is the amount of our loans to foreign governments?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The total outstanding loans amount to $9,380,219,124.27, divided as follows:

Belgium	$341,500,000.00
Cuba	10,000,000.00
Czecho-Slovaks	50,000,000.00
France	2,802,447,800.00
Great Britain	4,316,000,000.00
Greece	43,412,966.00
Italy	1,581,500,000.00
Liberia	5,000,000.00
Roumania	25,000,000.00
Russia	187,729,750.00
Serbia	27,268,608.27
	9,380,219,124.27

Mr. HARDY of Texas. So that our debt would then be between $16,000,000,000 and $17,000,000,000?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. Assuming that all of those obligations will be duly repaid, our total outstanding war indebtedness would be reduced to $16,346,083,150.25.

Calculating interest at 4 per cent per annum on a sinking-fund basis, this sum could be repaid in 40 years by the payment of $842,059,000 per annum. The amount would be paid in 50 years by the payment of $775,837,166 per annum, and the total principal and interest could be paid in 60 years by the payment of $736,697,999 per annum. I have made these calculations in round numbers, but they are within a few dollars in each instance of being correct. The figures as to indebtedness and loans are entirely accurate.

EXTENSION WILL NOT CAUSE INFLATION.

It is true that a large bond issue for money borrowed and spent in the country making the issue has a tendency toward inflation of prices and encourages speculation unless there is a corresponding tax levy. However, this danger does not obtain where the issue is simply to pay off or to take up and extend an existing indebtedness. The inflation and speculation in the one instance is caused by the superabundance of money which the presence of borrowed money occasions. Of course the issue which simply takes care of an indebtedness already existing does not increase the immediate supply of money. It is similar to the action of an individual in extending a note.

The converse of the proposition is true, to wit: A heavy levy of taxes where there is no bond issue and no occasion for an increase in the supply of ready money tends to business depression, and consequently to bring about stagnation of trade and commerce. The application of this principle, therefore, would further argue the advantage of the distribution of our obligation over an extended period.

It is all important that prompt action be taken in this matter. The nation, just at this critical period in the world's history, which gets the first start will have the distinct advantage in opportunity for the new business. The man who is on the ground first gets what is sometimes termed the "bulge," and it is difficult to dislodge him. Trade goes in channels or grooves in national as well as individual business. Hence, prompt assurance to the citizenship of this country is necessary if full advantage is to be taken of our opportunities.

NEED OF ECONOMY.

Another matter that is closely linked with the distribution of these taxes is the issue of public expenditures. During the war great expenditures were absolutely necessary, but in the future I expect to vote to reduce the expenses of government in every way possible. In many instances appropriations can be reduced, and in some cases entirely eliminated. Since the signing of the armistice I have voted against a great many of the appropriation items simply because I recognize the necessity of rigid economy. The people have a right to expect these appropriations to be "cut to the limit," and I for one expect to continue to vote with this end in view. Such a policy will further lighten the burdens which this as well as every other nation which engaged in the war must carry.

CONCLUSION.

It is a pleasure to know that the world is turning in heart and in spirit from the arts of war to the arts of peace. It is to be hoped that the people of the earth have grown sick and tired of war to such an extent as to turn with a sense of relief to the implements of friendly rivalry; from the processes of destruction to the processes of construction; from the grasping at each other's throats in deadly combat to the contests which make for happiness and prosperity rather than suffering and despair. This country has grown in a few short years from simplicity and honor to the proud heritage of freedom and power. Just now she is given the chance to reap the harvest which her institutions, her organized form of government, and

the industry of her people entitle her. How happy will be her people if she makes the most of these opportunities. How foolish we will be if by tearing at each other's throats in class rivalry we attempt a foolish policy of strangling business and fritter away the opportunities which great events have placed in our path.

I believe in the United States Government, her history, her institutions, and her people. Knowing the glory of her past, I have implicit faith in her future. Never defeated in a contest of arms, I hope she may never be defeated in the more glorious contests of peace. We have as a heritage the finest form of government that was ever fashioned by human intelligence on this or any other continent, polished albeit and made more perfect by the growth and experience of a just, fair-minded, and generous people. Added to this we have the greatest resources any nation has ever possessed. We have mastered the machinery of production as no other nation has ever mastered it. It is equally important to master the machinery of distribution.

I know not whether triumph or despair awaits us in the infinite sea of the future; I know not what inventions or discoveries the genius of man may conceive. The beginnings of a wonderful garment have been woven in the loom of our country's past. I know not in what form it may be finished; but I do know that if our people are given the unhindered opportunity to which their institutions, their sacrifices, and their industry entitle them the Nation's future will be triumphantly secure. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, incorporated by act of Congress, approved March 16, 1896, is hereby authorized and empowered on the petition of the vestry of any parish or separate congregation to give the same right to women to vote and hold office as is now conferred upon men by existing law.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "convention" in line 3 be made to begin with a capital letter.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection that correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This legislation was recommended by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington at its last annual convention.

It appears that the right to vote in the parishes of the Episcopal Church in this city is confined to men, and that this right was limited and defined by a statute passed by Congress in 1874.

The women of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of the District petitioned the last annual convention for the right to hold office and to vote the same as men, and the convention acted upon that petition and recommended this legislation. The legislation does not give the right absolutely to the women of the churches to vote, but authorizes the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington to grant the women of any parish that right upon the petition of the vestry of the parish; or upon the petition of the vestry of any separate congregation the women in that congregation may be authorized to vote and to hold office by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

This Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington is a corporation created by an act of Congress approved March 16, 1896, and it has jurisdiction and supervision to a large extent of the church in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FOCHT. I am highly in accord with the proposition contained in this bill; but I should like to inquire whether the chairman of the committee does not think that the suffrage movement is a little late in arriving among the Protestant Episcopal brethren in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAPES. Well, it is coming along now.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if there should be any qualifying words with reference to the right to vote and hold office, and if it should be to hold office and vote in the parish? Or is that implied?

Mr. MAPES. I think that it is implied. I called that matter to the attention of the committee of the church who called upon me in reference to this bill. That committee had one lawyer upon it, and this bill was drafted and recommended by the convention; and the committee thought the bill as it is covered the situation all right.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I notice that the bill gives—

The same right to women to vote and hold office as is now conferred upon men by existing law.

Does that sufficiently define it?

Mr. MAPES. The bill itself, of course, pertains entirely to the church organization.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say that the words "existing law" refer to the act of March 28, 1874? It is stated in the report that—

In this diocese the right to vote in parish meeting and to serve on vestries is determined by the Maryland Vestry Act of 1798 and by the act of the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia of June 26, 1873, approved by Congress March 28, 1874.

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. It further says:

To remove the disabilities of women, therefore, requires an act of Congress, so far as the parishes in the District of Columbia are concerned, and an act of the General Assembly of Maryland, so far as those parishes in Maryland are concerned, which have not already secured remedial legislation.

Mr. MAPES. The act of 1874, approving the act of the Territorial assembly, is the existing law.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the gentleman think that act should be referred to, rather than the words "existing law"?

Mr. MAPES. That was my impression at first, and I asked the church committee about that. The explanation given to me was that it is the intention of the church not to give the women the right to vote absolutely, but the idea is to authorize the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church to give the women the right to vote upon the petition of the vestries of the different churches.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BEE. This matter, as I understand it, is a matter of internal organization of the church.

Mr. MASON. Entirely.

Mr. BEE. It is not a matter that affects the body politic of the United States, but only the internal regulation of the church?

Mr. MAPES. That is it. But a statute was passed which confined the right to vote in the church to men.

Mr. BEE. I understand that is the rule in the Episcopal Church.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I take it the rules of the church prescribe the qualifications that the men must possess to have the right to vote.

Mr. MAPES. I think the Maryland statute confines it to men 21 years of age who hold pews in the church, or are regular attendants of the church in case the pews are free.

Mr. KEARNS. Does this put the women on the same footing as men?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Do the women have to be of age and own a pew?

Mr. MAPES. They will have to meet the same qualifications as the men.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, there is a little matter I desire to call the attention of the committee to, and I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes.

Mr. MAPES. General debate was limited before we went into committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 16 minutes of general debate remaining.

Mr. MAPES. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, on May 30 and at subsequent times the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] made a number of charges reflecting not only on the efficiency but in terms charging maladministration against the United States Employment Bureau. When a Government executive official is attacked here he can not have an opportunity to defend himself on the floor. I hold in my hand a memorandum furnished by Mr. Densmore setting out his answer to and refutation of the charges made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

In view of the serious nature of the charges and the widespread publicity given them by publication in the RECORD and the newspapers, I think it is a matter of justice and right that this memorandum constituting the reply of that bureau should be published in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing the communication indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter is as follows:

JUNE 18, 1919.

Memorandum: In re facts in connection with certain charges made by Congressman BLANTON with reference to the administration of the United States Employment Service.

(1) In reply to the charge that the United States Employment Service will only furnish information as to opportunities for employment to persons who are members of labor unions there is submitted an excerpt from an address of the Secretary of Labor made before representatives of 33 governors, of employers, employees, and United States Employment Service officials:

"Since we have been engaged in a Federal way in the placing of workers in the different lines of industry we have met with some criticism that I feel I ought to bring to your attention and to make some statements concerning them. And one of the criticisms that we have met with is that our Employment Service, the Federal Employment Service, is a union-labor employment service and gives preference to the placement of union labor. That statement is made incidentally in connection with the allegation that the Department of Labor, of which the Employment Service is a part, is a union-labor department, giving preference to union labor. Of course, any employment service that is a union-labor employment service, and that gives special preference to union labor as against nonunion labor, would not meet the employment situation of the United States.

"There are those engaged in industry who are trade-unionists. There are those engaged in industry who are nonunionists. I make no hesitancy in saying that I am a trade-unionist myself. I believe in trade-unionism; I also belong to a church. I belong to some fraternal societies. It doesn't follow that because I belong to a church or belong to a fraternal society that when I became an executive of the Government I would immediately set the machinery of the Government in motion to set up my church as the established church or to exclude all other fraternal organizations from the United States except those that I happen to be a member of. It is not a function of any branch of the Government to promote trade-unions. It is not a function of any branch of Government to promote corporations, but it would be folly to say that because it is not a function of the Government to promote corporations therefore the Government must not deal with corporations, and it is just as much folly to say that because it is not a function of government to promote trade-unions that therefore government must not deal with trade-unions. Those who are members of corporations, those who are members of copartnerships, those who are individualists in business, those who are trade-unionists and nonunionists are all citizens of the United States, and as a governmental agency, the Department of Labor and the Employment Service can deal with all of them. We are authorized by our organic act to promote the welfare of labor and to advance its opportunities for profitable employment. No distinction is made as between the union and the nonunion worker in the organic law, and no distinction has been made by the Department of Labor or by its Employment Service in the handling of labor affairs or in the placement of workers, except those distinctions that employers and employees have themselves, by their mutual contracts, made absolutely necessary. The one great example that has been used by our critics in connection with the allegation that we are a union-labor department and a union-labor service is that when the demand for ship workers and shipbuilders came from Seattle our employees in the interior of the country said to those who were applicants for employment that 'it is not advisable to go to Seattle unless you are either a union man or willing to join the union,' and we are held up as a trade-union department because we made that statement. After the criticism began we continued to make it. We are making it now. We will continue to make it while the conditions remain the same, and the conditions were these: That the employers and the employees in the shipbuilding industry in Seattle had come to an agreement that all people employed in those yards should be members of their respective unions. In other words, they had a closed-shop agreement, and if we had, at our instance, caused any man to leave the interior of the country and go to Seattle who was neither a trade-unionist nor willing to become a member of the Union, only to find when he reached there that he couldn't secure the employment that we had said was available, then we would have been justly subject to criticism and ought to have been denounced from one end of the country to the other.

"Now, on the Atlantic coast the situation was entirely different. The employers and the employees had no closed-shop agreement, and we placed more workers in the shipbuilding yards of the eastern coast by far than we placed at Seattle, and we placed them there without any reference to whether they were unionists or nonunionists. The question was never asked; it was not a condition of employment, and so they were sent to our shipyards on the eastern coast without any intimation that they would be unable to find employment if they were not trade-unionists or unwilling to become such. That has been our attitude.

"I may go further and say this: That if there was a call for nonunionists coming to the department, we would endeavor to supply the nonunionists, if they were available, and the only distinction we would make would be in the event of there being an industrial dispute. If there was an industrial dispute in existence we would not be the agency through which labor could be furnished to that industrial dispute. We take this ground with respect to industrial disputes:

"That there is a sufficient supply of labor there if a strike is going on. The labor is competent to perform the work that is required and has been evidenced by the fact that it has been doing it, and to send workers from some other community, however near or far, into a community where there is already a sufficient supply of labor of the necessary skill is simply to create a complication, a surplus of labor, one of the things that is to be avoided, and where a labor dispute is on it is not a question for our Employment Service to deal with; it is not a matter for it to handle. It is a question for our conciliation service to deal with, and when the conciliation service has successfully handled the problem, then you have the workers there, ready to go on with the work. That has been our attitude with regard to industrial disputes.

"I have referred to this criticism because undoubtedly you will find it more or less from time to time in your local communities, and I wanted to make clear to you at least what my attitude is on the matter, at least the manner in which we have been endeavoring to handle the problem from a national standpoint."

This statement of the Secretary very accurately outlines the policy of the United States Employment Service with respect to its attitude toward union and nonunion labor. Any violation of this policy by subordinates is immediately remedied when brought to the attention of the administrative officers.

(2) In reply to the charge that the United States Employment Service, through its Director General, J. B. Densmore, interfered with the activities of the San Francisco Mooney case, the following is a statement from Mr. Densmore, giving briefly the facts in the case:

"Since 1913 I have been Solicitor of the Department of Justice for the Department of Labor, appointed as such by the President. I resigned this position in January, 1918, at the request of the Secretary of Labor, to take up the work of establishing and directing the United States Employment Service.

"During the year 1917, as solicitor for the department, I was sent by the Secretary of Labor to San Francisco to make an investigation of alleged graft and corruption in the Chinese Immigration Service in connection with the fraudulent admission of Chinese laborers in this country. I had a few trained investigators of the Government service with me, and at the conclusion of the investigation we had turned up and dismissed some 23 employees of the Immigration Service who were involved in accepting money from Chinese and others for the illegal admission of alien Chinese and for the delivery and destruction of certain records of the Government pertaining to Chinese. These frauds also involved several lawyers in San Francisco who were working with these dishonest Government employees.

"I was instructed by the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General to present the whole matter to the Federal grand jury with the United States attorney, which I did, with the result that about 22 of the grafters were indicted. The grand jury investigation was finished and the indictments returned about November, 1917, at which time I returned to Washington, as there was no possibility of trying the cases in the near future. As several of the defendants had made complete confessions upon their arrest and were Government witnesses, I felt that it was necessary to leave one of the department's special inspectors to protect them from corruption by the more influential defendants and also as a matter of protection to the Government's cases, as an attempt had been made to corruptly influence the action of the Federal grand jury while considering the cases we had before it. With this in mind, one of the inspectors who had worked on the whole investigation was left in San Francisco, together with one other who lived there, and together they assisted the United States attorney in gathering additional evidence to be used in the trials."

"It was during the time these inspectors remained in San Francisco that they discovered an opportunity to present further evidence to the Secretary of Labor on the subject of the fairness of the trial of Thomas J. Mooney by the State's attorney for San Francisco, which subject had been gone into by the commission appointed by the President, of which the Secretary of Labor was chairman. They were authorized to do so in connection with their other work.

"In the meantime when I returned to Washington, in November, 1917, I was, as before mentioned, asked to take charge of the establishment and direction of the United States Employment Service, and I resigned as solicitor to do so. This new work engaged all my time, and it was not until the middle of October, 1918, that I found myself able to leave this work even for a few weeks to go to San Francisco and assist the district attorney in the prosecution of the cases. I was then Director General of the United States Employment Service, but I went to San Francisco at that time solely for the purpose of assisting in the Government's prosecution of the people indicted as a result of my investigation as solicitor, and not at all for the purposes, as universally charged, 'to investigate the Mooney case.' Such investigation as was made was carried on by the two inspectors of the department who remained in San Francisco, and no person connected with the United States Employment Service had anything to do with it.

"The investigation was practically finished when I arrived in San Francisco last October to assist the United States attorney in the trials, and the report of the investigators was transmitted by me to the Secretary of Labor. Unfortunately some of this report fell into the hands of the publisher of a local paper, who published it without any authority whatever."

(3) In reply to the charge that there were 513 high-priced officials connected with the administrative offices of Washington, the facts are briefly these:

Owing to the failure of the passage of the third deficiency appropriation bill in the last Congress, which carried an item in the sum of $1,800,000 for the continuance of the United States Employment Service until June 30, 1919, it became necessary on March 22, 1919, to reduce the operating expenses of the service approximately 80 per cent. At that time there were approximately 500 employees connected with the administrative offices, at an average salary of $132 per month per employee. Between March 22 and April 1 this number was reduced to approximately 100, which number included watchmen, charwomen, and laborers. In addition to reducing the number of employees connected with the administrative offices the salaries were also reduced. The Director General on April 1 reduced his own salary $1,000 per annum. A reduction of $500 per annum was made in the salaries of the heads of the several divisions, and corresponding reductions were made in the compensation of the other higher-salaried employees. Of the 100 employees retained 30 were reduced in salary.

(4) In reply to the charge that a large amount of money was expended by employees making useless trips, particularly Mr. Luther C. Steward, Harry L. Parks, and the three employees who were sent to France, and that the official stations of employees were made at different places from that where they were working, for the purpose of increasing salaries, the facts are these: In not a single instance was an employee's official station changed for the purpose of granting per diem or for the sole purpose of granting a per diem, thereby augmenting his salary. Since all employees were paid from a lump-sum appropriation a subterfuge of this character was not necessary, even if desired, to increase salaries.

Mr. Luther C. Steward prior to July 1, 1918, was connected with the field force of the Employment Service official station at Kansas City, Mo. In July he was called to Washington for the purpose of assisting in reorganizing the administrative offices. In August he was placed temporarily in charge of the control division of the administrative offices, and later made director of the control division, at which time his official station was changed from Kansas City to Washington, D. C.

Mr. Harry L. Parks entered the Employment Service in September, 1918, from California, as assistant director of the personnel division with official station at Washington. Records of this office show that in November, 1918, he made one trip to Baltimore for one day, and November 26 he visited Ohio and Chicago, Ill., returning December 1. In February he made two trips to Philadelphia and returned, spending three days on each occasion in Philadelphia. In March he was detailed to Philadelphia to take charge of the organization in Pennsylvania. He made one trip to Washington. In April he made one trip to Washington. In May his official station was changed from Washington to Philadelphia.

(5) On March 1 three employees of this service were sent to France under the following circumstances: Under date of January 27 the

United States Employment Service received a communication from Mr. John M. Dunn, colonel, General Staff, acting director of military intelligence, inclosing a copy of memorandum prepared by Capt. A. V. Dalrymple, of the Military Intelligence Division, on the subject of returning soldiers and sailors. This memorandum set forth that while in Europe Capt. Dalrymple found that there was considerable unrest among the soldiers because of unsettled conditions and a keen interest being manifested on the part of the soldiers, especially as the time approached for them to return home, to know what their prospects were in regard to future employment. It was suggested in this memorandum that the Department of Labor place officers in France whose duty it would be to furnish outgoing ships carrying troops with proper blank forms, the same as provided in military cantonments in the United States, to put the returned soldiers in touch with the facilities of the United States Employment Service for finding employment on their return to civilian life. This matter was taken up informally with Maj. Gen. Jervey, of the General Staff, who gave informal but enthusiastic approval to the suggestion and stated that he would recommend it if it should be handed to him formally. Accordingly, the matter was taken up by the Secretary of Labor with the Secretary of War, and in February the Secretary of War approved the proposed plan and issued a memorandum to The Adjutant General directing him to issue instructions by courier cable to the commanding general of the American Expeditionary Forces. In accordance with this arrangement with the War Department, 2,000,000 pamphlets describing the operations of the United States Employment Service and 2,000,000 applications for employment cards were shipped to the designated military officers in France. The carding system established abroad was instituted at the request of the War Department and has received its hearty cooperation and approval. Application cards from the soldiers abroad are received by the United States Employment Service at the average of more than 3,000 per day stating that they need assistance. The expense of sending three representatives to France cost approximately $4,000.

(6) In reply to the charge that Miss Jeanette V. Densmore took a pleasure trip from New York City to Atlantic City on July 4, 1918, at the expense of the Government, the facts are these: Miss Densmore, for 16 years a civil-service employee, was appointed to a position in the Immigration Bureau, Department of Labor, and then transferred to the United States Employment Service before a director general was appointed. For a week or two prior to July 1, 1918, many girls in New York City had just finished their year's schooling and had been applying for opportunities for work in the hotels and boarding houses at Atlantic City, N. J. The officer in charge of the work for the State of New York directed Miss Densmore to proceed to Atlantic City for the purpose of conferring with Col. Lewis T. Bryant, commissioner of labor for the State of New Jersey and Federal director of the United States Employment Service for that State, who resided in Atlantic City, and to make a personal inquiry into the opportunities that might be available in the numerous hotels and boarding houses of Atlantic City for New York girls who desired work of that character, as well as to ascertain conditions under which the girls would be required to perform their duties. The records of this office show that Miss Densmore left New York City on July 4, 1918, at 3.30 p. m. and arrived at Atlantic City at 6.30 p. m. that day; that she remained in Atlantic City for two days, July 5 and 6, and left there on July 7 at 9.15 a. m. for New York City, arriving at the latter place at 12.15 p. m. The record further discloses that in proceeding from New York to Atlantic City Miss Densmore used Government transportation request No. L 51736, the amount of which was $1.25, and that in returning she used Government transportation request L 51737, the amount of which was likewise $1.25, these items representing single fares between the points indicated. She paid cash fare for a seat in a Pullman car amounting to 98 cents each way. The total charge against the Government for the entire trip was $13.46. Two girls did accompany Miss Densmore from New York to Atlantic City, but they did not travel on Government transportation nor did they represent any claims to the Government for reimbursement of traveling expenses.

In substantiation of the foregoing facts there is attached as a part of this report the signed statement (1) of Col. L. T. Bryant, Federal director of the United States Employment Service for New Jersey, certifying that Miss Densmore conferred with him at Atlantic City on official business of the United States Employment Service on that date; (2) an affidavit of Mrs. Nina B. Riddell to the effect that she personally purchased with cash two tickets used by the two girls who went from New York to Atlantic City with Miss Densmore.

(7) Mr. C. H. Burroughs, a former employee of this service, who apparently is furnishing Congressman BLANTON with alleged facts concerning the unnecessary traveling of certain employees of the service, was a clerk in charge of administering and auditing what is commonly known as the revolving fund—a fund of $250,000 to be used in the advancing of transportation to wage earners from the place of recruitment to war projects. He had nothing whatever to do with the auditing of any travel vouchers except the expense vouchers of scouts accompanying the shipments of labor. He was not chief of the auditing section or of any other section. Any information that he may have, accurate or inaccurate, in connection with travel vouchers other than above stated, did not come into his possession legitimately, and if it was furnished by others it was for sinister purposes. He did resign voluntarily, but only after he had been required to make a report as to the condition of the work of which he was in charge and which he admits was in a deplorable condition, and it was fully known by him that the officials of the service were cognizant of his failure to perform the work for which he was employed. In other words, his statements are those of a disgruntled employee.

EXHIBIT 1.

[Letterhead of the United States Department of Labor—United States Employment Service.]

TRENTON, N. J., *June 17, 1919.*

MRS. MARGARETTA NEALE,
United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NEALE: I wish to advise you that I recall having had a conference with Miss Densmore regarding cooperative service for hotel help between New York and Atlantic City soon after the Atlantic City office was opened. The office opened about the 15th of June, 1918, and was in operation during the 3d, 4th, and 5th of July. It was open during practically all of the 4th of July on account of work which had to be performed.

Yours, respectfully,

(Signed) LEWIS T. BRYANT,
Federal Director of Employment for New Jersey.

EXHIBIT 2.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Mrs. Nana B. Riddell, of Chevy Chase, Md., being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That my attention has been called to the remarks of Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, and reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5 and June 14, 1919, in relation to a trip made by Miss Jeanette V. Densmore on July 4, 1918; that to my own knowledge the statements made by Mr. BLANTON therein to the effect that Miss Densmore received transportation and Pullman reservations for three persons on July 4, 1918, from New York City to Atlantic City, N. J., is untrue and misleading; that I was present at the Pennsylvania station in New York City on July 4, 1918, when Miss Densmore presented a Government transportation request for one ticket for herself from New York City to Atlantic City, N. J., and that to my knowledge she did not receive other transportation at that time on that date; that I know the two persons who accompanied Miss Densmore on that trip, inasmuch as one is my own daughter and the other a girl friend; that out of my own pocket I paid for the transportation and Pullman accommodations of my daughter and her friend for that trip; that I have not received nor sought to receive any refund of the amount paid out by me for that purpose at that time; that neither of the two persons who accompanied Miss Densmore at that time were employees of the Government; that I personally saw Miss Densmore and the two other persons depart on the train from New York; that these two persons did not return to New York with Miss Densmore; and that I myself paid out of my own funds for their return transportation from Atlantic City to New York City.

(Signed) NANA B. RIDDELL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of June, 1919.

[SEAL.] CHAS. CLAMBORN,
Notary Public.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield me three minutes?

Mr. MAPES. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this Congress I presented a petition containing some 75,000 names—people of my State—praying for the return of the troops from Russia. That petition is addressed also to the President of the United States. It has been presented to the Congress by presenting it here. I now ask unanimous consent that that petition may be presented to the White House at an early day, that it may be delivered to the President of the United States. That is only fair. It is a carefully prepared petition and contains the signatures of 75,000 people.

We get conflicting statements every day about the return of the boys from Russia. As near as I can get to the facts, the 5,000 American boys sent to Russia have practically been ordered back, except the Engineers and those who have been buried there. I do not know that any arrangement has been made for the return of their bodies.

In the city of Chicago, which is a part of my district, there are 600 women who have sons or husbands in Russia. I received this morning something like 12 letters, and I receive them almost every morning, asking when our troops are to be returned from Siberia. Ten thousand of them were sent to Vladivostok. At the right time and place I propose to discuss in this body the question as to the President's right to send them there. The American people do not believe we had any right to send them there. Those who write to me and those with whom I talk claim that we had no right to send them there. The President for six months refused to send American troops to fight in Russia because we had not declared war on Russia, and the President was of the opinion that the lawmaking power, known as the Congress of the United States, was the only power that could declare war. In response to this call which comes to me almost daily and hourly I intend to keep this matter fresh in the minds of the people. I consider it one of the great blunders of the war that we should have sent 15,000 men to subdue 180,000,000 people and take part in a political fight in Russia between the Czar and those who follow him and the Bolsheviki, in neither of which parties have we any interest. We have already taken quite a number of lives out of my district, and I have this right to have this petition presented to the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the petition be withdrawn from the House and presented to the President by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that the documents to which the gentleman refers are in the possession of the House. We are now in the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair thinks the request is hardly in order in the committee.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill H. R. 5032, with the amendments, to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass, together with the other bills which have been temporarily laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TREADWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bills H. R. 5032, 1199, 1713, and 3624, reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills as amended do pass.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendments and the bills to final passage.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment, until I can get unanimous consent in respect to this petition. It will not take a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question on the bills and amendments to final passage.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that in the House we can pass all of these bills in a bunch in that way.

The SPEAKER. They certainly could not all be passed in that way—in a bunch, as the gentleman says—but the Chair is disposed to think that the previous question can be ordered on all of them at one time. The question is on ordering the previous question on the bills and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the petition heretofore filed by me in regard to the return of American troops from Siberia be forwarded by the Clerk of the House to the President of the United States. The petition is addressed to the Congress and to the President.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the memorial and petition which were forwarded to him and by him filed with the Clerk of the House be forwarded by the Clerk of the House to the President of the United States. Is there objection?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire where these petitions come from?

Mr. MASON. They came from my district and came from the gentleman's district.

Mr. WHEELER. Any other county in the State except Cook County?

Mr. MASON. I do not know just what districts they came from, but they came from my district, about 75,000, and there are about 600 in my city alone.

Mr. WHEELER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that 600 out of 75,000 come from Cook County?

Mr. MASON. I do not know how many come from Cook County. There are some from Kane County, and I presume some from the gentleman's district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. It is simply to present a petition. The gentleman surely does not want to deny the right of petition to these people.

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made, and the Clerk will report the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3624) incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the petition to which I have referred——

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman has a right to interrupt the vote in that manner.

The SPEAKER. He can not do so except by unanimous consent, and the gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. MASON. Then I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Obviously there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. This is an automatic call, and the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 281, nays 0, answered "present" 0, not voting 149, as follows:

YEAS—281.

Ackerman	Aswell	Bland, Mo.	Briggs
Alexander	Babka	Bland, Va.	Brinson
Almon	Bankhead	Blanton	Brooks, Ill.
Anderson	Barbour	Boies	Brooks, Pa.
Andrews, Md.	Barkley	Booher	Browning
Andrews, Nebr.	Bee	Bowers	Brumbaugh
Anthony	Begg	Box	Burke
Ashbrook	Benham	Brand	Butler
Byrnes, S. C.	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Sims
Byrns, Tenn.	Hadley	Magee	Sinnott
Caldwell	Hardy, Colo.	Maher	Sisson
Campbell, Kans.	Harrison	Mapes	Small
Campbell, Pa.	Hastings	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Cannon	Hawley	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Caraway	Hayden	Mays	Smithwick
Carter	Hays	Miller	Snell
Chindblom	Hernandez	Monahan, Wis.	Stedman
Christopherson	Hersey	Mondell	Steele
Clark, Mo.	Hickey	Montague	Stephens, Ohio
Classon	Hicks	Moon	Stevenson
Cleary	Hill	Moore, Ohio	Stiness
Cole	Hoch	Moore, Pa.	Strong, Kans.
Collier	Holland	Moores, Ind.	Strong, Pa.
Connally	Houghton	Morgan	Summers, Wash.
Copley	Howard	Mott	Sweet
Costello	Huddleston	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Crago	Hudspeth	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Crisp	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Minn	Taylor, Tenn.
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Newton, Mo.	Temple
Cullen	Hutchinson	Nicholls, S. C.	Thomas
Currie, Mich.	Igoe	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson, Ohio
Curry, Calif.	Ireland	Nolan	Thompson, Okla.
Dale	Jacoway	O'Connell	Tillman
Dallinger	James	O'Connor	Tilson
Darrow	Johnson, Ky.	Ogden	Timberlake
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Miss.	Oldfield	Tincher
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Oliver	Towner
Dent	Jones, Tex.	Overtstreet	Treadway
Dickinson, Mo.	Juul	Park	Upshaw
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Parker	Vaile
Dominick	Kelly, Pa.	Parrish	Vare
Dowell	Kendall	Pell	Venable
Drane	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Vestal
Dunbar	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Vinson
Dunn	Kincheloe	Quin	Voigt
Dupré	Kinkaid	Radcliffe	Volstead
Echols	Kitchin	Rainey, H. T.	Walsh
Edmonds	Kleczka	Rainey, J. W.	Walters
Ellsworth	Kraus	Raker	Wason
Elston	Kreider	Ramsey	Watkins
Esch	LaGuardia	Ramseyer	Watson, Pa.
Evans, Nebr.	Lampert	Randall, Wis.	Webster
Evans, Nev.	Lanham	Rayburn	Welty
Fess	Lankford	Reber	Whaley
Fields	Lazaro	Reed, W. Va.	Wheeler
Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Rhodes	White, Me.
Focht	Lehlbach	Ricketts	Wilson, La.
Foster	Little	Riddick	Wilson, Pa.
French	Lonergan	Robinson, N. C.	Wingo
Fuller, Mass.	Luce	Robsion, Ky.	Winslow
Gallivan	Lufkin	Rogers	Wood, Ind.
Gandy	Luhring	Romjue	Woods, Va.
Gard	McAndrews	Rose	Woodyard
Garner	McDuffie	Rouse	Wright
Godwin, N. C.	McFadden	Rowe	Yates
Good	McKeown	Sanders, Ind.	Young, N. Dak.
Goodwin, Ark.	McKinley	Schall	Young, Tex.
Goodykoontz	McLane	Scott	Zihlman
Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sears	
Green, Iowa	McPherson	Sells	
Greene, Mass.	MacCrate	Shreve	

NOT VOTING—149.

Ayres	Fitzgerald	Larsen	Reavis
Bacharach	Flood	Layton	Reed, N. Y.
Baer	Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Riordan
Bell	Frear	Lesher	Rodenberg
Benson	Freeman	Lever	Rowan
Black	Fuller, Ill.	Linthicum	Rubey
Blackmon	Gallagher	Longworth	Rucker
Bland, Ind.	Ganly	McArthur	Sabath
Britten	Garland	McClintic	Sanders, La.
Browne	Garrett	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Buchanan	Glynn	McGlennon	Sanford
Burdick	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Saunders, Va.
Burroughs	Goodall	McKinley	Scully
Candler	Gould	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sherwood
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	MacGregor	Siegel
Carew	Griest	Major	Sinclair
Carss	Griffin	Mann	Slemp
Casey	Hamill	Mansfield	Smith, Ill.
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton	Mead	Smith, N. Y.
Coady	Hardy, Tex.	Merritt	Snyder
Cooper	Haskell	Michener	Steagall
Cramton	Haugen	Minahan, N. J.	Steenerson
Davey	Heflin	Mooney	Stephens, Miss.
Davis, Minn.	Hersman	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Dempsey	Hulings	Morin	Sumners, Tex.
Dewalt	Humphreys	Murphy	Tinkham
Donovan	Husted	Neely	Ward
Dooling	Jefferis	Nelson, Wis.	Watson, Va.
Doremus	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olney	Weaver
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Osborne	Webb
Dyer	Johnston, N. Y.	Padgett	Welling
Eagan	Kahn	Paige	White, Kans.
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Phelan	Williams
Elliott	Kettner	Porter	Wilson, Ill.
Emerson	Kiess	Pou	Wise
Evans, Mont.	King	Purnell	
Fairfield	Knutson	Ragsdale	
Ferris	Langley	Randall, Calif.	

So the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. MCGLENNON.

Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. BAER with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.
Mr. COOPER with Mr. CARSS.
Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. HAYDEN.
Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. AYRES.
Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. BENSON.
Mr. WHITE of Kansas with Mr. BLACK.
Mr. WARD with Mr. CANDLER.
Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. SNYDER with Mr. CAREW.
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. SLEMP with Mr. COADY.
Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. DOREMUS.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. REED of New York with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. REAVIS with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. EVANS of Montana.
Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. FERRIS.
Mr. MURPHY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. GARRETT.
Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. HASKELL with Mr. RUBEY.
Mr. LAYTON with Mr. HARDY of Texas.
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. HEFLIN.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. HERSMAN.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HUMPHREYS.
Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. LARSEN.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. LEA of California.
Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. LESHER.
Mr. HUSTED with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. HULINGS with Mr. LINTHICUM.
Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. LEVER.
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. MCKINIRY.
Mr. GOULD wth Mr. MAJOR.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. MANSFIELD.
Mr. GLYNN with Mr. MEAD.
Mr. GARLAND with Mr. MINAHAN.
Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. MOONEY of Ohio.
Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
Mr. FREAR with Mr. OLNEY.
Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. EMERSON with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. POU.
Mr. DYER with Mr. RAGSDALE.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. BUCHANAN.
Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. BROWNE with Mr. RUCKER.
Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. BAER with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. BURDICK with Mr. STEAGALL.
Mr. MICHENER with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
Mr. MERRITT with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. MACGREGOR with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.
Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.
Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. WEAVER.
Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. WEBB.
Mr. MURPHY with Mr. WELLING.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 1713.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. There are amendments, and the question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 1199.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 5032.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5032) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. PHELAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, for three days, on account of death in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on the subject of the passage of the joint resolution thanking the soldiers and sailors who took part in the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. I presented a petition some days since to the House, which was addressed to the Congress and to the President, praying that our troops be withdrawn from Russia. A few moments since I asked unanimous consent that that petition might be sent by the Clerk to the President, as it was addressed to him as well as to Congress. I wish to ask the Chair the parliamentary procedure to get a vote so that the right of petition may not be denied these people.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry. Of course, the gentleman made a proper motion. He asked unanimous consent, which was refused. The only way the Chair knows——

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, then I desire to move that that petition——

The SPEAKER. It is not in order. A motion to adjourn is pending.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, can not the gentleman take that down to the White House himself?

Mr. MASON. There is nobody at the White House to receive it but the janitor. [Laughter.]

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 552. An act to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conynham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conynham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.; and

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 25, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6376) to amend section 2 of the act approved September 8, 1916, relating to pensions, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 56), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KIESS, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5418) increasing the pay of printers and pressmen in the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 57), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Water Power, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 61), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 62), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the House resolution (H. J. Res. 120) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Tao Hung Chang and Zeng Tze Wong, citizens of China, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 63), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3143) to provide for further educational facilities by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at reduced rates certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade, technical, and public schools and universities, and other recognized educational institutions, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 64), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 6542) to repeal the act of Congress approved February 1, 1905, and to transfer national forests from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6543) to provide for the survey of a national highway connecting certain national monuments in the States of Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6544) for the protection of the water supply of the town of Sunnyside, Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6545) to protect the Government of the United States of America, its national emblem, its securities and obligations, and its military and naval forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 6546) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Anthony, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dodge City, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6548) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lyons, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 6549) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars and disturbances in Utah Territory from 1849 to 1869, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6550) to prevent the withdrawal of mineral lands of the United States from entry and occupancy under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6551) to establish a branch of the Interior Department in the Western States, and to transfer to such branch certain bureaus and offices of the Interior Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 6552) to create a department of Federal highways, to establish a national highway system, to promote efficient and economical highway transportation, and to amend an act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. EVANS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 6553) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, passed February 4, 1887, and subsequent amendments thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6554) to amend section 48 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 6555) to prevent breaches of the public peace in the District of Columbia by picketing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 6556) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau of citizenship and Americanization for the Americanization of naturalized citizens; amend section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6557) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens from the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 6558) providing for the survey of a canal from Cumberland Sound, Ga., to the Gulf of Mexico, and terminals; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 6559) to amend section 900 of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 6560) providing for the survey of a canal from Ocmulgee River, Ga., to Apalachicola River, Fla., and terminals; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 6561) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Addison, county of Lenawee, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6562) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Park Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 6563) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, and to repeal all acts and parts of acts amendatory thereto, and to provide for the disposition of all property acquired under and by virtue of the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 6564) for the erection of a public building at Hazlehurst, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6565) for the erection of a public building at Adel, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6566) for the erection of a public building at Baxley, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) for the erection of a public building at Ocilla, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6568) for the erection of a public building at Blackshear, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6569) for the erection of a public building at Jesup, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) for the erection of a public building at Nashville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6571) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Mexia, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6572) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Teague, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6573) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Greensburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6574) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Vandergrift, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6575) to provide for the construction of a public building at Spartanburg, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6576) for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6577) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6578) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Waynesburg, Green County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6579) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Berlin, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6580) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Connellsville, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6581) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Somerset, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6582) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Meyersdale, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6583) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Perryopolis, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6584) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Windber, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Addison, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6586) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brownsville, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6587) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Uniontown, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6588) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6589) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept in behalf of the United States certain lands within the Siuslaw National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MACCRATE: A bill (H. R. 6590) regulating the hours of labor at navy yards; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 133) authorizing session clerks to certain committees; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SNELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 135) authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling upon the Government officials to display the United States flag on all Government buildings and the people to display the flag at their homes on the third Sunday of June, which shall hereafter be known as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. REBER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) extending to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; also authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions the members of such local and district boards; also authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress an appropriate medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania urging appropriation for continuance of Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRAGO: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania favoring an appropriation by Congress for Frankford Arsenal sufficient to employ 2,400 men; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York favoring introduction of a measure which will accord citizens who desire to own a home the same inducements now afforded to farmers by Federal statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HULINGS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, with relation to the Frankford Arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, approving legislation which provides for the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, approving legislation which provides for the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, approving legislation which provides for the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6591) granting a pension to Edith Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6592) granting a pension to Catherine D. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) granting a pension to Mary J. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6594) granting a pension to Sabina A. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6595) for the relief of Blanch Winters; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6596) for the relief of Bertiel Nielson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 6597) granting a pension to Harrison Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 6598) granting a pension to Cynthia Ann Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6599) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6600) granting a pension to Frances Tucker Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6601) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6602) granting a pension to Louise Wamsley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Brewer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6604) for the relief of Alfred Cluff and others; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) granting a pension to Herbert E. Van Horn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6606) for the relief of Katheryn Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 6607) granting a pension to John E. Tingley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6608) granting a pension to Alfred M. Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6609) granting a pension to Floyd B. Daugherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6610) granting a pension to Thomas Mahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 6611) granting an increase of pension to Adam Goodlive; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6612) granting an increase of pension to Spencer S. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6613) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert Geslin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6614) granting a pension to Annie Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6615) granting a pension to John Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6616) granting a pension to James R. Garrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6617) granting a pension to Jesse Gibson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6618) granting a pension to John Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6619) granting an increase of pension to R. J. Stanberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6620) granting an increase of pension to Dudley R. Sloan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6621) granting an increase of pension to Raymond E. Daniels; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 6622) granting an increase of pension to Anna Christophersen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6623) granting a pension to Harriet L. Cobb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) granting a pension to Viola Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6625) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6626) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Gibbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 6627) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Parkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6628) granting a pension to Eliza K. Leman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) granting a pension to Peter F. Wesner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 6630) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Rilea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Huntley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6632) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6633) granting an increase of pension to William L. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6634) granting an increase of pension to R. Franklin Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6635) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Sidlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6636) granting a pension to Reuben Marks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 6637) granting a pension to Allen R. Vickers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Congregational Church Men's Bible Class, Williamsburg, Mass., favoring a league of nations, and asking that the United States Senate, without delay, ratify the treaty of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Local No. 295, Detroit Postal Clerks' Association, asking relief for the inefficiency in the Detroit post office due to the inadequate wage allowed postal workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring Senate bill 1029, for the reappropriation of surplus fund in payment for a proposed memorial archway to the entrance of Vicksburg Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), petition of City Council of Worcester, Mass., requesting that steps be taken to procure an investigation of the wholesale and retail price of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, asking for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, for the distribution of stored foodstuffs to reduce high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of members of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Dundee, Ill., protesting against any modification of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Bensenville, Ill., urging repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Aurora, Ill., urging repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of registrars and other volunteers who conducted the registration draft on June 5, 1917, Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that some appropriate recognition be granted to all who served in this work in any part of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of California Bean Growers' Association, to permit collective marketing through nonprofit cooperative associations of farm products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of five representative department stores of Sacramento, Calif., in favor of the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Memphis, Tenn., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Gallipolis, Ohio, protesting against and asking for repeal of section 904 of 1918 Federal income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Cook County (Ill.) Real Estate Board, favoring an appropriation of $1,500,000 for a harbor at Great Lakes Naval Station; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Valley Manufacturers' Club, opposing any appropriation for continuing the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of 100 citizens of Mazon, Ill., for repeal of tax on soda water, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of H. O. Bursum and Juan J. Gurule, committee on resolutions, asking for an appropriation to be used in behalf of drainage for the benefit of several Indian pueblos; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Protest of a resident of Smithville Flats, N. Y., against the appropriation of public money for the redemption of swamps, deserts, or cut-over lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of Charles Warren and others, customers of Schilleci Bros., Bessemer, Ala., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of R. H. Thompson and others, of Little Rock, Ark., asking for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Foster Drug Co. and others, of Little Rock, Ark., favoring the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolutions of Methodist Episcopal Church of Woonsocket, R. I., and Newman Congregational Church, East Providence, both in the State of Rhode Island, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition and for the passage of enforcement codes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of mass meeting of citizens of Turtle Creek, East Pittsburgh, and Wilmerding, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of sundry citizens of Muncy, Pa., asking immediate repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Resolution of board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging adoption by the Congress of the United States of resolution providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Petition of Local 33, National Amalgamation of Textile Operatives of Salem, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Local 797, Painters and Paper Hangers Union, Manchester, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging a resolution providing for the recognition of the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 200 citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., urging repeal of section 630 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Petitions of the Madison Tea Co. against the present interpretation by the Treasury Department of section 902 of the revenue act of 1918; the Madison (Wis.) theatrical managers, protesting against the continuation of the present admission tax on theater tickets; and Harley C. Lawrence and 11 other citizens of Ferryville, Wis., asking for the repeal of the taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the citizens of Belmont, Wis., against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Rhinelander, protesting against taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of F. G. Tassotti and others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the Jugo-Slav; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Resolutions by the City Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, Calif., in support of a bill to amend the naturalization act of 1906, urging free distribution of a textbook issued by the Bureau of Naturalization to every foreign-born student in public schools throughout the United States; and approving the work of the Bureau of Naturalization concerning educational matters within the States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Resolution passed by Stationary Engineers' Union, Butte, Mont., urging that Congress make appropriation for the continuance of the working conditions service, United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of citizens of Baylor, Glentana, and Avondale, all in the State of Montana, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Harold R. Young, secretary public affairs of National Retail Dry Goods Association, and many hundred citizens of New York, requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of board of aldermen of the city of New York, providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petitions of Gates Lodge, No. 565, International Order of Good Templars, of Gates, Monroe County, and of Monroe District Lodge, No. 24, all of Gates, Monroe County, N. Y., for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Resolution of Minneapolis Branch, No. 9, of the National Letter Carriers' Association, praying for congressional relief; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of Mrs. S. A. Manning, of Garfield; Dan G. Regan, of Oakesdale; William L. Pence, of Farmington; and others, in the State of Washington, asking repeal of tax on necessities, medicines, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Buckeye Extract Co., of Olympia, Wash., protesting against passage of either House bill 3458 or 3461; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Seattle, appealing for protection of the American magnesite industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of the First Methodist Church of Yakima, Wash., against the repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Miss Grace Bell and 27 teachers of the Irving School, Spokane, Wash., favoring the enactment into law of House bill 7, the educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Tennessee Manganese Co., by D. C. Campbell, president, relating to manganese industry of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania for the repeal of tax on soda water and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of M. Sludzinski, commissioner for an investigation of the high cost of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, asking repeal of tax on soda water and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of Huntington, W. Va., etc., favoring the repeal of present tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Sullivan County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, by its president, Mrs. Alma F. A. Brown, Cornish, N. H., for the enforcement of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Northern Star Lodge, International Order of Good Templars, Littleton, N. H., by C. W. Bedell, chief templar, and Melvina J. Page, secretary, asking the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the North Haverhill Woman's Christian Temperance Union, North Haverhill, N. H., by its secretary, Mrs. Ina B. Miller, for the enforcement of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *June 25, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

EDUCATION OF NATIVES OF ALASKA (S. DOC. NO. 43).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations in the sum of $50,000 required by the Bureau of Education for education, etc., of the natives of Alaska, fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1199. An act to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1713. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3624. An act incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5032. An act to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.;

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada; and

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask permission out of order to introduce a bill that has been prepared by the National Engineering Council. It is a bill changing the Department of the Interior to the department of public works. I am presenting the bill in order that the matter may be discussed and considered, its merits and demerits weighed, and a determination reached as to whether it would be wise to do what the bill proposes to do. I do not know whether I am in favor of it myself or not, but I think it of sufficient importance to have consideration.

Mr. McCORMICK. At whose instance does the Senator introduce the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the National Engineering Council is the origin of the bill.

The bill (S. 2232) to create a department of public works and define its powers and duties was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Diamondville, Wyo., praying for the settlement of the Jugo-Italo question through a plebiscite, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a resolution adopted by the Department of Washington and Alaska United Spanish War Veterans at its sixteenth annual encampment at Bellingham, Wash., favoring the extension of the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of lands so as to include Spanish war veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of the Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of the city and county of Sacramento, State of California, favoring the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of lands for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Council of Santa Rosa, Calif., praying for the modification or repeal of war-time prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of wines and beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 2233) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2234) to authorize the Director of the Census to conduct surveys of municipal activities; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2235) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces and to encourage the development of the agricultural resources of the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 2236) relating to affidavits required by the act entitled "An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 2237) authorizing the erection of a public building at Vermilion, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 2238) granting an increase of pension to William L. Pierce;

A bill (S. 2239) granting an increase of pension to William McAfee (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2240) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Lufkin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2241) for the relief of Louis F. Meissner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 2242) granting an increase of pension to George W. Davis;

A bill (S. 2243) granting a pension to Perlie I. Haskell;

A bill (S. 2244) granting an increase of pension to John A. Chadwick;

A bill (S. 2245) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Holmes;

A bill (S. 2246) granting an increase of pension to James J. Hamilton;

A bill (S. 2247) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bragdon; and

A bill (S. 2248) granting a pension to Sophronia N. Pierce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 2249) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to H. Allen Buie, Rayville, La., certain lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2251) for the appointment of Lieut. Thomas White to the permanent Dental Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2252) making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid at the request of the President in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $250,000 for the extension of Sunnyside Canal, Kennewick, State of Washington, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to present a conference report on the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "to take effect at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "not to exceed four months"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 7, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "supervision, possession, control, or operation therein specified"; and on page 2, line 25, of the engrossed bill, after the word "fully," insert "adjusted and"; also on page 2, line 25, of the engrossed bill, after "paid," strike out the words "and adjusted"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 11, and agreed to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "ninety"; and on page 3, line 5, of the engrossed bill, after the word "made," insert "to the Congress"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "each separate"; and on page 3, lines 9 and 10, of the engrossed bill, strike out the words "under the proclamations referred to in section 1"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "system from August 1, 1918, up to"; and the House agree to the same.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
ATLEE POMERENE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JOHN J. ESCH,
E. L. HAMILTON,
T. W. SIMS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ADDRESS OF HON. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by former Senator Beveridge, delivered before the Pennsylvania Bar Association last evening at Bedford, Pa.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE, DELIVERED TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 24, 1919, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PENNSYLVANIA BAR ASSOCIATION AT BEDFORD, PA.

LEAGUE V. NATION.

"Gentlemen of the Pennsylvania Bar Association: It is conceded by all that the gravest question except one ever raised in the history of the Republic is now before the American people for decision. It comes in the form of a treaty and therefore in a form difficult—some have said, perhaps some have hoped, impossible—for the people to reach. Yet because the answer to that question profoundly affects the present prosperity, happiness, and safety of every man, woman, and child in the United States; because it works radical changes in the American Government; because it concerns the very independence of the Republic; because it determines for all time to come the destiny of the Nation; because of all these facts the people ought to be given the right to pass upon that question, the people must be given that right and, unless the old American spirit is dead, the people will be given that right.

"In helping the people to answer that question American lawyers can render invaluable patriotic service. In this emergency they are the advisors of the Republic.

"The covenant of the league of nations is a long and complicated document; much of its language is vague and capable of many interpretations. How shall the meaning of that covenant be determined? What power will construe it? Will our Government construe the covenant or will the government of the superstate decide what powers the covenant confers upon it and what obligations the covenant places upon us? The power that construes determines the power that rules.

"Our own experience enlightens us. From the time the project of a league of nations was imported to America—for this ancient scheme was first revived in a foreign country but for tactical reasons brought here and presented as an American conception—the advocates of a league urged the analogy between our own Constitution and that of an international government.

"If this analogy is true the league covenant must be construed by the league's government at Geneva and not by the separate members of the superstate; or, rather, if one nation—our own, for instance—says that it has certain rights and powers under the covenant and the league says that those rights and powers were surrendered when that nation joined the league, then the construction by the nation must yield to the construction by the superstate.

"Did not these results follow the adoption of our own Constitution? Was it not ratified upon the distinct and positive understanding by the States that they retained all righs and powers not expressly granted to the Nation? Were not most of the rights and powers which the States believed they had retained construed away? Did not the National Government, by congressional legislation, by executive action, by judicial interpretation, steadily and constantly increase the powers of the nation and reduce those of the States? Did not a mighty combination of States deny what they repeatedly called the 'usurped' power of the General Government and finally go to war to reassert the rights which they believed had been wrested from them?

"And if the analogy between the establishment of our Nation and the formation of this superstate is just, will not our experience be repeated on a larger scale? Many of the ablest lawyers in the Republic declare that the league covenant takes from the United States some of our most dearly cherished rights, destroys policies vital to our security and well-being, impairs our sovereignty, limits our independence. Some advocates of the league—but not all of them—deny these conclusions. If we enter the league, who is to decide? According to the analogy pressed upon us by the league advocates themselves, the superstate will decide; the superstate will determine its own powers and the obligations of its members; the superstate will construe the covenant which creates it.

"And to what will this lead? In case the American Nation, as a member of the league, shall assert that we retain the rights, powers, sovereignty, and independence we now possess, and the superstate shall deny our claim, must we not yield? If we refuse to yield, what would that entail? Would it not entail war? Do we not, by joining the superstate, deliberately surrender our freedom of action and decision as to our own rights, powers, and policies—our very sovereignty and independence, indeed—or else knowingly place ourselves in a situation where we must go to war to maintain them? Yet they are not now in danger; they are now secure; but will any man say that they are not at least imperiled, if not destroyed, the moment we become a member of the superstate? Let those who have been told that this league of nations is to bring universal peace make sure that it does not instead sow dragons' teeth.

"Of course those who are willing that the American Nation shall become as subordinate to the superstate as our States are now subordinate to our General Government can logically favor making the United States a member of that superstate. But how can Americans who wish our Republic to continue to be a sovereign and independent Nation, clothed with all the rights and powers we now enjoy and retaining the advantages God has given us—how can Americans who want to keep for ourselves and hand down to our children unimpaired the heritage we received from our fathers unimpaired—how can such Americans ever consent that our country be merged into a hybrid international confederacy and the American Government be subordinated to it?

"Thus far I have merely followed to its logical and historical conclusion the analogy which the league advocates assert exists between the building of our Nation and the erection of the proposed superstate. It is certain that where the meaning of the covenant is obscure the interpretation will always be favorable to the power and authority of the superstate and against the rights and powers of any nation which conflict with the decrees of the superstate. And let us bear in mind that even the chief assistant American protagonist of the league admits that most of the language of the covenant is so hard to understand that the meaning must be literally 'dug out' of the opaque verbiage.

"What now of those provisions of the covenant that, seemingly, can be understood? What is their effect upon the American Nation? Do they conform to our Constitution, or do they abolish parts of it?

"Section 10 of the covenant would bind us to go to war to defend from 'external aggression' new territorial boundaries fixed up by the big four, as well as old boundaries recognized by that body, and to support the 'political independence' of the powers governing those territories. If this is not the true purport of that section, what is the real meaning of it? But our Constitution gives Congress the exclusive power to declare war.

"As a member of the superstate, which would govern us, section 10 of the covenant or the war power of our Constitution? Both can not stand; they are absolutely irreconcilable. By

the covenant we would be pledged to make war whether we wish to do so or not. If Congress should refuse, would we not break our treaty? And would not this invite retaliation? Would it not, as the very least and certain result, bring upon us the hatred of the nation we refuse to support and the distrust of all other nations?

"And what are the boundaries of the foreign States which the league covenant would bind us to defend with American blood and treasure? Does any human being now in America know? Is not this all that anybody in America does know, that these boundaries inclose new and old dominions in every quarter of the globe?

"We were at war with Germany and Austria only; we can make peace only with them; yet, if we become a member of the superstate, the covenant makes us the guarantors forever of the territories of 32 separate governments specifically named in the covenant and of at least 13 other governments to be added hereafter; and these 45 governments are scattered from Patagonia to Japan, from the Himalayas to the Mountains of the Moon, from the shores of the Indian Ocean to those of the Arctic Seas. Under the covenant, in short, we would underwrite forever the status quo of the whole world as the big four has framed it. But we do not even understand where the boundaries run that we are required to maintain.

"We know, of course, where Shantung is with its incalculable resources and its two score million of wronged inhabitants; but, except that we abhor and ought to repudiate the brutal immorality of delivering that land and those people to Japan, what is Shantung to us? If fight we must about Shantung, would we not prefer to fight on the side of its outraged millions rather than on the side of their despoilers? Yet not only are we to be made a party to that infamy, but, if we join the league, we shall be obligated to support it by American life and treasure. We have learned recently where Fiume is; but is the decision of the question whether that town shall belong to one European government or another worth the life of a single American boy or a dollar of the American people's money?

"Section 8 of the covenant provides that the size of our Army and Navy shall be fixed by the superstate and, when agreed to by our Government, can not be altered except by the consent of the superstate. No matter how grave the emergency, no matter what perils arise, no matter how immediate the duty before us, we can not increase our land and sea forces. In practical effect, the control of the American Army and the American Navy is to be surrendered to the superstate. But our Constitution confers on Congress the exclusive power to raise armies, build navies, and makes our President the Commander in Chief.

"Section 16 of the covenant would bind us, in certain cases, to cut off all commercial and financial relations with another nation, and even to prohibit all personal intercourse with individuals of that nation. But our Constitution gives Congress the exclusive authority to pass every law by which alone this terrible power can be exercised. Should the league demand us to sever all relations—economic, social, and personal—with another nation, an act that would surely wrench and dislocate the industry and business of our whole country, and should Congress refuse to enact embargo, nonintercourse, and other laws we would thereby violate the covenant.

"Section 15 of the covenant would bind us to turn over to the league for settlement any dispute with another nation 'likely to lead to a rupture'; yet our Constitution lodges exclusively in Congress the power to make immigration, tariff, and other laws over which controversies with other nations most often arise, and by our Constitution the interpretation of those laws is given to our National Government. Section 16, which must be read with the preceding section, is full of contradictory statements, but one sentence in the mass of confused verbiage provides that any dispute 'shall be referred' to the assembly of the league 'at the request of either party.'

"These are some examples—not all but some—of the mangling of our Constitution by the proposed covenant of the league of nations. Many basic national powers given Congress by our Constitution are, in practical and final effect, transferred from the American Government at Washington to the league's government at Geneva. For us Americans the issue is Nation or league—it can not be both.

"Those who advocated a league admitted that the first draft of the covenant was unsatisfactory. But they urged that the covenant could be amended so as to safeguard our sovereignty, our independence, and our rights. Nobody now in America knows whether any American amendments ever were proposed; and if so, what those amendments were. But we do know that if any American amendments were submitted they were rejected, except two, which were so juggled as to expressly defeat the purpose they were intended to accomplish.

"Take the so-called Monroe doctrine 'amendment.' That vital and purely American policy was, of course, not mentioned in the foreign draft of the league covenant which the big four at Paris adopted instead of the American draft which they rejected. When this fact became known to the American people a thunder of protest arose from every section of our land. To check the storm of American indignation the league covenant was 'amended' by a seeming recognition of the validity of the Monroe doctrine, and it was expected that this camouflage would deceive the American people until the league covenant could be clamped upon them.

"As a matter of fact that so-called amendment (section 21 of the covenant) specifically, and in terms, surrenders the Monroe doctrine. This traditional and exclusively American policy is defined to be nothing more than an 'international engagement' or a 'regional understanding,' like any of those recent and vague claims which various nations are now making. The right to say what this fundamental American policy means or how it shall be applied is taken away from the American Government and lodged in the government of the superstate.

"That this is true is proved by the interpretation of the Monroe doctrine 'amendment' which the British Government announced the moment that addition was made to the league covenant. The British delegation immediately issued a formal and official statement that this 'amendment' means that the Monroe doctrine has ceased to be an American policy, and that 'should any dispute over the meaning' of it 'ever arise * * * the league is there to settle it.'

"In the face of this assertion, made at the time this so-called 'amendment' was inserted in the covenant, made by the most influential power consenting to this 'amendment,' made by the power, indeed, that wrote the covenant, can any man doubt that if we enter the league the Monroe doctrine is destroyed? If the American delegation did not agree to the British interpretation of this 'amendment,' why did not the American delegation immediately deny that interpretation?

"It is said that harmony required silence on our part? Why on our part alone? Why did not harmony require silence from Great Britain also? Under the circumstances did not our silence amount to acquiescence? Is it not certain that in case of dispute the superstate will maintain that we did acquiesce, and that we are bound by that acquiescence? And are the American people willing to have that fundamental and historic American policy—that purely and exclusively American policy—the Monroe doctrine, thus annihilated?

"And yet, when this amendment was first cabled to America we were gleefully but hurriedly told that the Monroe doctrine had been 'saved.' How did it come to be in peril? Did we go to war to wreck or endanger that traditional American policy, so indispensable to the security, power, and well-being of the American Nation?

"Another 'amendment' to the covenant was made to meet the objection that if we went into the league and did not like it we could not get out of it except by war. This objection was so plainly true that even the secret conclave in Paris realized that something must be done to evade it. So an 'amendment' was adopted by which we are seemingly permitted to withdraw upon two years' notice—and yet we are prevented from withdrawing until we discharge every obligation which any nation on earth may claim to be due it from us, and also not until we discharge every obligation owing to the league itself. Whether we have thus fulfilled every claim made upon us is to be determined not by our Government at Washington but by the league's government at Geneva.

"If we wish to withdraw and assert that we have discharged all our obligations to every nation on earth and to the league itself, and if any nation, or if the league itself, says that we have not discharged any one of our obligations, we must stay in the league against our will or else cut our way out with the sword. Nor is this the worst. If, at any time during the two years, after we have given notice that we wish to withdraw, any member of the superstate claims that its territories are threatened or in danger, the United States must be ready to defend those territories by arms; and if those territories should be attacked, America must actually defend them by arms, should the superstate order us to do so.

"One would think that even those who formerly were for some kind of a league would be so affronted by the insult to our intelligence contained in these 'amendments' that they would turn in wrath upon the scheme now reported, the only certain thing about which is that, if we join this superstate, the American Republic will be subordinated to foreign powers and made a party to all their quarrels and all their wars.

"What now of the government of the league? It should be repeated that the big four has already designated 32 nations,

including Liberia and the Kingdom of Hedjaz, to be members of the superstate. Each of these nations is to have one equal vote, except the British Empire, which is to have six votes. These nations, little and big, white, brown, black, and yellow, are scattered all over Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere. The big four has invited 13 others to join, and these are situated in Europe, Asia, and South and Central America.

"The vote of any of these nations, no matter how small, poor, or remote, can kill the vote of the United States. South American Ecuador or African Liberia, Serbia in the Balkans, or Central American Salvador, Asiatic Siam or European Portugal, the Arabian Kingdom of Hedjaz or the Republic of Czechoslovakia—any one of these or any other member of the superstate will weigh as much in voting power as does the American Nation, except, of course, the British Empire, which is to have six times the voting power of America.

"Is it not reasonable to suppose that, as the member of the superstate having more wealth, greater resources, and more available men than any other, the United States will be required to supply the largest amount of the money and number of soldiers needed to maintain the superstate and enforce its decrees? And should these funds and forces be demanded of us by the league, must we not supply them or break the covenant?

"If it be said that the superstate acts principally through its council, the answer is that the council may be increased to any number 'with the approval of the majority of the assembly'—the assembly consisting of the representatives of every nation belonging to the superstate. And who are to be the first members of this council? Representatives of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Brazil, Spain, Greece, and the United States. Who is the executive officer of the superstate? He is the secretary general. This high official, already designated, is a British subject. This secretary general and his staff, conducting the routine of the superstate's government at its capital in Geneva, can and will make practical interpretations of the covenant. Indeed, this executive power must do so in the nature of things. The council can and will—and, indeed, must—still further construe it; but in the end all the members of the superstate, meeting in assembly can, will, and must control the policy of the league.

"In the end, every question coming before the league and vitally affecting America is to be decided by a majority of the members of the league, if the United States joins it. Who will control that majority? Certainly not America, with her solitary vote; certainly not America, the most envied if not the best hated of any country on earth; certainly not America, unless history bears false witness and human nature is repealed. No; America, richer and more prosperous than any other country, would, as a member of this superstate, be absolutely at the mercy of the majority of the other members. If we enter the league, can we escape from this desperate situation unless we go to war to resist the decisions of that majority?

"If it be said that this is not the true construction of the league covenant, let any man declare what is the correct interpretation of it. Contrasted with our Constitution, the league covenant is as a foggy midnight to a cloudless noonday. Yet it has taken a century of debates in Congress, decisions by courts, and an awful war to determine the full meaning of the Constitution. How many centuries and how many wars, then, will be required to settle the meaning of this league covenant?

"If this scheme, which makes the United States at once the roustabout and paying teller for the rest of the world, to do the work and pay the debts of other nations when ordered by the superstate—if this plan, as now revealed, were suddenly proposed without the way having been prepared for it by a skillful propaganda, would America consider it for a moment? Would not the country reject it with scorn and wrath?

"Would one out of a hundred of those who have been taught to believe that some sort of league is desirable tolerate this scheme if freshly presented to them? Would one in a hundred who have felt that some new arrangement was needed for the sake of international harmony have indorsed this covenant had it been proposed when, four years ago, the great international propaganda for a league began its work among the American people?

"Since then this propaganda has been openly and ceaselessly active; and there are evidences that the way was being prepared for it sometime before it began its undisguised labors. It has been and is heavily financed, maintains immense headquarters in New York, with certain officials drawing heavy salaries; it has traveling agents in the field; it has poured and is pouring Niagaras of literature upon the country; it has sent and is sending swarms of orators all over the land. All this costs money—tens of thousands of dollars, perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps millions of dollars. How much money that organization has spent nobody knows but its officers.

"From the beginning of its labors this propaganda was careful to tell the people only that a league of nations would forever prevent war—that was all; not a word about the surrender of American independence; not a word about the repeal of basic provisions of our Constitution; not a hint of any of those ruinous features of the scheme that finally has been laid before us.

"Thus many true Americans, noble men and women, were persuaded to join the organization which the propaganda formed in every State of the Union; and now they are told by the headquarters of the propaganda that this league covenant, drafted by a foreign Government and accepted by the Paris conclave, instead of the American draft, which our own people have not been permitted to see, is what the propaganda intended from the first. So, without reading this astounding document, many good Americans have thus accepted what the propagandists have told them about it.

"Let those who have thus been deceived read the league covenant and compare the product now forced upon them with the prospectus that, for four years, has advertised that product. Let them read it and compare the reality with what they are told a league was to be.

"The bald statement that the league of nations will prevent war, which has seduced most of those who still support this international scheme for a superstate, has been overwhelmingly refuted by your own eminent statesman, PHILANDER CHASE KNOX, one of the ablest men who ever sat in the Senate of the United States. Senator KNOX has shown conclusively that the proposed league of nations is an incubator of wars, a breeder of conflict, and that, if we become a member of it, we shall be forced to take part in those wars whether we want to or not.

"Senator KNOX's powerful argument has not been answered. No one has even attempted to answer it. No one will attempt to answer it—for it is unanswerable. Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, spoke the plain truth when, in his great address in the Senate during this month, he declared, after a calm and statesmanlike analysis of the league covenant, that the league of nations is not a peace combination but a gigantic war trust—and a war trust which requires America to spend most of the blood and the money for the benefit of the other members of the trust. That Senator JOHNSON is right will be apparent to anyone who will take the trouble to read the covenant.

"For instance, the fear of Russian attack upon India has governed Great Britain's far eastern policy for more than half a century. This fear was the cause of her military alliance with Japan. Should Russia again grow strong, as France did after the French Revolution, and should she attack India, we would be compelled to send soldiers to fight and die in the deserts and amid the mountains of Asia if the league so ordered.

"If Italy attacks the Jugo-Slovaks or they attack the Italians, American troops must be sent to fight on one side or the other whenever the government of the league at Geneva demands that our Government send them.

"To Japan has been delivered an enormous province of China containing some of the richest coal and iron mines in the world, and having a population larger than that of France, almost as large as that of England. This violation of Shantung, with its wealth of minerals and its 42,000,000 people, perpetrated against the bitter protest of China, of which it is a part, and against the despairing opposition of its inhabitants, is one of the blackest diplomatic infamies of history. Yet in case this bartered people revolts and in an attempt to recover her own despoiled China assists them, American lives must be given and American money spent to uphold Japan's supremacy, should the league so direct.

"And these are only three of many similar cases. If war breaks out among the arbitrarily constructed States which the big four has set up in Europe, the league government at Geneva can order as many thousands of American soldiers as it likes to kill and be killed on one side or another, as the league may decide.

"Our people have been led to believe that once this league is formed all will be peace and quiet; and yet, without our own and the Allies' armies on the ground, war is at this moment raging from the Baltic to the Caspian, and flames are springing up here and there at times throughout central-southern Europe. When our own and the Allies' armies are completely disbanded, is it reasonable to expect that the racial, political, and economic forces that already are causing these conflicts will cease?

"If they do not cease, if they continue to work as they are working now, and have worked throughout history, or if the Russian revolution takes the same course that the French revolution took, and a series of European wars follow the Russian revolution as they followed the French revolution, the United States, as a member of the league of nations, must pour streams of soldiers, ships, and money to Europe to maintain any angle of that many-sided and far-flung struggle that the league government orders us to maintain.

"The principal answer of those who would have America become a cog in the league's machinery is that none of the events pointed out will ever happen, and that we are safe in taking a chance. What do lawyers—what do any men of common sense and experience—think of that argument? Would anybody make a will on that theory? Was any serious contract ever written on such an expectation? Was any constitution ever framed on such a hazard? Is it not the chief purpose of contracts, wills, and constitutions to guard against contingencies that might occur if not thus expressly provided for? Yet this league covenant is more important than any contract, will, or constitution, because it can be avoided, set aside, or replaced only by war.

"I have named only some of the revolting and sordid foreign burdens of blood, debt, and misery which membership in the league would load upon the shoulders of clean, strong, solvent, and idealistic America. Is it not plain that the covenant of the superstate makes America the pack horse of the world? Instead of keeping us out of war, would not our membership in the league compel us to take part in perpetual conflicts on every continent?

"What is our danger of war if we do not enter the league? For more than a century no foreign nation attacked us until, in desperation, the lawless German Government perpetrated that folly and crime; and during that century we made no showing of our strength and unity such as we have displayed to all the world in this war. If, without such a demonstration of our solidarity and might we were not attacked for a hundred years, is it probable or possible that we will be assailed again so long as memory remains of our tremendous and successful efforts during the last two years?

"When foreign wars take place hereafter America can remain neutral or take part as wisdom and righteousness shall dictate at the time, provided America now holds fast to her traditional freedom of action. Will not future generations that must make the decision know better what should be done at that time than we who will then be in our graves? Shall we now shackle the mind and will of our children and childrens' children forever? Shall we commit them to a course they can not change, subject them to burdens they never can throw off?

"The limitations to our freedom of action which the league covenant puts upon us are, of course, equal to the obligations to which it subjects us. Take one such limitation which present events hold up before our eyes. The other day we were compelled to send our soldiers into Mexico to protect Americans on this side of the Rio Grande. Three years ago we were forced to send a military expedition into that country. As a member of the league of nations our hands would be shackled as to Mexico, no matter how much the safety of American citizens, the maintenance of American rights, the protection of American interests, or the vindication of American honor might require us to act.

"For years American citizens have been murdered in that savage land; American women violated; American property destroyed. Does it seem probable that these atrocities and outrages will cease? There are, always have been, and always will be more American men and women engaged in legitimate business in Mexico than those of all other nations combined; more American capital honestly invested in Mexico than that of all other nations combined. Is it not plain that, sooner or later, America's relation to Mexico must be established on a basis at least as secure as that on which our relations with Cuba rest? Yet, as to Mexico, if we join the league of nations, we are helpless.

"A plan appears to have been made to force us into this superstate by declaring that it is actually established, and that we are, in practical effect, already a member of it. We are to be subjected to the hypnosis of the fait accompli. Even now we are told that the thing is done and can not be undone. But this is not the truth. America is not committed to membership in the superstate and never will be, unless the American Senate consents. And the Senate never will consent until some way is found to place this tremendous question directly before the American people and their answer to it is secured.

"Will any league advocate tell us why the people should not vote on this mighty issue—an issue which affects the people far more seriously than any upon which they have voted since our Government was founded?

"Self-determination of peoples seems to have been lowered from the high plane of principle to that of a mere catchword, and then abandoned as catchwords have been abandoned heretofore. In Asia and Europe that phrase has become a hissing and a byword. But in America, thank God, the people are still strong enough and intelligent enough to assert their rights and express their will; and again, thank God, we have American Senators who will die in their places before they will permit the American Nation to be victimized, unless and until the American people themselves consent to surrender their rights, their powers, their sovereignty, and their independence.

"Consider our position and advantages—a position and advantages which all the money that ever was issued could not purchase, all the labor that ever toiled could not create. Nature has placed this Republic on the throne of the world—midway between Europe and Asia, from which we are separated by thousands of miles of ocean. We are perfectly situated for defense, and perfectly situated, too, for world trade, world friendship, and world helpfulness. Our forefathers cut with the sword all political relations with the Old World so that, under our institutions of orderly freedom, we could work out American ideals.

"Shall we abandon those advantages? Shall we sacrifice our heritage? Shall we enter into a government which places us in the same position as if we were a physical, integral part of Europe and Asia? Shall we poison American idealism and American aspirations with the age-old racial hatreds, ambitions, and intrigues of alien races and distant lands? Can anyone doubt what the answer of the American people will be if they are permitted to make answer?

"Were any one of the nations that are now so anxious to have us carry their loads of historic woe, pay their debts, and do their work—were any one of them in our place would that nation surrender what we are ordered to yield? Were England or France or Italy situated as we are situated, having the resources that we possess, blessed with the history and traditions that make America peculiar and glorious among the nations of the world, would France, would England, would Italy do what is now demanded of us?

"Every sane man knows that nothing on earth or in heaven could induce them to do so. The records of the peace conference prove that not one of them would yield the smallest fraction of what the covenant would exact from us. Those nations come out of the peace conference with territorial gains so great that the extent of them will astound America when we realize what has happened. America comes out of the peace conference with a debt which will reach a hundred billion dollars before it is paid, and with a demand upon us to mortgage the remainder of our assets.

"The wicked and insane attack which the brutal and stupid German Government made on us forced Congress to declare war. It was the act of God; for we thus went into the conflict just in time to save the Allies, who admit that but for us they would have been defeated. For what we did we are glad and proud. We do not regret our debt, crushing though it is. We do not begrudge the billions we loaned to the others who were fighting the same enemy that wantonly made war on us. But have we not at least earned the right to be let alone henceforward? Have not we discharged a thousand times over every debt, real and imaginary, which the wildest enthusiast ever claimed that we owed any nation whatever?

"With problems of our own, the wise solution of which will tax our intellect, strain our nerve, and try our soul to the utmost, is it not our duty now to attend to the affairs of our own household already in sad disorder and likely soon to be in desperate confusion? Is it not our immediate duty to exert our every energy to the tasks right before us in our own land and adjacent lands? Ought we not now give thought to the present and future needs of our own people?

"The results of a system of taxation that prevents business enterprise, of ancient commercial laws that shackle industry, of a foreign trade disorganized and declining, of financial inflation certain to produce serious reaction, of the cost of living steadily rising, of an immense urban population improperly housed, of unemployment already beginning—the results of these and many other portentous conditions will surely and soon create a situation to master which will require all the mind, courage, and character of the whole American people. Even now violence raises its head, and that man is blind or unworthy of confidence who does not realize that we must get ready now to meet a troubled future. The supreme duty of the hour is to prepare for the coming storm whose sullen and not distant thunder warns us of its approach.

"If we meet and discharge that duty, we shall save our Nation from years of turmoil, strife, and desolation—we shall save our people from suffering and want. And we will meet

and discharge that duty—meet and discharge it like men, like Americans refusing to waste our energies on the adventures of others in foreign lands, refusing to stain our clean bright sword in alien intrigues, but instead keeping its honor untarnished, its temper unweakened, and having it ready whenever, and only whenever, righteousness and American interests command that it be drawn and wielded."

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GRONNA. I present the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table. I give notice that I shall move to take up the report to-morrow morning for consideration.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 16, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, 46, 47, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 74½, 76, 90, and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 48, 49, 55, 56, 57, 58, 66, 68, 77, 85, 87, 88, and 89, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$327,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,326,121"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,326,121"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$5,783,231"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "*Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings be increased to $2,500 in so far as it applies to this paragraph: *Provided further*"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence in the United States of flag smut of wheat, take-all, helminthosporium, and other destructive soil and seed infecting diseases of wheat and of other cereals, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $50,000, to be used in cooperation with the plant disease survey, investigation, and control authorities of the several States to prevent the further spread of and to eradicate or control these diseases."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, almonds, Persian walnuts, black walnuts, hickory nuts, butternuts, chestnuts, filberts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing the same, $20,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of fruits during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, $83,200: *Provided*, That $20,000 of said amount may be used for investigating and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$132,700, of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of suitable land near the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of all necessary buildings and equipment, and for the establishment of a plant-inspection and detention station: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000 of this sum shall be expended for the purchase of the land: *Provided further*, That the limitation in this act as to cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,529,378"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$3,379,638"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the study and improvement of methods of dehydrating materials used for food, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, and to disseminate information as to the value and suitability of such products for food, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$979,901"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$1,391,571"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$100,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For conducting investigations and study of the nature and habits of the pest known as the camphor thrip, for the purpose of discovering methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, $5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$62,330"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$943,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$1,371,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$464,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$686,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$742,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,701,980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,905,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect until their termination the provisions of the proclamations of the President of June 18 and September 6, 1918, and the regulations thereunder, relating to the stockyards industry, including the employment of such persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $75,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, information on the supply, demand, commercial movement, disposition, quality, and market price of peanuts, and its products, $12,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$1,339,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (United States cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., p. 476; United States grain standards act, 39 Stat. L., p. 482; United States warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., p. 486; standard container act, 39 Stat. L., p. 673; and the acts making annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative specifically authorized in writing by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Bureau of Markets to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce the Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, $35,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,811,365"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$31,355,811"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That, in order to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers,' approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), as amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, the sum of $600,000 for the fiscal year ending on the 30th day of June, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed by the Senate amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed by the Senate amendment insert "seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$33,900,211"; and the Senate agree to the same.

On the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 the committee of conference has been unable to agree.

ASLE J. GRONNA,
HOKE SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. MCLAUGHLIN,
A. F. LEVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 1199. An act to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1713. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3624. An act incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5032. An act to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, last week in speaking upon the Knox resolution I took occasion to make some comments upon another resolution previously introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and passed by a practically unanimous vote of the Senate. I refer to the Irish resolution.

As a result of my remarks I have been the recipient of a large number of letters, many of them protesting, many of them abusive, many of them denunciatory, and many of them unprintable. I have been honored through the columns of the New York Journal with the sign manual of Mr. Hearst's disapprobation. I pass that circumstance by merely announcing that the integrity of his patriotism will be determined by the recorded verdict of history. But I am also in receipt of many

letters friendly and protesting in their nature, some of them from friends and acquaintances of long standing for whose good opinions I entertain the greatest solicitude.

It is impossible for me to make a personal reply to that portion of my correspondence at the present time. I have therefore determined to take one of the letters as a standard for all and, without disclosing the name of the writer, read the principal portion of his letter into the RECORD, together with my reply, and let that suffice as an answer to all.

This letter is dated the 20th of June and is addressed to me. The writer says:

JUNE 20, 1919.

HON. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have always admired you as a statesman, and you will not take this letter as coming from an unfriendly source. I have been with you as a delegate to the Democratic national convention in 1896, 1900, 1904, and at Denver in 1908, and in all four gatherings found myself on your side.

In common with many other friends of yours in the North, I am amazed over your attack on the young Nationalist Party in Ireland which carried the country in the last election by a vote of more than 4 to 1, a very much larger majority than was behind the American Revolution.

I may say here by way of digression that I do not recall making an attack upon any party, Nationalist or otherwise. I referred to the attitude during the war of a certain element of the Irish people which I did not think commendable. I proceed with the letter:

It is true that many of us sympathized with Germany against England before the Americans entered into the war, but once that our adopted land decided to enter no class of the American people fought the enemy with more unity or determination than the Irish. After seven centuries of oppression, the fact that many in Ireland saw no difference between English alien rule and Germany should excite no wonderment.

The Irish people in the North are the backbone of the Democratic Party in many States. Senator PHELAN can tell you that the almost solid vote they gave the President in San Francisco saved the election in 1916. Members of the Democratic national committee like Coughlin, of Massachusetts; Quinn, of Rhode Island; Mack, of New York; and others are fearful that the feeling of the Irish question may lose us much of our remaining members of the party in the North. The only places where we made any gains last fall were in districts heavily populated by the Irish.

You wrote me that out West the Germans had all gone Republican last fall. This accounts, in part, for our difficulties in the West, and I wonder if you have given any consideration to the thought that such an attack as you have delivered against the Irish people may not result in further destruction of the party.

You are living in the past if you think that there are any Irish in this country left who support the old National Party. That party is absolutely dead in Ireland, and all the Irish in the United States who take any interest in Ireland, including cardinals, heads of colleges, business men, and others who have subscribed more than $2,000,000 within the past six months, are standing by the young men and women of the Sinn Fein.

If the passions grown out of the war have not knocked out of the heads of the Democratic leaders all intelligence, the sooner that the Democratic Party encourages and supports the aspirations of the Irish race the better for its safety and preservation, for without the support of the Irish people our party will remain in a hopeless minority for a long time to come.

I remain with the deepest respect,
Sincerely, yours, ——— ———.

I have addressed this communication by way of reply to the writer of the letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 24, 1919.

MY DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your very frank and friendly criticism of my speech of the 19th instant in opposition to the Knox resolution, which you characterize as "an attack on the young Nationalist Party in Ireland, which carried the last election by a vote of more than 4 to 1, a very much larger majority than was behind the American Revolution." You also remind me that "it is true that many of us sympathized with Germany against England before the Americans entered the war, but once that our adopted land decided to enter no class of the American people fought the enemy with more unity or determination than the Irish."

To that fact I bear cheerful witness, albeit here and there could be found exceptions. But I must have expressed myself very clumsily if your inference that I reflected upon the loyalty of Americans of Irish birth or descent in the recent war is justified. I referred to that part of the Irish people known generally as the Sinn Fein, whose pro-German sympathies and affiliations during that period were continued and notorious. I might have justly criticized them more seriously than I did and still have kept within the bounds of the truth.

But my remarks were, or were intended to be, wholly impersonal. It is immaterial whether the subject of the Borah resolution be Ireland or Korea or India, the action of the Senate would in any case be gratuitous and deplorable, and particularly so at a time like this. And knowing you as I do, am very sure that did the resolution proceed from or concern any other than your own great race you would entertain, if you did not express, the same view. Yet we can not consistently, either with equity or justice, stop with the Borah resolution if other peoples included under geographical and political control with which they are discontented should make a similar appeal and for a similar purpose.

And if we assume this authority by exercising it, we can not complain if other Governments retaliate by a like indulgence in resolutions aimed at ourselves at the instance of any or all factions, races, territories, and dependencies, feeling themselves aggrieved and invoking external interference in their behalf. But, should England ever do so, I can imagine the transports of indignation it would justly arouse in America, and especially among my Irish friends. International rights and duties, like domestic ones, are reciprocal. We can not enjoy or exercise them exclusively, and it is due to ourselves quite as much as to other nations that we act at all times with due and constant regard to that fundamental fact.

I have entertained a genuine friendship and sympathy for Ireland and the Irish people ever since I knew anything about history. Their wrongs are ancient, deep seated, and unforgettable. I have cooperated, feebly indeed, but sincerely, when occasion offered, through the active period of a fairly long life with their representatives and spokesmen for the great boon of home rule, toward which Sir Horace Plunkett is now very wisely directing his efforts, although you think that movement is dead and gone. I enjoyed the acquaintance of Mr. Davitt, Mr. Dillon, and Mr. O'Connor, patriots all and beacon lights on the pathway of Irish history. But this is beside the point at issue. We are concerned with the authority of the Senate of the United States to entertain a resolution affecting international relations and with the counter results which the precedent may provoke, and as to that there can, in my humble judgment, be but one logical opinion.

Here I would gladly close, but the concluding sentences of your letter make that impossible. For you remind me that the Irish people of the North are the backbone of the Democratic Party in many States; that their vote in San Francisco saved the election in 1916; that prominent men in Democratic councils fear that "the Irish question" may lose us much of our strength. You remind me of my own statement that in the West the Germans went Republican last fall, which causes you to wonder if I "have given any consideration to the thought that such an attack as you have delivered against the Irish people may not result in further destruction of the party."

Lastly, you warn me that "if the passions grown out of the war have not knocked out of the heads of the Democratic leaders all intelligence, the sooner that the Democratic Party encourages and supports the aspirations of the Irish race the better for its safety and preservation, for without the support of the Irish people our party will remain in a hopeless minority for some time to come." Surely you will pardon me for reminding you that the German-American (I hate to use the hyphen) voiced the same warning to President Wilson and his party from May 7, 1915, to the close of the last presidential election and squared their conduct with their warning. Where to-day would America be had we accepted and acted upon it?

Yes; I have thought of the political side of the resolution. Beyond those like yourself who are strongly interested, that is the only side it has. "We mustn't offend the Irish vote" has been the chorus of the Capitol ever since its introduction. That feature is outlined upon its background as plainly as though it had been written in the body of the resolution. You have therefore broached the sole and underlying basis of the Borah resolution. The Republicans solidly voted for it, because they hoped you would desert the Democratic Party if they did. The Democrats almost as solidly voted for it, because they feared you would desert them if they didn't. How ennobling is the contemplation of such a spectacle at any time, but especially at this hour when we are striving to establish a "peace founded on justice among the nations." What an inspiration to patriotic young America, still enraptured by the ideals of his country's rulers and Constitution.

Your queries present the naked fundamentals of the problem, stripped of every ornament and demanding an unequivocal solution. What shall a servant of the people do when confronted with a great public duty, the discharge of which may threaten party disaster? To which alternative should he conform his conduct? Must he set his jaw and hold to the line or be recreant to his duty as he sees it, that his party may be advantaged? Unless he can reconcile these opposing forces, which is sometimes possible, he must turn away from one of them or desert his post.

"Then it is the brave man chooses while the coward turns aside,
Doubting in his abject spirit till his Lord is crucified."

I lay claim to no unusual degree of moral courage, and I love the great party to which my political life has been consecrated, yet I affirm that, confronted by such an alternative, I shall do my duty as a Senator of the United States as I am given to see it. Many parties have come and gone. Mine some time may become but a glorious memory, which God forbid, but our country must go on forever. I shall stand by and for my country.

Fortunately, however, I can assure you that to him who has intelligently studied history there can be no such conflict here, and, if there is, it can have but a transient effect upon the Democracy. Ours is, I trust, no party of opportunity. It depends neither upon occasional episodes nor yet upon success for its persistent and invincible survival of every antagonist it ever encountered. From the days of its founder to this hour it has always prevailed when it has been true to principle and to itself. And if, heedless of its great past, it shall prove now unfaithful to ideals, lest it lose votes, and seek success by pandering to every passing emotion, if it is to mold its principles to the acceptance of every demand and run from every threat muttered in its ears, its days are surely numbered. Such parties have occasionally arisen in America. They are gone. They died, as they deserved to die.

If "the Irish people" (of course, you mean the Americans of Irish origin) leave their party, "they will go to the Republican Party." Why? Would it be because they believed it would better serve America or the incipient Irish republic? Would the inspiring motive be America or Ireland? Did the German, the pacifist, the slacker, and other elements of disaffection vote the Republican ticket last fall to serve America or to voice their disapproval of a militant Democratic administration? Was the motive loyalty to America or loyalty to something else?

I grant you freely that if all your countrymen desert the Democratic Party its prospect of success in 1920 would be negligible. You would restore the Republican Party to power. I should not like that at all. But I can endure, as I have endured, Republican rule in America. It is not the best rule for our country. Ours is from my viewpoint immeasurably superior. But it is the next best. Many of its policies are injurious; many of its principles inadmissible, but it is passable. I have prospered fairly well under the Republicans, who after all are the family across the street and who are bone of our bone.

But what will you gain by it all? That party can not, any more than ours, satisfy you short of war with England. Nor the Germans short of the return of the Kaiser. Nor the Bolshevists short of a treaty of alliance with Lenin. Nor those voting with them because they hate Wilson, unless they turn back to antewar conditions. They will do none of these things. Coming into power through such agencies, how long will they last? Disappointed, and naturally and instinctively Democratic, you will return to the fold, other factions will also desert or become lukewarm, and the triumph thus secured becomes as transient as the influences underlying it. And your conduct, however laudable from your own viewpoint, would not be American.

Nothing is more sinister in the political affairs of the United States than what we call hyphenated Americanism, to which I regret to say both the great parties pay court. They may not have created, but they certainly have nourished and cultivated it. Indeed, in the ecstasy of their political hunger they have lauded it, legislated for it, and aided in its degradation of American citizenship, all for votes. I fear, from present indications, they will continue to do so, excluding the German-American for the present from the radius of their activities. Such a thing as divided loyalty is impossible. No man can serve two masters. The Civil War demonstrated the inevitable result of the effort to pay allegiance to both State and Nation. We of the South were taught to equally revere the sovereignty of both. But Mr. Calhoun taught that sovereignty was a unit which could not survive apportionment. North and South became unwilling converts to his doctrine through the arbitrament of war; they appealed to the sword; the sovereignty of the Nation emerged from the bloody contest, and that of the State disappeared from the arena of militant Americanism. Our Americans of foreign birth and extraction naturally and laudably cling to their ancestral countries and traditions. That is commendable, but they must not expand this sentiment into an overweening devotion to fatherland so great as to dwarf or pervert the inexorable demand of American citizenship for a single and undivided loyalty to the country of their adoption. That is the first and greatest lesson of the war, and if it be not accepted unreservedly by all, the war will have been waged in vain whatever may be the covenants of the treaty of peace.

It is evident that if the Irish-American persists in the exercise of a hyphenated loyalty and shapes his political course in America by the compass of Irish interests, the German-American, the Scandinavian-American, the Italian-American, the Russian-American, Mexican-American, French-American, Spanish-American, and all other qualifying adjective Americans must not be too severely censured if they do the same thing. And if they do, what becomes of America, whose political organisms seem more prone to cater to these tendencies and profit by them than to combat and antagonize them? What sort of foreign policy may we hope for and from what foreign entanglements can we escape if these conditions are to be perpetuated?

These kaleidoscopic foreign American tendencies and ambitions are bound to collide sooner or later with each other, as witness the ancient feuds of Irishman and Orangeman, or with America, as witness the war with Germany. We can not avoid tnis if we tolerate, much less encourage, them. Nor may we consistently reject a similar political grouping of religious Americanisms. Protestant-Americans, Catholic-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Mormon-Americans, Buddhist-Americans are quite as consistent with any other hyphenated alignments and quite as apt to tempt the cupidity of the country's political organizations.

I had not only hoped, but sincerely believed, that the perils of a divided loyalty among masses of our citizenship revealed in the days of our approach toward war and developed by its terrific ordeal, that the sacrifices we had made and the lessons we had learned would have so cleared our minds and purified our patriotism that loyalty to America, a renewed and sanctified devotion to her institutions and her tremendous needs, would stand out as the supreme lesson of the terrible conflict. But I have, I fear, been oversanguine. I perceive no abatement in partisanship, no serious change in the political machinations and marplots of the past, no promptings of duty lifting us from the dead and sordid line of implacable rivalries striving for success by fair means if we can, but success anyhow.

No friend has ever questioned my Democracy, and I trust none ever will. But if the great party to which I belong and its great antagonist shall persist in subordinating the country's needs and welfare to the urgencies of party success, if they shall surrender to demands and to interests which relegate America to the background, if they shall yield to the domination of a citizenship whose allegiance and interests are divided, and whose motto is not at all times America first, then the hour has struck for the organization of an American party; a party not restricted to the native born, but to every man and woman, native or naturalized, who knows no country, acknowledges no claim, is devoted to no land but America; who reverences his ancestry, remembers his origin, pays due tribute to his race, and is faithful to his religion, but who above all and beyond all is American; who has dedicated himself, his children, and his possesions to the maintenance of the great Republic, to the support of its mighty institutions, and to the preservation of every right protected and every duty symbolized by the banner of his country. I am confident that upon reflection you will fully share this sentiment.

America is the friend of Ireland. She always has been. In good time and in her own effective way she will use her influence in behalf of your people. She should be neither importuned nor threatened into any course not consistent with her duty, her dignity, and her international obligations.

Very sincerely, yours, C. S. THOMAS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment on this matter which has been called before the Senate by the letter of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. Those of us who have served with the Senator from Colorado for a number of years have no doubt he has the courage to do under all circumstances and at all times what he thinks a Senator should do. I quite agree, furthermore, with that portion of the letter which, if I understood it correctly, makes an appeal for Americanism without any prefix. I do not myself want to give encouragement, either by resolution or by word or deed, to any kind of Americanism except the simple, unmodified Americanism which is represented by the one word itself. In that respect I thoroughly agree with the sentiment so well expressed by the Senator.

Mr. President, I hope I am too candid not to admit that, of course, there is politics in the resolution referred to, as there is politics in practically every resolution which is or can be presented to the Senate. To my way of thinking it is not a discouraging fact, either, that all of these things spring from or finally culminate in what is called politics, because it is through the political machinery and the political organizations of the country that the people speak; and that is the only possible way in which they can make known their wishes and their desires upon any question. Our whole national life and all our national doing have to do with politics. That is simply to state in another way that we are still a free people and that the people take an interest in and form opinions on public questions.

I am not unmindful, of course, that there are hundreds and thousands and even millions of people in the United States who sympathize with the cause of Ireland, and who through political machinery, either now or hereafter, as they have heretofore, will express their desires from a political standpoint. Whether or not it shall ultimately redound to the benefit of one particular party or another is a question which the future will have to take care of. No man can foresee or foretell now what that result will be.

Mr. President, aside from the purely political feature of it, there was a deeper and a profounder reason for the resolution. Whatever may be charged as to the aim from a political standpoint of the author of the resolution, I beg the Senator from Colorado to understand that there was another reason, and that was this: The resolution asked for nothing more than a hearing upon the part of the representatives of Ireland before the peace conference at Paris in order to present the cause of Ireland to the conference there assembled. It did not assume to go further than to ask for that which had been granted to almost every subject nationality in Europe. Is there any man, especially any American, who would deny a hearing to any peoples before a tribunal whose action might profoundly affect their future happiness and tranquillity? I sympathize with Ireland, and that sympathy I have often expressed long before as well as since the beginning of the late war, but even if I did not sympathize with her aspiration for independence I could not out of a sense of justice deny her delegates a hearing.

I do not know any reason why a hearing should be granted to subject nationalities such as Poland and Roumania and other peoples without giving it to a people who have been struggling for 700 years to establish their right of self-government and independence. There is no possible ground, to my way of viewing it, upon which we can distinguish between the right of these other nations or peoples who have been heard and the right of Ireland to be heard.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. BORAH. I will.

Mr. THOMAS. I may be in error, but I perceive the distinction to be this, that to each of the countries which the Senator has mentioned has been given the political recognition of an autonomous government, and from the inception of the peace conference they were members of it. They were not given hearings, but they constituted component parts of the conference as independent nations. My own view is, therefore, that countries like Korea, India, Egypt, and Ireland, not having that autonomous, recognized, official participation, fall outside of the class which the Senator mentions. I may be in error about that, but that is my view.

Mr. BORAH. But, Mr. President, let us go back to the principle from which sprang the right of these peoples to be heard. That principle was the right of self-determination. It was upon that theory and upon that principle that these hearings were granted and upon which the recognitions were, in the first instance, made.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator does not state the entire situation. In addition to that these peoples were militant allies of the Allies; they fought in our ranks, and were engaged in a common cause against a common enemy.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, no such distinction as that was made during the war. It was repeated over and over again by Mr. Lloyd-George, particularly in his letter in response to the request of the President to state the terms upon which they would be willing to proceed to peace, and also stated by the President time and time again, that peace should be adjusted upon such principles that all peoples should have a right to invoke and to enjoy the principle of self-determination and that no people should be disposed of through force or superior power. Many limitations have been placed on the principle of self-determination since the war ended and many more will be placed upon it, but they were not placed upon it during the war.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, one more interruption, and I will promise not to interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. BORAH. I do not object to interruptions from the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I think practically every one of these peoples declared their independence and revolted prior to the

armistice. When Austria finally collapsed it was the signal for not only the independence but the organized independence of practically all the peoples to whom the Senator refers. Therefore they were not only recognized and encouraged, but, as I have said, they became constituent elements of the peace conference itself through their delegations.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely. The Senator states a condition with which I do not take issue, but he does not state all the case as it was presented to the world during the conflict with Germany. There was no modification, no exception, to the rule that subject nationalities should at the peace conference have a right to be heard, and that all peoples seeking their independence or their liberty or their freedom should, if their affairs were not adjusted prior to that time, have them adjusted at the peace conference. That was one of the great and transcendant duties which were to devolve upon the peace conference, to wit, the adjustment of the right of all peoples to govern themselves in accordance with their own wishes and their own desires, and to set up their own form of government in accordance with their own standards. For that reason, Mr. President, I am unable to distinguish between the cause of Ireland and the cause of a dozen other nationalities or peoples who might be mentioned who have had a hearing at the peace conference.

Mr. President, we saw day after day in the public press—and I think we all read it with considerable pride—that different nationalities, different peoples, were appealing to the President of the United States that the President of the United States might vouchsafe to them or see that there was given to them that which their masters had denied them throughout the decades in Europe.

It was believed by these peoples that it would be within the power of the President to assure to them the principle of self-determination and enable them to set up their own form of government and to enjoy independence.

I wish to say, in passing, that I have no doubt, if the President had been permitted to adjust the terms of peace and to write into the treaty what he desired to write into the treaty, the principle which he had announced would have been carried out, and that principle would have included Ireland and Korea and all other peoples feeling the spirit of nationality and a desire to govern themselves in accordance with their own standards and wishes and aspirations. But the President yielded finally, and the treaty is based upon the most vicious principles of imperialism—no treaty was ever more so. Now, my difference with the President arises out of the fact not that he failed—perhaps no man could have succeeded—but out of the fact that having failed and having been compelled to accept an imperialistic peace he insists on our guaranteeing it. If Europe would have an old imperialistic peace, let Europe guarantee it.

Mr. President, the acid test in the settlement at Versailles is not the adjustment of conditions for the subject nationalities of the conquered nations. It was all right and it was a proper thing for the conference to take from under the control of Germany those subject nations which had been oppressed by Germany for so many years; the whole world was satisfied with that procedure; but the acid test was not what should be done with the subject nationalities of the conquered nations, but what rights would be granted to the subject nationalities of the victor nations. I venture to say, Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, that the principle which was applied to the subject nationalities of Germany would have been applied to subject nationalities the world over if the policy which the President announced could have been carried out against the imperialistic designs, purposes, and ambitions of the nations of Europe.

I am not now, I repeat, criticizing the President for what he failed to do. I do not know what it was that forced him to yield. But, in my judgment, he was prevented from doing that which he would have done by reason of the imperialistic purposes and designs of those with whom he had to contend; there can be no doubt that the President's policy and that the sentiment of America included Ireland just as much as Poland, included Ireland just as well as Roumania, included Ireland just as well as other small nationalities which might be mentioned.

The only thing that the resolution presented by the Senator from Idaho provided for was simply a hearing for a people who have suffered and sacrificed for 700 years in order that they might enjoy that which every people worthy of the name will fight for until they do enjoy, and that is their independence and their right to enjoy all which goes with independence.

I believe that Ireland should have been heard. I think that Korea should have been heard. Korea is in a state of serfdom to-day.

Mr. McCORMICK. How about Egypt?

Mr. BORAH. Egypt is no better; and the settling of the peace terms or the writing of the treaty upon any other basis than this will not insure the peace of the world. I wish I could recall the exact language of the President, wherein he said in substance that the only peace which could be a permanent peace and which we could afford to guarantee would be a peace of justice, a peace which would enable the nations and peoples to enjoy their independence according to their own standards. I do not quote it exactly, and yet that is the substance of it; and be assured, Mr. President, that is the only peace that will endure.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. You may build your navies, you may organize your armies, you may enlarge your fighting force, you may burden the world with armaments, but until you learn—and, after you have learned it, until you have adopted it as a rule of conduct—that a people's love of liberty and independence can not be crushed out by force, you will never enter upon any program which will insure permanent peace. You may hold them in subjection for a time, but in time they will fight again for their liberty.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator—although the question may not be pertinent at this time—if he thinks the conditions imposed upon the conquered nations by the treaty of peace will tend to insure a permanent peace?

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to go into a discussion of the treaty of peace at this time, because I propose to do that later.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course I did not want to provoke any discussion of the treaty of peace.

Mr. BORAH. I will say in a general way, however—and I say this with the utmost sincerity—that in my opinion the treaty of peace is a guaranty of war; if war can be guaranteed such things as Shantung will guarantee it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to make a suggestion to the Senator from Colorado. I did not hear the first part of his speech, but I assume——

Mr. THOMAS. May I interrupt for a moment? I delivered no speech. I read a letter which was intended as an answer to a large number of letters which I have received from friends—former friends, and, I hope, my friends still—regarding some statements which I made on the 19th of June in this Chamber.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I so understood that the letter that was read into the RECORD was a reply to some letters criticizing the speech of the Senator delivered on June 19. In a most friendly way I want to call the Senator's attention to a paragraph in his speech and ask him if he really meant to say what that paragraph may be construed to mean.

The paragraph is as follows:

> Mr. President, those responsible for the resolution do not represent the Ireland of Parnell, of Redmond, of Michael Davitt, and of T. P. O'Connor, Irish nationalists all, but an element which exhibited but little devotion to the great principles of democracy when fighting for its life in the great crisis of the World War. They were consorting with the enemy, giving him aid and comfort for the undoing of the British Empire.

These words have been construed as suggesting that one great element of our people in this country, the people of Irish blood, were not loyal and were not faithful to the country. I do not think for a moment the Senator intended to convey that impression. I know that he did not; yet that language, which has on a few occasions been called to my attention by Senators on this floor was construed and is being construed as a reflection upon all who advocated in America the Borah resolution.

I want to say to the Senator that there never has been a time in my life when I have seen a race of people so united, so earnest, so sincere, and so devoted to a great principle as the people of Irish blood in America to-day are to the principle of self-determination. It is not a question of North or South, of Democrats or Republicans, of Catholics or Protestants. It is not with them, as it ought not to be, a party question. Anyone who doubts the unanimity of sentiment of Americans of Irish blood on the question of the Irish people having a government of their own choice, no matter what political party they may belong to, is not in touch with public sentiment. If there is anything axiomatic in America's thought, it is the recognition of the fact that all races of people have the spark of liberty in their breasts and long for self-government; and America ought therefore to be always willing and ready to sympathize with and to help any people struggling for independence and liberty, whether they are black or white, few or numerous, or in whatever part of the world they may be found.

I say to the Senator that I am sure he did not mean to convey the thought that anybody favoring or sympathizing with the Irish people to-day was to be branded as unpatriotic or as

not in sympathy with the cause which America has supported in the last two years.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. If the construction which the Senator says has been placed upon the quotation which he read, it certainly is a forced construction. I never said—and I think that the expression can only be tortured to make me say—a word reflecting or designed to reflect upon the loyalty and the patriotism of Americans of Irish birth and Irish descent in the United States. With here and there an exception, as I stated in my letter, which the Senator probably heard, no class of our people has been more devoted to America, to American institutions, to American traditions, to American conflicts, no people have more freely shed their blood upon every American battle field for the American Republic, than the class of people we are considering. My reference was entirely to those elements in Ireland which I think are concededly responsible for the resolution and which during the war were actively and notoriously consorting with the common enemy, Germany—a fact freely admitted by many of my correspondents, and who defend it, doubtless, with the utmost sincerity. Some of them also labored under the erroneous idea that I referred to Americans of Irish extraction. But they are not Irishmen; they are Americans. They are, of course, in sympathy with the Borah resolution, but that would not justify me in charging them with disloyalty during the war. It is history, Mr. President, that Germany made one or two attempts to land ammunition and a hostile force in Ireland during the war, and that they were cooperating with certain elements of the Irish people. That is the matter to which I alluded, and I am sure my distinguished friend from Massachusetts will not take exception to these facts. Let me thank him for calling my attention to what he justly says is an erroneous construction of my statement. Nothing could have been further from my mind than any such imputation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly, Mr. President; I know that the Senator does not mean what——

Mr. THOMAS. Why, Mr. President, I did not say it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I know the Senator does not mean what the language here might be, and in some quarters has been, construed to mean. Let me read this language once more:

> Mr. President, those responsible for the resolution—

What resolution? The resolution of the Senator from Idaho—

> Those responsible for the resolution * * * represent * * * an element which exhibited but little devotion to the great principles of democracy when fighting for its life in the great crisis of the World War.

Mr. THOMAS. Those responsible for the resolution, Mr. President, are those in whose interest, as the representatives of the Irish republic, it was introduced. It seems to me that it is plain.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But I am calling the Senator's attention to why his speech has called forth these letters and undoubtedly will call forth a great many more.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I will receive letters enough. Do not be afraid of that. That is one of the burdens of every Senator expressing opinions of his own.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Because, as I understand the interpretation put upon his speech by some, it is thought to reflect indirectly and remotely upon every boy of Irish blood who fought for his country and who now sympathizes with the Irish aspirations for self-government.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator persists in putting that construction upon it, which I hope he will not do, I can not help it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am very glad to have the Senator's explanation——

Mr. THOMAS. I have made one or two explanations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And I rose for the very purpose of denying that the Senator intended to say what the language appears to say. I wanted to prevent his being placed at some future time in a false position.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I thank the Senator, and am sure he will accept my assurance that I did not, nor do I, concede that the language justifies the conclusion. I can do no more than give it to him and to all who are similarly disturbed. If that is not satisfactory, I am unable to do more.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have but a single further thought on this subject, and that is along the line given expression to by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. This question ought not to be a partisan question. I for one shall refuse to allow it to be a party question so far as I can prevent it from being one; but I want to say, as a friend of the present administration, as one who believes in its policies and its principles, that if this peace conference ends without the representatives of this Government saying to the representatives of the other powers at the peace conference that when America said she believed in the principle of self-determination she believed in it not only when applied to our enemies but when applied to ourselves—I say with emphasis that we shall appear to the disinterested world to be insincere unless some representative of America at that peace conference has said, "To show our good faith, to show our belief in this fundamental principle, the United States invites to the peace conference representatives of the Philippine Islands to present their case for self-determination and independence; and we ask you, Great Britain, to allow here the representatives of the Irish people to plead and present their case also." This will be proof to the world that we believe unequivocally in this principle. This will be proof to the world that self-determination is to be applicable to the Allies as well as to their enemies, and that America stands for the right of every race of people, whatever their color, whatever their name—Filipinos, Poles, Slavs, Irish, whatever they may be—to organize a government of their own choice, and to maintain an independent government if they so desire.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], it might be worth while to note that on the 26th of May Mr. Lansing notified Mr. Walsh, Mr. Dunne, and Mr. Ryan that he regretted to inform them that the American representatives felt that any further efforts on their part connected with the matter of Ireland would be futile and therefore useless. The resolution of the Senate was adopted on the 6th of June; and on the 20th of June Mr. Walsh addressed a communication to the American delegation, which in part read as follows:

> Has the American commission or any individual member thereof made a request to the general peace conference for a hearing for De Valera, Griffith, and Plunkett?
>
> Has the honorable body or any individual member made a request to the peace conference for international recognition of the Irish republic?
>
> Has the honorable body or any individual member made a request of the peace conference for any person or persons to present the case of Ireland, its right to self-determination, to the peace conference?
>
> If such requests have not been made will the honorable body be good enough, in view of the manifold petitions and appeals herein referred to, and in the cause of humanity and justice, make such requests, or any thereof you deem proper; and if so, promptly advise us as to the result or make the same public so that all your petitioners may be advised?

There is no published account of any answer to Mr. Walsh's communication a fortnight or nearly three weeks since the resolution of the Senate was passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask a question with reference to the parliamentary status of an amendment to the military bill.

There was an amendment by the committee, I understand, increasing the Army from 300,000 to 400,000. That was a committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was.

Mr. BORAH. And we are still in Committee of the Whole?

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to give notice that I shall ask for a separate vote upon that amendment when the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. BORAH subsequently said: I stated this morning that I desired to have a vote in the Senate upon the matter of raising the Army from 300,000 to 400,000 men. I find that that is covered by some two or three amendments in the way of amount, and so forth.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I interrupt the Senator to say that the controlling amendment is the one under the caption, "Pay of the Army."

Mr. BORAH. Pay of enlisted men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is the whole chapter, as it were, pay of the Army, quartermasters, and all. It extends through four or five pages. It is a single amendment. That is evidently the amendment the Senator desires to reserve for a separate vote in the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely; beginning at page 26. It is understood, then, that that amendment is identified?

The SECRETARY. The amendment beginning at page 18, line 24, striking out and inserting under the head, "Pay of the Army."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to ask the chairman a question with reference to an item which was sent up by the War Department. It asks for an appropriation of $383,000 for the building of a mechanical repair shop at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. I ask the chairman if the item requested by the department can be taken

care of out of the lump-sum appropriation for barracks and quarters, water supply, and so forth.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is my opinion that it can be taken care of out of the items for barracks and quarters, water sewers, roads, walks, and drainage.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the information I desired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I believe there is an amendment pending, offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW].

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I presented this amendment last night and made a brief statement to the Senate as to the purpose of it, but there are a number of Senators now here who were not then present, and a short statement of what is intended to be accomplished by it may, therefore, be advisable.

It is proposed by the amendment to give authority to the Government to trade for part cash and part for other property a refrigerator plant which the Government put up in Chicago during the war. This plant was very much needed for war purposes. The Government has no need for it now. At the time it was built the Government made an agreement with the Central District Co., in conjunction with which it built the plant, that the Government might have the right to exchange it for other property at the close of the war. The Central District Co. owns a big warehouse also near this same refrigerator plant, which the Government very much needs. The proposition is to authorize the exchange by the Government of the refrigerator plant for the warehouse plant and a bonus of $877,000 in cash to the Government. Gen. Goethals appeared before our committee last February when we had the forerunner of this bill under consideration, and very strongly advised the exchange, and my information comes principally from what Gen. Goethals told the committee at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. NEW. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Have the two plants been appraised by anyone?

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator give us information as to the value of the plants and by whom they were appraised?

Mr. NEW. I do not think I have the appraisal here, but the whole matter is in direct conformity with an agreement written into the original contract between the Government and the company, and as I said is very strongly urged by Gen. Goethals.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Secretary of War recommend the transfer?

Mr. NEW. Yes; he does.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the sale of the property, with this difference in value of $877,000?

Mr. NEW. The Government gets the warehouse and storing plant in exchange for the refrigerator plant and a cash bonus of $877,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whose warehouse is it?

Mr. NEW. It was built by the central manufacturing district, aided by the Government to the extent of $3,300,000.

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to ask what is the relative cost of the two buildings, the warehouse as compared with the refrigerator plant?

Mr. NEW. The whole matter has been appraised, and $877,000 is fixed by the appraisers as a fair boot that is to be paid by the Central District Co. to the Government. They give the Government a great warehouse and $877,000 in cash for the Government's interest in the refrigerator plant. I am unable to state just what the actual figures of the appraisal were, but this amendment is made necessary by reason of the fact that the Senate cut out of the bill the authority of the Government to exchange property. As the bill now stands the Government is denied the authority to make any trade or exchange of real estate. The amendment gives specific authority for this particular trade.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 18, after line 20, insert the following as a new paragraph:

That the thanks of Congress be, and is hereby, extended to all members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, adjutant generals, assistants to adjutant generals, medical aids, and the members of the medical and legal advisory boards for their loyal and patriotic and devoted services rendered without military preferment or proportionate pecuniary reward in the administration of the selective-service law; and that the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress and the Government of the United States an appropriate medal, with suitable emblematical devices and inscriptions to be determined by him, and that to enable the Secretary of War to carry this provision into effect a sufficient sum of money, not to exceed $100,000, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, before our entrance into the war there was a concerted and well-organized propaganda throughout the country to create a sentiment in many instances favorable to Germany and against the policy of our country. After the war that propaganda kept up. It found fruit in many places.

When it came to passing the selective draft law there was an honest difference of opinion among legislators. Some believed in the volunteer system, others believed in the selective draft system. I have no quarrel with those who believed that the volunteer system was the best. I voted for the selective draft law because I thought it the best way to raise an army quickly and one of sufficient number to overcome the enemy. But speeches were made in the consideration of the selective-draft law that aroused a feeling against it. In some instances the opponents of the measure to arouse opposition to it said the words "conscript" and "convict" were synonymous. There was in certain localities a good deal of opposition to that law.

These men had to come under it. The Government had to raise the Army under the provisions and these local exemption boards and district boards were appointed. They had a most delicate task to perform. In many instances men who went upon these boards took their political lives in their hands. Backed up by the growing patriotic sentiment of the people, they performed their services patriotically and well. In many instances they received no pay for it, certainly in no instance proportionate to the services rendered.

There have been many bills introduced in Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, during the last session to give proper recognition to the work and the services performed by these men. I think probably in the House there were favorable reports made on some bill. In the Senate there has been no favorable action, but I think every Member of Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, believes that such a provision in this bill should pass and the thanks of Congress go out to these members of the local and district exemption boards, medical and legal advisers, appeal agents, adjutants general and assistants to adjutants general, and medical aids, and that in further recognition of their patriotic services this appropriation, which is not large but is most reasonable and about adequate, be used in having some emblem made that will cost possibly $3 or $4 each and to be given to these men as a token of the country's appreciation of the services they rendered.

The appropriation in the amendment is $100,000. There are, I am informed by the Provost Marshal General's office, 30,773 members of the local and district boards, adjutants general, appeal agents, and assistants to adjutants general, medical and legal advisers, and medical aids.

I hope that the committee will accept this amendment and that it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. So far as I have power to do so I am glad to accept this amendment. The Committee on Military Affairs of the last Congress had a bill under consideration for this same purpose very near the end of the session. There were certain amendments, however, to be made to it, and while the provision was being perfected and redrafted the Congress came to an end, and it was impossible to report it. I am glad the amendment has been offered, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. MOSES. May I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that he perfect his amendment by including the governors of the States among those who are to receive the thanks of Congress and medals, inasmuch as the governors named these boards and were held responsible by the War Department for the work of the boards they named.

Mr. HARRISON. I will state to the Senator that I thought of including the governors, but governors are elected by the people, and they are supposed to do their public duty. These other gentlemen were not elected by the people for this work, but were appointed and accepted the appointment. For that reason I excepted the governors. However, rather than see the provision defeated I would have no objection to including the governors.

Mr. MOSES. I would not carry my suggestion to the point of opposition to the amendment in its present form, but I thing the governors who rendered this service should be recognized as I have suggested.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator from New Hampshire ought to smile. He seems to be serious about it.

Mr. MOSES. I am serious, Mr. President. I have two distinguished ex-governors here on my right, and I know—from

personal observation in one case—that they are entitled to this recognition.

Mr. REED. I wish to inquire whether it has occurred to anybody that we might include the soldiers who did the fighting? Nobody has thanked them yet or provided any medals for them, to my knowledge.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a bill before the Committee on Military Affairs which directs that that shall be done. The bill has not yet been reported but I am sure it will be. I had the honor of introducing the bill.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, we ex-governors have never been accustomed to being overburdened with thanks and appreciation, and perhaps they will be just as well satisfied to be omitted from what otherwise I consider to be a very proper amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is always an unpleasant thing to oppose an amendment of this kind. The thanks of Congress have been extended in a very limited number of instances, and congressional medals have been regarded as badges of honor to be conferred only for very distinguished service. I question the wisdom of issuing several thousand congressional medals at one time and scattering them indiscriminately throughout the country. If we are to extend congressional thanks and confer congressional medals upon all members of the boards surely we ought to give congressional thanks and congressional medals to every man who served his country in this war, to the soldier who was the fighting man on the line of battle. If to the soldiers and to the boards why not to the physician who volunteered his services and left a practice sometimes worth many thousands of dollars a year, sometimes left a practice that meant the abandonment practically of his entire life's work? Why not include them? And if we include them why not include the thousands of women of the country who volunteered in the Red Cross and in other charitable and humanitarian service? Then why should we not extend that honor to the tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of women who worked in other capacities? If we are to give a medal of honor to a man who served upon a draft board why not give medals of honor to the women who organized the local associations in every city and who voluntarily gave all their time to the making of bandages and the preparation of all those things that were necessary to care for the wounded, the sick, and the dying?

If we start voting medals of honor to members of the draft boards, then we should extend that honor to include all of the other classes I have mentioned.

So far as I am concerned I would a thousand times rather confer a medal of honor upon the women who, in the hospitals of pain near the battle line, gave their time and their very souls to the service of their country than I would to confer that credit upon a man who remained at home and simply passed upon the qualifications of men who had been drafted. I would a thousand times rather pay this tribute of honor to physicians who left their practice at a tremendous sacrifice and undertook the service of their country.

I do not say that men who served upon draft boards did not do their duty, and that we should not respect them for it; but what is there in their service that entitles them to the thanks of Congress and to a medal to hand down to their descendants that does not apply with greater force to all of these other classes I have mentioned and to still others I have not dwelt upon?

If we give medals to everybody who did anything in this war of merit and of service, the congressional medal will cease to be a distinguished badge of honor, because it will become a thing that is so common.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is a mistake. If this amendment is to be passed, then I give notice that I shall introduce a bill or an amendment to confer medals upon others who have done equally distinguished service. I am not in any way belittling the service of these men, but why should they be singled out? Why should they have badges presented by Congress when the mother who gave her boy, and gave him with an aching heart and with a loyal soul, is not given a badge, while the man who passed upon his qualifications is to be given one?

It strikes me this is a mistake, and I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not urge his amendment. I do not like to oppose it; I do not like to oppose anything the Senator proposes; but there is no reason why these men should be given a vote of thanks by Congress and have medals conferred upon them that does not apply to many other classes with greater strength, in my opinion.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer an amendment in the way of a substitute for the pending amendment, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be inserted by Mr. HARRISON it is proposed to insert the following:

That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby tendered to Gen. John J. Pershing, commanding the American Expeditionary Forces, for his highly distinguished conduct in the war with Germany, wherein he displayed splendid qualities of leadership, which largely contributed to the successful termination of the war.

2. That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby extended through Gen. Pershing to the officers and men under his command for their faithful and gallant service during the war.

3. That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby tendered to Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, Provost Marshal General, for his highly distinguished services in the execution of the selective-service law, wherein he displayed marked ability in the raising of our national forces and in striking and maintaining a balance between the military and economic needs of the Nation with the minimum disturbance to the social conditions.

4. That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby extended through Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder to each member of the several local and district boards for their entirely satisfactory services in carrying out the powers and duties conferred upon them by the act approved May 18, 1917.

5. That the President of the United States be requested to cause this act to be communicated to Gen. Pershing and, through him, to the officers and men under his command; and to Maj. Gen. Crowder and, through him, to the members of the local and district boards.

Mr. HARRISON. I have not seen the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], nor am I sure I heard all of it read, and may I ask if he proposes to extend the thanks of Congress to members of the local and district boards?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has omitted the adjutants general, the assistants to the adjutants general, members of the local and medical advisory boards, appeal agents, and the medical aids. Was it the intention of the Senator from Tennessee to omit those?

Mr. McKELLAR. I had supposed that the language of my amendment was broad enough to include all of those; but if the Senator from Mississippi would prefer to have them named specifically I can see no objection to it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I may say that I have no objection in the world to the first part of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee. However, last night the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] offered an amendment which was practically the same as the first part of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, and that amendment was ruled out on a point of order. I did not care to complicate the amendment which I offered by inserting in it matter which had already been ruled out of order. All I desire is that the purposes of my amendment shall be accomplished.

Then, too, as I understood the reading of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, he does not propose now a "congressional medal," as suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. McKELLAR. I provide for the extension of the thanks of Congress and the American people.

Mr. HARRISON. But may I finish the sentence? There is nothing in my amendment which proposes a congressional medal, but a medal, or some little token or emblem, as a mark of distinction, so to speak.

Mr. REED. That is presented by Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. It is to be prepared or designed under the direction of the Secretary of War merely as a mark of appreciation by Congress and the Government of the services which were rendered, not a congressional medal of honor.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator please distinguish now, if he will pardon me—I am asking for information—between that and a congressional medal? I think, if the Senator will examine all resolutions which have ever been passed providing for congressional medals he will find that they have simply provided that the medal shall be prepared by somebody or by some committee, and shall be presented in the name of Congress. I think that is all there is to any of them.

Mr. HARRISON. My impression is, although I may be mistaken, that it is designated as a congressional medal when a congressional medal is proposed for anyone, and my amendment merely directs that the Secretary of War shall have designed some little medal or emblem to give to them for the services rendered as a mark of appreciation of Congress and the United States Government. May I ask if the Senator from Tennessee is opposed to the latter part of my amendment, which proposes to direct the Secretary of War to have prepared this design that is proposed to be given as a distinguishing mark of the appreciation of Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that it is going to be pretty difficult to discriminate between those who are entitled to it and those who are not; and for that reason it seems to me a general provision would be much better. I want the men who have done the work to be honored for it.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator from Tennessee share in the views expressed by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not.

Mr. HARRISON. Wherein does the Senator from Tennessee differ from the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. In that I think the thanks of Congress ought to be extended in a general way to those who have done the work.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator does not go that far.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I do.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator limits his amendment more than I limit my amendment. Of course, if we could go out and thank all the good ladies and everyone else who played a patriotic part in the war, I should be very glad to see it done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then we would have to——

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will permit me one moment further, these boards were acting under the law; they were created by law: their commissions were issued to them by the Provost Marshal General; they were a part of the Government; they were functioning for the Government and are altogether quite different from Red Cross organizations, the Young Men's Christian Association organizations, and all the other organizations that rendered such patriotic and unselfish services during the war. The members of the local and district boards at first, I think, served without pay, while later, I think, they were paid something, although quite insufficiently, for the services they rendered. They incurred in many instances every kind of risk and every kind of opposition to render the services they performed. They served most patriotically and unselfishly. Claims for exemption by the tens of thousands were presented by men who were drafted into the service. In many instances these boards overruled these claims and in doing so aroused resentments and thereby incurred opposition. So it does seem to me that in carrying out the purposes of the amendment I have offered, if we are going to include a part of the men who did work under the selective-draft law, we ought to include them all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senator ought not to leave out the adjutants general, assistant adjutants general, the medical advisory boards, the medical aids, and the Government appeal agents. I think that surely the provision ought to include a sufficient appropriation in order that this little design may be prepared, simple and cheap, but one that will be prized by the men themselves, and, as the Senator from Missouri has suggested, to be handed down to their children for the services so loyally rendered.

I have been most conservative in the appropriation requested. Bills which have been introduced to carry out a similar purpose have carried from $500,000 to $1,000,000. My amendment only provides for $100,000, which, at the most, would not allow an expenditure of over $3 or $4 for each design.

I sincerely hope the Senator from Tennessee will not jeopardize by his substitute the amendment I have offered, because there is opposition on this floor, as evidenced last night by the point of order which was raised against the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], which is embodied in the first part of the proposed substitute of the Senator from Tennessee. If that substitute is pressed it will clog the wheels; it will becloud the issue, and will likely prevent the passage of the amendment. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will withdraw his substitute; but if he insists upon it, I trust that he will at least make his substitute broad enough to cover the matters incorporated in my amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall take great pleasure in perfecting my substitute, and do so by adding after the word "boards," in line 16, the words "their aids, assistants, and advisors." That will surely take care of everyone.

Mr. HARRISON. That will take care of part of my proposal, but, if the Senator pleases, I wish to understand just where the Senator stands on this proposition. Is the Senator opposed to that part of my amendment not embodied in his substitute which directs the Secretary of War to have the design made, simple and cheap, so to speak, to be bestowed upon the members of the various boards designated in the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to that particularly.

Mr. HARRISON. Then why does not the Senator incorporate that feature in his proposed substitute?

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. I was trying to elicit an answer from the Senator from Tennessee. I wish to know just where he stands on this proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that I have no objection to that, and will be glad to put it in my amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator propose, then, to modify his amendment by inserting such a provision?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will in just a moment.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I think the Senate and the Congress are agreed that the thanks of a grateful Nation are due to those mentioned in the amendment which has been presented, but there is a great diversity of opinion as to how such thanks are to be extended and how the feelings of the Nation ought to be expressed. Owing to the diversity of opinion that has been developed here on the floor, and because there is no crystallized, concerted view about what ought to be done concerning the matter, I am going to make a point of order against both the proposed amendments, that they constitute new legislation and can not be attached to a general appropriation bill. This matter ought to come up in the form of a bill, which should receive consideration at the hands of some committee of Congress, and be intelligently and carefully drawn.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. There may be a diversity of opinion, but certainly the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and myself have not evidenced any diversity of opinion. The only opposition that has been heard on the floor was that expressed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and now by the Senator from Arkansas. I will ask the Senator if he is in sympathy with my amendment?

Mr. KIRBY. I certainly am; but this matter ought to be taken up in an intelligent manner and some agreement should be reached in regard to which particular class ought to be thanked by Congress, or as to whether they all ought to receive the thanks of Congress. I make the point of order against the amendment and the proposed substitute.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, may I ask the Senator another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas make the point of order?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; I make the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator withhold it for just a moment?

Mr. KIRBY. I will withhold it until the Senator has concluded, but I do not withdraw the point of order. The Senator from Mississippi can discuss it.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the point of order is merely reserved.

Mr. President, as to the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas, who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and was a member of that committee during the last Congress, I will say that there have been bills after bills on this subject introduced which have gone to the committee of which the Senator is a member, but they have never been reported out of that committee. One Congress has died and no action has been taken on them. The same is true of the Committee on Military Affairs of the other House. Bills after bills have been introduced there and have died in the committee. Here is the Army appropriation bill, a most appropriate piece of legislation upon which to attach a provision of the kind I have presented. Can the Senator from Arkansas give us any assurance, or any idea at all, when his committee will report out such a piece of proposed legislation? It certainly has had every opportunity to do so.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, if the Senator expects an answer to that question, I will say that it is not my committee. I am a member of the committee, but it is certainly under the direction of its chairman [Mr. WADSWORTH], who has announced that he is favorable to legislation of this kind. There has been no opposition in the committee to the reporting of a measure of this sort heretofore, so far as I know, and I have been pretty constantly in attendance on the sessions of the committee.

I say, however, the condition is such as to require some careful thought and some careful expression in connection with the drawing of a proper bill. The Senator from Mississippi has not even presented this amendment to the Military Affairs Committee, in order that it might be considered there.

Mr. HARRISON. That is very true, but I am presenting it to the Senate now. If the Senator can improve on the language of my amendment, I certainly will be glad to accept any suggestion. I have seen some of the best legislation passed by Congress attached to appropriation bills. I am not one of those who oppose general legislation upon general appropriation bills. If the Senator is in favor of this amendment, then I can not for the life of me see why he should raise his voice

against it, for if he raises the point of order it will probably be sustained, the provision will go out, and we will not then know when, if ever, this legislation can pass Congress.

Mr. KIRBY. I have given my reasons for making the point of order.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make the point of order?

Mr. KIRBY. I insist upon the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I make a statement before the Senator insists upon his point of order?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not want to take the Senator off the floor, of course.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, on December 30, 1918, I introduced a joint resolution, No. 204, which provided that the thanks of Congress be extended to all the members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards for their loyal and devoted services rendered in this work. Yesterday I introduced the same resolution, which is now Senate joint resolution 62, and which has been referred to the Military Affairs Committee.

The joint resolution introduced by me goes further than the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. It not only extends the thanks of Congress to these members, but it also authorizes the President of the United States to appoint by brevet to the Army of the United States the members of all the local and district boards who performed services in the administration of the selective-service law. My object is to give them a certain status. Holding commissions by brevet would permit their being members of different organizations that are being created throughout the United States by the returning soldiers. It also is a fitting and proper recognition of their services. In my opinion their work will stand out as one of the greatest achievements rendered our country in the successful prosecution of the war. Too much praise can not be given them. In saying this I do not mean to reflect in the least on the splendid work done by other organizations and the women of our country. Theirs, however, was largely voluntary, while the work performed by the members of these boards was done in pursuance of legislative enactment and under the direct authority of the War Department.

This joint resolution is now before the Military Affairs Committee. I take it that the reference made a few minutes ago by the Senator from New York to the fact that this matter had been before the committee, and had been referred to the proper department, was to this very resolution. I am in favor of extending to the members of these boards the thanks of Congress and also the appropriate medal referred to in the joint resolution introduced by me and in the amendment now before the Senate. I think it is just and proper that something of this kind be done. Now that the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi has been rejected on a point of order, I sincerely trust that the committee will give this resolution due consideration.

I ask that the joint resolution to which I have referred be printed in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) introduced by Mr. HENDERSON on June 23, 1919, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) extending to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; also authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions the members of such local and district boards; also authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress an appropriate medal.

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of Congress be, and are hereby, extended to all the members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards for their loyal and devoted services rendered without military preferment or proportionate pecuniary reward in the administration of the selective-service law; and, as a further expression of appreciation and gratitude for the able and efficient manner in which such services were performed, and in recognition of their achievements, the greatest of our Government, in the raising of our Army, and of their invaluable contribution to the successful prosecution of the present war, the President of the United States of America be, and hereby is, authorized to appoint by brevet to the Army of the United States of America the members of all the local and district boards, who, as such members of said boards, performed services in connection with the administration of the selective-service law; issuing commissions of the rank of captain by brevet to the chairmen of all such boards and the rank of first lieutenant by brevet to all other members of such boards; and that the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress an appropriate medal, with suitable emblematical devices and inscriptions to be determined by him, and that to enable the President and the Secretary of War to carry this resolution into effect a sufficient sum of money, not to exceed $500,000, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 74, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

Retirement of officers disabled during the European war: That any commissioned officer of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who served in the forces of the United States during the European war, so called, between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who has been or shall hereafter be entitled to be honorably discharged and who, on account of wounds, disease, or disability incurred in the line of duty and not incurred by his own willful misconduct, has become or hereafter becomes permanently disabled and incapacitated to pursue his ordinary business or vocation shall, upon his own request, in accordance with such rules, regulations, and procedure, not inconsistent with this chapter, as may be established by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, be entered and carried upon the retired list of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, with the rank held by him at the time of discharge, and while remaining on said retired list shall be subject to all the obligations and entitled to all the privileges and shall receive the same pay and emoluments as provided for officers of like grade on such retired list: *Provided*, That no person while carried on a retired list under the provisions of this chapter shall be entitled to the compensation provided under the war risk insurance act for the same disability or incapacity; but this provision shall not be construed to deprive the beneficiaries otherwise entitled thereto to the benefits provided by the war risk insurance act on account of the death of such person resulting from wounds, disease, or disability received, incurred, or contracted in the military service.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to correct what seems to me to be an inequality between officers who have served in the National Guard and the National Army and officers who have served in the Regular Army.

Under the existing law, when an officer in the Regular Army is disabled in service he is retired upon two-thirds pay. The National Guard officer or the officer in the National Army who has been similarly disabled is relegated to the war-risk compensation law, with a basis of $30 a month.

Mr. President, no man can fail to recognize this inequality who visits Walter Reed Hospital and sees, as he may any day, two officers in the same ward who served in the same regiment, who performed the same service, and who were wounded in like manner, each of them disabled for life; one of them, in the Regular Army, is retired on two-thirds pay, the other is sent back into civil life disqualified for his regular duties upon the inadequate amount provided by the war-risk compensation act.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator's amendment appeals to me with great force; and if he will only include the private soldiers who are thus injured, and are relegated to private life without any compensation, I shall be very glad to vote for it, and I think it will pass without any trouble if he will just include the private soldiers. I hope he will do that.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, there is a great deal of merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona. The difficulty is that it does not seem as if now it could be provided. The fact that the private soldier is not getting that to which he is entitled—and as to that I concur with the Senator from Arizona—is no reason, it seems to me, why we should not take the first step, and give to the National Guard and Regular Army officer that to which he is entitled. It will be the open door for that recognition of the soldier to which he is so abundantly entitled.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator why the first step should not be taken, if they must be separated, in behalf of the private soldier rather than in behalf of the officer?

Mr. SPENCER. The only answer I can make to the Senator from Wisconsin is that the arrangement for retirement of officers is already in operation along routine lines and simple to carry out. There is no such thing as the retirement of the private soldier. Undoubtedly some arrangement might be well made for that, but it is not now in existence. The present amendment would be the beginning.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I raise the point of order against this amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, on the ground that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

I want to say that while most of us are in sympathy with the object which the Senator has in view, this matter calls for broad and comprehensive legislation, dealing not only with officers but dealing with privates. This amendment, or one similar to it, I understand was brought before the Military Affairs Committee and was voted down. This is an appropriation bill. It is not a bill for general legislation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. Pardon me just a moment. There are many matters that we would like to see corrected; and much legislation growing out of the war will be required in the next few months,

not only to remedy inequalities and discriminations, perhaps, as between the Regular Army officers and the Regulars and reserve officers and those who have been mustered out of the service, but questions relating to a multiude of matters. It is a very unsafe thing on an appropriation bill to take up a question of this character, which needs calm and careful and dispassionate consideration, and the effect and ramifications of which we can not quite comprehend. I regretfully raise the point of order against it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withdraw his point of order for a moment.

Mr. KING. If it does not jeopardize the point of order, I will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. NELSON. I simply desire to say, in a few words, that the inequality of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] complains, and justly, is an inequality that existed in reference to the veterans of the Civil War. For more than 20 years we have tried to secure legislation for the retirement of the veteran volunteer officers of the Civil War. They never have had the show that the Regular Army officers have had. There has been no system by which they could be retired like the officers of the Regular Army. In one or two special instances—I think in the case of Gen. Hawley and in two other cases—we passed special bills retiring them; but the bulk of them are left outside of the breastworks. If this amendment should be adopted, I should certainly ask that the veterans of the Civil War be included; and I can say this without being selfish in the matter, for I was only a corporal in that war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator confirm the wisdom of the point of order which I raised.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have here a small amendment, which the chairman of the committee understands, and I think the Senate will accept it with him. I send it to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 18, on page 28, it is proposed to insert:

For pay of persons wounded, as found due and reported and set forth on page 20, House Document No. 1168, Sixty-second Congress, second session, $29,000.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if any Senator desires an explanation of this amendment, I will make it. It has been appropriated for. The sum of $71,000 was found due several years ago.

Mr. KING. That is on the Mexican border?

Mr. FALL. That is on the Mexican border.

Mr. KING. I am entirely familiar with that matter, and if the chairman of the committee does not object, I have no objection to it.

Mr. FALL. Congress approved the appropriation of $71,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill the following:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to be paid to Mrs. Blanch Winters, widow of Charles F. Winters, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, as compensation and relief for the loss, by death, on January 11, 1918, at Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas, of her husband, Charles F. Winters, who, while engaged in discharge of his duty, in conducting the camp bank at Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas, and in protecting the money and funds of the Government of the United States of America and of the soldiers of the United States Army, was feloniously killed by Louis R. Whistler, a commissioned officer and captain of Company E, Three hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment, Infantry, Eighty-ninth Division, of the Army of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Missouri if the man who was killed was an officer of the Army or was he a civilian?

Mr. REED. He was a civilian in charge of that bank. It was a bank established for the benefit of the Government and had the Government funds in it. This officer came into the bank, gained access because he was an officer and had on the Government uniform, murdered three men who were in charge, including this man, and took $68,000 of money, all the money there was. The money of the bank was afterwards recovered, but this woman was left without any support whatever.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 74, after line 6, it is proposed to add as a new paragraph the following:

That all persons serving in the military or naval forces of the United States during the war with the German Empire who have since April 6, 1917, resigned or been discharged under honorable conditions (or in the case of reservists been placed on inactive duty), or who at any time hereafter (but not later than the termination of the current enlistment or term of service), in the case of enlisted personnel and female nurses, or within six months after the termination of said war in the case of officers, may resign or be discharged under honorable conditions (or in the case of reservists be placed on inactive duty), shall be paid, in addition to all other amounts due them in pursuance of law, a further sum of $30 each, where as much as three and not exceeding four months' service was rendered; $60 each where as much as four, and not exceeding five, months' service was rendered; $90 each where as much as five, and not exceeding six months' service was rendered; $120 each where as much as six months' service and not exceeding seven months' service was rendered; $150 each to all serving seven months or more, said amounts being hereby appropriated and shall be paid from the appropriation for "pay of the Army" and "pay of the Navy," respectively, and under the directions of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively. This act shall not apply to persons who were not in the service on or prior to November 11, 1918.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to make the point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to offer three amendments, two of a corrective character in the title of two of the items, which I send to the desk, and one which I shall send in a moment, together with a letter from the Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 70, line 18, it is proposed to change the title to read: "Ordnance equipment for rifle ranges for civilian instruction."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. That does not increase the amount?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, line 1, it is proposed to change the heading to read: "Quartermaster supplies and services for rifle ranges for civilian instruction."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now I send to the desk another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, the following:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to make use of the courses and facilities of the various civil educational institutions for student officers stationed in the vicinity of such institutions, the cost of courses taken and facilities used to be not greater than that for corresponding service to private individuals; and he is further authorized to detail not to exceed at any time 2 per cent of the authorized strength of any staff corps, bureau, special service, or branch of the service to take advanced courses of study or instruction in civil educational schools and colleges or in commercial establishments in this country or abroad, the cost of the same to be not greater than that for like service to private individuals.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I simply desire to say this amendment was sent to me from the Secretary of War with the request that it be presented. It provides that the Secretary of War may send some of the officers of the Army to civil institutions of learning, with a limitation upon the number and a limitation upon the cost. I think myself it is a pretty good proposal.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I send to the desk another amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill insert the following proviso:

That it shall be unlawful for any person who, as a commissioned officer of the Army, or officer or employee of the United States, has at any time since April 6, 1917, been engaged on behalf of the United States, and within the territorial limits of the United States in procuring or assisting to procure supplies for the Military Establishment, or who has been engaged in the settlement or adjustment of contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for the Military Establishment within two years next after his discharge or other separation from the service of the Government, to solicit employment in the presentation or to aid or assist for compensation in the prosecution of claims against the United States arising out of any contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for said Military Establishment. A violation of this provision of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have here a letter from the Secretary of War which I shall not read at length, but I desire to read a portion of it, as follows:

Section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides as follows:

"It shall not be lawful for any person appointed after the 1st day of June, 1872, as an officer, clerk, or employee in any of the departments to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States which was pending in either of said departments while he was such officer, clerk, or employee, nor in any manner, nor by any means, to aid in the prosecution of any such claim, within two years next after he shall have ceased to be such officer, clerk, or employee."

It seems that the Department of Justice has made a ruling or rendered an opinion to the effect that the term "officer, clerk,

or employee in any of the departments" does not include Army officers, and that thereby it is now possible for an officer of the Army who served, we will say, through this emergency in the Ordnance Department or in the Quartermaster's Department, and was connected with the procurement of goods or the letting of contracts or the placing of orders, to indulge after his discharge from the service in efforts in prosecuting claims against the very department in which he worked but a short time before.

This amendment as proposed by the Secretary of War will make it illegal for any officer of the Army who served in any of these procurement divisions or contract divisions to take part in any such prosecution until after the expiration of two years from the date of his discharge from the service. I think it is an excellent provision.

Mr. KING. Under the construction placed by the Department of Justice upon the statute, employees of the department or privates in the department would be included?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are forbidden in any event, as it applies to civilian employees and clerks.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask a question in regard to the amendment? I understand it is for the purpose of preventing certain officers from taking part in departmental prosecutions which may have arisen during the period of their service in the department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It applies to any discharged officer who happened to be engaged in that kind of work during the war.

Mr. BORAH. What is he inhibited from doing after his discharge?

Mr. WADSWORTH. He is inhibited from taking part in the prosecution of any claim against the Government in connection with the very work in which he was engaged when an officer?

Mr. BORAH. When the Senator speaks of prosecution, he means presenting claims against the Government?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Acting as counsel or in any similar capacity.

Mr. McKELLAR. This seems to me to be an entirely proper amendment, and by all means it ought to be adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I may say that it does not apply to line officers who served with the troops and who of course had no connection with the procurement or letting of contracts.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to inquire why the limitation of two years is provided?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The statute now provides in the case of other employees of the departments the same limitation of two years, and this makes it upon all fours with that permanent provision.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That may be a sufficient reason, but I really think that men who have been in confidential relations with the Government and have special information of that sort should never be permitted to participate in the prosecution of these claims.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the reason is the same which induced us to put a disqualification upon Treasury officers whereby they can not enter private banking institutions until after the lapse of the same time. It is designed to prevent contracts for this employment made by an officer while he is in the service but to take effect immediately afterwards, and frequently resulting in the very situation to which the Senator from Nebraska refers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It seems to me this situation is a little different.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say one word in conclusion. This limitation under the law that is now on the statute books has been found to work satisfactorily.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There may be some reason for conforming to the existing law, but it seems to me that an employee of the Government, either an officer or civilian, who has had confidential relations with the Government and obtained particular knowledge of contracts for supplies, should be disqualified forever from prosecuting claims over which he had supervision against the Government which he represented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I request that the letter from the Secretary of War to which I referred be printed in connection with my remarks in explanation of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be printed.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 25, 1919.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just received from the Attorney General an opinion in a matter which has been giving me considerable concern. Section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides as follows:

"It shall not be lawful for any person appointed after the 1st day of June, 1872, as an officer, clerk, or employee in any of the departments to act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States which was pending in either of said departments while he was such officer, clerk, or employee, nor in any manner, nor by any means, to aid in the prosecution of any such claim, within two years next after he shall have ceased to be such officer, clerk, or employee."

The question has arisen in my department as to whether the provisions of this statute apply to officers of the Army who are now engaged in the prosecution of claims against the United States growing out of contracts entered into for supplies in the course of the war, and who were themselves engaged in procurement work during the war.

Since the department, after the signing of the armistice, undertook the adjustment of outstanding contracts for supplies, necessity for completion of which was terminated by reason of the suspension of hostilities, there have sprung up a number of agencies holding themselves out as able to offer special facilities to contractors in the adjustment of contracts with the department, and stating or implying in some instances that their services are of particular value by reason of a former connection of persons in those organizations with the governmental service, and intimating that their services are indispensable to the contractors if they are to secure a settlement satisfactory to them. While it is recognized that persons formerly employed by the Government have undertaken private employment in prosecution of claims in entire good faith, and that their services may, in many instances, be of legitimate value, nevertheless I feel that the connection of formr officers of the Army, or other employees of the Government, with such organizations or in such work, has become open to the gravest misconstruction by the public, and to possible abuse, in fact.

The opinion of the Attorney General is to the effect that officers of the Army as such do not fall within the provisions of section 190 of the Revised Statutes, for the reason that they are only officers of the War Department in the event that they are specially appointed to a particular office in that department, independent of their function as officers of the Army.

I feel it desirable that the existing situation should be covered by legislation as speedily as practicable, and it occurs to me that if it meets with the approval of your committee, a provision covering the matter might be offered as an amendment from the floor to the Army appropriation bill now pending in the Senate.

I inclose a draft of provision which would, in my opinion, meet the situation. You will note that the provision as drafted does not affect any officers of the Army except those who have been engaged in the procurement of supplies or settlement of contracts in the United States. I feel that there is no reason why a combatant officer should be subject to the proposed restrictions.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 70, after line 17, add the following:

That section 75, chapter 134, first session, Sixty-fourth Congress, United States Statutes at Large, volume 39, part 1, page 202 of the act approved June 3, 1916, be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That the provisions of this section, except those providing for physical examinations, shall not apply, and such tests shall not be required when such officer has served for three months in the field as a commissioned officer in the drafted National Guard, the National Army, or the United States Army, between July 3, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and who was honorably discharged from such service."

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe the amendment has the approval of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am perfectly willing it shall be taken up in conference. I have no objection to it now.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add at the proper place in the bill:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, to the respective widows and children of R. F. McBride, Martin R. Kempton, and Thomas K. Wootan, who were killed on February 10, 1918, in Graham County, Ariz., and of Mark Wildes, who was shot on May 19, 1918, near Fanning, Nev., and who died on May 23, 1918, as compensation for the deaths of their said respective husbands and fathers, such sums of money as by the act of Congress approved October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes," is provided to be paid as compensation for the deaths, occurring before the discharge or resignation from the service and resulting from personal injury suffered in the line of duty, of enlisted men employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department; and such compensation shall be payable and be paid as of and from the respective dates of the deaths of the persons herein named, and under and according to the terms, conditions, and basis of computation in said act provided.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee for a moment. McBride was a sheriff of Graham County, Ariz. Kempton and Wootan were deputy sheriffs. Officers of the local draft board called upon them and requested them to pursue fleeing men, outlaws who were drafted into the Army. The sheriff, after requests of Army officials and the draft board, pursued the outlaws and finally surrounded them in a lonely cabin, but the officers were killed by these outlaws, who were subsequently apprehended and are now confined in the penitentiary for life. As to the man Mark Wildes, the same set of circumstances apply. He was a citizen of one of the counties of Nevada.

I prepared a bill proposing adequate compensation to the widows of these unfortunate men, but the department disapproved the bill and sent this instead. The amendment was drawn by the War Department, but, of course, I know it is subject to a point of order. However, I ask the chairman if he will not permit it to go to conference, and there it can be discussed as to whether it ought to go in this bill and there it can receive the consideration that is usually given by conferees. All the officials of the War Department are profoundly impressed with the justice of the case, because these officers were acting directly at the request of the War Department and lost their lives in the service of their country in apprehending outlaws who declared that they would fight for Germany if they fought at all. They resisted the draft, and these officers went in pursuit of them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the men who are now confined in the penitentiary were regularly drafted. They refused to appear before the board, and officers were sent out for them. The men in behalf of whose widows this claim is presented were killed in their efforts to arrest the men. There were soldiers with the sheriff. They were summoned to go with them and they went with them, and the marshal and his two deputies in an effort to make the arrest lost their lives. It is clearly a justifiable case, their widows need the money, and I hope the chairman of the committee will not make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment would establish a precedent of extending the benefits of the war-risk insurance act to civilians, to officers of States and counties who lost their lives in the enforcement of law. If we start with this kind of a precedent the War Risk Insurance Bureau is going to be loaded up with all kinds of claims and special legislation by Congress. The war-risk insurance act was meant for soldiers alone. I do not like to see the door opened and the sheriffs of counties and officials of one kind and another under the State or county government admitted to its benefits. I think it is a very bad policy. I feel constrained to raise a point of order against this amendment, not because I have no sympathy with these three unfortunates, but I believe they should prosecute their claims, which are undoubtedly just, against the Government in the usual way.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, I accept it without any complaint whatever. I have no right to complain of the point of order made by the chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with the purpose of this amendment, but I also approve of the action of the chairman. The great difficulty about the amendment is that it will establish a precedent which would increase the already overburdensome expenses of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. However, my purpose in rising was to suggest that the Senator may not have been in the Chamber this morning when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] presented an amendment covering a similar case, providing for compensation direct instead of from the War Risk Insurance Bureau. I think if the Senator from Arizona will model his amendment upon the amendment of the Senator from Missouri we can put it on the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for his suggestion, but I first want to say that I do not complain of the position of the chairman, and I am perfectly content. If we are not to open the door, I am not complaining. I realize if a precedent were established it might lead to many other cases; but these cases came to me, and I included them in the proposed amendment because the War Department itself especially requested these officers to perform this service, and the War Department itself disapproved of the bill which I drew and sent me instead this particular amendment. If the Senator from Colorado thinks I should revamp or recast the amendment, I am very content to do that and will do it at some subsequent time, but not on the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely suggested that it was done this morning at the instance of the Senator from Missouri and without objection.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator, but I think there is a distinction between the two cases, because in that case the man killed was not in civil life; he was an officer.

Mr. THOMAS. The facts are not directly similar.

Mr. ASHURST. That is the trouble.

Mr. THOMAS. But the act of the Senate providing for direct compensation is a precedent that will and ought, I think, to be applied to analogous cases, of which that from Arizona is one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York make a point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, on the 23d instant I sent to the desk and had printed a proposed amendment to the bill now before the Senate, and on the same day I introduced a joint resolution upon the same subject. The joint resolution is now before the Foreign Relations Committee and I have reason to think it will be reported out favorably from that committee within the next day or two.

I appreciate the fact that the chairman of the committee has labored very industriously with this bill, and I have no desire to occupy the time of the Senate nor to disturb the orderly course of business in the enactment of this necessary legislation. I therefore shall not offer the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is now in the Senate. There were certain amendments voted upon in Committee of the Whole which were reserved for a separate vote in the Senate. The question now is upon concurring in the Senate in the amendments made in the Committee of the Whole with the reservations to which I have referred. Without objection, the amendments, except as stated, will be concurred in.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I reserved a certain amendment for a separate vote in the Senate, and in making the reservation it was my desire to present the question of the increase in the size of the Army from about 300,000 to about 400,000, that being the difference between the size of the Army provided for by the House and the size which will be provided for by the bill in case it passes in the Senate as it was passed in Committee of the Whole.

I do not want unnecessarily to delay the consideration of this measure, but the proposition which I have presented by my reservation of the vote is to my way of looking at the situation a rather important one. I think we ought to reflect upon our program not only with reference to the bill which is now pending, but with reference to all other measures which have to do with the question of armament.

The amount of the original estimate for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year of 1920 as presented by the department was $1,268,322,269. The amount carried by the bill as it passed the House was $718,654,591. The bill as reported to the Senate carries $888,703,848.50. In so far as the House curtailed the amount of the original estimate from $1,268,322,269 to $718,654,591, I am entirely satisfied. It does not seem to be from what I have learned during the debate and from the report that there is any occasion for increasing the Army in size and increasing the appropriation for the Army from the amount provided by the House to the amount which is now proposed by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator should add to $888,000,000 the sum of $100,000,000 which is reappropriated, as shown on page 34 of the bill, as I recall it. So the amount will be $988,000,000, as reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there was a very general belief, and pretty well justified by reason of declarations which have been made by practically all the governments of the world, that the close of this war would witness a real and substantial movement toward disarmament. The people anxiously awaited for some manifestation of good faith that such a program would be initiated and carried to a successful conclusion. The people were attracted to the whole scheme involved in the treaty of Versailles, including what is known as the league of nations, by reason of what they believed to be a fair assurance that there would be a guaranty, and such guaranty backed by actual performance, of disarmament.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand that the Senator from Idaho is very much opposed to the covenant of the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. I am.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In that connection I should like to inquire if the Senator feels that if the covenant of the league of nations is not adopted the movement toward disarmament will receive very much impetus? In other words, if the league of nations is not entered into by the United States, does the Senator feel that the United States then would be warranted in not going ahead with its Army preparedness?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator has submitted a question to which I intend to address my remarks; and therefore, without answering specifically the question that is now presented, I shall undertake to proceed with the matter as I

had outlined it in my mind, trusting that my position will be made clear as I proceed; and if not, I shall be very glad to be interrupted again by the Senator.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Of course, I shall be quite content to have the Senator deal with it in his own way.

Mr. BORAH. But, as I was saying, notwithstanding the desire upon the part of all people to see a program of disarmament and to see a situation brought about which would justify disarmament, we have presented to us a program in the form of the treaty and of the league which gives no guaranty or assurance of disarmament, and we have also an interpretation or construction of the treaty and the league by the Governments most responsible for it which indicates beyond question that the makers of the treaty themselves do not expect or want disarmament. Upon the other hand, there is to be the most stupendous program of armaments which the world has ever contemplated in a time of peace.

If one will examine the program as outlined in England for its army and for the increase of its navy, in France, in Japan, and in the United States, he will have no trouble in coming to the conclusion that those who are most familiar with the terms of the treaty and the league do not for a moment regard it as a program of disarmament. It is, on the other hand, calling for such an armament as none of these nations in their separate and individual action has ever heretofore contemplated. It presents such a program as none of these nations has heretofore thought it was necessary to have. England, France, and Japan are burdening their people as never before, in order, it is said, to do their part under the league.

I call attention to the provision with reference to disarmament and to the construction which has been placed upon this provision, to the action which is already being taken in the light of the provision, and to the different budget systems which are being framed in contemplation of carrying out the provision.

I do not undertake to go into the question whether or not we could disarm at this time, although I have my views upon it, but what I desire to call to the attention of the Senate and the country is that the construction which has been placed upon article 8 by the advocates of the league before the public is not the construction which is being placed upon it in the legislative assemblies or in parliaments where the question of the amounts necessary to carry it into effect are considered in a concrete and practical way. It is given one construction in popular parlance and before the people at large. It is given an entirely different construction in the appropriation committees and in the parliaments which have to deal with the subject.

Article 8 provides:

> The members of the league recognize that the maintenance of a peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

The language in which this statement is couched is somewhat significant of itself. It says: "The members of the league recognize." Without any particular commendation or any particular urgency of the principle, it recognizes that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armament, a principle which all thinking, reflecting, sane people do recognize. Without the reduction of national armament and a program which insures and guarantees that reduction, it is idle to talk about a world at peace.

An armed world is a fighting world. Nations armed to the teeth are not the elements of a peaceful world, and unless we can find a provision in the league which gives us the assurance that a program has been provided which can be enforced and carried out, it is not fair to the people of the world to say, as has been repeatedly said upon the public rostrum, that the league means disarmament. Reading further, the language is:

> The council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.
>
> Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every 10 years.
>
> After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the council.

"After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments." That leaves the question, Mr. President, of disarmament precisely where it was before. What is the difference between then and now and now and then? They recognize the principle that disarmament to the lowest point consistent with national safety is a sound principle, and every Government, I presume, would have been willing to say at any time within the last fifty years that it recognized that principle, and yet the same nation or the same Government proceeded at once to arm and to build vast fighting machines.

After recognizing this principle in paragraph 1, they turn about and leave the question of disarmament precisely where it was before, resting upon the individual discretion and judgment and initiative of each separate and individual nation.

It is true that after the program has been accepted they must consult the council with reference to increasing it. I do not now enter upon the question of the power of the council to enforce any such understanding; I do not care to discuss that; but the initiative, the original program, is left solely and absolutely in the discretion of each individual nation. The program seems to be now that at no distant day Germany is to be admitted to the league of nations. I take it that there never would be within the lifetime of anyone who sits in this Chamber any thought or consideration of disarmament to the slightest degree if the German Government is permitted, after it enters the league, to determine for themselves what their armament shall be. I take it, Mr. President, that there would not be the slightest step toward disarmament if the Japanese Government is permitted to determine for itself what its disarmament shall be. If they wanted to disarm, when was there a better time to begin than when they were sitting together at the close of this war and the enemy reduced to helplessness. So, Mr. President, we have the same program precisely, unchanged in the slightest from the program of the past, that each nation keeps its eye upon the other nations of the earth and arms or disarms according to its individual discretion and according to what it conceives to be its interest, the same old race of armaments.

I can not find anything in article 8 which authorizes in any way or in any way assures or guarantees a program other than that which has existed at all times during the last 100 years. If there had been in good faith a determination to disarm, there could have been placed in the league of nations and in the treaty certain standards or certain principles to which the different nations signing or agreeing would have agreed positively and affirmatively to accede; but no such program has been provided for—and why?

Notwithstanding the secrecy which has prevailed with reference to this matter at Versailles, everyone knows precisely why it was not inserted. It was because the nations of Europe were unwilling to have anything inserted which would in the slightest degree embarrass them in their program as it has obtained heretofore. Therefore we have only a general statement, a general recognition of an axiomatic principle, that disarmament must necessarily precede peace, without any substantial provision or guaranty whatever that any disarmament is to take place.

Not only does this present draft provide no program of disarmament and no means by which it can be assured or enforced, but the original draft was redrafted in this particular in order to weaken to a certain extent the power of the league over the question of armament.

The last vestige of authority or power, the last semblance of agreement of disarmament, according to any fair construction of the language, was eliminated from the second draft; and it was eliminated because the imperialistic powers and the imperialistic sentiments outside, I think I am justified in saying—although I do not know the internal workings of the conference outside of our own representatives—were for a full and unlimited discretion with reference to each individual Government as to what extent it should arm. Had the program of disarmament ever proceeded to the point where it could be enforced by or had the league depended upon any substantial program of disarmament, the league would not have been framed, for it is an imperialistic league, not a league based upon disarmament or upon the principles which were announced before the President went to Versailles.

Mr. President, I am frank to say that I am led to make these remarks to-day by reason of a statement which was made a few days ago, at Wichita, Kans., I believe, by the ex-President, wherein, referring to article 8, he said:

> Thus we are to stop forever the race for armaments, the truculence of bullying they endanger, their temptation to war, and their cruel and enormous destructiveness when war ensues.

Speaking further to the Kansas farmers, anxious to be rid of the great burdens of taxes which are imposed upon them by reason of this armament, he said:

> Unless we have this league of nations, this race of armament must go on with the dreary round of events—first burdensome taxation and consumption and waste of producing capacity, then war, then world suicide. These are the only alternatives to a league.

This statement is made in the face of the plain language which leaves action with each Government as before, in the face of the huge budgets for armaments in all Governments members

of the league, in face of the fact that the ex-President advocates conscription in time of peace.

There is no more seductive proposition that could be presented to the people of this country in favor of the league of nations than this proposition stated by the ex-President, that without the league disarmament could not take place, and with the league we are rid of armaments and the great fighting machines of the world. The one thing for which men have prayed during these years, long before this war began, was some system or organization or means by which these great burdens could be lifted for all time. When they are told by an ex-President that the league of nations is a guaranty to them of that which they have been hoping for it is the most conclusive argument which could be presented to them.

But it is up to the ex-President to state to the people of this country how disarmament can take place when every Government decides for itself to-day, as it has heretofore, what armaments it shall have. It is up to those who make such statements to point out the language by which, if Japan wants to build eight warships, she can be compelled to be satisfied with but two, and if Japan builds eight how many will the United States build? If the United States builds eight, how many will England build? So the round goes, leaving it to the individual discretion and action of each particular nation, without any power whatever in the league or without any agreement among the nations as to a proper standard of armament.

Mr. President, Horace Greeley once said that "the way to resume species payments is to resume," and the only way to disarm is to disarm. The only possible means by which it could be accomplished would be to put into the league itself, or the treaty, the standards by which armament should be measured, the clear, positive agreement that certain concrete steps looking to disarmament should be taken.

The men who went to Versailles to formulate the treaty went there under the solemn pledge to do specific things with reference to disarmament. Before the conference was called certain things had been promised to the people of the world, not that we will disarm in the far-off and most illusive sometime, not that we will recognize the principle that disarmament precedes peace, but they said, "We will do this concrete thing, and, doing this concrete thing, disarmament necessarily and inevitably follows." For instance, before they went to Versailles we were informed that the first essential, indispensable step toward the peace of the world was to establish the principle of the freedom of the seas. The establishment of that principle is just as requisite to the destruction of navalism as the destruction of conscription is indispensable to the destruction of the curse of militarism.

These two principles—the establishment of the freedom of the seas and the elimination of conscription—were the two great principles which were promised to the people of the world by the men who controlled and shaped affairs at Versailles before they went there; and the very fact that both of these things, the very basis of navalism and militarism, were eliminated, rejected out of hand, must be satisfactory proof to any reflecting man that, whatever they thought before they met, they came to the conclusion that disarmament was not practicable. That is what the people should be told, that they have not provided for disarmament because they found that it was impracticable to do so. It is a system of misrepresentation, seldom excelled, to tell the people, after these broken promises, that disarmament is to follow.

The Versailles conference had not been in session 24 hours—indeed, if I remember correctly, it had not yet met—when the English authorities announced that the question of the freedom of the seas would not be submitted to the jurisdiction of the Versailles conference, and, in order to render it safe beyond discussion, M. Clemenceau announced in the public press that upon that proposition he would stand by Great Britain. So before the conference had been convened, or at least before it had proceeded to any considerable extent, the first concrete proposition of disarmament was rejected, or rather disowned, by the conference. Placidly, almost facetiously, they put it aside.

During the campaign in England just prior to the peace conference Lloyd-George made a solemn pledge, as the representative of England, that the second step toward disarmament, the rejection of the principle of conscription, would be written into the treaty. He said:

> On the eve of this important election, which means so much to the country, I wish to make it clear beyond all doubt that I stand for the abolition of conscript armies in all lands.

Give attention to this language:

> Without that the peace conference would be a failure and a sham. These great military machines are responsible for the agony the world has passed through, and it would be a poor ending to any peace conference that allowed them to continue.

Mr. REED. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. BORAH. I am reading from a speech made by Lloyd-George to the electors of England in the last election.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What was the date?

Mr. BORAH. I have not the date here, but it took place, as the Senator will recall, after the armistice but before the peace conference had assembled.

Mr. LODGE. It was in December.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Massachusetts states that it was in December.

Mr. President, I am unable to pass over this statement of Lloyd-George with a simple reading of it. It not only states a principle, but states in a single paragraph all I contend for here, and that is that without these two fundamental steps, the establishment of the freedom of the seas and the inhibition on conscription, any talk about peace is a delusion and a sham. Lloyd-George set up his own test of disarmament, his own test of a genuine treaty of peace, and that test I invoke. I ask those who are talking to the people of this country about disarmament to give some attention to this merciless condemnation of the league which we are asked to accept as a guaranty of peace.

Germany is disarmed; she is reduced, so far as her military force is concerned, to a state of helplessness; conscription, if I remember the treaty correctly, is inhibited in Germany; and yet, while the only enemy whom we have feared, the only possible enemy who could have called us out of our isolation into the turmoil of Europe, the only enemy who we believe could in any sense threaten the civilization of the world, is disarmed and conscription prohibited within her borders, the nations which pledged themselves to disarmament refuse to apply, even in the slightest degree, the principle which Mr. Lloyd-George said was essential to peace to the other nations of the world. While Germany is disarmed, other nations are left to arm to their content or to their discretion, without any agreement amongst themselves or any understanding amongst themselves that their armaments shall be within certain confined limits or according to certain standards.

Permit me to read again:

> On the eve of this important election, which means so much to the country, I wish to make it clear beyond all doubt that I stand for the abolition of conscript armies in all lands. Without that the peace conference would be a failure and a sham.

Yet, Mr. President, the ex-President of the United States is stating that without the league of nations, which provides for nothing covering the subject matter to which Mr. Lloyd-George referred and under which the question of armaments is still left open, we proceed at once to the realization of the hopes of the people that disarmament is to be had.

There was a good reason, in my judgment, for refusing to inhibit conscription. The volunteer system, in my humble opinion, would always be sufficient to protect this Republic. I am not now proposing to enter upon an argument against the conscription system, so far as it applied to this war; I expressed my views at the time that question was pending, and I have in no sense modified them; but the volunteer system could, with apparent safety, be relied upon to protect the Republic when the Republic was in peril. The volunteer system, however, could never be relied upon to send soldiers to protect the territorial integrity of all the nations of Europe and Asia. Without the conscript system, without the power to conscript, it would be practically impossible to raise an army sufficient to perform our duties to the league under article 10, article 11, and article 16. Furthermore, if conscription were abolished war would be, to some extent, in the control of those who would have to fight. But with conscription men can be forced to fight regardless of their sense of justice or their belief in the righteousness of the cause. It was well understood by these men that men would volunteer to fight when their own countries were in peril, but if they were to be reduced to the miserable rôle of Hessians they would have to be conscripted.

Mr. Taft admitted that proposition in a speech in New York sometime ago, when this particular question was presented as to where we were going to get the soldiers to police or to protect the territorial integrity of the different nations of the earth, and as to whether or not it was expected that American boys would volunteer to perform any such service. Mr. Taft frankly admitted that we would secure them by conscription. He said:

> Very little service of any kind has been exacted from the great body of the people. Conscription is needed to discipline our native young men and to teach them respect for authority. It is needed to teach our millions of newly created citizens loyalty. Congress should enact a conscription law making provision not only for the present but for the future, after the war shall end.

So, Mr. President, instead of what Lloyd-George promised, an inhibition against conscription, it is permitted to stand, and we have already the assurance that it is to be applied in time of peace. England is to-day raising an army of close to a million men, it being only a few figures under that number. How is England proceeding to secure that army? By conscription in time of peace; and just so surely as we enter this league of nations and the obligations of articles 10 and 11 are imposed upon us and the conditions of those articles are to be carried out by finding American boys to perform the services which will be required, just that certain we will have conscription in this country in time of peace. We have now our great organizations already conducting a campaign for universal military training; we have a condition being imposed upon us which will require conscription, and upon top of that we have the promise made that we will perform our part of the service of policing the different parts of the world, which in itself would require conscription, if nothing else did.

Let it be understood, Mr. President, that this is the situation; let the people know the facts; and then, if the American people want to assume the obligation and accept this program, I shall be silent. I am perfectly willing that what a majority of the American people determine to be for the best interest of our Government shall prevail; but I seriously object to its being presented to those who are asked to approve the proposition that it means one thing, when in fact it means an entirely different thing.

Mr. President, there has never been any intention to disarm. When this Congress closed on the 4th of March with a little unfinished business on hand there was pending in the Congress of the United States a bill providing an appropriation of $750,000,000 to build what was stated to be the largest navy in the world. This bill was being advocated and urged in the light of the league, and, as stated by the advocates of both the bill and the league, in order to carry out the terms of the league. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars is more money than was expended by Germany, France, and England combined upon their navies in 1913; $750,000,000 is the largest appropriation twice over that any nation ever made for naval purposes in time of peace. Why was it proposed to appropriate that amount? Admiral Badger says in his testimony before the House committee:

> The Navy of the United States should ultimately be equal to the most powerful maintained by any other nation in the world. It should be gradually increased to this point by such a rate of development year by year as may be permitted by the facilities of the country, but the limit above defined should be obtained not later than 1925. Navies must be the principal support of a league of nations, and the United States, from its wealth, its influence, and its power, will be called upon to contribute a very large share of the international police force necessary to render such a league effective.

Then the admiral urges, as an advocate of the league, the large Navy because it is essential and indispensable for the service of the United States in the performance of its portion of its duty under the league. At the same time, Mr. President, we had, when Congress closed, pending before us a bill providing for an Army of 500,000 men. Gen. March stated in his testimony a few days ago that if the other nations of the world do their part, 500,000 men may be sufficient to enable the United States to perform its part under the league of nations. If the other nations of the world do their part, we can get along with an Army of 500,000 men; but if they should fail to do their part, heaven only knows the size of the Army which would be required upon the part of this Government in order to carry out, in good faith, its portion of the contract.

We are to have the largest Navy in the world, and an Army of 500,000 men, not because we are not entering into the league of nations, not because we are reverting to the old system and the old program, but in order to carry out our portion of our duty under the league of nations.

Some one may say that without the league of nations we might have to have more Army. That is a matter of speculation; but certainly no one is justified in saying what has been said by the ex-President, that the league means disarmament, when those who are advocating it say that the largest Navy in the world is necessary to perform our duty under it, and an Army of 500,000 men is essential to perform our portion of the police duty.

Gen. Maurice, when interviewed upon this subject sometime ago, spoke with considerable frankness in regard to it, and said that—

> Not only must the United States furnish the financial support for reconstruction of the war-stricken countries—without which assistance the league would be stillborn—but that a great American Navy is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the league.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator give the Senate the date of that announcement?

Mr. BORAH. According to my memorandum here that was on February 21. The Navy, Gen. Maurice declared, is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the league, and is its chief administrative weapon and the only means by which the principle of economic pressure can be sufficiently applied under the league; and the great American Republic must furnish its portion of the Army to maintain the integrity of the league.

Mr. President, no one who reflects for a moment upon article 10 and article 11 will disagree with Gen. Maurice. If we are going to enforce economic pressure every time there is a disturbance, or if we are going to police the world, he is a gibbering idiot who supposes for a moment that that means anything other than the most stupendous armaments, because you must be prepared every instant to oversee and police the whole civilized world, and that means arming to the utmost. Whether we use our fighting machine or not, it must be ready every moment.

Mr. Bonar Law said in the House of Commons last week that there are 23 wars now raging in Europe. Mr. Simonds, the famous war correspondent of the New York Tribune, gives a list last Sunday of 18. The New York Times gives a list two or three weeks ago Sunday of 16. Somewhere between 16 and 23 wars are now raging in Europe, and perhaps every one of them involves the question of territorial integrity or political independence. Gen. March was modest enough when he said that if the other nations of the world do their part 500,000 men may be enough to take care of 23 wars.

Mr. President, no wonder the men at Versailles abandoned disarmament and provided for armament. When they sat down and looked at the practical side of this question they said: "This promise which Lloyd-George made to the electors is all right for the electors, but it will not guard the territorial integrity of the different nations of the earth."

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. "That can only be accomplished by conscription." And, Mr. President, let me say here and now that conscription is the basis of Prussian militarism. Without it it could not exist. No modern military hero has been able to carry his program to any extent whatever without the power to place the grip of government upon the men who are to fill the trenches and crowd the hospitals of pain. Conscription is the groundwork of militarism, it makes no difference in what country it obtains.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. REED. The Senator has just passed the point. Is it not a fact that England's repudiation of the proposition of disarmament was complete when England herself insisted that she would not reduce her fleet by a single ship? Does it not follow from that fact that England's chief confidence lay in her wooden forts, as she used to call them—her steel forts or floating fortresses now—and does it not also follow from that that if England is to maintain an enormous fleet upon the seas, other nations must either implicitly trust her or they must be prepared to defend themselves?

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator quote when England said, at any time in her history, that she would not reduce her fleet by one vessel?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to hear it.

Mr. REED. During the early discussion of the peace league, after the delegates had assembled, the question came up and was discussed in the public press, not only for days but for weeks, as to what the attitude of England would be. There was a time when it was understood that it was doubtful whether England would agree to go into a league of nations. Finally, the language was devised and written into the league that in fixing the armament, account should be taken of the peculiar situation of each nation. I can not recall the exact language.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. "Geographical situation."

Mr. REED. Yes; and peculiar conditions; and it was then stated by a British statesman——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Who stated it?

Mr. REED. And stated by the press generally——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What statesman stated it?

Mr. REED. Just let me finish my statement.

Mr. BORAH. I can tell the Senator one of the statesmen who stated it—Mr. Churchill. I have it on my desk, but can not put my finger on it.

Mr. REED. Yes; that that language was satisfactory to Great Britain, and it was repeatedly stated by British statesmen that Great Britain would not reduce her fleet to any extent whatever. I did not suppose there was a man who would deny that proposition.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I deny it most emphatically.

Mr. REED. I assert it most positively, and I assert it upon the strength of the general public press; and I shall take very great pleasure in putting in the names and the quotations. I do not carry them here with me at my desk. Moreover, I challenge the Senator to show in a single instance where Great Britain has proposed to reduce her fleet, and I challenge him if it is not a fact that Great Britain's appropriations for keeping up her fleet are as great as ever in the past, and if the statement just made by the Senator from Idaho, that Great Britain's army that she is now preparing for the coming year is to consist of a million men, is not correct.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think there is no doubt that the Senator from Nebraska will find that Mr. Churchill stated that proposition in almost exactly that language.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will introduce it in his remarks. I consider it a highly reckless statement to say that Great Britain has said that she would not reduce her fleet one vessel, because the public opinion of Great Britain is just as powerful as the public opinion of the United States, and it is overwhelmingly in favor of a limitation of armament both on sea and on land; and it is that public opinion which is going to dominate the British Government from now on.

Mr. BORAH. Now, Mr. President, speaking with all respect for the Senator from Nebraska, how utterly—may I say absurd——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; that is a good word.

Mr. BORAH. How utterly absurd it is for the Senator from Nebraska and me to talk about public opinion in England except as it crystallizes itself into statutes and programs; and the largest budget that England has ever offered to her people at any time in a peace period with reference to upbuilding her navy and her army is now before the House of Commons, and has proceeded so far with practically no opposition whatever. The thing which aroused the bitterness of England, so far as a large portion of the press was concerned, was the very suggestion by the President that there should be a decrease of armament; and I have no doubt at all as to what it was that compelled the President to change the program which I have no doubt in the first instance was sincerely entertained. England never would have consented for a moment—if we are to judge by the expressions of such men as Churchill and Balfour and the bill which is now pending in the House of Commons—to anyone except England herself having any say as to the reduction of her armaments.

I read here, in this connection, a statement from Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig which tends to support the position which we have taken. This was made only a few days ago at St. Andrews University, where he delivered an address.

> Sir Douglas Haig, in his address, said we had all been appalled by the magnitude of the World War now drawing to a close, and would gladly believe that, even if we had not reached a stage of universal peace, at least mankind would never again become involved in a cataclysm so general and so terrible. If, however, we were to avoid a repetition of such catastrophes we must be prepared actively to prevent them and must know what course to pursue. Though for a while they might lie dormant, the passions from which war springs were not yet dead in the hearts of men. The seeds of future conflicts were to be found in every quarter of the globe, only awaiting the right conditions, moral, political, and economical, to burst once more into activity and cover the fields with harvests of armed men. * * * We could not afford to neglect military precautions, for to do so would be to invite war.

That is the same old principle, precisely, upon which England has always proceeded.

> If the responsibility for this war rested in any degree upon Great Britain, it was because the state of her military preparations made it seem to the foreign observer improbable, if not impossible, that she would venture to take up the challenge which her enemies cast at her feet. All available resources must be prepared and organized in time of peace with the view to their being used if and when occasion required.

That states not only the position of England, but the position of Japan, the position of France, and the position of the United States as expressed in the bills now pending before Congress; and instead of trying to gather up what public opinion is by reading newspaper views or the views of others, we can best gather it and best rely upon it as expressed in the budgets of the different nations which are now construing their obligations to their people with reference to military preparedness in the light of the league itself.

Mr. President, how could we disarm under this league? What a pitiable situation, with article 10 and article 11 staring us in the face day by day! How are we even to proceed in the first instance to disarm? Let us read article 10, and see if it is a disarming provision. See if it is a provision of peace, or a provision, as the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] said, for organizing a war trust:

> The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against the external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

We not only agree to be prepared to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity of all members of the league, which its enthusiastic advocates contemplate will be all nations shortly, but we agree to take the advice of the five or nine men sitting at Geneva as to how we shall perform our obligations under article 10.

There has been a great deal said here about the constitutionality of article 10, and the advice under article 10, and as to what limitations that places upon the power of Congress with reference to declaring war, etc. That is an interesting discussion, and I am generally as much interested in constitutional discussions as anyone; but this does not concern me at this time. Here is a solemn obligation, original, primary, that we will preserve the territorial integrity of these nations. It does not make any difference whether anyone advises or not; our duty is there, and it is a solemn obligation that we will perform it. We can only escape from it along the path of dishonor. It is an individual obligation. Those who argue that we may get out of this thing must adopt one of two courses: They must either show that to enforce it would be unconstitutional, or they must escape by disregarding and dishonoring our solemn contract. If we go forward, we violate the Constitution. If we go back, we violate national honor. If we go forward, we wreck the Constition. If we go backward, we wreck the covenant of the league.

If we enter into this contract, there is no escape on earth from it except through making it a "scrap of paper." It does not make any difference whether it is unconstitutional or not.

The moment that council advised that we should send 100,000 men to Manchuria or to guard the territorial integrity of Japan, including Shantung, every newspaper in the country and all the power of public opinion would be centered upon Congress, as they are to-day, to whip them into line, because some foreign council had decided that civilization was imperiled; and the Congress would likely do what it is said it is about to do—surrender its own judgment and obey the dictates of the press.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. LODGE. Is any action by the council necessary? Is not that an individual guaranty from the United States? And if one member of the league appeals for the fulfillment of that guaranty for her own protection are we not morally bound to respond to her call?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly, Mr. President. We could not stand before the tribunal of the civilized world and make any plea against the fulfillment of the contract. We would be branded the world over as having entered into a solemn contract with our eyes open, willing to accept its benefits and unwilling to assume its obligations. I trust that the Republic will never be placed in a predicament where it will have to assume that position.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether or not he has formulated any plan, satisfactory to himself, which would tend to insure the world's peace, unless there should be some concert of powers to prevent external aggression?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator says "unless there should be some concert of powers to prevent external aggression." The Senator and I are so far apart that it is scarcely worth while for us to discuss that matter; but, to my mind, the question of external aggression is one of the smallest items in the maintenance of peace.

The question of external aggression may not take into consideration at all the righteousness or the unrighteousness of the establishment of territorial lines. It may not take into consideration at all the question of the justice of the proposition. Let me call the Senator's attention to an instance of what I mean.

We have now turned over in the Shantung affair about 36,000,000 human beings to the control of a foreign power. That has aroused the antipathy and the feeling of about 400,000,000 more human beings; and yet, Mr. President, under this plea of preserving the territorial integrity of these nations, if these 36,000,000 human beings should resist the domination of the power under which we have placed them, and their fellow countrymen, 400,000,000 strong, should come to their support, regardless of the justice, of the liberty, of the conscience which was behind those who resisted it, we would have to furnish the men simply to preserve the territorial integrity of Japan which we have established over those people.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am afraid, Mr. President, the Senator did not catch the real point of my inquiry. The expression "external aggression" certainly can not include all of the circumstances which the Senator has just enunciated. "External aggression," to my mind at least, conveys a very clear thought; and unless some provision is made—I will put it that way—for the suppression of external aggression, can there be peace in the world, and is it not necessary to provide some method for preventing external aggression?

Mr. BORAH. I do not regard it so at all, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then I take it that we are willing to uphold the theory which we have attributed to Germany, that one nation may prey upon another, and it is no concern of ours or of the world?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, to give the Senator an illustration, if after this treaty is signed the Chinese should retake Shantung, I should sympathize with them, and I would regard it as a crime to send our soldiers there to defend Japanese unrighteous possession. I should feel that they were doing an act of justice to their own country and to their own people. I should feel that they were carrying out a principle of justice and establishing a principle of liberty which we would not dare to controvert. So there is an illustration that the mere question of territorial integrity does not signify anything at all, unless you go further back and inquire upon what terms and under what conditions and circumstances the particular territorial line was established.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In the very case the Senator has just suggested it is presumed, at least, that both China and Japan will sign this treaty; and, if they do, are not the boundaries established by mutual agreement?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if China signs the treaty, she will sign the treaty for the same reason that she signed the treaty with Japan, and, as she stated to the peace conference, under duress and force—the very thing which President Wilson denounced in one of his addresses.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then the Senator would have China treat this treaty as a mere "scrap of paper."

Mr. BORAH. But suppose China does not sign it; suppose China refuses to sign it; it will not make any difference. Japan is going to have Shantung anyway, and we would be under precisely the same obligation to maintain her supremacy over Shantung if China did not sign as if she did. The territorial lines would be established notwithstanding that fact.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I am greatly interested in the Senator's discussion of this very important question, and I take the liberty of reminding him, without expressing any opinion of my own upon the subject, that the article which he is now criticizing is mutual, and of course imposes the same obligation upon Japan in the event that we are menaced by external aggression that it imposes upon us in the case supposed.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is true.

Mr. THOMAS. The statement of the Senator without this reminder would seem to me to carry a one-sided impression and lead to the view that this is an obligation upon the United States which is not coequal with a similar obligation upon the other great powers.

Mr. BORAH. Of course I appreciate that if anyone assails our territorial integrity Japan would be under the same obligation to come to our rescue. However, it does not seem to me that the compensations are quite equal.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be. Indeed they can not be equal, because we are isolated.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator has made his position very clear with regard to the rights of the Chinese. I assume the Senator favors the establishment of the Poles in their independence with a national territory and government, and possibly the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs, and other peoples. That will be done, I assume, out of the conquered territory—that is, territory which the Allies have conquered from our enemies—and I see no way that it can be done except at the same time the treaty is signed. There is no provision for it, however, in the league of nations. Is it the position of the Senator that we shall take no part in the establishment of those races as governments or, having taken part in the establishment of them, that we shall contribute no power in the maintenance of them?

Mr. BORAH. Is that the question?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is the question.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that would lead me, if I should go into details, considerably from my line of discussion; but let me say that I am opposed to the United States assuming any obligation whatever to maintain the territorial integrity or to maintain in existence any nation in Europe or Asia. I do not mean to say by that that I am not in deepest sympathy with Poland, and I should like to see the Polish nation established. In other words, I should like to see the right given them to establish themselves as a people. I should like to see that same right extended to Ireland and to Egypt. If it had been my privilege to have had anything to say with reference to the treaty, I would have incorporated into it a principle which would have permitted those people, if they had the power and desired to do so, to establish themselves as separate and independent nations.

But when you ask me if I am in favor of assuming the duty upon the part of the United States of furnishing military means of power, or power in any way, to keep them in existence or maintain them, I say "No," without any hesitation whatever.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does the Senator believe that those nations instantly thrown into forms of government under conditions as they now exist could continue to exist as governments without the outside support of more powerful nations?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know; but that presents another phase of it to me, and that is that if they can not do so without our assistance then the argument of the Senator means we are not only to stay in Europe for the next 15 years but for all time to come.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator believes France will have to protect these newly constituted nations?

Mr. BORAH. France has an immediate vital interest in it, just as we would have an immediate vital interest in Nicaragua or Costa Rica or Mexico, and whatever France thinks necessary to do in order to protect her safety, of course she would do. That is a different proposition entirely from asking us to leave our position here upon this side of the ocean and undertake to do that with which we are only remotely, as Washington said, concerned.

Mr. PITTMAN. Italy would be in the same position, as I understand it, as France.

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly willing for Italy to do it.

Mr. PITTMAN. The question is, Would not England and Japan feel called upon to respond to the necessity of France and Italy, and if there were no league would it not result, at least, in an alliance between those four countries to do that which should be done by a league? The United States would not enter such an alliance. Would we not, then, find ourselves in the position where there would be an offensive and defensive alliance between Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, from which the United States would be excluded, because we will not go into any alliance, and would it not, then, be necessary, in the face of such an alliance, to prepare for a far greater Navy and a far larger Army than we would have to maintain if such an alliance against us did not exist?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think so. Judging the future by the past, I do not think so. Those alliances have existed for the last hundred years.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does the Senator approve of the results of such alliances?

Mr. BORAH. I approve of the results, so far as the United States is concerned, in staying out of them.

Mr. PITTMAN. Did the United States stay out of this last war?

Mr. BORAH. No; she did not stay out of this last war, but she did not go into it by reason of any alliance. She got into it because the time came when American rights were invaded and the American Republic was imperiled, and we will always get into war under those conditions, regardless of any alliance.

The reason why I object to any alliance is that it will take us into war an infinite number of times when neither our rights are invaded nor our Republic imperiled.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yet it must occur to the Senator, and I think his former speeches will demonstrate it, that it was the

military condition in Europe, it was the demand for alliances in Europe, it was the theory of a balance of power, it was the theory that one group must be more powerful than another, that was the great stimulus for this war; and unless we have the league of nations, then we are to have nothing, under the Senator's theory, except the old system that precipitated the last war. He knows it will precipitate another war. He says circumstances prevented us from keeping out of the last war, and he knows that the same circumstances will force us into all similar wars.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. FALL. If this proposed article 10 had been in effect and we subject to its provisions in 1846, would the grand imperial State of New Mexico, so ably represented, in part at least, by my colleague, who has been questioning the Senator, be in this Union or would it be Carranza's and Villa's?

Mr. BORAH. The question answers itself.

Mr. FALL. It was obtained by external aggression, as I understand.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FALL. I presume, then, that we will need the assistance of Japan to prevent the removal of that part of the country, possibly, back to the condition in which it existed then.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, coming back for a moment to the subject which I am trying to present, and that is the question of disarmament under the league, from which I do not want to stray too far, the suggestions which have been made here have all accentuated my position with reference to it. No one apparently contemplates anything else than the maintaining of the territorial integrity of all these nations by force. They are not discussing any other principle or any other theory upon which they may be maintained except that of force, and that is the basis of the principle upon which article 10 is built.

The able Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in discussing this question a few days ago, with his usual candor and ability, said:

> The covenant does undoubtedly, should the treaty be signed, obligate this country to make war.

After reading the article, he said:

> That plainly means that if the territory of any member is invaded or threatened by the military forces of any other nation within or without the league, all the members thereof will come to its assistance to repel the aggressor and coerce him into keeping the peace. It is true beyond a doubt that article 10 obligates us to make war.

The Senator from Montana is entirely correct and states it with clearness as well as with candor. Article 10 is a war-making provision. It contemplates war, and it contemplates nothing else but war.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment I will yield. There are other provisions in the treaty which may be said to look to arbitration and peace, but article 10 is conceived in the idea of maintaining the status quo by force.

I yield now to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator agrees that it means force when it becomes necessary; that is, the Senator just observed, as I rose to question him as to whether or not there were not provisions for arbitration and for settlement of differences that need not involve war and that this article does not necessarily mean war, it only means force if it shall become necessary.

Mr. BORAH. But the article standing by itself means what I have said. I have just said that there are other articles which might provide for arbitration.

Mr. FLETCHER. Even under this article.

Mr. BORAH. But article 10 standing by itself, which is complete within itself, which could be a treaty of itself, which could be an alliance of itself, contemplates force, and force without stint or limit.

Mr. FLETCHER. But even that article does not seem to me to involve at all independent actions, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, because the second clause of it relates to the manner in which it is to be enforced. It reads:

> In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

For instance, if one nation undertakes to commit an aggression upon another and that matter is brought under article 10 to the attention of the council, and the council advises economic pressure as against that nation, would not that result in all the other nations refusing to trade or deal with the offending nation in such a manner as to bring that nation to terms or to prevent the aggression, and would there be any objection to such an alliance on the part of the United States in saying that we will not export foodstuffs, we will not furnish ammunition, we will not furnish supplies, to an offending nation under that article? Is there any objection to such a contract or covenant as that? Might not that solve the difficulty without a resort to war?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; but, on the other hand, in the first place, when you begin to apply your economic pressure you are at the first step toward war nine times out of ten. In the second place, they might not see fit to apply it at all. In other words, it contemplates force, it contemplates military preparedness, in order to be ready to take care of it. It is true that a particular situation might arise in which it would not be necessary to use it, but can anyone contemplate our taking on that obligation or entering into that alliance and not standing in a constant state of preparedness to the very highest degree? That is the question which I am presenting to-day, simply the question whether or not under article 10 a nation or any member of this league could contemplate for a moment anything less than the highest degree of preparedness every minute of their existence?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Idaho has interpreted my views with entire accuracy. Of course, he has no more than quoted from the remarks made by me on the floor. The article unquestionably contemplates war as a last resort. But I desire to say, lest my own remarks might be misinterpreted, that in my judgment article 10 is the greatest guaranty of world peace found in the entire covenant. Let me explain for a moment.

The other day the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], for the purpose of illustrating the scope and effect of article 10, asked us to suppose that Bulgaria determined to make war upon Roumania. Then he said the boys of this country would be called upon to go to Roumania to resist the attack of Bulgaria. Quite true. So the boys of Great Britain, of the entire British Empire, would be called upon to go to Roumania to resist the attack of Bulgaria, and the boys of France would be required to go, and the boys of Spain would be required to go, and the boys of Norway and of Sweden and of Brazil and of the Argentine Republic all would have to rush to Roumania to resist the attack of Bulgaria. Under those circumstances I apprehend Bulgaria would think twice before she would endeavor to make war upon Roumania. That is what I meant by that. It is the greatest guaranty of world peace in the covenant.

Mr. BORAH. Let me assume for the sake of the argument that the Senator from Montana is correct as to the fact that it is a guaranty of peace. We will assume that for the sake of the argument for the present. But what the Senator from Montana proves beyond peradventure is that the boys of the United States and the boys of France and the boys of England and the boys of Spain must be in a constant state of preparedness to march to the protection of Bulgaria or against any other nation that may be involved. That is precisely what I am contending this league of nations contemplates, an armed camp from ocean to ocean and throughout the world. It contemplates, just as has been stated, the highest military preparedness upon the part of every nation in the world, and when Mr. Taft and those people state to the people of this country that your league means disarmament every word uttered by such candid men as the Senator from Montana disproves their statement utterly.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe, taking this instrument in its entirety, that while it may mean armament it means a very much reduced armament from that which exists at the present time?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I have been laboring here for an hour to prove to the contrary.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Is it not reasonable to suppose that?

Mr. BORAH. No; it is very unreasonable to suppose it, because the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has just demonstrated within the last few minutes that in order to protect one nation every other nation on earth must be prepared to the highest limit.

Another thing the Senator from Montana demonstrated was that every war will necessarily the moment it starts be a world war. The whole world will be called to act under article 10 at just the same moment any particular nation is called upon to act under article 10, and instead of localizing a war, instead of circumscribing its activities, any controversy will immediately spring into a world conflict.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does not the Senator realize that when any nation comes to the point of combat, if it has in its support 30 or 40 or 50 other nations it will realize the importance of not depending upon its own armament and can very well afford to have a less armament than if it had to defy the world?

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator from Montana started to interrupt me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from New Mexico has expressed the idea I had in mind.

Mr. BORAH. My answer to that is that of course we must judge the situation by the things which are actually transpiring. The Senator from New Mexico is speculating that we presumably will be willing to rely upon a less armament and less preparedness because of the fact that having our associates with us we can depend upon them and not have to rely solely upon ourselves.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suppose the Senator——

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator permit me to finish?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Here is the situation now: At a time when we are preparing to assume the obligations of the league, at a time when we are just entering upon the program that is to be outlined and carried forward under the league, such men as Admiral Badger, Gen. Maurice, Gen. Haig, and Gen. March, and that class of men are advocating greater armaments than have ever been advocated by them at any time in the past or advocated by any nation in time of peace in the past. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator is unquestionably informed of the fact that at least 32 nations are expected to sign this league of nations in its initiation, and does it not follow, as a matter of common judgment, that 32 peoples combined to do the same job would have to furnish very much less of the sinews of war than if one nation had to do it alone?

Mr. BORAH. Let me answer the Senator from New Mexico by the situation as it exists at Versailles now. The league of nations has been approved by France and Great Britain and Japan and the United States presumably upon the very theory which the Senator from New Mexico has advanced. France is unwilling to rely upon the league of nations for her safety for a single hour. The Senator's theory of security, and so forth, does not appeal to France at all. She notified the United States that she would not accept the league of nations unless the President would give her the assurance of an alliance, and the alliance was for the purpose of security, an alliance for the purpose of protection. She also required of Great Britain a separate and distinct alliance, a fighting alliance for her security, and so Great Britain has her alliance with France, and it is proposed that the United States shall make an alliance with France, and that the three shall be in alliance with each other, and Japan has her alliance with Great Britain; and this seems to be the only thing which they are willing to rely upon as security.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The fears of France of course are quite real to the French.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; they are not speculating these days.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. None of us can place any blame upon France because she wants to get as much security as possible. But to my mind the fears of France have no real foundation. If article 10 is entered into it amounts to a treaty and an alliance in a sense not only between the powers just named by the Senator, but between France and all the powers which may sign the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the Senator's position precisely. His position is based upon speculation as to what may or may not happen, but nevertheless you have the construction of the league of nations as a security due to the fact that they were unwilling to enter into it until they prepared what they conceived to be a system of real security.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Idaho whether in his view the alliance with France would not as a matter of fact give France the same security that she now has?

Mr. BORAH. I have not seen the alliance. Of course I can imagine an alliance which France would exact and which probably she has exacted which would give infinitely more security.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. What further security could she reasonably expect? What kind of an alliance does the Senator think she would have the hardihood to ask for other than an alliance which will protect her against aggression?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there are two answers to that. In the first place, what kind of hardihood does the Senator think France has for asking for this alliance if France has the same conception of the league of nations that the Senator from Montana has?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is beside the question.

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But I understood the Senator to contend that France is asking for an alliance with us because she does not rely upon the league of nations. Undoubtedly that must be her reason, but she can not ask for an offensive alliance, for we certainly would not grant anything of that kind, and if the alliance is simply a defensive alliance it is already covered by article 10.

Mr. BORAH. No; it is not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is what I wanted to get from the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Not in the contemplation of France evidently. Let me ask the Senator from Montana, although I am going to ask in a few minutes that I may be permitted to conclude, upon what theory does he suppose France asks for this alliance if France has anything like the same idea of the league of nations for security that the Senator from Montana has?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator asks what my idea about it is. My idea about it is that Clemenceau has no basis whatever, speaking for my own part, in any general plan of the league. He is a very old man, not with age but apparently in general experience.

Mr. BORAH. He seemed to be rather vigorous during the war.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is no doubt about that, but he seemed to want an alliance of the old kind. To my mind he is getting nothing more than is already secured by the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. I think his views are due to his close proximity to Germany.

Mr. GERRY. Does not the Senator also think that Mr. Clemenceau is interested in obtaining for the French people as much as he possibly can, and that possibly the French people do not understand the league of nations at the present time, and that he wished the peace negotiations to be backed up as much as possible? Although he himself may have felt that the league of nations is sufficient, he wished to appeal to the feelings of his people?

Mr. BORAH. I had rather agree with the Senator that the farther away from the league of nations you are the better you understand it. [Laughter.]

Before I leave the statement of the Senator from Montana which he made the other day, but which I quote always with entire approval, I want to read this statement by him:

> The Senator is right that there would be no escape from the obligations of the treaty—

Referring to article 10 and the advisory council—

> The Senator is right that there would be no escape from the obligations of the treaty but in repudiation and dishonor. But if he is correct in the view for which he contends, that the whole plan is violative of the Constitution, or is so violative in the particular feature involved in any transaction, there would be neither repudiation nor dishonor in declining to observe its terms. There is neither dishonor nor discredit in a man's declining to pay a promissory note executed in his name by one who never was authorized by him to make such an instrument.

The first sentence quoted from the Senator, that there is no escape from this treaty or article 10 except in repudiation or dishonor, which I think is a correct construction, ought to put at an end the discussion which is going on out through the country by our distinguished ex-President, to the effect that if we find ourselves in a situation under article 10 that is not conformable to the welfare and interests of the United States the American Congress can repudiate it and refuse to declare war.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator from Montana has stated the matter just as it is, that article 10 means that we may be called upon at any time to furnish military forces to guard and protect the territorial integrity of any nation signing this league, and that to refuse it is to brand the United States as a nation of repudiation and dishonor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to know if the Senator from Idaho has before him the language used by the ex-President that he has attempted just now to state.

Mr. BORAH. I have it somewhere, though I do not know whether I have it on my desk. I have reams of it.

Mr. PITTMAN. I asked the Senator the question because it is very difficult to believe that the meaning properly to be

given to the language of ex-President Taft is that which undoubtedly was conveyed and was intended to be conveyed by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I am satisfied—whether I can turn to it now or not—that the Senator from Nevada will have no trouble at all in finding that repeatedly stated in Mr. Taft's articles.

Mr. PITTMAN. Has the Senator from Idaho any recollection as to the speech in which the statement was made?

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no; not as to the particular speech in which it was made, but I have a very distinct recollection of it, it having been stated a number of times.

Mr. PITTMAN. I had an idea that the Senator must have that particularly in mind.

Mr. BORAH. The ex-President has repeatedly stated that you can not bind Congress, and that if a situation should arise in which we should be called upon to act under article 10, under the advice of the council, in a way that was inimical to our interest or to the welfare of the country, the Congress of the United States could repudiate, and had the power to repudiate, the advice of the council.

Mr. PITTMAN. I know that the ex-President, to whom the Senator from Idaho refers, has stated that it was within the power of Congress either to accept or to reject a plan laid down for the raising of forces to carry out the advice of the council.

Mr. BORAH. That is precisely the result, and the only inference that can possibly be drawn from the Senator's own statement is what I have stated. If we solemnly agree to do a certain thing and agree to act upon the advice of other people in the doing of that thing, and the emergency arises, the crisis is on, the advice comes, and we repudiate it, we do precisely what the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] says—we cover ourselves with repudiation and dishonor.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand the Senator has deduced his first statement from ex-President Taft's discussion of the power to raise armies.

Mr. BORAH. I have inferred what, in my judgment, is the only legitimate inference to be drawn from Mr. Taft's argument. If that is not the position of the ex-President, and if he does not want that inference to be drawn, why does he make such an argument? Why does he say to the people of this country, when they ask him if we shall not have to act upon the advice of this council, that Congress can reject it?

Mr. PITTMAN. I have elicited all I desire; that is, that the Senator from Idaho has drawn a conclusion instead of quoting the statements of ex-President Taft, and we may all differ with regard to the conclusion. That is all I want to get at for the present.

Mr. BORAH. I state again that I have drawn the only inference which a fair mind could draw from ex-President Taft's statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Idaho yield for another question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. The covenant expressly provides that the suggestions of the council as to the reduction of armaments shall not be effective until approved by the respective nations.

Mr. BORAH. I have already covered that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; but does the Senator think, in view of that provision, that it would be any repudiation of the treaty or a dishonorable act for a nation to refuse, in the event it desired to do so, to accept the advice of the council, it being specifically reserved in the covenant that it had the right to do so?

Mr. BORAH. Well, the Senator is now discussing the question of disarmament while I am discussing article 10, in which there is no exception to the question of advice. There we agree to do a certain thing, and at the same time we agree that certain parties shall give advice. If that is not an agreement to do the thing under the advice of those parties, then I do not understand the English language.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator contend that it would be an act of repudiation and dishonor not to accept advice?

Mr. BORAH. I do when it is put in the language as found here, and I am not alone in that contention. I read again, for the benefit of the Senator from Arkansas, what the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] said:

> There would be no escape from the obligations of the treaty "but in repudiation and dishonor." He is quite right.

I am now discussing article 10.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho must read my speech as a whole. Article 10 consists of two sentences. The first sentence is that each member of the league guarantees the territorial integrity and political independence of every other member. To violate that is to cover ourselves with dishonor. We can escape from that obligation only by repudiation. The language used is with reference to that. That, however, is followed by this sentence:

> The council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

The Senator from Idaho will find in my speech that the use of the word "advise" in that connection clearly indicates that each member is at liberty to follow the advice or not to follow the advice. There is no provision anywhere in the league covenant that the nations shall follow the advice thus given. I want that clearly understood by the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, the Senator from Montana must revise his speech.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; I beg pardon.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; the Senator will find that he was answering the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] when the Senator from Washington said that if we carried out this provision and accepted this advice we would violate the Constitution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I beg pardon.

Mr. BORAH. Well, if the Senator will turn to his speech, he will find I am not in error.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. BORAH. Then the Senator from Montana stated, "The Senator from Washington is right"—I am not quoting the exact language now—"but whether it is binding as a constitutional proposition or not, it is binding as a matter of honor, and we can not escape the advice of these men except through repudiation and dishonor."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the connection referred to in the speech was this: The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] was arguing that, by reason of the fact that large powers had been granted to the league of nations, a superstate or a supersovereignty had been created. He then declared that we were bound to go to war whenever the league declared that we should do so, and that there was no escape from the obligations into which we entered except repudiation and dishonor. He stated that we were, in fact, transferring the power to the league, because, although Congress would have to declare war, the declaration of war by Congress would be merely perfunctory and that there would be no escape from it, that Congress would be obliged to do so, and so on. It was in that connection that I said, "The Senator is correct in that; there is no escape from that obligation to make war as provided in article 10 except in repudiation and dishonor," referring, of course, to the first part of article 10.

I did call attention in that speech, however, to the second provision of article 10, in which it is merely declared that the council shall advise as to the means by which this obligation is to be carried out. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I will call his attention to what I said.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator may look it up later, but let me ask the Senator—I may have misconstrued his speech—what is the Senator's position now? May we disregard at our own discretion the advice of the council?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly we may.

Mr. BORAH. May we do so without any discredit and dishonor to ourselves?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly we may do so without any discredit or dishonor to ourselves.

I have called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the language is that the council may advise. We do not undertake to follow the advice. Mr. President, the question as to whether we ought to act in accordance with the advice as a question of policy or wisdom is one thing, but we have not bound ourselves to do so.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in other words, the Senator from Montana leaves the situation with reference to this matter just exactly where it is with reference to disarmament; that the United States may, with perfect honor and with perfect uprightness and discretion, refuse to accept the advice of the council; that Japan may do the same thing; that Great Britain may do the same thing; that France may do the same thing. So we have a rope of sand.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator may not be in a manner confused in his mind, but he is certainly bound to confuse his hearers by that statement. The council, in the first place, proposes a plan of disarmament for all the world.

Mr. BORAH. We are now discussing article 10.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Idaho was speaking about disarmament; he has taken that up now. The council proposes a plan of disarmament, and we are under no kind of

obligation to follow that plan. The very language is that the council shall propose.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, that very word implies that the advice may or may not be accepted. We are at perfect liberty to accept it or not, as we see fit, in view of what it provides for us as to disarmament and in view of what it provides in the way of armament for the other nations of the earth. We do agree, however, after that plan is adopted—and that is all we do agree to—not to increase our armament except by consent of the council.

Mr. BORAH. Well, the Senator and I agree upon that question perfectly; that is the position which I took in the opening of my speech. But what I want the Senator to tell me is whether or not under article 10 there is any obligation of honor on the part of any of the nations entering into this treaty to observe the advice of the council as to how we shall carry out article 10?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is no undertaking to follow the advice. The Senator can resolve the question of honor to his own satisfaction. The very word "advise" implies that we may or may not take the advice. If the language had been "the council shall prescribe the contribution of the various nations," it would be another thing, but what does the word "advise" mean? When a man is authorized to advise concerning a matter it necessarily implies that the one to whom the advice is given, the recipient, is not obliged to take it.

Mr. BORAH. Then answer me this: Will the Senator say to me that in case an emergency should arise and the question of the execution of article 10 were involved and the council should advise that the United States should, in carrying out its obligations under article 10, do so and so, furnish so many troops, for example, could we, with perfect honor and without any impairment of our moral standing whatever, decline the advice of the council?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We could in entire conformity with the treaty say "we will not do that; what we will do is the following."

Mr. BORAH. If we could say that we will not comply with the advice of the council, then the council's advice is in no sense binding, either legally or morally, upon any of the nations members of the league?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I leave out the moral question, because that is another matter.

Mr. BORAH. But that is what I am speaking of. Having agreed to do a certain thing under article 10, and having agreed at the same time that a certain body shall advise us, are we not under a moral obligation to follow that advice?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We are under no legal obligation, certainly.

Mr. BORAH. But are we under any moral obligation?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is a matter for the Senator himself to solve.

Mr. BORAH. That is precisely, Mr. President, what I have been contending, and that is, as the Senator will see if he will look at his speech, precisely what he said, namely, that, while we were not legally bound to do so, we were morally bound to carry out that obligation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, that is a question for the Senator to solve for himself.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator has solved it for me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. When the time comes it is sufficient to say that "we are under no obligation, according to this treaty, to take your advice."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. FALL. As I understand, the Senator from Montana, in answering the question of the Senator from Idaho, divides article 10 into two paragraphs, the first of which creates both a legal and moral obligation, namely, that we are obliged to protect the territorial integrity of the members of the league; but as to the method, if the council should advise that we use our Navy for that purpose, we could decline and use our Army for that purpose; but we need not follow the particular advice as to the number of men or the arm of our military forces to be employed, whether naval or military.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We certainly need not follow the advice unless we want to do so.

Mr. FALL. I thought I understood the Senator correctly. There is a legal obligation which we must follow, but we need not adopt the means in following it which the council advise.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is quite right.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator from Idaho will pardon me, I might go further and say that we might be able to guarantee the territorial integrity or protect the territorial integrity and political independence without resorting to military force at all. The league might think that military forces were necessary, while we might reach the conclusion that they were entirely unnecessary, and that the problem could be solved in another way. We are at liberty to follow the other way, of course, always being bound by the primary obligation to protect the sovereignty of members of the league.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, article 10 reads:

> The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league.

That states one proposition. That imposes a legal and moral obligation; there is no condition about it; it is primary; it is individual. The United States must perform that obligation whenever the condition arises which calls for it to perform it. But that is not the point to which I was directing attention. Then we further agree, because this is a part of the agreement also:

> In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Mr. President, if words have any meaning at all, while that, of course, is not a strict legal obligation as is the former, will anyone contend, if an emergency should arise and the council—the body that we have agreed to create—should advise that we send 100,000 men, that we could refuse to send 100,000 men, and send only 100 men to perform our obligation as a moral obligation? Would that be an act of honor or an act of dishonor? Having agreed to do a most important thing and having agreed to set up a body which would advise us as to how to perform the obligation, and that body advises us about it, assuming that we may, as a constitutional proposition, repudiate it, can we, as a matter of honor, repudiate it? If we can repudiate it, if we are in that position, if there is no reflection upon us for having repudiated it, then there is no reflection upon Japan, there is no reflection upon China or upon Great Britain or upon France in the event they repudiate it. So we each pursue our own individual, separate courses and means of executing the contract, and concert of action, unity of action, which is one of the things which has been boasted of, has absolutely disappeared.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But we have not agreed to follow the advice of the council. Undoubtedly the word "advise" is used instead of the word "prescribe," or some other similar word, so that there should be no obligation whatever to follow the advice that was given.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. Of course we get back to the proposition, then, that, so far as the second clause is concerned, it rests wholly in the discretion of each nation as to how it shall execute it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. And there is no obligation, either moral or legal, to follow the second clause.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is no legal obligation. The moral obligation, as I have said, is a matter that addresses itself to each Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. I contend that if you set up a body and agree that that body shall advise you how to perform a most solemn obligation, you can not reject its advice when the emergency arises without there being some imputation and some reflection upon the party who refuses to abide by that advice.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me for just a moment further, he is contemplating a situation that is impossible. Our representative is over there; he is one of the council of nine; there can not possibly be any difference between him and the Government here.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator mean to say that the man who sits at Geneva will always reflect with unerring certainty the wishes of the people of this country?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I undertake to say that he will not go very far from it. However, that is outside of the question.

Mr. BORAH. If we take the Versailles conference at the present time as an indication of what might happen, it does not seem to me that it is a very sure guaranty that our representative sitting at Geneva may always interpret exactly the feeling of the people of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has recently stated that, having obligated ourselves to respect and preserve the territorial

integrity and existing political independence of States members of the league, and having authorized the council to advise us, there is a moral obligation resting upon us to accept that advice, and a failure or refusal to do so would constitute repudiation. Let me ask the Senator from Idaho if he should request the advice of one of his colleagues upon any subject of importance to him, and the colleague should advise him wrongfully, as he should think, would he regard himself as obligated to accept the advice, even though he thought it wrong, merely because he had asked his colleague to advise him? And if he would not, would he not think that a nation, having authorized the council to advise it as to the means to be used in carrying out the obligation in the first part of the clause, would have the same right, when advice was offered by the council, to accept or reject the advice according to the peculiar circumstances of each case, always, of course, assuming that the nation will act in good faith and with a sincere purpose to carry out the obligation to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the members of the league?

Mr. BORAH. It is perfectly satisfactory to me to have the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Montana take the position which they do. I am not seeking to draw Senators away from their position, but I understand their position to be——

Mr. ROBINSON. I am asking the Senator a question now.

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment and I will answer it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the position of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Arkansas to be that, notwithstanding the fact that we have agreed to protect the territorial integrity of the different nations members of the league, and have agreed that a certain council shall advise as to how that shall be done, notwithstanding that agreement we may, with perfect honor and without any impeachment of our moral standing at all, if it does not suit us, reject that advice. I understand that to be their position. I place a different construction upon it. My construction of it is this: The primary proposition is that we have agreed to preserve the territorial integrity of these nations. That is a primary obligation; it is individual. We have agreed, however, in addition to that, that the council shall advise us as to the method by which we shall perform that obligation. That certainly means something.

I agree with the Senator that the second part of the article is not constitutionally binding, that it is not legally binding, and I presume that is why the word "advise" was used; but I totally disagree with the proposition that we are under no moral obligation; in fact, I assert that we are under the very highest moral obligation to accept the advice of the council which we have created for the purpose of giving advice.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then, if that is the case, why is it written in the covenant that the council shall "advise" instead of that it shall "prescribe" the means to be used in carrying out the provisions of article 10?

Mr. BORAH. "Advise" and "prescribe" here would have exactly the same meaning.

Mr. ROBINSON. We then understand each other.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me call the attention of the Senator to another provision. In case a matter of controversy not settled by arbitration eventually comes before the council for determination, and is determined, the provision of article 13 is that—

> The council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

I suppose the word "propose" also means the same as the word "advise" in the estimation of the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. So far as the question of honor is concerned and the question of moral obligation is concerned, there is no difference of meaning to my mind between "advise" and "propose." In advising how to do it they propose how to do it, and in advising how to do it they will prescribe how to do it. There is no difference there so far as the moral obligation is concerned.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is very satisfactory. If words mean anything at all, of course "prescribe" and "advise" and "propose" mean different things; but if they do not mean anything, why, possibly, they mean the same thing.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, they mean the same thing so far as the question of moral obligation is concerned, because when the council "advise" they "prescribe" the method and the manner. They "prescribe" how many troops we shall furnish, they "prescribe" what military power we shall furnish; or they "advise" what military power we shall furnish; they "advise" what troops we shall furnish; and we have agreed that they shall advise us. We are under a moral obligation to accept their advice. We may repudiate it, but we can not repudiate it without wrecking and destroying the entire unity of execution of article 10.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, as to the interpretation of words, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. PHELAN. I desire to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Senate advises the President, but it is very far from the duty and obligation of the President to accept the advice of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I have understood that.

Mr. PHELAN. If it is the matter of a treaty, the treaty may fail. I think there is a parity of reasoning there. The council may advise, but the advice may not be heeded.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely. The Senator has not followed, perhaps, all the argument. I am not contending that we are legally bound to accept it, although there is much argument to that effect; but I have said that we are under a moral obligation to accept the advice of the council which we created for the particular purpose of advising us how to perform an obligation. I am just as content to have Senators occupy the position which they do occupy as to have them occupy the position which I had supposed they occupied. It does not make any difference to me which construction they place upon it; but, so far as I am individually concerned, I can not see how we can escape acting upon this advice without bringing wreck and ruin and chaos to the entire proceedings. When we do that we have, in a sense, incurred the charge of dishonor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Under the same theory, the Senate has agreed to constitute a committee upon foreign relations, to which we agree to refer all bills or resolutions as they are introduced, for their consideration and advice as to whether the Senate should adopt or reject those measures. Now, then, a measure comes before the Senate—for instance, the Knox resolution comes in here—with the advice of the Foreign Relations Committee that it be passed. Does the Senator think that the Senate is under any moral obligation to accept that advice?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the Senators are proving conclusively to their own satisfaction that there is no moral obligation whatever. I am perfectly willing that that construction shall be placed upon it by the advocates of the league. I am not trying to argue the Senators out of their position at all; and let me state it again, so that there will be no misunderstanding about it.

As I understand the contention of the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Nevada, and the Senator from New Mexico, it is that we may decline to act upon the advice of the council without incurring in any sense the imputation of dishonor or any moral delinquency whatever. Let it be understood that that is their contention.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, just one thing further. I accept the Senator's statement that far, but I think we are under moral obligation to accept the advice of the council when, in our opinion, that advice is equitable between the nations, is fair to us, and will be efficacious in carrying out our promise. If it was not such, I think we would be morally obligated to open up the subject with the other nations involved and present our plan for carrying out our promise.

Mr. BORAH. In other words, Mr. President, the Senators are not willing to take the position that we are under no moral obligation to heed the advice of the council. Very well. I accept, then, that position.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, if the Senator states my position, he wants to add to it as to the method of carrying out the obligation.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. eYs, of course, but the Senator does not say so.

Mr. BORAH. Then let us understand that the Senators take the position that so far as the second clause of article 10 is concerned, it creates no legal or moral obligation upon the part of the United States to carry out the advice of the council. Very well. That matter, so far as that proposition is concerned, may be considered settled for the day.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if it will not interrupt the Senator, may I ask him a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FALL. That being the position of the Senators to whom the Senator has referred, I should like to know what his construction would be of the obligation as set forth in article 11, referring to article 10, because the first section of article 10 refers to any external aggression, the second section to any threat of such external aggression, and article 11 to any war or

threat of war. I do not think article 11 will bear the interpretation that the Senator has placed upon the second section of article 10, and in my judgment it must be construed with it.

Mr. BORAH. Article 11 says:

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

Mr. FALL. Would not that, in the Senator's judgment, include calling upon the forces of the league to preserve the peace of the world?

Mr. BORAH. The construction which the Senator places upon it is rather accentuated by reason of the fact that article 11 of the original draft provided that the league shall "reserve the right" to take action, but now they have changed it so that the obligation is imperative:

The league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

I presume that under article 11, if a situation should arise involving the territorial integrity of any nation, and that was deemed to involve the peace of the world, the league would have the power in that instance to take such action as it deemed necessary to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I expressed my views concerning the significance of that in a speech I made some 10 days ago, which the Senator has before him. I have it here and will be glad to read it if the Senator cares to have me.

Mr. BORAH. I am familiar with the Senator's position. I was simply stating my position. I was not undertaking to state the Senator's position with reference to article 11.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I rather addressed my remark to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, I will leave article 10, with the understanding——

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, before leaving article 10, while I do not think the ex-President's words need any defense, yet I do not feel that the matter referred to ought to be left just in the way it has been left. I have read a good many statements made publicly by the ex-President and several with regard to this particular article, and the language to which the Senator refers as having been made by the ex-President, according to my recollection, at least, was made in discussing the constitutionality of section 10; and the argument was——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not care to be interrupted to have the Senator interpret the ex-President's speeches. If the Senator desires to enter upon any defense of the ex-President, he may do so in his own time, if he pleases.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then I will ask the Senator if he does not——

Mr. BORAH. No, Mr. President; I do not desire to go into it any further at this time. I have stated what I think ex-President Taft said. I do not want to be diverted from the discussion of this matter, which I think is the real subject here—the question of armaments—into an interpretation of the ex-President's views. I think I can place in the RECORD, when I come to review my remarks, the exact words of the ex-President. If I can do it, I will do so. But I have been interrupted now for the last two hours, and I do not care to go into a discussion of what he said. I have repeated what he said time and time again, and I have no doubt but that I am correct in my position.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then I will ask the Senator if he does not think the language which he has undertaken to quote is a legitimate argument in the discussion of the constitutionality of section 10—that while by treaty we may agree to a covenant of this kind, yet it does not conflict with the Constitution of the United States, because the Congress has the absolute power to repudiate it if it wants to do so?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has practically stated the position of the ex-President. The Senator has stated, as I understand, that the ex-President contends that all these matters which we have agreed either directly or indirectly to do may be repudiated by the Congress. I say, however, that you can not enter into a contract of this kind, understanding before you enter into it what its obligations are to be, and repudiate it. Although you may do so constitutionally, you can not do it with honor.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I quite agree with the Senator, as to the first paragraph of article 10, that there is a moral obligation upon the Congress of the United States to carry it into effect.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from New York desires to get through; and I should like, if I may be permitted to do so, to close my remarks without any further interruption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has charge of the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to call attention, on the question of disarmament—which was the subject we started out to discuss—to section 16. I have called attention to section 10 as a war section of the covenant, a section under which it would be impossible to disarm, and which makes it impossible to put into operation any disarming program.

Article 16 says:

Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13, or 15 it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the national of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the league or not.

It shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.

Mr. President, article 16 makes every controversy, every war, in a sense a world war. If any controversy arises between any two nations, or if any controversy arises by reason of a nation being compelled to comply with articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war. If any nation shall refuse to comply with the terms of those articles, then all other nations members of the league shall immediately be concerned and shall immediately take steps to enforce whatever has been determined upon under articles 12, 13, and 15.

Now, observe the reading of the section with reference to what the council shall do in this instance:

It shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute to the armaments of forces to be used to protect the covenants of the league.

Do you think that under the second section of article 16, after the council shall have recommended to us what portion of the duty we shall assume and what armaments we shall supply, we can escape from that recommendation without the brand of repudiation or dishonor in that instance? Can we, in that particular instance, also utterly disregard the recommendation—not the advice, but the recommendation, the proposal, the specific program—which the council has prepared for us in order that we may carry out our part of the covenant?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator takes the position he did before, that to recommend means more than to recommend; it means to "command," or "prescribe," or "direct"; that "recommend" carries no optional suggestion with it. I understand that that is the theory upon which the Senator from Idaho says we are morally obligated to carry out the "recommendation." That is my understanding of his position.

Mr. BORAH. If that is the Senator's understanding, then, of course, that is the Senator's understanding.

Mr. PITTMAN. I assume, then, that my understanding is correct, or possibly the Senator would make his position clearer.

Mr. BORAH (reading)—

It shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall severally contribute.

What I say is that we are morally bound to follow the recommendations there made by the council, and that we can not escape from the recommendation without the charge that was made by the Senator from Montana, which I perhaps misunderstood, and which I apply in this instance, of repudiation and dishonor.

Mr. President, how can we for a moment say to the people of this country that we are going to disarm, or that the world is going to disarm, or that we may expect a period of disarmament, when we contemplate the obligation under articles 10 and 11 and the obligation under article 16? We must be prepared to the utmost pitch of preparedness every moment of our continued existence to meet these obligations, a violation of any of which upon the part of any single nation may precipitate a conflict. And that is the construction which is placed upon this covenant by those who made it. France is preparing upon a scale that she never contemplated before. England is preparing upon a larger scale than she ever did before. The United States is preparing upon a larger scale than she ever did before. Japan is preparing upon a larger scale than she ever did before. The construction which I place upon this is the construction which has been placed upon it by these several nations which have been engaged in constructing the treaty and in writing the covenant at Versailles. We must not expect a period of disarmament; and I recall again a statement of the ex-President at Wichita, in which he said that we must either accept the league and disarmament or we must reject the league and must accept a program of stupendous arma-

ment. There is no such program presented to us. Whether you have the league or you do not have the league, so far as any program is concerned, it means the same program of armaments that we have had in the past. Whatever virtue there may be in the league, whatever reason there may be for entering into it, the argument of disarmament does not apply, it does not obtain, and it should not be accepted by those who desire to know the real obligations which are imposed upon us by reason of it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator is just concluding, I am sure he will not mind my saying that the stupendous program proposed by the Secretary of the Navy when he was engaged in coercing England has been abandoned. The program embodied in the bill which will be shortly presented to the Senate and taken up is an entirely reasonable program. It is nothing but carrying out the program adopted three years ago. The new program, which was brought forward at the time the Secretary made the speech which the Senator has quoted, is not in the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say this to support the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts: The reduction which is now in the bill was suggested by the Secretary of the Navy in his report to the House committee, which adopted the bill in the first place; and the time when the Secretary of the Navy declared for such a very large Navy was a time when there was very grave danger that the old conditions between nations would continue to exist, and before the league of nations had become practically assured.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no, Mr. President. When the Secretary first brought that forward he said that great program was necessary to carry out the league.

Mr. PITTMAN. The program now appearing in the bill which has been reported to the Senate is the program reported by the Secretary of the Navy to the House committee.

Mr. LODGE. At this session.

Mr. PITTMAN. Undoubtedly, at this session. I did not desire the impression to be created, however, that the Secretary of the Navy favored any other program than that which has been adopted.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Idaho was quoting from the Secretary's argument at the last session.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; he probably has not seen the Secretary's argument of a later date. He has quoted a great many things, apparently, that were uttered a long time ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in this amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next reserved amendment is on page 2, line 16, reserved by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. THOMAS. I will not insist upon my reservation, Mr. President.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Secretary state the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the amendment on page 2, the amendment known as the selling agency.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The $12,000 limitation on salary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reserved is on page 10, line 14, known as the Air Service amendment.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, before we proceed I wish to inquire whether the amendment that was just voted on was the McKellar amendment or the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The entire amendment as amended.

Mr. PHELAN. As amended? I understood that notice was given that when the bill was in the Senate the Senate would have an opportunity to vote on the main question, as to leaving it discretionary with the Secretary of War to pay salaries out of the lump sum. Do I understand that the Senate has not had an opportunity to vote on that a second time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has voted.

Mr. PHELAN. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if the Senate has had an opportunity to vote upon the committee amendment in which there was no restriction upon the Secretary of War in fixing salaries under the lump sum?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this is the situation: When the item on page 2 was reached in the Committee of the Whole, after a long discussion the Senate adopted an amendment to the proposed committee amendment. That amendment limited to $12,000 annually the salaries to be paid under the office of the director of sales.

Mr. PHELAN. Was that in the Senate or in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the Committee of the Whole. Then the amendment, as amended in the Committee of the Whole, was reserved for a separate vote in the Senate. The Chair put that question just a moment ago, and the amendment as amended was voted upon in the Senate and adopted.

Mr. PHELAN. I, being in the Senate Chamber, was unaware that we were voting upon that important matter; and I move to reconsider.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next reserved amendment is on page 10, known as the Air Service amendment, reserved by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the part reserved referred to the purchase of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Factory. The Senate is thoroughly familiar with it. All I need to say is that the proposition, as it seems to me, is improper, and this large amount should not be used for this purpose.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Is that for the purpose of perfecting the amendment?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 15, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$3,260,000" and substitute "$2,660,000" in lieu thereof; and on page 16, line 1, after the word "station," it is proposed to strike out the semicolon and to insert:

: *Provided*, That not more than $1,000,000 of said sum herein appropriated for the Air Service experimental engineering station may be expended for the purchase of not more than 1,587 acres of land and improvements thereon for use in conjunction with said engineering experimental plant: *And provided further*, That in case a tract of land of less than 1,587 acres be purchased for this purpose, the total sum herein allowed for purchase of land shall be proportionately reduced: *And provided further*, That no portion of this land and improvements thereon shall be purchased until a board of appraisal, appointed by the Secretary of War, shall have determined its fair valuation and shall have recommended its purchase.

Mr. LENROOT. The amendment now pending was prepared by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. It has been submitted to the chairman and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs and approved by them. In a word, it reduces the appropriation for this purpose to $600,000. It provides for an appraisal of the land. That is the net result of the amendment. The Senator from New Jersey informed me that they are assured that the land can be procured for this sum. The amendment meets with the approval of those who have so strenuously contended for the inclusion of this proposition.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Of course the amendment very greatly improves the situation, and it should be adopted by all means. I am sorry it does not go further and strike it out, but I think the Senate surely should adopt the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. To conform with the amendment just adopted on page 14, line 8, I move to strike out "$55,000,000" and in lieu to insert "$54,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next reserved amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 41, line 3, in the total amount for "Incidental expenses," the Senate in Committee of the Whole struck out "$20,000,000" and in lieu inserted "$40,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. MCKELLAR. There is one other amendment that was passed over, the bonus proposition, on which I reserved a separate vote. I should like to have it voted on. It is a part of what is known as the Taylor system. The Senate voted on it, and I think Senators did not understand it fully. There were some Members of the Senate who came to me and said they did not understand it fully at the time it was voted on before. For that reason I ask for the yeas and nays on concurring in the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Is it not a fact that the labor unions are objecting to that part of the amendment which simply provided for the stop watch on their work?

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is a part of this same system.

Mr. ASHURST. I have a telegram from a labor union in my State, in which they say they support the bonus provision, that they want to stimulate honorable rivalry, that while they object to having their work inspected by a man with a stop watch they have no objection whatever to a bonus system.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be true in the Senator's State. The only thing I am saying is that it is a part of what is known as the Taylor efficiency system. I am asking for a separate vote upon concurring in the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Looking at the RECORD it shows that the committee amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. The question was divided. The Senate refused to concur in the Senate committee amendment striking out the first part of the paragraph. The Senate sustained the action of the committee as to the latter part of it.

Let me state, while I am on my feet, that I do not understand the latter part of the amendment to have anything to do except indirectly with the so-called Taylor efficiency system. I do not believe, whether it does or not, that the right of the workman to earn extra wages, if he can do so, is to be taken away from him by a Government department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee can offer the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. As a matter of parliamentary procedure I will offer the following amendment. I move to restore the words which were stricken out in the Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the words as they are in the bill.

The SECRETARY. On page 73, after the word "work," in line 10 and after the semicolon, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] moves to restore the following clause:

Nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this bill be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant: *And provided further.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole striking out the words which have been read.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On page 66, line 8, a printer's error of some consequence has happened. Under the caption "Automatic machine rifles" the House of Representatives appropriated $1,500,000. The Senate committee reduced the amount to $1,000,000, but the printed bill does not indicate that any amendment was made to that item and merely carries the amount at $1,000,000. I ask that the figures "$1,500,000" be inserted in front of the figures "$1,000,000" with a line drawn through them and that the figures "$1,000,000" be printed in italics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out from the bill as passed by the House "$1,500,000," in line 8, on page 66, and to insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments and that the Vice President appoint the conferees on behalf of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5608, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

OBJECTIONABLE WORDS IN DEBATE.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I submit a privileged resolution and ask that it be printed and lie over under the rules. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

NIAGARA FALLS WATER POWER.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report a joint resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration. It is an extension of the public resolution approved June 29, 1918, in regard to the use of water from the Niagara River, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ASHURST. Let it be read.

Mr. LODGE. It is an extension of the joint resolution in regard to the use of water at Niagara Falls. The existing law expires on the 1st of July and it is necessary to extend the power given by it.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) to amend public resolution No. 33, approved June 29, 1918, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That public resolution No. 33, of the Sixty-fifth Congress, approved June 29, 1918, be, and is hereby, amended by striking out in the first proviso the words "the first day of July, nineteen hundred and nineteen, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate unless sooner revoked or unless the," and by striking out also the words "before that date," so that the public resolution, as amended, shall read as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue permits, revocable at will, for the diversion of water in the United States from the Niagara River above the Falls for the creation of power to individuals, companies, or corporations which are now actually producing power from the waters of said river, in quantities which in no event shall exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second: *Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until Congress shall enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect. Any individuals, companies, or corporations violating any of the provisions of said permits or diverting water from said river above the Falls for the creation of power, except under a permit issued under the authority of this law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year nor less than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is no change except the date?

Mr. LODGE. There is no change at all except the date. It is a mere extension of the existing law.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGATION BUILDINGS AT BANGKOK, SIAM.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I am authorized to report unanimously a bill which has never been introduced, but is taken from a recommendation of the State Department. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered to have been read the first and second time and referred, that I may be permitted to report it.

The bill (S. 2250) providing for the exchange of certain legation buildings and grounds owned by the Government of the United States at Bangkok, Siam, was read twice by its title.

Mr. LODGE. Let it go to the calendar.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think we ought at least to know what we are voting on. I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. LODGE. I simply reported the bill from the committee. The committee agreed to it unanimously. It is for the exchange of certain legation buildings and grounds at Bangkok, in Siam. It carries no appropriation. It is a unanimous report of the committee, and I asked that it be read the first and second time and referred to the committee, that I might be permitted to report it and let it go on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, June 26, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Robert G. Hand to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Martin A. Morrison to be Civil Service Commissioner.
George R. Wales to be Civil Service Commissioner.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *June 25, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, let Thy kingdom come in all our hearts that whatsoever we do this day may be in harmony with Thy will; that the interests of the people here represented may be safeguarded and all that is dear to the American heart upheld and sustained; that good government may more and more obtain, to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I report an omnibus pension bill, and ask that it be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reports the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6639) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER. The bill and report will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered printed.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, it was impossible to hear what was transacted. What was it that was reported?

The SPEAKER. A report from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reporting a pension bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas reserves all points of order on the bill.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roll of committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TUNNEL UNDER THE HUDSON RIVER.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 409. It has been reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is it on the calendar?

Mr. SWEET. It is not on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what is the bill?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman call it or ask unanimous consent?

Mr. CARTER. The bill is not on the calendar, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALSH. It is on the House Calendar, but it has not been there three days.

Mr. RAMSEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that I asked the other day to be brought up.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the House Calendar, and the Chair understands that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWEET] calls it up.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. From what committee?

Mr. SWEET. From the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did they not have two bills called up and passed last week from this committee?

The SPEAKER. Yes; but they had only one day.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, is the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] correct, that it was not on the calendar three days, as required by the rule?

Mr. SWEET. It has not been on three days.

Mr. SISSON. Then it is subject to objection if unanimous consent is asked.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama objects.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws his objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress of the United States of America hereby consents to the contracts, agreements, or compacts between the States of New Jersey and New York authorized by chapters 49 and 50 of the Session Laws of 1918 of New Jersey and chapter 70 of the Session Laws of 1919 of New Jersey and by chapter 178 of the General Laws of New York for 1919, for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the city of Jersey City, in the State of New Jersey, and the borough of Manhattan, in the city and State of New York, and for the joint operation, maintenance, and repair of such tunnel or tunnels, for regulating their traffic and policing and protecting the same, for the fixing and collection of tolls and charges for the use of such tunnel or tunnels, and for the regulation of such other matters as are incidental thereto.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect the right of the United States to regulate interstate commerce or the jurisdiction of the United States over navigable waters.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RAMSEY] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RAMSEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is a very important public matter, interesting not only the people in the immediate vicinity of New York and New Jersey, but practically all of the people of the United States. The State of New Jersey and the State of New York by their respective legislative enactments are undertaking the construction of a vehicular or traffic tunnel under the Hudson River. The matter has been in contemplation for a number of years, and last year I think an effort was made to secure an appropriation from the United States Government to aid the States in this undertaking and which, in my opinion, was very advisedly refused.

This bill involves no expenditure of money by the Federal Government. The tunnel is expected to cost from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000, to be paid for equally by the respective States of New Jersey and New York. Everything is in readiness for the purpose of beginning the work. The matter has been submitted to the War Department and investigated by it, and according to a letter received from the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, there is no objection by the United States Government to this construction.

Now, what we want to do is to spend our own money to build this tunnel under the river. It is hoped to begin the work on the 1st day of July; therefore the necessity of the passage of this bill at this particular time.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Did the gentleman state in his opening remarks where this tunnel is to come out on the New York side?

Mr. RAMSEY. In or about the neighborhood, as I understand it, of Canal Street on the New York side, and on the New Jersey side in the city of Jersey City somewhere—the exact point I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. Thirteenth Street.

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes; Thirteenth Street.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The expense of this tunnel is to be borne altogether by the States of New York and New Jersey?

Mr. RAMSEY, Yes; equally.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Government is to pay nothing, nor to be called upon at any time to maintain or otherwise operate the tunnel?

Mr. RAMSEY. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman whether the question of navigation has been taken care of here?

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes. The bill provides in its second and third sections as to the protection of the Government, but under the legislative enactments the tunnel must be at least 50 feet below mean low-water mark on either side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know whether the plans for this tunnel have been prepared?

Mr. RAMSEY. I presume they have been.

I want to say this: That so far as my personal knowledge of the matter goes—which is very limited, except as it came to me through Senator EDGE the other day from the Senate side—the general impression is it is to be a double-decked tunnel—two, one below the other.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know whether it will be a toll tunnel or free?

Mr. RAMSEY. It will be a toll tunnel.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I presume the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would not have reported this bill unless the question of navigability had been submitted to the Secretary of War.

Mr. RAMSEY. He has been consulted and he consents and says it does not interfere with the regulations of the War Department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the plans prepared by these two States have been duly submitted to the Secretary of War, so that the rights of the United States have been safeguarded?

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes. The engineers, I am informed, together with the commissioners of the two States, met on last Wednesday and went over the matter and reported that they hoped to begin work by the 1st of July if possible, so that the plans must have been perfected and gone into.

The necessity for this tunnel was evidenced last winter as well as the winter before last. The winter before last, when the Hudson River was practically closed to navigation in the extreme cold weather that we had, there was no means of transporting any large package freight, for the purpose of export, to New York Harbor. Last year at the time of the lighterage strike the same condition prevailed. I will add that under the laws passed by the State of New York and the State of New Jersey public-service corporations are forbidden from using this tunnel. It is for traffic purposes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will it disturb the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. RAMSEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know what clearance there is between the top of the tunnel and the surface of the water?

Mr. RAMSEY. At least 50 feet, I think.

Mr. PARKER. Fifty feet.

Mr. RAMSEY. From mean low-water mark to the top of the tunnel.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A vessel having a draft of 35 or 40 feet, if we come to that, would be able to cross without any trouble.

Mr. RAMSEY. Oh, unquestionably.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The top of the tunnel would be 10 feet below that?

Mr. RAMSEY. Ten feet below, at mean low water.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is the greatest port in the world——

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We Americans so regard it.

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And it would be a very serious matter to have a tunnel constructed that would interfere with navigation now or at some future date. Does the gentleman know the depth of the Panama Canal?

Mr. RAMSEY. I do not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is 40 feet.

Mr. DENISON. Forty-five feet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Gentlemen differ as to whether it is 40 or 45 feet. I am inclined to think it would not be well to attempt to send a vessel through that drew more than 40 feet. The Kiel Canal is deeper. But after this tunnel is constructed, the Hudson River would still be deeper than either of these canals, if the present plans are carried into effect.

Mr. RAMSEY. Yes. Now, there is only one other thing I want to say and that is this: The necessity for this legislation arises from Article I, section 10, paragraph 3, of the Federal Constitution, which provides in effect that two States can not enter into a contract or compact without the consent of Congress, a very wise provision. The contract between these two States is ready to be entered into, but on account of this constitutional prohibition this legislation is necessary. Inasmuch as it is a great public improvement, and inasmuch as the expendture for the construction and maintenance is undertaken by the States of New Jersey and New York, we think immediate action ought to be taken in the interest of the public to whose benefit this improvement will accrue.

Mr. SWEET. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, the lower part of the city of New York at the present time is so overcrowded that it takes at least three or four hours for any freight to be taken by trucks or automobiles away from the ferry or freight piers; and in order to relieve that congested condition and obtain greater efficiency, not only in the use of these trucks and automobiles but in order to bring the markets of New Jersey closer to New York, both States, after giving the matter considerable study through their commissions, have reached an agreement to build this tunnel, the top of which will be at least 50 feet below mean low water. In other words, any ship arriving from the other side, even as large as the *Leviathan* or the *Imperator*, can make its way to its pier without any interference with the upper part of this tunnel, when it is built, because at that point, Canal Street, the depth of the water at the present time is between 40 and 45 feet, and that is a point where there is greater depth than farther up. The expense of constructing this tunnel is going to be borne by both States, and there can be no legitimate reason advanced why Congress should not consent to this important project and pass this bill.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. SIEGEL. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman know at what time it is expected that this tunnel will be completed?

Mr. SIEGEL. There is talk that they can get through with the work in between two and three years at the most. They expect to start to work as soon as this legislation passes Congress.

Mr. TILSON. They expect that it can be completed within three years?

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, yes; they expect that it will be completed and open to traffic within that time. The main idea of the tunnel is to relieve traffic conditions in New York City.

Mr. TILSON. The necessity of it is apparent to everyone who has been in lower New York.

Mr. SIEGEL. I do not think that requires any comment on my part, as it can not be disputed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Under the agreement between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey by whom are the rates or tolls to be fixed?

Mr. SIEGEL. By a joint commission of the two States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is that agreement referred to in the act?

Mr. SIEGEL. It is referred to. It says that it shall be under certain acts and agreements entered into between the two States.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I do.

Mr. PARKER. I have here the law passed by the State of New York and also the law passed by the State of New Jersey, which provides that a joint commission shall fix the tolls or rates, and they are to be so arranged that the tunnel will be paid for and the money paid back to the States within 20 years.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a project of the two States.

Mr. PARKER. Absolutely and entirely a project between the two States. There is no private corporation connected with it in any way at all.

Mr. SIEGEL. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD the acts of the State of New York and the State of New Jersey in reference to this matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD the acts of the States of New York and New Jersey relative to this project. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The acts are as follows:

An act to provide for the acquisition of lands and the construction of a tunnel or tunnels jointly with the State of New Jersey for vehicular and pedestrian traffic under the Hudson River and between the States of New York and New Jersey, and making an appropriation therefor.

The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Commission to construct tunnel or tunnels. The persons now acting as the commission created by chapter 260 of the laws of 1906, as amended by chapter 319 of the laws of 1907 and chapter 189

of the laws of 1913, known as the New York State Bridge and Tunnel Commission, together with the State engineer, ex officio, are hereby constituted the New York State Bridge and Tunnel Commission. Such commission is hereby authorized to construct, in cooperation with the State of New Jersey, a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between a point in the vicinity of Canal Street on the island of Manhattan and a point in Jersey City, in the State of New Jersey, for the exclusive use of pedestrians and of vehicles not operated by public-service corporations. Except as limited by this section, such commission shall determine the site, size, type, and method of construction of such tunnel or tunnels and all matters appertaining thereto and shall adopt detailed plans and specifications for the construction thereof.

SEC. 2. Agreement with New Jersey. Such commission may enter into a contract or agreement with the State of New Jersey or any properly constituted authority thereof for the joint construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of such tunnel or tunnels, which shall include the collection of tolls and charges for the use thereof and which contract or agreement shall contain a provision that such tunnel or tunnels shall be for the exclusive use of pedestrians and vehicles not operated by public-servce corporations, and which provision shall not be stricken from said contract or agreement or waived by either State without the consent and approval of the legislature and governor of the other State and shall agree in behalf of the State of New York, subject to appropriations made by the legislature therefor, to pay a share or part of the cost thereof, which share or part shall not exceed one-half of the total cost of such tunnel or tunnels, with the necessary approaches thereto, nor exceed the share or part to be paid by the State of New Jersey. The written opinion of the attorney general of the State of New York to the effect that the State of New Jersey or its duly constituted authority has the power to make such agreement shall be conclusive upon said commission. The commission may submit any such contract or agreement, after the same shall have been executed, to the Congress of the United States for ratification. The contract with the State of New Jersey or with any contractor or contractors for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels whereby the State of New York agrees to pay a share or part of the cost thereof shall be executory only, subject to appropriations made for such construction, and every such contract shall contain a stipulation that it is expressly understood and agreed by and between the parties thereto that the contract shall bind the State of New York only to the extent of moneys available therefor and that no liability on account of such contract shall be incurred by the State of New York beyond the moneys available for the purposes specified therein. No contract or agreement with a contractor or contractors for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels exceeding in amount the sum of $1,000 shall be made without advertisement for bids for such time and in such manner as shall have been determined upon by such commission. In case a joint committee is formed composed of representatives of the respective commissions of the State of New York and New Jersey for the purpose of facilitating cooperation in carrying out the purposes of this act, such joint committee shall be composed of an equal number of representatives from each commission.

SEC. 3. Survey and map of land or interest to be acquired; appropriation. Such commission shall cause a survey and map to be made of all lands, structures, rights of way, franchises, easements, and interest in land within the State of New York, including lands under water and riparian rights owned by any person or municipality, the acquisition of which it may deem necessary for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels, and shall cause such survey and map to be filed in its office. The members of such commission and its duly authorized agents and employees may enter upon such lands, structures, lands under water, or other interests, for the purpose of making such survey and map. There shall be annexed to such survey and map a certificate executed by the members of the commission stating that the lands, structures, lands under water, and other interests described in such survey and map are necessary for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels.

SEC. 4. Notice to owners. Upon filing such survey and map the commission shall serve upon the owners of the lands, structures, lands under water, and other interests described in such survey and map and upon all persons, corporations, and municipalities having any estate or interest therein a notice of the filing of such survey and map, which notice shall specifically describe that portion of the property belonging to the owner which has been so appropriated. If the commission is not able to serve such notice upon the owner of such property or the person or corporation having an estate or interest therein, after making reasonable effort to do so, or if it is unable to ascertain the persons, corporations, or municipalities owning such lands, structures, lands under water, or other interests, or is unable to discover the character of the estate or interest in and to such lands of any person, corporation, or municipality, it shall cause such notice to be published at least once in a newspaper published in the county where such lands, structures, lands under water, or other interests are situated and in such other newspapers as it deems advisable. The commission must cause a duplicate of such notice, together with the affidavit of the service thereof on such owner, either personally or by such publication, to be recorded in the books used for recording deeds in the office of the register of deeds in the county where such property described in such notice is situated, and the record of such notice shall be prima facie evidence of due service thereof. From the time of the service of such notice the entry upon and the appropriation by the State of the property described shall be deemed complete, and such notice so served shall be conclusive evidence of such entry and appropriation and of the quantity and boundaries of the property appropriated.

SEC. 5. Purchase or acquisition of lands; payment of purchase price. The commission shall cause an appraisal to be made of just compensation to the owners of the lands, structures, lands under water, and other interests, appropriated by the State as hereinbefore provided, and of the estates and interests therein of all persons, corporations, or municipalities. The commission shall always maintain a reserve, over and above all other obligations, of the moneys appropriated and available sufficient to pay the amount of such appraisals and a reasonable amount in addition to cover contingencies. The commission shall negotiate with the owners of such property for the purchase thereof, but in no case shall an amount greater than the appraised compensation for such property be paid. The commission and the persons, corporations, municipalities whose property has been appropriated and who have agreed upon a compensation to be paid therefor shall enter into an agreement for the conveyance or transfer to the State of the property appropriated and for the payment of the compensation to be paid, which shall be executed by the commission and such owners. Such agreement shall be filed in the office of the State comptroller. If the commission is unable to agree as to the compensation to be paid for such lands, structures, lands under water, or other interests, the court of claims shall have jurisdiction to determine the amount of such compensation, and upon proceedings being brought before such court as provided by law, an award shall be made of compensation for the lands, structures, lands under water, or interests so appropriated.

SEC. 6. Interest on allowance or award. The persons, corporations, or municipalities whose property shall have been taken under this act and who shall have agreed upon the compensation to be paid therefor, or to whom an award or compensation shall have been made by the court of claims, shall be entitled to interest from the time of the actual occupancy thereof by the State to the date of the payment of such compensation; but such interest shall cease upon the service by the comptroller upon the person, corporation, or municipality entitled thereto of a notice that the State is ready and willing to pay the amount of such compensation upon the presentation of proper proofs and vouchers.

SEC. 7. Payment of allowance or award. No warrant for the payment of the compensation fixed by agreement with the commission shall be drawn or moneys paid thereunder until the presentation and delivery to the comptroller of proper conveyances, duly approved by the attorney general, and the filing with the comptroller of a certificate of the attorney general to the effect that the State will by said conveyance acquire good title to the property or other interest therein described in such conveyances and in the agreement; and no judgment of the court of claims shall be so paid until there shall be filed with the comptroller a copy of the judgment duly certified by the clerk of the court of claims. Upon such a judgment being rendered, the attorney general shall file with the comptroller all searches necessary to prove the title to the lands, structures, lands under water, or interest taken, or in which a right of way or easement is taken, and, if such be the case, a certificate that no appeal from such judgment has been or will be taken. If any appeal is taken, no payment shall be made until a certified copy of the final judgment of the appellate court is filed with the comptroller.

SEC. 8. Commission may accept delegation of authority from President or Congress. Such commission is hereby authorized to accept the delegation of any authority from the President or Congress of the United States or from any official or agency thereof, and to exercise any such authority or to cooperate with any such official or agency for the accomplishment of any of the purposes of this act. It is further authorized to accept any moneys that may be contributed by any official or agency of the United States toward the construction of said tunnel or tunnels. The said moneys when so contributed shall be paid into the treasury of the State of New York.

SEC. 9. Administration of tunnel. The said commission is hereby authorized to administer, maintain, and operate said tunnel or tunnels when the same shall be completed, subject to the collection of tolls and charges for the use of the same, as the said commission may from time to time fix and determine, but not inconsistent, however, with any contract which may be made with the State of New Jersey as hereinbefore referred to. Tolls and charges for the use of such tunnel or tunnels shall be fixed at such amount as will pay the estimated cost of administration, maintenance, and operation, and in addition will pay within 20 years the amortized cost of construction.

SEC. 10. Vacancies. A vacancy in such commission, other than that of an ex officio member, shall be filled by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate.

SEC. 11. Appropriation. The sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the purposes of this act, including the expenses of the commission, and toward the payment of the cost of such tunnel or tunnels, or the share thereof of the State of New York, such sum to be expended under the direction of the New York State Bridge and Tunnel Commission, and to be payable by the treasurer on the warrant of the comptroller on itemized vouchers, certified to by the chairman of the commission or on the presentation and filing of a certified copy of a final judgment of the court of claims.

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect immediately.

CHAPTER 70.

A supplement to an act entitled "An act to extend the system of highways in this State by providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges and tunnels for vehicular or other traffic across the Delaware River and the Hudson River, or either of them, in cooperation with the city or State, or both, with which such bridges or tunnels, or either of them, shall connect," approved February 14, 1918.

Be it enacted by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

SECTION 1. The New Jersey Interstate Bridge and Tunnel Commission, in addition to the powers conferred by the act to which this act is a supplement, and in the discretion of the commission, as an alternative to any other method or means authorized and provided for in the act to which this act is a supplement, is hereby authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with the State of New York, or any properly constituted agency or authority thereof, for the joint construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the city of Jersey City, in the State of New Jersey, and the Borough of Manhattan, in the city and State of New York, and in addition thereto shall have power to provide for the collection of tolls and charges for the use thereof and to agree with the State of New York, or with such properly constituted agency or authority thereof, to pay a share or part of the cost thereof: *Provided, however*, That such share or part shall not exceed one-half of the total cost of such tunnel or tunnels, with the necessary approaches thereto, nor to exceed the share or part to be paid by the State of New York or such properly constituted agency or authority thereof as hereinabove referred to. Such commission, in conjunction with the State of New York, or such properly constituted agency or authority thereof, shall determine the site, size, type, and method of construction of such tunnel or tunnels and all matters pertaining thereto and shall cause to be prepared detailed plans and specifications for the construction thereof. In case a joint committee is formed, composed of representatives of the respective commissions of the State of New Jersey and the State of New York, for the purpose of facilitating cooperation in carrying out the purposes of this act, such joint committee shall be composed of an equal number of representatives from each commission. The New Jersey representatives shall be chosen by the New Jersey Interstate Bridge and Tunnel Commission from among the membership thereof.

SEC. 2. Such contract between said commission and the State of New York, or such properly constituted agency or authority thereof as aforesaid, or with any contractor or contractors for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels whereby the State of New Jersey agrees to pay a share or a part of the cost thereof, shall contain a stipulation that it is expressly understood and agreed by and between the respective parties

thereto that such contract shall bind the State of New Jersey only to the extent of moneys available therefor, and that no liability on account of such contract shall be incurred beyond the amount of moneys available for the purposes specified therein. And such contract between this State and the State of New York, or such properly constituted agency or authority thereof as aforesaid, may contain a provision that the same is executory only and binding on the State of New York only to the extent of moneys made available therefor by the State of New York, and that no liability is incurred by the State of New York beyond the moneys so made available. No contract or agreement with any contractor or contractors for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels, or for any work in connection therewith, exceeding in amount the sum of $1,000 shall be made without advertisement for bids for such time and in such manner as shall be determined upon. Upon the proper certification of said commission the comptroller shall issue his warrant, and the State treasurer, upon such warrant, shall pay from the moneys available for the purpose as in such certification or approved voucher is directed.

SEC. 3. Said commission, acting in conjunction with the State of New York, or such properly constituted agency or authority thereof as aforesaid, shall cause a survey and map to be made of all lands, structures, rights of way, franchises, and easements in lands lying within this State, including lands under water and riparian rights owned by any person, corporation or municipality, the acquisition of which it may deem necessary for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels, and shall cause such map and survey to be filed in its office. The members of the commission and its agents and employees may enter upon such lands, structures, lands under water, notwithstanding any interest in lands or other interests, for the purpose of making such survey and map. There shall be annexed to such survey and map a certificate executed by the members of the commission stating that the lands, structures, lands under water, and other interests described in such survey and map are necessary for the construction of such tunnel or tunnels.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act and the act to which this act is a supplement such commission shall have power to acquire, by condemnation or in any other lawful manner, lands, structures, rights of way, franchises, easements, or other interests in lands lying within this State, including lands under water and riparian rights of any person, railroad, or other public or private corporations or municipality. Such commission shall also have power to alter or change the grade of any highway or public street when necessary for the purpose of carrying out the plans by it adopted. If it shall become necessary to change the location or gradient of any waterway, canal, railroad, or street railway, or the appurtenances thereof, the person or corporation owning and operating the same shall be required to so relocate and change the same so far as needful and, if possible, to agree with said commission upon the details thereof, the costs thereof to be paid by said commission as part of the expense of said work. Whenever said commission shall be unable to acquire as in this act provided any lands or interests therein, except by condemnation, such commission shall cause to be prepared and served upon the owner or owners and the person or persons in possession thereof a notice that said commission will proceed to acquire such property under and by virtue of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the ascertainment and payment of compensation for property condemned or taken for public use (revision of 1900)." Within 60 days after the service of such notice said commission may enter upon and take possession of the lands or interest therein in said notice described and within 30 days thereafter shall institute proceedings for the acquisition of said lands or interests by condemnation in accordance with the terms of such notice.

SEC. 5. Such commission, acting for and on behalf of the State, is hereby authorized on behalf of the State to accept the delegation of any authority from the President or Congress of the United States, or from any official or agency thereof, and to exercise any such authority so as aforesaid delegated and to cooperate with any such official or agency for the accomplishment of any of the purposes of this act. It is further authorized to accept any moneys or other things of value that may be contributed by any official or agency of the Government of the United States toward the construction of said tunnel or tunnels. The moneys or other things, when so contributed, shall be paid into and kept by the treasury of this State for the use of the commission. Said commission is authorized to accept or to acquire from the city of Jersey City any lands or interests therein, including lands lying under water and riparian rights, as shall in the judgment of the commission be necessary for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. Said commission, upon the completion of such tunnel or tunnels, is authorized and empowered to enter into agreements with the State of New York, or its properly constituted agency or authority thereof, to provide for the joint operation, maintenance, and repair of such tunnel or tunnels, for regulating their traffic and policing and protecting the same, for the fixing and collection of tolls and charges for the use of such tunnel or tunnels, and for the regulation of such other matters as are incidental thereto, which agreements the said commission is authorized to alter, amend, or repeal from time to time, upon agreement with the State of New York, or with its properly constituted agency or authority thereof as aforesaid, as in the opinion of the commission may be proper.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect immediately.

Mr. SWEET. I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SWEET, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.; and

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will be absent to-morrow, and he designates the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH, to act as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has no further business to lay before the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the committees.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. FESS (when the Committee on Education was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 5225, relating to vocational rehabilitation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up the bill H. R. 5225, on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5225) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk reported the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That every person enlisted, enrolled, drafted, inducted, or appointed in the military or naval forces of the United States, including members of training camps authorized by law, who, since April 7, 1917, has resigned or has been discharged or furloughed therefrom under honorable conditions, having a disability incurred, increased, or aggravated while a member of such forces, or later developing a disability traceable in the opinion of the board to service with such forces, and who, in the opinion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be furnished by the said board, where vocational rehabilitation is feasible, such course of vocational rehabilitation as the board shall prescribe and provide.

"The board shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to furnish the persons included in this section suitable courses of vocational rehabilitation, to be prescribed and provided by the board; and every person electing to follow such a course of vocational rehabilitation shall, while following the same, be paid monthly by the said board from the appropriation hereinafter provided such sum as in the judgment of the said board is necessary for his maintenance and support and for the maintenance and support of persons depending upon him, if any: *Provided, however*, That in no event shall the sum so paid such person while pursuing such course be more than $75 per month for a single man without dependents, or for a man with dependents $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of article 2 of the war-risk insurance act.

"No compensation under article 3 of the act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,"' approved October 6, 1917, shall be paid for the period during which any such person is being furnished by said board a course of vocational rehabilitation and support as herein authorized: *Provided, however*, That in the event any person pursuing a course of vocational rehabilitation is entitled under said article 3 to compensation in an amount in excess of the payments made to him by the said board for his support and the support of his dependents, if any, the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall pay monthly to such person such additional amount as

may be necessary to equal the total compensation due under said article 3 of said act.

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the purpose of making the payments prescribed by this section and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, some days ago, under general debate, I had occasion to explain the purpose of this amendment. Briefly I will now make a statement of the changes that this bill proposes to make in the original law. The question of rehabilitation has rather a double interpretation as to who of the crippled enlisted men are eligible to reeducation or rehabilitation. We provided in the original law that—

and who, after his discharge, in the opinion of the board, is unable to carry on a gainful occupation, to resume his former occupation, or to enter upon some other occupation, or, having resumed or entered upon such occupation, is unable to continue the same successfully, shall be furnished by the said board, where vocational rehabilitation is feasible such course of vocational rehabilitation as the board shall prescribe and provide.

It is claimed that that puts the interpretation of the law into the hands of the War Risk Insurance Bureau rather than in the Vocational Board, so that the board charged with retraining and reeducation of the crippled soldiers can not receive an enlisted man for the purpose until certificated by the War Risk Insurance Bureau. The War Risk Bureau has interpreted the meaning of this law to mean that no one is eligible to the retraining until he has come in actual receipt of compensation under article 3. While the board takes the position that if the person was disabled in the service, whether he ever received any compensation, or whether he once received it and it was later on discontinued, or what not, he would be entitled to retraining if it could be established that he could not carry on his occupation successfully that he had before he was crippled.

There are, it is said, about 4,000 soldiers already examined who have not been certified, who are crippled and awaiting reeducation. One reason why they are not certified is that the war-risk insurance work has been so heavy that they could not reach it, and there are so many items that the War Risk Bureau must pass upon, such as, "Was the injured condition in the line of duty?" and "Was the injured condition in such a degree that he should receive this amount of compensation?" or that amount, that they would have to decide upon, the minutæ was such that it could not be decided on quickly. Therefore the details demanding time has deferred the possibility of entering upon the reeducation and retraining.

This proposed amendment is to transfer this authority of determining when the soldier is eligible for retraining from the War Risk Insurance Bureau to the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. When the gentleman from Ohio had the floor a few days ago explaining the importance of this amendment making the transfer, I understood him to state that there were 4,000 men whose eligibility for this industrial training had not been passed upon.

Mr. FESS. Yes; there are 4,000 now, and it is thought that there are 7,000 or 10,000 all told.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering, after thinking it over again, whether there might not be some danger in the language—I do not assume to say that there is—which would enable the Vocational Board when it passes on cases of admissibility to the training school to decide questions of disability beyond the percentage of disability as classified by the bureau.

Mr. FESS. I understand the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know that I have put it very clearly.

Mr. FESS. I understand the meaning of the question. There is a fear on the part of some that the Vocational Board would not be as careful about admitting the person who might not be eligible, who might be ineligible, and who would not be admitted by the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

In other words, there has been a feeling that it might be that the War Risk Insurance Bureau would hold more strictly to the meaning of the law than the board would. I have had that suggestion come to me from various Members. Personally I do not think there is any danger along that line at all. My opinion is that anyone who has been crippled in a degree such that he can not carry on successfully the work that he has left would present a case which would not necessarily take an immense amount of technical ability to pass upon. We could tell whether he could or could not do this or that, and I do not think the danger lies in admitting too many, but rather in not admitting enough or excluding too many.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course there ought not to be any unnecessary restrictions on the admission of men to this industrial training. On the other hand we ought to be as liberal as it is possible to be.

Mr. FESS. I agree with the gentleman in toto.

Mr. MADDEN. The only question that arises in the mind of many, and I do not say that it is my own opinion at all, but it has been expressed to me by others, is whether the admission of men to the industrial training by order or direction of the board would require a reclassification of their allotment for compensation.

Mr. FESS. I think not.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TOWNER. Let it be thoroughly understood that this bill confers no power to determine the disabilities attaching to the soldier. It merely confers the power to determine now, without waiting for the action of the disability bureau, whether or not at this time these men are entitled to their training under the vocational act. It has no further effect.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Not just at this moment. I will yield in a moment. In order that there may be no confusion or ambiguity I desire to read a statement from Secretary Glass, who speaks with authority for the War Risk Insurance Bureau. He says:

As the law is now interpreted there is unavoidable delay before the men selected by the Vocational Board as proper subjects for vocational education can be placed in training. This delay can not be averted so long as the requirement is placed on the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to determine their compensable status before their vocational training begins.

He asked that the transfer be made in the interest of the expedition of training. I wanted to state that so that no Member would think that there is an attempt to transfer without consent from one bureau to the other.

Mr. WELLING rose.

Mr. FESS. Before I yield again, let me make just one other suggestion. There is another change in the law that this amendment will secure, and that is, under the old law, the support of the person while in training was to be what he received, whether it was from compensation or his regular wage, whichever was the larger. Members can see that if it is compensation it might be more than the regular pay of an enlisted man, because if he comes back with two arms gone his compensation is $100 a month, while if it is simply an enlisted man injured it would be the amount of his wage, which would be $30, and whatever compensation would be fixed by article 3. You will note that officers receive a salary without reference to subsistence, while enlisted men receive $30, and it is expected that they will receive lodging and board and so on. But the law has been interpreted to mean only what he is paid. Consequently, we would meet this unfortunate situation. An officer is supported while being trained at a salary of probably $200 a month, while an enlisted man would be supported with a salary of $30 a month. That was not the purpose of the law at all, so that the amendment provides a flat amount to be paid while in training, $75 a month; and in case his compensation is such that the $75 a month is less than the compensation, then the War Risk Bureau pays the additional difference to bring up the compensation. For example, if a man got $75 a month, and was without arms, the compensation would give him $100 a month. The War Risk Insurance Bureau would pay him $25 to make up the compensation.

Then there is another feature that I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] to note. If the man has dependents, he gets $75 and whatever under the dependency clause of the bill would be permitted, which would be, if there is a wife and no children, $15; if there is a wife and one child, $25; and if there is a wife and two children, $32.50, with $5 additional a month for each additional child. I mention that to indicate that the $75, while it may seem low to some of you, is much beyond what the old law was, and I think it is quite reasonable.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. Has the committee made any investigation in respect to the men who have thus far been admitted to this vocational rehabilitation, as to the degree of injury they have received, and is the committee satisfied that the men thus received for vocational rehabilitation are all entitled to it?

Mr. FESS. I can say to the gentleman that the committee has nothing but approval of what has already been done. I put a statement into the RECORD some time ago about what had been accomplished, and I think it is a very good showing.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat will he yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I want to know if the gentleman's bill will relieve the situation as it now exists in this respect. The vocational officers in different parts of the country decide that a former soldier is entitled to be sent to a college to be educated. They also recommend that he be given compensation. That goes to the War Risk Bureau, and I know of a number of instances in my own city where these young men have become discouraged over waiting to get the allotment and have gone off and lost the opportunity.

Mr. FESS. I will say that is precisely what we are trying to cure.

Mr. DYER. I have talked with the Secretary of the Treasury, in charge of that matter.

Mr. FESS. We are trying to cure that situation.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr DARROW. If I understood the chairman correctly, he said that about 7,000 had already been taken?

Mr. FESS. About 4,000 have been examined but denied training, owing to a situation we want to cure.

Mr. DARROW. Already had availed themselves of the provisions of the law?

Mr. FESS. No; 4,000 are awaiting to avail themselves, but something like 7,000 in all——

Mr. DARROW. Has the gentleman any idea why those who have not availed themselves of the provision of this law have not done so? Is it not because the compensation is not enough to permit them to do so?

Mr. FESS. Without this amendment, that is certainly true, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No doubt that is a very interesting conversation, but nobody can hear a word of it.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked whether there is not a good deal of dissatisfaction and failure to take advantage of the law. I do not doubt the small amount of allowance while in training has something to do with it, and that was one of the things we are trying to cure. There is no doubt but what his statement is correct under the present law.

Mr. DARROW. My only feeling is the committee has not gone far enough in the law to enable them to do it.

Mr. FESS. I will say those in charge, who made a very close, careful, and accurate statement, fixed it first at $65 and on revision increased it by $10, making it $75, and I think it is quite a handsome recognition.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. This is putting a new duty upon the Vocational Board and will entail a great amount of expense as I understand it.

Mr. FESS. No; not entail a great amount of expense.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Well, a greater amount of work in determining these things which heretofore have been determined by the——

Mr. FESS. The Vocational Board is already organized——

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I understand, but the point I am getting at is that in the appropriation bill carrying the appropriation for the vocational work I am told by the members of this board that it limited the number of officers—for instance, doctors. I think probably one should receive a salary of $5,000, or two; that twenty should receive a salary of $4,000 and thirty should receive a salary of between $2,500 and $4,000, and so forth. The board tells me that this additional work that will be turned over to them can not be done if the House appropriation is maintained at the other end of this Capitol. In other words, they can not get the doctors to serve in quantities sufficient to do this work at the salaries made in the House appropriation, and they are now at the other end of the Capitol storming them to have them raise the limit and the number of employees to be employed within those limits, and I was wondering if this appropriation in this bill would take care of that situation.

Mr. FESS. There is no appropriation at all in this bill in the sense that it will add to the charge to take care of the crippled soldiers. This is simply a transfer from the War Risk Insurance Bureau over to the Vocational Board and dispose of this money, $6,300,000, all of which is to go to the soldiers for their training and nothing for administration.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. According to the board's statement to me, if you leave the duties of the board as they are now you have not the funds available to supply the personnel to take care of the work of rehabilitation of these wounded soldiers, let alone when you give these additional duties to them.

Mr. FESS. I do not understand why the board made no such statement to me.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. They did to me yesterday.

Mr. FESS. I do not understand why they did not make it to me, as they knew I had charge of the bill.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. They made that statement to me yesterday, and over in the Senate they are making it.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I will say for the information of my friend, which he knows is correct, while I do not care to criticize, there has been some friction between the Educational Board and the Appropriations Committee, and there has been some considerable trouble in securing an appropriation to meet some necessary work. I hope this will not be the case in the future.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I want to yield time to other Members, but I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I do not care except to correct what I think is an error. The gentleman has just stated there is no appropriation carried in this bill. At the end of the bill there is an appropriation of $6,000,000.

Mr. FESS. That is a transfer from the War Risk Bureau to the Vocational Board.

Mr. CANNON. Well, after all, let us see.

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $6,000,000,

And so forth. It seems to me that is subject to a point of order.

Mr. FESS. That amount of money would be appropriated for the War Risk Bureau, and in this case it would not be an addition, because it is simply administered by the Vocational Board instead of by the War Risk Bureau.

Mr. WELLING. If the gentleman will permit, the language he has read is in quotation marks. It is probably an amendment to change from the War Risk Board to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and that is the only change in the present law.

Mr. FESS. I will say there is no expenditure put on this bill not required if administered by any other agency for the education of the crippled soldiers.

Mr. WELLING. The $6,000,000 has already been appropriated.

Mr. FESS. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that the time shall be equally divided between those in favor and those opposed to the bill. Is there anyone opposed to the bill; if not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] for one hour.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, at the last session I introduced a bill, H. R. 12212, a companion bill to the Senate bill 4577, introduced by Senator SMITH of Georgia. The Senate bill was passed and substituted when it reached the House for H. R. 12212. On my bill a unanimous report was made by the Committee on Education, and I think by reading a few sections of that report I can better explain it to the House:

GENERAL PRINCIPLES WHICH HAVE GUIDED THE HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The general principles which have guided the House committee in its consideration of the problems of vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers and sailors are these:

(a) Aside from its wisdom, the National Government owes it to the disabled man that he be returned to economic independence and to normal and happy civilian life.

(b) Any scheme of vocational rehabilitation for the victims of the war should be under national control, discharged through a national agency.

(c) The work should be carried on through national support and the use of our national resources, dealing with vocational rehabilitation as a national obligation and a national war measure in a time of national emergency.

(d) In discharging this task the National Government should cooperate with all agencies, public and private, having anything to contribute to the successful discharge of the task.

(e) This should be done by the use of governmental agencies already in existence, rather than by the creation of new agencies and a multiplicity of boards. An effective cooperation should be established by those governmental agencies dealing in any way with the problems of disabled men.

(f) All the existing facilities and resources of the country should be utilized that are available for use in carrying on the work of vocational rehabilitation.

(g) Immediate action in dealing with this important problem is necessary for reasons which will be set out briefly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill is simply an enlargement of the bills introduced by myself and Senator SMITH at the last session.

While at home a soldier said to me that he was tired of Congress talking so much and doing so little for the soldiers. I believe by the passage of this bill we will show the soldiers that we are willing to do something for them. As I said in my district, I say here to-day I am proud I was able in part to assist at the last session in this matter of the rehabilitation of

the disabled soldiers, and I trust I may be of some assistance in securing the passage of this bill. I am willing, Mr. Chairman, to go to the limit to help place the wounded boy back in a position where he can earn an honest living when I remember that that boy fought for me and my family and assisted in making it possible for us to continue to live in this great country of ours. Congress can not do too much for them. When you see these boys as they go around the streets with one leg or with one arm gone or blind, I do not believe it is necessary to appeal to this House to give to the single man without dependents the paltry sum of $75 per month and the man with dependents $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances to assist him while learning a vocation in order that he may go out and fight his way in the world. No more important bill, to my mind, has come up or will come up in Congress, and I believe this House, on both sides, will give it unanimous support. At the last session the members on the Republican side and on the Democratic side of the committee of which I was then chairman made a unanimous report on the Smith-Sears bill, and at this session we come to you again with another unanimous report.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. A moment ago the chairman of the committee made the statement that it would not entail more expense on the Government to shift these duties, but will it not be an additional expense on this bureau rather than on the War Risk Bureau?

Mr. SEARS. I understand not, because, as a matter of fact, the Vocational Board before had the work to do. There was simply a conflict, the War Department holding the men for a certain time until they decided to turn them over to the Vocational Board, and there was an interlocking of labor performed by both boards; the War Department doing a part that the Vocational Board should have done and the Vocational Board doing a part that the War Department should have done. Therefore it should be cheaper by the passage of this bill than before.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Now, it will be cheaper to the Government, that is true——

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. The Board on Vocational Education will have to make original research and have to determine themselves on the eligibility of these applicants and will have to do much of the work that has been done heretofore by the War Risk Board.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will yield to me, I would like to say to the gentleman from Indiana that this does not under any circumstances add one single thing to the duties of the Vocational Board. It does not take one additional man or one additional hour of work. In fact, for the purpose of these 4,000 eligibles the work is already done. They could not be admitted because of the fact that that bureau has not passed upon it.

Mr. BRAND. I would like the attention of the gentleman from Indiana for just a minute. This very question that he has propounded was asked those officers in attendance at the hearings and meetings on this bill, and the answer was that the force has already been organized throughout the entire United States for the purpose of this additional work.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I will say that I have different information, but I will explain it in my own time.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] answer a question?

Mr. SEARS. I will try to do so.

Mr. DENISON. I want to know if this act, amending the vocational educational law, enlarges or increases the number that will be entitled to receive vocational education?

Mr. SEARS. Absolutely not, as I understand it. It is proposed to cover everyone who is incapacitated in any way, and this was my intention last year when I introduced the bill before referred to. This bill is simply more specific.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to invite attention to some language that I think clearly shows that the number may be increased. Let me call your attention to language in lines 5 and 6 on page 2, as to disability later developing, with reference to where a disability may later develop and the disability is traceable, in the opinion of the board, to service with such forces. So it would not only admit those who are disabled now but those that may be found disabled later on, and hence it must increase the number, because unquestionably some of the soldiers will be found disabled later on and they will be added to those who are at present disabled. So I judge it may increase the number who may take advantage of this law. Of course, no one objects to the increase or the bill. We want to do all we can for the soldiers.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman from Oklahoma is absolutely correct. The intent of the original bill was to give the ones who will receive assistance under this bill the assistance they were entitled to.

Mr. DENISON. Does not the original act provide that those would be entitled to vocational education who under the law would be entitled to compensation?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. This bill does not confine them to those, but enlarges it.

Mr. SEARS. When the injury is traceable to time of their service.

Mr. DENISON. This law would entitle every man to vocational education if he was injured in the service?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. But it seems to me that this would give every enlisted man who wanted it vocational training.

Mr. SEARS. I think he is entitled to same if it is directly traceable to his service. I think he is entitled to it if it is directly associated with his service.

Mr. DENISON. I was not raising the question whether he was entitled to it, but I was wondering whether it would increase the number who were entitled to vocational training.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman knows that that would be a mere guess on my part, because the fighting has stopped too recently to enable one to get the accurate number.

Mr. DENISON. If this bill is passed and becomes a law, the discharged soldiers will be entitled to vocational training without regard to the question whether or not they are entitled to compensation?

Mr. SEARS. That is true, if their injury is traceable to the service. For instance, a man might be injured in being returned to this country. He should get the training, although it has not yet been determined that he would get compensation.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. This bill is supposed to cover those cases.

Mr. DENISON. And it also gives a man vocational training, even if it should afterwards be determined that he is not entitled to compensation?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Then, is not this true, that the effect of this bill would be to give every wounded soldier or other man who has been in the service of the Government during this war a right to ask and to receive vocational training?

Mr. SEARS. Absolutely, if wounded while in the service, and that is the position that the committee takes. It would give everyone who is entitled to it under this act vocational training.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I would like to yield to the gentleman, but I have promised the larger part of my time to other members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], chairman of the committee, not only gave upon a prior occasion but also this morning has given to the committee the benefit of the views of the Committee on Education with relation to the purposes to be accomplished by this bill, I shall not undertake at this time an extensive analysis of the provisions of this bill as affecting wounded and disabled soldiers.

When we went into the war with Germany, gentlemen of the committee, we all realized that inevitably, as the fruitage of this war, a vast number of our young men who had served under the colors would be returned to their homes in a handicapped, maimed, and crippled condition. Hundreds of thousands of them would inevitably be so handicapped by virtue of their service that it would be physically impossible for them to follow their original trades or vocations; and the last Congress, in a broad and comprehensive way, meeting the solemn duty that rested upon it to provide for every man in that unhappy situation, enacted the Smith-Sears vocational training bill for wounded soldiers. I regarded it as a great honor to have had the privilege of being in charge of that bill on its passage through the House.

I regard that, gentlemen, as one of the finest pieces of legislation enacted by the Sixty-fifth Congress, and I submit for the

consideration of the committee that the administration of this law, through the instrumentality of the Federal board, has amply justified the arguments made for its establishment and has performed a magnificent duty toward the wounded and disabled soldiers of our country.

A great deal of criticism has been indulged in from some quarters with reference to the administration of the duties of the Vocational Board, and it might be helpful as a matter of information, if not valuable necessarily as a contribution to this debate, to call to your attention a brief summary of the work that has been accomplished by that board. Up to March 1, 1919, according to the figures furnished, there were registered and under study and the observation of the board 30,000 disabled soldiers. One thousand two hundred and fifteen injured soldiers not required to have exclusive training in order to equip them for future usefulness in life have been placed in positions where they can earn remuneration and a good living. Thirteen hundred and sixty-five have been assigned to occupations. Forty-two hundred disabled soldiers are now assigned under the administration of the Vocational Board to exclusive study in schools or in occupational trades in order to retrain them in their handicapped condition to pursue gainful occupations when they have concluded their courses.

And, gentlemen, if there were no other statistics relative to the work of this board in the brief time that it has existed, the fact that they have under their jurisdiction to-day 4,200 of our wounded and disabled soldiers who will, when their courses of training are completed, be in a condition to go back into the industrial life of the country with an earning capacity, it is estimated, of 50 to 100 per cent more than they had when they were in their normal condition—and those are the statistics of the English Government on this proposition, and I believe that ours will certainly duplicate them—then I say if they had accomplished nothing else save to train, as they now have, under their jurisdiction 4,200 wounded and disabled soldiers, they would have thoroughly justified the expenditure of $2,000,000 already expended on this work.

In addition to that there are 10,000 injured soldiers——

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can not yield now. I will yield when I have concluded my remarks, meaning no discourtesy to the gentleman.

We have over 10,000 wounded soldiers in addition to those assigned to schools, who have been furnished by the board with various occupations, so that they are in industrial retraining.

Remember, gentlemen, under the original act this board had authority, and it was a part of their duty, to undertake to find gainful employments for soldiers who sought the instrumentality of this board in order to be placed back in industry. There are 6,000 cases in addition to the 4,200 now in exclusive training who have been graded and assigned and will soon begin their exclusive training.

In other words, there are at the present time 4,200 in training. Six thousand have been graded and assigned and eligible for future training. In other words, over 10,000 wounded and disabled soldiers will soon come under the jurisdiction of this Federal board for retraining. One hundred thousand soldiers since the passage of the original act have been registered with the board, whom they are trying out in these trying-out schools that they have established, and this board is helping to classify and aid these 100,000 additional soldiers in securing profitable and happy employment.

In all it is estimated, as a minimum, that there will be 15,000 soldiers coming under the provisions of the original act who will be trained for new occupations or trades. Here is an element that certainly appeals to our compassionate consideration: There are 59,000 wounded soldiers still in the hospitals of the country undischarged whom this board will have to examine and register, to classify and determine whether or not they are eligible for training, and if found eligible to give them training. Now, I submit for your consideration that this brief summary of the activities of this board develops the fact that although they possibly may have indulged in some extravagance with reference to the number of their employees, although they may have paid in some instances rather extravagant salaries to especially trained and equipped men as instructors, yet, admitting that fact, I submit to you gentlemen that the great humanitarian work that they have accomplished for this element of our citizenship—who surely appeal more strongly to our sympathy and our sense of solemn obligation than any others in this country—justifies the original appropriation that has been made and the additional appropriation asked in this bill.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. I want to ask the gentleman about the appropriation, in order to get the matter clear in my mind. The sundry civil bill carried an appropriation of $4,000,000. That was in addition to the $2,000,000 that had been appropriated in the original act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT. Is this $6,300,000 carried in this bill in addition to those amounts?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I so understand it, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee. If I may be pardoned, in making my statement I will endeavor to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee.

I understand, in short, gentlemen, that the purpose of the pending bill is to enlarge the jurisdiction and authority of the Vocational Board, so that if this bill is passed where there are wounded or disabled soldiers whom they may determine might be eligible to retaining on account, as the bill says, of injuries received in line of duty then, whether or not the War Risk Bureau has passed on the question of their compensation and determined the amount of it, if, in the judgment and opinion of the Vocational Board, these men who have not been passed on by the War Risk Bureau are, under the provisions of this bill, entitled to retraining, they have jurisdiction to take them under their control and begin their training at once without waiting months and months to have the War Risk Bureau pass on their disability or compensation. And the appropriation carried in this bill of $6,000,000 is, in part, to cover the additional item of $10 per month allowed to each single man who is in training. At the present time the Federal board has been allowing $65 a month to a single man for his expenses. Experience has shown that that amount is too meager; that it does not meet the real requirements for comfort and some little pleasures and, in a measure, the temporary happiness, if I may so term it, of these wounded soldiers. I had rather be charged with allowing them too much than to little to meet their necessities. So it has been determined that $10 a month shall be added to that amount, making it $75 a month, so that amount each for 7,000 wounded and disabled soldiers constitutes the bulk of this item of $6,000,000. But, as I understand it, the amount appropriated by this bill, $6,000,000, would, as a matter of fact, be paid by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in large part if this bill were not passed.

Mr. GARRETT. That is stated in the report.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Now let me ask the gentleman this question, if I may: The sundry civil bill by a proviso which was adopted provided that no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I am familiar with that.

Mr. GARRETT. Not more than 20 persons.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: That is a limitation on that particular appropriation carried in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That relates to the organization and personnel of the board, its different bureaus——

Mr. GARRETT. I understand that. But let me ask the gentleman if it will not be possible under the terms of his bill for them to take out a part of this $6,300,000 and pay salaries in excess of the amount which Congress has determined in the sundry civil bill shall be paid?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think not. That is not the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman think that ought to be put beyond the possibility of any doubt?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not in charge of the bill. I am merely a member of the committee; but as far as I can see there would be no objection to that limitation being put on the appropriation. In other words, I am in sympathy with what the gentleman from Tennessee evidently has in mind—that there shall not be any extravagance in the operation of the personnel of the board if it can be avoided. The purpose of this appropriation is that this amount of money shall go to the benefit of the wounded soldier and not to increase the compensation or enlarge the activities of the membership of the board itself.

Mr. GARRETT. I am sure that is the purpose of the bill, and with that we are all in sympathy. If the gentleman will pardon me just a moment further, though, I call the attention of the gentleman to the express language in the bill on page 3. After reciting that it is for the purpose of making the payments prescribed by this section, it adds this language:

And for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman will realize that there will possibly be incurred some additional administrative expenses.

I do not know. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the details and structure of their present organization to give any definite opinion on that proposition, but they are necessarily enlarging the area and extent of their activities, and that may necessarily entail some slight additional expenditure in the personnel of the organization.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Briefly.

Mr. ALMON. It is stated by the chairman of the committee that the first estimate of the maximum for maintenance of the soldier while in training was $65 and that subsequently it was increased to $75.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what we are asking in the bill.

Mr. ALMON. Who made the estimate, the board, and then changed it to $75?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; they did it in part; they were moved to that by the experience and advice of the board and their information from other sources, including the complaint of soldiers themselves that $65 was not enough to pay all their reasonable expenses while in training.

Mr. ALMON. One other question. What is furnished the soldier in training in addition to his instruction and $75 maximum amount?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Nothing. But in addition, if he has a dependent family and children they have an allowance in addition to that.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will pardon me, the allowance is to cover the amount paid the soldier and his subsistence, and that was estimated at $65 and they have raised it to $75.

Mr. PELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELL. I see in the bill that it refers to men in the military and naval forces. Does that cover those brave and patriotic women who served as nurses in the semiprivate hospitals abroad?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know; that depends technically on their military status. I rather think it would not on the construction heretofore given to the status of nurses.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, in conclusion I want to say that in my judgment it will be impossible for this Congress or any subsequent Congress to do too much within the bounds of reason to undertake to discharge our great and lasting duty to the soldiers and sailors of the Army and Navy who were wounded, maimed, and disabled during that service. They are a class of people, as I suggested a few moments ago, who appeal to our sympathy and compassionate interest with most peculiar solicitude.

When we declared war in April, 1917, these men whose interests we are now considering were whole men; they were healthy men; they were buoyant and exultant in the pride of their manhood and their strength, and when they received the call to the colors they left their homes, went to the camps and crossed the seas to the battle front with the proud light of victory in their eyes, willing to do and dare everything for their Government and for their flag. [Applause.]

In the course of their heroic service, as a part of the fruitage of war and battle, they have come back to us and to their homes maimed, disabled, stricken, handicapped, not normal men as they went away, but broken men as they are now returning. All that they are asking is that we shall not bestow upon them any sickly sentimentality—for they resent that—but only that we come up to the full measure of our solemn and plain duty to them by the expenditure of money from the Federal Treasury that will enable them under the benign provisions of this great legislation to be so retrained that they may not go into the future of their lives as charges on the community or the objects of charity, but that they may go as remade men with an earning capacity that will enable them to make an honest livelihood for themselves and their children, and live in comfort and independence.

By doing this, as provided in a large measure by this bill, you will be making but a small contribution to that lasting and lofty obligation we all owe to those brave and gallant sons of this Republic who saved it, and saved civilization, in the hour of its greatest peril. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the committee are not perhaps aware of the fact that the Senate has passed this identical bill. Dr. FESS introduced the bill in the House in the identical language of the Senate bill which passed the Senate unanimously on the 6th day of June. At the proper time Dr. FESS will ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, I want to ask your careful attention to the necessity of the passage of this legislation. It comes about entirely from a misunderstanding and misconstruction of the provision of the law in the rehabilitation act which was passed, as you know, some time ago.

The language provided that those persons who are disabled under circumstances entitling them to discharge from the military or naval forces of the United States and compensation under article 3 of the war-risk insurance act shall be entitled to the benefits of the rehabilitation act.

The educational board interpreted that to mean that they had the right to determine whether or not a man was entitled to receive the benefit of the vocational training independently of the bureau. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance said no you can not get a dollar of the money from the Treasury unless we have already placed this man on the disability roll.

The consequence was that although the Vocational Board has examined and passed upon about 4,000 soldiers who are now awaiting action of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, the War Risk Bureau broke down entirely in their part of the program. They ask now that the Vocational Board shall have the right to pass upon the right of the soldier to vocational training without waiting for the War Risk Bureau determining what the soldier's disability status is. The Vocational Board have this duty in any event, for the War Risk Bureau do not determine whether the soldier is entitled to vocational training. They have only claimed they must perform their duty before they would allow the Vocational Board to perform its duty. This position they have now abandoned.

They have also asked that during the time of vocational training the Vocational Board should pay out or authorize payment to the soldier of the entire amount due him under the war-risk act and also under the vocational training provisions, as the case might be, except in such cases where the rights under the War Risk Bureau should exceed that of the right under the Vocational Board, and then they would pay only the excess, and so this $6,000,000 that is provided here in the form of an appropriation is merely in effect a transference of the funds that would be used for that purpose otherwise by the War Risk Insurance Bureau. It will be paid out now under the Vocational Board, and therefore it is necessary that the appropriation should be made directly to them.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. I note from the appropriation that $6,300,000 is to cover the training of 7,000 of these boys. Does that include the 4,000 who have not been admitted to vocational training, who have been delayed from entering because of delay in the War Risk Insurance Bureau?

Mr. TOWNER. That is the amount tentatively agreed on between the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the Vocational Board that will be necessary to make these payments to all of the soldiers, not only the 4,000 but the 3,000 already passed on, and perhaps others that may be admitted during the period that will be required.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, as I understand it, the 7,000 includes the 4,000 not yet admitted.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. DOWELL. Does that include all who will be entitled under the act to come within this act?

Mr. TOWNER. It does not. It is estimated that probably three or four thousand more will have to be examined and passed on later, and those are not included in the estimate.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman from Iowa has just stated that this legislation grows out of a difference in interpretation as to the meaning of the original act. I want to ask the gentleman if it does not do more than that and enlarge the number of people who will be entitled to vocational training?

Mr. TOWNER. Not one single person.

Mr. DENISON. Does not this bill allow persons to receive vocational training who would not be entitled to compensation under the war-risk act?

Mr. TOWNER. I presume not. Of course a man must have, under the disability act, a disability status. That is determined by the disability board. The disability board vacates that in so far as the time necessary for training is concerned—that is, for probably a period of 10 months. They say they can not dispose, and we do not want to dispose, of these cases at this time, because of the fact that they have not the men and

the time; but they do not want these soldiers to wait for their vocational training during this 10-months' period. That is all this amounts to—just during the temporary period of training. Then the permanent disability status of the soldier is determined by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. The vocational board does not intend to act on the question as to their permanent disability status. That is to be determined—must be determined independently of them by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. DENISON. Suppose the Vocational Board should classify and admit a person to vocational training and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance after he gets into the school for training should determine that he is not entitled to compensation, what would happen?

Mr. TOWNER. Nothing at all.

Mr. DENISON. He would go ahead and get the training?

Mr. TOWNER. The soldier, in a case of that kind, where there was a difference of opinion, would have the benefit of the training under the Vocational Board, and of course if he did not get his permanent disability status that would be his misfortune. Certainly the gentleman would not want the soldier to be deprived of his vocational training, if he was entitled to it, because the Bureau of War Risk Insurance should refuse him a permanent disability status. There are too many objections and delays already. Four thousand of these men are now waiting to obtain their vocational training. They are anxiously waiting for it. Some of them have lost the opportunity of profiting by it, some of them have become discouraged, some of them are going into insane asylums, because of the long and inexcusable delay.

Mr. DENISON. I want to say that I do not want to obstruct anything. I simply want information. I want to find out what is the meaning of the bill, because we are going to be called upon to vote for it.

Mr. TOWNER. The suggestion is made that the board may do something that is unauthorized.

Mr. DENISON. I did not make any such suggestion.

Mr. TOWNER. I do not think the gentleman intended that, but some gentlemen think that. Some gentlemen think that the Vocational Board will be generous. I do not know whether they will or not. I hope they will. I certainly do not want them to be ungenerous. I sincerely hope the Vocational Board in a question of doubt will resolve the doubt in favor of the soldier. I do not think it will be a very great loss if some soldier who is not permanently disabled shall receive this vocational training at the hands of the United States, if he has served his country during this time of trial. I would be glad if the United States would furnish every soldier that served, if he deserved it, an education. Of course, we do not pretend to undertake that; but the men who will receive this vocational training are few, anyway; they will probably not exceed 15,000 altogether. It does not seem to me that it is generous or even fair to the soldier to delay any action for fear the board may grant to some soldier who is not wounded severely enough a vocational training. I certainly believe this House and this committee will take the view that there ought not to be men waiting on the list, 4,000 in number, when the board that must pass upon them has already determined their status and has already determined that they are entitled to this vocational training. The Secretary of the Treasury says that we need this legislation. The board wants it and the bureau wants it. It will injure no one; it will increase not by one dollar, except perhaps the difference between $65 and $75 of allowance, the amount that will go to the soldier.

Let me again say there is not anything in this provision or in this amendment to the existing law that has any element of danger in it, any element of fraud, any element that is subject to suspicion. I can not imagine why gentlemen maintain that attitude, or seem to. Over in the Senate the bill was unanimously reported by the committee and was passed unanimously by the Senate. It comes over here to this House as a bill having received the unanimous indorsement of the Senate. I do not see any reason why we should hesitate to do what I conceive to be our duty here now.

Mr. DENISON. I fully agree with the gentleman. May I ask him another question?

Mr. TOWNER. Cheerfully.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to know the gentleman's opinion on this question. Would disease be considered a disability?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, yes. There are about 200,000 soldiers who are wounded and disabled. There are about 100,000 diseased and a great many of those who are diseased can receive vocational training but not nearly so great a proportion as there are of those who are injured or wounded.

Mr. DENISON. I take it then if we approve this bill that the Vocational Board will be a continuing or a permanent board just like our present Pension Department and 20 years from now if a man develops rheumatism or something that can be traceable to service he will be enjoying some amount of training——

Mr. TOWNER. I am sure the gentleman does not believe that. Of course, this rehabilitation work of returned soldiers can not last more than two or three years. It will go out of existence in that time. It only takes 10 months on the average, only 10 months to give this kind of training which is required. We have had the experience of what was accomplished in Canada, what was accomplished in England, in France, and we know about these things from the statistics and facts they give to us, and we know from our own training here in the United States that we have turned these men out of vocational training on an average in less than 10 months. And let me say this to the gentleman and members of the committee, that the statement is made that 90 per cent of those men who have received this vocational training are receiving a better wage now than they were before the war [applause], because of this training. That is what we are withholding to-day from 4,000 wounded soldiers.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. On the passage of this bill, as I understand it, these 4,000 who are ready to take vocational training can immediately enter into this training?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; just as soon as the board can place them, but let me say it does not only include vocational training, but the board finds places for these men. In a generous spirit the owners of manufacturing plants and of factories and of business enterprises have come voluntarily to the board and said, "We will be glad to have these men if they can come into our establishment and do the work." The number of vocational establishments which have already been put in operation as annexes to large manufacturing establishments shows the people of the United States are acting with generosity with regard to this matter.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. For a question. Will not this board be a better agency to place these men where they can be in comfortable, successful positions than any other agency that we could find?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly. The gentleman is exactly correct. The War Risk Bureau never had anything to do with the vocational training of these men. It only had the right to establish their status as entitled to compensation which the law provides under the war-risk insurance act after being disabled; if it is total, so much; if it is partial, so much. Of course, that takes some time, and we all know the conditions which have existed in the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The point which I was endeavoring to emphasize there was this, that this board, knowing these men, will be far better prepared to do the best for them than any other agency that can be found?

Mr. TOWNER. Why, certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not apprehensive there will be developed any opposition to the bill, but I am interested to know whether the hearings before the committee were convincing that the amount provided by the bill is adequate to accomplish the purposes sought?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. I yield the gentleman two minutes additional.

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that the committee really did not know the details of the arrangement between the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the Vocational Board in fixing the amount. We only know in a general way that the amount was determined, and I believe agreed to between the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the Vocational Board as necessary to cover the necessary expenditure for the period. I will say to the gentleman I am informed the Secretary of the Treasury in his estimate has withdrawn this amount from the estimate for his department, the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and it is to go now for the support of the Vocational Board.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a serious mistake in providing such relief not to provide a sufficient fund. I am sure the gentleman will agree to that. I thought perhaps he had made some investigation in reference to that.

Mr. TOWNER. I think there is no trouble in that regard——

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, the statement made by the board to us was an estimate of 7,000 at a rate of $75 per month, carried $525,000 per month, or $6,300,000 for the year.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TOWNER. I do.

Mr. DENISON. I want to state to the gentleman from Iowa I am not asking these questions because I am in any sense opposed to the bill, because I will do as much for the soldiers as the gentleman from Iowa or any other man, but I am simply asking for information because the gentleman has more information than I have.

Mr. TOWNER. I know the gentleman has that feeling, and I know there is no one who would be more generous to the soldiers than he would be.

Mr. DENISON. Now, I am asking particularly in reference to a provision on page 2. Of course, we all know that since the Civil War, even down to this day, men have applied to the Pension Bureau and have received pensions for disabilities that were contracted in the service. There is no limitation of time as to when such claims can be filed and allowed. This bill provides for disabilities later developed, traceable, in the opinion of the board, to service with the forces.

Mr. TOWNER. That is in the original law. That is no change.

Mr. DENISON. Under that provision will not this board have to remain in existence for years?

Mr. TOWNER. I think not. I do not think the board will remain in existence two years for this purpose. That is my opinion.

Mr. DENISON. Suppose after the board ceases to exist, in two years, as you think, a soldier should develop disability traceable to the service, what would he get?

Mr. TOWNER. Doubtless some provision would be made for the carrying of such cases, but they would not go to the Vocational Board in that case.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this observation with reference to questions being propounded by different members of the committee as to cases that may later develop and that are not taken care of by this bill, and to say that this Congress will, without a doubt, as the occasion and emergency may arise, pass other and such necessary legislation in the future which will reach out and take in any class of disability and diseases that may subsequently develop.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to say I think if we pass this act as it is now presented to us that that law will take care of every case of disabiliy that will arise for all time to come, and I think the board will remain in existence just as the Pension Bureau is now.

Mr. BRAND. The committee is of the opinion it will not last more than two years, but that if the occasion should arise on account of undeveloped cases Congress would take care of the same by appropriate legislation in the future. At any rate, we are reasonably sure that this legislation will take care of all pending cases. Of course the appropriation proposed by this bill covers all cases which the board has in mind at this time and which need immediate attention.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that by the construction placed on the act by the War Risk Bureau men can not receive vocational training until they are actually receiving compensation. This fact has resulted in delay, bringing about the situation, as heretofore frequently stated by members of the committee, of approximately 4,000 soldiers injured in the war, and who need vocational training, being deprived of the same, and who are compelled to wait around for months while their cases are being determined by the War Risk Insurance Bureau. The purpose of this bill is to take these cases out of the hands of the War Risk Bureau and put them in the hands and power of the Federal Board for Vocational Education; that is, it means simply paying at the hands of the Federal Vocational Board the amounts which would otherwise be paid by the War Risk Bureau, and the bill does not add to the expense of the Government except as indicated in the report of the committee. Under the rulings of the War Risk Bureau there are more than 4,000 cases of disabled men, injured in this war, that have not as yet been adjudicated by the bureau and therefore can not now be put into training by the Vocational Board under the bureau's interpretation of the law.

It may not be amiss to give some detailed information in regard to what has been done by the Vocational Board and the manner of its operations since it was organized by authority of Congress. The information which I obtained at the hearings before the joint session of the Senate and House Committees on Education and the subsequent hearings before the House Committee on Education, of which I am a member, when the pending legislation was being considered, and the information which the board furnished me, at my request, is of sufficient importance to go to the public. I take pride in the fact that I have the honor of representing, according to the 1910 census, the largest district in the State of Georgia, and I think it proper that the information thus obtained should go into the RECORD while this bill is being considered, not only for the constituents of my district who are interested, but that wounded, disabled, and diseased soldiers everywhere who have access to the RECORD may become familiar with the manner of obtaining the benefit of this appropriation.

Under the proposed amendment to section 2, compensation under article 3 of the war-risk insurance act, approved October 6, 1917, would not be paid for the period during which any person was being furnished by the board with a course of vocational rehabilitation and support.

The person so receiving support, if a single man without dependents, would receive $75 per month; if with dependents, $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed for family allowance under section 204 of article 2 of the war-risk insurance act. The amount heretofore paid was limited to $65 per month for a single man.

It should be noted that the distinction now existing between the officer and the enlisted man as to the amount received during the course of vocational rehabilitation is abolished.

In case the injured man pursuing his course of vocational rehabilitation is entitled, under article 3, to compensation in excess of the payments made to him by said board for the support of himself and his dependents, the War Risk Bureau pays monthly to such person such additional amount as may be necessary to equal the total compensation due under said article 3 of said act.

This bill calls for an appropriation of $6,000,000. From information furnished by the Vocational Board it appears that there are at present 3,200 men in training; there are more than 4,000 men whose compensability has been established and who are now awaiting placement in training. At the present time new cases are coming in at the rate of 500 per week. The board estimates that the average number in training throughout the year 1919–20 will be 7,000. As these men are paid a minimum of $75 per month, there will be a monthly outlay of $525,000, which for one year would amount to, of course, $6,300,000. This is the basis upon which this appropriation is estimated, and the reason for the amount asked for.

The vocational rehabilitation act became a law June 27, 1918, and in the 11 months which have elapsed the Federal board, separating its activities in rehabilitation almost wholly from those in vocational education, has established a central office, under the direction of the Chief of the Rehabilitation Division, at Washington, and has opened 14 district offices and 7 subdistrict offices throughout the United States. This was done in order to properly reach the disabled men in the hospitals and in the field. The 14 district offices are established at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Atlanta, New Orleans, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Denver, San Francisco, Seattle, and Dallas. Representatives of the board are stationed at practically all cities of over 100,000 population. The work of registering the cases of disabled men and of advising, training, and placing them is in each district in charge of a district officer with a force of supervisors, clerical assistants, and field agents.

A bureau of information for disabled soldiers was established at Paris, and a field service carried on in cooperation with the American Red Cross established contact with practically every disabled American soldier before his return to this country. Through its agents in France the board had personal conferences with 53,000 disabled men, according to their statements, of whom 19,000 indicated their intention of taking the training on their return to the United States. The total registration of disabled men brought to the board's attention May 17 through the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the American Red Cross, hospitals, and otherwise is 101,196. The board claims that it has established contact with 78,486 of these men, of which number actual surveys have been made by employees of the board in the cases of 55,502 men. Training has been recommended for 11,000 and has actually begun in the cases of over 3,000, as heretofore stated.

All recommendations for vocational training about which there is any question are submitted to a case board in the local office, made up of a representative of employers, of employees, and a medical officer, and all cases recommended by this local

board are referred to the central office and reviewed before a final decision is reached.

The training is carried on entirely through existing educational agencies, thus saving the Government many millions of dollars. At present the board is utilizing approximately 400 schools and colleges throughout the country, and a considerable variety of industrial and other plants where men are being trained on the job.

While the board undertakes the payment of tuition, most institutions charge only a nominal fee or no fee at all, and the man's expenses, so far as he is concerned, is that of maintaining him and his dependents during the period of his training.

When a man is placed in training at one of these institutions monthly reports as to his progress are required, and the board reserves the right to terminate the training period if the disabled man does not show proper zeal. His course of training at any industrial or commercial establishment is under constant supervision. After the completion of training, the man so trained is placed by the board in an occupation for which he has been prepared on a probationary term of one or more months, and it is not until the probationary period is over and he has qualified himself as a competent employee that the support of the Federal board is finally withdrawn. This term of training lasts 10 months as a rule.

The law requires the board to assist disabled men to find employment who do not need or want training, and also to place those who have taken training. Each case is a separate problem. In placing the handicapped soldier as a temporary ward of the Government, the agents of the board must protect him from hazards and unhygenic surroundings.

The policy of the board in its interpretation of the intent and spirit of the act of Congress creating it is as follows:

1. That Congress wanted all disabled men to know their rights and opportunities under the War-Risk Insurance act and the Vocational Rehabilitation act.

2. That Congress wanted every disabled man entitled to training or placement, and needing it, to have its benefits.

3. That Congress wanted every disabled soldier needing training or placement, or both, to be reached and helped as rapidly as possible, so that he might be saved from privation and dependency.

4. That Congress wanted the work of vocational rehabilitation for soldiers disabled by war to be done as well as is humanly possible, so that the hope of these men, that by training they may overcome their handicap, may be realized.

I dare say that no legislative body in the history of the world, with the possible exception of Canada, has done or offered to do more for the disabled soldier than the Congress of the United States.

The soldiers and sailors of the United States have helped to redeem and save the world from the criminal attacks of the most brutal and cruel monster that ever existed on earth, and in loving response to their patriotic service and sacrifice the American Congress will do all things, at any cost or expense, which the call of sympathy and humanity may make.

I have avoided at this time paying any tribute to the American soldiers and sailors, and the part taken by them in this great war. This has been done, and justly so, many times in both branches of Congress. The record of the American soldier and sailor has been applauded and heralded throughout two hemispheres. Their matchless valor has already become an historic fact and their heroism will be told in song and story as the generations come and go.

To the parents of those American boys who sleep under the lilies of France the benefits of this humane legislation will bring little comfort, and yet I bid them not to mourn and weep without hope, for while they have seen them for the last time on this earth they may meet them again.

Sergt. Talford, of the English bar, endeavored to depict the yearning of the Greek heart for immortality, in his great tragedy entitled "Ion." Ion has devoted himself to death in performance of a vow. Clemanthe, who loved him much, has exhausted her feminine arts in the effort to dissuade him from destruction—and failed. Resigning herself to the inevitable, she asks him out of her aching throat:

> And shall we never meet each other?

He replies:

> I have asked that awful question
> Of the hills that seem eternal; of the flowing streams
> That lucid flow forever; of the stars amid whose fields of azure
> My raised spirit hath trod in glory. All were dumb.
> But now, whilst thus I gaze into thy living face,
> I feel the love that kindles through its beauty
> Can never wholly perish. We shall meet again.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request as made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama also asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, who controls the time on the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL].

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation ought to be passed quickly, for the reason that so many disabled soldiers at the present time are unable to take advantage of this vocational training. Probably every Member of Congress has received numerous letters—I know I have—from men who have been across the sea, and who have become disabled and are anxious to take up this educational work. Under the present law, as I understand it, the Federal board can not take these men and begin to give them this education until the Bureau of War Risk Insurance passes upon their disability, and not only passes upon their disability but actually begins to pay them their compensation. As a result, there are many, and I believe the report before our committee states that there are 4,000 men, eligible to this education, that are now waiting to be placed in the school. This bill, as I understand it, simply takes away or amends the law to the extent that the Federal board may determine whether or not these applicants are entitled to vocational training. They pass upon that proposition and immediately put them into schools and begin to train them. They do not pass upon the disability.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VESTAL. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman is touching on a point which has excited my interest and concern—and I find that of many others of our colleagues—as to whether the effect of this bill is to take away from the original source the jurisdiction—that is to say, the War Risk Insurance Bureau—the right to determine whether these soldiers shall be classified as having such a disability as permits and makes necessary their vocational training. In other words, whether there shall be either a supplemental jurisdiction built up or the original jurisdiction taken away and conferred in this new board. And that suggests, from practical experience, this fact, that if the men who are to conduct the vocational training are to have it in their own power to determine who shall have vocational training, it will result in having made them to a great degree a self-perpetuating body.

Mr. VESTAL. In answer to the gentleman from Vermont, it is my understanding of this law that it does not take away from the Bureau of War Risk the original jurisdiction of determining the disability of the soldier, but it simply places into the hands of the Federal board the authority to start men on this vocational training. In other words, under the original law the Bureau of War Risk, as well as the Federal board, passed upon their eligibility to take vocational training. This bill relieves the Bureau of War Risk of passing upon this phase of the question.

But under this bill the Federal board has nothing to do in fixing or determining the degree of disability or the amount of compensation on account of said disability.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But they do determine the broad essential fact which leads to all the subsequent expenditures, and that is that they shall have vocational training.

Mr. VESTAL. I understand that this bill does that very thing.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VESTAL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The fear that my colleague has that this will be made a perpetual board ought to be relieved by the fact that the board is perpetual, administering on the original law, which disburses $7,000,000 a year for vocational purposes, and that has been already the work of the board.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Of course it ought not to be necessary to state for the purposes of clearing one's own record about such a matter as this that no one is hostile to the beneficent purposes of the act; but we are confronted with a question that is practical, and experience shows that unless there are reasonable safeguards in such matters as this it is the natural tendency of human beings to find employment under an act and perhaps a further extension of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VESTAL. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Should not this board take possession of these cases regarding boys in vocational training if the War Risk Bureau does not do it? I think these boys should be in some school. Should not the board have authority to do it?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. By analogy that would be equivalent to saying that every institution that we have built up in the public interest should be safeguarded by having a second institution built up for service in case the first did not do it.

Mr. DOWELL. But the gentleman does not want this vocational training defeated by reason of the board not acting?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; but that might apply to every other institution. Hold the head officials responsible and correct the personnel.

Mr. VESTAL. I think the gentleman from Iowa has well said that these 4,000 boys who are disabled and unable to follow their vocations or any gainful occupation ought to be cared for. Something ought to be done, and if something of this kind is not done they will simply get away. Some of them are getting away. They ought to be taken care of.

Again referring to the objection raised by my colleague from Vermont, I desire to say to the committee that under the original act the Bureau of War Risk Insurance might determine that a soldier was disabled to the degree that permitted him to have compensation under article 3 of the war-risk act and yet the Federal board find in the same case that the soldier was not eligible for vocational training. So far as the vocational training is concerned, the Federal board under the original law determined finally whether the disabled soldier was entitled to this training, but before they could make this decision the Bureau of War Risk determined whether or not the man was disabled, the degree of disability, his compensatory status; and further, after determining these facts, the soldier had to still wait until he was actually drawing his compensation before he could be accepted by the Vocational Board.

Under this bill the Vocational Board is not compelled to wait until the Bureau of War Risk determines his compensatory status, fixes the degree of disability, and begins to pay the compensation, but they at once determine if the disabled soldier is entitled to vocational training under the law, and if so place him in training at once, leaving the degree of disability to be determined and the amount of compensation to be paid to the Bureau of War Risk under the original law.

What will be the result? The 4,000 disabled soldiers that have made application for vocational training, and have by their own efforts and through their Representatives in Congress tried in vain to get their cases acted upon by the Bureau of War Risk, their compensatory status fixed, and their compensation paid, will be immediately placed in training by the Vocational Board.

We have said to our disabled soldiers that we proposed to reeducate them. Let us keep the faith. This legislation will make good our promise without delay.

The second feature of this bill that I desire to call attention to is the change in pay. Under the original bill we proposed to pay to the disabled soldier who availed himself of the opportunity to be reeducated the amount fixed by the bureau as his compensation on account of his disability or his monthly pay whichever was the greater. This act provides a payment of $75 to each disabled soldier, and if he be a married man to this amount is added the compensation due his family. This bill makes no distinction between an enlisted man and an officer.

We can not afford as a Nation to withhold from these disabled soldiers for a single moment the opportunity to make themselves self-supporting citizens. We called them to the colors; they left their homes, their places of business, the farm, the field, the factory, stout of heart and strong of body and mind, to give their lives if need be for the protection of America and American homes.

The least we can do for those who through this call to service have been disabled is to place them as nearly as possible, so far as earning capacity is concerned, as they were when they left their peaceful, happy homes to answer their country's call.

I hope this bill will pass the House without amendment and become a law as speedily as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have taken some of the gentleman's time, and I ask unanimous consent that he may have three minutes more, that time not to be taken out of the time allotted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is fixed by the House.

Mr. DOWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may have three minutes more, and that that time shall not be taken out of the time allotted.

The CHAIRMAN. We are in Committee of the Whole, and the time has been fixed by the rule.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am glad, indeed, to support this bill. The benefits conferred by it are richly deserved by the young men who served in the World War and who were disabled during such service. In many cases the degree of disability is very great. I have many cases in my district, but have only time to refer to two of them. One young man lost his left arm. He had made his living at a musician playing a violin. It was, of course, necessary for him to learn some new way to make a living. One young man, Frank Hammond, of Oakes, N. Dak., is still at Walter Reed Hospital. He was wounded in 14 different places and remained on the battle field 48 hours without aid. He has already been operated upon many times, one of them being an amputation of his left leg. He still has two operations to face, but he is hoping to live through them. Is there anything too good for a hero of this kind? [Applause.] I say, no.

Mr. FESS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am not unmindful of the very great privilege and honor it is to be a Member of the greatest law-making body for the greatest country of the world at this particular time in our country's history. I deem myself very fortunate indeed to be a member of the Committee on Education that reported a bill in behalf of the disabled American soldiers, sailors, and marines. I further consider myself unusually fortunate that my first speech on the floor of this House is in behalf of the disabled American soldiers and sailors.

Heretofore no soldier, sailor, or marine could receive the benefit of vocational rehabilitation or training, as provided by an act approved June 27, 1918, until the Bureau of War Risk Insurance had passed upon his case and had given him a certain rating. Because of the congested condition of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, there are more than 4,000 disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines who have in effect been denied this vocational training because the bureau has been unable to pass upon their claims and determine their rating; and there will soon be from five to ten thousand other disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines who will be entitled to this vocational training, but who will, in effect, be denied this right because of long delay.

These bills—both the House bill and Senate bill—give to the Federal Board for Vocational Education the right to take up the cases of these disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines and pass upon them at once, and say who shall receive the benefits of this act. There can be no difference of opinion, among those who have at heart the real interest and welfare of these disabled soldiers and marines, upon the merits of this excellent proposed legislation.

We need but for a moment to picture to ourselves that splendid host of young American manhood who, at the call of their country, left their homes, full of life, full of vigor, full of promise, giving up opportunities in the industrial, the commercial, or the professional world; giving up everything for you and me and their country. In your defense and in the defense of this country they have endured the hardships of camp, trench, and battle field, and many of them have gone through hell itself in a foreign land.

They are returning to us. But those who are the beneficiaries of this proposed legislation have come back, many of them without eyes, without arms, without legs, their health gone, their positions gone, and the hopes and opportunities that were so bright before they left buried forever. [Applause.]

This proposed legislation gives to each disabled single man $80 and to a married man $100 and allowances to his wife and dependents, per month, during the time that he is engaged in taking or undergoing this vocational training. Some Members

of this House have expressed the fear that the Vocational Board might be too liberal or too generous in their selection of the persons entitled to the benefits of this proposed legislation. I heartily concur in the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], in which he expresses the hope that this board will be generous and liberal. It was always my contention that the American soldier, sailor, and marine did not receive enough compensation during the war. Many of them gave up positions that were paying them several times as much as they received in the Army or Navy.

Now, we can not be too tender nor too generous with those who have lost an arm, a leg, an eye, or their health, in giving them such training as will equip them to earn a good support for themselves and for their families, to enable them to be self-supporting American citizens and not dependent upon the charity of this cold world. I hope this board will be generous and liberal, and in every instance where there is doubt to resolve that doubt in favor of him who helped to defend and save this country.

Since I have been a Member of Congress money has been appropriated as usual to furnish educational facilities to the people of the District of Columbia, to buy books and other supplies for the rich and poor alike, and to furnish dentists in these schools. Likewise, we have appropriated large sums of money for the Agricultural Department to furnish men to look after the health of the horses, hogs, and cattle of the country. I have no criticism to make of money appropriated to promote the animal industry and the agricultural interests of this country. I feel that money prudently spent in this way is well spent. But why should we hesitate to pass legislation for the benefit of the disabled soldier, sailor, and marine, our own flesh and blood? The only objection I have to this bill is that it does not provide enough. If we could have before us to-day the wounded, bruised, and broken bodies of our boys, the beneficiaries of this act, and realize their blasted hopes and helpless condition, it would melt the heart of every one of us; every Member who felt that he would like to oppose this measure would be struck speechless, and all of us would act now, and do what we could to relieve their condition.

I hope and pray that this House to-day will, without a single dissenting voice, pass this bill, and do this act of justice to these disabled heroes of our country. I consider it a high privilege and an honor to vote for and support this measure with all my heart and mind. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Before calling for the reading of the bill I ask unanimous consent that S. 1213 be considered, in lieu of the House bill H. R. 5225, it being identical with the House bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the consideration of S. 1213 in lieu of H. R. 5225. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Would not that have to be done in the House instead of in Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is in order in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the order of the House we went into the Committee of the Whole to consider the House bill. Will we not have to go back into the House to get permission to consider the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill?

Mr. FESS. We do not need to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question.

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is this Senate bill that you are trying to substitute here substantially the same as the House bill?

Mr. FESS. Exactly identical with it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this substitution has been made a thousand times.

Mr. GOOD. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask if the Senate bill carries a direct appropriation, the same as this bill?

Mr. FESS. In lines 14 to 21, page 3, there is this provision:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the purpose of making the payments prescribed by this section and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto.

The gentleman will understand that while the soldier is in training the compensation ceases and the money that is being paid for the training is in lieu of the compensation.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection to the request, but I want to reserve a point of order on the provision of the Senate bill, that is now for the first time before the House, making this appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that the gentleman can reserve a point of order at this time, but he will not lose any of his rights.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Ohio is asking unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill. So far as I know and believe there was no point of order reserved on the House bill. It seems to me that if anybody desires, unanimous consent can be given with the reservation of a point of order upon the Senate bill. I think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. But the Senate bill is not yet before the House and a point of order can not be raised until the Senate bill is before the House.

Mr. CANNON. Unanimous consent might be withheld.

Mr. SISSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SISSON. I was under the impression that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; that was on another bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was on a pension bill.

Mr. GOOD. I do not object, Mr. Chairman, to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order on the Senate bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to make the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. Only to the provision where it makes a direct appropriation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think, then, that we had better consider the House bill.

Mr. GOOD. But you have substituted the Senate bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] this morning be correct, the point of order does not lie against this appropriation. He said that it simply transferred the $6,000,000 from one fund already appropriated for substantially the same object to another fund. If that is true, these words in the bill do not constitute an appropriation in the proper sense of the term.

Mr. CANNON. It repeals one appropriation and makes another.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio said it took it out of one fund already appropriated and put it into another.

Mr. FESS. But the point of order does not come now until the last clause of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the Senate bill for amendment.

Mr. DENISON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENISON. Does the entire bill have to be read before an amendment is offered, or can amendments be offered to any paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. There is but one section in the bill, and the Chair will hold that the entire bill must be read as one section.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That every person enlisted, enrolled, drafted, inducted, or appointed in the military or naval forces of the United States, including members of training camps authorized by law, who, since April 7, 1917, has resigned or has been discharged or furloughed therefrom under honorable conditions, having a disability incurred, increased, or aggravated while a member of such forces, or later developing a disability traceable in the opinion of the board to service with such forces, and who, in the opinion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be furnished by the said board, where vocational rehabilitation is feasible, such course of vocational rehabilitation as the board shall prescribe and provide.

"The board shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to furnish the persons included in this section suitable courses of vocational rehabilitation, to be prescribed and provided by the board; and every person electing to follow such a course of vocational rehabilitation shall, while following the same, be paid monthly by the said board from the appropriation hereinafter provided such sum as in the judgment of the said board is necessary for his maintenance and support and for the maintenance and support of persons depending upon him, if any: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall the sum so paid such

person while pursuing such course be more than $75 per month for a single man without dependents, or for a man with dependents $75 per month plus the several sums prescribed as family allowances under section 204 of article 2 of the war risk insurance act.

"No compensation under article 3 of the act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,"' approved October 6, 1917, shall be paid for the period during which any such person is being furnished by said board a course of vocational rehabilitation and support as herein authorized: *Provided, however*, That in the event any person pursuing a course of vocational rehabilitation is entitled under said article 3 to compensation in an amount in excess of the payments made to him by the said board for his support and the support of his dependents, if any, the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall pay monthly to such person such additional amount as may be necessary to equal the total compensation due under said article 3 of said act.

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the purpose of making the payments prescribed by this section and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto."

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 21, strike out "$75" and insert "$90." On page 2, line 22, strike out "$75" and insert "$110" in lieu thereof.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am in hearty accord with the purposes of this bill, which has been admirably framed to carry out what we consider to be our duty to these disabled and maimed soldiers. But, in my judgment, the committee has failed in one important particular, and that is to provide a sum sufficient to enable these men to properly support themselves and their dependents while they are receiving the reeducation afforded by the provisions of this bill.

I personally know of numerous cases in my own city where young men, especially those with families dependent upon them, can not support those families on the amount fixed in the bill, and will thereby be unable to avail themselves of this opportunity. Gentlemen, we all know that under present conditions, with the cost of living and the cost of everything that goes to sustain a family—rent, food, and clothing—having reached a point hitherto unknown, we have not, in my opinion, properly provided in this otherwise excellent bill for these young men. It is far better for us, it seems to me, to make a just and liberal provision in the bill, so that everyone who is entitled to these opportunities may receive what a great and appreciative Government should freely and generously give, so that none will be forced to become wards of charity.

In Canada those who receive this same kind of reeducation are to receive $165.83 per month, and we are proposing to give our young men only $75, and those with dependents additional amounts, as indicated by rates governing the granting of allowances in the war-risk insurance act. I quote below a statement making a comparison of the amounts now received by disabled men in training in the United States and Canada:

In Canada each man discharged from the service, whether disabled or undisabled, receives, as a bonus, an allowance of $100 per month for the first six months after his discharge. In the United States he receives $60.

In Canada, therefore, a disabled man will receive during the first six months of his training a total of $600 as a bonus, and an allowance from the Department of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment, corresponding to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, of $60 a month, or $360, making $960 in all for support. In addition, he is allowed $35 for clothing, making a total of $995, which is an average support for each month of $165.83—practically $166.

Should the amendment to section 2 of the vocational rehabilitation act be passed in its present form, a single man would receive the following support for the first six months: He will get $60 as a bonus from the War Department and $75 per month for six months, or $450, from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Federal Board for Vocational Education, or a total of $510. This would give him an average support for the six months of $85 per month. It must be remembered, of course, that the bonus of $60 received by the man at the outset, in many cases, finds itself expended immediately to meet claims proved against the soldier while in the Army, so that it is practically negligible as a part of continued support during the six months.

The following table shows the comparative situation as between the United States and Canada in the matter of support of disabled men in training for the first six months:

	United States (with passage of bill amending section 2).	Canada.
a. Post discharged bonus	$60.00	$600.00
b. Support while in training	75.00	60.00
c. Total received during training, for 6 months	510.00	960.00
d. Clothing allowance		35.00
e. Total allowance	510.00	995.00
f. Average per month per man in training	85.00	165.83

If you adopt this amendment, it will make it possible, in my judgment, for every man to avail himself of this opportunity and put himself in a position where he can be self-supporting and self-respecting. There is nothing that will so take the spirit out of one of these boys as to make him an object of charity, as many of them will have to be, and are to-day, who are now receiving the present compensation. I know of instances where they have had to sacrifice their Liberty bonds, where they have had to be helped by the Red Cross, and where they are charges upon the hospitality of those from whom by natural ties they have no right to expect help, and for us to place ourselves in a position where we are going to force these men to a situation of that kind seems to me to be wrong and unjust, and not carrying out what we have pledged to do, and enable them to occupy a position where they can compete in self-respect in the years to come with those who are able-bodied. I certainly hope the committee will see fit to adopt my amendment, which, in my judgment, is only right and fair and just, and will be but carrying out our implied pledges to those who have borne the heat and burden of the day in successfully carrying on this war. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, permit me at this time to quote the creed of a disabled soldier: "Once more to be useful—to see pity in the eyes of my friends replaced with commendation—to work, produce, provide, and to feel that I have a place in the world—seeking no favors and given none—a man among men in spite of this physical handicap."

The Great World War has resulted in permanently injuring millions of men, but not disabling them, for these victims of battle and military service will be restored to self-support. We are going to put these men where they belong; where their sound energies and sturdy intelligence can be turned to mutually profitable account.

The man returning disabled from the front deserves the whole-hearted gratitude and respect of the Nation. We can never repay, and we must never forget, our debt of gratitude to these men who have sacrificed so much. It is but our public duty to afford every man disabled in the military or naval service an opportunity to be trained and reeducated in order that he may become a self-respecting and self-supporting citizen.

A missing foot is not a drawback for a desk responsibility; legs are not requisite at the cigar bench; expert typewriters never look at the keys; the watchful eye of a supervisor is not hampered by the absence of arms; and many other positions of responsibility and trust could be indicated for which a disabled man may be fitted through the course of vocational rehabilitation and training.

Gentlemen, we have by law provided for excellent courses of vocational rehabilitation, but have we been liberal enough in our allowances for the maintenance and support of these maimed men and their dependents, so that all who may be entitled to receive this training may be able to avail themselves of this opportunity? To my mind we have not. We can not do too much for these men; they are entitled to every consideration and as much assistance as can possibly be given them, and it would be a matter of deep regret to me if even only one disabled man was unable to take this course of reeducation and training because the allowances we have made are not sufficiently liberal to provide for his maintenance and that of his dependents. I have by this amendment, therefore, proposed to increase the rates contained in the bill under consideration and strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I rise under the rule in pro forma opposition to the amendment. It is obvious that no one in the committee has any idea of opposing the enactment of legislation that will carry out the spirit of the policy of vocational training for disabled soldiers. Therefore, we do not have to justify ourselves to avoid the possibility of popular criticism. But it seems to me as legislators we are particularly on duty to scrutinize carefully the details of the mechanism by which this policy is to be put into effect. It is urged that the reason for giving the Federal Board for Vocational Education jurisdiction over these 4,000 cases is that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, which had original jurisdiction, has not acted upon those cases, that the cases are delayed, and that great hardship and suffering to worthy heroes has thereby resulted. Therefore it is said the board which had original jurisdiction under the law of all of the terms of war-risk insurance, and to things that were to follow as the Nation's benefit to men who have acquired the right under the act, is to be supplemented in its functions by another board, which is to divide its jurisdiction to some extent. The only reason given why the second board should have a supplementary jurisdiction is that the first board seems to have failed in its own original jurisdiction.

As men of experience in the world's affairs, as men charged with the peculiar duty of legislating about these public affairs, I submit that we are following a wrong principle, one that ex-

perience has always proven to be abortive when we have attempted it anywhere else—that because a board, an institution, a commission, which we create to do a certain thing fails in that duty we shall not apply the proper remedy to that board for its correction, but that we shall create another board as a monitor to the first board and have the second board do what the first board ought to have done. It does not strike me that that is a practical thing.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In a moment. If that principle is once to be accepted as good practice for carrying out the affairs of this Government, then, just so soon as the second board seems in the opinion of somebody to have failed in its duty of monitor to the first board we will have to create a third board to look after the second board. Logically it carries itself along to a reductio ad absurdum. Our remedy should be to the first board, either to increase its capacity to carry out the law, a duty and responsibility with which we have charged it, or to see to it that the personnel is removed, if it is not a question of capacity, and another personnel substituted.

Although that is an executive function, yet we have found ways in legislative halls to accomplish it when we seriously have set out to do so. But here we go, undertaking to correct an evil or a fault which everybody admits, by substituting another board which may, in its own turn, be equally at fault in the same premise, or at least be a board that will develop other faults that will accomplish the same or other evil results.

You and I know as a matter of practical experience that when we have undertaken to give a board or bureau of this Government some specialized province and jurisdiction, that board never fails to find reasons why it should constantly continue in the exercise of those functions. They never fail to find reasons why their functions should be continued, but also eventually to be extended. They are certain to find that enough subjects who will keep them busy will come within the terms of their jurisdiction, and in this instance be persons who ought immediately to have vocational training no matter what the Bureau of War Risk Insurance may subsequently decide as to the degree of their compensable disability or lack of it. That is said in no discredit to our good intentions, nor is it because of any lack of confidence on my part in this board or its personnel, nor is it lack of confidence in the splendid purposes of the gentlemen who have brought out this bill. We are not arguing about that or about our motives. I am simply trying to get down to the basic fact that as legislators we have to build very careful machinery or we shall defeat our own good intentions and entail a great burden of expense upon the Government, to say nothing of the other thing which you and I know from our experience is characteristic of affairs in Washington. We keep multiplying boards and bureaus and commissions by splitting them in two, and true to the characteristics of a certain kind of animal life about which we used to be taught in school every time you chop off one to make another that subdivides itself and multiplies indefinitely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In reply to the statement just made by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], the gentleman has not been in during the entire term of the discussion, and so I think has misapprehended the facts. There is no substitution of the duty of one board for another. There is no attempt made of that kind. Here is the situation: We offer to the soldiers who were wounded two things. One is the right to a vocational training, if they so desire it and it would do them any good.

The other is the right to a status of disability under which they will be entitled to certain allowances and the Board of War Risk Insurance has to pass upon the question of disability, whether it is total or partial, and take action fixing the disability status of the soldier. That is not taken away; they still have it and will have it and must exercise it. The Vocational Board have the duty of determining, and still have it and will have it, whether or not the soldier is entitled to vocational training.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont rose.

Mr. TOWNER. Just one moment. Now, as the law was interpreted, however, and I think without the intention of Congress, it was held that in order to allow a soldier a right to his vocational training he must not only have it passed on by the Board of Vocational Training but also by the War Risk Insurance Bureau, which has nothing to do with his vocational training. Under existing conditions the War Risk Insurance Bureau say they do not want to exercise that power any longer. They want to resign and allow the Vocational Board to pass upon, as they have had to and will have to, as to whether or not the soldier is entitled to his vocational training.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman says that I labor under a misapprehension, which may not be the first time in my experience, but that alleged misapprehension was founded upon this language taken from the report of the committee itself. Referring to these cases and the present condition, the report concludes in this language:

It takes these cases out of the hands of the War Risk Insurance Bureau and puts them into the power of the Federal Vocational Board.

If that is not a substitution, I do not know what substitution means.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill S. 1213 had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I present to the House the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill and ask that the same be printed under the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri reserves all points of order. The Clerk will report the conference report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ordered printed in the RECORD under the rule.

AMENDMENT TO VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1213.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not necessary for the gentleman from Ohio to make that motion. The committee automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1213, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the language which the gentleman from Vermont quoted might convey that impression standing alone, but if the gentleman will read what precedes it he will see it refers entirely to vocational training. It is true that it does take away from the bureau the right to determine whether or not a soldier shall be entitled to vocational training. That the board must now do alone. It was its duty before, and it remains its duty. It does not either extend the power or take away the power of the Vocational Board.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; if the gentleman will permit, Mr. Chairman, I have not made any claim that there has been an extension of power. I meant to suggest simply that you have sought to correct a manifest and conceded evil by a substitution, and that process of substitution means putting into the hands of the people most likely to gain by the practice an opportunity to determine who shall have this benefit.

Mr. TOWNER. That would be true if the Vocational Board had not already that duty; they still have and must exercise that duty. But under the law as it now exists they can not exercise their power until the War Risk Bureau has fixed the disability status of the soldier. If this law is passed it will be left so that the War Risk Insurance Bureau will not have anything to do with it so far as vocational training is concerned. There is no substitution of power. It only does what the law originally intended; that is, that the permanent-disability status of the soldier shall be determined by the War Risk Insurance Bureau and that the right of vocational training shall be determined by the Vocational Board.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask a question. How many are now being trained under the appropriation that has been made?

Mr. TOWNER. About 3,000.

Mr. CANNON. There can be no difference of opinion about the question that vocational training ought to be made, and yet I think it is legislation that is ordinarily abused nine times out of ten, if not ninety-nine times out of one hundred, where you make an appropriation creating a service and then provide that the parties that expend that appropriation shall make the administration of the organization. Now, that is what this does. Well, if it is going to be abused—they say 3,000 are the most we have under training—are they outside of a building or where are they being trained?

Mr. FESS. Many in the State vocational schools.

Mr. CANNON. Many in State vocational schools. How many—most of them?

Mr. FESS. I should say so.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says most of them are in the State vocational schools. Organized under this legislation?

Mr. FESS. Under this act. I will say to my friend, the difference between our method and Canada is that Canada was required to institute schools for this special purpose while we use the existing schools established throughout the States, and thereby save a tremendous amount of expense.

Mr. CANNON. That is in schools long since established?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It is State universities, and so on, which are being utilized?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. They do not make any charge, do they?

Mr. FESS. Some of them do and some do not.

Mr. CANNON. Well, most of them do not, as I understand it; they volunteer their services. What did the gentleman from Vermont remark?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I did not mean to make it public, Mr. Chairman, but I think you will find most of the State universities charge tuition to everybody.

Mr. CANNON. That may be correct. That is the economical way to do it.

Now, I have here in my hand the hearings that were held on the last sundry civil bill that was reported to the House late in February. I was not a member of that subcommittee. They were asked to put in the RECORD a list of the employees that they had, and, looking over it hurriedly, they have something over 300, and substantially half of them get from $4,000 to $3,000 and a few $2,000 a year. I will say half of them average $3,000 a year. And there you are!

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is that the overhead expense here in Washington?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; I suppose not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Where are these employees?

Mr. CANNON. Out in the universities in the various States. And I suppose we are paying tuition besides. I do not know how that may be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Now, why is it necessary to have expensive employees of that kind if a man wants vocational training in an agricultural school? They have all the equipment and all of the professors necessary. If a man wants training in a manual-training school, they have equipment and professors there. At least, we have in our State.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Now, there are nearly 150 clerks, stenographers, and typists——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That must be overhead charges here in Washington.

Mr. CANNON. God knows; I do not. But whether it is in Washington or out of Washington, it is out of order, in my judgment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did not the Committee on Appropriations at the last session and at this session go thoroughly into this question, and after that make a limit on the amount of expenditures?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but this takes it off, as I understand it. That bill has not been passed. In the last Congress the sundry civil bill did not pass the Senate. I was not a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is in the present sundry civil bill that is now pending.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will refer to the sundry civil bill as it passed the House he will find, on page 39, line 22, the following language:

That no person shall be employed hereunder—

That is, under that appropriation—

at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum and not more than 20 persons—

And so forth.

Mr. CANNON. Not more than 20?

Mr. GOOD. Not more than 20 persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of $3,000, and there is a further provision in regard to other employees.

Mr. CANNON. That is 40.

Mr. GOOD. It reads that one person shall be employed at a rate of compensation not in excess of $5,000 per annum, and not more than 20 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation in excess of $3,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Now, there is 1 not in excess of $5,000 and 20 not in excess of $3,000, and so forth. This bill carries this language:

Six million dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used by the Federal Board of Vocational Education for the purpose of making payments prescribed by the section and for defraying administrative expenses incident thereto.

And the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is quite right that it takes off the limitation carried in the sundry civil bill, and while they could not pay more than $5,000 under that limitation they can pay $50,000 or $100,000 under the bill here. There is no limit except the sky.

Mr. CANNON. They pay now under the former appropriation, inasmuch as the last sundry civil bill is not a law, 150 people at $4,000 and $3,000 and a few at $2,000 a year. They will average, according to these tables, over $3,000. And then they had a clerical list of stenographers and others of just about 150. God knows, if these people are being educated in large part in State universities on tuition, what I object to, without knowing anybody that is employed, is that there shall be, under the name of caring for the soldier, built up and perpetuated an expensive salary list of individuals put on the rolls at salaries of $2,000 or $3,000 or $4,000 a year. If that is true, it is the most frightful misuse of patriotism of which I have ever heard.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, there are three specific misconceptions that have been announced here, and probably more than that, but three that I recall very distinctly.

The estimate of the number of disabled soldiers to be trained this year is 7,000. The estimate that was originally made as to the cost per soldier was $65 a month. It was afterwards decided to raise that to $75 per month. Seventy-five dollars per month for 7,000 soldiers would be $525,000. For a year it would amount to $6,300,000. The $6,000,000 asked here is to pay for the training of 7,000 soldiers at the rate of cost per soldier of $75 per month, as written in this bill. Now, there is an amendment offered by my friend from Pennsylvania to lift this from $75 a month to $90, and I see that there is a favorable response to that. I hope that that amendment will not carry, however. I do not want this legislation to lead anybody to charge that we are undertaking to sandbag the Government to get some money out of the Treasury on the basis that it is charity for soldiers.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I do not like that idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FESS. I will in a moment.

Seventy-five dollars per month does not go very far, it is true, as expenses are now running. However, it will be fairly sufficient to support the soldier who wishes to do the educational work that is here intended. And for that reason I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW], raising it from $75 to $90, will not pass. It will require additional expense. I do not know just how much to estimate it now. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CARTER. I wanted to ask the gentleman what he had to say about the language in lines 20 and 21 for defraying administrative expenses incident thereto?

Mr. FESS. That is language copied from the Senate bill.

Mr. DENISON. It is the Senate bill.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman's statement was that this was only to pay for the $75 a month.

Mr. FESS. That is the purpose of it. It is estimated that there will be 7,000 soldiers in training. We provided in the bill $75 per month per soldier. That for the year would make $6,300,000, without one dollar to go for administration—not a single dollar.

Mr. CARTER. But under this language any part of it could be used for administrative purposes, could it not?

Mr. FESS. I think so. But I repeat the estimate does not look to that purpose, notwithstanding the fact it may be necessary to use some for that purpose.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Since the administrative expenses can be taken care of under the appropriation in the sundry civil bill, which has a limitation attached, is not the gentleman willing to strike out the language which provides that part of this sum may be used for administrative expenses?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, as to making any amendment to the Senate bill, I want this to be understood by members of the committee, that because of the emergency of this legislation, of these persons waiting for training, we introduced by choice the Senate bill as it passed that body. The two bills that were originally introduced in the Senate and House were similar, but the Senate committee modified its bill, and we rewrote our bill to meet identically the Senate bill, as modified and passed, so that we could act upon it without amendment, so that it might become a law without going to conference. If you amend this bill to-day in any slight degree, it means that the bill goes back to the Senate and it may have to go to conference, and then it must go to the Committee on Appropriations, if certain suggestions that have been made by members of that committee are followed, and that means that it will not pass without undue delay.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think we could well afford to take a day or two to make this bill a law if by so doing we can provide that this money can actually be spent for soldiers and not for the purpose of paying big salaries in administration?

Mr. FESS. This is not for the purpose of paying big salaries. I have repeated the computation here more than once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague on the committee yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DARROW. My friend states that he is opposed to one of the provisions of my amendment. He does not state that he opposes the second provision, which raises the allowance of a family man from $75 to $110.

Mr. FESS. If a married man has a wife or child, or both, there is a provision in the compensation law which provides now for them——

Mr. DARROW. He gets $15 in addition——

Mr. FESS. Yes; $15 in addition for wife and $25 in addition for wife and child; $32.50 in addition for wife and two children.

Mr. DARROW. But $90 does not seem to be sufficient to take care of that man.

Mr. FESS. It is true that in the big cities it is expensive, but most of this training would be outside of the large cities, and I believe we would be subject to the charge that we have no regard for the soldier and that we are treating soldiers simply as subjects of charity, and I do not like that.

Mr. DARROW. Can anyone charge Congress with a matter of that kind when it comes to rehabilitating these crippled soldiers?

Mr. FESS. They ought not. But I will say to my friend from Pennsylvania that there is one thing very apparent in this House, and that is when you take up a matter of education, a matter of spiritual development of any sort, something that you can not place an estimate on as of marketable value, something outside of the dollar, that can not be measured by the yard or weighed by the ounce or sold by the bushel—if you take a subject that has no money value, instantly we have resentment shown on this floor. And I say that the strength of this Nation rests not in the size of its Treasury but it rests in the care of the citizenry of this country. [Applause.] I do not like, every time that we speak of making a stronger manhood by putting men on their feet and making them self-supporting, so that they need not be the subjects of charity at the expense of the Treasury, to see men get up and find fault on a money basis. While I do not like that, I do not blame the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for watching like a watchdog the outgo of money from the Treasury. I regard that to be his duty and no one should fault him for that stand.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman say that it will require during the next fiscal year all of $6,000,000 for all of the service of rehabilitation? Is that the gentleman's best judgment?

Mr. FESS. The best judgment that I have is from the figures given to me by the board and the War Risk Bureau as to the number now in waiting.

Mr. GOOD. That is $6,000,000 a year?

Mr. FESS. A little over that.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the sundry civil bill already carries $4,000,000 for the service, and I am sure he does not want to appropriate $4,000,000 more for the service than the highest estimate?

Mr. FESS. That is precisely what I have been pressing. Every soldier in training has his support as a student in training and is not a subject of the War Risk Insurance for compensation; the money you have appropriated for the War Risk Insurance will not be drawn on for this soldier while he is in training.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that. We carry in the sundry civil bill $40,000,000 for compensation and $24,000,000 for family allowance, and we also carry $4,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation, and according to the gentleman's statement you will only need $6,000,000. Now, the sundry civil bill that has passed carries $4,000,000, and you are carrying $6,000,000 here. That is a duplication in the appropriation for this service, and that is what we must watch if we want to keep the appropriations down.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman say that is the law?

Mr. GOOD. It is in the sundry civil appropriation bill as it passed the House.

Mr. FESS. It will be cut out if this bill passes, if it shall appear to be a duplicate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to be recognized, following the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not an idealist or a scientist. You can find them as thick as blackbirds, and no two of them agree, unless they happen to belong to the same exact school. Oh, they make great progress; yes; but the mails are loaded down with all sorts of wild, crazy schemes. You all get them. Somebody has this remedy, and somebody has that remedy, and somebody has the other remedy, and we have a Committee on Education, and we have several other committees here. Now, I suppose when God made me He intended that I should try to be practical, and so far as my vote goes, in expending the money of a hundred million people, I think we should let somebody else, by subscription, by voluntary maintenance, take care of the multiplied thousands of men, some with money, but most of them without money, who are seeking to make a living, who call themselves idealists. Therefore, as I am for this bill, I think it ought to be amended by striking out the administrative compensation that is in it. I do not relish being arraigned by inference because I dare insist that there should not be an average of 150 men on a salary of $3,000 or over, and about that same number of clerical help, away from the universities and the vocational schools, where you pay so much for tuition, as my friend from Vermont says, where there is no expense; and when I insist that the authority to make that kind of a pay roll should not be carried in an appropriation bill by words that are far-reaching, and which, unless you make close inquiry, are very mischievous, which are not for the rehabilitation of the soldier, but for the advancement of idealists, uplifters, and all that sort of thing. I have high respect for the gentleman from Ohio. As he followed me in some remarks that I made, I suppose he was referring to me. If so, he compliments me. [Applause.]

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been somewhat befogged by the distinguished gentlemen who have been quarreling over the question of what shall be expended for administrative purposes. So far as I am concerned, I do not desire to add to any administrative expenses of this board. But I do believe the time has come when this Congress should act promptly upon the question of getting these boys into the vocational schools. It is reported here by the committee that 4,000 are to-day being deprived of an education because somebody has failed to act, and they are now awaiting the action of Congress to make provision for their education.

The amendment provides for an increase in the monthly allowance for the expenses of attending school. I realize that I do not know—and from the statement of members of the committee I take it the committee does not know—just what

these actual expenses are to be. But this we do know, that under present conditions the amount provided in the bill is not a large sum, and my view is that Congress should make ample provision for all their necessary expenses.

These boys are attending, or should be attending, the various colleges and universities of the country. And it is a splendid privilege for them to have this opportunity. But this Government has agreed to educate them and it should pay all of their necessary expenses, whatever it may cost. We should not be questioning here the expenditure of the few dollars necessary for the education they desire and should have. We are told by the committee that there are approximately 7,000 who are now entitled to receive this education. Some of them are blinded and others have lost an arm or a leg and still others have been mangled and injured in various ways. This Government owes to these boys the best education it can give them. We can not afford to stint the amount we are giving them for their education. They were injured while defending our country and our flag and this great world of ours. Somebody had to sacrifice to win this war. They made this sacrifice. Now is the time for Congress to act and to give them an amount necessary for their education. Some of them are married and have families who are dependent upon them for support. I believe the amendment should be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SIEGEL and Mr. DARROW demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 64.

Mr. SIEGEL and Mr. DARROW demanded tellers.

Mr. DARROW. May we have the amendment read?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

Mr. BLACK. It is not in order to read the amendment while the House is dividing.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. DARROW and Mr. FESS.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, what are we going to vote on?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment again.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DARROW: On page 2, line 21, strike out "$75" and insert "$90." On page 2, line 22, strike out "$75" and insert "$110"" in lieu thereof.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 50 ayes and 71 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 14, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this bill did not have a privileged status. It was a legislative bill; it was dropped into the basket and referred to the Committee on Education. If it had been a privileged appropriation bill, when it came back it would have been offered on the floor of the House, and any Member would have had the opportunity to reserve points of order, and points of order could subsequently have been made. But it was reported back by simply dropping it into the basket, and the decisions are to the effect that if a bill comes in in that way, that is erroneously referred in the first instance, a point of order will not lie when the bill is under consideration. And so there was no opportunity to make a point of order to the House bill or the Senate bill, because no one in the House knew anything about it except the committee to which it was referred.

The Committee on Appropriations in the last Congress reported out a provision for $1,500,000 for this rehabilitation training. On the floor of the House that was increased to $2,000,000. We have just passed the sundry civil bill carrying $4,000,000 for this service. Dr. Prosser and Dr. Monroe, who were examined very closely, stated when the matter was under consideration that they could not tell how much would be required for the next year. It all depended on how many persons availed themselves of this training.

The committee reported it unanimously, and it passed the House unanimously as to the appropriation of $4,000,000. Every member of the committee, so far as I know, was in favor of giving every penny to this service that might be required to carry on the service in a broad and intelligent way. We all want to give these boys every dollar that is necessary for rehabilitation purposes.

We caused the same limitation to be carried in the last bill regarding salaries. The former committee discovered that there was one man receiving $5,000 out of one appropriation and $5,000 out of another appropriation connected with this service. So in the sundry civil bill that passed last Congress we put in this provision:

Provided, That no person shall be employed hereafter at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, and not more than 20 persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of $3,000 per annum, and not more than 30 persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation from $2,500 to $3,000, inclusive, per annum.

The sundry civil bill just passed carries a similar provision.

Now, this bill that we have under consideration pays absolutely no attention whatever to these restrictions. It pays no attention to the appropriation already made of $4,000,000. And if we enact this bill without amendment, what have you done? A Congress pledged to economy appropriates $10,000,000 for a service when the highest estimate for that service is only $6,000,000. I submit that that is very poor business; it is awful poor legislation for two committees of the House to assume jurisdiction and make appropriations for the same service.

What does the bill provide after appropriating this $6,000,000? The entire section is as follows:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the purpose of making the payments prescribed by this section and for defraying the administrative expenses.

Let me ask the gentleman in charge of the bill, What is the limit of salaries that can be paid if this bill becomes a law? Five thousand dollars? Oh, no. Ten thousand dollars? Oh, no. There is absolutely no limit; and he could employ a thousand clerks out of this appropriation at $5,000 a year.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. TOWNER. Why did not the gentleman read the rest of this paragraph; why did not the gentleman, in fairness to the committee, read the language "incident thereto"?

The time of Mr. GOOD having expired, by unanimous consent he was given five minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. Why, of course.

Mr. TOWNER. Which limits the appropriation to the administrative features incident to the operation of this particular provision here.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; this is an entirely different appropriation. The appropriation bill I read from a while ago, the sundry civil bill, provided that no part of that appropriation could be used to pay salaries in excess of a certain sum. That bill does not refer to this; it is an independent appropriation.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly; but it could not be used for any purpose not provided for in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. They can pay any salary they want to pay in the exercise of the administrative provisions of the bill, so long as it is under the limit.

Mr. TOWNER. No; not under the law in this bill.

Mr. GARNER. This bill is the law.

Mr. GOOD. This bill if enacted will be a part of the law. I want to say, as far as I am personally concerned, that I believe in this service; I believe that we ought to take these boys when wounded and give them the training necessary.

If the amendment that I have offered is adopted, it leaves the matter then so that any sum up to $6,000,000, in addition to the appropriation already made, could be appropriated any time for this particular service.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. As a matter of information, I would like to ask the gentleman this question. His amendment proposes to authorize the appropriation of $6,000,000 for this service.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. What is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations after an authorization of that kind is made? I supposed it was the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to make the appropriation as carried in the legislation authorizing it.

Mr. GOOD. Not at all. The Committee on Appropriations, if the amendment which I have offered shall become a law, if the Vocational Rehabilitation Board shall make an estimate

for $1,000,000, will hear them, and if they make an estimate for any sum, that the Committee on Appropriations will hear them, and then the committee will decide what in its opinion is necessary to carry out the purposes of the act, and will report that finding to the House, and then it is up to the House to do whatever it pleases with regard to the matter.

Mr. MAPES. Does not the gentleman's amendment in effect nullify the action of the House in authorizing an appropriation for a given amount?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think so. This merely places a limitation in this instance, and I will say to the gentleman that I think the bill would be just as strong if that last paragraph were left off entirely, because the committee would always appropriate for services of this kind all the money requested for performing the service. The committee does not appropriate up to the limit of cost or authorization, but only for the sum that the committee feels is necessary to perform the service.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, he simply proposes to subject this appropriation to the same orderly procedure and scrutiny that all other appropriations are subjected to that come before the House.

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As I understand the argument, there is plenty of money carried in the other bill for administrative purposes, simply subject to limitation.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And there will be no want of money for administrative purposes if the amendment prevails.

Mr. GOOD. No. Dr. Prosser and Dr. Monroe both stated before the committee they could not tell exactly how much they would need, but they placed it at $6,000,000. They had increased their estimate from $4,000,000 to $6,000,000 in anticipation that there would be more persons demanding the service. The gentleman knows what we did the other day for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. Within 24 hours after the House convened there was reported to this House a bill carrying $43,000,000 for family allowances. That bill went through both the House and the Senate within 48 hours after the hearing and was sent to the President. There will be no difficulty in getting all of the money that is needed, but in the exercise of orderly procedure I hope the chairman of this committee will not insist that the Committee on Education shall become an appropriation committee and accept a lump sum put in the bill by the Senate, where the Senate hearings disclosed the fact that they did not go exhaustively into the subject at all.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attitude of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I would expect him to take the position that he would not only have to protect the Treasury against any appropriation that might come from any committee, but that the appropriations ought to be confined to the regular appropriations committees. May I state to the membership of this House a matter that you have probably forgotten, namely, that the vocational bill, the original bill which created the Vocational Board, carried an annual appropriation of $7,000,000? That bill came from the Committee on Education. There was no point of order made against it. We discussed in the committee whether we should make it an authorization or an actual appropriation, and decided it ought to be an actual appropriation, and under that law this Vocational Board is now operating, and those persons who are insisting that the Vocational Board is reaching out to extend its functions are proceeding as if the Vocational Board will discontinue if this bill fails to become a law. This is only supplemental. It is a matter that is added to the board—a board already created, a board that has an organization, that has helpers, and all our legislation last year did was to extend the field of the board to rehabilitation, and all we now propose to do is to place the decision as to who shall determine the eligibility for training of the crippled soldiers under a board already created, which has the administration of $7,000,000 annually under a former law. This provision makes it simply supplemental to what the board is already doing.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. When the gentleman's committee considered this matter and determined to ask for an appropriation of $6,000,000, did that committee know that the sundry civil appropriation bill carried $4,000,000 for the same purpose?

Mr. FESS. I knew the sundry civil appropriation bill carried an appropriation for vocational training. I have a letter here from the board stating that the matter was laid before Mr. GOOD. I have here in my hand a letter from Dr. Prosser to Mr. GOOD, and on that very identical point, in which he asked for $6,000,000, and gives the figures upon which the $6,000,000 is based.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. At the time you asked for this $6,000,000, then the matter of appropriating the $4,000,000 in the sundry civil appropriation bill had not yet been determined? That was still pending?

Mr. FESS. I am not sure about that. Probably that is true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the two bills go through, then there will be a total of $10,000,000 for this same work, will there not?

Mr. FESS. I do not so understand. The sundry civil appropriation bill is not a law. If this bill passes and becomes a law, certainly the sundry civil appropriation bill can have subtracted from it all that is necessary to avoid duplication if it is found in the two bills.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the sundry civil bill passes, and it is rapidly in process of becoming a law, there will be $10,000,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, there is an effort here in this House, this moment, to prevent the passage of this appropriation and send it back to the Committee on Appropriations. We have waited for 35 days to try to get this bill before this committee, and this is the only time we could get it.

If you send this bill by an authorization back to the Committee on Appropriations, there will be no appropriation, no addition to what has already been suggested, and that is not enough, and if you want to defeat the purpose of this measure the way is to put yourself on record of voting against it and not by voting for an amendment that nullifies it and makes it absolutely of no value. What I want is that this appropriation shall be carried in this bill, and then if it is not needed it will not be used. If it is needed for the soldiers, it ought to be used, and if it is not used for the soldiers no harm can come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in my preliminary remarks to-day I expressed the hope that there would be no further friction between the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Education. The older Members of this House remember that during the last session for something like three months a small amount due for rent was held up by the Committee on Appropriations. They would not act nor permit this committee to act. The bill now under consideration does not do a thing except increase the amount allowed the crippled soldier to $75 per month while securing a vocational education. It does not touch section 8 of the bill, which is now the law and which limits the amount to be expended for certain purposes. If they do not spend the $6,000,000 it will be returned to the Treasury. They can only expend so much——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If I can have the gentleman's attention, I desire to ask for information to know whether or not this $6,000,000 carried in this bill will be in addition to the $4,000,000 carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. SEARS. Perhaps a part of it might be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I have but five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If it does this committee ought to do something.

Mr. SEARS. That appropriation has been passed. It is not sufficient and you can not increase it. The appropriation here simply increases the amount, and I want to say again to the gentleman that section 8 of the Smith-Sears bill passed last year by the House describes how the money shall be used, and we are simply to-day amending that bill or, I should say, a part of it, to wit: Section 2 saying to the Vocational Board, "You shall pay the disabled soldiers the sum of $75 per month," and if it takes $6,000,000 then you shall make the expenditure.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. SEARS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Was it known to the Committee on Education that they wanted $6,000,000 when the Committee on Appropriations had appropriated $4,000,000?

Mr. SEARS. In reply to the gentleman, was it known to the Committee on Appropriations that we wanted to give $75 a month to the disabled soldiers? We should not quibble over these matters, and I am in hearty accord with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] when I say that every time the question of assisting the young men of this country along educational lines, or the disabled soldiers, comes up some people are so jealous of their rights they rise and interpose an objection. I think this House to-day will pass this bill, and, as I said before,

if the money is not expended it will stay in the Treasury and we will at least say to the soldiers that we do more than talk, that now we are really going to assist them.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted on the amendment now before the House.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee.

Mr. DARROW. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has offered an amendment; he is a member of the committee, and the Chair recognizes him.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, regarding the erroneous reference of this bill, I admit that it was erroneous. The committee, however, were not responsible for that. I do not know how it came to the Committee on Education. But I do know that prior to this bills carrying appropriations have been referred to this committee and no objection has ever been made. But, Mr. Chairman, I desire the committee to understand that when an erroneous reference has been made it must be taken advantage of and corrected. Gentlemen can not come in here at this time and raise the proposition with reference to an erroneous reference to a committee.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. In just a moment. It is stated here in the rules, touching the erroneous reference of a public bill, that—

The erroneous reference of a public bill under this rule, if it remains uncorrected, gives jurisdiction.

To the committee receiving it. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma for a question.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman does not contend there is any question of erroneous reference being made or taken?

Mr. TOWNER. I just admitted the bill was erroneously referred, and I said unless the reference was corrected the committee had jurisdiction, and that is the law. Now, gentlemen, let us examine the circumstances as they now exist before us. This bill was first considered in the Senate, and while it was being considered in the Senate there was an arrangement made between the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Vocational Board as to the amount necessary to carry into effect this bill and the amount agreed upon was $6,300,000. I do not know whether that was in addition to the $4,000,000 or not. I do not know whether the $4,000,000 is to be considered a part of it or not, but I do know that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Glass, in a letter which he addressed to the chairman of the Senate committee, approved this bill, this Senate bill we are now considering, and asked that it be passed. The sundry civil bill carries $4,000,000, and the amount necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act is declared to be $6,300,000, and that is all the amount of money that will be used. That is the condition of affairs, and now, gentlemen, in what condition will we be placed if we defeat the passage of this Senate bill that comes here with a unanimous report and which has unanimously passed the Senate? The bill will go to the Committee on Appropriations of the House for consideration. There is no appropriation bill now before the Committee on Appropriations.

Does any gentleman know how long it will be before they bring in another deficiency bill in which it could be included? If you want these soldiers to wait, and wait indefinitely, then pass this amendment, but if you want this relief that is asked for these 4,000 waiting wounded soldiers, then I hope you will vote down this amendment that is offered.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not understand that the adoption of this amendment means the defeat of the bill.

Mr. TOWNER. I say it will go to the Appropriations Committee. It will delay the passage of the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It will be returned to the Senate with the House amendment, would if not, like other bills, and then it would be a question of whether the Senate receded or whether it asked for a conference?

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true, but the gentleman will understand it is only an authorization. Not one dollar can be taken from the Treasury until the Appropriations Committee passes on it and reports it to the House. Of course, the gentleman understands that an authorization is not an appropriation under any circumstances. The passage of this bill with an authorization only takes it to the Appropriations Committee for consideration, and they will report the amount whenever they get ready.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GOOD. There is an amendment pending, Mr. Chairman,

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending, and unless this is a substitute for the pending amendment it is not in order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if I understand the situation which exists here, the parliamentary situation and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], it seems to me we are giving ourselves some rather unnecessary concern.

I understand the situation to be this: This bill was introduced some time in the early part of June and was referred, admittedly improperly, to the Committee on Education. Being so referred, under the rules of the House that committee, although it was improperly referred, obtained jurisdiction because it was not changed in the regular manner. On the 10th of June this bill was reported to the House of Representatives from the Committee on Education. Succeeding that time, to wit, last Saturday, we passed through the House of Representatives the sundry civil appropriation bill, which carried for this service $4,000,000, in addition to the $2,000,000 that had been previously authorized in the original organic act. And that has gone to the Senate. I do not know whether the Senate has passed this item or not.

Mr. HASTINGS. No; it has not.

Mr. GARRETT. But it does not make any difference whether it has or not. I am trying to get at the practical situation. The estimate, to which my friend from Ohio [Mr. FESS] refers, expressing the desire to have this $6,000,000 must have been sent before the sundry civil bill was reported, because he reported his bill on the 10th of June.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was sent on June 2.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the language of the sundry civil bill under which the $4,000,000 was appropriated. It says:

For the purpose of providing for rehabilitation—

The particular act referred to being approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of February 26, 1919—

including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, printing and binding, etc., of books of reference, periodicals, etc., $4,000,000.

The gentleman will understand that this amount that we are now asking to be appropriated is an amount that would have been paid by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, not by this bureau. This can not be appropriated for the purpose that is included in this bill. We are taking up the duty and obligation of paying and trying to get the money to pay that which otherwise would have been paid by the War Risk Bureau.

Mr. GARRETT. The appropriation; but the appropriation was made, and my recollection is that we appropriated $40,000,000 for the War Risk Bureau.

Mr. TOWNER. This $4,000,000 is for the purpose of this original act.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Ohio agrees that Dr. Prosser or Dr. Munroe thought that all they wanted for all the services, including the enlarged service provided in this connection, was $6,300,000. Is it possible that this great service will take only $3,000,000?

Mr. TOWNER. Let me ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me ask the gentleman from Iowa a question. He said in his speech a short time ago that this $4,000,000 was for the same purpose as this $6,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Upon what fact was that statement made?

Mr. GOOD. I said that the estimate of Dr. Prosser was for $6,000,000 and was for the entire service.

Mr. TOWNER. You are going to determine upon the language of some gentleman before the committee rather than upon the law as it now stands?

Mr. GOOD. Well, this man is a great educator, and he did not ask for any increase that he did not think was needed.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa in my time, did the Committee on Education have before it any representatives of this bureau?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Did the Committee on Education have before them anyone of whom they inquired about the estimates submitted in the letter of Dr. Prosser?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say this to the gentleman, that the only information the committee had before it was the statement made by the representative of the Vocational Board, that this had been considered jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury, acting for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and the Vocational Board, and that they had agreed that this amount of $6,300,000 would be necessary to take care of the payments that otherwise would have been made by the War Risk Bureau and now would be paid by the Vocational Board.

Mr. GARRETT. That was before the sundry civil bill passed. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] if he is aware that any one single cent of the $4,000,000 carried in the sundry civil bill can be used for the purposes of this act? This bill was not a law at that time. This is an entirely different service than what was represented or spoken of before the committee on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not understand it that way.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the sundry civil bill has not been reported out of the Senate, and if it is so important to do this the natural and orderly way to proceed would be to go to the Senate after this bill passes and have the sundry civil bill enlarged.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say this, that no one need be at all afraid, in my opinion, that this service is going to suffer in any way.

There is no doubt but that this Congress will appropriate all the money that is necessary for this purpose. What I am interested in is that it shall not, in an irregular way—in a way admittedly irregular—appropriate moneys that are not necessary. Congress will take care of this service. No one need have any doubt about that. No one can have any doubt about that. And why take this extraordinary course of irregularly appropriating money as to the necessity for which we have absolutely no evidence before us from any committee at all?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am getting confused as to the facts of this situation. Now, we have heretofore actually given this Vocational Board $2,000,000. The other day we passed an item in the sundry civil bill of $4,000,000 for their benefit, and here is an authorization of $6,000,000. Is this $6,000,000 for the same purpose as the $2,000,000 already given and the $4,000,000 contained in the sundry civil bill, or is this in addition to those two sums aggregating $6,000,000?

Mr. GARRETT. My impression was that this would be an addition; that under the language of this act this would be an addition to the funds already appropriated and partially appropriated, so far as the House is concerned, for this service, which, added together, would make $12,000,000 in all. That is my impression about it. If I am in error about it I stand ready to be corrected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. In a moment. I do not want it to be understood that in taking the floor on this matter I am antagonistic to this service. There is no one in Congress who is antagonistic to this service. You will find no one who is antagonistic to it. But it is important that we do these things in a regular and proper way; that we shall have the estimates sent to Congress; and that they shall go to the proper committee and that we have the proper examination made in regard to it before we take the responsibility of appropriating the funds of this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it seems to me that there is some unnecessary confusion with reference to the facts involved in the appropriation carried by this bill. I call the attention of the committee, and particularly the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], because he has raised the inquiry, to the fact that the pending bill does not attempt to repeal or modify the entire provisions of the original rehabilitation act, but it applies only to section 2 of that act.

Now, what is section 2 of the original act? It is a section providing that soldiers who are entitled to compensation as ascertained by the War Risk Bureau shall be entitled to this vocational training. Section 8—and I call the attention of the gentlemen of the committee and particularly the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to it—section 8 of the original bill is still intact, and section 8 provides for all the administrative features of this whole rehabilitation scheme, so that as a matter of proper and legitimate construction the appropriation made in the sundry civil bill of $4,000,000 applies to the original administrative features of the bill, and the amount sought to be appropriated by this bill is an additional amount of $6,000,000, estimated to be made up of the items incident to retraining 7,000 soldiers at a cost of $75 a month each.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In just a moment. So that there is really no occasion for any confusion, and I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is patently in error—he is bound to be in error—as to the basis of the facts and estimates when he makes the assertion that the highest estimate ever made for the whole business involved only $6,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Six million three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When was that made?

Mr. GOOD. That is the highest estimate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When was that made? That is what I am asking.

Mr. GOOD. I can not give the exact date.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly. That accounts for the confusion.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know whether it was the 21st of May or the 21st of June, but I do know it was made here very recently.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. That had reference to general expenses provided for by section 8 of the original act. I challenge the gentleman to produce the hearings on that. The question involved in this bill is a separate and new item, involving the expenditure of an estimate of $6,000,000 to pay the $75 per month estimated by the board.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For a brief question.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman mean to tell this House that anybody down at the rehabilitation board estimates that the entire service next year will cost $12,300,000?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think not; but I think it is estimated that it will cost $6,000,000. If we pass this bill it will be really withdrawn from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. GOOD. The hearings show that it will cost nothing like that amount.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will read the report—his own report—he will see that this $6,300,000 is for the entire service.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Read it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will read it:

> It is estimated that the average number of men in training during the fiscal year 1919 and 1920 will be 7,000. At the rate of $75 a month, the support of these men will require $525,000 per month, or $6,300,000 for the year. Hence the request for the appropriation.

That covers the entire service.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That confirms what I said. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TINCHER. As I understand, the general appropriation bill that has already passed this House carried $4,000,000, and out of that $4,000,000 they could use money for administrative expenses?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Now, this bill carries $6,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It amends section 2 of the original act.

Mr. TINCHER. This provides "for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto." I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that language should be taken from the bill and this $6,000,000 appropriated for the purpose you say it is, if there is $4,000,000 subject to use for administrative expenses in the other bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That question has been answered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. It involves the good or bad judgment, under the circumstances, of amending this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is some confusion in the minds of Members. My recollection of the history of this is briefly this: They came before the Committee on Appropriations and wanted $6,300,000, according to my recollection, but it was estimated that up until the 1st of July they could not use even the $2,000,000 which had been appropriated. We gave them, then, $2,000,000. When the regular sundry civil bill was being made up we gave them the balance, $4,000,000, lacking only $300,000 of giving them the maximum amount asked for to carry them through the next fiscal year. Now, it is not contended by anyone that it will cost anything like $2,000,000 to pay the administrative expenses. If so, there will be some wildly extravagant salaries paid and an administration built up down there which will curse us.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. In one moment. Now, there are not many of these soldiers. They are going to be kept in the hospitals until the surgeons and physicians find they have done all that can be done in a surgical and medical way for them. Then after they are classified and released they can be taken charge of and this fund used for the purpose of sending them to various institutions where they can be fitted for work. There is no institution to be established. This is simply for the purpose of enabling these young men to get $75 instead of $60, or if married $125 instead of $85, according to my recollection. Now, the purpose of this bill is to increase the amount given to each soldier to pay his expenses and tuition. It is not contended by anyone, and these gentlemen will be unable to find any estimate anywhere, that any department ever asked Congress to give them $12,000,000, but that is exactly what you will do, for the identical service is provided for in both of these propositions.

Mr. SEARS. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. SEARS. Section 8 limits the expenditure for these purposes, and this does not change section 8 at all. So this money would not be expended except as provided in section 8 of the bill passed last year, which is now the law.

Mr. SISSON. As a matter of fact the purpose of this bill is mainly to increase the amount paid to the soldiers.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I find on page 26 of the hearings before the joint committee the statement of Dr. Prosser, who says:

> This bill proposes $2,000,000 for carrying on the work. I am quite satisfied, after going over the figures with Mr. KREIDER, that $2,000,000 is a safe figure for the first year under this measure.

And yet the bill will give $6,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the date of that?

Mr. GOOD. May 30, 1918.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, 1918. That was the original act.

Mr. GOOD. That is the hearing that has been furnished me on this matter.

Mr. SISSON. Now, gentlemen, let us keep our heads cool and let us not permit our enthusiasm on the floor to lead us to make any pretension that there is anybody in this House who is not disposed to do what is necessary to rehabilitate these soldiers and give them proper education and training.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Is not this bill necessary for another thing—to suspend the operation of compensation to the soldier while he is getting this $75 a month?

Mr. SISSON. That may be necessary. I am not controverting the good purposes of the bill. What I am complaining about is that this bill should carry, in addition to the $6,000,000, or whatever has been appropriated, another appropriation of $6,000,000, because Congress will be in session in December, and they will have had only six months within which to spend the $4,000,000, and whatever is necessary can be taken care of in an urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say that I was mistaken a few moments ago in reading the hearing, for I find that the hearing I was reading from was the hearing of last year and not this year's hearings. I sent to the Committee on Education to get the hearings, and that was what was sent me. I am now told—if I am mistaken I want to be corrected—that this committee has reported out a bill carrying an appropriation of $6,000,000, and that there has been no printed hearing for the information of the membership of this House on this subject, an unheard of proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope that in the time I have at my disposal I shall be able to state clearly and directly the facts as they appear to me and that I shall not be interrupted.

I have sat here and tried to absorb both sides of the question. It seems to reduce itself to this, that the $4,000,000 appropriation discussed here applies to certain specific things independent and apart from the proposed $6,000,000 appropriation.

The $4,000,000, as I understand it, is for the great mass of our troops—running up to an estimated total of perhaps 50,000 or 60,000—to provide for their retraining to meet the new conditions with which they are beset. To meet these conditions, there was a provision in the war-risk insurance act that when the compensatory status of the crippled men was established, they would then be given a compensatory allowance of a definite amount. By reason of the congestion or by reason of the inefficiency or whatever it may be termed in the War Risk Insurance Bureau, it was found that this provision was not carried out.

It was then ascertained that there were 4,000 crippled men who needed retraining, and while they were waiting to have their status determined by the War Risk Insurance Bureau they had to be supported. Now, this bill asks for $6,000,000 for that purpose, and I think that we are agreed that it is simply a question of tweedledee and tweedledum whether it was reported out by the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Education. We are all Americans; we are all earnest, honest men, who want to do right by our brave boys who unselfishly went forward and made the great sacrifice for the preservation not only of our beloved Nation but for the sustaining of liberty and justice throughout the world; to these men who have returned maimed and crippled the responsibility and duty are ours to arrive at a just and generous decision.

The calculation submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury for the War Risk Insurance Bureau and by the Vocational Education Board, and by the concurrence of both the bureaus as to the necessary amount, discloses the fact that the estimated amount of $6,000,000 is urgently needed for the support of the returned crippled soldiers while awaiting retraining.

Much has been said about "the administration incident thereto." My interpretation of this phrase is that if later it is found to be necessary in apportioning and allocating this $6,000,000 any reasonable amount needed for so doing will be used.

This $6,000,000 appropriation is not for the same purpose as the $4,000,000 appropriation. It is absolutely different and apart from it. It is taking the appropriation substantially from the War Risk Insurance Bureau and giving a comparative amount to the Vocational Education Board for immediate benefit of these men.

I can not see, with all due respect, regard, and admiration which I entertain for the Committee on Appropriations and its chairman, where there can be any objection to the passage of the bill now under consideration because it was not reported by that committee. It is simply the great question of tweedledee and tweedledum. We must not confuse this $6,000,000 appropriation with the $4,000,000, because it is another item. It is simply to be turned over or taken from the War Risk Insurance Bureau account and given to the Vocational Education Board, so that it will have the funds in direct control and be made available where it is most needed to carry out the purpose of the rehabilitation act. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGEE. I object.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, both I and every Member of this House want to do the proper thing by the soldiers. We all want to have it done so they will get the immediate benefit of it, but we will not show our devotion to the soldiers by ignoring common business principles and making duplicate appropriations.

The gentleman who has just spoken has said that the services appropriated for in this bill now before us were altogether different from those appropriated for in the sundry civil bill. This bill does not provide for one single additional service to be rendered to these soldiers except to pay them $10 a month more and to pay it before compensation is allowed. It makes no difference in the manner of the training. This bill amends the act of June 27, 1918, and the appropriation made in the sundry civil bill applies to the act of June 27, 1918. Both cover the same subject, and the only possible question that can arise is whether any of the $4,000,000 could be used for paying the ad-

ditional sum provided for in this bill. In my opinion there is no question about that. The $4,000,000 was appropriated for carrying out the purposes of the act of June 27, 1918, and these purposes have not been changed. There is no other or different work to be performed now, notwithstanding all the gentleman from New York has said about some new and different purpose for which the money was to be appropriated.

There is, then, this one solitary difference with reference to the compensation to be paid which controls the amount of money that is to be allowed the soldiers. This may require a little more. Now, then, are they going to exhaust $4,000,000 overnight or in a few weeks or even a few months? If not, there will be plenty of money under the provision already made, and the Appropriations Committee can proceed with the ordinary duties and appropriate the money in an orderly manner.

Are we to proceed in such a manner, to show devotion to the soldiers, that every time we have a bill before us we say what difference does it make how much money we appropriate and whether we duplicate the appropriation? Is the only thing to get the money as fast as possible and appropriate it whether it is needed or not? We can show our appreciation for the services of the soldier better by conserving the resources of the Nation, so that we will be able to perform our duty toward him. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FESS) there were 57 ayes and 54 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. GOOD and Mr. FESS as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 73 ayes and 57 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill——

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. ALMON. I have an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. An amendment having been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, should not that first be disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment pending at this time. The gentleman from Ohio made a motion that the committee rise, and that has preference.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Ohio is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if the gentleman from Ohio moves that the committee rise, it has preference; but if he moves that the committee rise and report the bill, it is not in order.

Mr. GARRETT. The motion of the gentleman from Ohio was that the committee rise and report the bill. A motion simply to rise would be in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the inquiry to have the RECORD straight. I am informed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] sent forward an amendment and was recognized by the Chair and that the amendment was pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is wrong. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] sent forward an amendment at a time when another amendment was pending, and so his amendment was not in order, and the Chair was not aware that he had offered the amendment again.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, of course I am not raising a question of veracity with the Chair, but I was so informed, I will say to the Chair, and I am informed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania understood that he was recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could not have recognized the gentleman for that purpose, because there was an amendment pending at that time, and his amendment would not then have been in order. The Chair will recognize the gentleman now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, what has become of the motion the gentleman from Ohio made?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to amend takes precedence of a motion to rise and report the bill. Therefore the Chair did not entertain that motion, after ascertaining that was the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DARROW: Page 2, line 21, strike out "$75" and insert in lieu thereof "$85," and, on page 2, line 22, strike out "$75" and insert "$105" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DARROW) there were—ayes 34, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "$75" and insert "$80," and, on page 2, line 22, strike out "$75" and insert "$100."

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply increases the amount from $75 to $80 for those who are not married and from $75 to $100 for those with a family or dependents. It is needless to go into an argument, it seems to me, at this late hour of the day to try to show that this is absolutely necessary in order that these men may have an opportunity to live in a fair degree of decency while they avail themselves of the opportunities afforded by this bill. There is no question about a man with dependents being unable to support them properly on the meager amount provided in this bill, and I would rather see too much appropriated than too little; and while the committees are contending over this matter, it would seem to me we ought to get down to the meat of the situation and make it so liberal that everyone who is entitled to it may at least have that which we are trying to give them and which they can not have unless we make the liberal appropriation we are asking for by my amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. I confess that after the emasculation of the bill by the amendment that is adopted some of us have lost interest through the fight that the opponents of the measure have made. Nevertheless, it is not wise to add beyond the estimate made by the board which has charge of it. I hope the bill will not be amended to increase the $75, because the original estimate was $65, and that was increased simply to make sure that there would be sufficient.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee if any investigation was made by the committee to ascertain what the cost of education of these boys would be?

Mr. FESS. The estimate was made by the board, and they reported that it would be $65 per student.

Mr. DOWELL. The committee made no investigation whatever?

Mr. FESS. It made an investigation through the board itself.

Mr. DOWELL. It was just a statement of the board?

Mr. FESS. A statement of the board through their investigation throughout the country.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely raises the amount $5 per month, and the allowance is only during the time he is attending school getting his education. I submit that this extra amount will not furnish to him any luxury. Five dollars per month additional is a small item for this Government to expend for the education of these wounded and disabled soldiers. We expended $30,000,000,000 to win this war. We should now properly care for and educate the disabled soldiers who made this sacrifice to win the war.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will prevail. I do not think that I have any more sympathy in my heart than any other Member of this House. I do not want to appeal to the sympathetic side of this controversy. It is necessary that these men should have a fair living compensation while they are doing this work. God knows that if we are under obligation to anybody in the world we are under obligation to these men and the families who sent them away, and I do not see how it is reasonably possible for the Congress of the United States, which represents 100,000,000 people who are so proud of the great victory that these men have brought to us and who are so anxious to show their feelings and pride in respect to them—how we could for a moment refuse this bagatelle, this increase. It is only a small thing. If we asked that much for the deepening of a river or harbor, there are enough people in this House who would vote for it to pass it. Then why not this?

Mr. PLATT. It is not intended to pay these men a salary to go to school. It is intended to support them.

Mr. CALDWELL. Then let us support them as they ought to be supported.

Mr. PLATT. The original bill provided that they should have their soldier's pay and allowance, and the compensation furnished by the War Risk Bureau. We have more than doubled that.

Mr. CALDWELL. Let us double it again, if necessary. There is no reason that any man may offer in the world why these men should not have not only a fair, but a liberal, allowance, and I do not think that $5 is enough for a man to say we should stop here in this thing. We all agree it should be as much as is set out in the bill. Now, we ask a little bit more, because there are some of us here who think they are entitled to just a little bit more. Let us let them have it. If there is doubt, resolve the doubt in favor of the boy.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I will.

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact this will be only for a few years and will be paid only to a limited number.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It is far less to a soldier who has a wife and one child than the clerks in our office receive, to whose pay we added $240 the other day, and I am in favor of the gentleman's motion, especially because it is temporary in a way. The committee has seen fit to raise this from $65 to $75, and we are only asked by this amendment to add $5 more now, and one reason I interrupted was because I had four months' experience with this work before coming to Washington. In my humble judgment this increase ought to be granted, and instead of being raised from $65 to $75 it ought to have been made at least $85.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman has made a much better speech than I could, and I thank him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the Chair was in doubt.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 62, noes 59.

Mr. BLACK. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas demands tellers. Fourteen gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out the following words: "and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the sum authorized herein shall be expended for any purpose except for the maintenance and support of the soldier while in training and for support of persons dependent upon him."

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill and will vote for it whether my amendment is adopted or not. It is admitted that the $4,000,000 appropriation for the Federal Vocational Board carried in the sundry civil bill, which passed the House a few days ago, is more than sufficient to cover all administrative expenses of the bureau and the vocational training schools.

It is admitted that the only purpose and necessity for the appropriation carried in this bill is for the maintenance and support of the crippled and disabled soldiers while in training and for the support and maintenance of persons dependent upon them.

The charge has been repeatedly made during the debate today, and not denied, that there have been more employees in this department than were necessary and that larger salaries have been paid than should have been. In other words, it has been charged that there have been waste and extravagance. The $4,000,000 carried in the sundry civil bill places a limitation on the number of employees and the salary to be paid hereafter. The effect of this amendment is simply to see to it that the money appropriated in this bill shall be used solely for the support and maintenance of the soldiers while in training and for the support and maintenance of their dependents. For that reason it would be in the interest of these schools and also in the interest of the soldiers in training if my amendment is agreed to. It simply guarantees that the soldier in training shall get the benefits of the appropriation and prevent it from being used in the payment of large and unnecessary salaries of employees of the department.

I voted against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] changing this to an authorization instead of an appropriation for the reason that I feared the delay resulting therefrom in securing necessary funds for these schools would cause delay in giving the soldiers the training which they should receive. I am in favor of making an immediate appropriation of the $6,000,000 provided for in this bill and authorizing the Federal Vocational Board to use whatever amount of it in their adjustment is necessary to give all of the soldiers entitled to this instruction its immediate benefits.

During the war I voted for and supported every measure necessary to raise the men and money with which to prosecute and win the war. I gladly supported every measure to give the soldiers all of the comforts possible while in the service. I supported the war-risk insurance bill and the vocational education bill. I think that our soldiers were entitled to the benefits of all of the laws which were passed in their behalf.

It now appears that there are many soldiers who received injuries and contracted diseases which disqualify them from discharging the duties for which they were suited and accustomed prior to their entrance into the service. We should admit them to these vocational training schools and prepare them for some vocation for which their present physical condition is suited and give them and their dependents maintenance and support while in training. This was the purpose of the vocational education law. I think the provisions of this bill to authorize the Federal board to determine who is entitled to admission to these schools is very much better than the original bill, which placed this in the hands of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

The board is in a position to determine better than anyone else who is entitled to this training. It is their business to give the instruction, and hence they are in better position to determine who is entitled to admission and the kind and character of training best in each case.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman realize that this paragraph of the bill has been amended so as to become an authorization instead of an appropriation?

Mr. ALMON. My amendment says "sum authorized herein."

Mr. CARTER. Would not that be a matter we could leave to the House at a future time when we come to make the appropriation as to whether it should be spent for administrative purposes or not?

Mr. ALMON. This is a matter for the House to determine whether they shall put this limitation on this authorization now or leave it to the Committee on Appropriations.

The American soldiers played their part during the World War with such distinguished efficiency and bravery as to not only reflect great credit upon themselves and their country but to win the admiration of the world. We committed to them the flag of the Republic, and they brought it back without a stain upon its folds. Many of them made the supreme sacrifice and left to this country a proud heritage of a noble sacrifice. They served in an Army that never retreated, and their deeds will live in the hearts and memory and gratitude of their countrymen. The American soldier saved the situation on the battle fields of France. They turned the tide which resulted in the defeat of the German Army.

Many of our soldiers were crippled and injured, and we owe it to them and to their dependents to care for them and give them all of the training and education that will be helpful to them through life. Such is the purpose of this bill. I trust and believe that it will pass this House without a dissenting vote. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, it appears that every Member who speaks on this bill prefaces his remarks by saying that he is in favor of it. Nobody wants to be known as being in opposition to it, and yet he immediately proceeds to offer amendments to emasculate it. A man's statement and his conduct must always be judged together. [Applause.] We enlarge upon the fact that reeducation is being had by 3,000 now, with 4,000 more in waiting, already examined, and possibly 7,000 more not yet examined, and everybody must see that there must be more teachers as the number increases. The bill that we have offered has been based upon the cost to the Government of the pupils supported, and while it is true that the amendment which was put in awhile ago seriously emasculated the bill, and it would not make very much difference now whether we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama or not, yet in view of the fact that I shall demand a separate vote in the House on the amendment which emasculated the bill, I am still hopeful that we may be able to rescind what was done a moment ago and put this bill in a position that makes it workable, and for that reason I hope this amendment will not be passed, but, on the other hand, that with the enlargement of the teaching force to care for the increased number provided for in this bill, if they see the necessity of the employment of new teachers, it will be permitted to be done.

Mr. ALMON. If the gentleman will permit, I want to say this: I offered this on the theory that the $4,000,000 appropriated through the sundry civil bill was ample and sufficient to employ all the instructors and pay all the expenses except maintenance.

Mr. FESS. That is to be administered under the War Risk Insurance Bureau's interpretation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. FESS. We here propose to do that work under the Vocational Education Board, and I want the membership of this House to know what they have done in this bill by striking out the appropriation and by putting an authorization in, which means, as most everybody knows, that nothing will be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on this amendment has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] has given notice that he expects to ask for a separate vote on striking out the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. If the motion should prevail and that amendment should be stricken out, there is all the more reason then why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON] should be adopted. I think the gentleman from Ohio is taking the matter too seriously when he says that this measure has been emasculated. It has not been injured at all. It has been safeguarded by the amendment made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], so that the purpose and intent of the measure will be more nearly carried out. And I also think even if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa remains in the bill after a separate vote, there is still reason why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON] should also remain. It has been developed during the course of the investigation concerning this vocational training business that this bureau has been accused of paying exhorbitant salaries, to one man $5,000, who was getting a like amount from another source, an extraordinary salary for very small service, and that is the reason why in the appropriation bill endeavor was made to protect the salary list. I think it should be fixed in this bill, for if it is not this bill will be passed after that other bill was passed, and it will be a repeal of that measure so far as the salaries are concerned, and it will result in the bureau having the absolute right to fix any salary they want and to make the salaries as high as they desire to have them. Now, in my opinion, the gentlemen of the Committee on Education should not object to this amendment being adopted, because I believe they are in accord with the idea that the sum fixed by the law heretofore with reference to these salaries should remain, and if that be their attitude there can come no harm to this bill by adopting the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON], because it will make certain under this clause providing for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto there will be no opportunity for the enlargement of these salaries. That was the purpose of making a fixed measurement of what these salaries should be, limiting a number at a certain figure and a certain other number at another figure. It is very essential, therefore, if the purposes of this bill are to be carried out and these boys receive the vocational training and receive provision for upkeep and living during this training, that the money shall not be squandered, as it was being squandered, by paying large salaries for small service. I believe the amendment should obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ALMON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 17, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill as amended to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. DARROW. To ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion to rise was agreed to; and Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5225 and had directed him to report back the bill S. 1213 in lieu thereof, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill H. R. 3157, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The conference report is ordered to be printed in the RECORD under the rules.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the report.

RETURN OF WIRE SYSTEMS TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to file a conference report on the bill S. 120, providing for the wire systems, for printing in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin submits the conference report on the bill S. 120, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled, "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise and take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved June 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The conference report is ordered to be printed in the RECORD under the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the conference report.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I desire a separate vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio demands a separate vote on the Good amendment. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments in gross. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withdraw it. I misunderstood the situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the Good amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 3, line 14, after the word "hereby," insert "authorized to be."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FESS and Mr. BANKHEAD demanded the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the amendment will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I understand this is the Good amendment we are voting on now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Good amendment. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 117, nays 208, answered "present" 3, not voting 102, as follows:

YEAS—117.

Ackerman	Gandy	Lehlbach	Sisson
Alexander	Gard	McAndrews	Small
Anderson	Garner	McFadden	Snell
Andrews, Md.	Garrett	McKenzie	Snyder
Ashbrook	Good	McKinley	Stedman
Ayres	Gould	McLaughlin, Mich.	Strong, Kans.
Barbour	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Summers, Wash.
Black	Green, Iowa	Magee	Sumners, Tex.
Bland, Ind.	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Thomas
Box	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Tincher
Browning	Hamilton	Michener	Upshaw
Brumbaugh	Hardy, Tex.	Mondell	Venable
Byrnes, S. C.	Hastings	Montague	Volstead
Byrns, Tenn.	Haugen	Moore, Pa.	Walsh
Cannon	Hays	Moore, Va.	Wason
Carter	Hernandez	Mott	Watson, Pa.
Christopherson	Hersey	Mudd	Watson, Va.
Coady	Hicks	Olney	Webb
Collier	Hoch	Overstreet	Welling
Connally	Holland	Park	Welty
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Peters	White, Me.
Curry, Calif.	Huddleston	Radcliffe	Wilson, La.
Dale	Humphreys	Rainey, H. T.	Wood, Ind.
Davey	Ireland	Ramsey	Woods, Va.
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Miss.	Ramseyer	Wright
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy, Iowa	Rayburn	Young, N. Dak.
Denison	Kettner	Romjue	Young, Tex.
Doughton	Kitchin	Saunders, Va.	
Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Schall	
French	Lee, Ga.	Shreve	

NAYS—208.

Almon	Esch	LaGuardia	Reed, W. Va.
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Mont.	Lampert	Rhodes
Aswell	Evans, Nev.	Langley	Ricketts
Babka	Ferris	Lanham	Riddick
Bankhead	Fess	Lankford	Riordan
Barkley	Fields	Layton	Robinson, N. C.
Bee	Fisher	Lazaro	Robsion, Ky.
Begg	Fitzgerald	Lea, Calif.	Rodenberg
Benham	Focht	Little	Rogers
Bland, Mo.	Foster	Lonergan	Rose
Blanton	Frear	Luce	Rouse
Boies	Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Rowe
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	Luhring	Sanders, Ind.
Brand	Gallagher	McDuffie	Sanders, La.
Briggs	Ganly	McKeown	Sanders, N. Y.
Brinson	Godwin, N. C.	McKiniry	Scott
Brooks, Ill.	Goodwin, Ark.	McLane	Sears
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sells
Burke	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Siegel
Butler	Griest	MacCrate	Sims
Caldwell	Griffin	MacGregor	Sinnott
Campbell, Kans.	Hadley	Mays	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Colo.	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Candler	Hawley	Miller	Steele
Caraway	Hayden	Minahan, N. J.	Stephens, Ohio
Carew	Hersman	Monahan, Wis.	Stevenson
Casey	Hickey	Moon	Stiness
Chindblom	Hill	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Howard	Moores, Ind.	Sweet
Classon	Hudspeth	Morgan	Taylor, Ark.
Cleary	Hulings	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Cole	Hull, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Costello	Hull, Tenn.	Newton, Mo.	Temple
Crago	Husted	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson, Ohio
Crisp	Igoe	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson, Okla.
Crowther	Jacoway	Nolan	Tillman
Cullen	James	O'Connell	Tilson
Dallinger	Jefferis	O'Connor	Timberlake
Darrow	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ogden	Towner
Dent	Johnson, Wash.	Oldfield	Vaile
Dewalt	Jones, Pa.	Osborne	Vestal
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones, Tex.	Parker	Vinson
Dickinson, Iowa	Juul	Parrish	Weaver
Donovan	Kearns	Pell	Webster
Dooling	Kelley, Mich.	Platt	Whaley
Doremus	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Wheeler
Dowell	Kendall	Ragsdale	White, Kans.
Drane	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, J. W.	Williams
Dunbar	Kincheloe	Raker	Wilson, Pa.
Dyer	Kinkaid	Randall, Calif.	Wingo
Echols	Kleczka	Randall, Wis.	Yates
Ellsworth	Kreider	Reber	Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Blackmon	Harrison	Heflin

NOT VOTING—102.

Anthony	Dupré	Kahn	Murphy
Bacharach	Eagan	Kiess	Neely
Baer	Eagle	King	Newton, Minn.
Bell	Edmonds	Knutson	Oliver
Benson	Elliott	Larsen	Padgett
Bland, Va.	Elston	Lesher	Paige
Booher	Emerson	Lever	Phelan
Britten	Fairfield	Linthicum	Porter
Browne	Flood	Longworth	Pou
Buchanan	Fordney	McArthur	Purnell
Burdick	Freeman	McClintic	Reavis
Burroughs	Gallivan	McCulloch	Reed, N. Y.
Cantrill	Garland	McGlennon	Rowan
Carss	Glynn	Maher	Rubey
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	Major	Rucker
Cooper	Goodall	Mann	Sabath
Copley	Hamill	Mansfield	Sanford
Cramton	Haskell	Mason	Scully
Dempsey	Hutchinson	Merritt	Sherwood
Dominick	Johnson, Ky.	Mooney	Sinclair
Dunn	Johnston, N. Y.	Morin	Slemp
Smith, Ill.	Stephens, Miss.	Voigt	Winslow
Smith, N. Y.	Sullivan	Walters	Wise
Smithwick	Tinkham	Ward	Woodyard
Steagall	Treadway	Watkins	
Steenerson	Vare	Wilson, Ill.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. BUCHANAN.
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.
Mr. HASKELL with Mr. RUBEY.
Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.
Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. COOPER with Mr. CARSS.
Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. REAVIS with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. SLEMP with Mr. BLAND of Virginia.
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. BENSON.
Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. VARE with Mr. MAJOR.
Mr. WALTERS with Mr. MCGLENNON.
Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. DOMINICK.
Mr. BAER with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. STEAGALL.
Mr. BROWNE with Mr. SMITHWICK.
Mr. BURDICK with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. WARD with Mr. DUPRÉ.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. DUNN with Mr. RUCKER.
Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. POU.
Mr. ELSTON with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. EMERSON with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. OLIVER.
Mr. GARLAND with Mr. MANSFIELD.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. LINTHICUM.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. LEVER.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. LESHER.
Mr. KING with Mr. LARSEN.
Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. MASON with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. MERRITT with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. CARSS.

Until Tuesday, July 6:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.

Until July 16:

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas). The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill, with instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DENISON. No; I am not opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any gentleman opposed to the bill who desires to submit a motion to recommit? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] to present his motion to recommit.

Mr. DENISON. I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education to report the same back forthwith, with the following amendment:

On page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit. The proposition involved is the exact amendment that was voted down in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro temopre. The point of order is overruled. The House has not acted upon the amendment.

Mr. TILSON. I ask that the motion to recommit be reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENISON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education, with instructions to that committee to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "and for defraying the administrative expenses incident thereto."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. MADDEN. Is that motion debatable? The previous question has not been ordered on that motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not debatable. The previous question has been ordered on the bill and amendments to the final passage. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] to recommit the bill with instructions.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. DENISON) there were—ayes 29, noes 104.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. FESS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bill H. R. 5225, of a similar tenor, be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that a rather peculiar procedure was indulged in with regard to this bill. The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the House bill. While in Committee of the Whole, by unanimous consent, the Senate bill was substituted for the House bill. I did not chance to be in the Chamber at the time, but I understand the Chairman, on the question being raised, held that it could be done. I simply wish to say, with all due deference to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, that I do not agree with that holding. I do not wish this to be taken as a precedent.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The point of order was not raised or ruled upon; it was by unanimous consent. The matter was mentioned, but there was no objection made.

Mr. GARRETT. I was not in the Chamber at the time. Of course, anyone who desired to raise the point of order when the committee rose and the House took up the consideration again could have raised it. I had no desire to do that, because I am not opposed to the bill, and I did not want to delay its passage. All I make the statement for is that it shall not be taken as a precedent in the future.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to add that I think the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from Connecticut, is incorrect in one statement. When the request was made to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill I did not intend to make a point of order against that procedure, but I rose on a question of parliamentary inquiry, and asked the Chairman whether or not it was in order to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill in the Committee of the Whole without going back into the House. If the Chairman had answered in the negative, I would have made a point of order against the procedure.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, I desire to say a word in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee. On the facts as they have been stated the action taken in the committee and the ruling of the Chairman was correct. It was in order by unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill so far as the Committee of the Whole was concerned, but I agree with the conclusions of the gentleman from Tennessee that this action would be subject to a point of order when the Senate bill was reported to the House. So far as the committee was concerned, it was competent to do what was done in that body by unanimous consent.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Virginia has stated precisely what took place.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Hence upon the facts as stated, everything that occurred in the committee was in order, and the substitution of the Senate bill for the House bill by unanimous consent was competent and parliamentary procedure.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes to-morrow after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. Reserving the right to object, to-morrow is set apart for the consideration of the water-power bill, conference reports, and other privileged matters. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the floor.

Mr. LANGLEY. Reserving the right to object, upon what subject does the gentleman from North Carolina intend to advise the House?

Mr. KITCHIN. I read a statement in the press by the gentleman from Wyoming, the majority leader, with respect to a billion and a half dollars saved by the Republican House at this session. I would like to correct the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to-morrow, and show how much saving has been effected and how little. I desire to address myself to the statement issued by the majority leader with respect to the alleged reduction.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask permission to address the House to-morrow morning for 20 minutes after the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, there are two conference reports before the House which should be considered in the morning. I am sure neither of the gentlemen desires to speak until after the conference reports have been disposed of. Following that, the water-power bill will be taken up, and I assume there will be some time in general debate in connection with the bill, and it has occurred to me that the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Pennsylvania might both arrange to speak in general debate on the water-power bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have understood that general debate on the water-power bill would be limited to the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Personally, I have no objection to the gentlemen having time after the conference reports are disposed of, but not to interfere with them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The conference reports are on the Speaker's table.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be glad to have the gentleman from North Carolina emphasize our economy up to this time.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] be granted 20 minutes in which to address the House at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] may address the House for 20 minutes, not to interfere with the consideration of conference reports. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to lay the bill H. R. 5225 on the table?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRANE, for June 26, on account of important business.

To Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin, for 10 days, on account of the death of a member of his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 26, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, calling attention to the necessity of an appropriation to comply with the House resolution 67 (H. Doc. No. 135) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4630) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkan-

sas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in said county and State, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 65), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4631) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Blackman Point, in said county and State, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 66), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWEET, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6450) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914," as amended, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 69), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FULLER of Illinois, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills of the House, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 6639) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, accompanied by a report (No. 67), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6263) granting a pension to Irwin R. Troxell, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6638) to repeal sections 630, 900, 901, 902, 905, and 907 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6639) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. WELLING: A bill (H. R. 6640) providing for a reclamation project on the Strawberry River, Duchesne County, Utah, to be know as the Castle Peak reclamation project; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6641) providing for a reclamation project on Price River, Utah; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6642) to amend sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes, prescribing the method of obtaining patent to mining claims; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6643) providing for a reclamation project on Green and Grand Rivers, in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6644) to establish the Zion national park in the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6645) for the regulation and improvement of grazing on the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6646) to cede unreserved public lands to the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 6647) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Attica, Harper County, Kans., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 6648) donating a captured cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Wheeling, Ohio County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 6649) to create a department of public works and define its powers and duties; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6650) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Tyler, Smith County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6651) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Henderson, Rusk County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6652) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Canton, Van Zandt County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6653) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Kaufman, Kaufman County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6654) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Quitman, Wood County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Gilmer, Upshur County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6656) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Longview, Gregg County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6657) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Athens, Henderson County, Tex., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 6658) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of quicksilver and ores or compounds of mercury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 6659) fixing the compensation of United States inspectors of customs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6660) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Bruneau, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 6661) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Helena, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Harrisburg, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Forrest City, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6664) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Earl, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6665) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Corning, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6666) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Blytheville, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6667) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Wynne, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6668) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Rector, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6669) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Piggott, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6670) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Paragould, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Osceola, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Marvell, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Marmaduke, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Marked Tree, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Marion, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6676) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Marianna, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6677) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Luxora, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6678) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Leachville, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6679) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Lake City, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6680) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 6681) for the opening and settlement of a part of the Crow Indian Reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 6682) to define the status of and to remove the restrictions from certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6683) granting the consent of Congress for an exchange of lands heretofore granted the State of Washington for the purposes of a university in said State for an area of lands of equal value, to be chosen from lands heretofore granted the State of Washington for the support of common schools in said State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6684) to provide employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces and to encourage the development of the agricultural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6685) to permit the wearing of United States uniforms by honorably discharged officers, soldiers, sailors, or marines wounded in line of duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6686) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Hampton, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6687) to amend section 2 of the act approved September 8, 1916, relating to pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 6688) relative to retirement of officers of the National Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6689) for the purpose of encouraging home ownership and the building of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6690) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Mankato, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 6691) to provide for the enforcement of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 6692) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River, at or near Forsyth, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 134) authorizing two additional clerks for the office of disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 135) requesting the Postmaster General to furnish to the House information concerning the loss of mail by fire in an aeroplane; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 136) providing for an investigation by the Committee on Ways and Means as to revenue on mixed flour; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 137) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 138) authorizing additional messengers in the House post office; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WELLING: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease to the United States Fuel Co. certain lands in Carbon County, State of Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) extending to members of the medical advisory boards, members and associate members of the legal advisory boards, members of the local and district boards, and Government appeal agents the thanks of Congress for their services in administering the selective-service law; and also authorizing the Secretary of War to have suitable medals made from captured German cannon and presented to each of such officials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, urging the enactment of legislation granting at least three months' full pay in addition to their regular compensation to each soldier, sailor, and marine who served in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Memorials from the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, petitioning the National Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for the operation of Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts favoring the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULINGS: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania favoring establishment of a national system of highways, etc.; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6693) granting a pension to David U. Denind; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 6694) granting an increase of pension to Edward Schrum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6695) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6696) granting a pension to Charles T. Pickens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 6697) to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 6698) for the relief of Ivy L. Merrill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 6699) granting a pension to Mary A. Watts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6700) granting a pension to Margaret Gress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) granting an increase of pension to Catharine MaConaughay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6702) granting a pension to Jane P. Hoyt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6703) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Waugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6704) granting a pension to Isadora J. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6705) granting a pension to Luella M. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6706) granting a pension to Charles H. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6707) to correct the military record of Edward C. Jacobs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6708) for the relief of Harry E. Fiske; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) for the relief of the widow of Walter E. Spicer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) for the relief of Francis M. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6711) granting an increase of pension to George G. Spurr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 6712) granting a pension to Matilda Lovey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension to Edward Hinman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 6714) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Brower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6715) for the relief of Edward B. Fox, administrator of the last surviving partner of the firm of Child, Pratt & Fox; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6716) for the relief of George H. Montgomery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6717) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Charles Johnson and his wife, Kate Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 6718) granting a pension to Henry Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6719) granting an increase of pension to William Cunagim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6720) granting an increase of pension to Edward Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6721) for the relief of Revilow N. Spohn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6722) for the relief of Julius Zanone; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 6723) granting a pension to William E. Warren; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6724) granting a pension to Jesse Callahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6725) granting a pension to William H. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6726) granting an increase of pension to Taylor Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6727) granting a pension to Bascom M. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6728) granting a pension to Blain Pedago; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6729) granting a pension to Sarah Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6730) granting a pension to Robert Strong; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6731) for the relief of Lawrence J. Kessinger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6732) granting a pension to Mark T. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6733) granting a pension to William A. Waggoner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6734) granting a pension to George W. Willets; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 6735) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Patrick McMahon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6736) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to H. Allen Buie, Rayville, La., certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Mrs. G. Kirk Dixon, Mrs. John Weaver, Mrs. Frank Jones, and residents of Fort Smith, Ark., and representatives of the first district of Arkansas, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against any repeal or weakening on prohibition laws, but safeguard the laws we have; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Swedish Baptist New York Conference, embracing the States of New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, assembled at Arlington, N. J., approving the passage of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution insuring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of St. Brendan Society, Boston, Mass., requesting recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of J. P. Bowman and others, of San Antonio, Tex., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of McElroy's drug store and others, of San Antonio, Tex., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committeee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Empire Fountain Co. and others, of San Antonio, Tex., for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of Thawville, Danville, and other towns in Illinois, asking repeal of taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of board of aldermen of New York, for self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of West Point, Platte Center, and Bancroft, Nebr., to repeal the taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of citizens of Boston, Cambridge, and many other towns of Massachusetts, protesting against the taxes on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of St. Brendan Society, Boston, Mass., requesting recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Boston Musicians' Protective Association, Local No. 9, A. F. of M., indorsing and urging United States Senate to adopt the league of nations as part of the treaty of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of 100 citizens of Rockford and 75 citizens of Streator, Ill., for the repeal of all taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of many hundred citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging repeal of taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Memorial of Civil War revenue cotton-tax claimants, represented by Cornelius J. Jones, Muskogee, Okla., chief counsel, for authority to try their claim in Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of First Methodist Church of West Plains, Mo., against repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ladies' Aid Society of the Presbyterian Church of Crane, Mo., against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of Albert Johnson, Chadron, Nebr., and 71 other residents of Chadron and vicinity, asking for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of M. E. Silvernail and 104 other residents of Gibbon, Nebr., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fred W. Johansen and 52 other residents of Hay Springs, Nebr., and vicinity, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ira Hollingsworth and 21 other residents of Burton, Nebr., and vicinity, requesting the repeal of the so-called "stamp tax" on family medicines, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Committee of Friends of Irish Liberty and citizens of Greeley, Nebr., demanding the peace conference at Paris to recognize the new Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, list of residents of the sixth congressional district of Nebraska, who petition for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, list of residents of the sixth congressional district of Nebraska, who petition for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of several hundred citizens of Jersey City, N. J., for repeal of tax on soda water, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of numerous citizens from the counties of Butler, Gage, Saline, York, and Fillmore, of the fourth congressional district, urging the repeal of luxury taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring repeal of luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of National Confectioners' Association of United States, for the repeal of excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary M. Mattingly, Helen R. Langdale, Alma M. Happ, of archdiocesan union of sodalities, against the Smith educational bill, S. 4987, as un-American; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., New York City, referring to the proposed long-and-short-haul amendment to section 4 of interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PELL: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Vickery, Atkins & Torrey, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the tax on fine art; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. Clara J. Bevers, of Oleta, Calif., protesting against the sale of the United States merchant fleet, and also protesting against the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the United States Independent Telephone Association, asking that Federal rates be continued for at least one year or until determination is reached; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of California Associated Olive Growers (Inc.), indorsing legislation making it clearly lawful for farm organizations to operate; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of M. C. Burritt, director of extension, New York State College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y., asking for increased appropriation for extension work in that State; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of department of vocational education of California, Sacramento, Calif., indorsing House bill 3143; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Jacob Nieto, San Francisco, containing copy of resolutions adopted by mass meeting held in the city of San Francisco, deprecating the pogroms against Jews in Poland, Roumania, and other European countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of California Bean Growers' Association, of Stockton, Calif., indorsing legislation making it clearly lawful for farm organizations to operate; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif., urging the return to agricultural districts of labor that was taken to the industrial centers during the war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Young L. Park, representative of the United Asiatic Society, setting forth the condition of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Grant Fee, general contractor, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing and asking support of House bill 2370; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the United War Work Campaign (Inc.), asking support of legislation authorizing the Federal banks to contribute to the United War Work Campaign; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing a bill to amend the naturalization act of June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Richter-McKinnon Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War veterans, petitioning for an increase in the base pay of permanently appointed chief petty officers of the United States Navy to $125 a month; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Pasadena Ice Co., Pasadena, Calif., protesting against the repeal of the zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of California Corrugated Culvert Co., West Berkeley, Calif., protesting against the repeal of the zone system of increased postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing the giving of free textbooks to foreign-born students who are studying for citizenship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Mrs. E. W. Ferris and Mrs. O. M. Hersey, of Westwood, Calif., indorsing war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fish and Game Commission of California, indorsing appropriations in the sundry civil bill for the Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of numerous citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging the immediate repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSE: Petition of citizens of Johnstown, Pa., and vicinity, asking for the repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of National Confectioners' Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring repeal of 5 per cent excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary M. Mattingly, Helen R. Langdale, and Alma M. Happ, of archdiocesan union of sodalities, Washington, D. C., against the Smith educational bill (S. 4987); to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Jugo-Slav Information Bureau, New York City, for justice in the Italo-Jugo-Slav controversy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. John H. Dooley, New York City, for recognition of Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of board of aldermen of New York City, asking for recognition for the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of mass meeting of citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against Polish pogroms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Pocatello, Idaho, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for Government ownership of railroads, express companies, telegraphs, and telephones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, soldier's affidavit in support of bill (H. R. 5376) granting an increase of pension to Aron M. Adamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Wadhams Grange, No. 1015, Patrons of Husbandry, Wadhams, Essex County, N. Y., urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Massena (N. Y.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the enforcement of war-time and constitutional prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted by Wadhams Grange, No. 1015, Patrons of Husbandry, protesting against the Lane reclamation project; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Clinton County (N. Y.) Pomona Grange, protesting against the Lane reclamation project; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Clinton County (N. Y.) Pomona Grange, protesting against reduction of appropriation of $4,500,000 for agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Clinton County (N. Y.) Pomona Grange, favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Board of Food and Drug Commission of Rhode Island, favoring the amendment of Senator KENYON to Agricultural appropriation bill requiring a full, honest, net weight to be declared on packages of wrapped meat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of John R. Cameron and other citizens of New Haven, Conn., for repeal of tax on soft drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Newport Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Newport, N. H., urging the retention of war-time prohibition and the enforcement of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of James A. Holmes et al., of Westboro, Mass., protesting against Lane bill to spend $500,000,000 reclaiming land for soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Petition signed by many residents of Lake County, Ind., in opposition to any change in the present prohibition law and asking that the said law go into effect fully on July 1, 1919; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June 26, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DENT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a memorial signed by 2,470 employees of the plant of the General Electric Co., at Pittsfield, Mass., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Royal Lodge, No. 109, Daughters of St. George, of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the deportation of those aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented telegrams, in the nature of memorials, from sundry business firms in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the United Irish Societies of Holyoke, Mass., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Granville, Auburndale, Wellesley, Pittsfield, and Southwick, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Gleasondale, Medford, Stow, and Hudson, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EDGE presented a petition of the Baptist Home Missionary Society of New York and New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the governor of Ohio to take steps to prohibit the Willard-Dempsey prize fight, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enforcement of prohibition and for the extension of the same so as to include Americans in foreign countries where treaties permit, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Topeka, Sun City, Stockton, Oakley, Baldwin, McCune, Pleasanton, Jennings, Dodge City, Emporia, Frankfort, and Phillipsburg, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kansas City, Arkansas City, Topeka, and Mulberry, all in the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Arlington Lodge, No. 414, Free and Accepted Masons, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Willow Camp, No. 163, Woodmen of the World, of Hanford, Calif., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN presented a petition of the congregation of the Broadway Reformed Church, of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enforcement of prohibition and for the extension of the same so as to include Americans in foreign countries where such is permitted by treaties, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Maine State Federation of Labor, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. POMERENE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Akron and of Summit County, in the State of Ohio, praying for the repeal of the so-called luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 219) for the relief of Kate Canniff (Rept. No. 47);

A bill (S. 257) for the relief of certain officers in the Army of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 48);

A bill (S. 715) for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co., Babcock & Willcox, Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co., and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota (Rept. No. 46);

A bill (S. 728) for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co. (Rept. No. 51);

A bill (S. 1004) for the relief of the owner of the steam lighter *Cornelia* (Rept. No. 40);

A bill (S. 1005) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa* (Rept. No. 41);

A bill (S. 1006) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Horatio G. Foss* (Rept. No. 42);

A bill (S. 1222) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett* (Rept. No. 43);

A bill (S. 1223) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer (Rept. No. 44);

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Amherst W. Barber (Rept. No. 45); and

A bill (S. 1694) providing for the refund of taxes collected for stamp tax on certain policies under the emergency tax act of October 22, 1914, under the proviso to which act such policies were exempt (Rept. No. 49).

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 687) to reimburse Horace H. Choumard, chaplain in the Twenty-third Infantry, for the loss of certain personal property, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 50) thereon.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 767) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Sneed, deceased (Rept. No. 55);

A bill (S. 1375) for the relief of Catherine Grace (Rept. No. 54); and

A bill (S. 1670) for the relief of the Arundel Sand & Gravel Co. (Rept. No. 53).

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and I submit a report (No. 52) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN SIBERIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with amendments Senate resolution No. 13, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that 8,000 United States soldiers are to be sent to Siberia; and

Whereas the purposes for which the said soldiers are dispatched to Siberia are undisclosed and unknown: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War be, and they are hereby, requested immediately to inform the Senate of the reasons for sending 8,000 United States soldiers to Siberia, what duties are there to be performed by these soldiers, how long they are to remain, and generally to advise the Senate of the policy of the United States Government in respect to Siberia and the maintenance of United States soldiers therein.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will you permit me to suggest that the resolution has been amended by the committee, and as amended met with, I think, the unanimous approval of the members of the committee? It is amended and was not read as amended.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the resolution been referred to the committee or reported by it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; the committee reports the resolution, and it was amended in accordance with the request of the committee yesterday.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think it was reported out unanimously.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object to its present consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who is present, will confirm that statement.

Mr. SWANSON. It was amended so as to be a direction to the President "if not incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Exactly. Will the Secretary please read it as amended?

Mr. SWANSON. I did not vote for the report, but I do not see any serious objection to it.

Mr. KING. I object to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes to the calendar.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, in line 1, after the word "the," to strike out "Secretary of State and the Secretary of War be, and they are" and insert "President be, and he is"; in line 3, after the word "Senate," to insert "if not incompatible with the public interest"; and in the same line, after the word "sending," to strike out "8,000," so as to make the resolution read:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that 8,000 United States soldiers are to be sent to Siberia; and

Whereas the purposes for which the said soldiers are dispatched to Siberia are undisclosed and unknown: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested immediately to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, of the reasons for sending United States soldiers to Siberia, what duties are there to be performed by these soldiers, how long they are to remain, and generally to advise the Senate of the policy of the United States Government in respect to Siberia and the maintenance of United States soldiers therein.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 93, submitted by Mr. FERNALD on the 24th instant, reported it favorably without amendment and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2254) extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Forsyth, Mo.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2255) granting a pension to George W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 2256) for the relief of Clotilda Freund; and

A bill (S. 2257) for the relief of George B. Hughes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2258) to correct the military record of Edward Johnson; and

A bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2260) amending the act of August 24, 1912, chapter 389, paragraph 1 (37 Stats., p. 550), to include periodical publications of regularly incorporated charitable organizations, admitting such publications to the mails as second-class matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2261) granting a pension to Rolph M. Collins;

A bill (S. 2262) granting a pension to Barney McKay;

A bill (S. 2263) granting a pension to Clara Farlow; and

A bill (S. 2264) granting a pension to H. Frederika Olcott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2265) for the relief of William L. Ross (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2266) granting a pension to Elvira James;

A bill (S. 2267) granting an increase of pension to Alice Hingson; and

A bill (S. 2268) granting a pension to Orvilla Curry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2269) granting a pension to Ben F. Perkins;

A bill (S. 2270) granting a pension to James Green;

A bill (S. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Colyar (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2272) granting a pension to Stephen J. Batchelder (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 2273) granting an increase of pension to Ray Cope (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 2274) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Charlotte W. Miller;* to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2275) granting a pension to Mercy M. Douglas (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2276) granting a pension to Lydia A. Edwards; and

A bill (S. 2277) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Boyle (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 2278) for the relief of John Healy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 2279) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SUITS IN ADMIRALTY.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Out of order I ask leave to introduce a bill on behalf of the Shipping Board. This legislation is really made necessary by reason of a late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2253) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

WAR DEPARTMENT FILMS AND MOTION-PICTURE CAMERAS.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. I will state that I have submitted it to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as well as nearly all the members of the committee, and they have no objection whatever to it.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is directed to report to the Senate the number of film and motion-picture cameras and tripods or photographic laboratory equipment or projector machines and other photographic equipment now in the possession of the War Department, together with the location and value of such equipment.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. KENYON. Notice is given that under Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I shall move, when the sundry civil appropriation bill is before the Senate, to suspend subdivision 3 of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate prohibiting an amendment proposing general legislation on any general appropriation bill for the purpose of offering a new section or amendment to said sundry civil appropriation bill, as follows:

A joint commission to report to Congress a plan for a national budget system is hereby established. Its membership shall consist of the Secretary of the Treasury and two other officials of the executive department of the Government, to be appointed by the President; three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, to be appointed by the presiding officer of the House and Senate, respectively.

SEC. 2. That no compensation shall be paid to any member of said commission.

SEC. 3. That said commission is hereby empowered and directed to report by January 1, 1920, a plan for the adoption of a national budget system for the Government of the United States, and showing therein what changes, amendments, or adjustments the adoption of said budget system would cause in the rules of the Senate and the House, in the laws now in operation relative to revenues and expenditures, in the organization of the Treasury Department, in the forms and method of preparation of the departmental estimates, in the method of presenting said estimates to the Congress, in the methods of accounting and audit, and such other and further information as said commission may see fit to lay before the Congress.

SEC. 4. That said commission is authorized to employ such experts and such clerical assistance as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

SEC. 5. That the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

SEC. 6. That said commission shall expire on the 1st day of January, 1920.

HUDSON RIVER TERMINAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York, which was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. EDGE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF SOLDIERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1213) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, which were, on page 2, line 21, to strike out "$75" and insert "$80," and, on page 2, line 22, to strike out "$75" and insert "$100."

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. If this matter requires any explanation, I will say that it is the bill, passed perhaps 10 days or 2 weeks ago, with relation to vocational rehabilitation for the soldiers. The House increases the amount from $75 per month to $80 per month for the subsistence of single men, and increases it for married men by the same amount, $5 a month; that is all.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. A Member of the House advised me last evening with respect to this matter that there was some controversy as to whether or not the appropriation carried here had not been provided for in another bill.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; I can explain that to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I was wondering if the matter had been cleared up, so that we are not duplicating the appropriation.

Mr. KENYON. I will explain it to the Senator. That was true; it was carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill. I have just come from the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, and the amount there has been stricken out; so it has been harmonized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PAGE. I suppose the naval appropriation bill is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

Mr. PAGE. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a privileged resolution which I submitted on yesterday and which I think will require but a short time to dispose of.

Mr. PAGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

OBJECTIONABLE WORDS IN DEBATE.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask the Secretary to read Senate resolution 94.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 94, submitted yesterday by Mr. ROBINSON, as follows:

Resolved, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask the attention of Senators for a few moments.

On Tuesday, June 24, during the progress of debate in the House of Representatives, a Member of that body, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, made remarks attacking the character and conduct of a Member of this body. The name of the Member of this body alluded to does not appear in the RECORD, but the statements and innuendoes and clear implications of the remarks which I complain of make it patent that the allusion was to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. It is not my purpose to read the objectionable language uttered on the floor of the House of Representatives, but I ask Senators to refer to pages 1785 and 1786 of the RECORD of June 24 and take such notice of the language there published as they may desire.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator again give us the pages of the RECORD?

Mr. ROBINSON. Pages 1785 and 1786.

During an experience of 16 years in Congress, 10 of which were spent in the branch at the other end of the Capitol, I have never known any Member of either body to refer to a Member of the other body in such bitter, vituperative, and denunciatory language as that used by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] and which constitutes the subject matter of this resolution. The language complained of plainly disregards the rules and precedents of the House of Representatives and constitutes a grave reflection upon a Member of the Senate.

It is not pertinent here, Mr. President, at this time, in my judgment, to enter into a discussion of the merits of the legislation under consideration by the coordinate branch of Congress when the language was used by the gentleman from Kentucky. Throughout the history of the House of Representatives reference to a Senator in terms of personal criticism has been forbidden. The language referred to in this resolution can not properly be characterized as a personal criticism. It is violently abusive and denunciatory to a degree which can not be properly characterized in parliamentary language.

Jefferson's Manual, section 365, contains this precedent:

While the Senate may be referred to properly in debate, it is not in order to discuss its functions or criticize its acts.

Citing Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents, section 5114 to section 5120, inclusive—

or refer to a Senator in terms of personal criticism—

Volume 5, section 5121 to section 5122—

or read a paper making such criticism.

Volume 5, section 5128:

On one occasion while I had the honor of serving in the House of Representatives I recall an instance in which a Member addressing the Speaker used this language:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman speaks of the Senators from—

Naming the State which the Senators represented.

Most people are trying to forget them.

The allusion, of course, was intended to be humorous. Nevertheless the Speaker very properly interposed, saying:

The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman does know, or ought to know, that his remark is against the rule of the House and is against all parliamentary usage.

On page 83, section 5126, volume 5, of Hinds' Precedents are contained synopses of several cases. In none of those instances was the language comparable in objectionable character to that to which I am referring and to which the resolution relates.

In every instance in which violation of the rule involved has been called to the attention of the other branch of Congress the Presiding Officer of that body has promptly and firmly enforced it, and enforced it with vigor.

It is proper in this connection to state that when the language referred to in the resolution was used the Speaker of the House of Representatives was not in the chair. The House

was in Committee of the Whole and had under consideration an appropriation bill, and the chair was then occupied by another Member.

I take it that any Senator who during the course of my remarks and who was not heretofore familiar with it has read the language used by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, is convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that the language is violative of those rules of parliamentary procedure which have been observed for many decades.

It only remains to be considered as to what is the proper procedure in such a case. The resolution is designed to follow the precedents. If the Presiding Officer of the other body had enforced the rule or if the matter had been called to his attention and the rules of the House had been enforced, there would have been no occasion for action on the part of the Senate.

Page 85, section 5130, volume 5, of Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents contains this citation:

It has always been considered the particular duty of the Speaker to prevent expressions offensive to the Senate or Senators.

On January 18, 1831, Mr. William D. Martin, of South Carolina, obtaining the floor for a personal explanation, called attention to the following passage in the published report of a speech made on the preceding Thursday by Mr. Churchill C. Cambreleng, of New York:

"I shall not, Mr. Speaker, travel out of my way and violate a rule of order by entering now into that discussion by examining the provisions of the Turkish treaty. Whenever I do, sir, my facts and my argument shall be founded on something more substantial than a newspaper rumor—more unquestionable than the statement of an unprincipled partisan, more unimpeachable than the evidence of a perjured Senator."

Mr. Martin said that he had occupied the chair as Speaker pro tempore when these words were uttered, but had not heard them. Had he heard them and not stopped the use of such language in reference to a Member of the other House he would have been guilty of gross misconduct as presiding officer. Therefore he made this explanation.

With reference to the question as to whether the resolution is the proper procedure, I refer to section 5126 of same volume, volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents, page 83, and read:

5126. On February 15, 1872, and April 25 of the same year, questions arose in the Senate as to the extent to which a Senator might go in replying to attacks made on him in the other House. While it was contended that a Senator attacked should not be precluded from the right of defense, the better opinion seemed to be that the parliamentary law should be adhered to, and that a resolution should be adopted bringing the matter to the attention of the other House rather than that the Senator should be allowed to reply. The question was not conclusively passed on however.

Section 5129 of the same volume contains this statement:

5129. After a speech reflecting on the character of the Senate had appeared in the RECORD, a resolution proposing an apology to the Senate was treated as a matter of privilege.

After examination by a committee, a speech reflecting on the character of the Senate was ordered to be stricken from the RECORD.

A point of order having been raised as to the privilege of the resolution, the Speaker said:

"There can be no doubt that legislative proceedings dependent upon two branches—two coordinate branches—would be very much impeded if personal and improper reflections were allowed in the one body on the Members of the other. This fact is so plain, so well established and understood that it seems unnecessary to say a word in regard to it. It is founded upon that principle which causes the Members of the House of Representatives to speak of each other and to address each other in debate by a phrase rather than by name. It is intended, as far as possible, to keep personal feeling out of public legislation, and the Chair is very glad, not only for the advantage of the relations existing between the House and Senate, but for the advantage of the relations of the Members themselves to each other and to the Chair, that this question should be passed upon in such manner as will make an impression upon us all."

The report of the committee which accompanied these resolutions declared:

"The Constitution assures to Members of the House freedom of debate. This freedom, however, like that of civil liberty, is held under well-recognized limitations, marked by rules of procedure and general parliamentary law, which are founded in reason and experience and are absolutely essential to the orderly conduct of public business.

"The coordinate branches of Congress are independent and, at the same time, interdependent—in separate action independent, in joint action interdependent. This mutual relation is such that unfriendly conditions between the two bodies must be obstructive of wise legislation and little short of a public calamity. The rules of both Houses and well-settled principles of parliamentary law alike forbid criticism of proceedings in either House by a Member of the other. Differences between the two Houses should be settled in a spirit of respectful courtesy, and, when (as must frequently occur) irreconcilable, should be submitted to without recrimination.

"Applying these established principles to the speech in question it must be regarded in its references to the Senate, individually and generally, as a grave infraction of parliamentary law and an abuse of the privilege of the House. It is in spirit and substance a bitter arraignment of the Senate for an alleged failure to yield prompt assent to a measure pending therein which had passed the House."

And so forth.

Mr. President, the language which I have read, and which is contained in the Precedents of the House of Representatives, expresses better than I can in language of my own the rules which should govern the relations between these bodies. It is of the very gravest—it is of fundamental—importance, indeed, that in the debates which occur here Members of this body should not only speak respectfully of one another, but that they should also speak respectfully of Members of the coordinate branch of Congress.

The same rule applies to the House at the other end of the Capitol. I take it for granted that had any Member of the House heard or understood the nature of the remarks uttered by the gentleman from Kentucky, remarks which violated every rule of proper parliamentary procedure, some objection would have been offered, and the correction would then have been made. I take it for granted that when the Senate by this resolution calls the attention of the House of Representatives to the matter, the Member violating its rules, doing discredit to the House and dishonor to the Senate and reflecting upon one of our most honored and worthy Members, will be required by that body to make apology for the wrong done, or if he fails or refuses to do so, that the House in its own way will take appropriate action.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, for the proper transaction of the public business nothing is more important than that the relations between the two Houses should be always within the bounds of courtesy and propriety. The protection of those relations has been recognized by all great parliamentary bodies. The history of England contains more than one case of breaches of privilege where an assault has been made by one house upon the other. Without such protection and without the observance of such rules the public business could not be carried on; the two Houses would pass from one personal brawl to another.

Mr. President, in our own Congress the House of Representatives has a rule making it out of order to attack the Senate as a body or to attack individual Senators by name or otherwise. In the Senate we have no such rule in the book; but we have an unwritten rule, which has been observed with the utmost care. Many Senators in referring to anything said in the other House will take the old formula of quoting the words as "having been uttered elsewhere." The Senate has been extremely careful in that regard. No rule could have made the practice more rigid. I have been in service here now for 32 years—6 years in the other House and 26 years in the Senate. No such case of personal attack on a Member of the other House has ever come to my knowledge. It is of no consequence whether the Senator was named or not; it was an attack upon a Senator; we know the Senator against whom it was directed. I need not say here that he is a Senator of the highest character and standing, respected and honored by all his colleagues.

This goes beyond the personal element. It is an attack on the Senate itself; it is an attack upon the Congress and upon the proper transaction of the public business. We should be derelict in our duty if we did not call the attention of the House to it.

This sort of thing in debate must not be permitted in either House. It is for the public good that I speak, wholly apart from my personal feeling, which I confess I have, owing to my friendship with the Senator from Ohio; but wholly apart from that, in the interest of good public service and proper conduct between the two Houses and the decent relations which ought to govern the transactions of this great body of Congress, this resolution ought to pass, and pass at once and unanimously.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, after the statements made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] little need be added; but, as a member of the committee which reported to this body the bill which seems to be the object of attack and to have provoked the attack referred to, I wish to submit one or two statements.

During the last session of Congress a bill was passed by the House of Representatives which was referred to as the "anti-profiteering" bill. It came to this body and was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Very promptly the bill was taken up for consideration. It was referred to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]; the former Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Hollis; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], who is now the honored chairman of the committee; the former Senator from Delaware, Mr. Saulsbury; and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. That subcommittee considered the entire subject, because it was an important one at the time, and perhaps still is, in a very comprehensive and thorough way. Hearings were had, and a number of persons appeared before the subcommittee and testified with respect to the matter.

After the matter had received, as I have stated, full consideration, the Senator from Ohio was directed to be the spokesman, if I may be permitted that expression, of the subcommittee and prepare a measure embodying its views. He executed the commission and prepared a substitute bill, which was submitted to the subcommittee, who gave it their indorsement and approval. It was thereupon reported to the full committee, and,

as my recollection now serves me, it received the approval of the full committee; at any rate, it was speedily reported to this body and was promptly taken up for consideration and passed. Conferees were appointed, and the House, in the usual manner, was asked to name conferees, in order that the disagreement between the House and the Senate might be reconciled and a measure agreed upon.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio, the subcommittee, and the full committee brought the best light which they had to the consideration of the subject. They reported a bill which met their judgment and which received the approval of the Senate.

It is not necessary to refer to what subsequently transpired other than to say that the conferees did not meet, for reasons which the Senate will remember. The conferees of the Senate, acting upon instructions of the Senate, did not meet with the House conferees, and Congress adjourned without action being taken upon this bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the attack made upon the honor, integrity, and good faith of the distinguished Senator from Ohio was also an attack upon every member of the District of Columbia Committee and was an assault upon the membership of this body. It was unwarranted, it was unjustifiable, and was a violation of all parliamentary procedure.

There ought to be, and there must be, not only cordial relations but sympathetic relations between the House and the Senate in order properly to transact the important business before them. It is a matter of gratification that during this great war, when legislation of the highest importance was before the Senate and the House, the relations between these two bodies have been most cordial. Aside from this incident, I do not recall that during the past two or three years there has been any matter that has been the subject of recrimination between the two bodies, or that there has been any attack made upon the membership of either branch by Members of the other branch.

As stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Ohio has the confidence, the esteem, and the affection of every Member of this body. As a legislator, he stands high; as a man of character and integrity, none stands higher.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] The resolution is unanimously adopted.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PAGE. I ask for the regular order.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair remembers—and he thinks he is correct—it has been agreed that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; that has been agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, under the subhead, "Pay, miscellaneous," on page 2, line 12, after the word "orders," to insert "and for traveling expenses of civilian employees"; and, on page 3, line 25, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$450,000," so as to read:

For commissions and interest; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers while traveling under orders in the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees, and for mileage, at 5 cents per mile, to midshipmen entering the Naval Academy subsequent to June 1, 1919, while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen; for actual traveling expenses of female nurses; actual expenses of officers while on shore patrol duty; mileage to officers of the Naval Reserve force traveling under orders of the Secretary of the Navy; hire of launches or other small boats in Asiatic waters; for rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards, including the rental of offices in the District of Columbia; expenses of courts-martial, prisoners and prisons, and courts of inquiry, boards of inspection, examining boards, with clerks, and witnesses' fees, and traveling expenses and costs; expenses of naval defense districts; stationery and recording; religious books; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising for the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); copying; ferriage; tolls; costs of suits; commissions, warrants, diplomas, and discharges; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; quarantine expenses; reports; professional investigation; cost of special instruction at home and abroad, including maintenance of students and attachés: *Provided*, That this appropriation and the appropriation "Pay, Marine Corps," shall be available for special allowances for maintenance to officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps serving under unusual conditions; information from abroad and at home, and the collection and classification thereof; all charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus for ice for the cooling of drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals), telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams, cablegrams, and postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; and other necessary and incidental expenses: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $450,000, and for necessary expenses for the interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction; in all, $5,100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, while I am very much interested in the naval bill and do not desire to occupy the Senate on matters that do not pertain to it, still, in view of the fact that remarks were made yesterday which require answer, in my judgment, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a very short period.

It is unfortunate that a thoughtful consideration of the Irish question should be marred by politics. It has been the policy of our Government from the beginning to express sympathy with the people of the world in their struggle for liberty and the realization of American ideals of government. In 1793 we requested France to release Gen. Lafayette from imprisonment. In 1851 Hungary declared for a republic and made Kossuth governor. Although our relations with Austria were friendly, we practically recognized the republic and rescued Kossuth from Austrian vengeance and brought him to the United States on an American warship, and a joint resolution was passed by the Senate and House cordially welcoming Kossuth to this country. In 1867 we interposed in Mexico, a friendly Government, in behalf of clemency for Maximilian. We protested to Spain, a friendly Government, in 1857 and again in 1897, in behalf of Cuban revolutionists. In 1867 we made representations to England in behalf of Irish political prisoners in England and in Canada, irrespective of the fact whether or not they were citizens.

Daniel Webster in his great Senate speech on Grecian independence against Turkish oppression stated that action should be based upon our own duty, our character, and our own interests as one of the free States of the world, and our obligation toward "those great principles which have hitherto maintained the relative independence of nations and which have more especially made her (America) what she is."

Woodrow Wilson has taken the same stand in laying down his 14 points, which he has epitomized in these words, "A reign of law with the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." He has also said that "no people should be forced under a sovereignty under which they do not wish to live." The project of a league of nations was, among other things, designed to maintain the independence of small States which have been established as the result of our successful war against autocracy. I am sure that he has been the spokesman for the small nations before the conference, and I am sure also that his sympathies are with Irish aspirations for a self-determined government. His paternal ancestors came from Ireland. I have heard from his own lips warm expressions of concern for her welfare, and that was when he accepted a statue of Robert Emmet, the Irish martyr and patriot, who died in seeking the independence of his country.

Any reasonable man, however, must appreciate the fact that in creating independent States in Europe and in endowing them with self-determination the conference at Paris necessarily confined itself only to the territory which had been as the result of war wrested from the enemy. England, France, Italy, and Japan, and even the United States, hold under their control several of the small countries of the world. Consistently with their principles the "Big Five" should open the doors to a policy of self-determination. But this is also a question of practical statesmanship. There are backward nations and nations fully qualified for self-government. The United States, for instance, has been educating the Philippine people in self-government in anticipation of their ultimate independence. England has some backward peoples in her Empire, but she has also self-governing colonies, like Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, which have as large a measure of independence apparently as they desire. Ireland has all the indicia of nationality and all the qualifications for independence, and for that reason the President, necessarily in a diplomatic way, has interested British statesmen in her cause. He can not demand that one of the Allies submit itself now to the conference without breaking up the conference. He has to proceed with tact and caution in order to preserve the Entente.

The World War, which dismembered the Germanic and Austro-Hungarian Empires, required the conference to immediately create new and independent States, which were without government or organization, and this principle having been estab-

lished with the conclusion of the peace and the establishment of a league of nations will pave the way to Irish independence. England will have less reluctance to give Ireland self-determination when she is thoroughly committed to the principle by the action of the conference with respect to other small States, and when under article 10 of the covenant she will be assured that the league of nations will prevent Ireland from being used as a base of operations by an enemy. Ireland herself, once free, will have no incentive to permit the trespass of a foreign power on her soil. She would join the league and would thus be protected without raising an army or a navy against external aggression. When free the logic of the situation will bring about a close commercial union between England and Ireland, because England is Ireland's nearest and best market.

Some persons interested in the cause have objected to article 10 because they fear it would guarantee the territorial integrity of the British Empire. This it does only with respect to "external aggression." Now, Irish independence can be won either by the voluntary act of England, a successful revolution, or the intervention by a superior force from the outside. Of these three avenues to independence the league only stands in the way of the last, namely, "external aggression." If Irish independence was won by another nation for her, a service which some radicals expected from Germany, she would have no reason to expect independence as a free gift. Germany would have made her a fortified island and administered her government doubtless with Prussian military severity. Desirable as Irish independence is, I do not know of any country that would go to war with England for the mere purpose of liberating Ireland, but if any country went to war with England, as, for instance, the United States, which would mean the disruption of the league of nations and with it the guaranties of territorial integrity, then, in the event of a successful outcome, the United States doubtless would give Ireland independence. It can not be possible that the Irish people would consciously seek to prevent the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, and thus avert war, in order that Ireland might profit by conflict, which, when it comes, will be more terrible and destructive than the one through which we have just passed.

If an Irishman tells me that he would put Irish independence before the spectacle of a world bathed again in blood, the loss again of millions of lives, and the hunger, disease, privations, sufferings, and torture inflicted upon millions more, then I would say he is less humane and more selfish than the world believes. The business of the conference was to establish peace and by every means possible to avert war in the future. But that is the question.

There is one thing certain, that there shall be no peace for England until Ireland is made free, because, as was said of the Romans, "What part of the world is not full of their labors"? The Irish line is flung around the world, and the insistent demand of Irishmen and lovers of freedom everywhere will compel the blunderers of Downing Street to yield to a world-wide demand based upon world-wide principles which the conference and the league have established. Bear in mind the league consists of a union of free nations, and if England does not yield to the absolutely logical case of Ireland and give her the decision then the Irish justifiably will expose England to every disadvantage in peace and in war throughout the world. From the days of the American Revolution England has been held strictly to account by America, and it would need less weight than the Irish to throw the scales of judgment against her whenever a conflict should arise. Before we entered the war we were on the very verge of a conflict with England by reason of her own acts interfering with our trade and opening the mails of our merchants.

Therefore since Ireland can not release herself from the English yoke nor expect any other nation to do so, the public opinion of the world and her own resolution firmly held may accomplish it sooner than we expect. It would be the wisest policy for England.

The right of revolution is not denied by the league; and, apart from this, the importance of the league to Ireland may be understood when I state that the Irish volunteers at the end of the eighteenth century, when England was engaged in foreign wars, established an Irish Parliament which endured for 18 years, when England, free from other engagements, abolished it. If Ireland wins independence now and joins the league, the warlike power of England can not be used against her. If there is no league, what is to prevent England from reconquering Ireland whenever her interest dictates such a course?

This is a grave question, worthy of very careful consideration before decision is finally made. Ireland fears the guarantee of territorial integrity will prevent her from securing outside help, for which she has vaily looked for centuries and which England has, without a league, been able to repe.. So the failure of the league would not necessarily bring independence any closer to Ireland.

On the other hand, if Ireland wins independence by the moral pressure of the world and her own steadfast purpose to be free, the league will insure her in her freedom.

Once established, the principles of the league, whose chief advocate was President Wilson, and which England has reluctantly accepted, become an accusing arraignment against England until she accords self-determination to the best qualified of her dependencies.

England's title to Ireland is by conquest, and for 700 years Ireland has never acquiesced, but protested with the lives of her people. The men who died on Easter Sunday, 1916—poets, philosphers, and scholars—have, in common with martyrs of other days, kept alive pure the case of Ireland before the world. To remind the present generation of British oppression against which Irish protest was made, let me quote Mr. Gladstone, who has said:

> The relations of England with Ireland have, as a whole, been more profoundly disgraced by cruelty and fraud than those between any other nations in the entire history of Christendom.

James Bryce says:

> They saw Irish manufactures destroyed for the sake of English manufacturers; Irish revenues jobbed away for measures too disreputable even for the corrupt England of that day. England did nothing for Ireland and suffered her to do nothing for herself. Thus at last the natural forces that make for freedom asserted themselves.

To-day, out of this country, consisting of 32,000 square miles and 4,000,000 of population, it is said that England takes $150,000,000 in revenue annually. Ireland is larger in area and population than either Belgium, Holland, Denmark, or Switzerland, and raises more than three times as much revenue as any of them. She has a race, language, and history of her own, and is in every essential particular a nation to-day fit to assume the duties of nationhood and should be so recognized by the nations of the world. England, however, bars the way; and, as I have said, Ireland will either have to win her own independence, have England concede it, or have some other country win it and present it as a free and unconditional gift.

When Daniel Webster was asked in the course of debate in the Senate whether he expected to win Grecian independence from Turkey by the force of American arms, he said, "No; but that the public opinion of the world, led by America, would ultimately effectuate Grecian independence." President Woodrow Wilson and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States have already invoked this moral power. The President has had a most difficult position, sympathizing, as he does, with Ireland, because he has been dealing with England to effect a matter of much greater importance than Irish independence, namely, the peace of the world, the establishment of free States out of conquered territory, and the abolition of war.

Why should Woodrow Wilson be singled out by Irish radicals who have assumed to lead us in this movement? Why have the political managers of one political party been allowed to claim a political advantage for the Senate resolution? I recall that in 1916 the following mild resolution, based on established precedents, was proposed in the Senate:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate expresses the hope that the British Government may exercise clemency in the treatment of Irish political prisoners; and that the President be requested to transmit this resolution to that Government.

The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate rejected it, but three members of that committee submitted it as a minority report. These Senators happened to be all Democrats—Messrs. Stone, Pittman, and O'Gorman. The resolution was adopted by 46 yeas, of which number there were only 8 Republicans, 2 regular and 6 progressive. Of the 19 nays there were only 3 Democrats. I think that vote was a real test of party predilection and sentiment. The other day, on the Borah-Walsh resolution, asking that the Irish delegates be heard, and expressing sympathy for Irish aspirations for a government of their own choice, a much stronger resolution, practically addressed to England, there was substantial unanimity. Only one dissenting vote was recorded, and that was by a Democrat who has consistently on all occasions voted against measures of this kind. Why on this occasion was the Republican membership of this body solidified? It was under the pressure of party discipline and intended, I believe, to embarrass the President, who, as I have explained, was in a very difficult situation serving his country and humanity. It was also done, I believe, to defeat the league of nations by exciting a false suspicion that article 10 prevented internal revolution. It is unfortunate that so great and worthy a cause should be so used as a means of winning votes by men whose previous action would indicate that they

have no real sympathy with Ireland and whose main contention in all the debate is that America should stay at home and leave Europe to its fate.

I beg to say, in conclusion, that in conversation recently with President Eamonn De Valera, of the Irish Republic, he emphatically declared that he trusted the holy cause to which he had pledged his life and honor would not be dragged into the mire of American party politics, but that the entire American Nation, with one acclaim, pursuant to its immemorial principles, might declare for the freedom of a brave and generous people. He had in mind the services which the Irish race had rendered America, and he might have recalled the appeal which the Continental Congress made, and did not make in vain, in an address inspired by Benjamin Franklin, "To the people of Ireland," July 28, 1775, as follows:

We are desirous of the good opinion of the virtuous and humane; we are peculiarly desirous of furnishing you with the true state of our motives and objects. * * * You have ever been friendly to the rights of mankind and we acknowledge with pleasure and gratitude that your nation has produced patriots who have nobly distinguished themselves in the cause of humanity and of America.

In response to this appeal Pitt declared, "Ireland is with America to a man." The mission of Franklin to Ireland was realized.

The public opinion now of the United States stands firmly, without party props, on the foundation of gratitude, justice, and the enduring principles of free and self-determined government.

Mr. President, as part of my speech I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on this subject and the declaration of Ireland's independence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

IRELAND'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, PROCLAIMED BY THE DAIL EIREANN IN DUBLIN, JANUARY 21, 1919.

Whereas the Irish people is by right a free people; and
Whereas for 700 years the Irish people has never ceased to repudiate and has repeatedly protested in arms against foreign usurpation; and
Whereas English rule in this country is and always has been based upon force and fraud and maintained by military occupation against the declared will of the people; and
Whereas the Irish Republic was proclaimed in Dublin on Easter Monday, 1916, by the Irish Republican Army, acting on behalf of the Irish people; and
Whereas the Irish people is resolved to secure and maintain its complete independence in order to promote the common weal, to re-establish justice, to provide for future defense, to insure peace at home and good will with all nations, and to constitute a national policy based upon the people's will, with equal right and equal opportunity for every citizen; and
Whereas at the threshold of a new era in history the Irish electorate has in the general election of December, 1918, seized the first occasion to declare by an overwhelming majority its firm allegiance to the Irish Republic:

Now, therefore, we, the elected representatives of the ancient Irish people, in national parliament assembled, do, in the name of the Irish nation, ratify the establishment of the Irish Republic and pledge ourselves and our people to make this declaration effective by every means at our command.

To ordain that the elected representatives of the Irish people alone have power to make laws binding on the people of Ireland, and that the Irish parliament is the only parliament to which that people will give its allegiance.

We solemnly declare foreign government in Ireland to be an invasion of our national right which we will never tolerate, and we demand the evacuation of our country by the English garrison.

We claim for our national independence the recognition and support of every free nation of the world, and we proclaim that independence to be a condition precedent to international peace hereafter.

In the name of the Irish people we humbly commit our destiny to Almighty God, who gave our fathers the courage and determination to persevere through centuries of a ruthless tyranny, and, strong in the justice of the cause which they have handed down to us, we ask His divine blessing on this, the last stage of the struggle which we have pledged ourselves to carry through to freedom.

CAN IRELAND STAND ALONE?

This question can be best answered by comparing Ireland with the other small nations of Europe:

Size.

Area in square miles:	
Belgium	11,373
Holland	12,582
Denmark	15,042
Switzerland	15,976
Ireland	32,531

Countries about the same size as Ireland are: Serbia, 33,891 square miles; Portugal, 35,290; Greece, 41,933; and Bulgaria, 43,305.

Population.

Norway	2,396,782
Denmark	2,940,990
Switzerland	3,888,990
Ireland	4,390,219

Countries whose respective populations are slightly in excess of Ireland's: Serbia, 4,547,000; Bulgaria, 4,751,000; Greece, 4,821,300. (Ireland's population in 1846 was 8,500,000.)

What have these other small nations paid normally to run their business?

Annual bills.

Serbia	$26,250,000
Greece	27,000,000
Switzerland	35,000,000
Bulgaria	35,000,000
Norway	36,200,000
Denmark	47,500,000
British rule now costs Ireland	200,000,000

All the small powers mentioned have maintained their own governments, their own armies, and three of them have fleets as well. It is cheaper to be free than in slavery.

Liberty has cost only $6 per capita per annum in Greece and Serbia, $7.50 in Bulgaria, $9 in Switzerland, $13 in Sweden, $14 in Portugal, $15 in Norway, while in Ireland subjection to British militarism costs $44 per capita per annum.

Ireland is large enough, populous enough, and rich enough to stand alone, and, judged by any standard, is admirably fitted for freedom.

[Reprinted from the Newark (N. J.) News.]

IRELAND AND THE LEAGUE.

If the views of many Irish-Americans on the Irish question have become more radical in recent months this is not surprising. Many who were merely home rulers a short time ago advocate complete independence to-day. Sir Horace Plunkett commented on the remarkable revival of interest here in the Irish problem. Incidentally, he revealed that his own opinions have changed. His views to-day are far from the views he held when he wrote "Ireland in the Nineteenth Century." The views of the men who have organized the new center party in Ireland have changed. These centrists were largely Unionists, opposed to broad home rule or home rule at all. Stephen Gwynn, the chairman of the new party, was a home ruler, but here is Gen. Hubert Gough, who resigned his army commission when Mr. Asquith threatened to enforce home rule, affiliated with the new party and declaring that the greatest need of Ireland is self-government. The secretary of the new party is a brother of a Carsonite member of Parliament.

Opinion has moved ahead on both sides of the Atlantic. But some of the most eloquent pleaders for the Irish cause should stop to consider the wisdom of linking their campaign with opposition to the league of nations.

Their opposition to the league is based on that article of the covenant which says other members of the league shall undertake to preserve the territory of any one of them against "external aggression." They interpret this to mean that the United States, as a member of the league, would be compelled to go to the aid of England in case of an uprising in Ireland. Of course, it means nothing of the kind. A rebellion in Ireland would not be "external aggression." Words mean what they say, as President Lowell would put it.

A league of nations can not injure the Irish cause. Can it be of any benefit to the Irish cause?

Absolute home rule has been opposed by leaders of Tory opinion in England almost as keenly as Irish independence is opposed and, from their viewpoint, logically so. The argument of the Tory, and even of many who are not Tories, has always been that an independent Ireland would expose England to foreign attack and aggression from the west. That argument vanishes the moment a league of nations is established. It will have thereafter no force. That very article of the covenant in which certain Irish-Americans profess to see a menace to Ireland actually buttresses the Irish case for self-government. Article 10 of the covenant pulls the chief contention against Irish self-government from beneath the British feet.

Suppose rebellion actually occurred in Ireland. How long would it be before an instrumentality like the league of nations would step in to mediate? The moral force of the civilized world would ultimately interfere, not to crush the rebels but to give them a hearing before all mankind; not to protect Britain, indeed, but to save the revolutionists. On the other hand, if the rebels were succeeding, a public opinion, born of human nature itself, would not permit interference.

To put it very baldly, suppose Russia in time becomes a member of the league of nations. Her pet hate, whether justly or unjustly, is Britain. Germany will be a member of the league of nations. Is it to be presumed that she will be very partial to England? And what about the Scandinavian nations? And Spain? And in the United States, what an engulfing sentiment would arise to exert moral pressure on Britain in case of an Irish revolution! Ireland might ineed covet the opportunity to take her case to the court of the league of nations. Without a league, where could she successfully appeal? Nowhere, with hope of action. It can never be called an impertinence for a league of nations to take up the Irish question, or for one or more members of the league to press for such consideration. That is very different from taking it up in the peace conference.

The league of nations is the substitute for imperialism. It is the death knell of imperialism. And imperialism is the idea that has kept self-government from Ireland. If there shall be no league of nations, what will happen to those German colonies? Into whose lap will they fall? Imperialism will continue to grow fat if there is no league of nations. And the day of self-government for countries like Ireland will be delayed.

The new center party in Ireland demands control of excise and customs duties by an Irish Parliament. That is, it wants Canadian home rule. Home rule on Canadian lines is surely the minimum to-day. Which will mean, again, Irish membership in the league of nations.

It is strange to hear friends of Ireland denouncing the league as an eternal barrier to Ireland's hope when it is exactly the opposite. It is strange to see these men occupying the same position toward the league as do some traditional Anglophiles who have suddenly evinced a brand-new suspicion of the motives of John Bull. It is odd to observe the Irish World and the Gaelic American making common cause with George Harvey's Weekly, the New York Sun, and the New York Tribune.

Truly the world is out of joint. But probably the overwhelming majority of Irish-Americans are doing their own thinking on this question and are not going to be persuaded by false prophets. That Ireland stands a better chance of attaining self-government in a world with a league of nations than in a world without a league of nations is as clear as daylight.

PROPOSED SALE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if any one fact has been clearly demonstrated by our experience in this war—and I think many have been demonstrated—it is that merchant ships are essential to create an adequate Navy; in other words, that

merchant ships are as important as battle cruisers. It is in that connection that I desire to submit some observations at this point, not entirely inappropriate, I think, to the general subject of the Navy.

Mr. President, on the 24th of June I offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That in the judgment of the Senate it is not advisable for the United States Shipping Board to sell at this time any of the merchant ships of the Government to foreign interests unless it be such as can not be successfully employed here.

Resolved further, That efficient merchant ships of the Government should not be sold at all at this time, except such ships as are undesirable for overseas trade and will bring approaching their actual cost or more, and then only with a view of replacing them with better ships and in order to properly balance the fleet.

I was somewhat influenced to offer that resolution by an article appearing in the Washington Times of June 17, 1917, entitled:

UNITED STATES SELLS 19 STEEL SHIPS.

Nineteen steel steamships have been sold to New York purchasers for $27,821,120, Chairman Hurley, of the United States Shipping Board, announces. Names of the purchasers, which include several big shipping concerns, will be announced later.

Also by articles which were quite generally published throughout the country in various newspapers, practically to the same effect, one of which, as a sample, is quoted as follows:

BOARD TO SELL MORE THAN 2,000 SHIPS—EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION WILL DISPOSE OF 2,424 VESSELS OF VARIOUS TYPES; PRICE TO RANGE FROM $210 TO $225 A TON; OFFICE OPENED IN NEW YORK—GOVERNMENT'S TERMS TO PROSPECTIVE BUYERS.

NEW YORK, *June 21*.

The United States Shipping Board will open an office here Monday for the sale of the entire 2,424 ships of various types owned by the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The price will be from $210 to $225 a ton, depending upon the type.

The announcement of the sale was made here to-day by John E. Barber, assistant to Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the Shipping Board, and who has been advising the American delegation at the peace conference on shipping matters. Mr. Barber, who will be in charge of the sale, said that time payments would be allowed. Twenty-five per cent of the purchase price must be paid on the day of the sale, 12½ per cent at the end of six months, and a similar amount at the end of the year. The balance of 50 per cent is to be paid within four years.

The foregoing clippings suggest that a definite policy should be determined upon with reference to our ships, and that Congress should enact legislation to carry out that policy.

It is true the Commerce Committee, during the last session, gave hearings extending almost throughout the session, often several days a week, inquiring into the shipbuilding program and the work of the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation. The primary purpose was to be helpful to these agencies in carrying on their very vital and stupendous undertakings. We realized the great responsibilities resting upon these agencies of the Government and the importance of their tasks. The need for ships is fully recognized, and it is unnecessary to dwell upon the essential and vital nature of the work before these organizations—the Fleet Corporation being the constructing body and the Shipping Board the supervising and operating body, speaking generally.

We found there had been delays in getting the construction of ships under way.

There was delay in organizing the board, to begin with.

The stupendous character of the enterprise made it necessary to first organize an efficient working force.

The novelty of the undertaking necessitated weeks and weeks of time to gather information and lay out the plans.

1. There was delay in preparing the designs for ships, and particularly caused by numerous changes in the designs, even after contracts were let.

2. Settling matters of private contracts and taking over ships on the ways.

3. Controversy about material—steel, wood, and concrete.

4. Finding labor in adequate quantity and sufficiently skilled.

5. Transportation arrangements—for material and for men as well.

6. Housing facilities were lacking.

7. Finding a general manager and other qualified officers.

8. Lack of coal interfered with operations.

As promptly as the committee could discover any condition holding back the program we at once proceeded to endeavor to remedy it.

We reported, and Congress passed, and the President approved measures—

1. To provide for housing ship workers.

2. To commandeer transportation lines when necessary to get the workers to and from the yards.

We also urged the provisions in the measure reported by the Committee on Military Affairs providing for commandeering timber in certain circumstances.

We found contracts were being made with parties operating yards—some 64 steel yards, 420 ways, and additional wooden yards on the Atlantic, Gulf, Pacific, and Great Lakes.

Advances were made by the Government for building yards in most instances.

There are three yards which the Government has the option to purchase, and which are designated as agency yards—meaning they are operated under the supervision of the Fleet Corporation, the contractors being agents of the corporation and receiving a fixed fee for each vessel, the corporation paying for the material and labor employed, the contractors having charge of the work. They were known as the Hog Island Yard, near Philadelphia, contractor, American International Shipbuilding Corporation; the yard at Newark, N. J., Submarine Boat Co., contractor, and the yard at Bristol, Pa., the Merchants Co., contractor.

The contracts were practically the same to begin with, but on recommendation of the Shipping Board and Mr. Schwab, the Submarine Boat Co. contract has been modified, so that they furnish all labor and material and build the boats for a fixed price.

The yard at Bristol (Merchants Shipbuilding Corporation) has 12 ways.

The yard at Newark Bay (Submarine Boat Co.) has 28 ways.

The yard at Hog Island (American International Shipbuilding Corporation) has 50 ways.

Contracts call for—

Merchants, 60 ships, 9,900 dead-weight tonnage each.

Submarine Boat, 150 ships, 5,075 dead-weight tonnage each.

American International (Hog Island), 120 originally, 60 added, making 180 ships, 110 class A, 7,500 tons each, and 70 class B, 8,000 tons each.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I notice in the statement just made by the Senator that a fixed price was made for some ships. Is that rigid, so that after the armistice, and particularly now, when prices have fallen somewhat, the same price is paid for a ship that was paid during the peak of high prices? There ought to be some flexibility, it seems to me.

Mr. FLETCHER. The contract of the Submarine Boat Co., to which I referred, was originally based upon the cost of construction plus fees, which make what may be called a cost-plus contract. That contract was afterwards changed so as to call for the contractor to furnish labor and material and to be paid so much for the building of the ships. I take it that the contracts cover the entire number of ships that they were to build. I will show a little later how many have been constructed and how many still remain to be built by the Submarine Boat Co. There are a few contracts similar to that elsewhere. In most instances the Emergency Fleet Corporation have reserved the right to cancel contracts, and they have canceled a number of contracts, especially where the keels have not been laid and the materials have not all been put on the ground and work ready to be begun. If it is more profitable for the Government to cancel those contracts, the Shipping Board has undertaken to do it, and in that case the contractor must be compensated for his loss, whatever it may be.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. One reason why I make the inquiry is because several complaints—perhaps that is too strong a term—several statements have been made to me by persons who are somewhat interested in the construction of ships, and they have stated that because of the rigid and inflexible contracts which the Government has with various individuals, under which the same prices are paid now that were paid when prices were at the highest limit, it is difficult to get contracts or to do anything for the reason that that set the pace and maintained the high level of wages and the price of everything connected with the ships.

They thought it was very unfortunate and would make for high prices in the construction of vessels and prevent private individuals from embarking upon the construction of ships who would be willing to do so if there were competition in the market, so as to permit it to seek its own level.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Shipping Board realize that situation, and, instead of endeavoring to keep the cost up to the peak to which the Senator has referred, they are endeavoring to bring it down to the proper basis to-day. They estimate that the cost to-day would be less than the high cost which they have paid in the past by some $50 a ton, as I recall it. The effort is to bring the industry on that level and away from the high peak of cost which it was necessary to pay when they had to build, sacrificing economy to speed. I believe now there is no difficulty in getting contracts in competition upon a fair basis.

The committee favored keeping the Hog Island yard down to 32 ways for the present, but the Fleet Corporation authorized completion of all the ways originally contemplated and directed

that 50 be finished. The Fleet Corporation also added 60 ships to the number—120—originally contracted for; so that this yard has been completed, 50 ways are in full operation, 22 ships built there have been delivered, and 34 ships launched. They are now launching three 7,500-ton steel ships every two weeks.

There are now being delivered to the Shipping Board four steel ships a day.

Contracts were let for a number of wooden ships, usually 3,500 tons, Ferris type. Fifty-eight of the composite type were ordered. They are usually classed as wooden.

Of these contracts there were canceled aggregating 1,437,000 tons.

Two hundred and thirty-seven of these wooden (including a small number of composite) ships are now being operated by the Shipping Board.

Two hundred and fifty are being built.

It is a question whether some of these may not be changed to barges or sailers.

One reinforced-concrete ship is being operated, and eight are being built as tankers.

I feel quite confident, after a careful inspection of the work, that these reinforced-concrete ships will be in every way successful, and that it will be found advisable and profitable to build more of them. In some respects they will have many advantages over any other type.

Of the wooden ships, 38 have been sold at an average price of $122 per ton, whereas they cost practically $200. They operate to Japan and across the Atlantic, as well as to near-by ports.

A later report is contained in the New York Journal of Commerce, which I will ask to have go in the RECORD and will refer to later.

Since the armistice the board has canceled contracts calling for 3,937,000 dead-weight tons, of which about two and one-half million were steel and the remainder wood.

The keels were not laid when they were canceled for about 3,500,000 tons of these cancellations.

The existing contracts and completed ships will aggregate about 13,000,000 dead-weight tons.

Among the canceled contracts are 35 transports at Hog Island yard and 20 ships of the Bristol (Merchants) yard.

The Shipping Board is now operating 965 ships of all classes, making 5,467,105 dead-weight tons, the property of the Government.

Some of the ships owned by the Government are operated by the Army and some by the Navy.

Our tonnage stands now—owned by the United States—6,544,832.

We may classify the ships in operation now by us as follows:

	Dead-weight tons.
1. American-owned ships taken over for the war	1,272,518
2. Foreign ships chartered	691,736
3. Foreign ships requisitioned (Dutch)	461,731
4. Captured enemy ships (ex-German)	610,112
5. Captured enemy ships (ex-Austrian)	45,453
6. Ships built since the outbreak of the war by the Emergency Fleet Corporation	3,543,335

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am intensely interested in what the Senator is saying. I am anxious to know whether the figures he has just given include the ships engaged in the coastwise commerce on our Gulf and the two oceans and also the coastwise commerce on the Great Lakes?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I am not dealing with our coastwise shipping at all.

Mr. RANSDELL. It is foreign-borne commerce of which you are speaking?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL. Then we have a very considerable additional ocean tonnage which is engaged in the coastwise business?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; American owned, but not owned by the Shipping Board.

Mr. RANSDELL. American owned and operated?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL. Both on the Great Lakes and on the ocean?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. That amounts, I think, to somewhere between six and eight million tons.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is in addition to the overseas commerce of which you are speaking, which is not coastwise?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. LENROOT. The 965 ships include all the ships operated by the Government, whether engaged in coastwise commerce or not?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; they do. Of course the Government has the right to employ them in the coastwise trade, and in a few instances there may be a little coastwise business done, but the shipping of which I speak is separate from our coastwise shipping, which, of course, is under the American flag and American owned, but not by the Government.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a further interruption?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator stated that we have requisitioned a number of Dutch ships, aggregating over 400,000 tons, and that we have taken over private ships aggregating one million three hundred thousand and odd tons. Is there any purpose upon the part of the Emergency Fleet Corporation or the Shipping Board to restore to Holland the ships taken from her and to private individuals the ships which were commandeered from them, and if so, when will they be restored?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think arrangements have about been completed with reference to the Dutch ships. I think they will go back to their original owners very shortly under a satisfactory plan that has been practically agreed upon. That is my information. As to the American-owned ships taken over by the Government during the war, to which the Senator refers, many of those were actually bought and paid for by the Government. I do not mean by that that they are privately owned ships just commandeered for use during the war, but they were ships on the stocks uncompleted and contracted for by private individuals, and the Government took them over and finished them, of course, and paid the original owners for them. Those ships will undoubtedly remain a part of the Government property.

Mr. LENROOT. It is true, is it not, that we are, however, still operating privately owned ships to a considerable degree which will be turned back as soon as plans can be made for that purpose?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is true; we have some Norwegian ships chartered and a few others. I know, however, that some of our ships, particularly two ships that we acquired from the transcontinental railroads—the *Great Northern* and the *Northern Pacific*—were paid for, and we own them, and they are operated by the Army and probably will be retained by the Army.

Referring now to the Shipping Board, it has been operating ships since January 1, 1919. It has built up an organization with a director of operations at the head, assistant director, with various departments and divisions, and 2,400 employees, and an annual pay roll of $332,699.50.

It has received a total revenue of $386,126,391.59.

Operating expenses, insurance, and depreciation (10 per cent on steel and 12 per cent on wood), $344,581,738.18.

The usual estimate for depreciation is only 5 per cent instead of 10 per cent. This deduction is excessive as to both wood and steel.

Earnings over expenses, insurance, and depreciation, $41,544,653.41.

If you deduct interest at 5 per cent on the investment in the ships, placing the value for this purpose of the wooden ship at $100 a ton and the steel ship at $200 a ton, giving a total of $913,541,252, you would reduce the earnings by $27,235,478.21, and leave a net revenue earned by the Government since January 1, 1919, over and above all expense of operation, depreciation—estimated as stated—and insurance and interest on investment, $16,453,361.83.

A number of the best ships—most profitable to operate, 193, have been in the service of the Army. To keep these ships busy and take care of the increase, now coming out at the rate of four each day, will require a considerable organization and capable, experienced officials, and an efficient force. Existing rates will come down, but for some time to come they will be much higher than prewar rates. There will be work for the ships and a pressing demand for carriers for an indefinite period, not ending in the very near future. The proceeds of Liberty bonds, held by the people, are in these ships. Now is the time to earn the interest on these bonds and lay up a surplus for the principal, and at the same time take care of the commerce of the United States and open up the routes of trade, ready and waiting for development.

We are in position to do this with our own carriers, owned by the people of this country.

It is a colossal business, but is it not a reflection on the Government to hold that on that account it can not be managed by the Government?

Is it not rather more reasonable to contend that because of its hugeness private enterprise can not be found strong enough to perform it.

THE NEED OF SHIPS.

Let us go back a little.

In 1620 there were about 40 ships in the trade between England and Massachusetts Bay. They were wooden sailboats of

about 35 tons. The freight rate was £3 per ton; passengers were carried at £5 each and horses at £10 each.

New England began to build ships—about 100-ton ships—at a cost of £4 per ton.

Virginia gave a subsidy of tobacco in Colonial days to induce her people to build ships, and they built one.

At the close of the Revolutionary War our population was scattered along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Georgia and westward to the Mississippi River, and, including slaves, aggregated about 3,500,000 people. The most populous States were Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. The largest city was Philadelphia, which boasted a population of 42,520. New York came next, then Boston, then Charleston, S. C., and, fifth, Baltimore.

For exports the Southern States produced tobacco, rice, and indigo and had relatively few ships.

The only means for transporting freight was by boats.

At Jamestown the colonists built shallops of 12 or 13 tons burden in 1611. The first seagoing vessel built in the United States for commercial uses was constructed in Maine in 1607. She was named *Virginia* and of the size of 32 tons.

The first American shipyard was built on the Mystic River, where Medford now stands, in 1630.

At the outset Congress was powerless to do anything; in fact, it was said Congress "could not even pay the rent of the hall hired for their meeting."

In 1789 there were 19 shipbuilders in Philadelphia, and they built only about 1,500 tons a year.

All American trade with the West Indies was forbidden by the British.

The whalers of Nantucket took steps to remove their industry to France.

All that portion of the United States west of the Appalachians the French and Spanish were united in an effort to cut off.

At this period our merchantmen reached out for the trade of the Far East.

In a letter of December 23, 1783, appearing in the Journal of Congress (1784, p. 333), Daniel Parker stated that a ship called the *Empress of China*, under command of Capt. John Green, would shortly sail from New York to Canton, in China, and requested "sea letters." This ship measured 360 tons. She sailed February 22, 1784, carrying outgoing cargo of ginseng, and she brought back tea and silk, making a profit in the venture of $30,000, a little more than 25 per cent on the investment.

She was soon joined by the *Experiment*, a vessel carrying 80 tons of cargo. Her crew numbered 15 men and boys and she carried 6 cannon and a supply of small arms.

Notwithstanding these conditions, and although the return voyage required 4 months and 12 days, the business was profitable, so that in 1789 no less than 15 American ships were in the Canton roads, carrying ginseng, fish, flour, butter, rum, wines, beer, and snuff, and bringing back principally tea and silk.

Just think of these small boats, the long voyages over unexplored seas, along uncharted coasts, carrying a flag which represented no power, when our people were financially prostrate and leading commercial nations were secretly or openly at enmity with us; yet these sturdy pioneers reached out for the commerce of all the East. They had the stuff in them that makes sea power, and boys became commanders of ships before they were of age.

By 1815 the United States had about half the tonnage of Great Britain, and by 1850 we had 3,535,454 tons, while Great Britain had only 4,232,960. Our shipping continued to grow, and by 1861 the difference between us was reduced to about 400,000 tons, Great Britain showing 5,895,369 tons, the United States 5,482,127 tons.

The war between the States came.

The steel ships came.

Our people seemed to lose interest in shipping—attracted in other directions.

When the war of 1914 burst forth we had 4,000,000 tons of overseas shipping in foreign trade less than we had in 1861.

We could only claim of such shipping about 1,400,000 tons. It is true American interests owned foreign shipping to the extent of about 2,000,000 tons, which served our commerce, being under American management though under foreign flag.

Great Britain owned about one-half the world's carriers of overseas commerce of 43,054,000 gross tons.

Only about 9.7 per cent of our foreign trade was carried in American bottoms. This was a dangerous as well as humiliating and inexcusable situation in which to find ourselves.

Of course, when German and Austrian ships of about 6,000,000 and 1,000,000 tons, respectively, were out of commission Italy's and France's ships were confined to their own business, and Great Britain requisitioned many merchant ships for war purposes, we began to realize what a perilous state of dependency we were in. Of course, freight rates went up to prohibitive points, as high as 1,000 per cent, and our products weighed down our terminals and packed our warehouses, with no means of getting them to their waiting markets.

We became a beggar of ships, "a fettered and embargoed trafficker on the seas."

We passed the shipping act, which we ought to have done years before.

There were no ships to be had. The only thing to do was to build them.

Later the submarine menace appeared, and its depredations were such that in the first quarter of 1917 they sank 240,000 tons more shipping than Great Britain built that year. In 1917 submarines sank one-sixth of the entire merchant marine of Great Britain.

The situation became desperate.

It was perfectly plain that although the Royal Navy stood intact, if this destruction continued a few months longer and we could not build ships as fast as they could be sunk, Great Britain would be out of the war.

Lord Inchcoape well said, "The British mercantile marine, which was built up without a penny of aid from the Government, has borne no small share in saving the country from defeat."

The war demonstrated absolutely that an adequate navy, sea power of a nation, must have something more than battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and the like, an aggregation of floating batteries. There must be colliers, tankers, supply ships, a merchant marine as well.

It was fortunate for the world that Great Britain owned so large a supply of merchant ships. She was, notwithstanding the terrific losses, able to carry 66 per cent of our troops as late as August, 1918. She also furnished 90 per cent of the patrol, guard, and convoys. Her merchant sailors rendered invaluable service.

It was made clear that a merchant marine is as much a part of an efficient navy as the battleships.

The United Kingdom lost during the war 8,000,000 gross tons by submarines and 1,000,000 gross tons by marine risk.

The figures are given by competent authority as follows:

	Dead-weight tons.
At the beginning of the war allied and neutral tonnage was, estimated	59,465,000
Total losses during the war	21,404,000
Total construction, both allied and neutral	14,247,000
Enemy tonnage acquired	3,795,000
Loss due to failure to build	14,713,000
Net deficit due to war on Jan. 1, 1919	18,062,000

The value of the world's shipping overseas in July, 1914, was about $2,500,000,000.

We will spend about $3,800,000,000 and own about one-fourth the shipping of the world.

	Dead-weight tons.
We completed in 1918	3,103,593
We created incompleted shipping in 1918	2,540,896
Total	5,644,489

This was 50 per cent more than Great Britain built and 25 per cent more than all the rest of the world and three times the amount launched in 1917 and more than the entire output of the United States for 1907 to 1916. To do this there were employed as many as—in the shipyards and plants—788,000 men. Quite regularly there were 400,000 shipyard workers engaged.

Congress has authorized the expenditure of $3,671,000,000 for carrying forward the work of creating an American merchant marine and appropriated $2,625,451,000. The Shipping Board asks for $673,368,301 more.

There were built 8,800 houses and 1,100 dormitories for the workers, at a cost of $75,000,000. For the transportation of the workers we spent $20,000,000.

We have been expending about $5,000,000 per day in carrying out the great shipbuilding program.

The Government now owns 555 steel cargo vessels, aggregating 3,385,000 dead-weight tons, and has under contract 1,336 more, of 9,225,000 tons.

Unless further cancellations take place we should have under our flag next year 16,732,000 dead-weight tons, of which about 14,000,000 will be fit for overseas trade.

There is no need so pressing at this time as ocean transportation.

The carrying capacity of the merchant marine to-day of the world is at least 5,000,000 tons less than it was in July, 1914.

There will be work for shipyards and an urgent demand for shipping until this loss is made up and the increased needs of the world shall be met.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Florida if he has any accurate figures showing the total destruction of the world's commerce by submarines during the war? I have understood that it was about 13,000,000 tons, and I wish to know if the Senator has looked carefully into that matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Louisiana was probably absent from the Chamber a moment ago when I gave that tonnage. The total losses during the war aggregated 21,404,000 dead-weight tons.

Mr. RANSDELL. How did that compare with the total ocean-going commerce?

Mr. FLETCHER. There were 59,465,000 tons of ocean-going shipping.

Mr. RANSDELL. Then something over one-third of the total of the shipping of the world was destroyed by the submarine?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes. As I have it, there were 59,465,000 dead-weight tons of allied and neutral shipping for the world, and the losses were 21,404,000 tons.

Mr. RANSDELL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from Florida what is a dead-weight ton?

Mr. FLETCHER. A dead-weight ton is the cargo capacity of the ship. The difference between the dead-weight ton and the gross ton is arrived at in this way: You multiply the gross ton by 150 to get the dead-weight ton, and you multiply the dead-weight ton by 66⅔ to get the gross tonnage. There is quite a difference between the two, and there is often some confusion created by the description of ships by tonnage. It is therefore important to specify whether one means gross tons or dead-weight tons when giving statistics relative to shipping.

Dead-weight tonnage is the ordinary method of expressing the commercial value of a cargo vessel for purposes of charter or purchase, and it is intended to be a measure of the cargo-carrying capacity.

Net registered tonnage is the gross tonnage less the space occupied by engines and boilers, plus 75 per cent, plus the space occupied by the crew.

Gross tonnage is the ordinary record of the tonnage of merchant vessels, and is the internal cubic capacity of the vessel divided by 100—that is, a gross ton is 100 cubic feet measured inside the frames of the space devoted to the carriage of cargo or passengers, or is otherwise inclosed.

To compute dead-weight tons from gross tons, take 150 per cent of the gross tonnage—for example, a vessel of 10,000 gross tons equals 15,000 dead-weight tons. To compute gross tons from dead-weight tons, take 66⅔ per cent of the dead-weight tonnage.

We are prepared to build ships, not only to meet the domestic requirements, but to supply the world demand. We have the shipyards, the trained workers, and the raw material in greater abundance than any other country or countries.

Ship plates and structural material has declined, according to Mr. James A. Farrell, who knows, $12 per ton here, with a corresponding reduction in collateral forms of iron and steel products. Ship plates are selling in England at $67 per ton, and shipbuilding shapes at $66 per ton, whereas in the United States they can be had at $53 and $49, respectively.

Since the signing of the armistice contracts have been canceled or suspended, which means the same thing in the existing circumstances, for 754 ships, aggregating 3,797,825 dead-weight tons, which would have cost to complete $797,564,276. The cost of cancellation is estimated at about $202,853,456. The cancellations amount to more than 25 per cent of the full program.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has just stated, as I understood his figures, that the cancellations would be more than $200,000,000. Does he mean that the loss to the Government will be more than $200,000,000 because of the termination of contracts which have been entered into and in order to settle claims for damages growing out of those contracts?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is practically the situation. There will be left on hand, of course, a lot of salvage material and that sort of thing, which the Shipping Board will have to dispose of and credit on this outlay; but the Senator has stated it about as it is, with the possible exception, as I have said, that we will be able to get something back out of the material on hand which was ordered to carry out these contracts.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, have the board agreed upon a basis of settlement to pay so much as damages for the obligation of the contracts upon which nothing has been done?

Mr. FLETCHER. Wherever nothing has been done and no materials have been ordered, there is no damage allowed, but wherever the material has been ordered, even though the construction has not actually been begun and the contract is canceled, then the question of damages arises.

I will say to the Senator that, according to the statement before the committee, the board fixed, rather arbitrarily but based on the best information they could obtain as to the actual cost of building to-day and values at this time, a maximum of $50 a ton as a limit for cancellation; that is to say, if a ship ought to be built at $50 per ton less now than the contract price, and if they cancel the contract and get out of it profitably on that basis, they will do so, provided the keel has not been laid and other complications have not set in which would make it pay to finish the ship. It is a plain business proposition, whether it would pay the Government to go on and finish the ship at the contract price or cancel the contract and pay the damages, not exceeding a maximum of $50 per ton, as I remember, which perhaps is rather an arbitrary figure. If the ship can not be sold when completed within $50 a ton of what it will cost under the contract, it is considered advisable, everything else being equal, to cancel the contract and pay damages within that amount.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I of course can not express any intelligent opinion with respect to the wisdom of those settlements. I have made some little investigation, and it seems to me that that loss is rather too heavy, yet, of course, the committee, having investigated the matter, would have fuller information than any of us not upon the committee have been permitted to obtain. But what I wanted to ask the Senator was whether or not the figures which have been given to the committee have been those that have been produced by employees or officials connected with the department, or has the committee obtained the services of some competent shipping expert to look into this question to advise it as to the character of the ships, what ought to be paid by way of damages for cancellation, and the subject generally? I make that inquiry for the reason that I find that many of these governmental agencies have furnished testimony which some of us think has been biased and needs some other testimony in order to present the full facts in the case.

This is a matter so important, it is a subject so transcendently important now, particularly the question of what should be done with the ships, the cost of the ships, and if they are sold, what price they ought to bring, that independent testimony, it occurs to me, could materially aid the committee in reaching a conclusion with respect to the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that the hearings before the committee have not been concluded. It has been our purpose to call in all the people who have accurate information on this subject, and who might help us in arriving at a proper conclusion about it. Of course up to this time we have had the officials, and then we have had some shipbuilding people and others who seemed to be posted regarding the matter. I will state also that the Emergency Fleet Corporation established a committee or board that made quite a thorough examination of conditions all over the country, and they have had the benefit of their advice on the subject.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I think it is a fact that in February they did make a survey of all commitments for material and all obligations that had been incurred by the various shipyards, with a view of determining what percentage of the contract price the Shipping Board would be compelled to pay on cancellations. That survey, of course, would be of little value now, because the work has proceeded to so much greater an extent; but I do understand, and it was testified before the committee, that a new survey is now being made.

With reference to the basis of cancellation, if I understood the Senator from Florida, he said it was based upon the difference between the assumed cost of building ships now and the contract cost with a maximum of $50 per ton. I do not understand that to be exactly the basis. It is what the Shipping Board assumes would be the maximum loss on sale of the completed ships as compared with canceling the contract now, which the board assumes would be a maximum of $50 per ton upon the sale. In other words, if we can complete a contract and sell the ship at a loss of not more than $50 per ton, and if it would cost more than that to cancel we do not cancel.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is correct about that, I think.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I was prompted to make the observation I did a moment ago for several reasons; one of them being that I have recently observed that representatives of the Shipping Board have stated that they were disposing of ships which had been constructed by the Government for $210 per ton, and that this was more than the ships cost. I have made some little investi-

gation and considerable inquiry. A number of persons connected with ship construction have stated to me that the ships have cost very much more than that amount. Indeed, one gentleman who had given some attention to the subject stated that the ships constructed and being constructed in the latter part of 1917 and the early part of 1918 would cost at least $400 per ton. I am not sure whether he stated that that was per dead-weight ton or per gross ton; but all of my information is that, taking into account the cost of the plants, the overhead expense, and those things that ought legitimately to be charged against the output of ships, the cost is very much more than $210 per ton; and if they are being sold for $210 per ton, in my opinion, based upon the information which I have received, the Government is sustaining a very great loss.

I was wondering if the Senator had given attention to that matter, and if, in his admirable address this morning, he will discuss that question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I would say that this matter of arriving at the precise cost of ships is a very complicated and a very difficult matter. For instance, the cost in one yard will be entirely different from the cost in another yard, owing to certain conditions; and the cost of the first ships put out by a yard will be much greater than the cost of subsequent ships, because at the outset you had to build your yard, you had to get the material. You had to organize your force and train your men. In subsequent operations of the yard you get the benefit of all that, and you are prepared to build your ships at a much better figure than you were at the beginning. The best they can do is to rather average this item of expense for building ships, and arrive at a cost spread out over the whole program; and that is what I presume they have done when they estimate these ships to cost about $206 per ton. In some instances they have cost more than that; in other instances they have not cost as much. In most instances the cost has been higher than was originally expected, because wages went up, material went up, and various difficulties were encountered; and, as I say, they had to build with a sole regard for speed and a disregard of all other economic questions.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. DIAL. Do I understand that the Shipping Board has a legal right to sell these ships at its pleasure?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will get to that in a few minutes. The actual state of the law is that the President has the right and power to construct, operate, and dispose of ships built in pursuance of the appropriations made, and the President has the right to delegate that authority to any agency he may select. I assume that the Shipping Board is acting under the authority granted to it by the President in pursuance of the law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator, but if he will permit one further observation, perhaps in the nature of a question, I shall be obliged.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. KING. A short time ago I made a rough calculation, based upon the best information I could obtain. I ascertained the appropriations which had been made to the Shipping Board for all purposes—that is to say, for employees, for the construction of shipyards, and for all of the objects which the board was created to carry out. Then I ascertained as best I could the number of tons that had been constructed, the number of tons that were upon the ways, and, as nearly as I could, the state of completion. Of course, the calculation which I could make, based upon those incomplete factors, of necessity would be inaccurate; but the very best figures that I could obtain from those calculations were that the ships that were completed—and, at the same ratio, those that were upon the ways, if they had been completed at the same cost—at the time of the armistice and about a month ago, when I made the calculation, would have cost the Government approximately $300 or a little above per ton.

Now, I should be very glad to know—and it seems to me that it is susceptible of computation—whether or not we are selling ships at a very great loss. I do not think it is quite fair for those who are disposing of these ships to bring into the equation here factors that ought not to be taken into account. We ought to ascertain what the cost of ships has been in the past, and, if we are determined to sell, sell them at the highest price possible. I have been told that we could have gotten for our ships more than $210 per ton. That information may be entirely inaccurate; but, if we are going to sell, we ought to know what the cost of the ships has been in the past, and we ought to sell for as much as the Government can get for its completed vessels.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no doubt that the board is getting all that can be had for these ships that it is selling. I am impressed that $210 per ton is a very excellent price for steel ships; but I will state that they arrive at the matter of cost in this manner:

First, however, let me point out to the Senator that out of these appropriations which he had before him we will say $100,000,000 went into the shipyards, $66,000,000 at Hog Island, and the balance of the $100,000,000 at Newark Bay and at Bristol. The Government's money built those yards. Then about $100,000,000 went into the housing and transportation. To arrive at the cost of the ships up to date, you want to distribute that cost through the whole program. You could not add that to your appropriation, and then figure that that is a part of the cost of ships built in these yards, for instance.

Now, here is the way that they arrive at the estimate of cost:

Built and contracted for by the Government there will be 2,434 vessels, aggregating 13,885,106 dead-weight tons, which will involve an outlay of $2,861,755,570. This would indicate the cost of the ships to be $206 a dead-weight ton; but, as explained by Chairman Hurley, if we deduct income and excess-profits taxes and the like, estimated to amount to $347,127,650, it leaves $2,514,527,920, or $180 a dead-weight ton, as the actual cost to the Government. Now, whether or not you want to figure that you have a right to deduct the excess-profits taxes, and take that out of the cost, just depends on your way of calculating; but, if you do that, as I say, the cost figures $180 a dead-weight ton.

The Shipping Board has sold some freighters, 7,500 tons, at $210 a dead-weight ton.

The board believes this tonnage will be 2,000,000 tons more than is sufficient to move 50 per cent of our exports.

We will have about 800,000 tons of wooden ships.

The Fleet Corporation delivered in May, 1919, 768,000 tons of ships, and launched 700,000 tons.

The ships on the program will cost, completed, it is thought, from $200 to $202 per ton.

If a proposed cancellation would cost exceeding $50 per ton, it would not be ordered.

Fifty dollars per ton is the estimated maximum cost of cancellation.

It is supposed that no contracts can be had in Great Britain for less than $140 to $160 per ton, and then only on long-time and a cost-plus or "time-and-time" basis.

Contracts equally favorable can be placed in the United States.

I have endeavored to condense the material facts showing our shipping situation.

We have had only a glimpse at the needs of an adequate merchant marine under the American flag. There is no call for any argument on that point.

We have noted what our experience has been thus far, both in construction and operation.

PROPER POLICY.

We have sketched what has been accomplished, the results and what lies in expectation.

The program of construction of 1918 has been reduced materially, and no new contracts are contemplated.

The Shipping Board and the Director of Operations recommend that the Government discontinue the construction of ships as soon as existing contracts are performed, that the Government sell its ships, and that the Government retire from the operating business.

The very important question is therefore, What shall be the future policy of the Government in respect to these matters?

They are of grave, far-reaching concern to the country.

Congress must determine now whether—

(1) The Government shall cease the building of ships when those under contract are completed. If so, what is to become of the Hog Island plant, which has cost about $66,000,000, as it stands; the yard at Bristol, Pa., and rights under the option respecting the submarine-boat yard at Newark, and interests in other shipyards?

(2) Shall the Government sell off all its ships, built and acquired; and if so, upon what terms and conditions?

(3) Shall the Government cease the operation of its ships entirely and abandon all organization and plans heretofore undertaken in that connection?

What is to be our policy—temporary or permanent?

President Wilson said May 24, 1914, in an address to the Pan-American Congress:

> One of our chief needs is to have a merchant marine, because if we have to deliver our goods in other people's delivery wagons, their goods are delivered first and our goods are delivered only incidentally, if at all. * * * Since private capital has not established an American merchant marine, it is now the duty of the Government to undertake it.

The President on another occasion, illustrating how clearly and deeply he sees into the future, foretold precisely what was likely to happen to us in these words:

> If other nations go to war or seek to hamper each other's commerce, our merchants will be at their mercy, for we have no ships of our own and can not control our own commerce.

He warned the country, as he, with that rare foresight and vision, which has characterized his administration, urged that the Government should build and own merchant ships, as he continued to say:

> Such a situation is not to be endured. It is of capital importance that the United States should be its own carrier on the seas and enjoy the economic independence which only an adequate merchant marine would give it.
>
> The great merchant fleet we once used to make us rich, that great body of sturdy sailors who used to carry our flag into every sea, and who were the pride and often the bulwark of the Nation, we have almost driven out of existence in inexcusable neglect and indifference and by a hopelessly blind and provincial policy. It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas.

Serious and diligent effort was made to have Congress act in accordance with the advice and views of the President, but determined opposition defeated the legislation then proposed and urged.

Finally, world conditions developed and, as the President predicted, we realized the mistake of depending on foreign ships to carry our goods and the absolute necessity of building our own ships without delay.

The shipping act, approved September 7, 1916, resulted. It was, as is most legislation, something of a compromise. It does, however, set forth a policy.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. KING. I hesitate to venture any opinion that runs contrariwise to the trend of the Senator's argument at present being developed, and yet it seems to me that the facts compel us to state that the merchant marine, to which such eloquent tribute has just been paid, was developed not by the Government, not by a system of bounties, but by the genius of the American people and by the enactment of liberal laws that contributed to the development of the merchant marine. It seems to me that if the same causes which gave us a great merchant marine that carried into every sea of the world the products of mine and field and farm could operate to-day they would produce the same result. I do not think it necessarily follows because we have not a merchant marine that it is attributable to the failure of the Government to build a merchant marine, and I do not think it necessarily follows that we will not have a merchant marine unless the Government itself builds the merchant marine.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, I am only giving the history of things. We can arrive at our own conclusions about it based upon whatever data there is before us. I am only saying that for 50 years private enterprise failed to build up an American merchant marine and that we had 4,000,000 tons less of merchant shipping on the high seas in 1914 than we had in 1861.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will yield further, belonging to the same political faith as the distinguished Senator from Florida, I think it would not be improper to challenge his attention to the fact that, at least, his party and my party have ascribed the absence of a merchant marine to certain unwise legislation which was enacted by the Republican Party.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to state that in the Journal of Commerce of New York for the 24th of the present month there is a statement to the effect that during April of this year 31 per cent of the ocean-borne export trade of the United States as measured by volume was carried under the American flag as compared with 20 per cent in April, 1918. Of this trade British ships carried in April, 1918, 50 per cent, while in April, 1919, the present year, they carried only 31.6 per cent. I can not vouch for the accuracy of this statement, but if it be true it certainly shows that under the policy recently adopted and put into effect by this administration we are carrying an enormously greater percentage of our commerce now than we were one year ago, backing up the general argument of the Senator that we are going forward by leaps and bounds in our shipbuilding program, which amounted to nothing when the war began in 1914.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think unquestionably we are taking our place on the sea. The problem now is, What shall we do to maintain that position and increase it? I agree with the Senator that there is no need to argue that the Government ought to give a bounty to shipping, or anything of that sort.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if there is an unrestricted authority to dispose of vessels just as the board wishes to do so?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is, Mr. President. I think the authority is vested in the President, and he has power to delegate it to the Shipping Board.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is just one of those wide powers we gave during the war to the President as to what he can do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will refer to that a little later on.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. May I ask one question more? Does not the Senator think that sales on long time, an amortization plan, part payments, a little more than interest on the money, would dispose of these vessels faster than selling them for cash?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think they are selling them on time. They are only asking 25 per cent cash down, 12½ per cent in one year, and the remainder distributed over four years.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Could they not just as well run for 10 years? Ought it not to be studied and planned to dispose of them at figures that facilitate the broadest number possible of purchases?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is true. I hope they are doing that. I, of course, can not tell exactly what they are doing, because this is new and we have no reports as to details. The only information I have on that subject is some statements made before the Committee on Commerce several days ago and these newspaper reports.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator intend to discuss later on in his remarks the question as to whether or not there is a reservation of title? My understanding is that ships are being sold to-day without any agreement that the ownership shall be retained by Americans and that they shall be operated under the American flag. It would seem to me that there ought to be such a reservation. It would be highly improper to use these vast funds of the Government to construct ships merely to dispose of them to aliens to be operated under the flag of some other country.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, undoubtedly, those that have been sold thus far are required to continue under American register. There is some suggestion that I saw in the newspapers of sales being made to foreign Governments. Of course, if there are any sales of that sort contemplated they will pass entirely under a foreign flag.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Have we not a bill pending before us now by which, with the proper amendments, we could restrict the power to sell entirely ships that will remain under the American flag?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is a bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], which provides for a future policy, but I think the present law protects fully as regards the transfer of flags. It is an old statute, and the Shipping Board has the absolute power to prevent transfer to a foreign flag.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Shipping Board has that power, but have we by legislation made it impossible for them to transfer to a foreign flag?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think not. I think it is a matter of discretion with the board to permit that to be done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If they did transfer to a foreign flag, and we, by legislation, have left that authority with them, would we not be equally responsible with them for the improper course they would pursue?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is one bearing that these remarks are intended to cover on this general question.

As I stated, the shipping act approved September 7, 1916, was, as is most legislation, a compromise. It does, however, set forth a policy. That policy was that the Government should proceed to build and acquire merchant ships to be employed in the overseas trade of the country.

That the Government should own those ships until "the expiration of five years from the conclusion of the present European war declared by the proclamation of the President."

That the Government could sell, lease, or charter such vessels, and must do so, provided if the board shall be unable after a bona fide effort to contract with any person, a citizen of the United States, for the purchase, lease, or charter of such vessel under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the board, then it could "engage in the operation of any" such vessels.

In other words, the policy was to charter the vessels to private parties if it could be done on a proper basis; otherwise the President would declare conditions existed justifying the operation of the vessel.

The emergency shipping act approved November 4, 1918, provides that "all ships constructed, purchased, or requisitioned under authority herein, or heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States, shall be managed, operated, and disposed of as the President may direct."

This act carried authorizations "for purchasing, requisitioning, or otherwise acquiring plants, material, charters, or ships now constructed," and so forth, of $250,000,000. For the "cost of construction of ships," and so forth, $500,000,000. For "the operation of the ships," and so forth, $5,000,000.

The act further provides that "all authority granted to the President herein, or by him delegated, shall cease six months after a final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire."

Until that time the President has absolute authority and power to manage, operate, and dispose of the ships constructed, purchased, requisitioned, or otherwise acquired by the Government.

I have been disposed to leave the authority and power there.

At any time within the limitation set by that act the President can, if he has not otherwise disposed of them, transfer the ships to the United States Shipping Board. In that case they come under the operation of the shipping act of 1916 and are to be, by that act, handled as it provides.

If it be the will of Congress to extend or modify the powers of the President under the act of November 4, 1918, it is obvious that early action should be taken. If Congress holds to the policy expressed in the shipping act of 1916 there is no real need of further legislation. The ships, contracts, and all property would come to the Shipping Board six months after peace or before, I take it, to be administered, managed, and handled as that act provides for at least five years more.

On the first question, as to policy regarding construction, I do not favor the abandonment of all construction by the Government and scrapping the yards, in which such large sums of money have been invested. I think the Government might gradually work out of construction, but in the meantime get the benefit of the plants and facilities already created, and build such ships for such purposes as the country needs.

GOVERNMENT YARDS.

For instance, we have the option to acquire fee simple title to the Hog Island property, on which we have expended about $66,000,000, for $1,740,747.15, and we can exercise that option at any time. It embraces 927.14 acres of land, with about a mile frontage on Delaware River, including riparian rights, piers, 50 shipways, warehouses, railways, water, sewer, and lighting systems, buildings, and improvements of every nature. As a great ocean terminal the property is worth practically what it has cost, but at auction it would not bring one-tenth its real value. It is too large for any private concern to operate as a shipyard. It might be divided into several yards. Just to close it down and attempt to sell it would call for enormous sacrifice. We could lease a portion of it and operate the other, continuing to build steel ships as demands for our foreign trade requires.

The yard at Bristol, on which we have spent $14,554,934.19, we might not continue. We had the option under the contract (vol 1, p. 763 of hearings) to purchase the real estate, including buildings, at $1,860,500 plus taxes and assessments.

The yard at Newark Bay, on which we have spent $17,328,980.06 and on which we have a lease with an option to buy, should yield us something.

There are at Newark Bay 112.79 acres (including streets, 71.41 acres) and we pay $32,560 per month for 21 months. The Fleet Corporation built the plant on leased ground and has an option to purchase the land at $12,000 per acre, which lease expires December 15, 1922.

The contracts were to build at these agency yards, with results thus far, as follows:

Submarine Boat, Newark, one hundred and fifty 5,000-ton ships; 54 hulls launched and 27 delivered. Merchants' Co., Bristol, sixty 9,000-ton ships; 11 hulls launched and 8 delivered; 20 hulls canceled. American International, Hog Island, fifty 7,500-ton ships; added sixty 7,500-ton ships, seventy 8,000-ton ships, 35 of the latter being canceled and 23 suspended; 22 ships delivered and 34 hulls launched.

Whatever we do as to the agency yards at Bristol and Newark, we should unquestionably exercise our option and acquire title to the yard at Hog Island.

My judgment is we ought to continue to build ships there.

An item in the newspapers of June 17 recites that 19 steel cargo ships, aggregating 128,472 dead-weight tons, have been sold by the Shipping Board at prices ranging from $210 to $225 a ton to New York ship operators. These vessels averaged 6,760 tons each. The question is, Why sell them? They can earn excellent profits on an investment of $300 a ton at this time.

Some of the money which has gone into these vessels under war conditions, when it was necessary to sacrifice economy for speed, and therefore laid the Fleet Corporation open to the charge of waste, can never be gotten back, and the excess cost can be wiped out by judicious operation for Government account. I think that should be done.

I quite agree that as the vessels were built with war uses in view, there may be types which should now be sold if it can be done without loss, in order to balance and better the fleet, but this idea of selling ships because they can be sold at or a little above cost, when they can pay for themselves in a few months, is a mistake. There is a real shortage of ships, and will be for some months, perhaps years, to come. Freight rates will continue abnormally high. The Government ships can serve our commerce on advantageous terms to shippers and still earn enormous profits, and I believe that should be done rather than sell the ships and have those profits go to the purchasers.

Chairman Hurley, who has devoted his best ability, his untiring energy, and his patriotic purposes, with rare patience and zeal, to the gigantic task which confronted the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, since he became chairman of the one and president of the other, is quoted in the press as saying, about June 18:

> The United States is the only country in the world to-day where ships can be sold for spot delivery. * * * Since we began selling ships a short time ago we have disposed of 322,045 dead-weight tons. The total amount of these sales now aggregate $51,854,620.

Treating these ships as a much-desired asset of the American people, whose money built them, why sell them at a time when such property is so scarce and they can be had nowhere else and their earning capacity must be at the maximum?

Because we can get approaching their cost is not sufficient reason for disposing of them absolutely, particularly if they can serve our commerce and earn a fair profit on more than their cost, as would seem to be the case.

They are now earning, Mr. Hurley admits, excellent profit on a cost of $300 a ton.

We are in the position of having property which is in keen demand all over the world, and which can be had from no other owners, and which we greatly need. If we part with that property it is gone forever, and, we are told, is not to be replaced.

Not only is it proposed to sell the property, valuable as it is, needed as it is, desirable as it is, but the great industry established for its creation and important to the Nation, must also be abandoned, so far as the Government is concerned.

Sound business, good judgment, and public interest call for the making of that industry secure and permanent. At great expense and infinite labor we have gone through the stages required for its foundation, its development, and its completed structure. Why make junk of our equipment, facilities, machinery, and fixtures, by the employment of which we have been able to lead the world in construction and output?

Why do that now, when the world needs that output and when that need is supplied it will have to be continually kept supplied with new output to take the place of losses and depreciation which are inevitable?

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope I do not break the line of the Senator's thought, but I would like very much to have him state whether he has investigated to see how rapidly the world is replacing the 21,000,000 tons of shipping which were destroyed, more than one-third of all the commercial ships of the world. Is that being very rapidly rebuilt and replaced?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was not my purpose to deal with that particularly, but I will answer the Senator in this way: It is my information that Great Britain can probably build 2,000,000 tons a year, France probably 1,000,000 tons, Japan probably half a million tons, and, of course, at that rate it would take a good many years to replace that shipping.

Mr. RANSDELL. Would not that back up the Senator's argument that we ought to maintain these yards and continue to operate them for a while, at least until we have restored the normal to the shipping of the world?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is my view of it.

Mr. RANSDELL. I think that is right in line with the Senator's argument. If he will permit me, I have a very interesting statement here—I do not know whether it is correct—from an English publication called Fairplay, dated June 12, which I would like to read. It is very brief:

> The German Government has decided to help German shipowners to build up their fleets, and the negotiations which have taken place between the Government, the shipowners, and the shipbuilders with regard to the necessary contracts have now been concluded. It has been decided that the shipbuilders are to construct the necessary steamers on time and lime, plus a percentage for profit. With regard to the payment for these vessels, the cost is to be divided between the Government and the shipowners on the following basis: The cost of ships is to be taken per ton gross on the 1st of August, 1914, and the 1st of October, 1918, and the difference is to be paid equally by the Government and the shipowners, and any increase since October is to be paid entirely by the Government. As costs have increased enormously since October, this will mean a heavy Government subsidy. For instance, it is stated that a steamer which cost 2,000,000 marks in 1914 cost 5,600,000 marks in October, 1918, and will cost 14,000,000 marks at the present time, with the result that, while the shipowner

will pay 4,800,000 marks for his ship, the Government will be liable for 9,200,000 marks (equal to £460,000 at pre-war rates), a liability which she will hardly be able to meet if the Allies impose their full terms on Germany. But, notwithstanding this generous subsidy, German shipowners are not satisfied, for, while they have given many orders to shipbuilders, it is reported that it is impossible to obtain deliveries of the necessary steel, with the result that the shortage of material will make shipbuilding impossible.

I understand that "lime" means cost.

Mr. FLETCHER. Cost plus.

Mr. RANSDELL. I read that simply for the purpose of backing up the very interesting argument being made by the Senator to show that at least Germany, if this account is correct, is certainly doing everything possible to restore its fleet, and it behooves us to bear in mind very carefully what is going on in the shipbuilding industry of the world when we talk about disposing of our ships and our shipyards.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am obliged to the Senator for this contribution to the discussion. I am quite clear, and I think that article shows it, that we can build in the United States as cheaply as building can be done anywhere. The time has passed, Mr. President, when Great Britain or any other country can build steel ships of a desirable kind at less cost than they can be built in the United States. We have the labor, we have the material, we have the facilities, we have the means and resources now for building as quickly and as efficiently and as cheaply as ships can be built anywhere.

It is very gratifying to note that the stockholders of the International Mercantile Marine, practically all American, decided not to sell its fleet to foreign interests, even at a tempting offer.

This action indicates that they realize the time has come when American citizens should, and are determined to, hold what shipping they have, and add to it as they may.

The United States is not ambitious to become the greatest military power. We are not anxious to be the greatest naval power.

We do expect to rank as the greatest commerial Nation in the world, and this, we believe, surpasses the other two. That nation which can produce a surplus of the prime necessities of life which other nations must have or go hungry and unclothed is in position of supreme strength. No nation can equal us in that respect if we supplement that capacity for production by adequate facilities for distribution; that is to say, if we own and manage the necessary carriers for the transportation of those products. We are just now, for the first time in over 50 years, able to claim we can do that. To make that certain and insure its permanency should be our determination. The means of doing it should receive our earnest solicitation and care. Our policy should be to preserve those means. If they go into private hands just as we have obtained them, what will become of them we can not say. Until it is made plain that it will profit private owners to use those means under our flag and in accordance with our laws and in our interest the Government should hold on to them.

Later, under proper covenants and assurances, the Government may relinquish its grasp on the industry and business, leaving private enterprise loyal and stimulated to maintain and perpetuate them.

NEW ROUTES.

There are markets undisclosed, regions untouched by trade, fields unexplored, possibilities of development not comprehended which we are in position to bring into their own.

Those Government ships afford us the means of accomplishing great results in that direction.

The Government need not interfere with existing lanes or with the business of the companies now operating.

The Government can help rather than harm them, and at the same time extend our trade and promote the commercial interests of our people.

Two things, the experts agree, will overcome all advantages any competitor may have and place us where we can compete with all countries on the sea.

First. Regular schedules and certain sailings over defined routes.

Second. Railroad cooperation in issuing through bills of lading from origin to destination, making a proper division of the freight with the connecting water line.

Third. Mail contracts based on service rendered.

What individual or what company can do these things?

A few individuals may have the vision to discern accurately the possibilities of commercial advantages and extension in new directions, but capital will be needed to carry into effect their ideas, and capital is proverbially timid. It will not be found to back visions. It requires something more than vision and prospects. It will know something about profits. It may back men of character and experience who have the vision to a limited extent, and very soon it will want to know about the practical results, and if the dividends are not coming in or satisfactory reasons given, based on realities, it will discontinue support.

Only the Government is in position to open up new routes of trade and develop markets now empty and waiting and ready.

President Wilson understood this when he addressed Congress December 8, 1914, and so admirably and forcefully said:

It may seem a reversal of the natural order of things, but it is true that the routes of trade must be actually opened—by many ships and regular sailings and moderate charges—before streams of merchandise will flow freely and profitably through them.

Hence the pending shipping bill, discussed at the last session, but as yet passed by neither House. In my judgment such legislation is imperatively needed and can not wisely be postponed. The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw. I very earnestly hope that the Congress will be of this opinion, and that both Houses will adopt this exceedingly important bill.

The legislation to which he referred was not enacted until and only as it came forth in the form of the present shipping act of September 7, 1916.

In that same address to Congress the President said what we should bear in mind to-day as a warning against a course which may place the country in the position it then occupied with reference to shipping, to wit:

How are we to build up a great trade if we have not the certain and constant means of transportation upon which all profitable and useful commerce depends? And how are we to get the ships if we wait for the trade to develop without them? To correct the many mistakes by which we have discouraged and all but destroyed the merchant marine of the country, to retrace the steps by which we have, it seems, almost deliberately withdrawn our flag from the seas, except where, here and there, a ship of war is bidden carry it or some wandering yacht displays it, would take a long time and involve many detailed items of legislation, and the trade which we ought immediately to handle would disappear or find other channels while we debated the items.

Referring in that same message to "our own neighbors, the States, great and small of Central and South Americas," and he might have added the rich islands between, he said:

Their lines of trade have hitherto run chiefly athwart the seas, not to our ports but to the ports of Great Britain and of the older Continent of Europe. I do not stop to inquire why or to make any comment on probable causes. What interests us just now is not the explanation but the fact, and our duty and opportunity in the presence of it. Here are markets which we must supply, and we must find the means of action. The United States, this great people for whom we speak and act, should be ready, as never before, to serve itself, and to serve mankind; ready with its resources, its energies, its forces of production, and its means of distribution.

It is a very practical matter, a matter of ways and means. We have the resources, but are we fully ready to use them? And if we can make ready what we have, have we the means at hand to distribute it? We are not fully ready; neither have we the means of distribution. We are willing, but we are not fully able. We have the wish to serve, and to serve greatly, generously, but we are not prepared as we should be.

Since then we have heeded his advice and we have begun and partially completed the means of distribution to which he referred.

We are now able to serve our neighbors and the world as never before. We have ceased to stunt and hinder the development of our merchant marine, and adopted a definite policy by which we are to own merchant vessels second only in quantity to Great Britain and unsurpassed in efficiency. These will carry our flag to every port and harbor that a ship can reach over the seven seas, and they will furthermore cause the development of harbors worthy of improvement, delayed only by lack of ships to use them.

Now, just as we approach that situation we are seriously threatened with a policy which will place us where we were in 1914, so clearly pictured and deplored by the President then. It is that we are to cancel contracts for ships right and left. We are to sell our ships. We are to rely on the patriotism and vision and enterprise of private individuals to keep our flag on the ocean and in the harbors throughout the world, and use the ships the Government has built and sold to them, and such as they may build, to serve the country, the producers and manufacturers, and merchants, from being dependent on our competitors in foreign markets for the delivery of our goods.

This policy brought us to our former helpless state, the gravity of which we never fully realized until 1914. Although Congress had endeavored, by various acts, to stimulate and develop the shipbuilding industry in the United States and promote the interests of American shipping, private enterprise refused to respond. The Government had to step in and do something. When the time came to insure ships and cargoes, the Government had to establish a bureau to carry the risk. We had gone so far behind and there was so much needed to be done, and done at once, individuals could not do it.

We have a considerable portion of the shipping the country needs. We are building sufficient to complete the requirements for the present, provided the contracts are not canceled in such number as to still leave us short of an adequate fleet.

Just as we begin to take our place as an independent, self-respecting Nation on the seas, just as we emerge from the pitiable and distressing position we had got in, and are prepared to serve our own commerce and reach out for the trade of the world, we begin to abandon the tremendous task we undertook, get weary on the forward march to the objective, incline to lay down the burden we have thus far safely carried, halt in the purpose wisely adopted, and, to my mind, weakly surrender when in sight of a glorious achievement.

As if a thing to boast of, we are told the ships are being sold, some of the wooden ships at about half their cost, others approaching cost, and some steel ships, it is proudly claimed, have brought as much as $225 a dead-weight ton. They are actually earning a splendid profit on a price of $300 per ton. We do not appear to think it worth while to have this property of the people, built by proceeds of Liberty bonds, earn back, for the people, some of the money which went into it, but prefer to dispose of it and have the purchasers get the benefit of the prevailing high rates on ocean traffic.

Not only so, but the terms of sale require only 25 per cent down, 12½ per cent in six months, with four years in which to pay the remainder.

It will be sorry management that will prevent these ships from paying for themselves within that period.

It appears a foreign government is negotiating for the purchase of 150 of these ships. I do not wonder. Nothing but a lack of money would interfere with the ships being taken up speedily and greedily.

The question is: Why does the Government cancel contracts, cease building ships and sell off the ships it has, or any of them, unless it be such as it can not use?

To be sure, it requires a considerable organization, composed of experienced, expert men, to operate the ships. It means a big business. But this is a considerable country, a big Government. These ships can be operated without interfering with established lines or with individuals who are in the business for profit, and such operation could be conducted to very great advantage to our people and benefit to the commerce of the world.

Individuals will not, naturally, risk their capital in establishing new business; buy ships to sail new lanes on a venture, however reasonable; or enter upon routes where time and further facilities will be necessary to make it profitable. Present rates are prohibitive in some cases and foreign business is to some extent handicapped and crippled by excessive freight charges. Our aim should be to reduce those charges, and the ownership and operation of ships would enable us to accomplish that. It would give us the means of unburdening commerce.

Instead of organizing a force and opening up offices "with credit, sales, legal, and engineering departments included in the offices," for the purpose of disposing of the ships, why not contribute an organization of proper character, and probably not more costly, for the purpose of operating the ships?

It may be of interest to note that while there have been some losses our experience in operating has certainly afforded no ground for discouragement. For instance, one of our Hog Island 7,500-ton steamers made a net profit of $461,151.29 one voyage on the Atlantic. Another ship, operated by the board, made a net profit of $801,000 one voyage of 110 days on the Pacific.

It will be borne in mind, too, that our rates are lower than the British, Italian, or French. Coal costing $5 a ton at Norfolk brings $25 a ton in Spain and $28 a ton in Buenos Aires. We can load in eight hours at Norfolk a ship it would require six days to load at Barry Docks, Bristol Channel, and ten days at Cardiff. Sales will result in the ships going to augument lines already established and in the concentration of our shipping in a few hands.

Persons with only limited capital wishing to start an independent venture and to do some pioneering will not get any of the ships.

As soon as a favorable opportunity to sell or transfer a ship occurs, it will lose American registry.

Yards in the United States, when it is more profitable to build for foreign account, will do so, to the diminution rather than the continued increase of American ships.

It may be "convenient" but it is not "practical" to sell now. "Current-world market" means our market now.

It would seem entirely feasible to form responsible operating companies to become the operating agents for the Government. Such companies need be furnished only enough money to insure the repair and upkeep of the ship. They could be assured of a small operating compensation, but their principal return would depend entirely on whether or not they made profits. If this is not feasible, I would rather charter the ships to private operating companies wherever they could demonstrate financial responsibility, business integrity and sagacity, and show a reasonable enterprise at any rate fixed by open competition that would return a moderate amount to the Government, and in judging of that I would not take into consideration any rate of depreciation greater than 5 per cent a year.

Those ships which can not be chartered to individuals who will engage to make any specific return to the Government and risk the ships for their own account could be employed by the Shipping Board in establishing new routes, just as mail routes are established. At first they will not pay, but they will develop trade, provide means of communication, uncover markets, and eventually become self-sustaining and then profitable.

Whether the Government should continue to build ships after the present program is completed it is somewhat early to determine now, and a decision on that point might well wait until we have the light and benefit of at least a year's experience. Some high-class mail and passenger ships, however, ought to be designed and ordered now by the Government, and the yards should be permitted, as now agreed, to build for foreigners.

Principles should be established for fixing rates, and the rate-making body should do its work in such a manner that private owners will build new ships and compete with the Government.

The liner field can be left to private owners or private operators, the latter having their ships at charter rates, fixed by competition with the owning companies as well as others.

These are not the views of those who wish to buy ships cheap from the Government, but I can not agree with them, and I fear they are not in position to express an unbiased judgment in the matter.

We are now in position to have a creditable, serviceable American merchant marine and to insure it for the future. If we act hastily and unwisely those in Congress to-day will not live to see another such opportunity. We have it in our power now, the chance is in our arm's length, and all we have to do is to close our grip around it to make the "starred banner the talisman of a world commerce." There has been a propaganda against the wooden ship, although it has been doing business for 2,000 years. I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a clipping from page 20 of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, of June 19, headed, "Freights and charters"; also some resolutions typical of others received.

On November 12, 1915, before the Academy of Political Science, in New York, I had this to say, among other things, which I believe is worth repeating here:

> Thought, however mature, conviction, however deep, get us nowhere until they begin to operate in will and act. Merely recounting with reiteration the deplorable situation, and nothing more, evidences a species of cynicism, an unhealthy state of mind—lays no keels.
>
> There never was a time when a change in shipping conditions would be less disturbing and more advantageous than right now. Now is the best possible time to inaugurate such changes. Nothing will be gained by delay. We have all the information upon which to act. Satisfaction with present conditions means a sacrifice of golden opportunities and an inexcusable lack of proper conception of our responsibilities.
>
> Monetary and trade supremacy had its inception on the banks of the Nile. It moved westward to the shores of the Mediterranean and thence farther westward out into the open sea of commercial activity. It passed from Portugal to Spain, then to Holland, then to France, and then to England. Venice, Lisbon, Amsterdam, Antwerp succeeded each other as centers; then London, the frontier town of the Middle Ages, at last supplanted them all.
>
> The earlier struggles were directed to the attainment of some particular national supremacy, and that was to be founded on monopoly. That meant trouble. But the distinctive feature of commerce to-day is its international character. It is not a question of monopoly or particular supremacy; it is a question in large measure of leadership, and in this the factors are natural advantages, better methods, better facilities of exchange, efficient and economical service, a sound currency and financial influence, and the freest markets. I have seen it averred that in all the world's history nothing has had lasting importance like trade. Pitt declared, "British rule is British trade." Chamberlain expressed the same thought in the statement, "The empire is commerce."
>
> The marvelous resources of the United States, her financial strength and facilities, the awakening of the East and the promising outlook in Latin America, the Isthmian Canal, the opportunities for forming new commercial ties, the relations founded on a better understanding, and mutual good will toward all the world mean, if we but discharge our responsibilities, the establishment of commanding centers of trade in the United States and drawing westward again commercial leadership.
>
> The great English poet and dramatist gives us this picture:
>
> Antonio is sad. Salarino says to him—
>
> "Your mind is tossing on the ocean,
> There, where your argosies with portly sail,
> Like signiors and rich burghers on the flood,
> Or, as it were, the pageants of the sea,
> Do overpeer the petty traffickers,
> That curtsy to them, do them reverence,
> As they fly by them with their woven wings."

To which Antonio replies—

"Believe me, no; I thank my fortune for it,
My ventures are not in one bottom trusted,
Nor to one place; nor is my whole estate
Upon the fortune of this present year;
Therefore, my merchandise makes me not sad."

I ask leave to have printed a resolution from the Mississippi Valley Association and also a communication from Tampa, Fla., Board of Trade, which are typical of resolutions and communications I have received on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHICAGO, *April 26, 1919.*

Hon. EDWARD N. HURLEY,
Chairman United States Shipping Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HURLEY: The following resolutions relative to United States Shipping Board policies were unanimously adopted by more than 500 delegates representing some 22 States, comprising the Mississippi Valley, in convention assembled in Chicago, Wednesday, April 23:

"*Resolved*, That the present time is inopportune for the general sale of the ships constructed by the Emergency Fleet Corporation. They should continue under Government ownership until an American merchant marine has been permanently assured, necessary trade routes firmly established, and a personnel of officers and men built up.

"These ships should be assigned on a commission or bare ship or time charter basis to reliable financially responsible American firms not under foreign influence and whose Americanism is established.

"Furthermore, that the Shipping Board ships should be utilized to build up American foreign trade and allocated on a fair basis to all American ports.

"The Mississippi Valley demands recognition of its Gulf ports and the assignment of ships of standard efficiency, sufficient to move the foreign commerce of the valley both for export and import through these ports."

These resolutions express the thought of business leaders throughout the valley.

There has been, as you know, some fear in the valley that an early forced sale of Shipping Board ships might leave some ports and some sections less adequately provided for than others, and I was glad indeed to learn your point of view as expressed at our conference last night.

The members of the Mississippi Valley Association desire to help bring about a satisfactory solution of the problem involved, and to that end may I request you to advise me wherein your ideas and the ideas expressed in the above resolutions differ, if they differ at all?

With kindest personal regards,

Very truly,

WALTER PARKER,
General Secretary Mississippi Valley Association.

—

THE TAMPA BOARD OF TRADE,
Tampa, Fla., May 31, 1919.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the water commerce bureau of this board of trade Mr. Philip Shore, chairman, held May 30, 1919, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted and the secretary directed to transmit the same to you:

"*Resolved*, That the perpetuation of the American merchant marine is to be secured for the present by Government ownership and private operation of the vessels of the Emergency Fleet Corporation as opposed to immediate sale or charter;

"That provision should be made for transfer of ownership of the said vessels to American private interests only after a period of from three to five years of their successful operation in established trade routes;

"That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the honorable the Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, respectfully urging action along such lines."

Respectfully,

C. S. HOSKINS,
Traffic Manager-Secretary of the Bureau.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will say that at the appropriate time I shall ask to have the resolutions which I have mentioned referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a clipping from the New York Journal of Commerce of June 19, 1919, showing the service—the actual performance—of some of the wooden ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Since the armistice vessel owners have been in a position to make their own rates, and naturally the scarcity of tonnage has made them independent. For the past two months, however, conditions have been growing more favorable to exporters, who have lost no time in sending forward consignments that have been held in storage for many weeks. That there is likely to be further decline in rates from this port to most foreign countries is the belief of shippers.

SHIPPING BOARD VESSELS.

Many of the wooden steamers under Shipping Board control are being placed with operators for trades in which it has been argued these craft were not adapted because of their alleged unseaworthiness. Those that have been given a trial appear to have made good, and the outlook is encouraging for the employment of many more. The Ferris type wooden steamer *Cumberland*, the first boat built at the Cumberland Shipbuilding Co.'s yard in South Portland, Me., for the United States Shipping Board fleet, arrived at Liverpool June 14 from Boston, the run across having been made in 14 days, a passage particularly gratifying to her builders in view of the propaganda that has been carried on against the wooden steamers of the fleet. The ship went over in command of Capt. Charles Willard. Considerable interest has been attached to this trip, as it has been stated that foreign parties who had been negotiating for the purchase of some of the wooden crafts were awaiting the result before making up their minds.

The steamer *Wanzu*, the first of the fleet dispatched from the Northwest under the management of the Columbia Pacific Shipping Co., has been chartered by the Triangle Steamship Co., of New York, for a combination of voyages which will land her in European waters. The management of the vessel continues to rest with the Columbia Pacific organization.

Delivery of the ship is to be made to the charterers at Norfolk, Va., where she will load coal for Havana, after which she will proceed to Port Arthur, Tex., in ballast, loading there for the River Plate, where another cargo will be awaiting her that is destined for the United Kingdom. Her movements beyond that have not been arranged for. The *Wanzu* loaded ties on Grays Harbor, getting to sea April 23, and she reported at Colon May 16, arriving at Philadelphia May 26.

"I consider the charter of the *Wanzu* for the trades indicated as the best illustration of the purposes for which the wooden steamers can be utilized," said A. C. Stubbe, manager of the Columbia Pacific. "Of course, we who have been in touch with ship construction in Oregon know the worth of these vessels, but the fact a New York steamship organization will take the steamer for such work, which means she will have to load various kinds of cargo, some of it being of a kind that could not be carried in a wooden bottom if there were any faulty hull features, is the best evidence of how Oregon-built ships are regarded."

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

Investigation of fuel oil: For an investigation of fuel oil and gasoline adapted to naval requirements, including the question of supply and storage and the availability economically and otherwise of such supply as may be allowed by the naval reserves on the public domain, and for such other expenses for transportation and hire of vehicles in connection with naval petroleum reserves, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem appropriate, for the purchase of necessary instruments and appliances, for the extension of the naval fuel-oil testing plant at the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and the temporary employment of civilian experts and assistants, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 1, after the word "purposes," to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$35,000,000," and in line 11, after "$500," to insert "*Provided further*, That all claims adjusted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy," so as to read:

Aviation, Navy: For aviation, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft, establishment and maintenance of aircraft stations, for experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, and for the purchase or manufacture and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes, $35,000,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service for aircraft stations shall not exceed $300,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft, where such claim does not exceed the sum of $500: *Provided further*, That all claims adjusted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of continental United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to insert:

For rehabilitating the island of Guam on account of typhoon of July 6, 1918, to be paid to and expended in the discretion of the governor of Guam, including the preservation from the weather, vermin, and insects of surplus crops and seed, the purchase of farming implements and farm machinery for use in and upon such public lands on the island of Guam as may be available and for rental thereof to natives desiring to utilize same, and for extending credits to native farmers, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE. After line 3, on page 10, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, after line 3, it is proposed to insert, as a separate paragraph, the following:

Until June 30, 1920, enlistments in the Navy may be for terms of from two, three, to four years, and all laws now applicable to four-year enlistments shall apply, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, to enlistments for a shorter period with proportionate benefits upon discharge and reenlistment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, under the subhead "Bureau of Navigation," on page 10, line 11, after the words "per annum," to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$600,000," so as to make the clause read:

Recreation for enlisted men: For the recreation, amusement, comfort, contentment, and health of the Navy, and for such other purposes of like character as the Secretary of the Navy may deem advisable, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum, $600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 15, to insert:

Officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force who were transferred from the National Naval Volunteers under the provisions of the act of July 1, 1918, shall be paid the same uniform gratuity as other officers of the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided*, That they shall not have received from any State such gratuity.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 21, to insert:

Schools or camps of instruction: Naval Reserve Force: That of the unexpended and unobligated balance remaining of all money heretofore appropriated and of the appropriation authorized in Public No. 182, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved July 1, 1918, under the heading "Schools or camps of instruction, Naval Reserve Force, for assembling, training, and instructing recruits and reserves of all classes, including the crews of section patrols, submarines and submarine chasers, and beach patrol, and for all purposes connected therewith," $500,000 is hereby reappropriated to defray the expenses incurred under existing law prior to September 1, 1919.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment, on lines 7 and 8, page 13, after the word "reappropriated." to strike out those two lines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, line 7, after the word "reappropriated," it is proposed to strike out the words "to defray the expenses incurred under existing law prior to September 1, 1919."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in support of the amendment to the committee amendment which I have offered, I will say that I feel quite sure that the Committee on Naval Affairs will not interpose an objection to it. There is a letter, I think addressed to the chairman of the committee from the Secretary of the Navy, which explains the fact that, if that limitation is placed in the provision, it will greatly cripple at least one or more of the training camps where these sailors are being demobilized, that it will be impossible to pay the obligations which have been incurred prior to September 1, and that it might affect the speedy demobilization of the sailors.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment I have offered. I will ask permission to insert a copy of the letter which came to the chairman of the committee, without reading it, as I do not wish to take the time of the Senate for that purpose.

Mr. PAGE. In order that the amendment may go to conference, I see no objection to accepting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. I now ask that the letter to which I have referred and which was addressed to the chairman of the committee respecting the matter may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

JUNE 25, 1919.

The honorable the CHAIRMAN OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to invite your attention to the wording of the naval bill, H. R. 5608, as reported to the Senate, on page 13, line 8, which limits the time that the $500,000 reappropriated under the caption "Schools or camps of instruction" will be available to September 1, 1919, and to request that this restriction be removed.

While all camps or schools of instruction may be closed by September 1, 1919, the final disposition of Government property and settlements relative thereto at these places will take a much longer time than the two months allowed.

The settlement of the college and university claims has been very slow, and it can not be stated definitely at this time when all these claims can be settled.

Further, owing to the very large number of men to be demobilized and recruited during the next fiscal year, it may be found advisable and advantageous to make use of one or more of these camps.

For the above reasons I request that on page 13, line 8, the words "prior to September 1, 1919," be stricken out.

Very sincerely, yours,

_____.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, as follows:

Naval training station, California: Maintenance of naval training station, Yerba Buena Island, Calif.: Labor and material; buildings and wharves; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and wharves; wharfage, ferriage, and street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; motor-propelled vehicles, wagons, carts, implements, tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; fire engines and extinguishers; gymnastic implements, models, and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and materials, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; fresh water, and washing; packing boxes and materials; and all other contingent expenses; maintenance of dispensary building; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; in all, $250,000.

Mr. PAGE. In printing the bill an error was made at the printing office. On page 14, line 2, I move, before the figures "$250,000," that there be inserted, with a line through the type, "$225,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 2, after the word "all," it is proposed to insert "$225,000" stricken through and insert "$250,000" in italics.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 15, line 18, after the word "expenses," to insert "$850,000; fuel, $400,000," so as to read:

Naval training station, Great Lakes: Maintenance of naval training station: Labor and material; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and piers; street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; motor-propelled vehicles, wagons, carts, implements, and tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, and one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; fire apparatus and extinguishers; gymnastic implements; models and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and material, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting, and repairs to power-plant equipment, distributing mains, tunnel, and conduits; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; washing; packing boxes and materials; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; and all other contingent expenses, $850,000; fuel, $400,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, what reason was there for the House overlooking entirely an item which is apparently so indispensable?

Mr. PAGE. During the next fiscal year there will be approximately 100,000 recruits to be trained at the various training stations, which must be heated. This item was formerly under the cognizance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, but it is now to be taken care of in one appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 15, in line 23, after the words "Great Lakes," to strike out "$850,000" and insert "$1,250,000," so as to read:

Provided, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $6,000; in all, naval training station, Great Lakes, $1,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 24, after the words "St. Helena," in the side heading, to insert "and naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.," and on page 16, line 4, after "$310,000," to insert "fuel, $440,000; in all, $750,000," so as to make the clause read:

Naval training station, St. Helena, and naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.: Maintenance of naval training stations at St. Helena and at naval operating base, Virginia, labor and material, general care, repairs, and improvements; schoolbooks; and all other incidental expenses, $310,000; fuel, $440,000; in all, $750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to insert:

Naval reserve force: For expense of organizing, administering, and recruiting the naval reserve force, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 7, to insert:

Naval detention training camp: Maintenance of naval detention training camp at naval barracks, Wissahickon, N. J.; labor and material, general care, repairs, heating and lighting, stationery, and other contingent expenses; in all, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 12, to insert:

Receiving barracks: Maintenance of receiving barracks, $250,000.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$500,000."

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the Navy Department, as I understand, insists that the sum of $250,000 will not be sufficient to maintain the receiving barracks. We have a great receiving barracks in New York, where most of the men are lodged during their stay on shore and while they are waiting to be transferred to ships. There are also a number of other barracks throughout the country. Of course, the Naval Committee knows more about this than I do, and if they think that the sum proposed to be appropriated is sufficient I shall not press my amendment.

Mr. PAGE. The amount carried by the bill for this item is all the department has asked for.

Mr. CALDER. I looked over the hearings, and it seemed to me that the department had asked for $500,000. As I have stated, I will not, however, press the amendment if the Naval Affairs Committee feels the sum provided is sufficient, but it has been represented to me otherwise.

Mr. PAGE. In a letter from the Secretary this matter was specially referred to, and he asked for the $250,000 appropriation and no more.

Mr. CALDER. Very well, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 16, line 19, after the word "same," to strike out "$55,250" and insert "$82,750"; in line 21, after the words "War College," to strike out "$300" and insert "$1,200"; in line 24, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "$1,300" and insert "$5,000"; on page 17, line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$22,500" and insert "$50,000"; and in line 4, after the words "Rhode Island," to strike out "$58,850" and insert "$90,950," so as to make the clause read:

Naval War College, Rhode Island: For maintenance of the Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; and care of grounds for same, $82,750; services of a professor of international law, $2,000; services of civilian lecturers, rendered at the War College, $1,200; care and preservation of the library, including the purchase, binding, and repair of books of reference and periodicals, $5,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $50,000; in all, Naval War College, Rhode Island, $90,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 24, after the word "employees," to strike out "$40,420" and insert "$39,540," so as to make the clause read:

Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., pay of employees: One secretary, $1,800; 1 foreman mechanic, $1,800; 1 superintendent of grounds, at $900; 1 steward, at $900; 1 store laborer, at $660; 1 matron and office assistant, at $720; 1 beneficiaries' attendant, at $480; 1 chief cook, at $660; 1 assistant cook, at $540; 1 assistant cook, at $480; 1 chief laundress, at $420; 2 laundresses, at $360 each; 3 laundresses, at $300 each; 1 chief scrubber, at $420; 3 scrubbers, at $360 each; 1 head waitress, at $480; 4 waitresses, at $360 each; 4 waitresses, at $300 each; 1 kitchen attendant, at $540; 7 laborers, at $600 each; 5 laborers, at $540 each; 1 stable keeper and driver, at $660; 1 master at arms, at $900; 2 house corporals, at $600 each; 1 barber, at $600; 1 carpenter, at $1,200; 1 painter, at $1,200; 1 painter, at $1,020; 1 engineer, $1,080; 4 laborers, at $720 each; 3 laborers, at $840 each; 1 laborer, at $600; 1 chauffeur, coal truck, at $960; 1 chauffeur, small truck, at $840; 1 chauffeur, governor's car, $840; total for employees, $39,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 17, after the words "Naval Home," to strike out "$145,786" and insert "$144,906," so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance: Water rent, heating, and lighting; cemetery, burial expenses and headstones; general care and improvements of grounds, buildings, walls, and fences; repairs to power-plant equipment, implements, tools, and furniture, and purchase of the same; music in chapel and entertainments for beneficiaries; stationery, books, and periodicals; transportation of indigent and destitute beneficiaries to the Naval Home, and of sick and insane beneficiaries, their attendants and necessary subsistence for both, to and from other Government hospitals; employment of such beneficiaries in and about the Naval Home, as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, on the recommendation of the governor; support of beneficiaries, and all other contingent expenses, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle, two motor-propelled vehicles and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes, $105,366; in all, Naval Home, $144,906, which sum shall be paid out of the income from the naval pension fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 23, after the date "1919," to strike out "to December 31, 1919, to 191,000 men, and from January 1, 1920,"; in line 25, before the word "men," to strike out "170,000" and insert "191,000"; on page 19, line 3, after the word "members," to insert "and nurses"; in line 4, after the word "Force," to strike out "(other than commissioned and warrant officers)" and insert "in enlisted ratings as"; in line 15, before the word "number," to strike out "total" and insert "average"; in the same line, before the word "officers," to insert "commissioned"; in line 16, after the word "and," to strike out "reserve" and insert "reserves, on active duty"; and in line 20, after the word "Force," to strike out "(other than commissioned and warrant officers)" and insert "in enlisted ratings," so as to make the clause read:

The total authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased from 131,485 during the period from July 1, 1919, to September 30, 1919, to 241,000 men, and from October 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, to 191,000 men, and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to call to or continue on active service on strictly naval duties, with their consent, such numbers of the male members and nurses of the Naval Reserve Force in enlisted ratings as may be necessary to supply deficiencies to maintain the total authorized strength for the periods herein authorized. The foregoing total authorized strength shall include the hospital corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court-martial to discharge, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, those under instruction in trade schools, and members of the Naval Reserve Force so serving. That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, no member of the Naval Reserve Force shall be recalled to active duty for training or any other purpose except as hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That the average number of commissioned officers of the line, permanent, temporary, and reserves, on active duty shall not exceed during the periods aforesaid 4 per cent of the total temporary authorized enlisted strength of the Regular and Temporary Navy and members of the Naval Reserve Force in enlisted ratings on active duty, and the number of staff officers shall be in the same proportion as provided under existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as affecting the permanent, commissioned, or enlisted strength of the Regular Navy as authorized by existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 3, after the word "members," to insert "except nurses"; in line 6, before the word "days," to strike out "30" and insert "90"; and in line 11, before the word "days," to strike out "30" and insert "90," so as to make the clause read:

Female members, except nurses, of the Naval Reserve Force and the Marine Corps Reserve shall, as soon as practicable and in no event later than 90 days after the date of approval of this act, be placed on inactive duty. Members of the Naval Reserve Force shall not hereafter be ordered to perform active duty on shore of a kind which is ordinarily performed by civilians, and all reservists now performing such duty shall be relieved from such duty within 90 days after the date of approval of this act.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to explain the significance of this amendment, why it increases the number of days to 90, and what is the reason of the exception of nurses from the operation of the proposed provision?

Mr. PAGE. It is absolutely imperative that the nurses be retained on active duty for some time to come on account of the large number of sick and wounded men who must be cared for.

On account of the great amount of clerical work incident to immediate discharge of a large number of men it was urgently requested by the department that this period be extended to 90 days.

Mr. SWANSON. Unless nurses were excluded from this provision all the female nurses in the Reserve Force at hospitals and elsewhere would be precluded from being employed by the Navy, and would go out with the clerical force doing clerical work in the department. It is practically impossible to conduct the hospitals in Newport, New York, and Norfolk without having some female nurses, and if this provision excepting female nurses in the Naval Reserve Force is not put in, every nurse in these naval hospitals will be discharged.

Mr. KING. In the case of hospitals, is it the purpose to retain the same number of nurses that existed during the war, regardless of the necessities?

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, no; we limit the number of people for all purposes in the Navy, and they can not exceed that number.

Mr. KING. Is there any limitation upon the number of nurses?

Mr. SWANSON. The nurse force and all forces in the Navy are limited in this bill, and in fact reduced.

Mr. KING. I saw no limitation upon the civilian employees.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, the Nurse Corps and the Hospital Corps and all the corps in the Navy are limited.

Mr. KING. I knew that many were, but I saw no limitation upon this.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, they are limited. We could not employ an unlimited number; but the entire hospital force would be absolutely demoralized if this should not be done. The 90-day provision is put there because they say that these women who are now in the Navy will be transferred, as far as they are needed, to the civil service, and it will take about 90 days to accomplish that. A great many of them will be able to stand the examination, and will be transferred; and the committee thought it was better to change it from 30 days to 90. They will not have any more than needed, because, under the civil-service law, there can not be any more clerks, and so forth, than are required. This simply extends the time for the transfer and the demobilization of the women in the reserve force from 30 days to 90 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 21, line 5, after the word "thereof," to strike out "$8,613,220" and insert "$8,263,220"; in line 12, after the

word "paragraph," to insert "except expert technicists"; and in line 14, after the words "District of Columbia," to insert "*Provided further*, That not more than 24 employees shall be so appointed at a compensation exceeding $2,000 per annum, and that in no case shall the compensation exceed $4,000 per annum," so as to make the clause read:

Members of the Naval Reserve Force and Marine Corps Reserve who accept such temporary civil appointments shall be given an opportunity to qualify by a civil-service examination for certification in accordance with civil-service rules to fill such vacancies as may occur, in cases where they are not already eligible for appointment or reinstatement. All temporary appointments made hereunder shall terminate not later than June 30, 1920. For pay of reservists so transferred to the civil establishment, or civil-service employees appointed in lieu thereof, $8,263,220, their pay prior to transfer to be charged to the appropriation "Pay of the Navy," and the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress on the first day of the next regular session a statement showing the number and designation of the persons employed hereunder and the rate of compensation paid to each: *Provided*, That no employee paid under the provisions of this paragraph, except expert technicists, shall receive annual compensation in excess of $2,000 for services rendered in the Navy Department, Washington, D. C.: *Provided further*, That not more than 24 employees shall be so appointed at a compensation exceeding $2,000 per annum, and that in no case shall the compensation exceed $4,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 4, to strike out:

The act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129), granting under certain conditions, to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only who are serving in the field as part of the American Expeditionary Forces under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 18, after the word "Navy," to strike out "and Marine Corps," so as to make the clause read:

The rates of pay prescribed in section 15 of an act entitled "An act to temporarily increase the commissioned and warrant and enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1917, are hereby made the permanent rates of pay of the enlisted men of the Navy during their present current enlistment and for those who enlist or reenlist prior to July 1, 1920, for the term of such enlistment or reenlistment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 21, to insert:

That officers who have served satisfactorily during the war with the German Government in a temporary grade or rank shall be eligible for selection for promotion and for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank until July 1, 1920, without regard to statutory requirements other than professional and physical examinations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 2, to insert:

Any officer with the permanent rank of rear admiral who has heretofore served a full term and is now serving as chief of any bureau of the Navy Department shall be credited with service for all purposes as provided by section 1486 of the Revised Statutes, and nothing herein contained shall operate to increase the rank or pay of any such officer as now authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 18, after the word "Navy," to insert "and members of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty" so as to make the clause read:

Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy," approved December 20, 1917, is hereby amended so as to read as follows: That hereafter there shall be allowed at the United States Naval Academy five midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, and five for the District of Columbia, 15 appointed each year at large, and 100 appointed annually from enlisted men of the Navy, and members of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty, as now authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the representations of the hardships and losses sustained by the occupants of certain premises within the naval station at Pensacola, Fla., who were required by an order recently issued by the Secretary of the Navy to give up such premises and remove their dwellings, buildings, and other property therefrom in order that room might be made for the aeronautic station, and the said Secretary is further authorized and directed to allow in such of said cases as are meritorious, and may in his judgment be deserving of relief, reasonable compensation for losses and injuries sustained by reason of removals necessitated by the department's said order, and there is hereby appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such sums as the Secretary of the Navy may award and allow hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to insert:

That for particularly meritorious service performed during the present war by Capt. William R. Rush, United States Navy, retired, on active duty as commandant of the navy yard at Boston, Mass., the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint the said William R. Rush a rear admiral on the active list of the United States Navy, to take rank immediately after Rear Admiral James H. Glennon: *Provided*, That the said William R. Rush shall be carried as additional to the number of rear admirals now authorized by law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee or the Senator from Virginia if this is the usual method by which men are transferred to the rear admirals' list to a number in excess of the general statute? Is it the usual way to carry in appropriation bills special legislation to advance some persons in the Navy to higher rank? It seems to me there ought to be general legislation rather than specific legislation dealing with these cases.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, this is an amendment in which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is especially interested. I shall be glad to have it passed over until he returns, if the Senator is willing.

Mr. KING. I think the next one, also, had better be passed over, then.

Mr. PAGE. And the next one, commencing on line 22.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, does the Senator object to the provision beginning on line 9, page 30? I hope not. That is a very meritorious case.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like an explanation as to those three items. I do not know that I shall have objection to either.

The only point in my mind was whether it was wise to have special legislation to deal with these cases. There ought to be some general statute which permits, under peculiar circumstances, increase in rank or elevation to some higher position.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the only way in which people can be recognized for special meritorious service is by Congress. People get their promotions, as the Senator from Utah has suggested, in the regular order prescribed by law. The only way in which a person can get a special promotion for specially meritorious service is by an act of Congress.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] presented this matter to the committee. Capt. Rush had done special work at the Boston Navy Yard. He had been retired by the plucking board in a way that left some doubt as to whether he should not have been permitted to continue. This old plucking board retired him. When the war broke out he was called to the Boston Navy Yard, which is one of the largest activities of the Navy, and he made a splendid officer. It is a great navy yard. He made a great success there; and this practically restores him to what he would have had otherwise, except for the action of the plucking board, I think.

Mr. PAGE. And may I suggest to the Senator that this action is urged by a special resolution of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; he was so efficient there that the legislature of that State asked to have him restored. As I understand, this restores him to what he would have had if the plucking board had not retired him. Under the old law they had to retire so many officers each year, whether they were efficient or inefficient. The law required them to retire 8, 10, 15, or 20 officers, and the plucking board retired this man. When the war came on the naval authorities wanted an efficient, strong, aggressive man at the head of the naval activities at Boston, and they put Capt. Rush there; and, if I understand correctly from the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts—and he is generally very accurate—this provision simply entitles him to have what he otherwise would have had if the plucking board had not retired him. We felt that when a man comes into the Navy during a war, and does war work, and does it splendidly, and the Navy needs him, he ought to have an opportunity to get what he otherwise would have had if this plucking board, the act creating which we have repealed, had not acted. It is left to the President. It does not direct it to be done. It says that the President is authorized—and he could not do it unless we authorized it—to consider the facts in this case, and if he thinks it is meritorious he can make this officer a rear admiral.

As to the other case, from lines 9 to 21, page 30, First Sergt. Edgar Hayes, we went into that very thoroughly. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was very much interested in that matter. Hayes was a retired marine officer. The facts are that though he was retired he went into active service. He was at a station, and some man reflected on the uniform—said he was going into disgraceful work in enlisting in the Navy—and he became very much enraged, and attacked this citizen, which was contrary to the regulations of the Navy. He was then court-martialed, and the court-martial had to find the facts, that he attacked a citizen for insulting the Navy and the uniform, and they unanimously recommended clemency to this man. The recommendation was not followed; and this man then enlisted as a private. He served during the war, and he

was an officer. We felt that after a man had enlisted as a private when the board had recommended clemency, and his only offense was that he had violated the rule, which the court was bound to find, by resenting an insult to the uniform, and after he had served through the war as a private he was entitled to be reinstated to the position he had at the time; and the committee was unanimous in making this recommendation.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me add that Sergt. Hayes is a citizen of my city and State, and I know the facts to be as stated. The offense for which he was degraded was one for which he should have been promoted. He resented an insult to the uniform in a way which was prohibited, and of course properly so, by the regulations. As a result he lost his position, and then enlisted, and his service has been so good that he is now First Sergt. Edgar Hayes.

Let me add merely this—that this provision does not restore him to the position he undoubtedly would now have, but puts him at the end of the grade, so that the restoration is only partial after all.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say in this connection, Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I have no objection to the item.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say that the only way in which relief can be given in these cases is by a separate bill or by putting them on an appropriation bill. The separate bills very rarely pass; and we may have in the coming bills, now and hereafter, some cases where hardships like this exist, which we are bound to correct, and the only way in which you can get efficient legislation is to put them on appropriation bills.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was not here when the matter of Capt. Rush came up, and I know the ground has been entirely covered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]; but as Capt. Rush has been on duty at the Boston Navy Yard, I desire to say just a few words in regard to him.

The Boston yard is a very large and important yard, and had an immense burden of work during the war. Nothing could exceed the success of the administration of Capt. Rush. The Chief of Operations, Admiral Benson, praised the administration of the yard in the highest terms. I have seen a letter from the Secretary, in which he spoke in the same high terms of Capt. Rush's work; and, what is somewhat unusual, I have received letters and petitions on the subject from the great working force of the yard. He not only managed the yard admirably well, but he had the support of all the mechanical force in it; and, what is still more unusual, his administration there was so successful that the legislature passed resolutions of commendation when his term expired.

Capt. Rush is a very fine officer. He has done a great work. The reason of the action of the plucking board has been explained. I think the provision which it is proposed to make in his case is very well deserved, and ought to be carried in the bill. It is practically the only way to meet these cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 29, after line 21, to insert:

That the provisions of the law regulating appointments in the Navy are hereby suspended for the purpose of this act only, and only so far as they affect Frank Pulaski; and the President of the United States is hereby authorized, in the exercise of his discretion and judgment, to appoint Frank Pulaski, late a lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve Force, to the same grade and rank as of the date of April 14, 1919, and to place him on the inactive service list as of the date of April 14, 1919: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Frank Pulaski to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 8, to insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as a first lieutenant in the permanent establishment of the United States Marine Corps, First Sergt. Edgar Hayes, United States Marine Corps, to be an extra number in that grade and in any grade to which he may hereafter be promoted: *Provided*, That the said Edgar Hayes shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy his mental, moral, physical, and professional qualifications to perform all the duties of said grade: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Edgar Hayes to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 35, after line 12, to insert:

To aid in construction of bridge connecting city of Portsmouth, N. H., with navy yard at Kittery, Me., $500,000, of which $250,000 is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That an equal amount shall be expended concurrently for the same purpose severally by the States of Maine and New Hampshire, the location to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy for convenient access to the Portsmouth Navy Yard

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, referring to the words "that an equal amount shall be expended concurrently," does that refer to the $250,000 or the $500,000?

Mr. HALE. I think that refers to the $500,000.

Mr. PHELAN. If it is so intended, I have no objection.

Mr. HALE. It is so intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr CURTIS in the chair) The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 35, line 23, after "$500,000," to insert "new power plant, $1,000,000," and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "$540,000" and insert "$1,540,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Boston, Mass.: Two 25-ton floating derricks, $40,000; shore facilities for Commonwealth Dry Dock, South Boston, $500,000; new power plant, $1,000,000; in all, $1,540,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this new power plant is needed at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am perhaps more familiar with it as it relates to the Boston yard.

This appropriation was placed in the bill last March by a unanimous vote of the committee after hearing very fully from the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in regard to it. The present power plant in that yard—which, as I have already stated, is a very large and busy yard—was placed very unfortunately at the extreme end of the yard, involving great expense and difficulty in the transportation of material and of coal. The space is entirely inadequate. They have made one addition, and I think two additions. There is no room for further additions. They must have a larger power plant sooner or later, and in fact they must have it sooner—very soon. The money now spent on that plant, as the commandant of the yard and the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks testified, is a practical waste, for sooner or later they must have a larger power plant.

This plan is to build a new power plant nearer the center of the yard accessible from all points. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars will be needed at once for an additional compressed-air tunnel for the present power plant. All of the machinery that is in the present power plant can be used. The loss is only in the building. There was $400,000 appropriated, I think, in the last bill for new machinery. They have only purchased a portion of it, because they regard the plant as it now stands as so insufficient; but what has been purchased can all be used in the new plant. It is nothing but the merest good economy to make this appropriation and build this new power plant, which must come sooner or later; and if it is not appropriated for there will be large sums of money spent on the present power plant which will be practically thrown away.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is the $1,000,000 merely for the erection of the building or to purchase additional equipment?

Mr. LODGE. There will be additional equipment. There must be.

Mr. KING. Will that be embraced in this appropriation?

Mr. LODGE. That is embraced within it. It embraces everything.

Mr. KING. I asked the question because it seemed to me that $1,000,000 would be entirely too much for a mere building.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; it is not for a mere building, of course. I was merely pointing out that they could use the old machinery; but they will have to move the machinery, and they will have to buy additional equipment, and, of course, make the compressed-air tunnels and the necessary means of running the power plant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, at the top of page 36, to insert:

Navy yard, New York, N. Y.: Steel storage, $250,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, just what does that mean?

Mr. PAGE. That means that at the Brooklyn Navy Yard the necessities are very pressing. They ought to have a place to store steel. The matter has been estimated for, and very carefully taken up by the committee, and it was unanimously approved.

Mr. THOMAS. The expression is a little bit ambiguous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 36, line 7, after "$100,000," to insert "general development for handling guns, armor, turrets, structural steel, $1,000,000; central power-plant improvements and distributing systems, $500,000; light machine shop, $400,000; pattern shop and storage, $400,000"; and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$3,800,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa.: Dry dock, to complete, and the limit of cost is increased to $4,700,000, $1,200,000; paving, railroad tracks, sewers, water pipes, and general yard developments, $200,000; kapok mattress and life-preserver factory, $100,000; general development for handling guns, armor, turrets, structural steel, $1,000,000; central power plant improvements and distributing systems, $500,000; light machine shop, $400,000; pattern shop and storage, $400,000; in all, $3,800,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator explain these large items of additions?

Mr. PAGE. As I understand, this is practically a new program, and is to proceed with the building of new ships at the Philadelphia Navy Yard—two battle cruisers. I have here a letter from Secretary Daniels, of which one paragraph reads as follows:

The first item is considered an important one in order to increase the facilities of the navy yard, Philadelphia, for the construction of capital ships. The principal structure to be provided under this item is a turret shop which will permit the construction and complete erection of turrets under one roof by means of adequate weight-handling facilities. With the increased size of turrets and the corresponding increased weight, it is essential that additional facilities of this type be provided. This yard is also without adequate facilities for the general storage of armor, guns, and structural steel, all of which is essential for the economical construction of capital ships.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Boston yard and the Philadelphia yard and the Norfolk yard are the yards in which a large amount of construction is going on to complete the ships that are under contract now. The Philadelphia yard, I suppose, has more ships under construction than anywhere else, and next to that is the Norfolk yard. The building ways are there, the material has been assembled; and in order to construct economically what the Government has undertaken there you have got to have a pattern shop, you have got to have storage for the steel, you have got to have cranes; and every one of these yards where we have provided for the construction of power plants has been earnestly recommended by the department. They appeared before us and insisted that they could not promptly and economically complete the program which they have under process of construction there unless this is done.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? This relates to the Philadelphia yard?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator is not asking anything for Virginia, is he?

Mr. SWANSON. I will discuss that matter when we get to it; but I will say to the Senator that I think this is just as important; I make no distinction as to whether it is in Philadelphia or Norfolk if it is necessary to construct this Navy that is in process of construction. You must remember that none of these vessels are being constructed in private yards. They are being constructed in navy yards. The Government navy yards can not construct these ships unless they have efficient means of doing it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator, before he takes his seat, if the same naval authorities made this recommendation who last year recommended the appropriation of $3,000,000, I think, for building a dry dock in Charleston Harbor and the appropriation of a similar amount of money for the purpose of dredging a channel to the dry dock?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, that has been settled—not last year, but it has already been settled.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that it is settled. I merely wanted to know if it was the same authority recommending this that recommended that.

Mr. SWANSON. This has been recommended both by the Construction Board, by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and by the Secretary of the Navy. If you can construct battle cruisers that cost $35,000,000 without machine shops, without pattern shops, without power, without the incidentals that everybody else has, all right; but it will be utterly impossible to do so economically.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true.

Mr. SWANSON. All of these appropriations are limited. None of the money is for the purchase of land. We have confined it absolutely to what the department stated was absolutely necessary to complete the work they have undertaken.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true; but the remarkable thing about it is that we have appropriated moneys for these huge vessels upon the assumption that we have the facilities for their construction, and we have been assured that a number of them were in process of construction. Personally, I have never changed my opinion with regard to the wisdom of these appropriation for large-ship construction. I believe the day has come when, figuratively at least, they will rapidly be doomed, as the fleet recently sunk in Scapa Flow was doomed. We build these dreadnought battleships to meet a supposed or actual menace to the country or to some of its interests, and then we cast them aside when they are completed in order to make room for what are said to be equally essential and important appropriations for additional vessels.

I clipped this statement from a Washington paper only a few days ago.

12 OLD WARSHIPS DOOMED—PREDREADNOUGHT BATTLESHIPS DESTINED BY NAVY FOR JUNK OR TARGETS.

Twelve predreadnought battleships will be relieved of active duty with the fleet, placed out of commission, and probably eventually broken up for junk or used as targets under plans now being worked out by the Navy Department. The ships are of the "mixed-battery" type, and are not considered to be of any value against latest type fighting craft.

Four of the battleships—the historic squadron comprising the *Oregon, Indiana, Iowa,* and *Massachusetts*—have already been relegated to the scrap heap. The remaining eight, apparently doomed to the same fate, are the *Kearsarge, Kentucky, Illinois, Alabama, Wisconsin, Maine, Missouri,* and *Ohio.*

The twelve vessels, built between 1893 and 1901, represent a total expenditure for hulls and machinery alone of more than $335,000,000. When placed out of commission, they will release for other duty approximately 10,000 enlisted men and nearly 400 officers.

And so, Mr. President, the procession goes. The ships for which we must construct additional building facilities will be constructed only to follow the fate of those the list of which I have just read. It may be good business; it may be necessary for the protection of the country's affairs that this shall continue, but to my mind it is an entirely needless and wasteful expenditure of money, particularly in view of developments that are now being made in aircraft, which ultimately will make nearly all types of surface warships practically obsolete.

I shall not oppose this appropriation, but I am not at all impressed with the fact that we should make it because some of the officials of the Navy Department have recommended that the appropriation be made now.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to one matter which has been brought to my attention. I am not sure that the complaint which has been made to me involves the item which is now under consideration, but it has been reported to me that bids have been asked from these various Government yards for the construction of vessels, and there is a sort of rivalry, whether real or imaginary I am not able to state, between these Government-owned and Government-conducted yards with respect to the obtaining of contracts to construct vessels. The charge is made, or the statement is made, that after some of these bids have been made and contracts awarded appeals are made to Congress to improve the facilities in one of the yards, perhaps the yard that got the contract, and anticipating that it was going to get improved facilities and larger appropriations it made a better showing in the bid than one of the competing yards, and this has led, as I am advised, to some criticism and some complaint. Of course, the result of that procedure inevitably leads to a demand by the other yard or yards, if not in the then pending bill, in the next appropriation bill for larger appropriations in order that the other yards may make a lower bid and thus compete successfully with the yard that got the large appropriation at the preceding Congress.

Mr. PAGE. Answering the Senator from Utah, I can say that I understand every Government yard to-day is full to its capacity building these ships. There is no proposal to build any ships except to complete what is known as the program of 1916.

In providing, as we do, for the additions to be made to the navy yard in Philadelphia, and I also might add the navy yard at Norfolk, we are doing now only what seems to be absolutely necessary for economic and speedy construction, according to the best information we can get. I am not prepared to enter into a scientific consideration of the question suggested by the Senator from Utah, but speaking specifically with regard to the amendment now before us, I think I may say that we have no testimony and no letter from any department that does not fully justify the increase we are seeking to make at Philadelphia and at Norfolk.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that while we do request the Government navy yards to make an estimate as to what a ship will probably cost, all the work is done on account of the Government. We used to have work done by private yards, which the yards have not been very desirous of doing for several years, and when the question came up as to whether it should be assigned to a Government yard to build the ship or to a private yard, it partook more of the nature of a contract for the Government yard at that time than it does now. We asked the Government yard to make an estimate of what a battleship would cost. We would open those bids, and we had a right to reject either one, and frequently, not now, but at that time, the Government yards did make estimates a little less than the ship would really cost. But now these ships are assigned to navy yards, and they have been taxed to their utmost capacity for two years on account of war conditions. The ships are in various stages of construction, and they can not be completed without providing these instrumentalities. All the work done at the navy yard is done at the expense of the Government. If you have not the proper facilities, if you have no cranes, if you have not the power on a ship being constructed at the expense of the Government you lose by lack of efficiency.

Admiral Taylor, who I think is one of the greatest naval constructors in the world, who certainly has a reputation equal to any, has gone over these estimates carefully as to what is needed for construction. The matter of construction is under him, and he and the Secretary believe there is a necessity for the construction of these ships, and have stated that it is absolutely necessary and that the Government will save money by getting these modern methods of construction at the yards where the construction of these ships is to be carried on.

Mr. THOMAS. This is another instance where the Government saves money by expending it.

Mr. SWANSON. Any man would save money if he were constructing a ship by having tools instead of relying on day labor. The entire purchase of machinery shows that you do save money by spending money for machinery. If the Senator from Colorado is correct, we ought not to have any machinery to do the sawing, no machinery to do the drilling, but we should do it all by hand. However, the experience of the world has shown that machinery saves money. This appropriation is simply to equip the Government yards equal to the private yards.

Mr. THOMAS. What I dislike is the fact that with every appropriation for new ships we have to furnish new machinery.

Mr. SWANSON. I suppose in the Philadelphia yard we have several hundred million tons under construction. It is simply a business proposition. Will you furnish machinery and tools to do that work economically, efficiently, and promptly, with what everybody is using in that business, or will you not? The department thinks that this is economy and adds to efficiency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 23, after "$25,000," to insert "addition to power plant, $200,000; in all, $225,000," so as to make the clause read:

Buildings and grounds, Naval Academy: Repair of roads, $25,000; addition to power plant, $200,000; in all, $225,000.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator from Virginia if this is another instance in which provision for machinery is necessary to economy and for the efficiency of the cadets?

Mr. SWANSON. We have enlarged the academy at Annapolis. We have increased the number of students there to double and treble what it was. We have the buildings, and there is very little reason for having the buildings without heating them.

Mr. THOMAS. That was done some two or three years ago.

Mr. SWANSON. We have not yet completed the buildings. I see no reason for having buildings at the Naval Academy for two or three thousand cadets which they can not occupy for lack of heat. If the Senator thinks that wise——

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; I am asking for information. I recall that we made the appropriations, I think, in the last naval bill because of the increased capacity for the purposes of the war.

Mr. SWANSON. This is to build a power plant in the building we have constructed. We did not want to appropriate for a power plant before we constructed the building.

Mr. THOMAS. The House, of course, gave careful consideration to the bill before it was reported from the committee there and before it was passed. These additions are made here I presume because the House failed to do it. I imagine the House must have had some good reason, sufficient to themselves at least, for not making these appropriations.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. THOMAS. If it is necessary, I shall not object to it.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to read just one sentence from a letter received from the Secretary of the Navy. He says:

The power plant at Annapolis has been found to be inadequate for the service required after the additions already made to the buildings of the academy, such as Isherwood Hall and Bancroft Hall, and two temporary boilers have been installed. Before the completion of the Seamanship Building permanent boilers of larger capacities, with coal-handling apparatus, should be made available, and this will require a sufficient addition to the building to accommodate the new apparatus. It is recommended, therefore, for your consideration that an amendment be made to the pending naval bill to provide $200,000 for an addition to the power plant at the Naval Academy.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not object to the appropriation. I merely wish to call attention, while I am on the floor, to the fact, however, that the navy yards at Philadelphia, and at Boston, and at Mare Island, Calif., and Norfolk, Va., all seem to be suffering from a lack of machinery, which I suppose economy requires that we shall supply, the totals of which amount well up toward $10,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say to the Senator that at all these yards the amount of construction has been more than doubled. There is no occasion to buy the additional machinery when you are constructing but one battleship in the yards, but when you put two battleships there to be constructed you need that much more machinery.

I will say in justice to the department and to the committee, we have insisted that nothing shall be included in this bill that is not absolutely necessary to complete the construction under way. The Senator knows well that as we increase the number of ships of various sizes at these yards, we are bound to increase the machinery.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SWANSON. And it is not proposed to increase the machinery in these yards to a greater extent than the construction program requires.

Mr. THOMAS. I also know the argument which has been used in regard to appropriations on previous naval bills and Army bills and other bills is that the appropriations are absolutely necessary. Of course, if they are they should be made, but when one takes the statements running over a number of years showing the aggregate annual appropriations for these various items, which continue year after year, we are appalled by their magnitude. It seems to me machinery wears out faster and becomes obsolete more rapidly when used by the Government than when used anywhere else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 5, after "$75,000," to insert "machine and electrical shop building, $400,000; pattern shop and storage, $400,000; steel and lumber storage, to complete, $300,000," and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "$825,000" and insert "$1,925,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.: Water-front improvements, $500,000; tracks, streets, and sewers, $100,000; auxiliary fitting-out cranes, $100,000; grading Schmoele tract, $25,000; dispensary, $25,000; paint and oil storehouse, $75,000; machine and electrical shop building, $400,000; pattern shop and storage, $400,000; steel and lumber storage, to complete, $300,000; in all, $1,925,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 18, page 37.

Mr. KING. Perhaps, under the rule which obtains, inquiries as to matters which are not amendments are not permissible now, but recurring to an item which has just been read, I should like to make an inquiry now. I notice an appropriation here for the navy yard at Charleston, S. C.:

Dredging, to continue, $30,000; air compressors and auxiliaries, $118,000; oxyacetylene plant, $25,000; fire protection, $50,000; in all, $223,000.

I recall that when a prior appropriation bill was under consideration there was some discussion as to the wisdom of continuing the plant at Charleston. The limited information which was then vouchsafed to Members who challenged this item was not at all satisfactory to me that this expenditure was prudent. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has just called attention to the facts with regard to this item, that you have to dredge in order to reach the place where the dry dock is to be constructed.

I was not permitted to attend all the hearings of the committee, owing to my being required to attend other committee hearings, and I was wondering if the question has been considered by the committee of retaining this plant at Charleston. It seems to me in the light of information we had a year or two ago and in the light of the fact that we have so greatly increased other plants and the facilities in the other plants, there ought

to be some reconsideration of the determination to build a dry dock or to construct a plant at Charleston, and that it ought to be abandoned.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator please, we have a unanimous-consent agreement not to take up such matters until we have completed the committee amendments. Would it be just as satisfactory to the Senator to reserve his inquiry and take up this item later?

Mr. KING. Certainly. I stated at the outset that perhaps this was in violation of the understanding.

Mr. PAGE. I wish that might be done, because I should like first to complete the reading of the bill and action upon the committee amendments.

Mr. KING. I shall have no objection to that course.

Mr. SWANSON. This appropriation does not take care of the dock. The only dispute about the Charleston Navy Yard was with reference to the dry dock to be erected there. The dredging has always been necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you mean to say we have always had to dredge there?

Mr. SWANSON. We have always had to dredge to some extent, like we do at most harbors. Whether you have to dredge deep enough to permit the largest battleship to go in there is another question. We have spent $9,000,000 in the construction of the navy yard at Charleston. It has activities of various kinds and character. I do not suppose in 20 years anybody ever advocated abolishing the yard. It is absolutely indispensable. The only question that has ever been subject to debate is whether we should put a dry dock there so that the largest battleship could come into it.

Mr. POMERENE. If I may ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question, How much is it going to cost the Government or has it cost the Government to dredge out this harbor so as to permit the sending of a large battleship to the dry dock?

Mr. PAGE. I do not know. I am not well informed on the subject.

Mr. SMOOT. It has not been dredged. An appropriation was made for the purpose in the last river and harbor bill.

Mr. POMERENE. What was the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. SMOOT. Something like $3,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, no; not for dredging.

Mr. SMOOT. It was quite a large sum.

Mr. SWANSON. It was the usual appropriation for the purpose there. The river comes in and fills up some every year, but all the dredging that was to be done there was not for the dry dock.

Mr. POMERENE. I want to suggest, if there is a matter of several million dollars to be expended for the making of a harbor into which can float big battleships, it is well enough to consider these other minor matters, too.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt but what the appropriation was made for that purpose. We fought it out upon the floor of the Senate here as vigorously as we could, but you can not get anything out of a river and harbor bill. It covers all the States of the Union.

Mr. POMERENE. It is possible, even by an amendment to this bill, to repeal that.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, but I doubt whether you could get the vote to do it.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 20, after "$100,000," to insert "replacing two temporary marine barracks, $30,000; in all, $130,000," so as to make the clause read:

Navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.: Maintenance of dikes and dredging, $100,000; replacing two temporary marine barracks, $30,000; in all, $130,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 21, to insert:

For purchase of right of way and for construction of railroad connection between causeway now crossing Mare Island Straits and the South Vallejo railroad yards, $165,000.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator having the bill in charge if it is not rather unwise to stipulate the payment of an exact amount for right of way unless an agreement has been entered into and we are merely carrying out an executory contract? If we make an appropriation of $165,000 to acquire a right of way, certainly the man who has the ground will insist upon the payment of $165,000. If there is no contract and you are making the appropriation for the purpose of securing the right of way, there ought to be some restriction on the payment and there ought not to be a lump sum appropriated absolutely. There ought to be inserted the qualifying words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. PAGE. I think myself it might very properly be amended by inserting "not exceeding" that sum. I wish to say concerning this amendment that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is present and knows all the facts connected with the matter and he can speak authoritatively about it.

Mr. PHELAN. This item was recommended by the Secretary of the Navy and explained by Admiral Parks before the committee. It seems that the Government now pays $80,000 a year for lighterage. So two years' charges for lighterage would pay the cost of the right of way and construction of this railroad to the end of the present causeway to South Vallejo, which enables the Government to bring in its heavy materials without incurring either the delay or the cost of lighterage. So it is money made, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] said, for the Government to construct this uncompleted railroad. The causeway is now there across the stream. The lump sum of $165,000 is for both the right of way and construction and equipment, and we are leaving to the discretion of the department the settlement of the bill for right of way. We are not in a position now to estimate it, and they say the whole cost of right of way, equipment, and construction will not exceed $165,000.

Mr. KING. I suggest an amendment, so that the point I indicated a moment ago may not be raised, by adding, after the word "yards," in line 24, on page 37, the words "not exceeding," so that it will read:

For purchase of right of way and for construction of railroad connection between causeway now crossing Mare Island Straits and the South Vallejo railroad yards, not exceeding $165,000.

Mr. PAGE. I accept that amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 2, before the words "kilowatt generator," to insert "one hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 9, after "$10,000," to insert "new piers, $75,000; repairs to east wharf, $20,000; in all, $105,000," so as to make the clause read:

Torpedo station, Newport, R. I., buildings: Oil storehouse, $10,000; new piers, $75,000; repairs to east wharf, $20,000; in all, $105,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 23, to insert:

Marine barracks, Quantico, Va.: Construction of officers' mess building, $50,000; incinerator plant, $67,790; in all, $117,790.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Virginia what necessity exists for the construction, after the war is over, of mess buildings, and so forth, at the marine barracks, Quantico?

Mr. SWANSON. That has been made permanent headquarters for the marines.

Mr. THOMAS. It was before, was it not?

Mr. SWANSON. No; it was only during the war that it was put there. The officers' mess building burned down, and this replaces it. You are bound to have an incinerating plant there, but this is to replace, I understand, the officers' mess hall that burned down.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 4, after the word "works," to strike out "$11,074,350" and insert "$16,582,140," so as to make the clause read:

Total public works, $16,582,140, and the amounts herein appropriated therefor, except for repairs and preservation at navy yards and stations, shall be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 22, after the word "line," to insert "and also a site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park," and on page 41, line 4, after the word "station," to insert "*Provided*, That should Congress make no provision for construction, or take other action respecting sites for training station or hospital, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to retransfer the property," so as to make the clause read:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to accept from the San Diego Chamber of Commerce, San Diego, Calif., free of all encumbrance and without cost to the United States Government, 135 acres of land situate on the Bay of San Diego, San Diego County, Calif., for the purpose of establishing a naval training station thereon, providing that the city of San Diego will donate to the United States Government free of charge the tide lands in the Bay of San Diego adjoining said lands to the bulkhead line, and also a site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to have prepared and submit detailed plans and specifications for the construction of a suitable naval training station on said land and to report at the next regular session of Congress the total estimated cost of said station with an itemized cost of all necessary buildings and improvements thereon and the estimated annual cost of maintenance of said station: *Provided*, That should Congress make no provision for construction, or take other action respecting sites for training station or hospital, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to retransfer the property.

Mr. KING. Before the amendment is agreed to I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the plan is to establish another naval hospital?

Mr. PAGE. The plan is to make an investigation, and it has been prompted by the fact that a large gift of land has been made at or near San Diego. The investigation will determine whether we will or will not make a further investment at that point.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the Senator from Utah, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me, that I was in the city of San Diego last April and visited the proposed site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park. I do not believe it can be excelled for location anywhere in the United States. The climate is about as nearly perfect all the year round as can be found anywhere in our country. I know nothing about the expediency or necessity of constructing another naval hospital, but I am sure that the tender of this gift by the city of San Diego to the Navy Department should be accepted by all means.

San Diego is the southernmost city of California and is located upon the only natural harbor in Southern California. It is one of the most magnificent harbors on the Pacific coast.

The naval activities have very naturally and very properly been enlarged since our entry into the Great War. It is the nearest port to South and Central America on the Pacific coast, and there are a naval station there of considerable dimensions, a large aviation station, and a training camp. All those things will require a hospital of some dimensions sooner or later unless the Government should unfortunately abandon its activities in that part of the State.

I am very glad to be able to offer my personal testimony to the admirable location of this proposed gift and to the need, in my judgment, of the Government acting upon it before the offer may be withdrawn. Indeed, I may say without in the slightest degree reflecting or intending to reflect upon any other port or city upon the Pacific coast, San Diego is ideal for a naval hospital, for naval construction, for naval training, and for a naval base.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to add just one word to what the Senator from Colorado has said. It is the present idea that we will soon divide our Navy into two fleets, and that the necessity for additional naval facilities at some point on the Pacific seems to be very great. I have heard no discussion during the consideration of this bill that did not seem to suggest that the selection of San Diego, with the great benefits offered, is desirable.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will not press his objection. If he will examine the entire paragraph he will see between line 13, on page 40, and line 8, on page 41, the tender of this land is in the nature of an acceptance by the Government of an option. The Secretary intends personally to visit the Pacific coast this summer with the Pacific fleet, and his object is to study the conditions there, which will warrant him, possibly, in making recommendations to the Congress. The Helm report of Navy engineers has not been acted upon by either the department or this body, and it made recommendations for stations along the coast, including San Diego.

It is necessary to have a hospital at San Diego, the most salubrious point on the coast. The citizens there tendered, out of their public park, by this provision which the Secretary is authorized to accept, a valuable site without consideration. The paragraph provides that should the Government not ultimately build a hospital the property may be returned to the citizens. The same is true of the training station. It is a mere tender on the part of the citizens.

That land is worth on the Bay of San Diego probably $250,000 and has to be acquired from private parties by the citizens in order to make this tender. Then by the provisions of the bill the Secretary is authorized to accept it, and in case Congress does not construct a training station there, then the Secretary is authorized to retransfer it. So I would construe the paragraph merely as giving an option to the Government and obligating it to nothing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 8, to insert:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to exchange a tract of land, containing 1.29 acres, being a part of the Marine Corps base reservation, San Diego, Calif., and bordering on the northerly line of said reservation approximately 1,500 feet from the extreme northeasterly angle thereof for so much of lot 320 shown on the plan of the city of San Diego, Calif., as lies between the Point Loma Boulevard and the property of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 44, line 15, after the words "per annum," to strike out "$35,863,989" and insert "$37,402,959"; in line 20, after the word "constructors," to strike out "$1,946,272" and insert "$5,663,808"; on page 45, line 13, after the words "Hospital Corps," to strike out "$87,507,405"; in line 21, after the word "Force," to strike out "$15,371,176" and insert "$17,214,776"; and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "$163,274,110" and insert "$175,842,701," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of the Navy: Pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, and the pay of midshipmen shall hereafter be $780 per annum, $37,402,959; officers on the retired list, $3,442,918; commutation of quarters for officers, including boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, machinists, pharmacists, pay clerks, and mates, naval constructor, and assistant naval constructors, $5,663,808, and also members of Nurse Corps (female), $44,200; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them or commutation of quarters not to exceed the amount which an officer would receive were he not serving with troops and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, $25,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, $585,000; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, $525,570; interest on deposit by men, $30,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineers' force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools; and pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, $93,075,890; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, $1,836,000, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, $4,694,400; pay of the Nurse Corps, $1,392,600; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, $55,800; retainer pay and active-service pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force, $17,214,776; payment of $60 discharge gratuity, $9,953,780; in all, $175,942,701; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That hereafter the Pay Corps shall be called the Supply Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 3, to insert:

That the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, regarding the promotion of captains in the line of the Navy shall not restrict the promotion of such captains as may have been wounded in line of duty and are retained on the active list for shore duty under provisions of section 1494, Revised Statutes of the United States, and shall not deprive them of the benefits of the act of March 4, 1911.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for provisions for the Navy, etc., on page 47, line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "$42,664,500" and insert "$45,798,300," so as to read:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for such general courts-martial prisoners in such amounts as seem to him proper, which may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, but which shall in no case exceed 30 cents per diem for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency rations as required; in all, $45,798,300, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, on page 48, line 24, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$4,700,000" and insert "$5,700,000"; and in line 25, after the words "in all," to strike out "$13,571,200" and insert "$15,701,600," so as to read:

Provided, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storemen, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $5,700,000; in all, $15,701,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 7, after the words "Naval Establishment," to insert "except the naval hospital," so as to make the clause read:

Hereafter the provisions of the sundry civil act, approved July 1, 1918, providing for the establishment of a Government fuel yard in the District of Columbia shall not apply to the fuel required for the Naval Establishment, except the naval hospital, in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Steam Engineering," in the item of appropriation for engineering, on page 53, line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000"; and in line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$32,500," so as to read:

Provided, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed $3,000,000: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for the purchase of land for a site for a radio shore station at Otter Cliffs, Me., shall not exceed $32,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, in line 22, after the word "messages," to insert:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to cause to be prepared in the Office of Communications, Navy Department, a publication known as the Shipping Bulletin, and to publish and furnish the same to the maritime interests of the United States and other interested parties at the cost of collecting and publishing the information, including the cost of printing and paper and other necessary expenses, the money received from the sale of such publication to be returned by the Secretary of the Navy into the Treasury of the United States, to be used in the future preparation of the publication referred to, publication of which is authorized until such time as the publication may be self-supporting. Twenty thousand dollars of this appropriation, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be applied to the purposes hereof.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge to the item which has been read, the amendment beginning on page 53, line 22, down to and including line 11, on page 54. I desire to say that that amendment has reference to the future publication by the Navy Department of the daily Shipping Bulletin. I hold in my hand a copy of the bulletin. Under existing law the Joint Committee on Printing has full authority to authorize the publication of this document. In the hearings I notice that the department asks for a year's continuation of its publication. There is no question that the Joint Committee on Printing, if the publication of this bulletin is found advisable and the Secretary requests its publication for another year, will grant the request.

I desire to say, however, in passing, that it is partly a duplication of work. This information is already collected in part by the Commerce Department. It is information furnished by them; but if it is desired to continue the publication for another year I have no objection to that, although at present I do not believe it is necessary. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, it is expected that this publication will be self-sustaining. There is a great demand in every part of the United States for this publication relative to shipping, so that everyone who desires may have copies of it. I do not know in what respect it furnishes duplicated information. This information has been furnished; and I repeat there is a great demand for it all over the world by commercial people. They get the radio news, which is published every day, as to ships in nearly every large port of the world. News of the arrival of ships and other similar information is published in this bulletin. The entire commerce of this country, which is larger than that of any other country in the world, is greatly accommodated by this publication. I do not know what the program of the Senator from Utah is.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Virginia that this information in part is furnished by the Commerce Department, and it is by that department that it should be furnished. It is relative to the commerce of the world, and that subject should be handled by the Department of Commerce.

What we are trying to do is to stop all duplication in printing, if possible. If the Senator will look at the hearings, he will find that all that is asked is the continuation of the printing of this document for one year.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator from Utah say that the publication of this bulletin would be a duplication of information?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is a duplication of information. Not only that, but all the Navy Department will have to do is to show the Joint Committee on Printing that this publication is absolutely necessary and there will not be a question about the matter. The Senator from Colorado will remember, however, that in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which was passed at the last session of Congress, there was a provision inserted authorizing the Joint Committee on Printing to abolish the issue of all unnecessary public magazines and publications of the Government. If the Senator from Colorado will take the time with me and go down to the room of the Joint Committee on Printing right at this moment, I will show him the vast amount of printing that is being done by the different departments of this Government, or, rather the printing which has been done in the past. There has been duplication after duplication, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars for paper, in addition to the cost of the printing. That will be discontinued, and yet we have received hardly a protest against such discontinuance. The provision to which I have referred was passed in order to stop duplication and unnecessary work. It is for that reason I ask that this provision be disagreed to. If the Secretary of the Navy will come, as is provided by law, and show to the Joint Committee on Printing that this is a necessary publication, I will assure the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] that there will not be a single member of the committee who will object to its being printed.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, all they desired was that the publication be continued for one year. The information which the commercial interests obtain from this bulletin is information they can get from no other source. This bulletin receives the radio news from all parts of the world.

Mr. SMOOT. They claim to have information as to the movement of all the ships in the world.

Mr. SWANSON. They have been furnishing this news; they have been paid for it; and they ask that the publication be continued for one year. It is for the shipping interests. So far as the Navy and naval activities are concerned it does not help them at all. It is for the commercial interests. As a naval proposition it is not needed, but the Navy has access to it.

The information is furnished and charged for, and as I have said is great accommodation to the entire commercial interests; but, I repeat, so far as the Navy is concerned, it does not affect the Navy at all. So far as my information goes, I think, if this publication be eliminated, the shipping and commercial interests would be deprived of something which they are desirous of having. The amendment, however, is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that, but I do not want to make the point of order. I simply say to the Senator from Virginia that the publication is unnecessary. I do not desire to make the point of order; but if the amendment is not to be withdrawn, I shall make the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. From what the Senator from Utah says I think the point of order should be made against the amendment. His committee is engaged in the very laudable task, not only of eliminating duplications but of saving money. It would be poor encouragement to that committee, upon the other hand, if we increase our duplications.

Mr. SMOOT. I will make the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. I will make the point of order in a moment, and shall be glad to do so. I do not perceive the consistency of the publication of such a bulletin by the Navy Department. This bulletin has reference to commerce, and very properly falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. If the department has not the facilities for obtaining radio intelligence, then it should take steps to obtain it at once. I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word before the point of order is ruled on. I desire to say to the Senate at this time that a few years ago the paper bill of the Government amounted to $917,000. Since then it has increased, until last year it amounted to nearly $5,000,000. I undertook to ascertain the cause of this increase. It was not occasioned by the price of paper, which during all the time had not advanced very much in price. So I began an investigation. I myself found 47 publicity bureaus in the departments. I thought I would ascertain how widely publicity publications were being sent out through the mail. I wrote to a friend of mine out in Kansas, living in a little town of about 20,000, requesting him to keep for me, beginning with the following Monday morning, for six days the number of circulars sent under franked envelopes from the different departments of the Government, and to send them back to me at Washington. I want to tell the Senate what the result was. Beginning on Monday of that week until Saturday night there were sent to this one man 106 circulars; and out of the 106 circulars 11 of them were duplicates and issued by different departments of the Government; there were four duplications in another case and three in another case out of 106 such circulars. That was only for one week. I did not make the test in New York or in Chicago; but I took a little city, away out in Kansas, and I took an ordinary business man, and I found that 106 circulars were sent to that one business man in one week. That is why the Government's paper bill went from $917,000 to nearly $5,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And the publications were of no value.

Mr. SMOOT. And I desire to say that if the Joint Committee on Printing can stop this practice, it is going to stop it. It is for this reason that I offered the amendment to the legislative bill in the closing hours of the last session of Congress; and I say to the Senate that we are not going to save merely $100,000, but we are going to save to this Government millions of dollars if the Senate of the United States will stand by its committee.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. On the Army appropriation bill, page 72, there was a provision to continue certain Army publications, and the Senate did not hesitate a moment, on the statement of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, to eliminate that provision. I hold in my hand the law which we passed. I merely want to put it in the RECORD. Congress passed a law, and, as chairman of the committee at that time,

I gave notice to all those having charge of these various publications of the proposed action of the committee on the further continuance of such publications. In that notice I called attention to section 11 of public act No. 314, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved March 1, 1919, which provides:

Provided further, That on and after July 1, 1919, all printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive Office, the judiciary, and every executive department, independent office, and establishment of the Government shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except such classes of work as shall be deemed by the Joint Committee on Printing to be urgent or necessary to have done elsewhere than in the District of Columbia for the exclusive use of any field service outside of said District.

Under the provision to which the Senator from Utah has referred we have already saved hundreds of thousands of dollars, and, as he suggests, if we will stand by the committee in this matter, we will save a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars more—yea, I believe millions.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, after hearing what the Senator from Utah has said, I wish to read exactly what the situation of this matter is. I hope the Senator will save millions of dollars, but in saving millions of dollars I hope he will not hurt the best interests of the country. This is only an appropriation of $20,000 to provide for the publication of this bulletin, which will be sold to the public. If the Senator makes a point of order, that is all right, but I wish to state how the publication of this bulletin grew up in the Navy Department. Here is what the Secretary of the Navy says about it:

Secretary DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, on page 775 of the hearings in the House committee you will find a statement by Admiral Bullard, in charge of the naval communication service. Early in the war there was no way to find out anything about the movements of ships, and the Navy Department began with a little daily bulletin, typewritten and manifolded, and then it grew into a bulletin, and quite a large bulletin, giving this information, and we show, for instance, the location of 11,000 merchant vessels, where they were at any and all times.

The CHAIRMAN. How often was that published?

Secretary DANIELS. Every day. It showed to all the shipping world the movement of ships. We have had letters from, I might say, all the shipping interests, the Associated Press, United Press, and International Service, all the mediums of publicity, asking that we should continue to publish that bulletin. Of course, we published it during the war and distributed it free at quite an expense. In time of peace it probably would be right that this publication should be paid for by those who desire it, and the House introduced into their bill an appropriation of $20,000 to put the bulletin on its feet, and the authorization that we should publish it and charge for it, and this $20,000 was to help us along until it would be self-supporting. Of course, being new legislation and subject to a point of order, it went out in the House on a point of order. It was unanimously reported by the House committee that it was a very important service, and that we ought to at least keep it up for a year longer, and I would suggest that this committee insert the same provision that the House committee inserted. It is a very great and important service, and unless we render it I do not know how it will be rendered in the next year.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it will lead to no other appropriation than $20,000?

Secretary DANIELS. No; Admiral Bullard, who has looked into the matter very thoroughly, says that if he has $20,000 he can get it on its feet and then it will be a matter of sale. Of course, after the next year it may come to be a private enterprise, when we may get out from it altogether, but I think that having begun it and carried it on for two years so well, and having the facilities, the wireless and all the apparatus to do it—and nobody else has those facilities—it would be a very wise thing to do.

Senator PITTMAN. Is not such information of very great value to the Navy?

Secretary DANIELS. It is of the greatest importance to the Navy as well as to the shipping world. You see, this information has never been published before, I think, by any nation. Lloyds furnish it in Great Britain and we were more or less dependent on that, and now they are exchanging information with this bulletin. So we are enabled to put in it all that the Navy and the naval forces can secure and exchange information with the service across the sea. It is of very good value to the Navy, and is of very great value to the shipping world. I have had a number of letters from press associations and shipping agencies as to its vital importance. I think that it can be put on distribution if that amount is allowed.

The only purpose of this appropriation is to continue the distribution of this information. If the appropriation is not made, the publication will cease; but I submit that it ought to be continued, as the shipping world is now desirous of securing it, although I do not believe there should be any duplication. I admit, however, that the amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order because of my reliance on the statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], which I do not doubt for a moment. On any question of this kind I think the unqualified statement of the Senator from Utah can be relied upon absolutely. From that statement it appears that this information is being furnished by another department. That department can function with regard to every object sought to be accomplished by this publication that the Navy Department can. If the Navy needs it, it can be transmitted there by the Department of Commerce. But the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] says the Navy is the department receiving the information. That being so, it has the information necessary for naval purposes, and it can easily and readily be transmitted to the Department of Commerce for commercial purposes. Certainly the practice of needless duplication is not businesslike, is not proper, and can not be defended. For that reason I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator from Utah a question, does the Department of Commerce issue a bulletin that serves the same purpose as the one provided for in this item?

Mr. SMOOT. The Department of Commerce up to the present time does not issue a bulletin perhaps as comprehensive as this, but this was gotten out at the time of the war. As I said in the beginning, if it is absolutely necessary that this bulletin be published for a year longer, all that Mr. Daniels has to do is to come to the Joint Committee on Printing and get authority under the law for continuing the publication. But we do not want to begin——

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So that it can be printed, even if we do not authorize it in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. That is what I said in the first place; and not only that but I wish to say to the Senator from Virginia—and the Senate ought to know this—that when Secretary Daniels was asked what it cost per day for the cablegrams from all over the world——

Mr. THOMAS. Radiograms, I presume.

Mr. SMOOT. I presume the information was received by radio—he said the cost of getting this information from all over the world, while he could not give an exact estimate, the best estimate that was given was $1,000 a day. That was the best estimate that could be even thought of. All I want to ask the Senate is, after giving authority to the Joint Committee on Printing to determine whether or not these magazines or bulletins should be published, not now to begin to tear that authority down in every bill that comes into this body. I assure the Senator from Virginia and also the Senator from Vermont that if the Secretary of the Navy can show to the committee that it is necessary to continue the publication of this bulletin the committee will grant that privilege for another year as requested.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Who defrays the expense of that $1,000 a day for this information?

Mr. SMOOT. It is paid out of a lump-sum appropriation, I will say to the Senator, and nobody knows the exact amount, and we never will know. That is the curse of these lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about this appropriation. It is simply an allowance of $20,000 out of the appropriation made, to be used to continue this bulletin, and it is expected that the public will pay for it. Secretary Daniels says that $20,000 is necessary to continue the publication of this bulletin, but expects it to be self-sustaining.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I was not referring to that; I was referring to the statement made by the Senator from Utah that it was costing $1,000 per day to get the information which they only ask $20,000 to disseminate.

Mr. SMOOT. The $20,000 is for the printing of the publication, not for gathering the information.

Mr. SWANSON. According to the hearings, Secretary Daniels said he did not know what the actual cost of gathering the information was, but the department was getting radios every day from 11,000 ships, which information was put in the form of a bulletin, so that the shipping interests could know where the different ships were located each day. As to the exact cost of that he said he did not know, but he expected to include that cost, the cost of printing and the cost of distribution, and make those who wanted the information pay for it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What I want to know is, who defrays the expense of these radiograms and cablegrams that are printed in this bulletin?

Mr. SMOOT. I told the Senator who defrayed that expense. We grant a lump-sum appropriation, and the expense is paid out of that lump-sum appropriation. If the statement of the Senator from Virginia is correct that there are 11,000 of those daily reports by radio, the estimate of $1,000 a day is much too small.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator, as usual, did not get a clear statement of what I said. I did not say that 11,000 radiograms were received every day. I said that information as to 11,000 ships was received every day. In one harbor there might be 100 ships located, and one radio could give the number of ships located there. This bulletin gives the location on each day, as I have said, of 11,000 ships, but I did not say that the department received 11,000 radio reports.

Mr. SMOOT. The name of the ship has to be given daily and its location; but, of course, if there are 100 ships located at one

time in one harbor, the location could be given for the 100 ships in one radio.

Mr. SWANSON. The Navy Department wishes to continue this service, which the country wants; but if the Senate thinks best to discontinue it, I assume it will be discontinued.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I should like to know what the parliamentary status of the pending question is? I understood the Senator from Colorado made a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I withheld the point of order in order to enable Senators who wanted to speak upon the subject to do so. I now renew it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 55, line 4, after the word "necessary," to insert "for this purpose," so as to make the clause read:

So much of the naval appropriations for the fiscal year 1920 as is necessary for this purpose may be transferred on the books of the Treasury to the credit of the regular appropriations of the Coast Guard and Lighthouse Services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Academy," on page 56, line 16, after the word "coppersmiths," to insert "who shall be considered practical instructors of midshipmen," so as to make the clause read:

Department of marine engineering and naval construction: For master machinists, assistants, pattern makers, boiler makers, blacksmiths, machinists, molders, coppersmiths, who shall be considered practical instructors of midshipmen, and other employees, $52,694.16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marine Corps," on page 61, line 13, after the date "1920," to insert "so far as practicable," so as to make the clause read:

The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps is hereby temporarily increased to 27,400, plus such number of men as may be serving with the American Expeditionary Forces abroad: *Provided*, That the average number of enlisted men of the Marine Corps on active duty during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, so far as practicable shall not exceed 27,400, distribution in the various grades to be made in the same proportion as provided under existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 16, to insert:

That in making reductions required by this act, officers holding temporary appointments may be given temporary appointments in lower grades, and officers so appointed shall take precedence from the dates of their original appointments in such lower grades: *Provided*, That 25 additional marine gunners and 25 additional quartermaster clerks are hereby authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 23, to insert:

That so much of the act of July 1, 1919 (Public, No. 182), as authorizes the promotion of retired enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps ordered to active duty shall not be so construed as to make illegal promotions of such men as have heretofore been made to warrant grades or as to deprive them of any of the pay, allowances, or other benefits accruing under such promotion.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 14, to strike out:

In the office of the paymaster: One chief clerk, at $2,250; one clerk, at $1,500.

And insert:

That in the office of the paymaster, Marine Corps, Washington, D. C., and in such subordinate offices of the paymaster's department as the Secretary of the Navy may direct, a pay clerk may be detailed as chief pay clerk: *Provided*, That chief pay clerks so detailed shall receive the pay and allowances and other benefits of the next higher grade.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 11, after the word "force," to strike out "$45,711.28" and insert "$41,961.28," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for pay of civil force, $41,961.28, and the money herein specifically appropriated for pay of the Marine Corps shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as pay of the Marine Corps, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 16, after the words "Marine Corps," to strike out "$19,320,560" and insert "$19,316,810.28," so as to make the clause read:

In all, pay, Marine Corps, $19,316,810.28.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps," on page 67, line 7, after the word "buildings," to strike out "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require," and insert "and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such buildings not to exceed a total cost of $5,000 during the year," so as to make the clause read:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such buildings not to exceed a total cost of $5,000 during the year, $660,898.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, as an amendment to the committee amendment, after the word "buildings," on page 67, in line 7, I move to insert "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and outside of the District of Columbia for the erection of temporary buildings, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy." I offer this amendment at the request of the quartermaster of the Marine Corps.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like a little information upon the committee amendment itself. This phraseology is somewhat unusual, "and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such buildings not to exceed a total cost of $5,000 during the year, $660,898."

Does that mean that from the general appropriation for repairs of barracks for the Marine Corps a maximum of $5,000 may be expended for the erection of temporary buildings?

Mr. PAGE. I believe that it has been found necessary to erect a few temporary buildings for the benefit of the Marine Corps in the field. That, I think, applies to such places as Santo Domingo and Haiti.

Mr. THOMAS. This does not increase the House appropriation, but makes a special appropriation of $5,000 from that sum. That is the effect of it, is it not?

Mr. PAGE. It makes a limitation of $5,000. That is the effect of it.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well.

Mr. PAGE. In so far as I may do so, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 67, line 7, after the word "buildings," it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 7 and down to and including the word "year," in line 11, and insert:

In the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and outside of the District of Columbia for the erection of temporary buildings with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if the Senator designs to leave out the limitation of $5,000 in line 11?

Mr. HALE. Yes. The department ask to leave out the limitation of $5,000, because they can not tell how much they will need and they do not think that any limitation is necessary.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the department do not think that any limitation is necessary.

Mr. HALE. Very little is used for this purpose.

Mr. McCORMICK. They never do think that a limitation is necessary.

Mr. HALE. There is a limit, of course, anyway.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator means the aggregate limit?

Mr. HALE. Yes. But they stated that $5,000 would not in any event cover what they ordinarily use in the course of the year.

Mr. McCORMICK. They suggest a limit, then?

Mr. HALE. I should like to read a letter which I have regarding this matter from Gen. McCawley, the quartermaster of the Marine Corps. The letter is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR HALE: I have just received a copy of the naval appropriation bill reported by the Senate, and note with great regret the change made in the appropriation "Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps," on page 67, which defeats entirely the object intended, as you will note that this prevents the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, and also limits the cost of the erection of temporary buildings to $5,000 when built at places outside of the District.

I would infinitely prefer to have the House wording remain rather than this Senate amendment, as practically nothing can be done with $5,000 toward the erection of a building, and I certainly wish to retain the authority of law for renting, leasing, and improving buildings, not only in the District of Columbia but elsewhere, where the public exigencies require.

There seems to have been an unfortunate misconception in regard to the wording of this appropriation which has remained in the law for the last 20 years and about which there has been no abuse. As you know, there is a general law which prohibits the rental of buildings in the District of Columbia without the specific sanction of Congress, and as there is no time to obtain such specific sanction now the Marine Corps would be obliged to vacate several buildings which are now under lease in the District of Columbia.

So you will see that a very serious situation presents itself unless the wording of this act is changed. Won't you please therefore either have the wording changed as you proposed in the hearings the other day, and authorize the erection of buildings outside of the District of Columbia, and if this can't be done induce the Senate to recede from its amendment to the House bill, as I would rather postpone any further discussion of the matter until next December when the new estimates are

presented than to have the bill go through the way the Senate has amended it.

This is so important that may I ask you to give it your personal attention, or else we must abandon several very important buildings now occupied by us in the District, which would practically throw us on the streets, as they involve a garage, a stable, carpenter shop, and office space.

The following change would be acceptable to us:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and outside of the District of Columbia for the erection of temporary buildings with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Very sincerely, yours,

C. L. McCAWLEY.

Hon. FREDERICK HALE,
United States Senate, Washington.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I accepted the amendment of the Senator from Maine; but inasmuch as the limitation of cost is left out I will withdraw my acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the words "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require," should be stricken out of this bill, for if they are allowed to remain in here they authorize the Marine Corps to rent buildings and lease buildings and improve buildings in the District of Columbia. We have just appointed a public-buildings commission to assign space in the Government buildings to the different departments of the Government. This law being passed after the creation of that commission, which law gave them certain powers, it seems to me that it will simply repeal the provision of that law, and, as far as the Marine Corps is concerned, they can go ahead and rent as many buildings in the District of Columbia, within the appropriation, as they see fit, or lease and improve the buildings within the appropriation. That is not what Congress intended, and it does seem to me that the amendment striking out that part of the provision of the law ought to be agreed to.

As to the other part of the amendment I have nothing to say.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I am with the Senator on this commission to assign space. I think striking out "in the District of Columbia, and at such other places as the public exigencies require," was to some extent a clerical error. I will illustrate to the Senator what I mean.

The Marine Corps have some buildings that they have been leasing here. They are bound to have some transitory buildings. The Marine Corps is not a stable body like one of these departments with a lot of clerks, and so on. Sometimes more of the corps are here and sometimes less. They have some leased buildings, and of course under this provision that we have we can assign them to buildings. If they have any money to lease buildings, we can take them out and give them to somebody else; but if that language is put in there they will not have any money to lease buildings, and we will not have any authority to say whether they can have them or not have them. Do I make myself clear to the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the surveys here, nor can I remember what assignment we gave to the Marine Corps.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think that was included, or only to some extent. I do not know why it came out. My idea would be this:

They are bound to lease some buildings here. You do not want them to own all their buildings here, because their force is a temporary one at times. They have a certain number passing through here and staying for a short while and leaving in a year or so. My idea is that a mistake was made in striking out "in the District of Columbia," because we want to prevent erecting these buildings here, and that was intended to apply to the erection of buildings, and we wanted to prohibit it. It seems to me that the commission, of which the Senator from Utah and myself are members, could handle this matter if it read:

For the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, and the erection of temporary buildings elsewhere.

If they lease any buildings here, any that they lease are subject to the disposal of this commission; but if we do not authorize them to lease some here, and we have no authority or money to lease any, we will have none to assign to them.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, would the Senator object to an amendment so that it would read as follows:

For the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, by and with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. SWANSON. I think that is all right. I think that is good policy.

Mr. SMOOT. I would have no objection, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senators may understand this matter down there, but nobody up here understands anything about it.

Mr. SMOOT. The item, then, would read as follows:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, $660,898, and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, such buildings not to exceed a total cost of $5,000.

Mr. HALE. That should be left out.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator want that out?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I think while this amendment is here it might be well to put that limit at $10,000. If we send marines to Santo Domingo or Haiti or Panama, this fund is used to erect temporary buildings there. If we gave them unlimited authority, they could erect temporary buildings at Quantico, or they could erect them anywhere. This limit was put there with the purpose of prohibiting them from erecting temporary buildings anywhere except when the force was out in the field. I think $10,000 will enable them to cover the necessity for any temporary buildings anywhere.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the amendment would be the same as I read down to the word "Navy," with the following——

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator read the whole amendment again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Secretary state it.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the entire paragraph and insert a new one, to read as follows——

Mr. KING. On what page?

The SECRETARY. Page 67, line 4. Strike out the entire paragraph and insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, $660,898.

Mr. McCORMICK. Where is the limitation?

Mr. SMOOT. "Such buildings not to exceed a total cost of $10,000 during the year."

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that limits them, then, simply to repairing and improving buildings in the District of Columbia, and they want the right to do it in other places besides the District of Columbia. That part has been entirely left out of the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish the Secretary would state the amendment again.

Mr. SMOOT. May I state the way in which the amendment to the proposed amendment would read? After the words "Public Buildings Commission," put in "and at such other places as the public exigencies require," and after the word "Navy," insert "such buildings not to exceed a total cost of $10,000 during the year." Now I will ask the Secretary to state the amendment as finally framed.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the entire paragraph and insert the following:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, quarters, and other public buildings at posts and stations; for the renting, leasing, and improvement of buildings in the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, and at such other places as the public exigencies require, and the erection of temporary buildings after the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, such buildings not to exceed a total cost of $10,000 during the year, $660,898.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered; the committee amendment is disagreed to, and the amendment now offered is agreed to. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 68, line 19, after the word "men," to insert "mess equipment for properly constituted officers' messes," and on page 70, line 7, after the word "paid," to insert:

Provided further, That the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stats., 350), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," as amended by the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stats., 1077), shall hereafter apply to officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps under similar conditions, and the amount of such loss so ascertained and determined shall be paid from the appropriation, "Pay, Marine Corps," and the certificate of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps shall be sufficient voucher for, and shall be final as to, all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder.

So as to read:

Contingent, Marine Corps: For freight, expressage, tolls, cartage, advertising, washing of bed sacks, mattress covers, pillowcases, towels, and sheets, funeral expenses of officers and enlisted men, and retired officers on active duty during the war, and retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps, including the transportation of bodies and their arms

and wearing apparel from the place of demise to the homes of the deceased in the United States; stationery and other paper, printing and binding; telegraphing, rent of telephones; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters; apprehension of stragglers and deserters; per diem of enlisted men employed on constant labor for periods of not less than 10 days; employment of civilian labor; purchase, repair, and installation and maintenance of gas, electric, sewer, and water pipes and fixtures; office and barracks furniture, vacuum cleaners, camp and garrison equipage and implements; mess utensils for enlisted men; mess equipment for properly constituted officers' messes; packing boxes, wrapping paper, oilcloth, crash, rope, twine, quarantine fees, camphor and carbonized paper, carpenters' tools, tools for police purposes, safes, purchase, hire, repair, and maintenance of such harness, wagons, motor wagons, armored automobiles, carts, drays, motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes, and other vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official military and garrison purposes; purchase of public horses and mules; services of veterinary surgeons, and medicines for public animals, and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase of mounts and horse equipment for all officers below the grade of major required to be mounted; shoeing for public animals and the authorized number of officers' horses; purchase and repair of hose, fire extinguishers, hand grenades, carts, wheelbarrows, and lawn mowers, purchase, installation, and repair of cooking and heating stoves and furnaces; purchase of towels, soap, combs, and brushes for offices; postage stamps for foreign and registered postage; books, newspapers, and periodicals; improving parade grounds; repairs of pumps and wharves, water; straw for bedding, mattresses; mattress covers, pillows, sheets, furniture for Government quarters and repair of same; packing and crating officers' allowance of baggage on change of station; deodorizing, lubricants, disinfectants; for the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries; and for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising at home and abroad, but impossible to anticipate or classify, $2,740,322: *Provided*, That hereafter the funds received in payment for laundry work performed by post laundries shall be used to defray the cost of operation of said laundries and the receipts and expenditures shall be accounted for in accordance with the methods prescribed by law and any sums remaining at the end of the fiscal year after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of operation of such plants is paid: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat., 350), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," as amended by the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stats., 1077), shall hereafter apply to officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps under similar conditions, and the amount of such loss so ascertained and determined shall be paid from the appropriation, "Pay, Marine Corps," and the certificate of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps shall be sufficient voucher for, and shall be final as to, all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to submit and ask the attention of the chairman of the committee to an amendment to this amendment. This amendment is intended to extend to the Marine Corps the benefits which now are enjoyed by the Army in compensation for baggage lost in the military service; and I offer an amendment to extend the provisions so as to include the Navy.

I move to insert, on line 14, after the words "of the," the words "Navy and"; on line 16, change the word "appropriation" to "appropriations"; before the words "Pay, Marine Corps," insert "Pay of the Navy and"; on line 16, after the words "Pay, Marine Corps," insert "respectively"; change the word "certificate" to "certificates"; on line 17, before the words "major general commandant," insert "Secretary of the Navy and"; on line 17, after the words "Marine Corps," insert "respectively"; and on line 18 change the word "voucher" to "vouchers."

The effect of these several changes will be to extend the benefits of this provision for the recovery of baggage lost in the military service to the Navy as well as to the Army and the Marine Corps.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I understand that the only effect of this amendment is to place the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps on a parity. I believe the amendment is a good one, and so far as I am able to do so I am glad to accept it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that of course the conditions are a little different as to losses on naval ships in marine service. There ought to be some limitation that will give relief to naval officers on account of conditions due to the war. I think this matter ought to go to conference, but some little changes may be necessary in order to make it applicable to the Navy. The Marine Corps serves under conditions similar to those of the Army; and I should like to have the Senator, who probably will be on the conference committee, look at that phase of it and see to what extent modifications should be made on account of the difference in the two services.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think these two amendments cover the entire proposition as suggested by the Senator from Virginia, but I shall be glad to look into it further. It covers private property destroyed in the military service of the United States. That covers all contingencies in the military service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Is there not some legislation now to provide relief for those engaged in the naval service for losses that occur under the circumstances which this amendment seeks to cover?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No. Heretofore the only legislation on the subject has applied to the Army. The Senate committee adopted an amendment extending those provisions to the Marine Corps. Through inattention the Navy was not considered in that connection. I offer this amendment simply to extend to the Navy the provisions of that act, which heretofore has been exclusively for the benefit of the Army.

Mr. KING. Not remembering the terms of the act, does the Senator think its provisions would be applicable to the Navy? I can easily conceive of circumstances under which losses might result in the Army which would be so different from those which might obtain in the Navy that the statute with respect to providing for losses in the Army ought not to apply and could not be applied. It occurs to me that this is a subject which would require independent legislation.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, we have given relief in this war to marine officers. We have given it to Army officers. Under certain conditions, sometimes on land, naval officers are similarly situated. Now we put in there "the Navy," and it puts it in the same position, so that relief can come to all three services at the same time. It seems to me that is right; but I simply suggest to the Senator that I think, as the Senator from Utah has said, that there will have to be a different provision for each. However, this puts it in conference, so that the proper relief can be given to all three of the branches at the same time.

Mr. KING. I am not disposed to raise the point of order, because I feel that in justice those in the Navy ought to receive relief the same as those in the Army and in the Marine Corps; but I do suggest that a statute that gives relief to the Army might be wholly incongruous when you sought to apply it to losses sustained in the Navy, since the conditions are so different as to the personnel in each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in that connection I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD the act of March 3, 1885, referred to in this amendment, in order that the entire record may be available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Chap. 335. An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to examine into, ascertain, and determine the value of the private property belonging to officers and enlisted men in the military service of the United States which has been, or may hereafter be, lost or destroyed in the military service under the following circumstances:

First. When such loss or destruction was without fault or negligence on the part of the claimant.

Second. Where the private property so lost or destroyed was shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of any officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment.

Third. Where it appears that the loss or destruction of the private property of the claimant was in consequence of his having given his attention to the saving of the property belonging to the United States which was in danger at the same time and under similar circumstances.

And the amount of such loss so ascertained and determined shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and shall be in full for all such loss or damage: *Provided*, That any claim which shall be presented and acted on under authority of this act shall be held as finally determined, and shall never thereafter be reopened or considered: *And provided further*, That this act shall not apply to losses sustained in time of war or hostilities with Indians: *And provided further*, That the liability of the Government under this act shall be limited to such articles of personal property as the Secretary of War, in his discretion, shall decide to be reasonable, useful, necessary, and proper for such officer or soldier while in quarters engaged in the public service in the line of duty: *And provided further*, That all claims now existing shall be presented within two years and not after from the passage of this act, and all such claims hereafter arising be presented within two years from the occurrence of the loss or destruction.

Approved, March 3, 1885.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 71, line 4, after the word "works," to strike out "$42,749,888.28" and insert "$42,746,138.28", so as to make the clause read:

Total, Marine Corps, exclusive of public works, $42,746,138.28.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Emergency Fund," on page 73, after line 17, to insert:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to investigate and, at the beginning of the next regular session of Congress, to report to Congress the facts and circumstances relating to losses or delay caused to contractors and subcontractors in the performance of work or supplying of materials or construction, upon fixed price contracts, for or with the Navy Department, where such losses or delay were caused by increases in the cost of materials, labor, or transportation charges, or

by embargoes, or restraints upon trade, brought about by the action of Government agencies, after the date upon which such contracts were entered into; and to make recommendations to Congress for an equitable adjustment of compensation or waiver of damages in each of such cases.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 5, to strike out:

That no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in the United States for a sum less than they can be purchased or acquired elsewhere.

And insert:

That except for emergency requirements no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement in any foreign country of any article or articles or materials that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced at reasonable prices in the United States unless the efficient operation of the Navy necessitates purchase or acquirement elsewhere.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 14, after the words "United States," to insert "when time and facilities permit," so as to make the clause read:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and that no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards of the United States, when time and facilities permit, for a sum less than it can be purchased or acquired otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if, in view of the increase in the amount for naval aviation from $15,000,000 to $35,000,000 on page 7, he will not accept an amendment increasing the maximum limit of heavier-than-air stations from 6 to 9 and let the matter be worked out in conference? I do that because I am advised that when this limitation was put on the bill that failed last winter a larger number of stations were in progress of construction.

I should be very glad if the Senator would allow me to explain this matter.

Mr. PAGE. I am very well satisfied that it is going to lead to a good deal of opposition and discussion if the Senator proposes it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to state why I make the request, and if the chairman does not agree to it I shall withdraw it. A larger number of stations were in process of construction. I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] occupying the attention of the chairman, and for the present I shall desist.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows a great deal more about it than the Senator from Utah does.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall suspend for the present.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 30, following line 21, it is proposed to insert as a separate paragraph the following:

That the President is hereby authorized to nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint, Lieut. Commander Renwick John Hartung, United States Navy, retired, to be a captain in the United States Navy on the retired list: *Provided*, That for the purpose of longevity pay said Renwick John Hartung shall receive credit for service on the active list, and active service while on the retired list, and shall in time of peace be required to perform such active duty on the retired list as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe: *Provided further*, That said Renwick John Hartung shall receive no back pay or allowances by reason of the passage of this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, this amendment just having been adopted, and observing that on page 29 an amendment was adopted which raised Capt. William R. Rush to the rank of a rear admiral, I will ask the chairman of the committee why it is necessary in a bill of this kind that we select some particular persons to be raised in their rank and recommend them without any recommendation coming from the President or the appointing power?

Mr. PAGE. I understand that if we wish to promote a man outside of the ordinary law there is no other way of doing it than through special legislation of this kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. I supposed that the appointment should be made in the first instance by the President. In this way you get around that by suggesting the appointment first, and providing the position, and then asking the President to make the appointment, which very naturally will follow. If there should be places created for meritorious persons, why would it not be the duty of Congress simply to create the places and allow the President to exercise his ordinary function of making the appointments in the first instance for the confirmation of the Senate?

Mr. PAGE. I will state to the Senator that I could not pretend to answer him. I only know that this matter has come before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs and has been passed upon and has been approved. If the Senator desires to offer any amendment along parallel lines, I see no reason why it should not be made.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I have no one in view for whom I want to secure a position or retire him with a certain rank, perhaps above what he would be entitled to. I leave it to the executive department to determine what appointments should be made. I simply do not like the system of singling out men by a committee or by some Senator and placing them upon the retired list, or promoting them, without reference to any action by the President.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the only way in which this can be done in cases of especially meritorious service or in cases where injustice has been done is for Congress to act on all these bills to authorize the President to act in the case, which gives him an opportunity to do it. At one time, I think, we included 10 names of some of the best officers that were plucked by this plucking board. A great many of the officers that we have been including in our legislation were retired by the plucking board, who had to retire so many officers a year, whether they were efficient or inefficient. They could only come back first by Congress authorizing it, and we have always included in the legislation a provision leaving it discretionary with the President. If especially meritorious service has been performed by any officer in the Army or Navy, the only way in which it can be recognized is for Congress to authorize it, and then leave the appointment discretionary with the President to make it or not to make it.

Mr. McCUMBER. It seems to me that if the position is one that is open to be filled the President would have authority, without any further act of Congress, to fill the position, subject to confirmation by the Senate. If you need the other official position so that some good friend may receive it, then it would seem to me the proper method would be to create the position and allow the President to fill it.

Mr. SWANSON. An officer might be on the retired list, retired by the plucking board. The war came on. He came back into active service. He went into the Naval Reserve. The President can not promote him at all. He can not give him any recognition. All this does in many cases is to give the man the position which he would have held if he had not been retired by the plucking board, and for special services rendered in cases which the committee investigated and thought were meritorious and justified it, and where we thought the President would be justified in giving him the position.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator recognizes the danger of this method of procedure, when we find that a Senator upon the floor, moved by friendship or his feeling toward some particular individual, by an amendment immediately inserts a name to be promoted in the bill itself. The committee has not examined it, no one has reported upon it, and it becomes a part of the bill. I do not think the bill ought to be made a vehicle for individual preferences.

Mr. SWANSON. I was not alluding to the one that was recently adopted. I do not know anything about that case. But these were reported by the committee; all the facts were investigated, and the cases are very small, considering the long war and the number of men engaged. One was where a man was dismissed from the Marine Corps for cursing a citizen who insulted the uniform. He enlisted as a private and went through the war. The President could not reinstate him. We thought a man who did that certainly ought to be reinstated. The one that was introduced at this time I do not know anything about.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yet if it passes through conference that will become a matter of law as well as the rest of the bill.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I want to ask either the chairman of the committee or the Senator who has just spoken with reference to another matter. When the war came on it was found necessary that a great many of those who had been retired, either through age or injury, should be reappointed and perform services in the war, and under such reappointment they performed their services, and many of them were promoted.

Of course, when the war is over they will necessarily be demoted to their original rank at which they were retired. It seems to me that some provision ought to be made whereby those who, through meritorious service, have honestly gained promotion might be retired, even though it is a second retirement, holding the position they held during the war.

I have had some correspondence, which I submitted to the Senator from Virginia. He informed me, as I understand, that the naval law now practically corresponds to the military law with reference to those promotions during the war period. In other words, a limit is fixed to which the promotions may go and below which they will not be demoted if returned again to private life. I can not understand why all those who have been in the war and have been promoted should not be retired with the grade to which they were promoted.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator if he would not deem it advisable to take up this matter in a separate bill and provide the different grades or ranks in which these men should serve?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I should not take it up, because I am seeking information. It may be right and just as it is now, but it would seem to me that there ought to be the promotions. It may be possible that there would be so many of them during the short period of the war that it would be unjust to the country to incur the extra expense, but there ought to be some law with some limit upon it. I would appeal either to the Senator in charge of the bill or the Senator from Virginia to explain why they are not put upon the retired list at the grade to which they had risen during the war.

Mr. SWANSON. In the Army retired officers called into active service were permitted to be promoted as high as major. I think last year, or soon after, we passed a law permitting retired naval officers, when they came into active service, to be promoted as high as lieutenant commander, which corresponds to the rank of major in the Army. Army officers, when called to active service, could be promoted, as I have stated before, and then when they were retired they could be retired with the rank they obtained in active service, not exceeding the rank of major.

An amendment was adopted last year to the naval bill permitting naval officers when they came into active service, like a lieutenant, to be promoted as high as lieutenant commander, and to be promoted as rapidly as a man in active service would be promoted, provided his active service was equal to the service of the man in the active line in the Navy. Then we amended that by providing that when he was retired he should be retired with the grade he possessed by this promotion.

When you come to retiring officers who have obtained temporary rank at that rank, as suggested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], that has not been done in either the Army or the Navy. A great many Army officers have been temporarily promoted to the rank of brigadier general. They will go back, some as majors and others as colonels. To promote a retired naval or Army officer to a temporary rank and then permit him to retain what he obtained in temporary rank would be doing more for the man not in active service than the man in active service. A great many men in the Navy, captains now, will go back and be lieutenant commanders or lieutenants, because as you reduce the size of the Navy the number of captains is reduced, the number of commanders is reduced, and the number of lieutenant commanders is reduced, and consequently the temporary rank of the active force is reduced. I see no reason why, if a man is a retired officer and goes back to the retired list, he should be retired at what his temporary rank was when the active man in the Navy will not retire with that rank.

The Army has permitted temporary appointments up to colonel. I understand it is a debated question whether or not they can retire with a rank higher than major, as provided in the Army bill. The only difference there would be between the Army and the Navy is that they are allowed to be promoted temporarily to one grade, and it is very doubtful whether the retirement law will permit them to be retired in a place higher than that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if it is now in order, I desire to submit a motion to strike from the bill all after the word "work," upon line 3, page 75, down to and including the word "plant," in line 7 on the same page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado proposes, on page 75, in line 3, after the word "work," to strike out the following:

Nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senate committee eliminated that provision from the Army appropriation bill, and its action was sustained by the Senate. Consistent with our action there, we should eliminate this provision from the naval appropriation bill. The matter was discussed on that occasion, and I do not care to go again into the merits of the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to complete the statement which I was about to make when I had the floor a few moments ago.

In a bill that failed last winter the appropriation for aviation was considerably reduced and the maximum number of heavier-than-air stations limited to six. The department had in process of construction at that time a larger number of heavier-than-air stations than six, and this limitation caused the suspension of work on several of them. On one some two or three hundred thousand dollars had been expended. It occurred to me that it would be but fair to raise the maximum number to nine in view of the increase in the amount allowed by the House for aviation to $35,000,000.

Mr. PAGE. May I ask the Senator if he is referring to the station in Texas?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is one of the stations I had in mind. Nearly $300,000 had been expended there when work ceased on account of the limitation before referred to. In view of this situation opportunity should be given to consider the completion of the station. However, if the chairman thinks it inadvisable I shall not insist upon it. I simply submit it to him to see if he will agree that it go to conference.

Mr. PAGE. I think it inadvisable at this time to accept the amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the Senator agree to seven instead of nine?

Mr. PAGE. No; I prefer not to agree to any change whatever.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I shall not press the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment and call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, after the word "retirement" in line 2, insert:

Provided, That no part or parts of any existing laws shall be construed as having discharged from the naval militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia those members of the National Naval Volunteers, who were transferred to the Naval Reserve Force by authority of the act of Congress making appropriations for the naval service, which became a law on July 1, 1918, nor to prevent members of the Naval Reserve Force from being or becoming members of the Naval Militia of any State, Territory, or District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. I reserve a point of order against the amendment until the Senator explains it so that at least I can comprehend the purpose in view.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make a point of order. I do not know that it is subject to a point of order, because I do not think it changes existing law; it merely preserves the present status. It is largely a matter of legislative construction in order to remove doubt as to the effect of war legislation on the establishment of the Naval Militia. It involves no appropriation.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator kindly indicate the purpose which he has in view by the amendment which he has tendered?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The purpose I have in view is to make it perfectly clear to those who are interested in the Naval Militia in the several States. Of course, the States on the Great Lakes and on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are the ones primarily concerned. Some of them are anxious to restore the activities of their Naval Militia, as provided for in the act of Congress of 1914, with which the Senator is familiar. By reason of the passage of the Naval Reserve act and the enlistment of the Naval Militia in the Naval Reserve of the United States some question has arisen, some doubt at least, as to the effect of those proceedings upon the Naval Militia, upon the right of a man who retired from the Naval Reserve to join the Naval Militia of his State.

I do not expect at this time to go into the question of the merits of the Naval Militia of the States. This amendment does not undertake to establish any new policy with regard to it. It

simply provides that the existing Naval Militia shall continue, the object being to allow the matter to go over in its present status under the law until the regular session of Congress.

Mr. SWANSON. As the Senator knows, at one time we had a very large Naval Militia, an organization similar in the Navy to what the Volunteers were in the several States, and last year we transferred them into the Naval Reserve and one corps of the State militia into the Naval Reserve. They were all united in one corps. This corps of reserves will go on the inactive list, and of course the State volunteers or the State Naval Militia will be on the inactive list in reserve in some of the States. This is in order to help the Naval Militia.

Something ought to be done, and it seems to me this could very safely go to conference. The department is preparing some legislation that they have not yet perfected to care for both the Naval Reserve and the State Militia.

I will be frank and say that I do not favor this entire provision. I think it ought to be very much modified. It allows a person to belong both to the Naval Militia and the Naval Reserve at the same time, which I think is objectionable. But I think something ought to be done to give the conferees an opportunity to take care of the Naval Militia at this time. The department has not yet perfected legislation so that we can put it on this bill. If it is done, it will be very efficient in helping the naval service.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, it is not necessary to determine the policy as to the members of the Naval Reserve being allowed to join the Naval Militia, but I may remark in answer to what the Senator from Virginia has said that there is nothing inconsistent whatever in the members of the Naval Reserve joining the Naval Militia. As a matter of fact, the militia of the States is a reserve military force of the United States, both in its land forces and its naval forces, under the Constitution of the United States, subject to the orders and the regulations and the support of Congress. That is one of the enumerated powers of Congress.

Mr. PAGE. It seems to me this is a matter of a good deal of importance, and in view of its importance I am rather inclined to accept the amendment and let it go to conference.

Mr. KING. I will not press the point of order in view of the statement made by the Senator from Virginia and the statement of the chairman of the committee, provided the modification suggested by the Senator from Virginia will be made to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington and such additional provision as shall be deemed necessary to fully protect the situation. I am not in entire sympathy with the amendment as it has been tendered. I think some legislation is needed, and with the assurance by the Senator that it will be perfected along the lines suggested, I will withdraw the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. I offer the amendment I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 29, after line 21, insert:

That all officers of the naval service or any branch thereof who have served on active duty in the war with Germany with the rank of commodore shall, upon the ending of hostilities or within six months after signing of a treaty of peace, be commissioned as rear admiral in the United States Navy and placed upon the retired list with the rank of and three-fourths of the highest pay of rear admiral, second nine, any act or parts of acts to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator how many new rear admirals that will make?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator reserve his point of order for a moment until I make an explanation of what the amendment really means?

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. CALDER. This amendment affects 28 former commodores in the American Navy. Most of these men resigned from the Navy with the rank of commodore; some were dropped from the Navy when they were captains and received the additional rank of commodore. The amendment will not increase the expenses of the Government a particle. It simply permits the increase of retirement rank to these men who went back to the service of their own accord, who were not compelled to go back, but who served during all the war, and now are to be given this additional rank without any cost on the part of the Government. I hope the Senator from Virginia will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. SWANSON. I insist on my point of order. These officers were retired as commodores. We abolished that rank and made some of them rear admirals. This proposition would increase their pay. We now have a pretty large retired list, requiring the expenditure of a great deal of money, and if we keep adding to it it will continue to increase. I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On page 23, line 17, I move to strike out "April 7" and to insert "February 1" instead.

Mr. President, I offer that amendment for the purpose of according to the young men who enlisted in the months of February and March the same opportunity for discharge from the service which the bill gives to those young men who enlisted in the Navy after April 7, 1917. Diplomatic relations with Germany were broken off about the 1st of February, 1917; I think on the 1st of February; I know that the President appeared before Congress on the 3d of February and made the announcement. Enlistments were very rapid during that month and the month following, and these men enlisted with the same motives and under the same impulses as the young men who enlisted after the declaration of war, yet they are in the service for four years and can not be discharged sooner. I know that there are a great many applications for discharge which can not be entertained under the terms of the bill as it is now written, because the men enlisted after February 1 and prior to April 7, 1917.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a word further. At the time those enlistments were made the Navy regulation permitted any enlisted men to purchase his discharge from the Navy at the end of two years' service. That regulation has now been changed, and they can not free themselves from the service under it. It seems to me equitable that they should be put upon the same footing as those who enlisted after April 7.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, it seems to me that that is not only just, but that it ought to be done. A man who enlisted in February, expecting his country to get into war, deserves more credit than a man who delayed doing so for 30 days. This date was inserted because it was the date of the declaration of war. I do not see why a young man who volunteered in February, and who enlisted for four years, because he could not enlist for the duration of the war, should not have the advantage that was given to the man who enlisted later. It seems to me a man deserves much more credit for enlisting earlier and ought not to be penalized for doing so.

Mr. WARREN. Should not a similar provision be made in the Army appropriation bill? The condition is the same in the Army as it is in the Navy. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, if he wishes to apply it to the Navy, why not have it also include the Army?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be very glad if I can offer the amendment in that shape.

Mr. WARREN. I also make that suggestion to the Senator from Virginia; that it ought to cover the Army as well as the Navy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It ought to go into conference amended as I have suggested; and I think then the conferees could so frame it as would make it apply to the Army as well.

Mr. WARREN. It could not be inserted as to the Army unless you put it in here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am willing to make it cover the Army as well as the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS. There are no four-year enlistments in the Army.

Mr. SWANSON. Unless the provision for the Army is included in the Senate, I am afraid we shall have trouble; and even then we may be considered to be encroaching on the preserves of the Military Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I think there will be no difficulty of that kind, and if there should be, if it is once in the bill it is a subject for conference. There are not a large number of men either in the Army or in the Navy who are in the class covered by the amendment; but it is exceedingly hard for the few men who, the moment they thought there was about to be a war, entered the service under the only law we then had, to be bound for six years—three years with the colors and three years in the reserves—while the men who were drafted and went in perhaps unwillingly, or whether they went in willingly or unwillingly, after 30 or 60 days are being discharged.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think we ought to penalize a man who volunteered.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator whether that was the law in force at that time? Were not enlistments made for one year and three years?

Mr. WARREN. Not at that time. The only law as to enlistments was for six or seven years—three or four years with the colors and the balance of the time in the reserves.

Mr. THOMAS. I had the impression it was the Chamberlain bill of 1916 that made the change.

Mr. WARREN. The change in reference to the one-year and three-year enlistments was made a short time ago.

Mr. PAGE. May I ask the Senator from Virginia if there is any reason why this particular feature should not be taken care of in conference on the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. SWANSON. The reason it can not be so taken care of is that it is not a matter of conference.

Mr. WARREN. It is not a matter of conference. The only way it can go into conference is by being put on this bill. When Army and Navy matters have come up in the Senate, there are men who are always on the lookout, as they should be, to obtain every benefit for one branch of the service that is given to the other. In fact, I think the law has not been abrogated which gives that privilege to the Navy. So I wish to see the same privilege accorded to the Army as it is proposed to accord now to the enlisted men of the Navy.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] I will perfect my amendment by adding in line 16, after the word "the" and before the word "Navy," the word "Army." If on account of the difference of the enlistment term in the two branches of the service the amendment requires some modification, such modification can be made in conference.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the words "Secretary of the Navy" in line 24 do not also need modification.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think they do.

Mr. SWANSON. It should read "the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. After the word "Navy," in line 19, I move to insert the words "or the Secretary of War."

Mr. THOMAS. And the same in line 24.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the suggestion is made to me that that amendment needs perfecting in two or three particulars, and I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not give it a little more careful consideration, and see that a proper amendment is drawn. In that event, so far as I am concerned as the chairman of the committee, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, with the changes that have been made by the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, my attention is called to the fact that if the amendment is to be made applicable to the Army as well as to the Navy on the following page there are a number of places where changes must be made. I apprehended we were about to conclude the consideration of the bill, but if I can have time to look the bill over and make those changes I will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Permission will be granted to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PAGE. I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin to make the best arrangement he can of the language here, and then we can take care of it in conference, I presume.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If that be so, then I will leave the amendment as I have already proposed it, with the modifications which I have made.

Mr. PAGE. I should be very glad to have the Senator give the benefit of his legal judgment to me by saying that the amendments which he suggests may be made in conference. I should dislike to have a matter go to conference when it was not sent to conference in such form as to permit it to be legally amended. I am told that there is some objection to the amendment of the Senator on that ground.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I withdraw the amendment for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I notice on pages 72 and 73 a list of vessels of different kinds, the limit of cost of which has been very materially increased. I desire to ask the Senator from Vermont whether the 75 vessels—I think my count is correct—enumerated on those pages are included in what is called the naval program of 1916?

Mr. PAGE. They are all included in that program, or nearly all of them.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask if these increases are designed to cover the armament as well as the construction of the various ships?

Mr. PAGE. They are, exclusive of armor and armament.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator give an approximation of what the added cost of armor and armament will be?

Mr. PAGE. I am not able to give the Senator the aggregate cost or armor and armament for these vessels. Here is a sentence from the report, which I will be glad to read, in connection with the Senator's previous question:

> The present estimated cost of the three-year program is $686,000,000, toward which $107,000,000 has been appropriated, leaving $579,000,000 to be appropriated. (This is just approximate.)
>
> The vessels of the three-year program which have not yet been commenced are: Nine fleet submarines, one transport, one destroyer tender, one repair ship, two battleships (Nos. 53 and 54; proposals are now pending on these).
>
> The $66,073,000 added to the program is for the extension of the limit of cost on work already authorized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the increases in the limit of cost are additional appropriations, are they not? That is, the difference between the first and the second sums is an additional appropriation?

Mr. PAGE. I so understand.

Mr. THOMAS. And those increases amount to $66,000,000?

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the time this program was considered and adopted I ventured to offer some remarks in opposition to it, believing that it was entirely unnecessary, in view of the development of the submarine and of the airship, to expend so much money in the construction of surface vessels. I think that the developments and the experiences of the war have demonstrated the correctness of my suggestion then made. We are going ahead, notwithstanding the tendency of a treaty of peace containing articles for a proposed league of nations, with a naval expenditure that is very much in excess of anything which preceded the war, and we are now proposing to build battleships which, without armor and armament, will cost the people from $15,000,000 to $21,000,000 each, and battle cruisers costing, without armor and armament, $23,000,000 each. I think it is safe to say that the added expense of armor and armament will make the cost 25 or 30 per cent greater than the amount here specified.

A few moments ago I read an extract from one of the Washington papers reciting the abandonment and scrapping of what were considered first-class battleships only a few years ago. If we are going to continue our aviation development, which I hope we shall, and if we are to prepare for strictly defensive warfare, which I trust may be the program, then expenditures of money for other than aircraft, submarines, and torpedo-boat destroyers do not address themselves to my sense of wisdom, especially in view of the enormously increasing cost per unit of these vessels.

The race between the first-class powers in naval construction prior to the war, and the determination of each to build the largest and best vessels necessarily involved an orgy of expenditure which largely contributed to the war feeling and to the ultimate outbreak of hostilities. Now, if we are to continue the construction of vessels like those which are here enumerated, we must expect Japan, Italy, and France to do the same thing. Notwithstanding the changed methods of warfare, notwithstanding the experiences which this war has afforded, the race for large, ponderous naval armaments seems to be the order of the future.

I have no intention, Mr. President, of holding up this bill or doing more than taking the occasion which is at present here offered of expressing my dissent from this program. I think as every year passes its waste will be demonstrated. I am not one of those who are able to believe that wars will disappear from the earth and that the nations will hereafter forever live in harmony together; but I am not disposed to encourage, by my vote at least, or by my silence, the construction of antiquated engines of warfare at enormous and constantly increasing cost to the Public Treasury, when the fact appears, and is admitted by some naval officers of high standing, that they are either obsolete or rapidly approaching a state of obsolescence.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am in substantial accord with the views just expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. It is not my purpose to interpose objections to the passage of this bill, or to indulge in any analysis of its provisions. It is imperative that the appropriation bills before Congress be enacted into law before the first of the coming month. This fact alone has prevented that scrutiny of the numerous appropriation bills carrying stupendous amounts which their importance requires.

I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and feel reluctant to criticize this bill, because I have been unable to offer

any constructive criticism during its preparation. My membership upon other important committees which were holding daily sessions during the period the Naval Affairs Committee was considering this bill prevented me from giving but perfunctory attention to the hearings; in consequence of these conditions, I was unable to become familiar with many of the provisions of the bill, and the testimony offered in support of the same. I have, however, become sufficiently familiar with this measure to reach a general conclusion as to its merits, and what I conceive to be its imperfections.

In my opinion, the bill carries appropriations entirely too large with respect to numerous items, and in the aggregate carries several hundred millions of dollars in excess of the reasonable requirements of the hour. I am not satisfied that we should carry into execution the so-called naval program of 1916. Our experiences since that program was prepared are of such nature as to not only warrant but demand a material modification of the same. The Great War through which we have just passed is pregnant with important lessons. This bill, in my opinion, fails to take cognizance of the lessons so taught, and blindly pursues a course or policy adopted prior to the period when these instructive and illuminating experiences came to our country. A nation would be foolish, indeed, to continue the same military policy during the coming year as that projected two or three years ago. This war has revolutionized military operations. The use of poison gases, the employment of tanks and air craft, the massing of machine guns and heavy ordnance—these and many other developments in the art of war will compel a change in all military programs. So, too, the naval experiences of the nations engaged in this war demonstrate the necessity of changes in naval programs. But this bill in the main follows the lines heretofore laid out and ignores, in part, at least, experiences and lessons of the past.

In my opinion, the appropriation of five or six hundred millions of dollars for the coming year ought to be regarded as an extraordinarily large appropriation and ought to have been satisfactory to the most radical advocates of a great Navy.

I admit that the situation in which our country finds itself does not permit the abandonment of naval preparations. I am in favor of an adequate Navy, and one which meets modern conditions and the requirements of the times. But in making this statement I do not want to be understood as supporting a proposition which calls for an appropriation of the magnitude indicated in the pending legislation. The construction of some of the warships provided for should be abandoned, and a new program, well balanced, scientific, and up-to-date, should be adopted. Instead we are slavishly following an obsolete one, expensive, extravagant, and unnecessary. There should be a reduction in the personnel to one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty thousand men.

I respectfully submit that the conditions in the world, turbulent and unsettled though they may be, do not now call for this gigantic appropriation.

The chairman and other members of the committee have given serious attention to the provisions of this bill, and I have no doubt feel that it is as satisfactory a measure as could at this time be devised. I am offering no criticism of my colleagues upon the committee, nor am I criticizing the representatives of the Navy Department whose suggestions and testimony influenced, no doubt to a very large degree, the action of the committee. It is a difficult thing to formulate wise and proper legislation to meet periods of transition, periods when nations are passing from a war status to peace. The conflicting and surging tides which at the present time run around the world augment the difficulties and add perplexities and complications of an extraordinary character. But considering the situation as best I can, I am constrained to express dissent from some of the provisions of this bill and to express my regret that the aggregate amount exceeded four to five hundred millions of dollars.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not want at this stage of the proceedings to take the time of the Senate to make any remarks upon the general policy of the bill, other than to say that I concur fully in the views expressed by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] as to the excessive appropriations which the bill makes. If this session had been called to meet immediately after March 4, as it should have been, there would have been time to properly consider every item of this bill and every item of the Army bill which we passed the other day. The failure of the President to call Congress to meet at that time rendered adequate consideration of these measures impossible. The end of the fiscal year is near. The money must be provided for these departments to continue their work without interruption. We are in the position of being compelled to pass these great appropriation bills practically as they have been prepared for us. There is no time at this session to change this big Navy and big Army policy. I am opposed to both now, as I was in 1916, and at the next session I hope Congress will be able to consider this subject with the thoroughness and deliberation demanded to properly dispose of the great problems dealt with in the Army and Navy bills. However, recognizing the necessity for quick action that confronts Congress, and realizing the futility of any effort at this time to change the policy that underlies these measures, I am content to merely voice my protest against the bill and to express my agreement with the views of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 51, line 17, after the numerals "$31,000,000," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That no part of the appropriation carried in this paragraph shall be available if the mechanics and laborers employed under the same in the naval stations and navy yards of the United States are required to work regularly more than 44 hours weekly.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, during three months in each year the laborers and mechanics at the navy yards and naval stations of the United States work 44 hours a week. During the other nine months they are required to work 48 hours a week. The clerks and draftsmen in the navy yards and naval stations of the United States work only 42 hours a week. It has become the almost universal practice throughout the country to-day, in our trades and in our factories, that the men are required to work eight hours each day on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday and four hours on Saturday. The American Federation of Labor last week at Atlantic City unanimously adopted a resolution indorsing this very proposition. I trust that it may have the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is an attempt to place general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment is not subject to a point of order. It is a limitation, and I think it has been held repeatedly in the Senate that an amendment of that kind, which does not necessarily carry any additional appropriation, is not subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it is new legislation, changing an existing statute, and therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think I have this amendment in form now.

On page 23, line 17, I move to strike out "April 7" and insert "February 1." Also, if I may state the entire amendment as affecting the whole subject, on page 24, line 13, I propose the same amendment, to strike out "April 7" and insert "February 1"; and then I move to add, at the end of the paragraph that concludes on line 4, page 25, the following:

Provided, That the privileges herein granted to the enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as to discharge from the service are hereby extended to enlisted men in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PAGE, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. HALE, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that at not later than 6 o'clock to-day the Senate recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, without amendment, a joint resolution of a few lines, for which I ask present consideration. It refers only to employees of Members of Congress. It is not an appropriation of money, but makes the necessary changes so that their employees may be enrolled, as our clerks are, by name. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the appropriation in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 1, 1919, for clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners may be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to two persons to be designated by each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, the names of such persons to be placed upon the roll of employees of the House of Representatives, together with the amount to be paid each, and Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners elect to Congress shall likewise be entitled to make such designations: *Provided*, That such persons shall be subject to removal at any time by such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with or without cause.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The Secretary read the report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill explain to the Senate the particular points of disagreement and the important amendments tendered by the Senate from which the Senate conferees receded?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the only amendment on which the conferees disagreed is amendment No. 13, which provides for the inspection of horse meat. I will say to the Senator from Utah that it was found that the language carried in the bill as it passed the Senate would not compel the labeling of this product. There is no opposition by anyone to this legislation, so far as I know. I believe that every Member of each House agrees that the product should be plainly labeled. That is the only amendment in disagreement.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator did not understand my question, or else I did not explain my position very clearly. The Senator will recall that there were a number of amendments tendered by the Senate. I should have been glad if the Senator would have taken the time to explain to the Senate, as doubtless few of us have had the opportunity to read the report, the disposition which was made of the amendments made by the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the amendment in which the Senator from Utah is especially interested is the last amendment, No. 92.

Mr. KING. Oh, there are others in which I was more interested than the one which I proposed.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that that amendment places a limitation of $2,500 on the salary that may be paid to any employee in the Agricultural Department out of a lump-sum fund. The Senator knows that there is a permanent law which takes care of that, but the amount is much larger than the amount named by the Senator from Utah, namely, $4,500. I sympathize with the Senator's intention to begin with economy. I am in hearty sympathy with it; but I will say to him in all earnestness that it will be impossible at this time to adopt this amendment, and the House conferees were unanimously opposed to it. We could not come to an agreement on that particular amendment, and so the Senate had to recede.

Mr. KING. Did the conferees attempt to formulate some other provision that would meet the situation, which, it seems to me, calls for some corrective legislation?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that that was discussed for a long time. I suggested that we might place the maximum lower than the present law and higher than the amendment of the Senator from Utah, but the House conferees would not agree to it. They said that at this particular time they did not believe it should be done; that in their judgment $4,500 was not too much for the services that are being performed by the men who are being paid out of these lump-sum funds, because these men are scientists. They are employed in the various bureaus of the Agricultural Department, and it would be impossible to get along if the amendment of the Senator from Utah should be adopted. In other words, it would disorganize the entire Department of Agriculture. I should have been very glad to have the amount reduced somewhat. Of course, however, I should not have agreed to the amount that the Senator named in his amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suppose the Senate is powerless to enforce its mandate. Without expressing in any way any criticism of the conferees, especially the distinguished chairman of the committee, his statement does not quite indicate to me that the Senate conferees very earnestly insisted upon this amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that we had a full statement of every one of these items printed in the RECORD. Of course, I could read them. The Senator, I know, will not ask me to do that.

Mr. KING. Certainly not.

Mr. GRONNA. We have made an effort to be as specific as possible. We were in conference on this bill for a week, and sat every day, and some days we sat until 11 o'clock at night; and I want to say to the Senator that we gave not only to his amendment but to all these items very serious consideration and very earnest consideration. We made the best fight we could to retain them. I am sure that my colleagues from the Senate will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the amendment to which the Senator from North Dakota has particularly called my attention is not by any means the most important of the amendments made by the Senate, but I do insist that that amendment was aimed at an evil which must be corrected. During the time I have been in the Senate I have heard Senators repeatedly inveigh against these lump-sum appropriations, under which compensation is paid according to the whim and caprice and discretion of some executive officer. I think that to commit that power without limitation to executive officers tends to demoralize the service.

The Senator said that if this amendment were adopted it would disorganize the Agricultural Department. Of course, I can not assent to that broad statement made by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I intended to say that that was the information the conferees received.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt that men in the department, in their importunities for an increase in compensation, and to induce the perpetuation of an evil system, painted to the committee some very terrifying pictures of the evils that would result if they were stripped of their power, and if the salaries paid were cut down to a reasonable sum. I repeat that this policy of making large appropriations to executive departments, with authorization to expend these large sums in such manner as they may see fit, without any limitation as to the amount which may be paid to one or more individuals, tends to a disorganization of the service of the Government. Certainly it inspires discontent with those who have employment under fixed salaries, and who are in the classified service, and whose compensation has been fixed, perhaps years ago, by statute or by some regulation.

We all have come in contact with the present evil, or, I was about to say, vicious system. The war has accentuated it. Bureaus have been created, or, at least, agencies and executive instrumentalities, a large number of them during the war, and large sums have been appropriated to those in charge of these executive instrumentalities, and they have been authorized to employ individuals for the purpose of discharging the duties pertaining to the particular work.

In most of those bills no limitation has been placed upon the discretion of the executive officers as to the number of employees or the compensation to be paid to each of them, and the result has been that these executive instrumentalities and agencies have invaded the regular departments, have offered compensation and salaries to employees who have been there for years greatly in excess, in some instances double and in some cases that have been brought to my attention treble the compensation which they had been receiving for years in the past. The result has been that men and women have been taken away from the work with which they were familiar in departments and bureaus where they had been employed for years and have been taken to these new instrumentalities, where they have received compensation very much in excess of that which they received in the past. That has led, of course, to discontent upon the part of thousands and tens of thousands of Government employees in the classified service found in the various departments.

I say again it is a mistake. In some of these departments five, ten, fifteen, and perhaps twenty-five thousand dollars have been paid to these new employees.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that there is a great deal of merit in his amendment. I think I so stated before. I, of course, can not speak for the Members of

the House, but I believe the Members of the House are in sympathy with the idea the Senator from Utah has expressed in his amendment; that is, to get these men all on the statutory roll—that is, to get all these men on the statutory roll—and that the lump-sum appropriation should, as far as is possible, be done away with. I believe that is the intention of Congress in the future, at least of those Members who have given this matter attention.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I think we would be serving the public better if we would get many of them off the roll, because the public service is not very greatly improved by having them there, and many of them are fastening themselves upon the Government when the Government does not need their services.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator perhaps misunderstood me, or I did not make myself clear. What I intended to say was that where the services of these men are required, instead of paying them out of lump sums, they should be placed on the statutory roll. The Senator knows there are men who have been in the departments for 20 years who are to-day paid out of these lump-sum funds. They are mostly high-priced men. Many of these men are new men, undoubtedly, and they are men whose services are required on account of their special knowledge of the science of agriculture. Of course, it is impossible for the department to have those men placed on the permanent roll, and we must make provision so as to allow the Secretary of Agriculture some latitude and give him an opportunity to employ these special men for this specific work. The Senator, I think, will admit that.

Mr. KING. It is of course gratifying to know that my amendment receives the sympathy of the conferees, but that is not quite satisfying.

Mr. GRONNA. I realize that.

Mr. KING. I do not quite agree with the Senator that all the persons to whom he has referred should come within the category of scientists. I wish I had the time to read a number of letters which I have received from persons familiar with many of these so-called scientists and their qualifications, men who are going up and down through the country, employed by the Agricultural Department as scientists, and I believe the Senate would withdraw that appellation as applied to them. There are men called scientists who are not scientists, men who are posing as scientists, who are pseudo-scientists, and who are obtaining compensation as scientists, but who perform the most ordinary class of work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish, in this connection, to call attention to the fact that the abuse of the expenditure of lump-sum appropriations does not apply wholly to what may be termed the scientists.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will not put me in that position. I did not intend to say that they were used for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I was not answering the Senator from North Dakota. I simply want to call attention to what came before our committee to-day to show the Senator the situation. There was a lump sum appropriated to one of the Government agencies where the statutory salary of a number of employees was $875. Through the bonus of $120 provided for this fiscal year and the amount paid to all of them out of the lump-sum appropriation, under what authority of law I can not conceive, these salaries were raised to $1,490. The statutory salary of $600 and the $120 bonus allowed was also taken out of the lump-sum appropriation and raised to $1,320, not one but all of them in that class.

Mr. KING. I suggest to my colleague that some of those heads of bureaus ought to be investigated; perhaps suit ought to be instituted against them to recover these expenditures illegally made, and it is possible their actions are such breaches of the law as to call for their removal.

Mr. President, just a word or two further along the general line I was discussing. When our country entered the war of course it became necessary to increase the number of employees. The result was that tens of thousands came to Washington, many more in my opinion than were needed. It has seemed to me that there is a predetermination upon the part of departments, bureaus, and governmental agencies to keep all in Washington and in the service of the Government those who were brought here for an emergency. Instead of there being an attempt to separate some of these individuals from the rolls there seems to be a determination to keep them upon the rolls as employees of the Government. Only a few thousand have been discharged from the various departments, and in many of the departments and bureaus there are more people employed now than there were at any time during the period of the war.

Instead of endeavorng to reduce expenses and practice economy, many of these executive agencies are evincing a purpose to continue upon a war basis and expend the same or larger sums than the necessities of the war called for. Reductions will only come when Congress enacts appropriate legislation and refuses to make the appropriations demanded by such agencies and departments. As long as the appeals and demands of bureaus and departments and agencies and instrumentalities are controlling, this vast army of employees in Washington and throughout the country will be continued. I venture the opinion that every department and every executive agency represented here in Washington have submitted many reasons for continuing war agencies and war machinery and war appropriations. There are outcries and wails of despair when Congress attempts economies and threatens to reduce the number of employees or the compensation which was based upon war conditions. The result has been that committees have been halted in their desire and determination to cut down expenses and cut off appropriations for temporary organizations that should have died when the armistice was signed or soon thereafter.

We have appropriated such huge sums during the war that it seems to have affected our perspective, and we seem to be unable to appreciate the extent of our demands upon the Treasury. During the war the expenditures of the Government were necessarily stupendous; but we promised that as soon as the war was over the most rigid economy would be practiced and reductions would be made. Over and over again we said we would "cut to the bone" and we would reduce the number of employees and try to get down to prewar conditions again. But we are not doing it, and some appropriation bills seem to be mounting higher and administrative expenses in some governmental fields seem to be increasing.

The bill under consideration appropriates more money than was ever appropriated for this department in the past, except during the war to the general or regular appropriation, when there was a special appropriation made. Thirty-odd million dollar are appropriated in this bill for the Agricultural Department, and by far the greater part of the same goes for salaries to employees. There are more than 25,000 employees in the department; and in other departments similiar conditions prevail.

I would like to see some general reform along the line of appropriations. I would like to see some true spirit of economy manifested here. We talk about economy, we promise that we are going to economize, we promise the people that we are going to cut down the taxes, but we then pursue a course that renders it absolutely impossible to effectuate any reforms or relieve the taxpayers from onerous burdens. It seems quite obvious that there will not be for some time, if at all, a reduction of the national annual revenue to $4,000,000,000.

With the temper and spirit of the times, it would appear as though the burdens of taxation will be grievous and heavy for an indefinite period. There are hundreds of schemes and plans to get money from the Federal Treasury. There are few patriots urging us to remember the taxpayer and guard the funds and credit of the Nation.

We have just appropriated for the Army nearly a billion dollars for the coming year. The naval appropriation bill, carrying over $800,000,000, passed this body within the past 30 minutes, and other measures will be presented for consideration during the next day or two which call for more than a billion dollars. When we come to raise the revenue, as we will have to do, we will hear from the people, and they will rebuke us for our extravagance. We should remember that when we spend money we must provide the way to obtain it. Now is the time to cry out for economy, to stand against the mad cries for appropriations, and to demand that the departments and executive officials, as well as all others who are connected with the Government, shall practice the most severe economy.

Mr. President, I know that this conference report can not be defeated. I am going to ask the chairman of the committee as soon as this report has been disposed of, or soon thereafter, to consent to the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to report to the Senate of the United States the number of officials and employees of the Department of Agriculture, including the number who have been specially employed since the declaration of a state of war with Germany, with classification of the salaries received; also the number of persons who are employed as scientists or who are classified as scientists, and as to whether any of such scientists are employed outside of the city of Washington, together with a statement of the character of work done by such scientists, and when such work shall be completed, and report the number of such scientists who are receiving more than $2,400 per annum, and the amount which they severally receive.

If the Senator is in sympathy with my efforts to effectuate some reforms and to strike at the evil of lump-sum appropriations, he will join with me in asking for this information. I submit that we ought to ask for information as to some of the other departments in regard to lump-sum appropriations, the disposition made of the same, the salaries paid, and the work and services rendered by those receiving compensation from lump-sum appropriations.

Will the Senator join with me in asking for the adoption of this resolution when the conference report is disposed of?

Mr. GRONNA. All I can possibly do will be to vote for the Senator's resolution. I assure the Senator I shall be glad to vote for his resolution when the conference report has been disposed of. I ask that the conference report be agreed to except amendment numbered 13, and that the Senate shall further insist on that amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees on the part of the Senate on this bill, but Senators will notice my name does not appear as signing the conference report. It seems to me that I ought to say just a word in explanation of my declination to sign the conference report.

The conferees, both on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, met for several days, forenoon, afternoon, and evening. They spent a great deal of time. They were all very earnest and very conscientious. I am not imputing any motive but the very highest to the any of them. The dispute that took up the time and brought about the delay arose over a very few amendments.

There was an amendment numbered 67 put on the bill by the Senate increasing the appropriation for agricultural extension work from $1,500,000 to $2,500,000. Most of the debate and discussion perhaps centered around that one amendment.

Another amendment was Senate amendment numbered 66. That is closely allied to the agricultural extension work in which the Senate increased the appropriation of $551,280, made by the House, to $751,280, being an amendment of increase amounting to $200,000, to be used in farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt.

The third amendment that had a good deal to do with the delay and the disagreement was amendment numbered 82, the Senate amendment making a new appropriation of $2,000,000 to carry out the so-called Weeks bill for the purchase of land along the mountains of the Atlantic coast. The House conferees finally agreed to recede on the $200,000 amendment. Am I right about that, I will ask the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, there were 10 amendments——

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, I understand; but I am only discussing these three principal ones.

Mr. GRONNA. There were 10 amendments on which the conferees could not agree, and the amendments which the Senator from Nebraska has named were included in those 10. Amendment numbered 67 is an appropriation for extension work, but it applies to cities having a population of less than 2,500 people.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I understand that; but I am asking the Senator whether the Senate conferees receded on that amendment or the House conferees receded on it?

Mr. GRONNA. The House conferees receded.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I thought. I thank the Senator.

On the amendment appropriating $2,000,000 to buy some of the Appalachian Mountain land an agreement was reached by which the House receded, with an amendment appropriating $600,000 for that purpose.

On amendment numbered 67, for the agricultural extension work, the Senate conferees receded and no additional appropriation was made for that item. With entire courtesy and respect to the House conferees, I desire to say that they refused to make any compromise of any kind in regard to that amendment. I desire to say for the Senate conferees who have finally agreed to the conference report that they were loyal to the Senate's action and did everything they could to get the House conferees to recede or to get them to compromise. All kinds of propositions were made, in which all of the Senate conferees concurred, agreeing to various compromises as to that amendment; but at no time during all the days of discussions and quarrels were we able to get any concession whatever in regard to that particular amendment. It was because I believe that the conferees on the part of the House showed a disposition absolutely to refuse to give any consideration to the Senate's action, though it seemed to me to be the duty of conference committees, if they could, to reach some kind of a compromise, that I felt that if they were not willing to compromise in any degree I would not be willing to sign a report which did not get something for that particular Senate amendment.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of argument, I admit, on this question both ways; I am not claiming that the argument is all one way; but I conceive it to be the duty of a conferee, as well as of a legislator, where there is any disposition to compromise, to reach an agreement, to evince a willingness to attain that end.

The appropriation for agricultural extension work is, in part, to carry out an act of Congress passed a few years ago, which is known as the Smith-Lever bill, by which a graduated appropriation for agricultural extension work is made every year, growing each year $800,000 until it reaches the maximum amount provided for in the law. The Agricultural Department claims that when the war came on, in carrying out an appropriation made by Congress to increase production, by which we gave them the money to extend the work provided for in the Smith-Lever bill a few years earlier than the bill then provided for, they formed an organization to carry on that work, which exists now, and that if this appropriation is cut to the House figures it will destroy that organization.

The effect of this amendment of the Senate is simply to ripen the Smith-Lever bill a few years sooner than it would have ripened under ordinary circumstances. Had the war not begun, had the war not existed, and had we not developed that work faster than the law itself provided, there would have been no contention now to increase this appropriation; but as the work did develop it was discovered to be a very popular as well as profitable piece of work on the part of the Agricultural Department. I think it is conceded that great good will come from it. It is an expensive proposition, but the good that is coming from the farm extension work is even not yet fully appreciated or realized by those who have had experience with it or had anything to do with it, either on the part of those who are doing the work or on the part of the farmers, and the farmers' organizations in different parts of the country are, as a rule, with very few exceptions, very high in its praise. With the bill left as it is in the conference report much of that work must be abandoned. We shall get up to this appropriation again as the years go on and the Smith-Lever bill gradually ripens according to its terms, but it seemed to me a matter of economy, while we were now administering the law as we must administer it in a few years and had the machinery to do the work, that it was the height of folly to stop when we knew we should have to start in again to build up this great machinery.

It is charged that in building up this machine so rapidly there have crept into it in the States inefficient men. There is no doubt, Mr. President, in my judgment, that to quite an extent that is true, and we should naturally expect it to be so; but those matters can be rectified; they can be taken care of, it seems to me, by continuing the work being done now rather than by dropping down two or three notches, and then building up again. I do not believe such a procedure is wise; I do not believe it is good administration. That is particularly true, Mr. President, when we take into consideration that the tearing apart of this machine and the breaking down of this work now will interfere in a great many places over the United States with the work the people locally and the administration officials of the Agricultural Department are now performing.

I realize that this session of Congress was not called until it was practically an impossibility for Congress, however diligent it might be, to pass the appropriation bills before the end of the present fiscal year. If it had not been for that condition, my judgment is that my coconferees would not have signed this report. We would have disagreed and fought it out. I sympathize very greatly with the desire—I have that desire the same as other Members of Congress—that we should as nearly as possible pass the necessary appropriation bills before the 1st of July. That is almost essential. I realize, too, that, since this conference report has been agreed to by the House, it is perhaps futile to try to defeat it in the Senate; in fact, I doubt the wisdom of trying to defeat it, and I am not trying to defeat it. I am not going to ask that it be rejected, for under existing circumstances it is almost imperative that this bill and several other bills be put into statutory form before the 1st of July. We are confronted with a condition which makes it advisable to accept what almost seems to be the inevitable. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] says he hates to do it; so do I.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I wish to say merely a word, not pertaining to the subject which I have been discussing, but in reply to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who I am sorry is not now in the Chamber. He has had a good deal to say against various items of this bill and has made criticisms, many of which are just and many of which, in my judgment, are not just. We ought to get out of our minds the idea that the Agricultural Department properly managed is not

a scientific institution. One of the most scientific businesses in the world to-day is agriculture. The Agricultural Department ought to have, and must have, if it is to perform what I conceive to be its duty, some of the best scientists in the world. The old idea that anybody who could not do anything else could operate a farm has disappeared, but I fear that there are some legislators who have lingering in their minds a recollection of the notion that used to be prevalent in years gone by.

In agriculture, chemistry, a purely scientific subject, is an absolute necessity. Engineers who understand all kinds of engineering are necessary. The amendment of the Senator from Utah that was tacked on to the agricultural appropriation bill prohibiting the employment by the Agricultural Department of anyone at a salary of more than $2,500 a year would have brought ruin to one of the most necessary branches of the Agricultural Department. I happen to know of my own personal knowledge that the Agricultural Department has been handicapped ever since the beginning of the war because of its inability to pay the salaries which were necessary to retain the services of the right kind of chemists. They have lost some of their best chemists. Men drawing salaries of from $2,000 to $3,000 a year have gone to work for private corporations and institutions at salaries of from $10,000 to $20,000 a year, and the department has been unable to employ other chemists at the salaries they could pay.

If the Senator from Utah will amend the resolution which he read, and which, as it is drawn, applies only to the Agricultural Department, so that it will apply to every department in our Government, I will be glad to support it; but I am not in favor of picking out the Agricultural Department whenever we want to practice economy, and go to the Navy Department, to the War Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Justice whenever we feel like being extravagant and want to expend a whole lot of money.

Much that the Senator says about lump-sum appropriations I think is proper, and I should be glad to have and I think we ought to have a report not only from the Agricultural Department, but from every other department, giving in detail the salaries and classification of all men who are paid out of lump-sum appropriations, but in my judgment the amendment the Senator from Utah thinks the most of is one that would bring ruin if enacted now.

We will find that unless the cost of living goes down we will have to increase some salaries not only in the Agricultural Department but in every branch of the Government where scientific knowledge is required of an employee. There are about as many such employees in the Agricultural Department as in any other, and there will be more, there ought to be more; we need more of that kind of men now. That is one reason why I do not want to see the Senate amendment in regard to the agricultural extension work entirely defeated.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from North Dakota if amendment No. 66, which was attached to the bill in the Senate increasing the amount of $551,280 to $751,280 for farm demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, was agreed to?

Mr. GRONNA. The House receded on that.

Mr. HARRISON. They have receded on that proposition and agreed to the Senate amendment; but on amendment No. 67, increasing the appropriation for farm extension work from $1,500,000 to $2,500,000, which the Senate adopted unanimously, the Senate receded?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Farm extension work is most important. I agree with everything the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has said about it, and I know that the Senate conferees have insisted upon it and have done well in trying to bring about the adoption of the Senate amendment; but before I get to that I wish to say that I understood from the Senator that there was one item in disagreement, the conference committee having agreed on everything else.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. In view of the fact that the Senate has voted this increase of $1,000,000 for farm extension work, voted unanimously for it, and the House has never voted on the proposition——

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say that the House has voted on it this afternoon again. The House has accepted the conference report.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand, but the Senator did not let me finish. Here is my point:

On this particular item there was a motion made in the Senate to increase the $1,000,000 practically $2,000,000 more. On a fairly close vote that amendment was rejected, but by a unanimous vote of the Senate the $1,000,000 increase carried; so the Senate, by a separate action, has passed upon that specific item and approved it. The House never has taken any specific action on it. The House committee brought out the bill carrying $1,500,000. They never have voted on the proposition whether it should be $2,500,000 or not. That question never has come up for discussion or for specific action by the House; but the action of the conferees in this report now is based purely on the action of the conferees of the House, three men representing the House. We do not know whether or not they are carrying out the sentiments of the House. Of course, we assume that they are; but the House has never passed upon that particular proposition.

In view of the fact that there is one item in disagreement, would not the Senator consent to a motion that might be made as a substitute for his, that the Senate refuse to recede on Senate amendment 67, and that the conferees upon the part of the Senate be instructed to insist upon Senate amendment 67? That would leave Senate amendment 67 and the other amendment in disagreement. It would go to the House, and the House then could pass on that proposition, separate and alone, and we could see what the sentiment of the House is.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I should be very glad to do that myself; but I will say to the Senator that, much as I should like to, the parliamentary situation is such that we could not do that without rejecting the conference report. We would have first to reject the conference report.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that we could do that, or that I could file a motion as a substitute, for instance, or the Senator could, my motion being as a substitute that the Senate refuse to agree to the conference report on amendment 67 and instruct the Senate conferees to insist upon the Senate amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senate could not instruct its conferees until after it had first rejected the entire conference report, and then, after it had agreed to another conference, it could give any instructions it wanted to give to its conferees; but we would first have to reject the conference report, and the entire bill would have to go back to conference. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I am in entire sympathy, too, with what the Senator wants to do. I should be glad to do it.

Mr. HARRISON. May I understand the parliamentary status? The Senator from North Dakota is moving to agree to a part of this conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the only question that can be before the Senate is the question of agreeing or disagreeing to the conference report as a whole.

Mr. HARRISON. What becomes of the exception that the Senator from North Dakota made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota must then make another motion asking the Senate to further insist upon its amendment in disagreement or else recede from it.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from North Dakota, in view of the peculiar situation and the strong reasons that have been advanced, and which the Senator from North Dakota believes to be well founded, will he submit to voting down the conference report, so that then we could get this matter into a parliamentary status where we could instruct the conferees to insist upon Senate amendment 67?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will be perfectly frank with the Senator from Mississippi and state that if the Senate should insist on the item which the Senator from Mississippi wants to increase, the $1,000,000——

Mr. HARRISON. The Senate wants to do it, too.

Mr. GRONNA. If that is done, there will be no agricultural bill before the 1st day of July.

So far as the amendment in question is concerned, let me say to the Senator that I intend to move to concur in that amendment. In other words, I have written an amendment myself. The language supplied here on the floor of the Senate with reference to labeling horse meat was not in proper form. The inspection department would not have been compelled, under that language, to label it "horse meat." The proper language was supplied and offered in the House, and I agreed to it. I will say to the Senator that it is my purpose, as soon as the bill comes over, to move to concur in the amendment proposed by the House.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from North Dakota will yield a moment, he makes the statement that if we do not agree to this conference report there will be no appropriation bill. Why does the Senator make that statement?

Mr. GRONNA. For the reason that the House conferees absolutely refused to give us another dollar for this extension work.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senate should turn down the report and insist on this Senate amendment, certainly the House conferees would go back to the House and ask for an expression of the House on it. Does not the Senator think that is so?

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the Senator that the Senate conferees—and I know both my colleagues will substantiate what I say—called attention to the record vote which was had in the Senate on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to increase the amount from two million and a half to four million and a half. On that amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi there were 24 yeas. Twenty-four of the Senators voted for that motion. Now, we called attention to that. We had the RECORD before us. We called attention to the fact, which the Senator has stated, that there was no objection to the $1,000,000 increase; and we went to the trouble of hearing many witnesses before the committee of conference. We had men from New York, from West Virginia, and from several States. When they were asked the question, "How much money do you want, how much do you need, in order to carry on this work?" the House conferees were able to prove that there was more than enough carried in this particular bill. Now, the question was, where does that money go? Is it expended for administrative purposes or does it go for demonstration work? And the House conferees refused to give us another dollar. We offered, as the Senator from Nebraska has just stated, to recede from eight or nine other amendments if they would give us even a part of this appropriation, and they refused.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has made the statement that the Agricultural bill would die unless we agreed to this report.

Mr. GRONNA. That was their statement—that they would not agree to another dollar for extension work.

Mr. HARRISON. There are three or four days remaining before the 30th of June. This is the 26th, I think.

Mr. GRONNA. I realize that.

Mr. HARRISON. And they could take it back to the House and get an expression from the House on the proposition.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that when the report has been disposed of the Senator will have, of course, the opportunity to make his motion.

Mr. HARRISON. I will not have an opportunity if the report is adopted. I was trying to get the Senator to agree, in order to carry out the wish of the Senate——

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator's proposition, of course, can not at this time be insisted on.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the trouble I am in. I am just trying to extricate myself from it, and I asked the Senator's help. Will not the Senator agree, in order to enable us to get a separate vote in the House, to have the Senate vote down his motion and allow us then to instruct the conferees?

Mr. GRONNA. I can not accept that proposition.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I simply want to say that there is no way of compelling the House conferees to take the matter back to the House.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that there is not any way to compel the House conferees to take it back to the House, but if the Senate insists upon this proposition it seems to me that any conferees representing the House would do it.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that the House has already acted upon it, and has adopted the conference report.

Mr. HARRISON. The House has never acted on this item.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? I think every angle of this proposition that could possibly be mentioned was taken up at the various meetings of the conference committees of the two Houses. The point which the Senator suggests, that the House has never voted on it and that it would be desirable to have a vote, was discussed at considerable length. I brought it up several times myself, and tried to work out an arrangement by which the House conferees would agree to go back to the House and get instructions on this matter. They refused to do that, and they claimed—I did not look up the RECORD, but they are all gentlemen of honor, and I have no doubt that what they said was the truth, so that I never even looked it up—they claimed that they did have a vote, not a roll call, but that they did have a vote on this particular item. They gave the result of that vote—a rising vote, too, I think. The Members were counted, and the result was announced. I believe—now, I am speaking from memory, and, as I say, I did not look up the RECORD—I believe they informed us that the proposition to increase this appropriation received only 37 votes in the House.

Mr. GRONNA. Thirty votes.

Mr. NORRIS. Thirty, was it? Well, something of that kind. Now, I think we could succeed in getting this proposition again before the House. It would take some time to do it. Let us see what we would have to do:

First, we would have to reject this conference report. It only needs our concurrence now to make it law, and, in addition, our agreement to the amendment that the Senator is going to offer to what the House has added to the one amendment in disagreement. Then we would message back to the House that the conference report had been rejected, and the House would take action on that, and another conference would be asked and would very likely be allowed by each House. Another conference committee would be appointed, and that conference committee would have in disagreement all of the items, all of the Senate amendments. In other words, it would be just exactly where this conference committee was at the beginning. Assuming that both Houses appointed the same conferees—which might or might not be true, but probably would happen—we would meet the same contentions then that we met before. We know that as far as those conferees are concerned there could not be any arrangement—any sacrifice of anything else in this bill—that would bring about their consent to the allowance of a single dollar. Now, we would go on for a while until the Senate or the House got tired of waiting, and the conferees of either one or both Houses would probably be instructed to bring back some kind of a report, and they would come back with a disagreement; and when they came back they would ask for a separate vote in each House on this item.

If I had not been convinced, from the vote that the conferees gave us, that the House was practically unanimous against it, I would have thought there was some possibility of having the House refuse to stand behind its conferees. Then you must understand, too, that when it gets into the House of Representatives the conferees are unanimous; they are the representatives of both political parties; and there would not be anybody in the House entitled to the floor to defend the position which the Senate conferees had taken; so it would undoubtedly mean a long delay on this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that they insisted that this million and a half carried the appropriation under the Smith-Lever bill up the full amount that it would reach when it had reached its maximum, and that the $4,000,000 was to be the permanent sum, and to put it beyond the permanent sum now would be ill-advised and not promotive of a permanent organization unless we intended to increase it.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator from Mississippi particularly that I would not hesitate to go to any length if I had a reasonable hope that at the end of the fight we could win out. That is the reason why I take the course that I do, because it seems to me that when we got through we would probably end just where we are now. I am afraid we are up against a hopeless proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am in perfect sympathy with the Senator from Nebraska on the Senate provision, but I yielded because I did not believe we could get it from the House; and as it takes both Houses to agree to legislation and to agree to an appropriation, if the other House is not going to agree to it, we can not get it. That was the view I took. I should like very much to have the appropriation.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, Mr. President, I believe that the appropriation is so necessary that I would go to any length within my power to obtain it; but since the conferees on the part of the Senate express themselves so convincingly and assuringly that they believe it is impossible to get it, of course we have reached the end of the limit; and I shall not be obstreperous, because I always try to comport myself in a very mild-mannered way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock p. m., Thursday, June 26, 1919) the Senate, under the previous order, took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, June 27, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.

UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE.

Frank L. Polk to be Undersecretary of State.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Hugh S. Gibson to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Poland.

Richard Crane to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Czechoslovakia.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

CLASS 1.

Charles D. Tenney.

CLASS 3.

T. Hart Anderson, jr.
Ray Atherton.
John W. Belt.
Frederick C. Chabot.
Matthew E. Hanna.
Arthur Bliss Lane.
Casper Y. Offutt.
J. Donald C. Rodgers.
Charles H. Russell, jr.
Cornelius Van H. Engert.
Walter C. Thurston.

CLASS 4.

Harold L. Williamson.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Frank K. Nebeker to be Assistant Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *June 26, 1919.*

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALSH).

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, so move, we beseech Thee, upon the minds and hearts of Thy children and remove every vestige of war and transform them into lovers of peace—war is from beneath, peace from above; war is hell, peace is heaven; war is from the earth earthy, peace is Godlike—that the good old earth, with all its blessings, may be made a safe place for men to dwell in and happiness reign supreme; that the angels of heaven may smile upon us and the hearts of mothers rejoice in the happiness of their children; that Thy love, poured out on the Hill of Calvary 2,000 years ago, may be realized in every home, in every nation, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name; and praise be upon the lips of all men. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his question of privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of yesterday morning, June 24, in a statement placed therein at the instance of Mr. John B. Densmore and as a part thereof, there appears on page 1713 of the RECORD the following:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Mrs. Nana B. Riddell, of Chevy Chase, Md., being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That my attention has been called to the remarks of Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, and reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5 and June 14, 1919, in relation to a trip made by Miss Jeanette V. Densmore on July 4, 1918; that to my own knowledge the statement made by Mr. BLANTON therein to the effect that Miss Densmore received transportation and Pullman reservations for three persons on July 4, 1918, from New York City to Atlantic City, N. J., is untrue.

I submit to the Chair that I have a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman bases his question of privilege on a statement under oath of Nana B. Riddell to the effect that the gentleman from Texas had made a statement which was untrue?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman has a question of privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I intend to take only a few minutes of the time of the House if I am not interrupted. I attempted to avoid the question of privilege yesterday by using general debate in the committee of which I was a member——

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman yesterday occupied a portion of time——

Mr. BLANTON. This will not be taken out of my time.

Mr. CALDWELL. Occupied a portion of time discussing this same matter, and I made a point of order and his speech was cut in two, and the point of order I make now is that he has already discussed this subject, and it is not a question of privilege, because it has been discussed by the gentleman already.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks that the gentleman yesterday did not undertake to discuss the matter as a question of privilege. He was precluded from continuing the discussion by the point of order, and the Chair thinks it is now in order for him to discuss this matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Had I been permitted to take up this matter yesterday I would have done it in about five minutes, and I would have avoided the use of any time of the House at this time. After the Densmore statement was put in the RECORD I noticed that Mr. Densmore admitted parts of my contention, but denied others. My statement which is denied was that on July 4, 1918, Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, sister of the director general, at the railroad station in New York, under her mileage transportation book which she carried around with her, applied for and secured transportation from New York to Atlantic City, and that she obtained at that time Pullman reservations for three people. I also stated that on July 7 she obtained transportation and Pullman reservation for herself back from Atlantic City to New York. Mr. Densmore admits that she used transportation from New York to Atlantic City, and says it cost only $1.25. He admits she used a Pullman reservation for herself from New York to Atlantic City, but said it cost only 98 cents, and that she paid for it out of her pocket. He admitted, however, that his sister, Miss Densmore, collected $13.46 for this trip, and in this affidavit of Mrs. Nana B. Riddell she admits that two people who were not connected with the Employment Service did accompany Miss Jeanette Densmore from New York to Atlantic City. After noting these denials day before yesterday, I having gotten immediately from the clerk of debates the Densmore statement, just after my friend from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] got permission to insert same under leave to extend, I immediately took steps to obtain indisputable evidence of the fact that this Mrs. Nana B. Riddell is mistaken, and that Director John B. Densmore has misled and imposed upon us. I had addressed already, very fortunately, a letter on that same date, as follows, touching this matter to use in the hearing granted me before the joint committee of the Senate and House.

The following is the letter I delivered to the following Government employees in Director Densmore's department:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 24, 1919.*

Mr. STANLEY R. LYNN,
United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The joint session of the Senate and House Committees on Labor have authorized me to present before such session to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 201, Senate Office Building, certain evidence.

I respectfully request that you kindly appear there at that time, as I desire to interrogate you concerning certain business of your department.

Kindly bring with you the following documents:

(1) The record card of travel for Luther C. Steward for months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1918.

(2) Request for transportation No. L51736, signed by Jeanette V. Densmore July 4, 1918, from New York to Atlantic City, N. J., and the three Pullman coupons attached thereto, numbered, respectively, as follows:

Office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5071; office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5072; and office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5073, all of same being from New York to Atlantic City, issued July 4, 1918.

(3) Request for transportation No. L51737, signed by Jeanette V. Densmore July 7, 1918, from Atlantic City, N. J., to New York, and the Pullman coupon thereto attached—office No. 2304, Form 43, No. 6206—from Atlantic City, N. J., to New York, July 7, 1918.

(4) Voucher No. 30682, travel expense, Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, for $747.33; trip begun about September 3, 1918. I might add that I have personally inspected the above, and they should be easily found in your department.

I will ask you also to be prepared to tell what you know concerning about $300 collected by Mr. Harry Parks, personnel section, official station, Washington, for trips he took away.

Also please investigate voucher No. 20479 for $13.75 to Lillian Haberkost, Akron, Ohio, December 12, 1918, and voucher No. 27137 for $12.70 to Lillian Haberkost, Akron, Ohio, March 6, 1919.

Kindly investigate voucher for $15.10 giving reason of S. Tyson Kinsell to go to his home in Philadelphia.

Hoping that you will kindly comply with the foregoing requests, I am,

Very truly, yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

In compliance with this request, I will state to my colleagues of this House that in the face of the statement of Mr. John B. Densmore, Mr. Stanley R. Lynn, an employee of the United States Employment Service at that time, from Director Densmore's department, appeared before the joint session of the House and Senate Committees on Education and Labor, in Senate room 201, this morning, and looking Mr. Densmore squarely in the eye Mr. Lynn stated that up to two and a half weeks ago these three Pullman coupons from New York to Atlantic City, issued July 4 and used by Miss Densmore, were pinned to this transportation request No. L51736, which request, signed by Miss Densmore, he brought before the committee, but since that time, up to yesterday, they had been taken away from there and had disappeared from the department and were no longer attached to this request No. L51736. What became of them? Fortunately, very fortunately, this witness testified that some two and a half weeks ago I requested him to make copies of these three Pullman coupons, giving the numbers and full descriptions of same, and to give me a copy of same, which he did. He testified to that before the committee. Fortunately, that was done. Fortunately, three different people inspected these three Pullman coupons. If that had not been done, and if I had not used the precaution to preserve their numbers, so that the railroad can easily identify them, I would have this woman's denial standing in the RECORD with no proof of its incorrectness.

Now let us see. Mr. Densmore says that his sister did collect $13.46 for the trip. He says she paid the 98 cents Pullman ticket out of her pocket, and that the other two ladies who went with her and whom he admits were not in any way connected with this Government, paid theirs.

If they did pay their Pullman fares, it leaves Mr. Densmore in a worse position than before. For, like Banquo's ghost, these three Pullman coupons issued July 4, 1918, office No. 2357, Form 2, and numbered 5071, 5072, and 5073, will not down, because until two and one-half weeks ago they were attached to the transportation request No. L51736, made out by Miss Jeanette Densmore herself in her own handwriting, and signed by her, and upon which trip she caused this Government to pay out $13.46 in expense.

Now, did she collect for these three Pullman coupons?

Let us see. Three railroad tickets from New York to Atlantic City, at $1.25, makes $3.75. Three Pullman tickets from New York to Atlantic City, at 98 cents, makes $2.94. One ticket back from Atlantic City to New York, $1.25; and one Pullman ticket back from Atlantic City to New York, 98 cents, makes a total of $8.92 for the three railroad and Pullman tickets to Atlantic City and one railroad and Pullman ticket back, which she used. That leaves $4.54 balance that she collected for the expenses, because Mr. Densmore himself tells us that the expense was $13.46 for this trip. I leave it to my colleagues to state whether John B. Densmore has attempted to mislead us on this item.

In connection with the other requests I made, Mr. Stanley R. Lynn, an honored employee of that department, brought before this joint committee this morning the other traveling-expense voucher—No. 30682—I asked him for when I sent him the said letter, showing that on September 3, 1918, Miss Jeanette Densmore started on another trip for which she collected from this Government $742, going from Washington to her home in Polson, Mont., which is likewise the home of the director general of this bureau; that in going from Missoula to Polson she used an automobile, because she did not want to wait for the usual mode of travel. And the only thing disallowed her was when she paid tips over 25 cents to Pullman porters. They limited her to 25 cents a tip. On that trip she even went down into Florida, where some of my good colleagues go sometimes in the hope of finding perpetual youth. And in addition to her very large salary, she was allowed and paid this $742 travel-expense allowance.

I do not take up the time of the House merely to deny this matter and show that my statement was correct, although I would have done it on that issue. The particular denial merely involves $13.46, but I take it up for another purpose. I brought facts after facts before that committee this morning and yesterday, to show that by our action here in appropriating millions of dollars and turning them over to this department without any restrictions whatever, hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money have been wasted and misapplied. Yet we are still voting more money to this director general in lump-sum rider appropriations without any safeguards or restrictions whatever.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing his question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must proceed to discuss his question of personal privilege as made.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will if you do not make me violate the question of privilege.

Mr. DENISON. I will not.

Did Mr. Lynn, in the course of his testimony, explain or give any specific excuse for the disappearance of these important documents?

Mr. BLANTON. He said that immediately after I placed that charge concerning that Atlantic City trip in the RECORD and after I had told him to make copies of them for me, so that if they disappeared there would be evidence of their existence, an honored employee of his department told him that Mr. Densmore had had that department searched from one end to the other to find the vouchers used by his sister and others. And it was after he was told that that he happened to find that they had disappeared, and the pin marks were still on this travel voucher —No. L 51736, which he brought before the committee—showing where those three Pullman coupons had been attached to it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the purpose of the travel in the case where the $742 was paid?

Mr. BLANTON. The auditor, Mr. Burroughs, who had charge of that transportation, testified this morning before the committee that under the rules of his office that voucher, No. 30682, should have been submitted to him to approve the transportation portions of same. He said, despite that fact, it was audited and paid without ever having been submitted to him.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. SEARS. Who placed those pin marks on the paper?

Mr. BLANTON. I will let the gentleman go down there and find that out himself. I have time only to present other matters to this Congress.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman makes an accusation. I thought maybe he would give it.

Mr. BLANTON. Since the gentleman's mind seems to be so cloudy, I will help him out on it.

Mr. SEARS. It is only clouded when the gentleman from Texas is speaking, and I want to get it clear.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to remove the cloud.

Mr. Lynn testified that these three coupons were pinned to that document. At the time I asked him to make copies of them, giving me the numbers, so that the railroad company today could get those original Pullman tickets that correspond with those numbers and could furnish that evidence, he said when I called his attention to the fact that I wanted copies of them they were pinned to that document. All of them were pinned to the document when he saw them, and when I saw them last. And I will let the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] go home and figure out himself during the next few hours how the pin-pricks happen to be in the document.

I am not going to take up further time of the House except with this concluding remark, that if we have in this department of the Government a man in charge who has been drawing a salary of $6,000 a year, fixed not by Congress but fixed by the department, if you please, out of blanket appropriations—if we have such a man, who will remove evidence from his department, if he did remove same—remove documentary evidence from his department that is damaging to his interests, I do not care whether that documentary evidence affects one dollar or a million dollars, I say that man has no right to be in charge of any department of this Government. I do not know who removed them. I do not know what caused them to be removed, but I know the person to whose interest it is to have them removed.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. MACCRATE. Did not the witness you produced before the Committee on Labor this morning admit that he took all these records out of the files of the department without the permission of his superior, never let the superior know he was taking them, and brought them to our committee this morning, and said he never even spoke to you about them until yesterday morning?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, but he also stated that he had answered many questions I had asked him on a number of

occasions. The witness admitted that he acted upon the requests made in my letter to him, and that in bringing these documents before the joint session of the House and Senate committees he took them from the department under Mr. John B. Densmore, and I showed to the committee by the report of Mr. John B. Densmore to the Secretary of Labor, dated November 1, 1918, that he (Densmore) spent two whole months in California installing a dictagraph instrument in the office of a district attorney of California, not to help the Government ferret out evidence of crime, but to thwart the purpose of the Government and the prosecuting officers of the Government in apprehending and punishing criminals of this country. That is what I showed to your committee this morning. Talk about the committee! The committee knows that there was an effort to try to embarrass that young fellow by saying to him, "You did not have any right to bring these documents here." That was the stand taken by some one. He was asked by you, I believe, "Who told you to bring them here?" He said, "I received a letter from a Congressman, telling me to bring them before a joint committee of the House and Senate, and I thought I had a right to bring them."

I want to tell you here that he did have a right to bring them. If a committee of this Congress and a Member of Congress who is trying to protect the people of this country from improper practices in the departments, if a witness or employee of this Government, at the request of such a committee or such a person who is trying to apprehend such facts can not bring such evidence as a file of papers belonging to this Government before the committee, I ask you, in God's name, why can not he do it? I will ask you to answer that question?

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLANTON. I certainly will. I wish you would ask many of them.

Mr. MACCRATE. Did any member of the committee ask that the gentleman referred to bring the papers brought by this man, or did you or any member of the committee make a demand on the gentleman to bring those papers?

Mr. BLANTON. The committee did not ask it; but I did. The committee authorized me to bring evidence before it in a hearing, and I secured documentary evidence, requested witnesses to attend personally, and requested this witness to bring these particular Government papers from his office before the committee. I might add here what I told your committee yesterday. Before the hearings began yesterday I called two witnesses out of a gallery to find out what they knew, and while talking to them they called my attention to one of Mr. Densmore's employees, with his back turned to me, within 10 feet of me, who they said was one of Mr. Densmore's agents, and the fellow was eavesdropping, trying to hear what I was saying to the witness. It is needless to state that I paid my respects to this eavesdropper. And in this connection I will say what I said to the committee, that the gentleman from Texas is amply able, mentally, morally, and physically, if you please, to maintain whatever position he takes on the floor of this House or before any committee or anywhere else.

Mr. MACCRATE. The gentleman will concede that other members of the committee may do the same?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes. But I want this employment bunch to understand that the gentleman from Texas is able to take care of himself anywhere all along down the line, and you will find me taking care of myself. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for this time used.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, had requested a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate resolution 94.

Resolved, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.;

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmudston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada; and

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

SENATE RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Senate resolution 94.

Resolved, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives, and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject—

to the Committee on Rules.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5227, the Army appropriation bill, disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the same, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Army appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California how much the Senate amendments increase the total of the bill?

Mr. KAHN. The bill as it passed the House carried $718,000,000. The bill as it passed the Senate, I am informed, carried $888,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman from California and the other House conferees fully realize the attitude of the House in regard to these increases. I believe they are fully aware of the fact that there is a very strong sentiment in the House in favor of adhering approximately, so far as can be properly done, to the provisions of the bill and to the appropriations provided by the House. [Applause.]

I think the gentlemen realize that the House is so earnest in regard to this matter that the House will not agree to any conference report that considerably increases the appropriations or provides for new legislation on this bill, and that the House will expect an opportunity to express its views in the matter if there is any difficulty in arriving at a conclusion and an agreement approximately on the basis of the House bill. In view of this situation I shall not object, believing that the House view will be urgently insisted upon by the House conferees, and that in any event the House will be given opportunity to express its opinion if the view of the House as expressed in passing the bill is not virtually agreed to in conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs, under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, declined to add any legislative provision to this appropriation bill. Many very important legislative pro-

visions have been added to the bill by the Senate, and I take it that it will be the policy of the conferees on the part of the House to resist such legislative provisions and amendments to this bill, and that if an agreement can not be reached on these matters the House will be given an opportunity to take action on them.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, there is no one on this floor who knows better the sentiment of the House regarding the size of the Army than does "the gentleman from California," and "the gentleman from California" will make every effort to secure the acceptance of the House provisions at the hands of the Senate conferees. [Applause.]

I have been a conferee on the part of the House for some years on the Army appropriation bills, and I do not recall that I ever refused or neglected to give the House an opportunity to express its views on any mooted question. I certainly shall not deviate from that course at this time. [Applause.]

In regard to the statement of my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], I have always resisted the effort to fasten substantive legislation on the Army appropriation bill. Committees of the House and Senate ought to pass upon these questions, and after being fully considered by the committees they ought to be reported to the respective Houses so that all possible light can be thrown upon the questions at issue. [Applause.] I shall try to carry out the wishes of the House in that regard also.

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to get a little information. I rather gather from some things I have heard in an unofficial way that the representatives of the War Department—the military caste—made their presentation of their case to the House committee and had it passed on by the House committee, and then by the House; but, not satisfied with the decision, they have gone before the committee of another body and have endeavored to present there an appeal, and have succeeded in securing a very considerable increase in the appropriations made by the House. Is that information correct?

Mr. KAHN. I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the War Department submitted practically the same testimony to the Senate committee that they submitted to the House committee.

Mr. LITTLE. Tried their case over again?

Mr. KAHN. Exactly. But the House committee felt that it was time to take stock to find out where we stood; and in the rush of the few weeks that were to elapse before the 1st of July there was no opportunity to study these questions as fully as they should be studied. Therefore the House committee felt that the lowest possible amount should be given commensurate with safety, because the committee realized that only five months would elapse before the next appropriation bill would be presented.

Mr. LITTLE. The committee have found no reason to change their minds as yet?

Mr. KAHN. I have heard no indication on the part of any member of the committee that he intended to change his mind.

Mr. LITTLE. I am very glad, and I hope the committee will maintain that position.

Mr. KAHN. The conferees have always felt that they are bound to respect the views of the House when they go into the conference, and this will be no exception to that rule. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, I think it is time for this House to take a position upon these things and stick to it. If we were right the other time, we are right now, and as far as I am concerned I do not propose to be bulldozed by anybody. If they do not want the appropriations that the revenue-raising body of this Congress gives them, let them go without, as far as I am concerned. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. QUIN. Reserving the right to object, the honorable chairman of the Military Affairs Committee states very plainly that he is going to give the House a chance to vote on these questions. Now, in the face of what the other end of the Capitol has done on this bill, increasing the appropriation for aviation from $15,000,000 to $55,000,000, and many other increases, and also raising the Army up to 400,000 men, in the face of what the House has done, I believe our conferees ought to stay out until the Capitol rots down before they agree to it, or, if they do agree to it, they ought to come back to this House and give us a chance to vote on it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. They have said they will.

Mr. KAHN. I will say to the gentleman that before the conferees will agree to it they will come back to the House.

Mr. QUIN. And get further instructions from the House?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. With that assurance from the gentleman from California, I am satisfied.

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Can he inform the House what became of that legislative provision of the bill as it passed the House to prohibit the War Department from buying additional land for military purposes?

Mr. KAHN. That has been amended by the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. To what effect?

Mr. KAHN. To the effect that those contracts which have been agreed upon shall be carried out, as I recall it.

Mr. MILLER. Does that carry the Camp Benning proposition?

Mr. KAHN. In part. I understand that as to some of the acreage the price has not been agreed upon, and, of course, that would not be involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, only for the purpose of asking a question, I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to say that the military appropriation bill as it passed the House carried approximately $718,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And as it passed the Senate it carried $888,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. That is my information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would be an addition of $170,000,000 to the House bill. It seems to me that is the point of difference between the House and Senate, and the country ought to know it.

Mr. KAHN. I can say to the gentleman that, of course, a large part of that increase is due to the fact that the Senate agreed on an average Army of 400,000 men, whereas the House agreed to an average Army of 300,000 men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker pro tempore announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DENT.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3157, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the reading of the report be dispensed with, and that the statement be read instead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the statement.

The statement accompanying the conference report was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 16, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, 46, 47, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 74½, 76, 90, and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 48, 49, 55, 56, 57, 58, 66, 68, 77, 85, 87, 88, and 89, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the

sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$327,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,326,121"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$5,783,231"; and the Senate agree to the same .

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "*Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings be increased to $2,500 in so far as it applies to this paragraph: *Provided further*"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence in the United States of flag smut of wheat, take-all, helminthosporium, and other destructive soil and seed infecting diseases of wheat and of other cereals, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $50,000, to be used in cooperation with the plant disease survey, investigation, and control authorities of the several States to prevent the further spread of and to eradicate or control these diseases."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, almonds, Persian walnuts, black walnuts, hickory nuts, butternuts, chestnuts, filberts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing the same, $20,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets, studies of the behavior of fruits during the processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, $83,200: *Provided*, That $20,000 of said amount may be used for investigating and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$132,700, of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of suitable land near the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of all necessary buildings and equipment, and for the establishment of a plant-inspection and detention station: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000 of this sum shall be expended for the purchase of the land: *Provided further*, That the limitation in this act as to cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,529,378"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$3,379,638"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For the study and improvement of methods of dehydrating materials used for food, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, and to disseminate information as to the value and suitability of such products for food, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$979,901"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$1,391,571"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$100,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For conducting investigations and study of the nature and habits of the pest known as the camphor thrip, for the purpose of discovering methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, $5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$62,330"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$943,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$1,371,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$464,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$686,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$742,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,701,980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,905,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect until their termination, the provisions of the proclamations of the President of June 18 and September 6, 1918, and the regulations thereunder, relating to the stockyards industry, including the employment of such persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $75,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, informaton on the supply, demand, commercial movement, disposition, quality, and market price of peanuts, and its products, $12,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$1,339,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (United States cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., p. 476; United States grain standards act, 39 Stat. L., p. 482; United States warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., p. 486; standard container act, 39 Stat. L., p. 673; and the acts making annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative specifically authorized in writing by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"To enable the Bureau of Markets to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce the Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918, as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, $35,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,811,365"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$31,355,811"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That, in order to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers,' approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), as amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, the sum of $600,000 for the fiscal year ending on the 30th day of June, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed by the Senate amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed by the Senate amendment insert "seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$33,900,-211"; and the Senate agree to the same.

On the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 the committee of conference has been unable to agree.

G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. MCLAUGHLIN,
A. F. LEVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

A. J. GRONNA,
HOKE SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the amendments of the Senate, namely:

On amendment No. 1: This amendment changes the name of "Office of Farm Management" to "Bureau of Farm Management." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment changes "office" to "bureau." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 3: This amendment increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Farm Management from $4,000 to $5,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 5: This amendment changes "Office of Farm Management" to "Bureau of Farm Management." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 6: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 7: This amendment increases the appropriation for inspection and quarantine work $50,000, and adds a proviso making available $50,000 to meet the emergency caused by an outbreak of sheep scabies in the Western States. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$545,282" and insert in lieu thereof "$525,000," and eliminate the proviso.

On amendment No. 8: This amendment increases from $500,000 to $800,000 the amount of money to be set aside for administrative and operating expenses for investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 9: This amendment decreases from $1,-000,000 to $700,000 the amount to be set aside for the payment of indemnities when animals infected with tuberculosis are destroyed. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 10: This amendment increases the appropriation for investigations and experiments in animal industry $40,000. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$347,680" and insert in lieu thereof "$327,680."

On amendment No. 11: This amendment authorizes the use of $40,000 of the appropriation for investigations and experiments in animal industry for experiments, study, and investigation of the "soft pork" problem. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 12: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 13: This amendment increases the appropriation for meat inspection $100,000 and adds new language authorizing the use of $100,000 for the inspection of equine meat. The conferees have been unable to agree as to this amendment.

On amendment No. 14: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 15: This amendment increases the appropriation for investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits $5,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 16: This amendment adds a new proviso to the paragraph for the investigation of diseases of orchard

and other fruits and makes available $5,000 for the investigation of the raspberry. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 17: This amendment adds a new proviso to the paragraph making appropriation for crop acclimatization and fiber plant investigations, removing the limitation in this act, as to this paragraph, to the cost of farm buildings. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment changing the proviso so as to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings be increased to $2,500 in so far as it applies to this paragraph."

On amendment No. 18: This amendment strikes out the word "more" and inserts in lieu thereof the word "less" in the proviso for cotton-seed interbreeding in the paragraph making appropriation for crop acclimatization and fiber plant investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 19: This amendment strikes out "Provided further" and inserts in lieu thereof "And provided further" in the paragraph making appropriation for crop acclimatization and fiber plant investigations. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 20: This amendment inserts "location of and" in the proviso pertaining to the barberry bush, in the paragraph making appropriation for investigation and improvement of cereals, so the appropriation may be used both for the location and the destruction of the barberry bush. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 21: This amendment inserts "barberry bushes and other" in the proviso pertaining to the barberry bush, in the paragraph making appropriation for investigation and improvement of cereals, so as to make it clear that this bush along with others in which such rust spores originate may be destroyed. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 22: This amendment strikes out the proviso in the item for investigation and improvement of cereals setting aside $20,000 for the investigation of take all, flag smut, and related diseases of wheat, oats, barley, rye, and rice. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 23: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $100,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by take all, flag smut, helminthosporium, and other soil and seed-infecting diseases of wheat and other cereal and farm crops, and provides the manner in which the fund is to be used. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out of the Senate amendment "and farm crops," and "in the development of the field work of the Plant Disease Survey of the Department of Agriculture," and substitution "$50,000" in lieu of "$100,000."

On amendment No. 24: This amendment strikes out the item appropriating $16,760 for testing and breeding fibrous plants in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 25: This amendment adds a proviso to the item for dry-land agriculture investigations, exempting this paragraph from the limitations of this act as to the cost of farm buildings. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 26: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $39,000 for the investigation, improvement, and the determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of certain nuts, and the best methods of growing, harvesting, and shipping same. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "$39,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000."

On amendment No. 27: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $103,200 for the investigation and improvement of fruits, the method of fruit growing, harvesting, etc., and in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets to study the behavior of fruits during the process of marketing and while in commercial storage. The amendment also provides that of this sum $20,000 may be used for investigating and developing new grape industries and methods of utilizing grapes heretofore used for the production of alcoholic beverages. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "$103,200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$83,200."

On amendment No. 28: This amendment increases the appropriation for investigations in foreign seeds and plant introduction, etc., by $55,000, and adds new language authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expend $55,000, or so much as may be necessary, for the purchase of not to exceed 50 acres of land near Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of necessary buildings and equipment, and for the establishment of a plant-inspection and detention station, and provides that not more than $15,000 be expended for the purchase of land, and provides further that the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "$137,700," "$55,000," and "$15,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$132,700," "$50,000," and "$10,000," respectively.

On amendment No. 29: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 30: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 31: This amendment as a proviso to the item for the purchase of tree seed, cones, nursery stock, etc., authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use so much as may be necessary, but not to exceed $200, to purchase land now used as a forest nursery site for the Michigan National Forest. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 32: This amendment increases the appropriation for silvicultural and dendrological work by $25,000. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 33: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $20,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with State agricultural colleges and experiment stations, to conduct investigations as to the fungi and bacteria causing decay in pulp and wood pulp, and to devise and apply methods of control. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 34: This amendment increases by $50,000 the appropriation for the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fences, etc., in the national forests. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 35: This amendment increases by $50,000 the amount that may be expended for the construction and maintenance of boundary and range division fences, corrals, stock driveways and bridges, the development of stock watering places, and the eradication of poisonous plants on the national forests. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 36: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 37: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 38: This amendment provides for "one administrative assistant" at a salary of $2,500 per annum in the Bureau of Chemistry. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 39: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 40: This amendment restores a paragraph appropriating $20,000 for investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of fish, etc. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 41: This amendment restores a paragraph appropriating $15,000 for the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 42: This amendment adds a paragraph appropriating $100,000 for the study and improvement of methods of dehydrating materials used for food, in cooperation with persons, associations, and corporations, and to disseminate information as to the value and suitability of such products for food. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "$100,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

On amendment No. 43: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 44: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 45: This amendment strikes out the paragraph appropriating $31,340 for exploration, investigation, and determination of sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 46: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 47: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 48: This amendment increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology from $4,500 to $5,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 49: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 50: This amendment increases the appropriation by $35,000 for investigations of insects affecting southern field crops. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "$120,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,400."

On amendment No. 51: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $5,000 for investigating and studying the pest known as camphor thrip, and for studying and applying methods of eradication and control. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out the period at the end of the Senate amendment and substitute in lieu thereof a semicolon.

On amendment No. 52: This amendment increases by $25,000 the appropriation for investigation, identification, and classifi-

cation of miscellaneous insects, and adds a proviso making available $25,000 for investigations relative to the screw worm fly. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$77,330" and insert in lieu thereof "$62,330."

On amendment No. 53: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 54: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 55: This amendment increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey from $3,500 to $4,000. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 56: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 57: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $5,000 for improvements of the game preserves in Sullys Hill National Park. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 58: This amendment inserts the word "gophers" in the paragraph for investigating the food habits of North American birds, mammals, etc. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 59: This amendment increases the appropriation of the item for investigating the food habits of North American birds, mammals, etc., by $100,000. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "$489,440" and inserting in lieu thereof "$464,440."

On amendment No. 60: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 61: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 62: This amendment adds "one mechanical foreman, $1,400" in the Division of Publications. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 63: This amendment strikes out "five" before "skilled laborers, at $1,000" and inserts "four." The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 64: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 65: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 66: This amendment increases the appropriation by $200,000 for farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 67: This amendment increases the appropriation for cooperative agricultural work $1,000,000. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 68: This amendment adds a proviso to the insular experiment station item, and grants or extends the same privileges as to leave to the employees of the Department of Agriculture in the Virgin Islands as are conferred upon employees in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam. It also permits the employees to take at one time unused annual leave which may have accumulated within not to exceed four years, and be paid at the rate prevailing during the years such leave of absence has accumulated. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 69: This amendment increases the appropriation for home economics investigations $30,000. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 70: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 71: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 72: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $75,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect until their termination the provisions of the proclamations of the President of June 18 and September 6, 1918, and the regulations thereunder, relating to the stockyards industry, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: After the word "including" in the Senate amendment strike out "the payment of such rent and," and, after the word "person," strike out "and means."

On amendment No. 73: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $12,000 for collecting and distributing, by telegraph, telephone, mail, and otherwise as to supply, demand, commercial movements, disposition, quality, and market price of peanuts. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: After the word "otherwise" insert the word "information."

On amendment No. 74: This amendment strikes out "poultry, butter, and hay" from the item for food products investigation service and adds "and other perishable farm products." The House recedes and agrees with an amendment restoring "poultry, butter, hay," stricken out by the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 74½: This amendment strikes out "in interstate commerce" from the item for food-products inspection service. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 75: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 76: This amendment adds a proviso to the paragraph for the administration of the United States warehouse act, limiting the maximum salary of the employees under the provision to $2,500 per annum. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 77: This amendment perfects and makes more workable the United States warehouse act by striking out of said act the following: In the first sentence of section 6 the words "other than personal security"; in the second sentence of section 6 the words "including the requirements of fire insurance"; and at the end of section 18 the words "if it have plainly and conspicuously embodied in its written or printed terms a provision that such receipt is not negotiable." The House recedes.

On amendment No. 78: This amendment restores a paragraph providing that hereafter in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of the provisions of certain specified acts the Secretary of Agriculture, or representative authorized by him for the purpose, shall have the power to adminster oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: After the word "representative" insert the word "specifically," and after the word "authorize" insert "in writing."

On amendment No. 79: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $35,000 to enable the Bureau of Markets to complete the work of domestic wool section of War Industries Board. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 80: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 81: This amendment represents an amended total.

On amendment No. 82: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $2,000,000 for the purchase of lands under the Weeks law. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$600,000."

On amendment No. 83: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to expend not to exceed 4 cents instead of 2½ cents per mile for a motor cycle when used for necessary travel on official business. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "4" and inserting in lieu thereof "3."

On amendment No. 84: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to expend not to exceed 10 cents instead of 6 cents per mile for an automobile when used for necessary official business. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out "10" and inserting in lieu thereof "7."

On amendment No. 85: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $100,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and international fairs held within the United States and provides limitations as to the amount to be expended in connection with any one fair. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 86: This amendment adds a new paragraph appropriating $5,000, and authorizes the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress to be held at Kansas City, Mo., in September, 1919. The House recedes and agrees with an amendment striking out all the language of the paragraph after "1919."

On amendment No. 87: This amendment adds a new paragraph authorizing the President to extend invitations to all nations interested in the manufacture or raising of cotton to appoint delegates or representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1919. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 88: This amendment adds a new paragraph providing that the word "package" where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include and shall be construed to include wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 89: This amendment adds a new paragraph providing for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 90: This amendment adds a new paragraph granting to the field employees of the Department of Agriculture 30 days' leave of absence each year. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 91: This amendment adds a new paragraph limiting the maximum salary of persons employed under lump-sum provisions of this act to $2,500 per annum. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 92: This amendment represents an amended total.

G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. MCLAUGHLIN,
A. F. LEVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the House carried appropriations aggregating $32,377,553. As passed by the Senate, it carried $36,646,453, an increase of $4,268,900. The conferees have agreed to an increase of $1,510,658. In other words, the conferees have agreed to about one-third of the increases made in the Senate. The decrease is $2,758,242.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to call attention to the increases, as was done as to the preceding bill, in order to emphasize the fact that whereas the House is endeavoring to save money and to live up to its pretenses of economy, increases are being inserted in another body overriding the will of the House. I ask the gentleman what was the difference between the total appropriation as the bill passed the House and as it passed the Senate?

Mr. HAUGEN. Four million two hundred and sixty-eight thousand nine hundred dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The House passed it for $32,377,000, and the Senate has added more than $4,200,000, bringing the total up to $36,646,000. By going to another body, those who desire to secure increases over the appropriations allowed by the House have had them inserted to the extent of upward of $4,200,000 on this Agricultural appropriation bill alone.

Mr. HAUGEN. Might I suggest that the Senate committee increased the appropriation bill last session about $6,000,000, while this bill they increase about four and a quarter million dollars?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What was the principal increase inserted by the Senate?

Mr. HAUGEN. Two million dollars under the Weeks Act. The conferees allowed $600,000. There was also a $1,200,000 increase to the cooperative extension work. The conferees allowed $200,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of the $4,200,000 increase, $2,000,000 of it is to go for the purchase of land?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; $2,000,000 and $1,200,000 for farmers' cooperative extension work. Two hundred thousand to be added to the $551,000 for farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, which is not subject to the Smith-Lever Act, and $1,000,000 to be expended under the Lever Act. The conferees have agreed to the $200,000 to be added to the $551,000, and the Senate recedes from the million-dollar item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the Smith-Lever Act get $2,000,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. Three million and eighty thousand dollars under the Smith-Lever Act and the $1,500,000 granted by the House and agreed to in conference.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That goes into salaries largely.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; and all of it except $480,000 to be matched by the States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What was the necessity of buying more land under the Weeks law at this time?

Mr. HAUGEN. That was the position taken by the House, but the Senate insisted on $2,000,000. The best we could do was to compromise on $600,000, a decrease of $1,400,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Several appropriations have been extended on the other side for the benefit of expositions.

Mr. HAUGEN. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They originated on the other side?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask what reason there is for expositions at this particular time?

Mr. HAUGEN. The department represents that there is great interest in the expositions. The appropriation carries $100,000 for State fairs, and so forth. I think the gentleman will agree that $5,000 maximum for exhibits at a State fair can be expended to good advantage.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is an outright appropriation of $5,000 for the purpose of an international farm congress at Kansas City, Mo. Will that include the expenses of the foreign delegates who have been invited?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; that was stricken out. That went out of the bill. Authority is granted to extend invitations, but no appropriation for the expense of delegates.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask whether the daylight-saving law repealer remains in the bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. It remains in the bill, as put in by the Senate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not that conflict with the legislation enacted by the House?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; if the conference report is agreed to I think there will be no necessity to pass any further legislation, unless it is determined to fix definitely the zones.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to know whether the gentleman can inform us if it is the thought of the conferees that the passage of this Senate rider in the appropriation bill on the daylight-saving law will be all-sufficient, and that Congress may proceed no further with the bill passed here the other day, which came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? If that is so, perhaps the House would have no chance to discuss the matter.

Mr. HAUGEN. My answer to that is, in the opinion of many, that is all that is required. Others may disagree. There are those who contend that the zones should be established definitely. There is, of course, a difference of opinion. The position taken by the House is that the zones should be established by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senate contends that should not be done. The provision in the bill as passed by the Senate simply repeals the act.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the thought is that the agriculturists will get what they want if this rider passes, whether they get any further legislation or not.

Mr. HAUGEN. They will be satisfied.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. The House passed a bill repealing section 3 of the daylight-saving law, which authorized the moving forward the clocks at a certain day in March of each year and back the last Sunday in October of each year. This section was all that was complained of before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The original law authorized the establishment of time zones by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That commission has acted and established the zones so authorized and made its report. Does this law as carried in this repeal provision make noneffective the zones already established, or does it make them permanent, rigid zones that can not be changed at all except by act of Congress, that provision of the law having already been executed? If the zones as established are rigid, because this complete repeal takes all power away from the Interstate Commerce Commission to do anything further, then it would require an act of Congress to change the zones so established; but if it makes null and void the zones so established, then it leaves all power to change or establish time zones alone to the railroads, without any authority of law or regulation as to what the zones may hereafter be, and I can not see why it was done, as the farmers did not ask for anything of that sort.

Mr. HAUGEN. The situation is this: The Senate proposition is simply to repeal the act; the contention is that or nothing, hence the whole bill hinges on this one proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. While the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is on his feet. Is it not the thought of those who inserted this rider in the appropriation bill that it will be safer, so far as a presidential veto is concerned, in an appropriation bill than it would be if it goes to the White House in a separate measure?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not a mind reader.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Maybe the gentleman from Tennessee is.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. The paper and pulp industry has been very much interested in amendment No. 33 of the Senate, which provided $20,000 for an investigation of the deterioration of pulp and pulp wood. Will the gentleman inform the House what has been done with that, and what provision, if any, has been made for carrying out that investigation?

Mr. HAUGEN. The work is now being done by the Bureau of Plant Industry, and it does not seem wise to duplicate the work or make appropriations under two heads. If an appropriation is to be made, the appropriation for the Bureau of Plant Industry should be increased. Our understanding is that although this is splendid work and ought to be continued and encouraged, yet, considering it in connection with other important items, the conferees did not see their way clear to increase the amount, and certainly not to make the appropriation under two heads.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman understand that there is money enough available at this time to make that investigation?

Mr. HAUGEN. I so understand.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman thinks we can get the investigation with the funds already appropriated.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. SNELL. I want to ask another question. The $1,000,000 that was added in the Senate for State Relations Service, which I understand goes to the farm bureaus of the country, was cut out in the conference.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. How will that affect the individual bureaus of the country?

Mr. HAUGEN. Under the Smith-Lever Act, $3,080,000 is available. The House added $1,500,000; in addition there is an item of $645,000 and one of $551,000. The conferees have increased the $551,000 to $751,000. In all, the Federal appropriation is $5,976,000, which amount must be matched by the States, counties, or municipalities, with the exception of the $751,000 item and $480,000 of the $3,080,000, which may be apportioned unconditionally among the States; or, in other words, $4,745,000 must be matched, which brings it up to $9,490,000, plus the $751,000 and $480,000. We have about 2,850 counties, some sparsely settled. The service has been extended to about 2,400; hence there is on an average available for each of the 2,400 counties more than $4,000.

Mr. SNELL. How much of that money is used up in administration charges and how much actually gets to the farm bureaus of the country?

Mr. HAUGEN. The complaint is made that in some way or another all the money does not seem to reach the counties in the States. Take, for instance, the gentleman's own State. There are 55 counties. You get $111,000 from the Smith-Lever Act, $58,000 from the million and a half dollars, $7,800 from the $551,000. The last amount has been increased $10,000. The State matches the amount, the first amount by $101,000; the second amount by $58,000; the third by $7,800; and, besides that, the State appropriates $106,000. All told, you have an average of $8,000 for each of your 55 counties.

Mr. SNELL. As a matter of fact, when it gets down to the counties——

Mr. HAUGEN. The contention is that this money is being absorbed here in Washington, or on the way. The contention of the gentleman from New York who appeared before the committee was that a large amount of the appropriation is used for the experts. There are 60 of them in New York, with 55 counties, more than one expert to the county. Sixty experts are carried at $250,000, or more than $4,000 per expert. Bear in mind that we make appropriations making available more than $10,000,000 for the States Relations Service, but the bill carries $32,000,000 for this and other activities and the experts are paid in part out of other funds.

And in the case of New York, as I understand it, in some instances, half is paid by the Bureau of Farm Management and the rest by the other bureaus; whatever the amount may be, that must be added to the $10,000,000 available for this work.

Mr. SNELL. The contention among our people is that they do not get enough for the real farm bureau, where the farmer gets the benefit of it, but that the money is used and trickles along down before it gets to the fountain head. Is there any possible way to cut that off?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is a matter that has to be taken up with the Department of Agriculture. It is the arrangement that is made by the Secretary and the State colleges. That is, they determine what amount shall be expended for home economics or county agents, or experts, or what——

Mr. SNELL. Who appoints these experts?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think the experts are appointed here in Washington; the county agents are appointed by the colleges.

Mr. SNELL. Does not the gentleman think this department should be so arranged that they would get more money to the real farm bureau in order to obtain the full benefits from the appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is a matter that can probably be better decided by those who have the matter in charge. I, for my part, believe that if each county is supplied with a county demonstration agent and an assistant in home economics that is all that is necessary, except the experts which are sent out by other bureaus. Of course, it is necessary to send out experts, but there should not be experts sent out by one bureau and then by another bureau, thereby duplicating or overlapping the work.

Mr. SNELL. The pay of these experts comes out of this money?

Mr. HAUGEN. Some. I understand in the gentleman's State, in many instances, half is paid by the States Relations Service and half by other bureaus.

Mr. SNELL. It is largely a matter of the administration of the fund; that is the reason why the Farm Bureau itself does not get any more money out of this enormous appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I should like to ask the chairman what disposition was made of amendment numbered 87, inserted on the Senate side, in regard to the cotton conference in New Orleans. Is that item retained?

Mr. HAUGEN. That item is retained by the conferees. It simply gives authority to extend invitations.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In conformity with the bill introduced which heretofore passed this House?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. On page 98 is amendment numbered 82 that originally provided for an appropriation of $2,000,000 to carry out the purposes mentioned in section 3 of the act entitled "An act to entitle any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of watersheds of navigable streams," and so forth——

Mr. HAUGEN. That $2,000,000 was cut to $600,000.

Mr. BLACK. That is quite a sum of money?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is.

Mr. BLACK. I want to inquire if that is one of the activities that ordinarily come under the administration of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; made so by the act.

Mr. BLACK. I have not had time to examine it.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is expended through the department and a commission; two Members of this House are members of the commission.

Mr. BLACK. I want to inquire further whether a similar appropriation has heretofore been carried in any bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. Eleven million dollars, under the Weeks Act, and that has been expended.

Mr. BLACK. Already?

Mr. HAUGEN. And the contention is now that we appropriate more money to take care of gaps between tracts already purchased and fill them up.

Mr. BLACK. This is furtherance of the plan already worked out?

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. With pleasure.

Mr. CANDLER. Amendment numbered 11, put in by the Senate, specially set apart and authorized the expenditure of $40,000 of the total amount appropriated for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry to be used for experiments, study, and investigation of the "soft pork" problem——

Mr. HAUGEN. That was cut out——

Mr. CANDLER. While that specific amendment was cut out, I understand, however, that within the general appropriation there is $20,000 included to be used in the plan of work of the department for "soft pork" investigation, and that the $20,000, out of the lump sum, is to be set apart for that purpose and will certainly be used to investigate the situation and conditions in reference to "soft pork."

Mr. HAUGEN. For the investigation of "soft pork"; yes.

Mr. CANDLER. Twenty thousand, then, will surely be used for that purpose. I was in favor of the $40,000, but if that amount could not be allowed, I am glad the $20,000 will surely be available. I am sure it will be a good investment.

Mr. HAUGEN. We compromised by cutting it in two and have an understanding with the department that $20,000 will be used for the "soft pork" investigation.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, last spring this House passed a good many appropriation bills which never became laws because somebody else did not see fit to take a little time to enact them into law. Last year we sent over somewhere an Agricultural appropriation bill. The chairman tells us that somewhere else they raised it $6,000,000, and we appropriated $32,000,000 this year, which, I think, should have stopped there.

That was enough. We examined it carefully. They raised that $4,000,000. We have employees down in the Agricultural Department who submit their evidence before the House committee on which the House reached the conclusion that $32,000,000 should be allowed the Agricultural Department. Yet over there they held it should be $36,000,000. How does it happen that these department bills are always raised over there? Why do our friends never cut department appropriations?

Gentlemen, I think it is time the work of this House began to receive more definite consideration. For two years we have been abused for idling and doing nothing, and there has never been a time within the two years that this House was not waiting on the departments for facts on which to decide whether their estimates were correct or on another body to finish the legislation we had well begun.

If there is any lack of respect for this branch of the Congress of the United States it is because you do not respect the House sufficiently yourselves. When you reach a decision it should, as a rule, stand. Your clerks hear you and then they think they can go somewhere else and slap on four or five million dollars any time they like.

This is the revenue-raising body of the United States. It was the intention of the Constitution that you should decide how much money the people should have to pay. That is the most important part of the work of the United States. All the executive officers are in your employ. Our conference committee has cut down a $4,000,000 claim to a million and a quarter, and I shall not criticize it. But I think it is pretty near time that some conference committee said to some other conference committee that when the House has examined a matter carefully and reached a decision to save money, that money ought to be saved. I am not opposing the conference report. I would like to be able to say that the House appropriated only $32,000,000 because the people need the money, but they ought to stick to it. I think the House ought to take its actions more seriously, and the next time somebody comes in here with a raise of millions of dollars, which nobody wants except those who spend it, the House ought to have enough respect for its convictions to live up to them. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to an amendment inserted by the Senate, No. 77, which was agreed to by the House conferees. That amendment seeks to amend the Federal warehouse law in three particulars. It seems to me that while the amendments taken separately might be considered unimportant and relatively insignificant when they are taken together and considered with reference to the purposes of the warehouse law they do weaken that law if they are not essentially vicious in themselves. In the first place, the warehouse law requires that the warehouseman licensed by the Government shall give a surety bond to abide by the law and the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture and to carry out his contracts. I recognize that provision gives to the surety companies a practical monopoly of that business, and there may be some justification in providing for a bond secured by personal security in view of that fact. And if that were all that were done in this amendment of the Senate I do not think I should object to it. But, in addition to this requirement, the warehouseman is required to keep the products stored in the warehouse insured for the benefit of the owner. An amendment of the Senate strikes out that provision, so that the question of whether insurance shall be required to be kept for the benefit of persons having products stored in the warehouses is left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The third amendment strikes out a provision which provides that the warehouse receipt shall state the grade and quality of such products as cotton or wool. The result of these three amendments is this: That a warehouse receipt will be issued which will be backed by nothing more than the personal security of some citizens in the locality where the warehouse is located. The certificate will not be any assurance to the holder that the property stored in the warehouse has been insured or that the property is of any certain quality or value. So you have a certificate which is practically valueless in the hands of an innocent purchaser. And the whole amendment of the Senate, it seems to me, will result in great confusion, in fraud, and in destroying the purposes of the warehouse act, because the purpose of that act was to make a warehouse receipt as negotiable and as certain as to what it represented as a national-bank note.

I call the attention of the House and of the conferees to this matter because it may be that reasons were given justifying these amendments. But I have a great curiosity to know what those amendments are, in view of the weakening of the entire law which they accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY].

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the conferees to amendment 88 that provides:

That the word "package," where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include, and shall be construed to include, wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

The point I wish to call to the attention of the conferees is this: That for some time there has been more or less of a controversy regarding the effect of the net weight laws and regulations applied to the marketing and sale of wrapped meats.

I read in the paper the other day that food necessities have increased 92 per cent since the war began; and this amendment, if enacted into law, will defeat the very purpose for which it was introduced. I think that it has been adopted hurriedly for the amount involved, and it will reach into every home in the United States. Instead of making ham and bacon cheaper it is bound to increase the price of them.

It is not a new question by any means. It has been considered at great length heretofore and by people in authority; and after extended hearings and deliberation they decided that it was not necessary to stamp the net weight of wrapped hams and bacon.

During the past several years there has been more or less controversy regarding the effect of the net weight laws and regulations as applied to the marking and sale of wrapped meats. Two questions have arisen—the first, whether meat wrapped in paper, cloth, gelatine, or other substances, are in "package form" so as to come within the package marking provisions of the net weight laws; and, second, whether the so-called net weight laws prohibit the sale of such wrapped meats at gross weight.

REASONS FOR WRAPPING MEATS.

1. To satisfy the demand among the best retail trade for a product of the highest grade and prepared in the most sanitary manner. The trade always has the option of buying wrapped or unwrapped meats.

2. The chief purpose of wrapping meats is a sanitary one. In the case of hams and bacon the same are wrapped immediately after they come out of the smokehouse, and this wrapping is kept thereon until the hams and bacon reach the retail dealer for sale to the consumer. As there is usually a considerable lapse of time between the smoking of hams and bacon and their ultimate sale to the consumer, this wrapping serves to protect the meat against dirt, flies and other insects, and the handling which smoked meats customarily undergo.

3. The wrapping also serves to retain the natural juices of the meat; that is, it prevents evaporation of the juices to some extent, and not only prevents shrinkage in weight but by retaining the natural juices, preserves the quality and flavor of the meat.

4. It prevents deterioration and wastage due to such deterioration; for instance, the cut surface of an unwrapped ham or side of bacon will become blackened and hardened and after long exposure to the air often necessitates the trimming of the cut surface as well as the rind.

5. It enables the packer to guarantee against spoilage for a certain period of time, varying in different communities, usually about 30 days. This is generally regarded by the retail trade as a big assest. The packers can and will make no guaranty against spoilage in the case of unwrapped smoked meats.

The application of this statute to wrapped hams and bacon was given most careful consideration by the committee appointed to formulate rules and regulations for the enforcement of the law, consisting of the Secretaries of the Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce. Their deliberations covered a period of more than six months, during which time they thoroughly investigated the conditions under which wrapped hams and bacon were manufactured and sold in order that their conclusion might not be based upon any essential error of fact, and they procured the advice and counsel of their own solicitor as to the legal aspects of the subject. As a result the following official action has been taken under opinion given June 5, 1914, by the Department of Agriculture:

You are advised that, in the opinion of the department, single hams and single sides of bacon when covered, as you have described, with paper, gelatin, or cloth, for the purpose stated by you, are not in "package form" within the meaning of the net-weight amendment, and consequently it is not required that the quantity of the meat be stated on such coverings.

Respectfully, C. L. ALSBERG, *Chief*.

There were produced under United States inspection in the United States during the year 1918 approximately 75,000,000 hams and 75,000,000 sides of bacon.

Approximately 70 per cent of the hams and 70 per cent of the bacon were sold by the packers in an "unwrapped" condition. The pieces were cured and smoked, labeled with a hot iron and were sold, without wrapping, at a price per pound, based on scale weight at time of sale, and never at a piece price for the whole.

Approximately 30 per cent of the hams and 30 per cent of the bacon, after curing and smoking, were "wrapped" as hereinafter described. These wrapped hams and sides of bacon were then sold by the packers at a price per pound, based on scale weight at time of sale, the weight of the wrapping being included and charged for at the meat price, which is the same for wrapped as for unwrapped hams and bacon. Wrapped hams and sides of bacon are never sold at a piece price for the whole.

In every case the purchaser had the option to buy wrapped hams or bacon at the same price per pound as the unwrapped goods, and the dealer who purchased the wrapped hams and bacon knew that he was charged for the weight of the wrapping at the meat price; in other words, that he purchased at gross weights and that if he desired he might obtain unwrapped hams and bacon at the same price per pound.

Wrapping is partial protection against climatic influences and the attack of insects, and on wrapped hams and bacon the packers give a limited guaranty against spoilage from these causes. On unwrapped hams and bacon the packers give no such guaranty.

Wrapping is also a partial protection against "shrinkage" or loss of weight. Wrapped hams and bacon lose some weight, but not so much nor so rapidly as the unwrapped product.

The packer's guaranty against spoilage and the partial prevention of shrinkage are the main considerations for the payment for the wrapping.

The cost of wrapping to the packer, including labor and material in some cases, exceeds the price received by the packer for the wrapping through selling at gross weights. In other cases the amount received for the wrapping is slightly more than its cost, if no consideration be given to the expense involved in making good on the spoilage guaranty, which applies only on wrapped meats; but when the expense of making good on the guaranty is charged against the cost of wrapping there is no measurable profit or loss to the packer in the wrapping of hams and bacon.

Various kinds of wrapping are used, depending upon the season of the year, climatic conditions, and insect enemies which may be expected at the probable time and place of sale. More hams and sides of bacon are sold wrapped during the hot months of summer than during the winter, and naturally a wrapping which is adequate protection for meat sold in the more temperate localities is entirely inadequate to protect meat sold in the South, where the skipper fly is prevalent and the summers are more torrid.

On two-thirds of all the wrapped hams and bacon a paper wrapping is used, either one sheet of absorbent paper alone or one sheet of absorbent paper and one sheet of parchment paper. The parchment paper is secured by a string and a label is pasted on the paper, the whole not being sealed in any way. Even the unwrapped hams and sides of bacon are labeled, the label being burned into the meat with a hot iron.

The remaining one-third of the wrapped ham and bacon, or 9 per cent of the whole amount produced, is wrapped in one of the following ways: In a coating of gelatine, in muslin, in burlap sacking and one sheet of absorbent paper, and in so-called wash canvas wrapping, which consists of absorbent and parchment paper and a muslin sack, the latter being covered with paste. It is the custom of the trade for the dealers in ordering from the packer to specify the sort of wrapping they prefer as best suited to their locality and class of trade.

The weight of the wrapping varies not only with its style, but also with each particular ham and side of bacon, depending upon the size of the piece of meat and the conditions to which it has been exposed after wrapping. The sheets of paper vary in size, the packer aiming to use as small sheets as possible. This paper varies in weight even in sheets of the same size as the packer receives it, while the absorbent paper absorbs fat and moisture after it has been on the meat for some time, the quantity absorbed varying with the heat and other conditions. Any declaration of net weight of a ham or side of bacon based on the deduction of the weight of wrapping from the gross weight would necessitate the weighing of the wrapping used upon each particular piece, and even if this were done the net weight thus marked would not be correct even a few days afterwards because of shrinkage in the ham and the increase in the weight of the wrapping due to absorption of fat and moisture.

The actual approximate weight of the wrapping in the case of the hams wrapped with parchment paper is about 6 ounces avoirdupois. As stated, the parchment-paper wrapped hams and bacon constitute 70 per cent of all the wrapped hams and bacon.

The other styles of wrapping described are used upon the remaining 30 per cent of the wrapped hams and bacon, or 9 per cent of the whole number of hams and sides of bacon produced. Some of these other wrappings weigh more than the parchment wrapping. In the southern trade, and to a limited extent in other territory, the trade demands a wrapping which will protect from the skipper fly and from excessive shrinkage due to intense heat. For this trade hams and sides of bacon are wrapped in the so-called wash canvas, a covering which experience has shown to be nearly impervious to air and of a nature calculated to repel insects. This is the heaviest wrapping used. The meat is covered with two thicknesses of paper and finally with a cotton slip treated with a wash of a nature to keep out the air and also to repel insects. On the outer covering of a ham weighing from 15 to 16 pounds about 10 or 12 ounces of this wash is necessary to accomplish these purposes. There is no undue profit to the packer in selling hams wrapped in this manner. The percentage of hams and bacon so wrapped is not above 10 per cent of the total number wrapped. This is the class of wrapped goods sold under the strongest guaranty as to keeping qualities, and the cost of the material and labor plus the reclamations under the guaranty more than offset the seeming gain attained by selling at gross weight.

What proportion of all the wrapped hams and bacon goes to the consumer in the piece?

The proportion varies with the class of trade and the section of the country. In the plantation trade of the South and the ranch trade of the West a much greater proportion of wrapped goods goes to the ultimate consumer in the piece. In the city, where the hams and bacon are largely sold in markets and butcher shops, where cutting facilities are found, practically all is sold by the slice and none in the piece. In grocery stores, which have no cutting facilities, the trade is by the piece. In localities remote from cities, particularly in the West and South, more hams and sides of bacon are sold to the consumer as a whole than in other sections. The number of wrapped hams and sides of bacon sold to the consumer in the piece is constantly decreasing, due, perhaps, partially to the high cost of meat and partially to change in manner of living. From the best information obtainable by the packers, taking the country and production as a whole, it is believed that not over 5 per cent, or 1 in 20, of the wrapped hams and bacon go to the consumer in the piece. These figures may be slightly low, but it can be positively stated that not to exceed 10 per cent, or 1 in 10, of the wrapped hams and less than 10 per cent of the wrapped sides of bacon are sold to the consumer in the piece.

But the gentleman who introduced this amendment is defeating the very purpose for which it was introduced. Instead of decreasing, he is increasing the price of hams and bacon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will be delighted to.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I understand the gentleman's argument, he is trying to show that it is a great privilege given to the consumer to pay ham and bacon prices for paper and string.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will say that at first blush the majority of people feel as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota does, but let me tell you. You do pay the same price for the paper, which amounts to from 4 to 6 ounces, as you do for the ham and bacon, and the average person believes that it is outrageous to pay the same price for paper that you pay for meat. But when the ham is shipped to the retail butcher or grocer, he must weigh that ham or bacom in the presence of the consumer. Under the present circumstances the net weight of a ham is not stamped on it. As against the 4 or 6 ounces that you pay for in paper, there is a shrinkage, I will say to my dear friend from Minnesota, which amounts to twice as much as the paper. For instance, if the paper amounts to 4 ounces, the shrinkage will amount to 8 ounces.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I understood the gentleman's argument, the purpose of the paper is to prevent shrinkage.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No. The purpose of the paper is to keep intact the natural juices of the meat, to make it more palatable, and to keep it sanitary and clean; and the person who buys the wrapped ham or bacon has the privilege of buying the unwrapped; if he buys wrapped ham or bacon, he pays for the paper, which is 4 or 6 ounces, and if this law goes into effect he will not pay for the paper, because the ham will be stamped with net weight, but he will pay for the shrinkage, which amounts to twice as much as the paper. Wrapping is a partial protection against shrinkage or loss of weight.

And, gentlemen, let me say this: To pack these hams and bacon will require an expense of from $3,000,000 to $6,000,000. It will be an overhead expense which must eventually be added to the cost of the ham and bacon. So that, gentlemen, here is the attitude of the industry: They do not profit by the paper, because with this ham that is wrapped they give a guarantee against spoiling for a certain length of time. They profit to the same extent on unwrapped hams and bacon as on wrapped hams and bacon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman know that the Federal Trade Commission estimated that the packers made a profit of about $7,000,000 a year on this paper and string with which they wrap the hams and bacon?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I do not know what they found, but I believe that legislators in enacting a law should not do as this commission did. Before you enact legislation that will be injurious to the consumer you ought to have hearings and hear both sides of the case, and not take snap judgment.

I will say that the reason why the packers of this country are villified, and the reason why they are misunderstood by the public, is because of just such legislation as this. Instead of reducing the cost of meat to the consumer by the enactment of this legislation, you are going to increase the cost of it; and not only that, by this amendment you are going to permit the retail grocer or butcher when it is stamped to sell it without his weighing it. When a man buys it he has the right to buy it either wrapped or unwrapped, and if you stamp the net weight on it, then it will not be necessary for the retailer to weigh the ham or bacon. At present it is necessary. For instance, if this amendment is adopted, a man buys a 15-pound ham. It is not weighed at the shop, and if the consumer goes home and unwraps the ham and discovers that there are only 14½ pounds or 14¼ pounds instead of 15 pounds he immediately begins to damn the packer more viciously than he has already been damned. I take it that the majority of you gentlemen want to be fair and want to reduce the price of the necessities of life. But do not attempt to do it in this way, because in this way you are increasing, instead of decreasing, the cost of these commodities.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I wish my colleague would explain why the consumer has to pay for the shrinkage of an unwrapped ham.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. He does not have to pay for the shrinkage of an unwrapped ham.

Mr. DENISON. I understood the gentleman to say that.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No. If this law goes into effect, he will have to pay for the shrinkage on this wrapped product, and the shrinkage amounts to twice as much as the weight of the paper. For instance, experts who are familiar with the subject and practical men in the meat industry say that if the paper weighs from 4 to 6 ounces the shrinkage will amount to from 8 to 12 ounces; in other words, at least twice as much as the weight of the paper plus the enormous expense that will be entailed in order to stamp the net weight on each package. Gentlemen, understand they are now weighed in gross. There is an additional expense of anywhere in the neighborhood from $3,000,000 to $6,000,000, because each package must be weighed separately and then stamped. [Applause.]

The gentleman at the other end of the Capitol who introduced this amendment thought it would reduce the cost of living. Now, I come from a district where the people must work for a livelihood, and many make sacrifices in order to rear their families. I stand second to no one either in this House or the other end of the Capitol in the desire to do everything humanly possible to reduce the cost of living.

I want to see the laboring man's rights recognized. I want to see him receive a just wage. I am anxious that the consumers of these great United States be able to purchase the necessities of life at a reasonable price, and I am also anxious to see that men engaged in the industries receive fair return on capital invested.

All real Americans believe in fair play.

Now, the question most frequently asked is, "What is the matter with the packing business?" My answer is that the packers have failed to take the public into their confidence; that when they are attacked in this or any other legislative body they do not answer their critics. Their silence is construed by some to be an admission of guilt or a great disregard for the public. I do not believe that is their intention, however, and my desire is to have the producer, consumer, and packer understand one another.

I know if it was not on account of the way these great packing industries have perfected their business the consumer would have to pay a great deal more for meat. If it were not for the packer, we would not have been able to feed our Army.

Now, the question is, "Where does the profit go?" The answer to that is, The producer gets part of it, the commission merchant or the jobber gets part of it, and the retail butcher or the grocer gets part of it—how much I do not know, but the statement of the packers before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives and before the Senate Committee on Agriculture in January and February, 1919, showed the packers' profit amounted to a trifle more than 2 cents on each dollar of sales, which is about one-half of 1 cent per pound. It is doubtful whether any other industry in the country does business on such a narrow margin of profit.

According to the statistics of the United States Department of Agriculture, the average person eats 193½ pounds of meat in a year. Thus a profit of one-half cent per pound would amount to only 97 cents for each person in a year. The packer receives less for the beef he takes from a steer than he pays for the animal. He makes his profit on the by-products.

The report of one of the packers for the year of 1917 showed that he paid $84.45 per head for cattle and that he received $68.97 for the meat from the steer. But, on account of the large scale of operations and a high degree of specializing in manufacturing, the packers can work on a small profit.

I shall always condemn unfair and dishonest practices, but believe that industries that are fair to the public and to the laboring man should be encouraged.

I hope I have made myself clear to the Members of the House on the matter before us. I am endeavoring to do what I suggested I would do on the floor of this House, resent any unfair or unjust criticism or any legislation which is objectionable to the people or the industries of my district. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not want to delay the passage of this bill, but I want to call attention to Senate amendment No. 89, which I think is an illustration of a very bad practice, and I think the conferees on the part of the House made a mistake in agreeing to it under any conditions.

This bill carries the appropriations for the Agricultural Department, which, of course, had to originate in the House. It went over to another legislative body, and there a legislative rider was tacked on to it. That is the provision for the repeal of the daylight-saving law. That is a matter that belongs to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both branches of Congress. It received the attention of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, and we gave full hearings, and after full hearings and full consideration reported a bill to repeal the law. That bill passed the House on the 18th of this month, and since that time has been reposing in the room of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, which has jurisdiction to legislate upon that question. Notwithstanding that fact, that committee has taken no action, but the Agricultural Committee of the Senate tacks a provision for the repeal of the law in the form of a legislative rider on this appropriation bill. I do not think the conferees ought to have agreed to it at all, and I am going to tell you why. It leads to confusion and unwise legislation——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And there is no way to get at it without voting down the Agricultural bill.

Mr. DENISON. No; the gentleman is right.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the advantage that has been taken of the House in that respect.

Mr. DENISON. Yes. If there was any way to get at it without delaying the passage of the Agricultural appropriation bill, I would be glad to have the House act in the matter, although I am in favor of the repeal of the daylight-saving law; but I am opposed to this practice of allowing another legislative body to tack legislative riders on appropriation bills, and I think the House ought to stop it.

Mr. HAMILTON. How does the Senate amendment differ from the House bill?

Mr. DENISON. The Senate amendment differs from the House bill in this respect: The original daylight-saving law contained four sections. Three of them provided for dividing the United States into time zones and fixing a standard time in the different zones, and the other contained what was called

the daylight-saving clause, which provided for retarding the clock at a certain time and advancing it at a certain time. Now, there was no complaint in the country at all concerning those provisions of the act which provided for fixing time zones and standard time. The complaint came concerning that provision of the law which provided for daylight saving. The act which the House considered and passed a few days ago simply provided for the repeal of section 3 of the act, which was the daylight-saving provision, and that is the only part of the law that the country wanted repealed. Now, the Senate in this rider repeals the entire law, so that if it goes into effect as the Senate has passed it in this bill the question as to what will be standard time in the United States is going to be very much in doubt; and that is a good illustration of the lack of wisdom of allowing another legislative body to put a legislative rider on a bill of this kind without mature consideration and without any hearings upon it.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; briefly.

Mr. ALMON. I heard the colloquy between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in reference to the zones fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. I want to inquire of the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission got its authority for establishing those zones by and through the daylight-saving law?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Then, is it not a fact that the repeal of the daylight-saving law would repeal the zones?

Mr. DENISON. No; I do not think so. I have serious doubt about that, and I am going to explain why. I was just coming to that.

Prior to 1883 there was no standard time in the United States, but in that year the Association of Railway Managers arbitrarily fixed standard time zones in the United States to suit their convenience, and that was the only standard time we had in the United States prior to the passage of what we call the daylight-saving law. It was before then not a matter of law but a matter of arbitrary arrangement between the railroad companies.

When we passed the daylight-saving law we authorized the fixing of standard time zones by act of Congress. That act authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to divide the country into time zones and to fix the standard time for those zones. Now, the Interstate Commerce Commission have done that. They have divided the country into zones and fixed standard time for those zones.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. I want a little more time. Is there any way to get it?

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes, so that my colleague [Mr. DENISON] may have five minutes and that I may have five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ALMON. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks that amendment that passed the Senate repealing the daylight-saving law destroyed these zones that he is talking about?

Mr. DENISON. I do not think it will. The daylight-saving law authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to divide the country into time zones and to fix the standard time for those zones, and then authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to change those zones from time to time.

Now, this rider repeals the law, but, as I understand, it will not undo what has been executed. It will cut off the authority hereafter of the Interstate Commerce Commission to change the time zones, and leave them permanently fixed as they have been fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore, the rider placed in this bill will not accomplish the purpose that was sought by gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol. It is going to leave permanent the time zones fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the only way that they can be changed hereafter is by an act of Congress.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. SEARS. It will set the clock back an hour?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; it will do that.

Mr. SEARS. In my State they changed the zones and set the clock ahead an hour and so changed the time two hours, so that we are sleeping in the daytime.

Mr. DENISON. I know there is much opposition to that feature of it, and we have changed that by the bill that passed the House. But the custom of allowing legislative riders to be tacked onto our appropriation bills at the other end of the Capitol is unwise and ought to be stopped in some way, if it can be done. This rider attached to this appropriation bill is going to lead to confusion. There is no doubt that those responsible for it thought it would repeal the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and not only that but that it would repeal what has been already done by the commission in fixing the zones. I do not think it will do that, or at least I have serious doubts about it. But even if it should annul what has been done, there can be no good reason given why the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as competent a body to fix the time zones as are the railroad corporations. The railroads have a right to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and have a hearing, and if the action of the commission should not be satisfactory they could have the zones changed. At least we ought to have an arrangement for standard time zones fixed by law and not simply by the arbitrary action of the railroads themselves.

This action now of the Senate in putting this rider upon this bill, and of the conferees in accepting it, has resulted in the repealing of that part of the law which is good and ought not to be repealed. I thought the House ought to have its attention called to the effect of this amendment, to the end that something may some time be done to prevent this habit of putting legislative riders on appropriation bills.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will, certainly.

Mr. SEARS. I am in hearty accord with the statements of the gentleman as to legislative riders, but under the rules of the House any Member could have made a point of order when the bill was originally up. We tried to pass it and some one made a point of order, and the only way we can get the provision on is by riders at the other end of the Capitol. I think that some way should be devised so we can vote directly on such a proposition in the House as the House wishes to.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement that appeared in this morning's Washington Post, from Julius Barnes, United States Wheat Director, which tells the condition of the wheat crop. On June 13 there were 40,033,000 bushels as compared with 18,599,000 a year ago. Yet the price of flour has increased over $2 a barrel the past year. We have been told at various times that the price of flour was being increased every month or two because of the scarcity of wheat. And yet here are the official figures showing that at this very moment there are 40,000,000 bushels of wheat while the new crop is coming in, as against 18,000,000 bushels a year ago. There is certainly something rotten somewhere when such a condition exists.

Inasmuch as the high cost of living is the paramount question of the day, I am going to take advantage of every opportunity to call such facts as are contained in Mr. Barnes's statement to the attention of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I call the attention of the House to these wheat figures now because I think it is a matter which is up to the Secretary of Agriculture to do something about. Let him tell us the reasons for this condition of affairs. Bananas are being sold at prohibitive prices although the supply is largely in the control of the United Fruit Co. whose report shows that they are making $40 a share independent of huge excise taxes.

Another fact in connection with this discussion on the high cost of living: Under the auspices of the Government last week a sale of canned meats was held and no bids could be submitted except for 30,000 pound lots. This does not look as though the people who own this meat were getting the right kind of a chance to bid upon it. I hope, therefore, with the passage of this bill with the additional powers conferred upon him that the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to put his finger upon the weak spots of the food administration so that the people may get proper relief. When President Wilson gets home I intend asking him to institute drastic measures that I hope will correct this situation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to find that the conferees on the Agricultural bill have agreed to Senate amendment No. 88. That amendment requires—

That the word "package" where it occurs the second and last time in the act entitled "An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes,'" approved March 3, 1913, shall include and shall be construed to include wrapped meats inclosed in papers or other materials as prepared by the manufacturers thereof for sale.

The acceptance of the Senate amendment will add at least $7,000,000 a year to the cost of the manufacture of the commodities sought to be regulated by this amendment. Of course, the gentlemen representing the House on the conference committee of the Agricultural bill must have realized that this expense will be passed on to the consumer. Now, it seems to me that they could have given consideration to the question of reducing the cost of living, instead of increasing it. I apprehend that these gentlemen, speaking for the House on this conference, must have known that the adoption of this amendment would increase the cost of living. But it seems that that side of the question was not taken into consideration at all.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time. It did not appear to be of sufficient importance to consider the consumer of meat, if, by any chance, they could get a crack at the men who packed the meat. The consideration of the question along lines of research was not a matter before them, it seems. The preservation of meat by wrapping is absolutely necessary. The Federal Trade Commission, made up, as it is at present, of men who have no regard for any vested rights in America, has declared it to be their policy to crucify any man whose balance sheet shows a profit, but while you are crucifying these men who have money invested, who are ministering to the wants of the people of the United States and of the world, you ought not to be so unmindful of the men who have to buy, and the women and children who have to consume, because every time you add to the cost—although you may not have intended to add to the cost, but rather to take from the profit of the manufacturer—you thereby add to the cost of those who must buy from the manufacturer. Instead of doing any good, as this amendment pretends to do, you have done infinite harm to the American people. We are in a period of transition, and the cost of living is higher now than it has ever been. It has gone up by leaps and bounds, and our business should be to reduce the cost and not to increase it. I regret very much to be obliged to say what I have said, but I can not reach any other conclusion than that the action of the conferees of the House has added to the cost of the living of the people.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman believe that the inevitable and necessary result of this is to add 3 or 4 cents to each ham, for instance, when it is wrapped?

Mr. MADDEN. Without doubt. It is almost impossible for any person in the United States to eat ham or bacon now; but we are represented on the Agriculture Committee by those who speak for the men who raise hogs. Yet they make it impossible for the men who raise these hogs to continue in business, because they make it impossible for people to buy the meat.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentlemen from Chicago who speak here are interested only in the consumer, and I know that they would not think of talking from any other standpoint. It is too bad that the Senate has suggested an amendment here that their constituents must quit selling paper under the guise of meat. I just want to suggest as a representative of the producer that if their constituents will give the consumer one little portion of the $40 or $50 a head they have taken off steers in the last 60 days, just one little portion, they could help the consumer more than you can help them on the floor of this House by a speech.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when these gentlemen who represent the Chicago packers on the one hand and the Kansas producers on the other fall out in this House, I assume the consumer, whom I represent, will at last get his due. [Laughter and applause.] I want to emphasize the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], who made a very good speech a little while ago about the inclusion of riders on appropriation bills. That is one of the evils of legislation which the newer Members of the House, as they grow in experience here, will realize. We pass a bill like the daylight-saving law, and we think we have a voice in it, only to find that when an appropriation bill comes back from conference somebody in another body has tacked on a daylight-saving repealer, and we have either to vote down the appropriation bill or vote it up, in order to get a chance to discuss the rider. Some day the House may rise on its hind legs and assert itself in matters of this kind. I am praying for that day.

Gentlemen talk about economy and endeavor to save the public money; they endeavor to reduce taxation now that the war seems to have come to an end. Yet, despite the fact that the House has laboriously sought to reduce appropriations in several of the routine appropriation bills, each one of them as it has come back from another body has come back loaded down with new and expensive items, which made the bill almost as oppressive as it was during war time. The Agricultural bill comes back now—after we have just heard about $170,000,000 additional being tacked on to the Army appropriation bill—with $4,200,000 additional over and above the appropriations authorized by the House.

I want to get it into the heads of the new Members of the House, and try to revive the memories of the old Members of the House, that the Constitution of the United States provides that revenue legislation shall originate in the House of Representatives. Some day it may be necessary—and I am glad the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], as the leader of the House, spoke on this subject a little while ago—to fight some of these appropriation bills after they come from conference. It may be necessary, some day, for the House, after it has given careful consideration to these bills, only to find them loaded over there with riders establishing new legislation and creating new bureaus and other expensive agencies of the Government, to say that they shall not pass. [Applause.] I believe I am about ready, if the Army appropriation bill comes back with $170,000,000 more than the House provided for tacked to it by the Senate, to say to the Secretary of War, to the Chief of Staff, and to the hundred other agents of the War Department who go to the Senate after the bill has left the House to secure something the House would not sanction, that the responsibility for this added taxation on the people shall be fixed, and that it will not rest with the House of Representatives, even though an appropriation bill be defeated. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, the lecture that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has delivered to the Senate of the United States I think is a wholesome lecture.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield.

Mr. CALDWELL. Just for a minute.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to suggest, however, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have an easier way of reaching the powers that be in the Senate if he should make a little trip across there and speak to the leader of the Senate, who is from his own State, and tell the leader of the Senate——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I say that I think I know to whom the gentleman refers and he is entirely in harmony with the views I have expressed?

Mr. LEVER. Then he does not lead in the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think he does.

Mr. LEVER. Then he leads into trouble, as the gentleman himself admits.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think he is in entire sympathy with the expressions I have just made to the House.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman admits that he is the leader, and he then criticizes his leader in the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was discussing bills which were handed down by a late Democratic administration.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; handed down by the late Democratic administration. Take the Agricultural bill, for instance, increased by the Republicans, when it was reported to the House, by nearly a million dollars, and it went to a Republican Senate and was there increased over $4,000,000. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Republican economy!

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman it makes no difference to me whether it is a Republican Senate or a Democratic Senate, I stand by what I have just said. I myself draw attention to those increases.

Mr. LEVER. Now, the gentleman and myself are putting ourselves on a higher plane; I agree with him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We are both statesmen now. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken and the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from amendment No. 13 and to concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAUGEN moves to recede and concur with the following amendment:

"In the second line on page 19 of the bill as passed by the Senate, after the words 'page 674),' insert the following: 'as amended by the act of March 4, 1907 (34th Stats. L., p. 1256).'

"In line 6, on page 19, after the word 'act' insert 'as amended.'

"In lines 6 and 7, on page 19, strike out the following: 'all of the provisions of which are hereby made applicable to such meat,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'and hereafter no person, firm, or corporation, or officer, agent, or employee thereof, shall transport or offer for transportation, and no carrier of interstate or foreign commerce shall transport or receive for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to any place under the jurisdiction of the United States or to any foreign country any of such meat or food products thereof unless plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse meat" or "horse-meat product," as the case may be, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. All the penalties, terms, and provisions in said act as amended, except the exemption therein applying to animals slaughtered by any farmer on a farm, to retail butchers and retail dealers in meat-food products supplying their customers, are hereby made applicable to horses, their carcasses, parts of carcasses, and meat-food products thereof, and the establishments and other places where such animals are slaughtered or the meat or meat-food products thereof are prepared or packed for the interstate or foreign commerce, and to all persons, firms, corporations, and officers, agents, and employees thereof who slaughter such animals or prepare or handle such meat or meat-food products for interstate or foreign commerce.'"

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 13 increases the amount $100,000 and adds this language—

of which sum $100,000 may be used for the inspection of equine meat in the manner provided in said act, all of the provisions of which are hereby made applicable to such meat.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide for the proper labeling of horse meat when sold. Under the proposed amendment it must be inspected and sold as such. It must be labeled, and the label or tag must state distinctly that it is horse meat. That is the purpose of offering the amendment. It seems to be a proper amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Why did you not bring in an agreement?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will say frankly to the gentleman that the amendment offered here would have been subject to the point of order if included in the report. It did not seem wise to bring in anything subject to a point of order in the report. We thought it should be submitted and stand upon its own merits.

Mr. CANNON. This is to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; it provides for the proper labeling of the meat. It transfers it from the pure-food act to the meat-inspection act, and unless this amendment is agreed to all that would be required would be to stamp the meat "inspected and passed," which, in the opinion of many, is not sufficient and that it would be better to have the label state what the meat is.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Can the gentleman state for the benefit of the House how much horse meat is consumed in this country during a year?

Mr. HAUGEN. I could not state that. There are six plants in operation in the United States at the present time.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Where are they located?

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not say—one is at Milwaukee. I can not say where the others are. I am told there are six of them. They are under State inspection law and not operating under Federal law. We are now extending the Federal inspection service to horse meat, and the amendment provides, as I have said, for labeling it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. That is to be tagged the same as the other meats?

Mr. HAUGEN. With other meat all that is required is that it be inspected and passed. The amendment will compel the tagging of this, the tag stating that it is horse meat, so that there can be no deception.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. As I understand the chairman of the committee, the motion pending is to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. Now, I had not heard any preferential motion being made to concur in the Senate amendment. My inquiry is this: Suppose the gentleman's motion to concur with an amendment is voted down, with no preferential motion having been made to adopt the Senate amendment, what will be the status of the amendment at that time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will still remain in disagreement. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like about five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to put some figures in the RECORD, suggested by the remarks by my friend from Illinois and others who have spoken on the meat situation. I take these figures from the Bureau of Markets, along the line of foreign production, and I especially ask the attention of the Members of the House to these figures with reference to the significance on the price of meats to-day.

We are told constantly that we must send our food to Europe because of the conditions there, and it is not necessary for anybody to emphasize the fact that if Europe becomes a market of our surplus products and makes a demand on the basis that her suffering is such that we must feed her at any price, the prices of food products here must inevitably be exceedingly high. There is no doubt about that. The figures will indicate whether all Europe or at least parts of it are suffering from the want of meat, especially live stock.

Cows and heifers in milk or in calf in the United Kingdom in the year 1914, 4,595,128; 1917, 4,514,803; 1918, 4,603,841. In 1918 there were more of this class than in 1914.

Other cattle, 2 years old and above: 1914, 2,330,200; 1917, 2,338,407; 1919, 2,289,684. The number in 1917 was higher than in 1914; the number in 1918 a little more than in 1914.

One year old and under two: 1914, 2,586,988; 1917, 2,757,222—200,000 more; 1918, 2,747,295 (200,000 more in 1918 than in 1914).

Under 1 year old: 2,662,189 in 1914; in 1917, 2,771,804; in 1918, 2,670,329, making a total in 1914 of 12,184,505 head of cattle all told, and in 1918, 12,311,149—an increase in 1918 over 1914 of nearly 130,000 head. These figures were taken from the report of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

I want especially to have the membership note the statement in reference to the maintenance of price. I now quote from the Bureau of Markets of date June 19, 1919:

The foregoing schedule if maintained will mean that the prices for home-dressed beef will have to be controlled until October or November, 1919, and that the price of such beef will have to be maintained at a fairly high average until the fixed live-weight prices are discontinued. It would appear that there will be difficulty in doing this if the plans materialize for obtaining the beef from Australasia and Argentina, to be sold at a lower price than that from the United States. There is a preference for home-dressed beef, but there is a question whether this preference will be sufficient to maintain the high price if other beef can be obtained at considerably lower prices.

This is the statement of the authority of Britain on the maintenance of price, and the fear is expressed that the price will break if they permit imports from Argentina and Australasia at a less price than paid to us. Now, while we want a good price for our surplus goods, we must not overlook the dangers of prohibitive cost to our own people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is in the control of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the statement I wanted to conclude is that while we want the best price that is reasonable for our exports, yet if the export price determines the cost of living here, and the Government is regulating that price, it immediately becomes a question whether our Government is regulating the price in the interest of the consumer as well as it is in the interest of the dealers in meat products. With live stock, especially cattle, abundant in the United Kingdom, still we are called upon to feed Europe, and in a sense to restrict our own consumption, and in that you have at least a partial explanation of the tremendous scale of prices of meats. And I say again, we must take care of our own consumption, and then we can look after the foreign consumption.

In the meantime we must endeavor to solve the question of the high level of cost. We are assured by cattle growers that the cost of feeding cattle is so high that the producer does not realize a profit. I am informed by people in whom I have confidence that feed and labor have become so expensive that the cattle raiser gets no advantage of the excessive high price charged the consumer. This situation enlists an interest of the Government in an attempt to get at the bottom of the real situation. It is a function of the Government which ought to be concerned about the rapidly scaling price of necessities.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY].

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], who has just spoken, the other day when I was on the floor asked me if I was familiar with the amount of meat that was in cold storage at that time. I told him I was not, but since then I have an analysis of the Bureau of Markets' report of cold-storage holdings of frozen and cured meats on June 1, 1919. At that time there was 1,348,000,000 pounds of beef in storage. Now, the impression is had from readers of these reports that these stocks of meat are ready for market and are withheld from trade channels to maintain or advance present prices. That impression is wrong. The facts are that approximately 65 per cent of the meats reported consist of products in process of curing, that must remain in pickle or salt for a period of 30 to 60 days before available for the smokehouse or for shipment as cured meats.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is referring to pork products?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I am referring to frozen beef, frozen lamb, mutton, and other meats, salted, smoked, pickled, frozen or unfrozen, and so forth.

Mr. ANDERSON. The general statement the gentleman has just made that all these products must be in storage for 30 to 60 days can not be true.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Sixty-five per cent of the pork.

Mr. ANDERSON. It may be true as to pork.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know the relative amounts as of date June 1 this year and June 1, 1914?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No; I do not.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. That would be a good illustration.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Ten per cent consists of frozen pork, which later on must be put through the curing processes. Six per cent represents a fairly normal stock of lard, and considering the fact that a goodly portion of that must find its way to Europe, the remaining 19 per cent——

Mr. HAUGEN. Was the gentleman referring to meat that was contracted for for delivery?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. No, sir. This was 1,348,000,000 pounds in storage.

The remaining 19 per cent consists of frozen beef and mutton put away mainly for overseas shipment. Even if the 165,000,000 pounds of beef and mutton were available for and wanted by the domestic trade, the quantity would be of little consequence, as it amounts to only 1½ pounds per capita.

The latest available Government figures give the per capita consumption of meat as 193½ pounds. At this rate the total consumption of meat in the United States is 20,000,000,000 pounds, of which the stock on hand reported by the Bureau of Markets on June 1 represents only 7 per cent.

Few people realize that it requires an output of 75,000,000 pounds of meat each working day in the year to supply domestic and export demands, and only 10 per cent of that is for export.

Even if the reported 1,348,000,000 pounds were promptly available and restricted to domestic consumption, the stock would last only 20 days.

It therefore should be clear from the foregoing analysis that meats are not being hoarded, but that the stocks reported represent a necessary supply because of the time required in preparation and to assure the consuming public a steady flow of finished meats.

The following is the Bureau of Markets report of cold-storage holdings of frozen and cured meats, June 1, 1919:

	Pounds.
Frozen beef	158,000,000
Cured beef	26,000,000
Frozen lamb and mutton	7,000,000
Frozen pork	143,000,000
Dry salt pork	398,000,000
Pickled pork	437,000,000
Lard	83,000,000
Miscellaneous	96,000,000
Total	1,348,000,000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this session of Congress the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] has insisted upon reading into the RECORD a series of statements which are calculated, without having it on their face, as a criticism of the administration. The gentleman has been complaining about the high cost of living. The gentleman is a student of political economy. He was a student before he came here. He has learned much since he got here.

I want to say this, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, that the factors now entering into the cost of living are well-known factors to students of political economy. They are, first, the high cost of labor, the high cost of production—and that is a more comprehensive term—and, second, the profit which the producer is demanding, and, third, the fact that the whole world is on an inflated currency basis. The value of a dollar is not much more in this country now than 50 cents was as compared with prewar conditions. It is hardly worth that much.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio drives himself to either one of two conclusions: Either he is not willing that labor shall be paid for the sweat of its brow or that the farmer who produces the raw material shall not have a just and reasonable profit for the sweat of his brow.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, when a new vision has taken possession of the world, when men no longer are going to sell their muscle and their brawn for a mere pittance, labor is going to demand a living wage; that labor is going to contend that it is not a commodity to be kicked around, but that it has rights on the face of this earth; that labor has a right to decent hours of work, and that labor has a right to an income sufficient to educate its children and put them into the battle of life on an equality with other folks.

And another new vision has come. The farmers of this country have reached the conclusion, because they have tasted the blood, that they are no longer going to sell the sweat of their brows for a mere song. They are no longer going to permit their children to work from early morn until late at night producing the things that men eat and wear at a mere pittance of a living. They are going to demand more than a living. They are going to demand an actual income, such as other classes of people have; and the gentleman from Ohio, when he continues to criticize the situation as it exists, drives himself either to one of two conclusions: That we shall reduce the wages of men who work or the profits of farmers who produce, or else that he does not understand what he is talking about. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], to recede to the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 13 and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the last two votes taken and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a further conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for a further conference with the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, before that consent is granted I want to draw the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to one fact that has just been brought to my attention, and that is that a Senate amendment—No. 40, page 53—has been inserted—

> For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of fish, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, $20,000.

And in that connection, so that the gentleman may be informed, I draw his attention to the sundry civil bill, recently passed by the House and now on the other side, in which, on page 148, appears this item:

> Propagation of food fishes: For maintenance, equipment, and operations of fish-cultural stations, general propagation of food fishes and their distribution, including movement, maintenance, and repairs of cars, purchase of equipment and apparatus, contingent expenses, temporary labor, and not to exceed $10,000 for propagation and distribution of fresh-water mussels and the necessary expenses connected therewith, $400,000.

This may not be a duplication, but certainly it is an overlapping of authority in two departments, one in the Bureau of Fisheries in the Department of Commerce and the other in the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture. I call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to this matter, so that some adjustment may be had, if possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asks unanimous consent for a further conference with the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. LEVER.

Mr. ROGERS rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, a year ago at this time Congress passed a resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue for a period of one year revocable permits to manufacturers along the Niagara River for the diversion of the water in connection with the industries there. The time expires next Monday, the 30th of June. If the legislation is not continued, it will mean the closing down of the industries along the bank of the Niagara River. The Secretary of War has asked Congress to pass a continuing resolution. Such a resolution has already passed the Senate, and a similar resolution has been reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House this morning. In view of the urgency of the matter I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and of conference reports, it be in order to take up House joint resolution 139, which I think I may safely say will not provoke any extended discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the disposition of pending conference reports, it shall be in order to take up for consideration House joint resolution 139. Is there objection?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I had a conference with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] with reference to this resolution last evening, and we reached an understanding that in view of the fact that it is proposed to extend the existing terms for one year I would not interpose any objection on the ground that the subject matter of the resolution might be in conflict with the jurisdiction of the general Water Power Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts how often these extensions have been granted?

Mr. ROGERS. The first legislation authorizing these permits was passed in January, 1917. There have been two since that time, and this is the fourth, if my recollection is correct. May I add, however, that this legislation is expressly framed so as to expire automatically when the general water-power legislation becomes law; and I presume that most of us expect that that law will become effective within a very few months. Thereupon this temporary legislation will automatically go out of existence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Just a moment. Ever since I have been a Member of the House this Niagara Falls problem has been before Congress in one shape or another. Extensions have been granted, first on one proposition and then on another, with the promise repeatedly made, certainly with reference to that class of legislation that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that that committee would bring in some bill. I have talked with older Members who have been here 10 or 15 years longer than I have, and they say this question started before they came here. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that legislation will be taken up that will permanently settle that problem?

Mr. ROGERS. It is the special order of the House that general water-power legislation be taken up to-day.

I now ask unanimous consent that this resolution be in order to-morrow morning after business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that House joint resolution 139 be made in order to-morrow morning after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and of conference reports. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I am not sure at the moment whether the general water-power bill will settle all these controversies with reference to Niagara Falls or not. It occurs to me that there was some exception with reference to that, was there not?

Mr. ROGERS. The water-power bill as reported by the Special Committee on Water Power is universal in its terms, and I suppose that as it stands it will be broad enough to cover Niagara Falls and all other boundary streams.

Mr. WINGO. Did not the water-power bill that passed in the last Congress have an exception with reference to Niagara Falls?

Mr. ROGERS. The Special Water Power Committee created a year and a half ago had expressly excluded from its jurisdiction all legislation with reference to Niagara Falls; but the Special Water Power Committee created on the 22d of May of this year received broader powers; Niagara Falls is not excepted from its jurisdiction, nor are any other boundary or other streams.

Mr. WINGO. I shall not object; but while I hope I shall be permitted to stay in Congress a great many years, I also hope that this question will be settled before I leave Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, under the rules of the House to-morrow is pension day, and I desire at that time to call up an omnibus pension bill that is on the calendar. We would not like to be deprived of the opportunity to do that.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that this Niagara Falls bill has been up two or three times and never evoked any long discussion. This measure being identical in its terms with the bill passed a year ago, I think it will not delay the consideration of the bill which the gentleman desires to call up.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. I shall not object, but at the close of this business I shall call up the pension bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report on the Agricultural bill.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY] ask unanimous consent to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on H. R. 4226, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 9, 10, 11, 36, 37, 40, 42, 46, 51, 53, 55, 56, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 87, 89, 97, 97½, 104, 105, 109, 110, 119, 120, 121, and 132.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 39, 41, 43, 47, 49, 50, 52, 59, 65, 68, 70, 78, 81, 82, 83, 96, 101, 103, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 1 and 45: The committee of conference has been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$124,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "statistical" and insert in lieu thereof the word "chief"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one $840, one $780, two at $660 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "six at $660 each, five at $600 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$68,560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$454,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The assessment of costs against abutting property on account of the construction in November, 1918, of a concrete roadway on Howard Road for a distance of 1,600 feet west from Nichols Avenue, may be postponed, in the discretion of the commissioners, for not to exceed one year from the date of the approval of this act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "employee," insert the word "heretofore"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,925,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800," and in line 6 strike out "$12,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "the complete," and in line 2 strike out the sum "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic

centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, $25,000: *Provided*, That not more than 20 per cent of this sum shall be expended for payment of secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "fifty-six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "two hundred and twenty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,272,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$89,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000," and in line 3 strike out the sum "$3,100" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$28,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For repairing the elevators in the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, $1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the figures "1916," in line 10, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Such compensation as the commission provided for in said act may award to employees of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid in the manner provided by law for the payment of the general expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. For carrying out the provisions of this section there is appropriated $5,000; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall submit annually to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, estimates of appropriations necessary for the foregoing purpose."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive, of the matter inserted by said amendment, and in lines 13 and 15 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 13. That the provisions of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia,' approved May 31, 1918, are extended and continued in full force and effect for a period of 90 days following the definite conclusion of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government."

And the Senate agree to the same.

C. R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendment No. 1, which relates to the half-and-half method of appropriating for the District of Columbia.

On No. 2: Increases the pay of the veterinary surgeon from $1,200 to $1,400, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 3: Strikes out the increase of $200 proposed in the pay of the storekeeper in the purchasing division.

On No. 4: Appropriates $1,600, instead of $1,500 as proposed by the House and $1,800 as proposed by the Senate, for temporary inspectors in the building-inspection division.

On No. 5: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the commissioners to impose fees for all inspections or services to be performed by any public officer or employee of the District of Columbia.

On No. 6: Corrects a total in the bill.

On Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriates $900 for a storekeeper in connection with the care of the District Building.

On Nos. 9 and 10: Strikes out the additional inspector at $1,200, proposed by the Senate, in the license bureau.

On Nos. 11, 12, and 13, relating to the collector's office: Provides for two additional clerks at $1,200 each, and strikes out the additional bailiff at $1,200.

On Nos. 14 and 15: Appropriates $1,500, as proposed by the Senate, for a seventh assistant corporation counsel.

On Nos. 16, 17, and 18, relating to the Public Utilities Commission: Appropriates for employees in detail, as proposed by the Senate, instead of under a lump sum, as proposed by the House, and reduces the appropriation for incidental expenses

from $20,000, as proposed by the House, to $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 19 and 20: Increases from $300 to $600, as proposed by the Senate, the amount for temporary clerk hire in the department of insurance.

On Nos. 21 to 31, inclusive, relating to the Public Library: Increases the pay of seven assistants from $840 to $900 each; appropriates for seven assistants at $780 each instead of $720, as proposed by the House, and $840, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for six assistants at $660 each instead of $600, as proposed by the House, and $720, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $660 for a copyist instead of $600, as proposed by the House, and $720, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $780 for a cataloguer instead of $720, as proposed by the House, and $840, as proposed by the Senate; provides for two cataloguers at $660 each instead of at $600, as proposed by the House, and $840, as proposed by the Senate; increases the pay of one stenographer from $900 to $1,000 and another stenographer from $720 to $840, as proposed by the Senate; fixes the pay of one attendant at $780 instead of $720, as proposed by the House, and $900, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for six attendants at $660 each instead of $600 each, as proposed by the House, and $720 each, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for five attendants at $600 each instead of $540 each, as proposed by the House, and $720 each, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for a collator at $660 instead of $600, as proposed by the House, and $720, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 32 and 33: Inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, providing for the maintenance of telephones in the residences of the assistant superintendent of the street-cleaning division and the chief of the bureau of preventable diseases.

On No. 34: Appropriates $6,000 instead of $5,000 as proposed by the House, and $6,225 as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of the coroner's office.

On No. 35: Appropriates $6,000, as proposed by the Senate, for rent of offices for the recorder of deeds.

On No. 36: Reappropriates an unexpended balance for repair of buildings when injured by fire, as proposed by the House, instead of appropriating $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 37: Strikes out the appropriation of $2,000 for lithographing and binding office maps in the office of the assessor.

On No. 38: Appropriates $200,000, instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House, and $220,000 as proposed by the Senate, for assessment and permit work on streets.

On Nos. 39 to 44, inclusive, relating to street improvements: Inserts the following appropriations: Thirty-three thousand dollars for paving Euclid Street NW., $122,000 for paving Georgia Avenue NW., $17,000 for paving Eleventh Street NW., and strikes out the following appropriations: Thirty-nine thousand dollars for improving Connecticut Avenue from Pierce Mill Road to Chappell Road NW., and $136,000 for paving Connecticut Avenue from Chappell Road to Chevy Chase Circle NW.

On No. 45: The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the appropriation of $3,820 to pay Thomas W. and Alice N. Keller for ground taken and damages on account of condemnation proceedings.

On No. 46: Appropriates $40,000, as proposed by the House, for the opening, extension, or widening of streets.

On No. 47: Appropriates $20,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the House, for sidewalks and curbs around public and municipal buildings and reservations.

On No. 48: Inserts a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senate, postponing for not to exceed one year the assessment of costs against abutting property on account of the construction of a concrete roadway on Howard Road.

On Nos. 49, 50, and 51, relating to the sewer department: Inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of a motor field wagon; reappropriates the unexpended balance of the appropriation for suburban sewers for 1917, as proposed by the Senate; and continues available during the fiscal year 1920 the appropriations for sewer-construction work for the fiscal year 1919.

On Nos. 52 and 53: Appropriates $656,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $621,000, as proposed by the House, for the collection and disposal of city refuse, and restores the limitation, stricken out by the Senate, covering into the Treasury any proceeds received from the disposal of city refuse and garbage.

On Nos. 54, 55, and 56, relating to the electrical department: Appropriates $4,000, instead of $3,500 as proposed by the House and $5,000 as proposed by the Senate, for placing wires underground; strikes out the increase of $1,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for extension and relocation of police-patrol system; and strikes out the increase of $1,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for extension and relocation of the fire-alarm system.

On Nos. 57 to 81, inclusive, relating to the public schools: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, preserving the status of an employee heretofore transferred to the position of assistant principal of the Central High School; fixes the compensation of teachers in Group A of class 6 at $1,060, instead of $1,000 as proposed by the House and $1,200 as proposed by the Senate; fixes the compensation of teachers in class 5 at $1,000 each as proposed by the Senate, instead of $950 each as proposed by the House; fixes the compensation of teachers in class 4 at $900 each, instead of $850 each as proposed by the House and $1,000 each as proposed by the Senate; fixes the compensation of teachers in classes 1, 2, and 3 at $860 each, instead of $800 each as proposed by the House and $1,000 as proposed by the Senate; fixes the compensation of 10 librarians in class 5 at $900 each, instead of $840 each as proposed by the House and $1,000 each as proposed by the Senate; makes provision for school playgrounds during the vacation, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the provision for directors and officers in connection with vacation schools and playgrounds; strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, for school officers in connection with the maintenance of night schools; appropriates $12,500 for Americanization work in the public schools, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the Senate, and makes provision for a principal at $1,800, instead of $2,500 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $200,000, instead of $210,000 as proposed by the Senate and $190,000 as proposed by the House for repairs and improvements in school buildings and grounds; inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, granting an allowance to the chief medical and sanitary inspector of schools for the maintenance of a motor or horse-drawn vehicle; appropriates $25,000, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the equipment of a machine shop in the new Central High School; appropriates $25,000, instead of $30,000 as proposed by the House, for expenses of conducting community forums and civic centers, modified so as to limit the expenditures for payment of secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks to not more than 20 per cent of the appropriation; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the paragraph authorizing the use of floor and room space in the Franklin school building for office purposes.

On Nos. 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, and 89 relating to the metropolitan police: Provides for an additional captain at $2,000 and additional lieutenant at $1,600, as proposed by the Senate; provides for 56 sergeants at $1,400 each, instead of 54 as proposed by the House and 57 as proposed by the Senate; provides for 225 privates at $1,080 each, instead of 187 privates as proposed by the House and 237 privates as proposed by the Senate; provides for 9 telephone clerks at $900 each, instead of 8 as proposed by the House and 10 as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the 5 additional drivers at $900 each, proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the War Department to transfer to the commissioners, such ordnance and worn motor, mounted, or other equipment as may be required, and restores the paragraph, proposed by the House, limiting the authority of transfer to worn mounted equipment.

On Nos. 90, 91, and 92, relating to the House of Detention: Fixes the pay of 6 guards and a janitor at $660 each, instead of $600 each as proposed by the House and $720 as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 93, 94, and 95, relating to the harbor patrol: Fixes the pay of 2 firemen, 1 watchman, and 2 deckhands at $660 each, instead of $600 as proposed by the House and $720 as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 96, 97, and 97½, relating to the fire department: Inserts the authority, proposed by the Senate, for the installation and maintenance of telephones in the residences of the superintendent of machinery and the fire marshal; and strikes out the appropriation of $10,368 for a concrete and frame drill tower.

On Nos. 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103, relating to the health department: Provides for 10 sanitary inspectors at $1,200 each, instead of 9 as proposed by the House and 12 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for 3 food inspectors at $1,400 each, instead of 2 as proposed by the House, and 4 as proposed by the Senate; increases the sum for maintenance of a motor vehicle in the pound service from $360 to $600; appropriates $2,600, instead of $3,100 as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase and maintenance of a motor ambulance; and appropriates $15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Washington diet kitchen.

On No. 104: Strikes out the appropriations of $25,000 each toward the maintenance of the schools of medicine and dentistry and the hospitals, of the Georgetown and George Washington Universities.

On No. 105: Strikes out the increase of $2,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for the emergency fund.

On Nos. 106 and 107: Provides for an electrician at $900, as proposed by the Senate, for the courthouse of the District of Columbia.

On No. 108: Appropriates $28,400, instead of $27,200 as proposed by the House and $29,600 as proposed by the Senate, for the pay of bailiffs in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

On Nos. 109 and 110: Strikes out the appropriation of $2,600 for the purchase and maintenance of an additional ambulance for the Board of Charities.

On Nos. 111, 112, and 113, relating to the Washington Asylum and Jail: Appropriates $350, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of apparatus for the operating room, and appropriates $2,500, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000 as proposed by the House, for the transportation of prisoners.

On Nos. 114 and 115: Appropriates $13,000, as proposed by the Senate, for an additional amount for the extension of the colored women's ward at the Home for the Aged and Infirm.

On No. 116: Appropriates $1,500 for repairing the elevators in the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, instead of $22,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs and the purchase and installation of a new elevator.

On Nos. 117 and 118: Increases the appropriation for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds at the tuberculosis hospital from $2,000 to $2,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 119, 120, and 121: Strikes out the increase of $200 proposed by the Senate in the pay of the agent in the Board of Children's Guardians.

On Nos. 122 and 123: Appropriates $5,000 and $1,500, respectively, as proposed by the Senate, for the National Library for the Blind and Columbia Polytechnic Institute.

On Nos. 124, 125, and 126: Reduces the compensation of the assistant superintendent of the reformatory from $2,000 to $1,800, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 127: Inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate authorizing the Secretary of War, in connection with the reclamation and development of the Anacostia Park, to take immediate possession of lands against which condemnation proceedings have been instituted and to proceed with such public works thereon as have been authorized by Congress.

On Nos. 128 and 129: Increases the compensation of the chief steam engineer in the water department from $1,750 to $1,800, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 130: Appropriates $450,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House, for the extension of the water-distribution system.

On No. 131: Appropriates $9,600, as proposed by the Senate, for the installation of water meters in United States buildings, reservations, or grounds in the District of Columbia.

On No. 132: Strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, requiring payment by the Government of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia for all water used by them.

On No. 133: Inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate requiring the officials of the District of Columbia, when purchasing materials, supplies, and equipment from sources other than the Government of the United States, to show affirmatively that they were unable to procure the same from the United States.

On No. 134: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, extending the benefits of the United States employees-compensation act to the employees of the government of the District of Columbia, modified so as to eliminate the provision for a permanent fund for the payment thereof, and to require annual estimates of appropriations for the amount necessary to make payments under the section.

On No. 135: Inserts the section proposed by the Senate regulating the driving of public cabs and public vehicles, modified so as to eliminate the second paragraph of the section describing what constitutes loitering.

On No. 136: Inserts a substitute for section 13 providing for the extension of the so-called Saulsbury resolution for a period of 90 days from the date of the definite conclusion of a treaty of peace.

C. R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he will consume his hour. I presume there are a great many matters the gentleman will wish to explain.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman mean a great many matters that he wishes me to explain to him or that I want to explain?

Mr. SISSON. That the gentleman will want to explain.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; I will not use the whole hour.

Mr. SISSON. I hope the gentleman will not move the previous question until a reasonable time is given for debate. I want to congratulate my friend and the conferees on the part of the House on the result of the conference.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I will take at this time very little of the time of the House to explain this bill. No doubt but that on account of the great number of items contained in it and the conflict of views that exist between the Senate and the House there will be many Members on the floor who will desire to be heard on some of them. While I am very desirous of getting this matter to a close as speedily as possible, I will be as lenient as possible.

I will say, in the first instance, that this bill as it passed the House carried $14,780,981. The bill as passed by the Senate carried $15,944,954, an increase of $1,163,973.

The conferees, well knowing the desire of the House, I think on both sides, and the country at large, that economy should be practiced wherever practicable, and yet in no instance to practice economy to the great detriment of the public, were animated by that spirit. I will say now that the bill carries about one-half of the increase proposed by the Senate, and the Senate receded from the other half. In round figures the amount which the Senate receded from was $576,613, and the amount that the House conceded was $586,440.

The conferees have come to a full agreement, and to our minds as satisfactorily as it possibly can be done if we were to sit for months on all the items in the bill except two. Those two items are the half and half and the Keller item of $3,800. Those are the only two items that the conferees are unable to agree upon.

When I get through I am going to ask the House to grant a further conference on these two items. I am aware that there are many Members present who desire to be heard, especially upon the half-and-half amendment. I hardly think there are any here who will care to be heard on the Keller proposition. That is a matter this House has definitely settled for a great many years.

I will not at this time say anything concerning the two items in disagreement, and if the gentleman from Mississippi wants a little time I am willing to yield him 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I did not know but that the gentleman might make some explanation as to the agreements that have been reached with the Senate conferees.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will answer any question that I can concerning these items which the gentleman from Mississippi and I disagree upon.

Mr. SISSON. There is one item that involves a good deal of money, and those are the amendments 57 to 81, where the basic salary of the school-teachers has been changed from a thousand dollars, class 6, to $1,060, and $1,200 proposed by the Senate. They voted for $1,200 and the conferees agreed on $1,060. Then the basic pay of the teachers going from that down to the first class, as ratified under the longevity law, makes the lowest salary for entrance into the school at $860. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Eight hundred and sixty dollars; yes.

Mr. SISSON. Plus the $240 would make $1,100 as the lowest salary?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; that is the lowest.

Mr. SISSON. That would be the first year of a teacher in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is as I understand it.

Mr. SISSON. Does the change in classification by this language change the amount of longevity pay?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not think it does.

Mr. SISSON. Then the teacher who receives $500 under the original act would get $25 longevity for each year for 10 years? Those in the grade above, as I recall, get $50?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; $30. They get $25 and then $30 and up to $40 before they get $50. I investigated that thoroughly and found that to be true.

Mr. SISSON. The highest longevity under the organic act in the grades was $50 a year, up until you got to the high school, where it commenced at $100?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; but between the $50 and the lowest grade it ran down 40, 30, and 25, and that is the law to-day.

Mr. SISSON. The longevity law?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The longevity law.

Mr. SISSON. So the overwhelming majority of the teachers in the District of Columbia have taught a good deal more than two or three years. Some of them have been here a good many years and get the highest longevity pay. With the base pay ranging from $860 in these grades to $1,060, it will make the salaries of the teachers in that grade higher than in any city in the United States in those grades.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman states that and I am not prepared to contradict him.

Mr. SISSON. My investigation shows that the city of Boston paid the highest salary in the graded schools, and this is a little above that. What I wanted to get at is this: Has Congress any reasonable assurance that our friends will now be satisfied with this very radical increase. The gentleman and I increase the salaries from $500 to $750. Then the House increased the salary to $800, and now we have increased it $60, and in addition to that we increased the bonus from $120 to $240. That has all been done within 12 months.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think that is a matter of history.

Mr. SISSON. Will we then have to confront again a demand for higher pay, or will our friends be satisfied with a very liberal allowance which we are making them in this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will refer the gentleman to the school board of the District, to the superintendent of schools.

Mr. SISSON. I am sure my friend will remain in Congress a long time if he lives, and I trust that he will live a long time.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will say that so far as he is concerned, at least for the immediate future, he feels we have done for the teachers in the District of Columbia all that ought to be done reasonably, that might have a very great tendency toward preventing a demand next year for a still higher rate.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would say to the gentleman that if he had propounded that question to me five or six years ago, before the World War started, I would have answered him in the affirmative. He wants me now to pledge myself in advance. I would say to the gentleman it may depend wholly upon what occurs across the water after peace is declared, after the league of nations has been adopted, and so forth. It is a matter that I can not pledge myself to now, because I do not know, and I do not think the gentleman knows, what is going to occur in the next six months or the next two or three years.

Mr. SISSON. With the present conditions which surround us, if the salaries should be lowered in all of the other departments of the Government, and in activities outside of the Government, if the States should find it necessary to curtail, we certainly ought not to be putting ourselves in the attitude of inviting further increases.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And the gentleman might add further to that, if the cost of living be cut in two and rents be reduced one-half. Then I might be in a better position to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, that is all the time of the gentleman that I care to take, if he will yield to me further when he concludes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. In a moment. I wish to say that the principal increase in this bill comes from four or five items. Since the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] has suggested it, I might state that the Senate requested an increase in the teachers' salaries of $347,000 more than contained in the bill that failed March 4 last. That was the increase that the Senate proposed. Of that increase we granted, in round numbers, $111,500. We refused to grant, so far as the report is concerned, $236,140. One of the main increases in the bill is the $111,560, the increase in the pay of the teachers. The next largest item, perhaps the largest, is the item on streets. Your committee after hearing the Senate and conferring with them concluded that the amount of improvement for streets, and so forth, should be increased by $172,000 more than the original bill. The Senate wanted $175,000 in addition to that. We met them pretty nearly half way, and that is a very large increase. Again, we increased the amount for extension of a water plant from $400,000 to $450,000. Those three items alone account for over one-half of the increase that was brought into the bill since you gentlemen voted on it before.

Mr. SISSON. Amendment No. 131 provides for $9,600 for metering the Government buildings. Did that item go out?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have left $9,600 in there for metering the Government buildings, but we cut out any and all propositions pertaining to the Government's paying for its water, leaving that for future Congresses to determine. We have allowed $9,600 a year for the purpose of metering these buildings, chiefly to ascertain who is wasting the water in the Government buildings, if any be wasted, not for the purpose of making the Government pay for it unless a future Congress should so determine. A good many of the Government buildings have already been metered.

Mr. SISSON. We quit the policy of metering the buildings because, first, of the expense attached to it, and, second, because the Government having owned its water plant should get its own supply of water. The Government having built the plant, of course it should use its own water. I have no objection to stopping waste, and I think that ought to be done, but I am afraid that they are endeavoring to make a showing and they claim that the Government ought to pay more for the water, so as not to increase the rates in the city.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the chairman it might be well for him to state that the Senate conferees said that hearings show a great waste of water in certain Government buildings, an unnecessary waste, and the only way to determine that fact was to put meters on so as to check it up in that way, otherwise the city would fail in its water supply.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is why we agreed to put the meters on.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not going to argue in extenso because I believe that the Members of the House understand the items in disagreement.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi suspend for just a moment for me to submit a unanimous-consent request, not to be taken out of the gentleman's time?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk of the House be authorized to modify the part of the substitute of the gentleman from Iowa to amendment No. 13 of the Senate to the Agricultural appropriation bill relating to the lines and pages of the bill so that the amendment will conform to the engrossed bill. I make that request because of the fact that in his reference to lines and pages in offering his amendment he referred to the printed bill with the Senate amendments and not to the enrolled bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk of the House be authorized to modify the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to the amendment of the Senate to the Agricultural bill so as to conform to the engrossed bill in respect to lines and pages. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, as I started to state a moment ago, I do not think it is necessary to discuss the half and half as to its being a fair and a just system of taxation in the District of Columbia, because the House has too repeatedly overwhelmingly voted against it. I do not think it is going to be contended at any source except one small body of men that it is tenable. Everybody that has ever investigated the matter at once decided that it is not tenable, but I understand there is some question on the part of some people in the city as to the accuracy of some figures which I gave the committee in a speech I made the other day in reference to taxation. I want the RECORD to show that the figures which I put in the RECORD were taken from letters in answer to letters which I wrote to the city authorities in nearly all the cities, and the tax collector or tax assessor, whose duty it is to possess the particular information that I wanted, wrote me letters giving that information, and that information was obtained just before the close of the last session of Congress, so I have in my judgment the most accurate and the latest information as to the rate of taxation—later than that of the Census Department. The last statement that I got from the Census Department was the report in 1917, which did not give always the 1917 rates, but gave rates in 1916, so in order to bring it down to date I gave those facts. Now, the facts stated on pages 1628 and 1629 of the RECORD, where I give the per capita tax here and the per capita tax of the other cities, the per capita tax of the citizens of Washington was obtained by taking the total amount paid for the governmental expenses for that year by the taxpayer of the District of Columbia and dividing it by the population as shown by the latest census. And I believe those figures are as nearly correct as it is possible for statistics to show. Then everyone who wants to be fair will admit that the District of Columbia ought not to exempt choses in action, money in banks, and so forth, and after this statement was

made I concluded I would look at it from another angle and see whether property of the District of Columbia was assessed about as it is assessed in other cities, so if you will take the population of the District of Columbia and take the total assessment of the District of Columbia and the total assessment in other cities and look it over you will find by comparison it is about what you would expect it to be, showing that the assessment is about the same in cities of like size, but when it comes to a comparison of the amount of money paid into the respective treasuries of the States, counties, and cities, which includes choses in action and money in banks, you will find a great disparity between the amounts paid by the taxpayer in the District of Columbia and the amounts paid in the other cities.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas rose.

Mr. SISSON. So there is practically nothing collected from that source of revenue, and large amounts are collected in the other cities from that source. Therefore the people of great wealth come to the city of Washington in order that they may escape the taxation on their choses in action, as I stated in a speech which I made a day or two ago. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the gentleman from Mississippi overlooked the fact that on the choses in action and other property of that character the citizens of Washington paid $850,000 last year?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, no.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the fact.

Mr. SISSON. However, I will state to the gentleman, all of that $800,000 was not paid absolutely on choses in action and money in banks. There are certain other personal property taxes included in that item, but the gentleman's figures are, I suppose, correct to that degree——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. All that character of property.

Now, the gentleman says that more money is paid into the treasuries of other cities of like size than into the treasury of the District of Columbia. Does not the gentleman know that the District of Columbia has no source of revenue except such as she gets from the action of Congress?

Mr. SISSON. I am not blaming the District people. I am simply blaming a certain body not very far from this and a few men in this House for the attitude which they assume in reference to keeping on the statute books——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The amount of money that goes into the treasury, for instance, of Detroit, Baltimore, or Kansas City, or much of it, may be from the sale of bonds, from licenses, and other sources.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, no.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, the gentleman says "Oh, yes." But the figures I give you eliminate the bond sales. It takes the annual budget.

There is not a city of 100,000 people or over in the United States where the rate of taxation is not more than double what it is in the District of Columbia. Now, there are some of the smaller cities where, when you confine their tax roll simply to the city tax—and that is the comparison that the friends of the half and half would make—it is only a little larger than the rate paid in the District of Columbia. But, mark you, those towns have to pay a county tax and a State tax on their city property. But that tax which those cities pay to maintain the county and to maintain the State is all merged into this one tax act in the District of Columbia. For instance, there are the suburban roads, which are kept up outside of the city proper. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and I have visited those roads, and have gone to the remote portion of the District where country roads are kept up, and where they actually maintain some little rural schools out there.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. I have in my hand a brief filed in 1916, and which gives the comparative tax rate between Washington and other cities, and which makes them nearly the same. Why this discrepancy between this brief and your statement?

Mr. SISSON. I wish to say that that is made by Mr. Noyes, who is the principal attorney for the half-and-half plan. The trouble with Mr. Noyes is—and I did not know the basis of his contention; I only saw the result—is that he has eliminated the county and State tax in all these cities.

That ought not to be done, because the tax for the courts, the ferries, the roads, the bridges, and schools would be paid in the cities outside of the District of Columbia, and go to support those institutions, including the nisi prius courts and criminal courts, and so forth. And yet all that is covered in the District of Columbia, because we have only one unit here. I think that is the trouble with his figures, but I do not happen to know the source of his information. I only know that there comes to the desk of Members of Congress about the time this matter comes up a brief which was in the summer of 1916 filed with the joint commission of the two Houses, one of the dodges for the purpose of defeating the change of this system of taxation, because then they asked that this matter be heard before a joint commission that would go into all the facts, and the people of the District of Columbia had ample opportunity and for weeks went before that commission. And I have not seen any statement in that great volume of records that was not a statement made in favor of the people of the District of Columbia and the present system of taxation. Yet, notwithstanding there was practically an ex parte hearing, the three gentlemen on that commission on the part of the House and the three on the part of the Senate had consistently voted for the half and half. They had not investigated it, and yet that commission changed their mind, all six of them, and signed a unanimous report that the half and half could no longer be maintained in principle and that it had outlived the day of its usefulness.

There is another thing that ought to be said: At the time the half and half was placed upon the District in 1878 the District of Columbia had been run into debt and they had a perfect saturnalia of crime here in the peculiar city government they had, and money had been expended riotously, so much so that the actual indebtedness of the District of Columbia not covered by bonds was floating around, contractors had claims against the city, and the District was in frightful shape financially.

In that condition the joint commission was appointed, and the House at that time, my recollection is, was Democratic and the Senate Republican; and Mr. Blackburn, of Kentucky, who was afterwards in the Senate, was chairman of the committee in the House, and I believe Mr. Blaine—although I am not sure it was he—was on the commission in the Senate. They then discussed it, and at that time, my recollection is—and if I am incorrect about it somebody who has investigated it will tell me—they fixed a rate on the present valuation of property, which has not been changed since 1878, at 1½ per cent on two-thirds valuation, but they provided in that agreement, which is now the law, that the District of Columbia would only pay half of its expenses—and then the tax was 1 per cent on full—and also assumed the payment of $44,000,000 of indebtedness which was ascertained to be due, and that included the then-existing bonded indebtedness, and what they called the floating indebtedness, for which no arrangement had been made to pay. And all the debts of the District were absorbed in this bond issue. The Federal Government issued what was known as the 3.65 bonds, wherein the Government told the bond purchasers that they would guarantee the payment of these bonds with the 3.65 interest, and from that day to this the Federal Government has been paying one-half of the indebtedness of the District of Columbia which was incurred by the District authorities when they had their own self-government here—one-half of the bonds with the interest—and at that time, mark you, not a sidewalk or street around a piece of property owned by the Federal Government was paid for out of any District fund, because that government was entirely separated from the Federal Treasury.

Now, I had not intended to go into that because I thought I had explained that before, but in view of the interrogatory of my friend I thought it necessary to explain that fully, so that there could be no misunderstanding of it.

Now, at that time they reduced the rate of taxation down to 1½ per cent on a two-thirds' valuation, 1 per cent on a full valuation. So when other cities throughout the United States collect a certain per cent of tax on full valuation according to law the only thing necessary to compare their rates with the District is to ascertain whether or not they have made a fair assessment. If they have made a fair assessment, then the next question is whether or not their assessment has been made upon a basis which values the property according to the same rule, and about as it is valued in the District of Columbia. When you arrive at that basis you have then arrived at a basis where you can determine whether a man investing a dollar in Washington pays more or less taxation than he would pay on that same dollar invested in some other city.

Now, reducing it down to that basis as nearly as it is possible to do you will find that a man investing a dollar in property here, if he buys it at a reasonable price, would pay twice as much tax on property in other cities of the same size as he pays here. I want to congratulate the chairman of this committee and the conferees on their action, because I believe they have made a magnificent showing and made a splendid

fight, and the bill as agreed upon, except as to these two items, No. 1 and the Keller item, is as good as anybody could have obtained. I say I want to congratulate these conferees, and I think the House and the country ought to congratulate them on the good work that they have done.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. As to the valuation of real estate in the District, is it valued at its actual market value?

Mr. SISSON. That is the law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. It is assessed at its actual market value?

Mr. SISSON. That is the law. I do not know whether it is done or not.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is assessed at two-thirds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I would like to have two minutes more.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, how much time has been consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thirty minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would like to give the gentleman a little more time, but the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] wants 10 or 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] wants 10 or 15 minutes, and I want a few minutes myself.

Mr. SISSON. I do not want to consume any more time than is necessary, but I think that gentlemen who want to debate this matter should debate it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I should hate to lose the advantage of this hour and have it run over to another hour.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman realizes that it might take a great deal more time if an attempt is made to abridge debate. I think it will economize time to let it run a little.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississipi is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SISSON. Now, the property here is assessed at its full value, but the collection of taxes is made on a two-thirds value, and the rate is applied at 1½ per cent on a two-thirds value of the property.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Then is it the gentleman's opinion that it ought to be assessed on the full value?

Mr. SISSON. It is assessed at the full value, but the tax is collected on two-thirds value. I agree with the gentleman literally, because if they would assess it on its full value and collect the tax at its full value the tax rate in the District of Columbia would show 1 per cent and 1½ per cent, as it now shows.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. That is the point I want to make. And another point is that the actual market value of real estate in the city of Washington would be arrived at according to the income of that particular property, and therefore if that were done it would probably stop some of the profiteering.

Mr. SISSON. My friend has struck the very point. If you take the rental value of property in the last two or three years here, you will see that the property is not assessed in accordance with the rental. I have investigated the subject and have made some inquiries as to conditions in the city of New York, and I find that there the rule for property is that they want 10 per cent gross income on all real estate, and after paying the taxes and expenses if they make from 3 per cent to 5 per cent net they are satisfied.

Now, I have not the time to discuss further the profiteering features, but I want to congratulate the conferees on another agreement, and that is with respect to the Kellar item, which has been here for, lo, these many years. Let us understand the Kellar item, because, small though it is, it involves an important principle. In straightening out the street on which the property is located there was a store jutting out on the sidewalk, and they desired to make that conform to the street line back toward the city. They established a building line. Mark you, they do not take your property away from you when they establish a building line, but they simply provide that you shall not build on it when a building line has been fixed. It enables you to have a front yard, but it must not be built upon.

They took this store, as I say, which jutted out on the street, and the building line cut the storehouse in two, and Mr. Kellar had two lots adjoining next to this store, which was an eyesore. They awarded to the man who had the store about the value of his store building as damages on that. I think $2,000 was a good price for his building. They gave him damages for that, and in view of the fact that the removal destroyed his business they allowed him additional damages. It cut his wedge-shaped lot up so badly that it damaged that. But the Kellar lots were long lots, and they assessed Mr. Kellar with some benefits, because it took away from his property this old store.

Now, Mr. Kellar went into court. He had his day in court. The jury decided the suit against him. He did not appeal and the judgment was final. Then he went to the Senate, and notwithstanding the fact that he had had his day in court he demanded $2,800 damages. We, Mr. Page and I, went to look at the property, Mr. Page at the time being chairman of the subcommittee. All of you who know Mr. Page, of North Carolina, know that he would not do anybody an injustice, and I am sure I would not do it intentionally. But after a careful investigation we concluded that the item ought not to be allowed. If you open up this matter you will find that there is not only one claim, but there are thousands of claims, as we are informed, somewhat similar to this, lying in offices and in various business houses, but particularly in lawyers' offices, and they say if you open this matter up you must let them have the same opportunity which this man has had. But in view of the fact that this man has had his day in court, it would be wrong, in my judgment to reopen the case, because a private citizen who is not in the employ of the Senate and has not the opportunity to present his case to the Members of the Senate every day would be at a disadvantage. You and I and everybody else knows that if Mr. Kellar had not had access to the Members of the Senate he would not have gotten that item in the bill at all. I do not believe that this House ought ever to yield on that item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss other matters, but I am not going to trespass on the time of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the so-called half-and-half principle. A good many Members here have probably heard that expression without knowing exactly to what it refers.

During the early history of Washington the city had her own government and assessed her own taxes and paid her own expenses. At times she depended upon the whims or the generosity of Congress. The conditions were so bad between 1870 and 1878 that it was found necessary to do something toward giving the city of Washington a permanent form of government, a permanent system of taxes, and a regular source of revenue for the maintenance of her streets and alleys, for the upkeep of her sidewalks, and for the maintenance of her schools and the other institutions of the city. In 1878 a commission, of which Gen. Blackburn, of Kentucky, was the chairman, brought in a report and provided a charter—or constitution, if you please—for the government of Washington, and gave them a permanent form of government here, with a permanent system of taxation, with a regular source of revenue upon which the city could depend for the maintenance of its streets, alleys, sidewalks, parks, schools, hospitals, and other institutions maintained at public expense.

Ever since 1878 the act creating the fiscal relation between the city and the Federal Government has been known as the half-and-half principle. That act provided that the city of Washington should pay one-half of the appropriations for the maintenance of the city and that the Government of the United States should pay the other half; so that the city has been assessed from year to year to make up its share, for one-half of the appropriations for the city, for the maintenance of a government here that is in keeping with the necessities of a National Capital. In that time the streets have been paved, sidewalks have been laid, a great school system has been established, hospitals are maintained, parks have been made, and one of the most beautiful cities in the world has been created here in Washington.

Before that time the streets were impassable during the winter season. I have talked with elderly persons here who have described to me their efforts to get from the hotels at which they were staying to the door of the carriage when they were invited to the White House. They had to step from one stone to another in order to avoid stepping into anywhere from 3 to 6 inches of mud. Pennsylvania Avenue was a mudhole from the head of the street to the Treasury.

All that has been changed since the adoption of a charter or constitution for the government of Washington, that has given a regular and uniform system of taxation here and a regular and uniform sum out of which the city of Washington could be maintained.

Now it is proposed to change this charter of the city of Washington by a rider on an appropriation bill. It has not received the consideration of a committee authorized to consider legislation touching the welfare of 400,000 people, but in the hurried and fevered conditions of an appropriation-committee room a conclusion is reached that it is not the just way to apportion taxes in the city of Washington and it is proposed to do away with the half-and-half system as provided for in their constitution and to change all that by a rider on an appropriation bill. The matter that these conferees are taking back to conference is as to whether or not they shall recede from their insistence and yield to the Senate amendment striking out the House provision doing away with the half-and-half, or whether the House will recede and let the half-and-half principle stand as it has ever since 1878, under which we have built up the city of Washington.

I say that this principle is provided for in what is Washington's charter or constitution. The Supreme Court has used just that language with respect to it, and I do not believe that Members of the House, who within the last six years have grown tired of legislation by riders, are ready to change the fundamental law of the Capital of the Nation by a rider on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a brief question.

Mr. JUUL. I have listened to the gentleman very carefully, and I would like to know from him if he thinks it is moral and proper for us to sit and take the money out of the National Treasury and give it to a wealthy city like Washington before Washington has at least paid as much upon the property here as any other property would have to pay in any other city in the Union?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The city of Washington pays on an average about the same rate that is paid by like cities throughout the country.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will give me——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would discuss that with Members who are discussing that question. I am now discussing the fundamental law of Washington. The Supreme Court used this language in discussing the fundamental law, the charter of this city:

> But our conclusions are not controlled by this construction alone. The court below placed its decision on what we conceive to be the true significance of the act of 1878. As said by that court, it is to be regarded as an organic act, intended to dispose of the whole question of a government for this District. It is, as it were, a constitution for the District. It is declared by its title to be an act to provide "a permanent form of government for the District." The word "permanent" is suggestive. It implies that prior systems had been temporary and provisional. As permanent it is complete in itself.

It is important that the National Capital should have a permanent form of government and a permanent and regular system under which it shall be taxed and governed. A commission recently appointed to investigate this very question used this language, to which I call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL]:

> The committee believes that independently of the question of what should be the proper subjects of taxation in the District of Columbia, the payment of taxes on real estate from the assessments as they are now constituted is a fair and reasonable response in such taxation for municipal benefits received by the citizens of the District.

Further on, and in conclusion, the members of that commission stated:

> Our unanimous conclusion is that the rate of taxation in the District should be fixed and certain; that the Congress should pursue a definite policy of regular and liberal appropriations, having in view not only the permanent moral and physical advancement of the city but also its preeminent beauty and grandeur as the municipal expression of the Nation's home and its people's pride.

This report is signed by W. E. Chilton, Willard Saulsbury, and John D. Works for the Senate, and by HENRY T. RAINEY, WARREN GARD, and Henry Allen Cooper for the House.

It seems to me that we should hesitate long before we set aside the charter of the city of Washington by a mere rider on an appropriation bill. If this fundamental law is not the right way to govern this city, if this is not the right way to meet the expenses of the District of Columbia, then let us give it a new charter; but let us not create that charter by a rider on an appropriation bill. Let it be the result of the best judgment of a proper committee of this House, brought in here and considered independently and upon its merits, and not force it through as a necessary part of a bill that provides for the maintenance of the city for the next fiscal year. This is the Capital of the Nation. There are many obligations that we must observe as a Congress. Taking the streets and alleys and the parks and places for public buildings, the Government of the United States owns a very large portion of the area of the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I may recognize the gentleman a little later. If the Chair will recognize me now, I will make a request. I want to get the previous question on this conference report adopted within the hour. There are many Members who want to talk on the half-and-half amendment. There are only two disputed questions; that is, the half-and-half and amendment 45, the Keller proposition. If I can get unanimous consent for the previous question on the conference report within the hour, I am willing that we shall go on for an hour further and discuss the half-and-half and instruct the conferees or do anything that is wanted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be no trouble in making that agreement in the disposition of the conference report. As far as I am personally concerned, we will help the gentleman to get the previous question on the conference report and leave these two items for a reasonable discussion.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is what I desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the previous question on the adoption of the conference report be considered as ordered at the expiration of the hour. Is there objection?

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and coconferee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], desires five minutes on the report before the previous question is ordered.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Illinois can get his time after the conference report is adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the adoption of the conference report at the expiration of 10 minutes, which will be at the end of the hour.

Mr. FESS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. What will be the effect of the previous question on further discussion if it be ordered. How can you go on indefinitely after the previous question is ordered?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The effect of the previous question at the expiration of an hour will be to close debate on agreeing to the conference report and bring it to a vote immediately. It will permit subsequent discussion of the two amendments which are still in disagreement.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We can make it by unanimous consent that there be one hour of general debate on the disputed questions.

Mr. FESS. The inquiry I am making is as to the effect of the previous question. Will it not necessarily cut off any further debate on the amendments in disagreement?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will not affect the amendments in disagreement. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The previous question will be considered as ordered at the expiration of 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was about to suggest some of the obligations that this city is under that other cities of a like size do not encounter. We have embassies here from every country in the world, and it is necessary to police them. We have monuments here that it is necessary to maintain protection for. We have large gatherings here of international visitors, and it becomes necessary to furnish police protection on the arrival of those visitors. There are many things of that character necessary in Washington that are not necessary in Milwaukee, Chicago, Kansas City, or other cities of the country.

In order to do these things, a high order of government has been created here by the Congress of the United States. The citizens of Washington have absolutely no voice in their government or in the amount of their taxation, nor in the way it shall be spent. They can not raise the salary of a schoolteacher. They can not fix the salary of a fireman. They can not fix the salary of a policeman. That is done by the votes of gentlemen here. They have absolutely nothing to say about what property shall be taxed or how much it shall be taxed.

They are 400,000 people without representation and without voice as to taxation. Theirs is truly a government in which there is taxation without representation. One of the compensations to the people of Washington for being denizens rather than citizens is that since 1878 we have endeavored to build up a great National Capital and pay one-half of the expenses. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes, all the time remaining, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the portion of the conference report which is in agreement, I would like to call to the attention of the House one or two matters therein. One is the matter relating to the community centers and civic centers.

In 1918 they were given an appropriation of $10,000, and then they came in for $5,000 deficiency, making a total of $15,000. The current year they had an appropriation of $15,000 and the deficiency is $6,000, or a total of $21,000. In the bill as it passed the House they are given $30,000. The Senate struck out that item, and in conference an agreement has been reached by which they are to receive $25,000, a larger amount than they ever had heretofore, even with the deficiency, but they are restricted in the use by a proviso that not over 20 per cent shall be used for salaries. In that connection, permit me to call to the attention of the House, and through the RECORD to the attention of those in charge of the work, that in their estimates for $30,000 they have brought in a salary list of $18,635, apart from the janitor work.

I am personally heartily in sympathy with the idea of community centers, of the greatest possible use of our public buildings by the people, but I am not in sympathy with an appropriation that is to be a grab bag for every person who has a fad, so that he may get a salary under the Government. I want to state that so far as I am concerned as a member of this committee, when this appropriation again comes before our committee, I hope to go into it more thoroughly than I had the opportunity to do this time.

I deplore the appropriation for janitor work because of this fact. In one school building, for janitor and engineer and fireman, for these occasional meetings, it is proposed to expend as much as $1,700. I suggest that the people in charge of this work will show a better order of business judgment than heretofore, and will stand better in the opinion of the committees of Congress if they do not spend that $1,700 in the reckless manner indicated by the estimates.

In the few minutes I have I desire to call the attention of the House to the last amendment in the bill. Amendment No. 136. This was added by the Senate and is known as the Pomerene amendment. When it was offered the introducer in the Senate stated that its purpose was to give "tenants a reasonable time in which to turn around" after the expiration of the Saulsbury law. The Saulsbury law will expire upon definite conclusion of the treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government. That date, of course, is uncertain. It might come in July; it might not come until October or January; but thereupon, unless some legislation is passed, the Saulsbury law ceases to be effective in the District, and tenants become subject to whatever charges the landlords of the District desire to make. The Pomerene amendment, which was supposed to aid that situation, upon examination proved to be a repeal, upon the taking effect of this law, of the Saulsbury law, and providing in lieu of it, and as permanent law, a 90-day notice to quit in all cases. As a permanent law a 90-day notice to quit is too long, and as a relief to the tenants of the District it would be of no use whatever. This appropriation bill taking effect on the 1st of July, the landlords, under the Pomerene amendment, could give every tenant 90 days' notice, and on the 1st of October, moving day, when the 90 days would expire, there would be evictions or great rental increases. Hence the conferees were successful in agreeing on an amendment which appears in the report, which simply continues or extends in terms the Saulsbury law for a period of 90 days from the time when peace is definitely concluded between the United States and the Imperial German Government. Whether peace be concluded in July or October or January, whatever may be the date, the law is extended for 90 days longer than would otherwise have been the case.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. What is the language of the extension of the Saulsbury law?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is very brief—

That the provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia, passed May 31, 1918," are extended and continued in full force and effect for the period of 90 days following the definite conclusion of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman has no idea about the time that would cover?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is out of the hands of the District Committee. That is entirely a matter for the future to develop. There is certainly nothing lost.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This means a definite conclusion of the treaty of peace, not the mere signing of it in Paris, but a definite conclusion of the treaty of peace. The Saulsbury law continues until the end of that, and then 90 days further.

Mr. GARD. What is the gentleman's interpretation of a definite conclusion of peace?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Perhaps a proclamation by the President of the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Following a ratification by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GARD. Which will it be?

Mr. CRAMTON. Following a ratification by the Senate of the United States, and that event is somewhat uncertain, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Your conferees went as far as they could under the amendment. I think we are all interested, many of us personally. As far as I am personally concerned, if the Senate amendment would have permitted it, we might have put it for six months or a year.

Mr. GARD. Unless we get something like it, it will be impossible to live here.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We could not go any further than that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. The previous question has been ordered. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there are quite a number of gentlemen on both sides of the question of the half-and-half and the Keller propositions who desire to be heard. I am inclined to be quite liberal. I suggest that by unanimous consent we extend the discussion upon that for an hour or an hour and a half, say until half past 5.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I think we can get along with less time than that.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. SISSON. Let me make this suggestion to my friend from Minnesota: I think an hour would be ample time. I do not think we will need half so much time on this side.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In the present situation, the conference report having been adopted, who is entitled to the floor and for how long on these two other amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to the floor to move to further insist upon a disagreement and ask for a further conference.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. LONGWORTH. He is not entitled to time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; he is entitled to an hour.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to an hour, at any time within which he can move the previous question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless by unanimous consent the time shall be extended.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Then I understand that debate will be limited to an hour?

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman ask that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] control half the time and the gentleman control half the time?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield? In order to bring these two amendments before the House, in order to get something before the House, it will either be proper for the gentleman from Minnesota to move that the House further insist or, if he sees fit, that the House concur, but there must be some motion pending before the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will make that motion, Mr. Speaker, that the House further insist on its disagreement upon these two amendments and ask for a further conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments No. 1 and No. 45 and ask for a further conference.

Mr. SISSON. Now, the debate is on that motion. Do I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] controls half the time?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; he to control 30 minutes and I to control the other 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the motion pending before the House is to further insist upon the disagreement on amendment No. 1 and amendment No. 45 to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to an hour.

Mr. SISSON. Now, it is understood the gentleman from Minnesota is to yield 30 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield 30 minutes of time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], and I will control the other 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota yields 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the House kindly gave me 30 minutes to address the House immediately after the conference reports were acted upon to-day, but as it looks now it will be about 6 o'clock before that happens, and I do not believe that at that hour I could inform the House very much on anything, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that instead of taking 30 minutes to-day that I have 30 minutes immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent that he may have 30 minutes to address the House immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow and the disposition of business upon the Speaker's table——

Mr. KITCHIN. No; immediately after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow in place of the 30 minutes accorded him by special order to-day after disposition of conference reports. Is there objection?

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he would not include in his request that I be given 20 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can ask that after I obtain consent; there will be no objection to that on this side at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes to-morrow after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina to-morrow he may address the House for 20 minutes instead of occupying the 20 minutes accorded him by special order to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what is to be before the House to-morrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The water-power bill probably will be before the House to-morrow.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ESCH. It is not likely we can reach the water-power bill to-night; will that remain the continuing order for to-morrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that under the order adopted in reference to the water-power bill that it remains the continuing order to-morrow, although the House has adopted an order making House joint resolution 139 in order to-morrow after the reading of the Journal. These requests of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will supersede——

Mr. ESCH. Subject to those two items of business, it would be the continuing order, notwithstanding the fact that to-morrow will be devoted ordinarily to pensions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has that impression.

Mr. DYER. May I inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin, if the water-power bill is taken up to-morrow, there will be general debate on it?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; there will be a limited amount of general debate.

Mr. DYER. Then I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would be willing to take time in general debate?

Mr. HULINGS. I would prefer very much the other arrangement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get half a minute to make a statement——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Immediately upon adjournment of the House to-day there will be a session of the Democratic caucus in this Hall, notice of which is now being given.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I had not intended to make any remarks whatever on this question, but after listening to the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I could not restrain myself. I am sure when you listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas you thought that the people of the District had assembled in mass meeting, in solemn convention, and had adopted a sacred constitution.

It may interest you to know that this holy instrument that he designates as the constitution is nothing in the world but an act of Congress, just like any and every other act of Congress. It may astonish you when I tell you this holy act has been amended several times, but as the amendments lowered the taxes of the property owners of Washington no objection was urged to so changing this "organic constitution." And some of these amendments were passed as riders on appropriation bills. Now, speaking to my new colleagues, I want to give you some of the history of this fight. Of course, I can not do it in seven minutes.

But from 1802 to about 1874 the District of Columbia was managed by a mayor and city council, just as every other city in the United States is managed, and Congress had nothing whatever to do with the management of the affairs of the District of Columbia. If you will look in front of the Municipal Building, on Pennsylvania Avenue, you will see a statue, and that statue is one of Mr. Shepherd, the last mayor of the District of Columbia. Up to that time the citizens of the District of Columbia levied their own taxes, managed their own affairs, just as every other city in the United States does, and Congress from time to time made appropriations, because Congress thought it was equitable, on account of the Government owning much property here, that the Government should make contributions to the support and maintenance of the government of the District. At the time of the solemn, sacred act of Congress, June 11, 1878, when the half-and-half principle was adopted, it was adopted to apply to the then city of Washington, which comprised what is known as Georgetown and Washington, embracing about 5,000 acres. The half-and-half principle to-day has been extended, and the people of the United States are made to pay half the expenses of maintaining a 50,000-acre tract of land, the whole District of Columbia.

My good friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] spoke of the deplorable condition of the streets—the mud, and so forth—at the time this sacred instrument was adopted in 1878. I apprehend every city in the United States about that time was in a similar condition. When you went out in the rain you walked in mud.

Now, I can not take it up in detail in the time allowed me, gentlemen, but you will find that in the city of Washington only one tax is levied, and that is the city tax. They do not pay here any county or State tax, as you and I do in our respective States, but all taxes collected here are embraced in this one tax. If you compare the tax levy here on real estate you will find it is lower than the tax levied in any other city in the United States anywhere like the city of Washington in population, after deducting, as Mr. Noyes and the other advocates of the half-and-half do in arriving at their figures, county and State taxes. But you who own property in other cities have to pay county and State taxes, just as you pay city taxes. Are the citizens here better than your constituents and entitled to have the United States pay half their taxes? I do not think so.

In the Sixty-fourth Congress I introduced a bill to repeal this half-and-half plan, and in every Congress since then the House has passed a resolution repealing the act of June 11, 1878, known as the half-and-half plan, and always the Senate refuses to consent to the repeal; and up to this hour the half-and-half principle is still in force, and the advocates of the half-and-half prin-

ciple look to the Senate as their bulwark to protect the half-and-half, and up to this good hour they have not looked in vain.

When we had this bill up in the present Congress this month the abrogation of the half-and-half principle was passed by the House without any debate. The Senate puts it back, and the bill is now here with the half-and-half principle involved. What do the advocates of the half-and-half plan say? They say you should not take advantage of the people here; that you should not do something in haste and repeal the half-and-half. As I told you, every House since the Sixty-fourth Congress has repealed it, and in that Congress the House passed a bill repealing it, and the Senate disagreed to it.

The bill was put in conference, and the conferees could not agree. The House was determined to stand and see that the half-and-half principle was repealed, and as a compromise a commission was appointed to investigate the principle as to whether the half-and-half should be repealed. And for two or three months in Washington hearings were had, and the result of those hearings was that the commission thought the half-and-half should be repealed.

Now, gentlemen, we who are advocating the repeal of the half-and-half seek to do no injustice to the people of the District of Columbia. We agree with my friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] that there should be a definite, specific tax levied here. What do we advocate? We advocate that Congress levy a tax upon the property owners of the District of Columbia to the amount that Congress thinks just, right, and equitable, and then, we say, let that tax be collected, and whatever it lacks of raising a sufficient amount of money to run the affairs of the District of Columbia as Congress says it should be run, let the deficit be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury.

What is the result under your present half-and-half plan? As I said a moment ago, the tax rate here is less than it is in any other city, and notwithstanding that small rate there has accumulated in the Treasury of the United States over $5,000,000 to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Now, what do we say do? Levy whatever rate of taxation you think just and first use that money for the District, and if it is insufficient for its needs appropriate whatever additional amount may be necessary out of the Federal Treasury. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL].

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] when he stood here in front of the Members of this Congress of the United States and said to me that I was talking about little questions. Gentlemen, this bill, and another bill in this House, gives to the city of Washington and vicinity eight and one-quarter millions of dollars as a free gift. And before the other States and cities in the Union are called upon to donate, they should first find out whether or not the gift is needed, and then, if the gift is needed, they ought to find out whether we are in a position just now, with a great war on our hands and with many of the bills yet to be paid, to ask the taxpayers of this country to give money away to cities that do not need our money.

Now, the city of Washington pays approximately 1½ per cent on two-thirds of the appraised value of the property in the District of Columbia. And the gentleman from Kansas stated that owing to the fact that it is the Capital of the Nation, they had to have police, that they had to have schools, that they had to have parks.

Now, gentlemen, I have once before compared the tax situation in the city that I in part represent with the tax situation in Washington, D. C. We also have a police force, and the city pays the police, and the city to-day levies a tax of $1.97 for every $100 worth of property owned out there. We also have a park system, and we take a pride in our park system, and we like to keep it up and make our boulevards beautiful; but we have to step up to the tax collector's desk and pay for park purposes in most of the towns composing the city of Chicago 70 cents additional for every $100 of valuation. But those taxes do not represent all that is being paid. We pay in addition to that 80 cents on every $100 of valuation as our contribution to the State of Illinois.

We pay also for our schools $1.87 per $100 valuation, and the totals last year amounted to $6.38 for every $100 valuation in the city of Chicago, based upon one-third of the fair cash value. Then we are called upon as citizens of the great State of Illinois, and you are called upon as citizens of your respective States, after having paid taxes of this kind, to permit the city of Washington to come in and take the money that ought to be paid as pensions to our soldiers, to be paid for artificial arms and legs for those soldiers, and for general national purposes—you are called upon to take that money out of the Treasury in broad daylight and hand it over to one of the wealthiest communities in the country, and to say, "Here is our gift to you." Now, I maintain that this city does not need the gift, and I maintain that it is indecent and dishonest on our part to stick our arms down into the Treasury of the United States and hand them the money. [Applause.]

Every time I have seen a little girl or boy during the war days going about the city selling war stamps, asking people to buy a quarter's worth of war stamps or a dollar's worth of war stamps, I have sat down after I had listened to the little boy or girl and tried to figure out how many thousands of little children in the United States were going around in the same way appealing to people to buy war stamps, and realized that instead of all of it going into the Treasury of the United States to run the war, seven millions of it went into the coffers of the city of Washington to run purely local affairs. [Applause.]

Can we agree upon the proposition that there is nothing in the school system here that ought to be helped? Yet you will find the school system in the bill 50 cents on the dollar. Out our way we pay, ourselves, what it takes to educate our children, and we pay 100 cents on the dollar.

Now, suppose the police force of the city of Washington does what my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the city of Washington say it does. He was very kind to me and directed at me some good-natured jibes and gave me some advertising that I would not otherwise have received, and as a consequence I am grateful to him. [Laughter.] He speaks pathetically of these school children, and he speaks of the police force, and he refers to foreign ambassadors. With a city tax of $1.97 per $100 valuation in our city we manage to pay our policemen. The people here pay $1.50 for all purposes, and then, in addition to the burdens that we bear, they come to us and want us to help them.

I have read a great many articles here on the subject of Washington's taxes, and what they are continually hammering on, gentlemen, is the per capita. Most of you gentlemen have been in municipal life and in county and State offices at home, and you, all of you, know that when they talk about per capita in the matter of taxation they are talking bunk—b-u-n-k, pure and simple. [Laughter.] The per capita, the number of inhabitants or the number of dwellers in any given city, has absolutely nothing to do with taxation, and I will tell you why. They never levy a tax on the fellow who has not got anything, and you know why. It is because they can not collect it. The per capita tax that they are continually speaking about, showing that Washington pays more than any other city, I will explain to you in this way: Taxes are levied, not per capita, but on property, tangible and intangible. We pay $1.97, as I said to you before, on the $100 valuation, for city purposes, but we also pay the State, the county, for sanitary district, for parks, in addition thereto. Now, gentlemen, I want to be fair——

Mr. KETTNER. And for schools and roads.

Mr. JUUL. Yes; and for schools and roads, and we pay a sanitary-district tax. I want to be fair. I am getting to love this city. When they tried to put me out of business in Illinois last fall, I loved this city so well that I tried to come back, and I am glad I succeeded myself. [Laughter.] But I want, when I look into my mirror, to see in the glass the reflection of the face of an honest man, and if I hear of something going on down here that, in my judgment, ought not to continue, I do not want to sit still and listen to it. We have no more business to put our arms into the Treasury of the United States and give money to a city that is able to take care of itself than we have to turn that money over to New York or Chicago.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes; I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. MADDEN. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing that the Government of the United States should pay any part of the taxes on account of the vast amount of property it owns here?

Mr. JUUL. I will come to that in a moment, and I want to say that I hope I will succeed in making gentlemen here understand that I am honest, even on that proposition. I feel, however, that the possession of the National Government in a city is so great an asset that nothing can be compared with it. There is a flood of gold poured out of the United States Treasury into the lap of the citizens here, so that they can well afford to pay even that which the Nation ought to pay for the frontage it owns.

But they go further here in their indecency, in their diving into the money boxes of this country. Streets are being paved that are located miles and miles away from the Nation's property, and they have got the nerve to come in here and ask you and your States to pay a share of the frontage tax for a local improvement that has not anything to do with national governmental affairs or the Nation at all.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes; with the greatest pleasure. The more I yield the better I get along.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Who ordered that pavement?

Mr. JUUL. The National Congress of the United States, sitting as a town board. And I want to tell the gentleman that I am dead against this Congress sitting as a city council or town board, sitting here in solemn session spending its time on local questions relating to the government of the city of Washington. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, quite recently the distinguished Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], had the courage and the sense of justice to make declaration before the assembled Chamber of Commerce of the city of Washington that the half-and-half proposition was no longer necessary and should not be maintained as a legislative proposition. [Applause.] Immediately there was newspaper editorial comment, and the question was raised of the sacred charter or constitution of the District of Columbia. And now we find upon the desk of Members to-day a document purporting to be the argument of Theodore W. Noyes before the joint select committee of the Congress of the United States; a document printed in the Government Printing Office, coming here to all of us under Government frank, spending the Government's money to bring to you the statement of the man representing—I say it with the utmost respect—representing the great interests in the District of Columbia and the principal advocate of the so-called "half-and-half." This statement comes to us paid for by the Government under official frank. And we also saw in last night's edition of the paper which Mr. Noyes owns—a most excellent paper, I may say—the statement that the half-and-half principle was not condemned by the commission which recently investigated the matter. Now, I rise principally for the purpose of showing the Members of the House who have not been here long exactly what this joint select committee did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I have not very much time, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the document that the gentleman alludes to as having been put before us?

Mr. GARD. The argument or brief of Theodore W. Noyes, a prominent and wealthy Washingtonian, before the joint select committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it a part of the report of the joint select committee?

Mr. GARD. No; it is the argument of Theodore W. Noyes in behalf of the half-and-half principle.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where did it come from?

Mr. GARD. I do not know where it came from, but it was printed in the Government Printing Office and came to us under some official frank.

As I say, I desire to tell gentlemen about this committee. It was appointed in 1915, and three members were appointed by the Speaker of this House at that time, and those three members were Mr. Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois; Mr. Henry Allen Cooper, of Wisconsin, and myself; and there were three Senators—Mr. Chilton, of West Virginia; Mr. Saulsbury, of Delaware; and Mr. Works, of California.

The committee met. In all, the committee was in session 40 days. The interests were all before the committee—the allied organizations, the real estate owners—all in favor of the half-and-half, persistently and insistently, and after very complete hearings this committee found that the purposes of the half-and-half were no longer necessary and that it should not be maintained; that there was no reason for any arbitrary rule of proportionate contribution.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I want the gentleman to bring out whether he was a member of the commission.

Mr. GARD. Yes; I was a member of the commission, and I speak of the fact, because there have been statements made here and in newspapers about what was meant in this report. I want to tell you that I know what was meant, because, with the exception of the last paragraph added at the last moment, the entire report was written by me, and I know what it means. [Applause.] I know that not alone in the minds of the committee at that time but in the mind of every fair-minded man who has ever investigated these affairs in the District of Columbia there is absolutely no necessity for the half-and-half. No man can hear or read any considerable portion of the evidence and believe that the half-and-half is any longer necessary in this day of great change in District finances.

Let me read to you from the report of the Auditor of the District of Columbia this language:

> The surplus on hand, cash and credit to the general fund of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1918, $6,051,313.95. Some charges against the fund reduce it, but the present surplus, added again, nearly totals the above amount.

There is the gist of it. What we are doing under the half-and-half as Washington has developed is that we are taking the taxes, and in addition to what they pay as taxes—they collect here about $9,000,000—we put $9,000,000 of your money and your constituents' money in the coffers of the District of Columbia, and they do not spend it because they can not spend it. Here, now, with everything that is taken out in 1919, June 30, a few days from now, there will be about $6,000,000 unexpended to the credit of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman says that the District can not spend it. I will ask the gentleman if the District of Columbia did not appeal for larger appropriations than Congress is willing to make, and if the appropriations had been made as requested by the citizens of the District of Columbia there would be no surplus in the Treasury?

Mr. GARD. If every dollar requested, on most liberal estimates by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for several years past, were appropriated by Congress without reduction, there would still be three or four million dollars unexpended in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia know what the District needs; they know what improvements are needed; they know what streets are needed; they know what buildings are needed—everything that goes to make this the great Capital City of the Nation—and that is what I want to do. But I am not in favor of creating here a vast unexpended and unnecessary credit in the Treasury for the District of Columbia of the money from Indiana, from Kansas, from Nebraska, Maine, and New York and piling it up here so that in a few years, perchance, they may seek to abrogate the tax levy entirely.

Now, I desire to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who made inquiry, that I have figures from the assessor's office showing that all United States property, religious and educational property, in this city amounts to $288,000,000, while the privately owned property is estimated at $410,000,000; and that is two-thirds valuation, so that the total value is $615,000,000.

Those are the latest figures from the assessor's office of the District of Columbia, being a difference between $430,000,000 and $650,000,000—nearly $200,000,000—on behalf of the privately owned property; and yet they say the Nation must appropriate as much as they contribute in taxation for the maintenance of this city.

If that was necessary, I would be for it, because I want to do everything I can to make the Capital of the United States the premier city, not alone of the United States but of the world. Some one said the other day that in a few years it will not be the capital of the United States but the capital of the world, as far as government is concerned; and I want to see it properly maintained. I want to say that the proposition which calls for loading up a huge credit of the District of Columbia is absolutely indefensible, and no man, no matter what his personal interests may be, can defend it; and no man seeks to defend the half-and-half unless he has some personal interest in it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. I made no personal reference to the gentleman, and certainly charge no improper interest to him.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But I have just defended the half-and-half principle on this floor, and I have not a dollar's worth of property in this District.

Mr. GARD. I am sorry to learn that the gentleman has no property here, but if the gentleman chooses to put himself in the category of those who are interested in the District, he may do so.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not interested in the District except as a citizen of the United States interested in his Capital.

Mr. GARD. I have no quarrel with the gentleman——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And I do not even live here.

Mr. GARD. Or about any of his possessions, but I say and repeat that no man, after an intelligent investigation, can defend the principle of the half-and-half as it exists in this community to-day. It is to-day absolutely unnecessary and economically wrong.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of residence in the city of Washington more than 25 years ago. The half-and-half proposition was an issue then as it is now. It has been up here at regular intervals ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. I have long felt that Congress should not take away the half-and-half principle until we are prepared to give the people in this District representation in the House and in the Senate. I think this complaint will continue indefinitely until the actual residents of the District of Columbia have representation. No matter how beneficial a plan is offered to them, they will be dissatisfied. Taxation without representation is never pleasant. I have no sympathy with the statements printed from time to time that the taxes here are excessive as compared with other cities, but I think that has nothing to do with it as long as we deny to the actual residents of the District the right to participate in the management of their affairs. I hope the time will soon come when Congress will authorize a census of the District of Columbia to find the number of actual residents of the District. When that time comes I think the people who acclaim that they have a population of 400,000 here will find that they have not in actual residents as many as they have inhabitants. But that is neither here nor there. I rose for the purpose of saying that in my opinion Congress should not take away this plan which has existed, or determine on any other plan, until we have given the citizens of the District the right to vote and have given them representation in Congress. I yield back whatever time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this matter has been up in Congress for at least seven consecutive years. It has been debated here at length on this floor. The Senate has never debated it but once, and that for a very short time; and after a discussion there of a very short time by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. James, and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. KENYON, two men themselves who were not thoroughly familiar with it, about one-third of the Senate voted for this very amendment. This last time not one word was said about it.

As I understand it, the thing the real estate people of the District of Columbia want is that we shall recede from this amendment and let the matter be taken up as a separate piece of legislation. In 1915 they asked that a joint commission be appointed, and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, then a Member of the House, offered a resolution, and such a committee was appointed. When that committee reported, it reported unanimously against the half-and-half principle, and the Senate members of that committee voted unanimously against it. Not a single one of them said a word in favor of the half-and-half. I have read the report of the committee very carefully, and the statement that they had indorsed it is, in my judgment, a misinterpretation of what the committee said. They did say that the assessment was fair. In this amendment we do not ask to change the assessment; we do not ask to change the rate of taxation. This amendment has been carefully prepared by a subcommittee that went carefully into the matter. It is not a thing that has been hastily done, as men would have you believe, but it was done after deliberation, after debate. The amendment was carefully drawn, so that it does not in any way interfere with the assessment or the rate of taxation. It simply says that the people of the District will continue to pay the same rate of taxation they are now paying on the same assessment they are now paying, not a single dollar extra, but that the money collected shall first be applied to the payment of the expenses of the District, and the Federal Congress shall pay whatever is necessary to make up what they appropriate.

And that is as fair, that is as just, a proposition as can be found, and yet you hear gentlemen speak here endeavoring to make you believe a violent assault is being made upon a sacred thing, an act of Congress passed in 1878 for the purpose of relieving the taxpayers of the District of Columbia from absolute bankruptcy, and at that time they were assessing property under the same rule as now and paying upon two-thirds of that assessment, and the rate was about 1½ cents on two-thirds value and has remained so, and everyone in this House realizes that taxation in every other city in the United States has been gradually increasing all the time, because the cities demand better improvements, and while the taxes in the States—the States you come from as their representatives in the Federal Congress—have, I say, been going up all the time, the rate of taxation here in the District has remained 1½ on a two-thirds value, or 1 per cent on full value, and yet the statement is made that here we are trying to do the District an injustice. I know my heart and my mind, and I know I would not do an injustice to a human being in the District of Columbia. I have never served upon this committee because I wanted to serve upon it, and not a single chairman of the Committee on Appropriations but will tell you I have gone on this committee under protest. This is a service that has been wished upon me, and I have simply endeavored to perform my duty and give to the Congress the facts as they have been developed after these years of investigation; and yet men call it undue haste to put a rider upon an appropriation bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no dollar's worth of property, real estate or personal, for that matter, except that I pay my bills and have my belongings where I live, at the hotel. I am not going to discuss the question of whether we should enact this legislation or not. It is absolutely a practical question.

I understand from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] that there is $6,000,000 to the credit of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States. Never can one dollar of that money come out of that Treasury unless Congress says so. They say we will get more money from taxation than half the sum required to pay the expenses of the District of Columbia. Well, under the law it goes into the Treasury of the United States and does not bear interest. There it is. It may amount up to $12,000,000. I do not know what it will amount to. This body levies the taxes; that is, it legislates, and if the House and Senate agree upon an increase or a decrease of taxation, there it is.

Now, it is to me, as I said, purely a practical question. This putting of riders on appropriation bills has become quite popular. Frequently they are put on in the Senate, and sometimes they are awfully disagreeable, and sometimes they are somewhat disagreeable when we ourselves put the riders on. But it is against the rules of the House, and, as I understand it and if my recollection is correct, against the rules of the Senate, to put riders on appropriation bills. The District of Columbia appropriation bill failed in March because the Senate would not give way and the House would not give way. This bill may fail in the same way, I suppose. That would leave the District government, that we created by legislation, without anything to sustain it, police force or anything else, and in these days of the Bolsheviki that would be unfortunate.

I do not know whether this bill is to fail or not. I am perfectly willing to go to work and use this money that is in the Treasury for the benefit of the Treasury, so far as that is concerned, if it can be worked out; but I apprehend it can not be, although it might be utilized now in any way they choose to utilize it, the House, the Senate, and the President agreeing.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Of this $6,000,000 that is in the Treasury, is it not a fact that $6,000,000 of the people's money is applied to the expenses of this District, of which the taxpayers of the District have the benefit?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, half and half have been appropriated since 1878 to the present time.

Now, as to the practical question: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment and asks for a further conference. I have no objection, so far as that is concerned. But sometime between this and the 1st day of July this appropriation has to be made. The Senate was stubborn before and the bill failed; and we were stubborn. The $6,000,000 in the Treasury is over and above what was raised by taxation which Congress levied. There has been sufficient to pay the District's half and accumulate the money in the Treasury. It never can be gotten out of the Treasury without an act of Congress.

I will not discuss the question about the District's representation in Congress—with a Member in the House and two in the Senate. It was never intended that the District should have

representation. The people here are mostly Government employees, and those that are not Government employees live upon the official population that is here. It was never intended that they should have representation and I will never so vote. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Most of the employees here vote back in the States.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, seven minutes, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, practically everything that can be said on this proposition on both sides has been said, but I wish to invite attention, and particular attention, to the proposition which the House, for nearly half a dozen years now, has adopted at each Congress, and which the other end of this Capitol—and which, I believe, Mr. Speaker CLARK at the last session said could not be mentioned—has defeated. As many times as the House has adopted this change the unmentionable body has put it back to the old status.

Listen to this and see what could be more fair. This is the House proposition:

That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor, and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. But the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses.

Now, as I explained the other day in talking about this and also about some unmentionables, I stated that this clause was put in by the House so that it would not be subject to a point of order—that is, that the United States should pay less than half; should not pay as much as half. Under the Holman rule this amendment is strictly in order and in conformity with the rules of the House. But what can be more fair, now that the United States is paying one-half of the expenses of the District of Columbia? This says that the money of the District of Columbia shall be used as far as it goes, and after that the United States Government shall contribute all the rest that is needed, provided, however, it shall not contribute as much as one-half. If you strike off one cent or one dollar, then the United States will not contribute as much as one-half. But why, will somebody please tell me, should the United States Government continue to contribute as much as one-half of the expenses of the District of Columbia, with a surplus growing all the time to the credit of the District of Columbia?

It has just been said that this money is in the Treasury of the United States, and it can not be gotten out except by act of Congress. Why is it there? Because when the people of the District of Columbia had their own legislature and their own officials, and when they had the ballot for the election of those officials, they went into debt, and they would not trust each other, and Congress would not trust any of them, and consequently, in order to avoid the expense and, added to that, the distrust, Congress provided the money should be put into the United States Treasury for safe-keeping. And Congress went further than that. When the accounts were to be examined between the United States and the District of Columbia, according to solemn act of Congress, it was provided that nobody who lived in the District of Columbia should be selected for that purpose. Distrust and lack of confidence ran to that extent at that time, so wasteful of the public means had the local officers been.

Somebody has said that if Congress would appropriate this $6,000,000 it would be spent in the District of Columbia, because the United States Government owns so much property here. The United States owns Lafayette Square in front of the White House. It is worth millions of dollars.

The United States is losing interest in carrying that. The United States is losing a large sum every year in keeping it as a park. For whose benefit? For the man in California? No. For the man in Maine? No. For the people here in the District of Columbia. [Applause.] The United States Government owns Franklin Square down here at Fourteenth and K Streets. Millions of dollars are invested in it. It is carrying that as it is carrying the park in front of the White House. For whose benefit is that park? And yet it is to be charged up to the United States on the tax system. Nobody gets the benefit of it except the people and the children who live here. Lincoln Park is another park that the United States Government is carrying the same way. The District of Columbia is full of them. Take Potomac Park. Potomac Park has been made in the last few years by pumping the mud and water out of the Potomac River behind the bank that the United States Government has built. Potomac Park has been made in that way. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the language of the House bill provided that all the revenues of the District should be used for District expenses and the balance taken from the Public Treasury. The provision substituted by the Senate provides for equal expenditures.

It may interest the House to know that the revenue of the District estimated for the ensuing year would be $9,547,000, and that the expenditures for the District, including not only the bill before you, but the District items in the sundry civil and the deficiency and the legislative bills, would amount to approximately $18,000,000; so that whatever you do with the language in the first section of the bill, the people of the District will pay something like 50 per cent of the expenses of the District.

If the House provision is continued, roughly speaking—we have no knowledge yet what the deficiency for the ensuing year will be—but roughly speaking under the House provision the District will not pay over 55 per cent, and the United States will pay 45 per cent.

Further, I find that in 1912 the total appropriations on all bills for the District were $11,370,000, and for the current year $18,000,000, an increase of over 50 per cent in a few years; so that it is manifest that it is not the purpose of Congress—the same Congress that has all the time been voting to abolish the half-and-half—to be unfriendly to the District or its institutions.

But, my friends, this afternoon we are facing a very definite and important situation. It seems to me we ought to face the facts. Since I have been in Congress every time this matter has come to a vote in the House I have voted to abolish the half-and-half, and I hope that sometime that will come about, and it will be no harm to the District, but a benefit, when it comes. It may not be improper for me to say that, as a member of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, I voted to put in the language abolishing the half-and-half, and that in the full Committee on Appropriations I again voted to retain that language.

Now, as one of your conferees upon this bill, I have a deliberate responsibility, and I want to say to the House that the question that is before you now is not whether you will abolish the half-and-half, but whether you will have this appropriation bill go into force and effect on the 1st day of July. Sometimes in the past we have had difficulties about conferences with the Senate on this bill. We had no difficulty this year in meeting the Senate conferees, and while there was no extended argument in conference on this item, we certainly had a satisfactory exchange of views, sufficient to satisfy me, as one of your representatives on that conference, that the Senate will not, before the 1st of July, recede on that item.

Furthermore, if you send the bill back to the Senate for further action, so far as I know, there is no voice ready to be raised in the Senate on our side of this issue. When the bill was in the Senate before the only voice that spoke was that of Mr. NUGENT, who announced his future opposition, and that of Mr. KING, who stated that in this emergency he did not feel that he should raise the question, but gave notice that at another time, when the question could come up with proper time for investigation, he would raise the question.

Now, on the contrary, by insisting upon this provision, you can prevent the bill from becoming a law by the 1st day of July, because this is the 26th of June, and there remain now during June but three legislative days, and in that time we must dispose still of the deficiency, the Army, the Navy, and the sundry civil bills, four great appropriation bills, in those three days. So you can prevent this bill from becoming a law by insisting on the House provision, but you can not abolish the half-and-half.

On the other hand, I am privileged to state that in the presence of the chairman of the Senate committee on District legislation [Senator SHERMAN] we were assured that if a bill came from the House to the Senate abolishing the half-and-half, it would have due consideration in the Senate committee.

I do not understand that to mean that the committee agrees to report it favorably or that it will be passed by the Senate, but I believe it to be a sincere statement that the bill will have the fair consideration of that committee. I have known the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. MAPES] for many years, and I have the most absolute confidence in his ability, his integrity, and his sincerity; and in view of that attitude of the Senate District Committee,

I am satisfied to let our House District Committee have an opportunity to take up this question as a purely legislative matter and bring it before this House for our action and then send it to the Senate; and then, if that method does not secure results, there will be other District of Columbia appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared as a conferee to follow the instructions of the House. But I feel I ought to give my own judgment sincerely and frankly to the House, and that is that good legislation and the best interests of all concerned will be secured by getting final action on this bill and having it disposed of and getting it out of the way of other important measures; and in order to secure that we should recede from our opposition to Senate amendment No. 1 and leave the conferees free, and I am sure that there will be no trouble about amendment No. 45.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] for another matter, not to be taken out of my time.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I desire to submit a request that he be allowed to file a conference report on the military bill for printing in the RECORD under the rule, after the adjournment to-day and before 12 o'clock to-night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, asks unanimous consent that a conference report on the Army bill may be presented for printing under the rule after the adjournment to-day and before 12 o'clock midnight. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

JULIUS KAHN,
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will resume consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the District conference committee six or seven years. The question that we have been discussing here has been as earnestly discussed during all that time as it has been to-day, and more time has been given to it. Now, I want to indorse every word that my colleague [Mr. CRAMTON] has said.

I want to say that I believe the District legislative committee will give, as they have stated, earnest consideration to legislation along the line of the half-and-half; and my suggestion now to this House is, after years of deliberation, that the Committee on the District of Columbia, having charge of legislation relating to the District of Columbia, and the similar committee of the Senate, are willing and ready to take this matter up and settle it in a legislative manner; and my honest judgment is that we will gain nothing whatever at this time by further consideration of this question upon this District of Columbia appropriation bill. I simply ask for a further conference in order that we may wind up this matter in a parliamentary way.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to further insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion of the gentleman from Minnesota is that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments 1 and 45.

Mr. RAKER. I present a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question comes first upon the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 1.

The question being taken, the motion of Mr. Raker was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 45.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the House having refused to concur in the Senate amendment, is not that tantamount to nonconcurrence, so that it is not necessary to put the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion of the gentleman from California included only one of the amendments. The motion of the gentleman from Minnesota includes both of them.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have the Keller proposition also?

Mr. CRISP. I had overlooked that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments 1 and 45, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments No. 1 and No. 45 and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi offers a motion which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SISSON moves to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky) there were 73 ayes and 51 noes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California makes the point that no quorum is present and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi will answer "aye" and those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 129, not voting 139, answered "present" 3, as follows:

YEAS—159.

Alexander	Doughton	Lankford	Riordan
Almon	Dowell	Layton	Robinson, N. C.
Anderson	Drane	Lazaro	Robsion, Ky.
Ashbrook	Dunbar	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Ayres	Echols	Lesher	Rose
Babka	Edmonds	Lonergan	Rouse
Bankhead	Evans, Nev.	McAndrews	Rubey
Barbour	Ferris	McKeown	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Fields	McLane	Saunders, Va.
Bee	Fisher	Mapes	Schall
Begg	Frear	Mays	Sears
Black	Gandy	Michener	Sells
Bland, Mo.	Gard	Miller	Sisson
Blanton	Garner	Minahan, N. J.	Small
Boies	Garrett	Mondell	Smithwick
Box	Goodwin, Ark.	Moon	Stedman
Brand	Graham, Ill.	Mooney	Stevenson
Brinson	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Brumbaugh	Hardy, Colo.	Morgan	Sumners, Tex.
Buchanan	Hastings	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, S. C.	Haugen	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hersman	Newton, Minn.	Thomas
Caldwell	Howard	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson, Okla.
Candler	Huddleston	Nichols, Mich.	Tillman
Caraway	Hudspeth	Nolan	Upshaw
Carew	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell	Venable
Carter	Igoe	O'Conner	Vinson
Casey	Jacoway	Ogden	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	James	Oldfield	Walters
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver	Watkins
Connally	Johnson, Miss.	Overstreet	Webb
Cooper	Jones, Tex.	Park	Welling
Crago	Juul	Parrish	Welty
Crisp	Kearns	Quin	Wilson, La.
Currie, Mich.	Kelly, Pa.	Ragsdale	Wilson, Pa.
Davey	Kettner	Rainey, H. T.	Wingo
Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Ramseyer	Woods, Va.
Dickinson, Mo.	Kitchin	Randall, Calif.	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Lampert	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Doremus	Lanham	Ricketts	

NAYS—129.

Ackerman	Briggs	Burdick	Campbell, Kans.
Andrews, Nebr.	Brooks, Ill.	Burke	Chindblom
Benham	Browning	Butler	Christopherson

Classon	Greene, Mass.	Luce	Sanders, Ind.
Cleary	Greene, Vt.	Luhring	Siegel
Coady	Griest	McArthur	Sinnott
Cole	Griffin	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Cramton	Hadley	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Crowther	Hawley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snell
Curry, Calif.	Hayden	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snyder
Dale	Hays	McPherson	Strong, Pa.
Darrow	Hernandez	MacGregor	Temple
Davis, Minn.	Hickey	Magee	Thompson, Ohio
Dempsey	Hicks	Montague	Tilson
Denison	Hoch	Moore, Pa.	Timberlake
Dickinson, Iowa	Holland	Moore, Va.	Tincher
Dyer	Houghton	Moores, Ind.	Vaile
Elliott	Humphreys	Mott	Vestal
Ellsworth	Husted	Newton, Mo.	Voigt
Elston	Ireland	Olney	Volstead
Esch	Jefferis	Osborne	Wason
Evans, Nebr.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker	Watson, Pa.
Fess	Johnson, Wash.	Peters	Watson, Va.
Fitzgerald	Jones, Pa.	Platt	Weaver
Flood	Kendall	Radcliffe	Webster
Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, J. W.	Wheeler
Foster	Kennedy, R. I.	Raker	Williams
French	Kinkaid	Reed, N. Y.	Winslow
Fuller, Ill.	Kleczka	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Gallagher	Kraus	Rhodes	Yates
Ganly	Kreider	Riddick	
Good	LaGuardia	Rogers	
Gould	Lehlbach	Rowe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Bell	Cannon	White, Me.

NOT VOTING—139.

Andrews, Md.	Freeman	McClintic	Sabath
Anthony	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Aswell	Gallivan	McDuffie	Sanford
Bacharach	Garland	McGlennon	Scott
Baer	Glynn	McKenzie	Scully
Benson	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Sherwood
Blackmon	Goldfogle	MacCrate	Shreve
Bland, Ind.	Goodall	Madden	Sims
Bland, Va.	Goodykoontz	Maher	Sinclair
Booher	Graham, Pa.	Major	Slemp
Bowers	Hamill	Mann	Smith, Ill.
Britten	Hamilton	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Brooks, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	Martin	Steagall
Browne	Harrison	Mason	Steele
Burroughs	Haskell	Mead	Steenerson
Campbell, Pa.	Heflin	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Cantrill	Hersey	Monahan, Wis.	Stephens, Ohio
Carss	Hill	Morin	Stiness
Clark, Fla.	Hulings	Mudd	Strong, Kans.
Copley	Hull, Iowa	Murphy	Sullivan
Costello	Hutchinson	Neely	Sweet
Cullen	Johnston, N. Y.	Padgett	Taylor, Tenn.
Dallinger	Kahn	Paige	Tinkham
Dent	Kelley, Mich.	Pell	Towner
Dewalt	Kiess	Phelan	Treadway
Donovan	King	Porter	Vare
Dooling	Knutson	Pou	Ward
Dunn	Langley	Parnell	Whaley
Dupré	Larsen	Ramsey	White, Kans.
Eagan	Lee, Ga.	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Ill.
Eagle	Lever	Reavis	Wise
Emerson	Linthicum	Reber	Woodyard
Evans, Mont.	Little	Rodenberg	Wright
Fairfield	Longworth	Rowan	Zihlman
Fordney	Lufkin	Rucker	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. DUNN with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. POU.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. MAHER.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. MAJOR.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. LINTHICUM.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. MADDEN with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. MASON with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. JOHNSON of New York.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. HARDY of Texas.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. REBER with Mr. DUPRÉ.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. TOWNER with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. WARD with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas with Mr. BLAND of Virginia.

Mr. VARE with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL (from Tuesday, June 24, to July 6).

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. DALLINGER with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. PELL.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. LARSEN.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC (about July 16).

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman from Texas, Mr. HARDY, voted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He did not.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas for the day. I withdraw my vote of "no" and desire to be recorded as "present."

The name of Mr. WHITE of Maine was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

The Chair announced the following conferees: Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. BUCHANAN.

OBJECTIONABLE WORDS IN DEBATE.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate resolution No. 94, on the Speaker's desk, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, in respect to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, be referred to the Committee on Rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the resolution has already been referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] to-morrow I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCDUFFIE, for the balance of the day on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 27, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting notice of an error in the figures for Terre Haute, Ind., item No. 20, Exhibit B (H. Doc. No. 136) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) amending public resolution No. 33, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 73), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 128) requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish the House of Representatives certain information, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 75), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee on the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of Charles A. Carey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 72), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HERNANDEZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of William E. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 74), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 628) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McClure; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 779) granting a pension to Otto M. Payton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2009) granting a pension to Mary J. Doyle; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2010) granting a pension to Angeline E. Holt; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hyland; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Hiller; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3803) granting a pension to Eliza J. St. Clair; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Kieffer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6737) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morris, county of Stevens, Minn., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 6738) to enable the Government to carry out the recommendations of the committees in Congress and to establish a home or homes for the aged and infirm colored people and working girls, and to establish an industrial farm and to aid the people who must move from the alleys in the District of Columbia, and to provide work for the colored youth during the summer vacation, and to provide work for the returning colored soldiers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 6739) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6740) to amend subdivision 4, section 13, of the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 6741) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Pompton Lakes Borough, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6742) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the township of Little Falls, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6743) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Hawthorne, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to North Haledon Borough, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6745) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Wayne township, county of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 6746) pertaining to citizenship and the dissemination of knowledge to stimulate loyalty; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 6747) to repeal the sections of the war-revenue act, approved October 3, 1917, relating to and providing for a zone system for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6748) to amend the revenue act of 1918, in relation to the estates of soldiers and sailors dying in service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 6749) to abolish the Subtreasuries and to transfer their duties to the Federal reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6750) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6751) to aid in the construction of the Roosevelt Highway along the Pacific coast of Oregon; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 6752) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of West Orange, N. J., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 6753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to John C. Burks Camp, United Confederate Veterans, Clarksville, Tex., and to Camp County, Tex., and to Cass County, Tex., and to Titus County, Tex., and to Morris County, Tex., and to Marion County, Tex., and to Bowie County, Tex., and to Lamar County, Tex., and to Delta County, Tex., and to Hopkins County, Tex., and to Franklin County, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece or other trophy of similar character; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6754) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Mankato, county of Blue Earth, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6755) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of New Ulm, county of Brown, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6756) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Blue Earth, county of Faribault, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6757) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of St. James, county of Watonwan, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Fairmont, county of Martin, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Windom, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Jackson, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6761) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Worthington, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6762) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Slayton, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Pipestone, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Luverne, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Redwood Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6766) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ivanhoe, Minn., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6767) to provide for the enforcement of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Resolution (H. Res. 139) to protect the Nation's birthday against desecration by a prize fight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 140) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to Alice Q. Lovell and W. S. Lovell; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 141) favoring the choice of Boston as one of the free ports of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6768) granting an increase of pension to William T. O'Bannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6769) granting a pension to Alice Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 6770) granting an increase of pension to John H. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ECHOLS: A bill (H. R. 6771) to reimburse Tennie A. Anderson, postmaster at Maplewood, Fayette County, W. Va., for money, money orders, and postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6772) authorizing and directing the transfer of 10 acres of land to rural high-school district No. 1, Lapwai, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6773) for the relief of Albert C. Burgess; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 6774) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 6775) granting a pension to Eliza Gnatz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6776) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay war-risk insurance to the foster parents of Edward Short; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 6777) granting a pension to Anna Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6778) granting a pension to Mary R. Adair; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6779) granting a pension to Mary R. Mellinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 6780) for the relief of Barney M. Hornblas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 6781) granting a pension to Cora W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6782) granting a pension to Georgie O. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6783) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Gibbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6784) granting a pension to George W. Bales; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Beard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 6786) granting a pension to Presley F. Black; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6787) granting a pension to Marion Carnahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of Springfield, Mass., asking for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of sundry employees of the New York & New England Co., against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of Stephen L. Le Compte, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against any modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., for the repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of H. E. Early and others, protesting against any laws to enforce military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of District Association No. 5, New Jersey State Nurses' Association, Camden; also of citizens of Camden, N. J., urging legislation to confer military rank upon Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOIES: Petition of National Confectioners' Association of United States, for repeal of excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rock Valley, Alvord, Rock Rapids, Inwood, Archer, Sheldon, Hospers, and Soubay, all in the State of Iowa, representing 134 men from Sioux, Lyon, and O'Brien Counties, protesting against the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of National Confectioners' Association of the United States, for the repeal of excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE: Petitions of Riley Creek Baptist Church, of Hanover County, and Presbyterian Church and Christian Endeavor Society of Marseilles, both in the State of Ohio, protesting against repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Schofield and Wausau, Wis., protesting against the exclusion from the House of Representatives of Victor Berger; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Petition of Mr. E. G. Hopkins and various other persons in Mecosta County, Mich., requesting the repeal of the provisions in the revenue act taxing sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of La Crosse, Wis., asking for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Rev. H. F. Lawler and 300 other citizens of Belvidere, Ill., opposing repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of the residents of Cherokee County, Okla., for repeal of stamp taxes on family medicines, toilet preparations, clothing, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the citizens of Wagoner County, Okla., for repeal of stamp tax on family medicines, stock medicines, toilet preparations, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Cooks' Union, Local No. 44, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing farm homes for returned soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging Congress to adopt a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, indorsing work of Naturalization Bureau; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, urging passage of amendment to naturalization laws so as to permit distribution of textbooks on duties of American citizenship to all foreigners attending school, whether applicants for citizenship or not; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of City Federation of Women's Clubs, of San Francisco, urging passage of legislation to grant certificates of citizenship to wives and children of naturalized citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolution of the Board of Commerce, Pontiac, Mich., urging the deepening of the St. Lawrence River and Welland Canal and the construction of larger and better locks, so that transportation of ocean boats may be had to and from the Great Lakes; also that the State of Michigan create a commission and appropriate sufficient money to cooperate with the United States Congress making the matter a part of our national program; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of members of Grace United Evangelical Church, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., pro-

testing against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring repeal of taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of First Methodist Church, Paterson, N. J., asking enforcement of prohibition act and extending prohibition to Americans in China and wherever else treaties permit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Federated Clubs of New Haven, Conn., protesting against enforcement of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of William F. Beesley and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring strong prohibition enforcement legislation, definition of intoxicating liquors as including all alcoholic liquors, and extending prohibition to American citizens in China and wherever else treaties permit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, urging an increase of salaries in the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of sundry citizens of Fulton, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Fulton, N. Y., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of Gust A. Heinman and 35 other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., that this session of Congress enact laws providing for full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, and also definitely define intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition from Local No. 854, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the immediate return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions adopted by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce favoring a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition from Vickery, Atkins & Torrey of San Francisco, Calif., for the repeal of section 902 of the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association for additional salaries and appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Land Bank of the State of New York, asking for a law exempting land-bank bonds from Federal taxes except inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PAIGE: Protest of the First Congregational Church of Royalston, Mass., against modification of the war prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: Petition of Baptist Home Missionary Secretary for New York and New Jersey, for House resolutions asking Gov. Cox, of Ohio, to protect Nation's birthday against desecration by a fight for title of world's champion prize fighter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. Simon Blacker and many members of Broadway Reformed Church, Paterson, for a resolution in Congress asking Ohio governor to prevent desecration of Nation's birthday by Willard-Dempsey contest for title of champion prize fighter of the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, for prohibition enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against tax on fur trimmings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., New York City, N. Y., referring to the proposed long and short haul amendment to section 4 of interstate-commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Land Bank of State of New York, asking that the bonds issued by land bank be exempt from Federal taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association, indorsing the request of Secretary of Commerce for additional salaries and appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: Resolution of the division of manufacturers, Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the continuance of Federal Employment Service and the subject of providing a national clearing house for employment; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, telegram from Cincinnati Manufacturing Confectioners' Association, protesting against the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of residents of Minot, Douglas, Surrey, Norwich, and Max, N. Dak., for the repeal of the so-called stamp tax on medicines, toilet preparations, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Town Criers' Club of the city of Minot, N. Dak., indorsing the Smith-Towner educational bill (revised); to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of citizens of Plaza, N. Dak., urging repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petition of members of the First Methodist Church, of De Soto, Mo., including Sabbath school, Epworth League, and Young Men's Club, against any repeal of war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Colebrook Women's Christian Temperance Union, Colebrook, N. H., Mrs. Mariette Cummings, president, urging the enforcement of both war-time and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of West Unity Women's Christian Temperance Union, West Unity, N. H., urging the enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of 700 citizens of Pennsylvania, for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition filed by members of Independence Lodge, No. 300, International Order of Good Templars, of Worcester, Mass., urging enactment of legislation providing for enforcement of eighteenth amendment, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Rev. John H. Hopkins, rector of Church of the Redeemer of Chicago; Methodist Episcopal Church of Chestnut; First Methodist Episcopal Church of Galva; bishop of Evangelical Church of Evangelical Association of Forreston; First Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Atlanta; the Disciples of Christ, in session at Murphysboro; Presbyterian Church of Elmira; St. Stephens Methodist Episcopal Church of Chicago; First Methodist Episcopal Church of Atlanta; Reitzel Bros., of Sterling; and International Order of Good Templars, of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, urging prompt prohibition enactment of laws providing for full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June 27, 1919.*

(*Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.*)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that in the consideration of the bill the formal reading may be omitted, and that the bill may be read for amendment, the Senate committee amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator to yield to me for a moment, that I may present the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Kansas does not ask for its immediate consideration?

Mr. CURTIS. Not unless the Senator from Wyoming should agree to lay aside the pending appropriation bill temporarily. However, it would take only a few minutes, I think, to dispose of it.

Mr. WARREN. If the conference report is to excite any considerable debate I will ask my colleague on the committee to lay it aside until we can proceed with the appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that we ought to have the report printed and have a chance to examine it.

Mr. CURTIS. It has already appeared in the House proceedings, but I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed in the RECORD.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 9, 10, 11, 36, 37, 40, 42, 46, 51, 53, 55, 56, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 87, 89, 97, 97½, 104, 108, 109, 110, 119, 120, 121, and 132.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 39, 41, 43, 47, 49, 50, 52, 59, 65, 68, 70, 78, 81, 82, 83, 96, 101, 103, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, and 133, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$124,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "statistical" and insert in lieu thereof the word "chief"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one $840, one $780, two at $660 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "six at $660 each, five at $600 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$68,560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$454,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "The assessment of costs against abutting property on account of the construction in November, 1918, of a concrete roadway on Howard Road for a distance of 1,600 feet west from Nichols Avenue, may be postponed, in the discretion of the commissioners, for not to exceed one year from the date of the approval of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "employee," insert the word "heretofore"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,925,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800," and in line 6 strike out "$12,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "the complete," and in line 2 strike out the sum "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"For payment of necessary expenses connected with the organization and conducting of community forums and civic centers in school buildings, including equipment, fixtures, and supplies for lighting and equipping the buildings, payment of janitor service, secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks, and employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community forums and civic centers, $25,000: *Provided*, That not more than 20 per cent of this sum shall be expended for payment of secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "fifty-six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "two hundred and twenty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,272,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$89,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000," and in line 3 strike out the sum "$3,100" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$28,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For repairing the elevators in the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, $1,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the figures "1916," in line 10, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Such compensation as the commission provided for in said act may award to employees of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid in the manner provided by law for the payment of the general expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. For carrying out the provisions of this section, there is appropriated, $5,000; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall submit annually to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, estimates of appropriations necessary for the foregoing purpose"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive, of the matter inserted by said amendment, and in lines 13 and 15 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 13. That the provisions of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia,' approved May 31, 1918, are extended and continued in full force and effect for a period of 90 days following the definite conclusion of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Imperial German Government."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference has been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45.

CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CHARLES R. DAVIS,
L. C. CRAMPTON,
JAMES P. BUCHANAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

REPORT OF PORT FACILITIES COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Out of order, I desire to present for reference to the Committee on Printing a report made by the United States Shipping Board Port Facilities Commission, covering English ports. This furnishes a great deal of information that will be very valuable to the American shipping interests in connection with shipping legislation. I could have it printed as a committee print, but it is of such a character that I do not believe it comes really within the spirit of the resolution permitting the committee to have matter printed. It is quite a large document; and there are quite a number of maps, and so forth, in it. So I ask that I may have it printed and that the request be referred to the Committee on Printing. I hope that the committee will give the matter very careful consideration and trust that they may act favorably upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

WILLIAM T. ELLIS (S. DOC. NO. 45).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a response by the Acting Secretary of State to the resolution of the Senate asking for information concerning William T. Ellis, American correspondent of the New York Herald, while in Egypt. It will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The communication is as follows:

To the Senate:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, in the absence of the President from the country, has the honor to make the following statement in response to Senate resolution 82, of June 17, 1919, requesting information concerning William T. Ellis, American correspondent of the New York Herald, while in Egypt.

The case of Mr. William T. Ellis was brought to the attention of the Department of State by a communication from the office of the Director of Military Intelligence, giving the following information:

"1. On April 6, 1919, our military attaché at Cairo, Egypt, advised us that William T. Ellis and his son, representing the New York Herald, had arrived recently in Cairo, both wearing the regulation American uniform complete with regulation buttons, letters 'U. S.' on the collar, cap device, and Sam Browne belts. He stated that he asked if it was proper that correspondents wear this uniform, and stated further that if it is proper for them to wear that uniform he considers it extremely unfortunate that they have appeared in Cairo just now, as, whenever nationalist disturbances are occurring, the Ellises are making themselves most conspicuous, and that the idea is furthered in the minds of the Egyptians that the United States is interested in their movement for independence, due to the fact that Ellis favors them to a certain degree and, in uniform, receives some of their leaders. The military attaché states that the American diplomatic agent is thoroughly in accord with his ideas, as the military attaché has taken the matter up with him.

"2. Replying to this cable from the military attaché, he was instructed as follows:

"'Re your 168, April 6, Special Regulation 102, September 10, 1918: "Every correspondent shall provide himself with olive-drab garb for the field period. He shall wear no accouterments not of a neutral tint period. He shall be supplied with a white arm band 2½ inches in width, bearing the letter 'C' in red, to be worn on the left arm." No record Washington that William T. Ellis and son accredited correspondents; stop; advise them discontinue use uniform at once, and if they do not comply ask British authorities for appropriate action.'

"3. This office also informed the chief military intelligence with the American Expeditionary Forces in France of the facts set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 above. Upon April 21 the military attaché, Cairo, cabled us as follows:

"(No. 181.)

"APRIL 21.

"Ellis (see my cable No. 168) on the night of April 18 attended a meeting of the nationalists at the center of all the present sedition, El Azhar University, where he received a great ovation after addressing the meeting. The nationalists regard his presence as a sign of sympathy for their movement on the part of the United States. The above has been transmitted to Warburton.

"BREWSTER."

Upon April 27, 1919, he cabled us as follows:

"(No. 186.)

"APRIL 27, 8 p. m.

"Ellis's actions in Cairo have become so objectionable that on April 22 the high commissioner was obliged to write a letter of complaint to the diplomatic agent.

"I have had Ellis and his son remove all insigna from their uniforms.

"For your information, Ellis is sending to-day a very objectionable cable direct to the Secretary of War, requesting permission to wear all insignia again and objecting to my action."

In view of this information, on May 6, 1919, the Department of State telegraphed to the American agency at Cairo the following instruction:

"Do not amend passports William T. Ellis and son without department's express authorization. Obtain passports and strike out India. Also strike out Turkey, if it is included."

By telegram of May 17, the agency at Cairo reported to the Department of State that, in compliance with the above instruction, the passports of Mr. Ellis and his son had been changed so as to eliminate India, and by dispatch of May 19 the Department of State was informed that Mr. Ellis desired that it revoke its decision in the matter of viséing his passport for Turkey.

By telegram of May 24, from the American agency at Cairo, the Department of State was advised that the military authorities of the British intelligence department at Cairo had that day informed the American agency that "Mr. W. T. Ellis submitted to the censor a series of articles which contained a considerable amount of censurable matter, but which were allowed to be transmitted uncensored. Mr. Ellis transmitted, by registered post at Suez, duplicates of these articles. The envelope containing these duplicates was indorsed in Mr. Ellis's handwriting: 'From C. P. Russell, Assioot, Egypt.' That apparently Mr. Ellis, knowing the original articles submitted to the censor were censurable, attempted to evade the censorship by mailing duplicates from Suez in disguised envelope. No action against Mr. Ellis for this breach of faith is contemplated, but I think that the American authorities should be informed of this action."

On May 29 the Department of State instructed the American agency at Cairo, by telegraph, not to amend Ellis's passports for British colonies unless British authorities consented to his going there.

On June 5 the American agency at Cairo reported to the Department of State that the military authorities now state that they have no objection to Mr. William T. Ellis proceeding to Palestine, Syria, or Constantinople, but they were not willing to permit him to visit Mesopotamia or India.

By telegram from the agency at Cairo, dated June 10, 1919, the Department of State was advised that Mr. Ellis and his son had left the day previous for Constantinople.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 25, 1919.

PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS (S. DOC. NO. 44).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, information relative to Jewish massacres, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution of the Senate bearing date May 26, 1919, and reading as follows:

"Whereas it is reported that innocent men, women, and children, particularly of the Jewish faith, are being outraged and massacred in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Department of State be, and hereby is, directed to communicate such reports to the President of the United States and request that he confer with the representatives at the peace conference of the countries where such outrages and massacres are reported to occur and inform them that this body and the American people generally deeply deplore acts of violence and cruelty committed against men, women, and children because of race or religion"—

the undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, in the absence of the President and Secretary of State from the country, has the honor to make the following statement: Prior to the passage of the resolution of the Senate on April 25 last the department had instructed the American minister to Poland, who was then in Paris, to make investigation on his arrival in Poland of the truth of a report that on April 5 last certain Jews were massacred by the Poles at Pinsk while the passover bread was being distributed.

Subsequently thereto and prior to the passage of the resolution other instructions were sent by telegraph to Mr. Gibson, the American Minister at Warsaw, to make investigation regarding other reports that had been received of massacres of Jews in Poland, and subsequently to the passage of the resolution further telegraphic instructions have been sent.

The minister was instructed to associate with himself two commissioners in the investigation of the charges which had been made and of the reports which had been received.

The department suggested the appointment by the minister, as members of his commission, of Dr. Boris Bogen, in charge of the Polish work of the Jewish joint distribution committee, and Lieut. Col. Walter C. Bailey, director for Poland of the American Red Cross, and they were appointed and acted with him.

The Department of State has also, in pursuance of the directing terms of the resolution, communicated it to the President, and has been instructed by him to inform the Senate what steps are being taken to have the reports investigated. The President has further given some thought to the advisability of sending another commission to Poland, which matter will probably be definitely decided after Mr. Gibson has had an opportunity of discussing the subject at Paris.

Both prior to the passage of the resolution and subsequently thereto the American minister at Bucharest was instructed by the department to investigate carefully the Jewish situation in Roumania and to report promptly.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 26, 1919.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the bill, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. BUCHANAN managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BROWNING, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, Mr. PADGETT, and Mr. RIORDAN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DENT managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, praying for the dispatch of Federal troops to the State of Mississippi for the protection of United States citizens from anarchy and mob violence, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERNALD presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Aroostook County, State of Maine, remonstrating against the free entry of potatoes from other countries, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Building Trades Council of Portland, Me., praying that all ships which have been under construction be completed before being sold to any foreign Government, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

THE POWER OF THE SENATE OVER TREATIES.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Committee on Printing. I report a resolution and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. WARREN. If it will result in any debate, I shall have to object.

Mr. MOSES. It will occasion no debate whatever, I am sure.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the article submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] on June 9, 1919, entitled "The Senate's power over treaties," by Simeon E. Baldwin, former governor of Connecticut, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From Leslie's Weekly, June 14, 1919.]

THE SENATE'S POWER OVER TREATIES.

(By Hon Simeon E. Baldwin, formerly governor of Connecticut.)

(Editor's note: Hon. Simon E. Baldwin, one of the most prominent Democrats in the country, has long been an eminent jurist and an authority on international law.)

"In most countries treaties are made by the executive department, be it a king or a ministry, but require ratification by a majority vote of the legislative department. In the United States and Mexico they are made by the executive department, with the 'advice and consent' or approval of but one branch of the legislative department—the Senate. This concurrence of the Senate in Mexico, by the constitution of 1917, requires only a majority vote. In the United States it requires a two-thirds vote.

"The House of Representatives in our Congress has no share in the treaty-making power. A treaty may call for action of the House, in order to carry out its provisions. It may stipulate for a payment from the Treasury, and in such case it is implied that the House will pass the necessary appropriation bill; but this is simply one of the effects of the treaty after it is made.

"The Senate can decline to approve a treaty unless certain amendments are made in it. In such case, the executive department may propose the amendments to the other parties to the treaty, or it may let the treaty drop.

"The phrase 'advice and consent,' as used to denote the action of the Senate, means nothing more than 'consent.' It is an ancient formula of Norman origin, and the reference to 'advice'—avis—is only a bit of legal verbiage.

"The share of the Senate in the treaty-making power was the subject of considerable discussion in the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States.

"The original draft of the Constituion, made by the Committee of Detail, gave the sole power of making treaties to the Senate (Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention, II, 169, 183), and so did that reported by it early in August.

"The Committee of Eleven, appointed on August 31, reported on September 4 in favor of the following: 'The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall have power to make treaties, * * * but no treaty shall be made without the consent of two-thirds of the Members present.' The convention on September 7 inserted after the words 'but no treaty' the clause 'except treaties of peace.' (Farrand, II, 495, 533.) Madison favored this amendment because these could be made 'with less difficulty than other treaties'; but it was struck out the next day. (Farrand, II, 545.) In the course of the discussion on these points a motion made by James Wilson to require the advice and consent of both Houses of Congress was defeated by an overwhelming majority, Sherman leading the opposition and insisting that 'the necessity of secrecy in the case of treaties forbade a reference of them to the whole legislature.' (Farrand, II, 538.)

"Madison then moved 'to authorize a concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate to make treaties of peace without a concurrence of the President,' saying that the President 'would necessarily derive so much power and importance from a state of war that he might be tempted, if authorized, to impede a treaty of peace.' Gouverneur Morris replied that 'no peace ought to be made without the concurrence of the President, who was the general guardian of the national interests.' Elbridge Gerry gave it as his 'opinion that in treaties of peace a greater rather than less proportion of votes was necessary than in other treaties.' James Wilson argued that 'if two-thirds are necessary to make peace, the minority may perpetuate war against the sense of the majority.' The discussion was a lengthy one, and finally Madison's proposition was lost by the decisive vote of eight States to three.

"A motion was also defeated by a similar majority that 'no treaty should be made without previous notice to the Members and a reasonable time for their attending.'

"In the draft of the Constitution committed to the Committee on Style in September the provision as to treaties read thus: 'The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall have power to make treaties. * * * But no treaty shall be made without the consent of two-thirds of the Members present.' (Farrand, II, 574.)

"As reported back, it took this shape. 'He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.'

"The introduction of the word 'provided' here has some significance. 'Provided' is the appropriate term to denote a condition. Conditions in law are either 'precedent' or 'subsequent.' Here the condition is a condition precedent, and without the fulfilment of the requirements thus imposed no treaty can be made.

"It appears from this review of the doings of the Convention of 1787 that the first scheme was simply to transfer the power to make treaties from the existing Congress of the Confederation to the Senate which was to be created. There was then no President of the United States. There was merely a President of Congress. The States then made treaties, as represented by their delegates in Congress, each State having an equal vote. By the new scheme, the President must originate and approve the treaty; but virtually the States, acting jointly with him, would continue to make them, as represented by the Senators in the Senate, each State sending two of the Senators.

"The scheme finally adopted gives to the President alone the power of initiative. He makes a treaty, and the Senate consents to what he has negotiated. It does not itself share in the negotiations.

"To negotiate a treaty requires the action of both the powers concerned. Such action by the United States can only be taken by the President. But when the negotiation results in a treaty satisfactory to him, and he asks the Senate to consent to it, that body is not restricted to a choice between consent and rejection. It can consent on conditions, or with reservations, which it declares. It is then for the President to determine whether to ask the other party to the negotiations to agree to these conditions. If he concludes to make the request and the response is favorable, the treaty goes into full effect, as soon as the ratifications are exchanged and due proclamation made. If the response be unfavorable, the treaty falls to the ground, subject to the right of the President to renew negotiations on a different basis.

"Any alterations made in this manner must be proposed by a two-thirds vote in the Senate. Nor can the Senate qualify its consent to a treaty by adding a reservation stating what it understands to be the legal effect of any of its provisions. If their effect is as so stated, the reservation is of no consequence. If their effect is different from that stated, the reservation is equally immaterial, unless the consent be made conditional on the assent to it of the other signatory power, and that assent be subsequently given. This was decided in a case arising under our treaty with Spain of 1899. (Fourteen Diamond Rings *v.* The United States, 183 United States Reports, 176, 180.)

"Under these well-settled principles the Senate will be entitled, when the treaty of peace with Germany is sent to it, to reject it unless amendments which it may suggest are made. They may be formal or vital. If the project of a league of nations is embodied in the treaty, it can be either struck out altogether, or given a different shape or scope. It would then be for the President to decide whether he would or would not ask the consent of the other powers to such amendments. If it were not asked, or asked and refused by any one of them, it would be necessary to begin over again and frame a new treaty."

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Mr. MOSES. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the bill (S. 2216) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain department publications and to provide for crediting the department's printing allotment with the proceeds, to report it without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell, at a price to be fixed by him based on the cost of paper and presswork, such technical, scientific, statistical, and other publications issued by the Department of Commerce or any bureau, office, or service therein as he may deem best for the public interest: *Provided*, That the receipts from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to, and to that extent increase, the department's allotment of the appropriation for printing and binding for any fiscal year within which such deposits may be made: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the usual free distribution of any publications to officials of the Government or to foreign Governments, libraries, and scientific associations and institutions of learning as provided by law.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN SIBERIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Wyoming to yield for just an instant. I ask unanimous consent to take up and pass Senate resolution No. 13, which yesterday was submitted and upon the objection of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] went over for the day. I have spoken, I think, to those who are familiar with the matter upon the other side and I believe there is no objection to it. I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up.

Mr. WARREN. I will reserve the privilege of objecting if it leads to debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no intention to oppose the request of the Senator from California, owing to the fact that he is obliged to present it this morning or run the risk of its being delayed for some time, and I assume that the resolution is in the usual form, directed to the President and asking that the information be furnished if not incompatible with the public service?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, sir; it was so amended at the request of gentlemen on the other side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, in line 1, after the word "the," to strike out "Secretary of State and the Secretary of War be, and they are" and insert "President be, and he is"; in line 3, after the word "Senate," to insert "if not incompatible with the public interest"; and in the same line, after the word "sending," to strike out "eight thousand," so as to make the resolution read:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that 8,000 United States soldiers are to be sent to Siberia; and

Whereas the purposes for which the said soldiers are dispatched to Siberia are undisclosed and unknown: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested immediately to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, of the reasons for sending United States soldiers to Siberia, what duties are there to be performed by these soldiers, how long they are to remain, and generally to advise the Senate of the policy of the United States Government in respect to Siberia and the maintenance of United States soldiers therein.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object to the present consideration of this resolution, although in my view the situation does not justify its passage. Indeed, I believe it to be unwise, in view of the complicated conditions now existing with respect to Siberia and Russia. The Committee on Foreign Relations having given their approval to the resolution, I do not feel like taking the responsibility of opposing its consideration. I did desire, when this resolution was presented, to submit a few observations concerning conditions in Russia and the relations of the allied Governments, as well as our Government, to Russia and to the Russian people. I desired to express my views in regard to the Omsk government, of which Admiral Kolchak is the head. I have felt that there should have been a full and complete recognition of the Omsk government as a de facto government. In my opinion, the policy pursued by the allied Governments toward Russia has failed to meet the requirements of the hour. The results of the uncertain policy are apparent. A recognition by the allied Governments and this Government of Admiral Kolchak would do much toward restoring Russia to peace and quiet and in solving the Russian problem, with which for so long we have been concerned. The Russian people need the sympathy and help of our Government and the allied nations. It is time that a policy should be adopted that will remove the menace which Russia presents to the peace of the world. I shall not, however, interrupt consideration of the important appropriation bill now before us, but at another time I shall ask the Senate for the privilege of briefly speaking upon the Russian situation.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

GERMAN PROPAGANDA.

Mr. MOSES. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, with amendments, Senate concurrent resolution No. 4, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendments were, in line 2, to strike out the words "ten thousand" and insert "five thousand five hundred"; before the word "report," in line 3, to insert "10,000 copies of the"; in line 9, after the word "copies," to insert "of the report and 2,000 copies of the hearings"; in line 10, after the word "copies," to insert "of the report and 3,000 copies of the hearings"; and, in line 11, after the word "copies," to insert "of each," so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 5,500 copies of the hearings and 10,000 copies of the report of the committee entitled "Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda and Bolshevik Propaganda," held before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, in the second and third sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress, pursuant to S. Res. 307 and 469, of which 3,500 copies of the report and 2,000 copies of the hearings shall be for the use of the Senate, 6,000 copies of the report and 3,000 thousand copies of the hearings for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies of each for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 2280) to increase limit of cost heretofore fixed by Congress for purchase of site and erection of building for use of post office at Fallon, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for Mr. WOLCOTT):

A bill (S. 2281) to incorporate the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2282) canceling Indian trust patents Nos. 307319 and 366449; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 2283) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 2284) granting an increase of pension to William C. Wilson; and

A bill (S. 2285) granting an increase of pension to James H. Larimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 2286) granting a pension to Sarah E. West (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 2287) for the relief of Alfred Cluff and certain other settlers at Forestdale, Apache County, Ariz., who were evicted from their homes by reason of a change in the location of the north boundary of the White Mountain or San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 2288) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of free zones in ports of entry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GAY:

A bill (S. 2289) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Relf; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2290) to provide an equipment-maintenance allowance for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2291) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KING submitted an amendment proposing to organize an interdepartmental social hygiene board, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. FERNALD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 97), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to employ such counsel and expert assistants as

may be necessary, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 98), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENT EXPENSES.

Mr. CALDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 99), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

THE RAILROAD PROBLEM.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present an article from the Manufacturers' Record, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to having it printed in the RECORD, if the committee sees fit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing for consideration.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the action of the House of Representatives on the Agricultural appropriation bill be laid before the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. I hope that will not lead to debate, but I shall not object unless it does lead to debate.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that if it does I shall not press it.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, agreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 13, with amendments, which were:

On page 18, line 25, after "page 674)," to insert "as amended by the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. L., p. 1256),". In line 4 of Senate engrossed amendment numbered 13, after "Act,", to insert "as amended,". In lines 4 and 5 of said engrossed amendment, to strike out "[all of the provisions of which are hereby made applicable to such meat,]" and insert:

"And, hereafter, no person, firm, or corporation or officer, agent, or employee thereof shall transport or offer for transportation, and no carrier of interstate or foreign commerce, shall transport or receive for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to any place under the jurisdiction of the United States or to any foreign country any of such meat or food products thereof unless plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged 'Horse meat' or 'Horse-meat product,' as the case may be, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. All the penalties, terms, and provisions in said act as amended, except the exemption therein applying to animals slaughtered by any farmer on a farm, to retail butchers and retail dealers in meat food products supplying their customers, are hereby made applicable to horses, their carcasses, parts of carcasses, and meat food products thereof, and the establishments and other places where such animals are slaughtered or the meat or meat food products thereof are prepared or packed for the interstate or foreign commerce, and to all persons, firms, corporations, and officers, agents, and employees thereof who slaughter such animals or prepare or handle such meat or meat food products for interstate or foreign commerce."

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The motion was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives insisting upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to submit a conference report on the Army appropriation bill.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JULIUS KAHN,
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments, agree to the further conference asked for by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KING. What is the matter in disagreement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have been asked what is the matter in disagreement. May I say that the matter in disagreement almost entirely revolves around the proposed size of the Army for the next fiscal year, the Senate having passed the bill providing for an Army of an average of 400,000 men as contrasted with the House's original proposition for an average of 300,000 men. The Senate conferees proposed that the average be made 350,000 men, but we were unable to agree with the House conferees, and rather than take the responsibility we have reported the disagreement.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 2, after line 1, to insert:

For temporary employees in the Department of State, $250,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum.

Mr. KING. Unless a satisfactory explanation is made of the amendment, I shall move that we do not accede to it. That department had very large appropriations during the war in order to meet the increased expenses and to meet the requirements of temporary employees. This is an increase over the compensation heretofore provided.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah is mistaken about that. The compensation heretofore has been of a more liberal character than this, but of course it ceases at the end of this fiscal year. This proposes to give $250,000 for temporary employees, because the State Department has but a small number of regular statutory places, and instead of the five hundred and some thousand dollars which it would take to carry the temporary force they have had this last fiscal year, we propose to appropriate $250,000 for this purpose. The war has carried to that department much extra work, as to all other departments, and yet the closing of the war and the cleaning up presses more heavily upon the Department of State than perhaps any other department. For instance, there is the passport business, which comes on now, and is being handled carefully, as they ought to be very particular about what we grant and what is asked for. There is the recording and filing of the matters that attend the closing of the war. So the committee felt that this was the very smallest amount to enable the department to keep its work anywhere near current.

Mr. KING. The Senator will excuse me; I do not think I am in error in the statement which I made. I know increases have been granted to this department for employees, and in a number of deficiency bills which have been passed increased amounts have been granted to this department for clerical and other aid, not only for the department in Washington but to extend its activities and operations into other fields.

Mr. WARREN. This appropriation gives no more regular employees. It simply gives for the current year what this amount of money will provide for. The provisions that the Senator mentioned have been for temporary employees from time to time in the past, and have been for a great many more than they will be able to employ under this appropriation.

Mr. KING. I think this appropriation is entirely too much, but the committee has had the opportunity to investigate it. I

shall not interpose my judgment against theirs, but reserve the right to dissent from their view.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

OFFICE OF AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The unexpended balances in the appropriations of $297,130 for compensation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, as provided by the legislative act of July 3, 1918, and for positions diminished under authority of the act approved March 3, 1917 (Public, No. 381), are reappropriated and made available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quarantine stations," on page 12, after line 20, to insert:

Baltimore, Md.: The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept at a cost to the United States not to exceed $176,775, the transfer of the Baltimore quarantine station, and hereafter to operate the same as one of the quarantine stations of the Public Health Service, $176,775.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engraving and Printing," on page 24, line 24, after the word "assistants," to strike out "$2,300,000" and insert "$2,429,500," so as to make the clause read:

For salaries of all necessary employees, other than employees required for the administrative work of the bureau of the class provided for and specified in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, and plate printers and plate printers' assistants, $2,429,500, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, including $8,400 for custody of dies, rolls, and plates: *Provided*, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes or Treasury notes of larger denomination than those that may be canceled or retired, except in so far as such printing may be necessary in executing the requirements of the act "To define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of War Risk Insurance," on page 26, line 24, after the word "law," to strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$53,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

Military and naval family allowance: For the payment of military and naval family allowances as authorized by law, $53,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 3, after the word "law," to strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$70,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

Military and naval compensation: For the payment of military and naval compensation, funeral expenses, services and supplies, as authorized by law, $70,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 31, line 15, after the words "Surgeon General," to insert "assistant surgeons general at large," so as to make the clause read:

For pay, allowance, and commutation of quarters for commissioned medical officers, including the Surgeon General, assistant surgeons general at large, and pharmacists, $850,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 22, after the word "force," to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000"; and in line 24, after the word "Congress," to insert "*Provided further*, That of the above sum not exceeding $100,000 may be used, in the discretion of and under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, for expenses already incurred by the governor of Alaska in combating the influenza in Alaska and in affording relief to the indigent natives thereof," so as to make the clause read:

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, trachoma, influenza, or infantile paralysis, to aid State and local boards, or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, $500,000: *Provided*, That a detailed report of the expenditures hereunder shall annually hereafter be submitted to Congress: *Provided further*, That of the above sum not exceeding $100,000 may be used, in the discretion of and under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, for expenses already incurred by the governor of Alaska in combating the influenza in Alaska and in affording relief to the indigent natives thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000," so as to read:

Rural sanitation: For special studies of, and demonstration work in, rural sanitation, including personal services, and including not to exceed $5,000 for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 36, to strike out:

Pellagra: For rental, equipment, and maintenance of a temporary field hospital and laboratory, including pay of personnel, for special studies of pellagra, $30,000.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I trust that the amendment of the committee, which has just been stated, on page 36, to strike out the paragraph embraced in lines 1, 2, and 3, will be rejected and that the item will be retained. There is in my State a hospital devoted to the study of pellagra, which, I believe, is the only one of the kind, and it is pretty generally admitted that its work in that direction is very useful. It is the only institution in the United States where special attention is being given to this subject, and I therefore hope the amendment of the committee will not be agreed to and that the hospital in my State will be allowed to continue. The appropriation is for but a small amount.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that paragraph in the bill was stricken out by the committee so that the matter might go to conference in order to ascertain what information the House might have relative to the subject. We had before us the physician who had charge of the institution and others, but we could not obtain any information which was of real value. In fact, it was frankly admitted that they had not obtained information as to what had caused the disease or what would cure it, but that they were only satisfied that abstaining from certain foods would in time possibly lead to a diminution of the disease. The subcommittee who had the matter in charge, after having heard this testimony, decided that we had better strike the item out and take the subject up with the House, and see if we could thereby obtain further information.

Mr. DIAL. One of the physicians in charge of this subject, I understand, has been absent in Europe.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me another word or two, I will say that the general appropriation for the prevention and cure of these diseases is large, and of course it covers pellagra the same as it does other similar diseases. I think the matter will be taken care of to the full satisfaction of the Senator from South Carolina and others who believe with him that it is important.

Mr. DIAL. I merely desire to say that I think the physician in charge of the subject has been absent in Europe. Probably if he had been in this country the information desired by the subcommittee would have been forthcoming. I hope the appropriation will be retained in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the striking out of this item on the score of economy, for I think a great many more items in the bill should have been stricken out than have been, but I shall not as to some of them at this time make any question.

This appropriation of $30,000 at some time could profitably be made. Beginning some 12 or 15 years ago the subject of pellagra was investigated. In southern Europe, and especially in portions of Italy and the Balkan Provinces, it was charged that the cause of pellagra was the use of corn products. That charge caused a very considerable diminution in the export trade in the various corn products. The investigation, begun by the States and prosecuted under some of the health officers of the General Government, was not only with a view of stopping the ravages of the disease, but of fixing its cause, so that it might not be charged against harmless food products. The investigation really had both purposes in view.

I know in a good many foreign markets the claim is made that corn products are the cause of this disease, that the European victims of it are chargeable to that source. At some proper time, although I am in favor of leaving this item out at present, I shall be glad to support some item for this purpose.

It is said that undernutrition is the cause of pellagra. I do not think the cause has been discovered, so far as I have been able to ascertain, unless it has been discovered within the last 90 days. Undernutrition is sometimes one of the incidents of the cause of the disease. It is said that eating musty foods, flour that is heated or which has been kept in moldy places where it has been rendered unfit for consumption, that various forms of food grains that have become moldy or have spoiled, not where they are perfectly inedible but where they ought not to be used, are the causes. It generally is found in institutions where a large number of poorly nourished persons are kept or elderly persons whose systems of nutrition or digestive tracts have become impaired. The disease is not found usually among the vigorous or the young. It is generally found among middle-aged or elderly persons who are living under some unfavorable conditions.

As I have stated, at one time we made the investigation under State authority to discover the cause, and communicated with a great many authorities in this country and in Europe, but found no consensus of opinion as to any certain cause. The matter is an open question; yet it ought to be ascertained in the interest of patients who are suffering and in the interest of the markets for our farm products. At this time, however, I favor leaving the item out on the ground of economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee for a moment, I desire to say that I was called out of the Chamber for a short time, and during my absence the item found on page 35, line 19, was reached. The appropriation contained in that paragraph is increased from $50,000 to $100,000. I should like the chairman of the committee to consent that that amendment may be reconsidered, and after we have passed upon the other amendments I shall offer an amendment to it to strike out one or two paragraphs on that page.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. KING. I shall not ask to return to it at present, but shall address myself to it and make a motion to strike out the entire item later in the proceedings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote whereby the amendment referred to by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was agreed to is, without objection, reconsidered and the item passed over for the present. The question now is on the amendment of the committee at the top of page 36 proposing to strike out the paragraph from line 1 to line 3. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. DIAL. I call for a division, Mr. President.

The question being put, on a division the amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 36, after line 14, to insert:

That on or before December 1, 1919, the heads of the War, Navy, Interior, Treasury, and Agricultural Departments shall report to Congress a plan for the consolidation of the various health divisions and bureaus of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 38, after line 23, to insert:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to pay additional compensation to the engine-room forces of the sewage pumping station and the water department pumping station in the District of Columbia and there is hereby appropriated for said purpose the sum of $12,000, payable one-half from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half from any moneys in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 13, after the words "in all" to strike out "$20,100" and insert "$23,000," so as to make the clause read:

Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum: For general repairs and for additional construction, including labor and material for each and every item connected therewith, $5,100; for expenses of heat, light, and power required in and about the operation of the hospital, $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; in all, $23,000, to be expended under the direction of the Superintendent of the Capitol, and paid, one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half out of the Treasury of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Federal Board for Vocational Education," on page 41, line 4, after the word "amended," to strike out "by the act approved February 26, 1919"; in line 8, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000"; and in line 9, after the words "shall be," to strike out "in addition to the sum of $2,000,000 appropriated in the said act: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, not more than 20 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation in excess of $3,000 each per annum, and not more than 30 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation from $2,500 to $3,000, inclusive, per annum," and insert "in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918," so as to make the clause read:

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, $6,000,000, which shall be in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask for an explanation as to the increase of this appropriation from $4,000,000 to $6,000,000 for the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is not an increase. If the Senator will notice the language, there are two amounts stricken out, one of $4,000,000 and one of $2,000,000, and the appropriation of $6,000,000 replaces those two.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that this entire amendment is simply to carry out laws which have already been passed. It is true that the bill passed the other day by the Senate and also passed by the House the day before yesterday has not been signed by the President, but no doubt it will be, and this provision is also intended to carry out the provisions of that proposed law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I wish to ask him a question in regard to striking out lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. The Senator recalls that the Senate a few days ago, in connection with a bill for vocational education, which the House has since passed, incorporated a limitation as to salaries. It seems to me the same kind of limitation ought to be also incorporated in this bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that that will have attention; but this is the condition: As the Senator knows, the provisions in the paragraph are designed to cover the original vocational education act and also similar acts of legislation which have since been passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, but I was referring to the limitation as to salaries.

Mr. WARREN. There have been three bills passed, the last one having been passed within a few days. There were five million and a half dollars carried in the military bill for a similar purpose. Then in the sundry civil bill, as it came from the House, $4,000,000 were provided for the original law for vocational rehabilitation in addition to the $2,000,000 carried under the act approved February 26, 1919. Then a bill was passed by the Senate a few days ago, in charge of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], which has to be provided for. This was a special bill and carried $6,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. WARREN. That bill, of course, embodied the limitation as to the salaries of employees. It went over to the House, but it seems that the Committee on Appropriations of the House had no notice of it; the bill went into the basket in the usual way; it came up, and was passed late and hurriedly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was it passed with the salary limitation in it?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. That threw it all into chaos; and, in order to straighten it out, we have taken the lines stricken through out of the bill, so that we can compose the three measures, apply the restrictions that were intended, and appropriate the necessary amounts all together, as should be done; because otherwise we would have two separate organizations, with officers for each, and the money would be expended in two different quarters.

This has had the approval of the Senator from Iowa, who had charge of the other bill on its passage through the Senate. He is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and was present when we adopted this amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator is absolutely correct about that, and it is a very proper thing to be done. I am not calling attention to the $4,000,000 and the $2,000,000 and the $6,000,000 appropriation. I understand in regard to that; but, as I recall, the act that was passed a few days ago, known as the Smith-Kenyon bill, which was in charge of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. KENYON], there was a limitation as to salaries.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, the Senate committee has stricken out the limitation as to salaries in this provision, with the result, as it seems to me, if this amendment is agreed to, that we would have one class of salaries for those who are engaged in carrying out the last act passed and a wholly different set of salaries as to those who are carrying out the original law.

Mr. WARREN. The very opposite is the case. The very difficulty of which the Senator is speaking is what we propose to avoid. We propose, by striking this language out, to get the matter before the conferees and have all the bills together and show in the result of the conference exactly what is intended.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely satisfactory. I can understand the reason for that. The Senator says, then, as I understand, that he is going to straighten the matter out in conference, so as to put in the limitation the Senate has already provided in the other measure.

Mr. WARREN. Entirely so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is an appropriation "in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act approved July —, 1919," amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, but the limitation contained in that act is stricken out.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not necessary in this amendment. This is merely an appropriation, and the provision incorporated in this bill will not interfere with the law at all. Whatever the law contains will stand, but this is in lieu of the appropriation made by the act referred to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. KING. In view of the statement just submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the chairman of the committee, I am somewhat in doubt with regard to this provision. My recollection is that the first bill creating the vocational rehabilitation board called for $2,000,000. Then a bill was passed authorizing the board to rehabilitate wounded and disabled soldiers. That called for a large appropriation, my recollection being that it was substantially $4,000,000. Then the bill passed the other day, known as the Smith-Kenyon bill, which authorizes the vocational board to go into the States and take charge of everybody who has some organic disease or any physical ailment whatever and rehabilitate such individuals, called for an appropriation the first year of $500,000. The bill as it was reported appropriated $200,000 for the services of employees, but, on motion, that was amended so as to provide an appropriation of only $150,000 for that purpose. I am not certain whether this is intended to cover those three appropriations called for in those three bills.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will notice page 4, lines 16, 17, and 18, he will find that the appropriations contained here are "in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act approved July —, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918." The act of June 27, 1918, is the original act for the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation.

Mr. KING. With respect to the soldiers?

Mr. SMOOT. That had reference to the soldiers alone. The reason the date is not put in is that the bill, although passed by both the House and the Senate recently, has not yet been signed by the President. This appropriation is in lieu of the appropriation carried by that bill.

Mr. KING. I understand that; but then the Vocational Board, as I understand the Senator now, would have an appropriation in all of a sum aggregating more than the $6,000,000 carried by this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that in the aggregate the amount is $11,500,000, as I remember, including the appropriation in the Army bill. That will be the aggregate amount for this purpose.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator whether or not, in view of the evidence before the committee, such a large sum is warranted?

Mr. SMOOT. The difficulty is that the appropriation of $5,500,000 has already passed Congress, and this appropriation is in lieu of one as mentioned, and therefore we can not change it. The action of Congress has already settled the fact that we must provide the appropriations contained in this provision.

I agree with my colleague that the $11,500,000 is an extreme amount to be expended for this purpose within the time limit; but that has been decided upon. The question now is to provide the appropriation for it.

Mr. KING. I will ask my colleague whether or not, in any of the bills dealing with this subject, provision has been made to determine the compensation of the employees and limiting the amount which is to be paid to one or to all?

Mr. SMOOT. If the House agrees to the provision that was put into the bill by the Senate, and the conferees agree to that, if there is a conference—and I think there will be, because I think amendments were made in the House—there would be a limitation as to the amount of salaries; but in the original act there was no provision providing a limitation for salaries; and if the conferees do not agree to the amendment offered on the floor of the Senate and agreed to by the Senate, and that goes out, then there would be no limitation on the salaries.

Mr. KING. If my colleague will permit me, the amendment to which he refers—one which I think I offered—is limited to the appropriation of $200,000 carried in the last bill, known as the Smith-Kenyon bill, and would not extend to the activities of the board in the expenditure of the two other amounts.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true; but the reason why the committee struck out the provision of the House bill was that, as the Senator said in the beginning, they wanted the matter to go to conference, because if there is any provision on the subject in the bill that passed here the other day they ought at least to be the same. This provision of the House is not the same provision that was passed by the Senate, and that question will be taken up, of course, in conference.

Mr. KING. I want to suggest to the chairman of the committee and those who act as conferees that this entire subject ought to be dealt with, because the Senate has indicated what its purpose and desire is with respect to these appropriations. The Senate has clearly indicated that it desires limitations placed upon these appropriations and the amounts paid for compensation, and a limitation with respect to the appropriation of $150,000 only would not be all that the Senate desires.

I certainly hope the conferees will see that a comprehensive provision is inserted in the final bill dealing with the entire subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Federal Trade Commission," on page 42, line 5, after the word "act," to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$900,000," so as to make the clause read:

For all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Trade Commission in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including personal and other services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, supplies and equipment, law books, books of reference, periodicals, printing and binding, traveling expenses, per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed $4, newspapers, foreign postage, and witness fees and mileage in accordance with section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission act, $900,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I hope very much that upon further consideration the chairman of the committee will not insist upon the amendment here proposed, which is to reduce the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission from $1,000,000, as provided by the House, to $900,000. I think a very little history in connection with this matter may be of value.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a moment? It seems that they have had more money than they wanted to use, and this very bill carries back into the Treasury $300,000 that was not used last year. The $900,000 seemed to be all if not more than they could use this year, and hence the cut.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the committee in some way or other has been misinformed with regard to this matter. As I understand, the Federal Trade Commissioners were not heard before the committee, and they were not heard because they had been led to believe that the appropriation made by the House would not be reduced. Their showing before the House committee was very full and complete and indicated very clearly that if the commission was to do the work which probably would be required of it during the coming year a million dollars, at least, would be necessary.

The reference by the Senator from Wyoming to the refund has a little history, too. Toward the close of the last session, when this bill was before the committee of the House, a member of the Federal Trade Commission was before that committee and said to the committee that in his judgment a refund of $300,000 could be provided for; that is, that the commission would not spend its present appropriation by $300,000. That was said without reckoning on additional labor required of the board. An investigation was imposed upon the Federal Trade Board by the request of the Executive, and it turns out that on account of this additional work there is but $200,000 to be refunded; and it would be an idle thing to provide for a refund of $300,000 when there is but $200,000—to be exact, I think it is $207,000—in the appropriation yet unexpended. I intend to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming, when we reach that point, that the bill be amended in that respect so as to provide for a refund of but $200,000, because it is utterly impossible for the commission to refund $300,000 when it has expended all but $200,000 of its present appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been unable yet to see how it is possible for the Federal Trade Commission to expend $100,000 after their letter agreeing to turn over to the Treasury $300,000. It lapses on the 30th of June. They could not make any investigation that is going to cost $100,000 between the time they wrote that letter and the 30th day of June, and it seems to me that they must come here and admit that they have made a mistake

or else they do not want the action taken by the committee for some other reason. The Senator must admit that they can not spend the money by June 30.

Mr. CUMMINS. What money?

Mr. SMOOT. The $100,000 that the Senator is talking about.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why, certainly not. The money has already been spent. There is but $207,000 remaining of the appropriation for the present year. It is not pretended that between now and the 1st of July the $100,000 will be spent, and I assume that the Senator from Utah does not mean to imply that the money has been wrongfully expended.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the showing before the House was that they had $300,000 to turn back into the Treasury of the United States. The contention of the "Senator from Utah" is that from that time it has been impossible for them to spend $93,000 more than they anticipated.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, that is all I claimed.

Mr. CUMMINS. But does the Senator from Utah want Congress to require the Federal Trade Commission to return $300,000 when it has but $200,000 on hand?

Mr. SMOOT. No; but the "Senator from Utah" would like to have the Federal Trade Commission explain where the $93,000 has gone.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Federal Trade Commission came or tried to come before the Committee on Appropriations and explain that very thing, and they did not get an opportunity to do it. I do not want even to suggest that the opportunity was wrongfully refused.

Mr. SMOOT. There was no refusal made.

Mr. CUMMINS. But a member of the Federal Trade Commission has just said to me that he went to the room of the Committee on Appropriations, asking to see the chairman of the committee. The chairman was so occupied that it seemed impossible to secure a hearing at that time; and the facts were presented, as I am told, to some employee of the committee, with the understanding that they should be communicated to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I know the Senator will yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Of course the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has a right to expect that every time the committee makes a cut in anything that goes in an appropriation bill the committee is going to be blamed. That we take as a matter of course. On the floor of the Senate larger amounts are usually insisted upon, and everybody wishes to increase what the chairman and the committee may wish to allow; and yet the most common criticism of the day, on the floor and in the cloakrooms and in the newspapers, is against the liberality of the committees, and especially the chairmen.

What the Senator says about this matter I recognize as being almost ex cathedra; but as to the hearing, it will be remembered that this bill was one that failed last year, and that to-day is the 27th day of June. We were in a hurry. We held the hearings and listened to all the persons that wanted to come before us in time. When the gentleman from this commission came to us the subcommittee had nearly finished this bill—not only this item, but all the balance of it. We could not then reopen the hearings without consenting to hear at least 50 or 75 people on small and large things who could have come in time, but who wanted to come before us then.

As to this $900,000 item, representing a reduction of $100,000 from the $1,000,000, I, as one Senator, am only too ready to correct that if we have made a mistake. As to the $300,000 that they are to turn over, that we have passed as it came from the House. If the Senator is certain that that ought to be cut down, when we come to it, I shall not antagonize it. It can be cut down so that the item can go to conference, and in the conference we can hear not only from the Senator but from those who know what the expenses are up to the end of the month, because the end of the month will be here by that time.

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as the refund is concerned, I really did not intend to speak of that until a later time. There is an absolutely sound explanation for the mistake that has been made, and I do not charge or even imply in any way that the Committee on Appropriations failed to give the commission a hearing.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, I understand that; but, after the remark of the Senator, I thought it was well to let the RECORD record the reason why the committee had to proceed with some speed.

Mr. CUMMINS. I recognize that, and I am not complaining of it. I refer again, however, to the fact that before the House committee there was a hearing. The explanation has been made with regard to the refund in the House; but there was an error or an oversight with regard to the item in the action of the House committee; that is all. I do not care anything about entering into that phase of the subject. I know the gentlemen who compose the Federal Trade Commission. I know that they are high-minded, honorable, honest, faithful, and efficient public servants; and I assume that no one will even harbor in his mind the thought that one penny of the money has been wrongfully or improperly expended.

But I come now to this amendment. I understand the desire of the Senator from Wyoming and all other Senators to reduce the expenditures of the Government; but we must be very careful in our discrimination. I know something about the work of the Federal Trade Commission. It happens to be in that field in which I have been especially interested in times past. I believe that if the appropriation is reduced to $900,000, the board will not be able to do all of the work which it ought to do. I think it is performing a most valuable service for the people of this country; and in the coming days of reconstruction—reconstruction of all kinds, not only relating to railways but relating to all industries—there will be no function of the Government more essential than the Federal Trade Commission in bringing to the attention of Congress and the public those facts which are necessary in order to enable us to understand just the conditions which surround us, and which must be met, and successfully met.

I concede that the Federal Trade Commission, if you give it but $900,000, will, of course, go on and do the very best it can with that appropriation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I only warn you that if the appropriation is reduced there will be some of the things undone which you will think after the year is over ought to have been done. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I have given some little attention to the Federal Trade Commission and its activities during the past year. I have discovered that some of the work which it performed had theretofore been performed by other agencies of the Government and that some of the work which it performs is now being performed by other agencies of the Government. One concrete case: It did a great deal of work in ascertaining the cost of metalliferous production, in ascertaining the cost of the production of raw ore from the mines as well as its reduction in the smelters. That work theretofore had been done by the Bureau of Mines and is now performed by the Bureau of Mines, and it is my information that some of the employees of the Federal Trade Commission engaged in that sort of work are now performing the same work with the Bureau of Mines.

In other words, the functions of this commission were largely increased during the war, and with that augmentation of work by it, it failed to expend by nearly $300,000 the appropriation which was made. Manifestly, the war being over, and the commission getting down to its normal activities, its work will be considerably less during the coming year than it was during the past year. Therefore this appropriation ought to be very much less than it was during the past year.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know the standpoint from which the Senator from Utah looks upon all these matters, and I have some sympathy with him if he understandingly and discriminatingly attempts to prevent useless work. But I have no sympathy whatever with him or with any other Senator who is attempting in this vital time to prevent the performance of duties which will be essential in the work which Congress has before it in the coming months. I can only say that I believe $1,000,000 is not more than enough to enable the commission to do the work which we will all agree is necessary work for the country.

With regard to the duplication of labor, the Senator from Utah will remember that all such work as he mentioned was performed by the Federal Trade Commission at the request or command of the President of the United States, and the commission is not to be criticized because it obeyed a command or yielded to a request coming from that source. So far as I am concerned, I think its work in those respects has been exceedingly valuable and that the President was entirely warranted and justified in asking it to do what it did do.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I know a number of persons employed in the Federal Trade Commission have separated themselves from that service because there was nothing for them to do, and I believe work was devolved upon that agency which other agencies of the Government were more competent to perform and there was an unnecessary duplication of work, and if you continue these large appropriations there will be additional duplication of work. This commission has done work which the Census Bureau could have done, and did, and work that was done by the Bureau of Mines and other agencies and bureaus and instru-

mentalities of the Government. The trouble is we are getting so now that we must have a commission, bureau, agency, or Government instrumentality to advise us upon the most ordinary things of life.

Mr. CUMMINS. I recognize, as I said before, the view of the Senator from Utah. I think if his view were carried out, the Government of the United States would shrink into absolute insignificance and would abandon a very large part of the important work in which it is now engaged. I do not sympathize with that view at all. I think the Government must keep pace with the development of the times. The things which individuals can not do the Government must do, and those things will continue to increase and multiply as the years go on.

The citizen who is not willing to clothe his Government with sufficient power and authority and means to answer the needs of the people will just to that extent destroy efficient government in the United States.

But I have said vastly more about this matter than I intended to say. I wanted to be recorded upon it. I have a pride in the Federal Trade Commission; I do not conceal it. I was somewhat instrumental in organizing it. I believed it was needed and I think it has justified its existence, and I have met every year an effort to cripple its activities and destroy its usefulness. I am not saying that this particular reduction has any such motive behind it. I only say that that will be its effect. I say that the provision made in the House, which was made after a full and complete hearing and after the commission had laid before the House committee the future as it appeared to the commission, is a proper one, and I think that the Senate, without any hearings at all, ought not to reduce the item simply in pursuit of the theory of economy. If that is a good theory, then we might reduce all these appropriations by 25 per cent or 50 per cent entirely through the schedule of governmental expenditures. But I know that will not be adopted by those who have given attention to the subject. We must still keep our Government alive and keen and alert and prepared to do all of those things which the people of the United States expect it to do.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Appropriations Committee proposed this amendment to the Senate. I want first to say that while the effect may be in a different direction, whatever may be the motive, I have no desire to charge the Appropriations Committee with anything but the most lofty purpose and motive. But the fact does remain almost without an exception throughout the bill that various departments and bureaus and offices of the Government have been increased by the amendments of the Senate Appropriations Committee. There are two notable exceptions that stand out. One is the Federal Trade Commission and the other is the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission has been by the Senate committee eliminated practically and wiped off the map, and the Federal Trade Commission has its appropriation reduced in two respects, and in every case without an opportunity to be heard.

It is said this will go to conference and we will investigate it. Let us see, Mr. President. Does the Senate or the Congress of the United States want to legislate in that way? Would it not be more logical if they intended to change the bill, if those hearings were had, before the Senate committee, and then let the Senate pass on it rather than arbitrarily without any hearing and, as I believe, without just reason reduce the amount and then have a hearing before the conference committee and thus usurp the functions of Congress itself?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator must not in his enthusiasm forget that the Senate Appropriations Committee is merely recommending to the Senate what they may do. It is entirely for the Senate itself to determine whether it shall conform to the recommendations of the committee or not. Of course the Senator must know that with the tremendous amounts which we have appropriated during the war and the amount of work that has fallen upon the different bureaus with the close of the war the labors of many of these bureaus must now or soon become less and our expenses must become less, unless we intend to continue the taxation we have and even increase it. I know the Senator does not want to do that. So I say the subcommittee and the committee, after full hearings, undertook to fulfill their duty under the law and to lay the matters before the Senate, and it is open, of course, to their approval or disapproval as to each item.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course I recognize that the Senator from Wyoming has correctly stated the parliamentary situation, but I say to him, or any other Senator, that an amendment which comes into the Senate made by the Appropriations Committee has behind it an influence that is almost irresistible in this body. The Senator from Wyoming knows, and every other Senator knows, that right now half the seats in the Senate Chamber are vacant, and if we had a roll call and the bells were rung and the Members came in, without hearing the debate and perhaps without sufficient time to understand intelligently what the real question is, the query with them would be, "What does the committee want? Stand by the committee." Technically every word the Senator from Wyoming says is true, and yet he does not deny that the proposition which they make in the shape of an amendment as a recommendation to the Senate to reduce this appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission has been made without giving the Federal Trade Commission an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr THOMAS. Is not the same true of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; the same is true of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. THOMAS. Which is given no appropriation at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Their appropriation is entirely cut off.

I want Senators to remember that any ordinary person, in taking the bill and going through it, will see that the Senate committee amendments have been passed on right along almost without exception and increases made, and the amounts necessarily increased, I concede, and when it comes to these two items—the Federal Trade Commission and the Tariff Commission—a reduction is made in one case so that it will blot it off the map if it is agreed to by Congress and put into the law. What will be the idea that the ordinary citizen of the country will get? If we want to abolish one of these commissions, let us do it openly and bravely and without any camouflage. Instead of crippling it, even if you do it innocently and with a laudable desire to reduce the expenses of the Government, let us come out, if we want to take that position, and simply deny it any appropriation, kill it at one stroke and not strangle it by degrees.

Mr. President, since this bill has been reported I have heard expressions from many Members of this body saying, in substance, that is the way to get rid of these two commissions—do not appropriate for them. That is one way to do it. Let us not appropriate for the Federal Trade Commission and the Tariff Commission and then their activities are ended. That is true. But the country is going to know it. The Federal Trade Commission has been very active. It has done, in my judgment, a great work, and I am not going to question the patriotism or the honesty or the wisdom of the man who does not agree with me on that subject. He has a right to that opinion; he has a right to believe the commission ought to be abolished if he wants to. But I believe the people of the country have a great deal of confidence in the investigations which have been made by the Federal Trade Commission. They have found it necessary in the performance of their duty to investigate some of the greatest corporations and most powerful financial institutions in the country. They have exposed profiteering as no other commission or body of men in the United States has exposed it. Of course no commission or no set of men could do that kind of work without bringing down upon their heads condemnation from all quarters of the country of the particular interests whose profits they are exposing and whose profits their work is affecting. The great common people of the country are, in my judgment, behind the Federal Trade Commission, and they are not going to look with favor upon any Congress that interferes with their activities as long as they go on as they have been going. In the friendliest spirit and in the best of motives I want to warn the Senate that they can not, in my humble judgment, break down either one of these commissions without bringing upon the heads of Congress the condemnation of a vast majority of our people.

I have, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, come in contact with some of the work of the Federal Trade Commission. I know a great deal about the work that they did in perhaps one of their greatest activities—the investigation of the packers. I know that all over the country organizations of farmers and consuming societies, women and men, have been studying the report and the answers that have been made in that record, and they are alive to the situation which was exposed by the Federal Trade Commission in that great investigation. I do not believe the Senate ought to approve, and I do not believe the country will approve the action of the Senate if the Senate does approve, this amendment of the committee.

It is said, as one of the reasons why it has been recommended, that the Federal Trade Commission did not use all the money that was appropriated for their use last year. That ought to be a recommendation in favor of their honesty and their economy.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Nebraska remember the amount appropriated last year?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it was $1,500,000.

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriation for last year was $1,500,000, and the Senator knows why that amount was appropriated. There were specific reasons given why it should be done. The war was on and they had certain work which they wanted to accomplish. The commission itself did not ask for more than $1,000,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I simply want to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska and the attention of the Senate to the fact that last year the appropriation was $1,500,000, of which the board has spent about $1,300,000. The House reduced the appropriation from $1,500,000 to $1,000,000, and it would seem to me that that was a very fair and proportionate reduction, and the Senate committee seemed to have reduced it to $900,000 without any reason at all.

Mr. NORRIS. None as far as I can see.

Mr. President, when interrupted I was speaking of the argument which is made in favor of refusing this appropriation. According to the estimates of last year the commission did not use all the money that was appropriated for it, and therefore it is urged that we should cut down the appropriation.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator advise us as to the amount of the surplus the commission have on hand?

Mr. NORRIS. They have $200,000 on hand, and in another place in the bill they are required to put back into the Treasury $300,000, which is quite a difficult thing to do as a matter of fact.

Mr. POMERENE. That is, $300,000 after the $200,000?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. That matter is not before the Senate now, but when the proper time comes, if some other Senator does not move to do so, I shall move to strike out "$300,000" and to insert "$200,000." That is not in the committee amendment, and it will be necessary for a separate amendment to be offered to do that. It can not be done now because we are only considering committee amendments.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the Senate to get the impression that the Federal Trade Commission have asked for a million and a half dollars this year or that Congress has refused to grant them what they have asked. The estimate that came from the Treasury Department at the request of the Federal Trade Commission was not for $1,500,000 this year. The estimate sent to the House amounted to $1,945,000. I derived the impression from what the Senator said that Congress had reduced the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission from $1,500,000 to $1,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I did not say that. Nobody has claimed that the Federal Trade Commission was asking $1,500,000; but I did say that the appropriation made by the House was a reduction of $500,000 from the appropriation made last year.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I shall yield in just a moment. I want to proceed a little further in the matter which the Senator from Utah mentioned.

The House of Representatives reduced the appropriation from the amount of the estimate and the Senate committee now proposes to reduce it $100,000 more. Now I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is just on that point that I desire to call attention to the fact that after the reconvening of Congress there is no intimation in the hearings before the House committee that the Federal Trade Commission appeared at all, but in the March proceedings there is a report of an appropriation at the hearings for the Federal Trade Commission. It seems that the House allowed the $1,000,000 that is carried in this bill plus the $300,000 which was alleged to have been carried over.

Mr. NORRIS. No; the Senator from South Carolina is wrong about that, I think.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The point I want to make is this——

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is clear that the Senator is wrong. The House did not reappropriate the $300,000; it ordered it turned into the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I was just examining the record. As I understand, there was a million and a half dollars appropriated last year, and now the House has appropriated $1,000,000. If this $300,000 was carried over from the million and a half dollars, then, as the Senator says, it was covered into the Treasury and will not be available. Do I understand that is now the status?

Mr. NORRIS. That is the status. It will not be available.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So that if the million dollars in the House provision should obtain that would be all that the Federal Trade Commission will have to operate upon in lieu of one million and a half dollars?

Mr. NORRIS. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I understood the Senator from Utah to say that there was about $300,000 carried over, and that conveyed the impression to my mind that that would be available to supplement the million dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah never stated that.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Utah has not made that contention, for it is not true.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from South Carolina desires to get that clear, because it would largely determine his attitude toward this amendment if the $300,000 that is covered into the Treasury will not be available to supplement the million dollars here provided. It seems to me that a million dollars is the very least that the Federal Trade Commission could possibly get along with.

Mr. NORRIS. I will make the point perfectly clear if the Senator from South Carolina has any doubt about it. If he will take the bill and turn to page 209, down to line 20, and follow me, he will see just what happens to the $300,000, which, as a matter of fact, is only $200,000. On page 209, line 20, the bill reads:

SEC. 7. That the following portions of the unexpended balances of appropriations for the fiscal year 1919 for the support of the various services, as set forth in this section, shall be covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act, namely.

Then follows a list, and in that list, on line 4, on page 210, is "Federal Trade Commission, $300,000."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I see.

Mr. NORRIS. As I stated before, and as the Senator from Iowa explained, the House committee arrived at that sum of $300,000 at a time when the Federal Trade Commission supposed it would have that sum to turn back to the Treasury.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment; let me finish this. As a matter of fact, after they had conveyed the information to the House committee that the commission would have $300,000 at the end of the year to turn back, and they had made their estimates according to the work they had mapped out, they were given a great amount of extra work to do which consumed practically $100,000 of that money.

Senators will remember that under the law the Federal Trade Commission may be put into action upon any particular line by a simple order of the President, and also that there are a great many things which the President has found it desirable for them to do, and the necessary orders having been given requiring them to do such work they have consumed $100,000 of the $300,000. So they now have in their hands $200,000, and will have on the 1st of July that sum unexpended.

As I have said, when we reach that place in the bill I do not believe there will be any objection to striking out "$300,000" and inserting "$200,000," because it is physically impossible for the commission to turn back $300,000 when they have only $200,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee will not contend against a proper amendment of that kind. Now, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, I desire to say that the committee has done its duty and placed this matter before the Senate. I am not going to continue the argument at all, but I am perfectly willing that it shall go to the Senate without any further discussion of the point.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, we on this side of the Chamber are unable to hear the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the request of the Senator from Wyoming is simply a polite suggestion that I give way and stop talking and permit the Senate to vote. I was going to do that just as soon as I could.

Mr. WARREN. I stated that so far as the committee was concerned I was perfectly willing that the matter should come to a vote now.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, quite a while ago when I was interrupted I was discussing the argument that the Federal Trade Commission ought to have its allowance reduced because it was so economical last year that it turned back to the Treasury some of the money that was appropriated for it. I think we ought to give them a chromo; that ought to be a

reason why we should trust a commission which will do that with the funds of the Treasury which have been placed in their hands.

You must remember that no man can tell just what the activities of the Federal Trade Commission are going to be. They may be called upon by the Senate or by the House or by the President to go into anything; they may have to employ 100 or 200 men a month from now, and they may be able to discharge them in 30 days after they have employed them. It is one of the bureaus of the Government about which no one can tell in advance what its activities may be under the law that created it. They have very often to hire experts, and to get them wherever they can, the best that can be had, because their work is criticized everywhere, and it is necessary that they should be very careful. I think their record will show that they have handled the funds of the Treasury very carefully. That is shown by the fact that they have been able to turn back $200,000 of the appropriation. For that reason, and in view of the fact that the nature of their activities must necessarily be uncertain, it seems to me we ought to be willing to appropriate for them a liberal sum, knowing from past experience that they will handle it judiciously and turn back what is not expended.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the amendment of the committee may be rejected.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished chairman of the committee that he is willing to have this appropriation continued and approved as it came from the House; but I can not refrain from expressing a word of commendation for the work which has been done by the Federal Trade Commission.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and several other members of the Interstate Commerce Committee, including myself, gave a great deal of thought to the Federal Trade Commission act, and it is one of the pieces of legislation of which I am very proud. I think the Federal Trade Commission is doing a great work. While it may be that there will be less of certain kinds of work to be done during the coming year than during the past year, there will be an increase in other work. When it comes to such questions as coal and steel and the activities of the meat packers of the country, it may be true that all of us can not approve all that has been done, but they have been of very valuable assistance to the Government and to the public.

We must bear in mind also the fact that the public, in my judgment, is not fully familiar with the functions of this commission when it comes to the investigation of unfair trade practices, but as the country becomes better acquainted with it they will resort to the Federal Trade Commission to settle their trade disputes rather than go to the courts of the country and subject themselves to the law's delay.

Let me also call the attention of Senators to the fact that at the last session of the Congress we added to the work of the Federal Trade Commission by the provisions of the export trade bill. Bear in mind that we have authorized the organization of export trade associations to deal exclusively in our export trade. I can understand how there may be controversies arising as to whether these associations are dealing exclusively in export trade or in domestic trade, and, in my judgment, the Federal Trade Commission is going to have a vast deal of very important work to do in order to keep these associations in line with the spirit of the law authorizing their creation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Ohio will remember that in the export-trade act the agreements which are to be made, whether by way of incorporation or by way of association, are all to be laid before the Federal Trade Commission and must receive its approval before the association or incorporation can go into business.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Iowa is entirely right; and I would have preferred that the Appropriations Committee had come in here with an increase of this appropriation rather than a decrease.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. Does he know who the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission is now?

Mr. POMERENE. I think Mr. Colver is the chairman now.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know where he is at this time?

Mr. POMERENE. I do not; I am not my brother's keeper in that respect.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am not his keeper either, but I believe I have some accurate information about where he is. Unless he has returned recently, he is in England. When the Senator speaks of the fostering care of the Federal Trade Commission on our export trade, I will say that I believe I will have adequate proof to present here that instead of promoting our export trade he is destroying it in England by unfriendly comments, by violent speeches reported in English newspapers denouncing certain of our export lines. I think he is paying his traveling expenses across the ocean out of such appropriations as this.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, Mr. President, I have no advices on that subject, and I gather from what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said that he is not entirely certain as to his facts. I have a very high opinion of Mr. Colver; I think he is doing his work as he thinks it ought to be done. I do not know whether he is abroad or not; but if he is abroad, I dare say he is abroad on official business.

Mr. NORRIS. I saw him this morning.

Mr. SMOOT. He has returned from England.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well, then, he is not abroad. But whether every individual connected with the Federal Trade Commission may be doing his duty or not, according to the estimate of certain Senators, does not alter my position with respect to the merits of the commission. If there has been anything wrong done, let us correct that, but let us not destroy the commission itself, for it is just as valuable to the business of this country as are the Federal courts.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word. The Appropriations Committee thought that there was a sentiment in the country that appropriations should be reduced and that the taxpayers of the country really were demanding of Congress that appropriations should be reduced and taxes lowered proportionately. I say now that the appropriations will never be reduced so long as we grant all the appropriations asked for by the departments.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has not this appropriation been reduced 33⅓ per cent compared with the appropriation of last year?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows why the appropriation last year was $1,500,000. That amount was appropriated to the commission upon the plea that a great deal of extra work had been given them to do. There is not, Mr. President, any desire of the commission to reduce the number of employees now under the Federal Trade Commission. Does the Senator know how many employees the Federal Trade Commission has?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know, but I do know that the number has been very greatly reduced. The Senator is not well advised when he suggests that the Federal Trade Commission has the same number of employees that it formerly had, and, of course, with an appropriation of $1,000,000, it will not have the same number of employees that it had with an appropriation of $1,500,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to allow me to read what Mr. Colver says about that very point?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah knows all that Mr. Colver has stated in his testimony before the House.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. This is very startling and is a revelation to me.

Mr. SMOOT. As to the number of employees?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Here is what he says about it. I think this information will be of value if the Senator from Utah will allow me to read it.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. Colver in his testimony states as follows:

> About a year ago when we were here the commission entered into an agreement with this committee—

That was the House committee—

> that the committee try an experiment with us, at our request—that is to say, because of the war conditions, and because we were not able with any exercise of ingenuity or industry to give you even an estimate of what we were going to do—we suggested, and the committee accepted the proposal that you give us a sum of money without any definite allocation as to what it was to be used for, that we were to come back to you if it was not enough and ask for a deficiency and, if too much, turn back what was left, and in any event the next time we came here we were to give you an accounting. Before we go on, if it is agreeable, I can give you a very hasty account of what we have done.
>
> Mr. BYRNES. I wish you would.
>
> Mr. COLVER. The committee set aside for the use of the commission $1,677,500. At the time the armistice was signed last November the commission was expending money at the rate of $2,000,000 a year. At that rate—there was an ascending curve and that was the high point of the commission's activity—we would have had to ask you for about

$300,000 deficiency. Instead we are now prepared to turn back to the Treasury, on last year's appropriation, about $300,000.

The legal work of the commission has not been greatly affected by the war. The economic side of the commission was devoted almost wholly to war work. On the economic side at the time of the signing of the armistice we had 493 employees, and the expense was running at the rate of about $1,200,000 a year. Immediately the armistice was signed reductions were made as rapidly as might be and that has been pulled down now about 20 per cent of the number of employees, to 388 employees, and the expenditures are down to about $890,000 a year. That, however, will drop further and very rapidly now, and will land somewhere in the neighborhood of 250 employees, with an expenditure of $600,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations knew of that testimony. The committee gave $900,000. In the investigation as to the space occupied by the different departments of our Government to-day, we found that that bureau has 384 employees to-day, and it reported to that commission that by January 1 it intended to have 500 employees. Does the Senate want to appropriate more than they said they could get along with, in the face of the fact they are asking here now an additional appropriation to take care of 126 more employees between now and the 1st day of January?

The trouble about this whole thing, Senators, is that we are duplicating work by every department of the Government. The Senator from Ohio says that the Federal Trade Commission has taken into its hands and has been directed by Congress to look after our export trade.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. Just as soon as I get through with this subject I shall be glad to yield. Why, Mr. President, let us examine into the Commerce Department, and we will find requests for appropriations for this very work. That is the work of the Commerce Department. Some of us have stood upon the floor of the Senate and complained bitterly of the appropriations made for the State Department with a view to our encouraging our export trade; and there is duplication in the State Department of the work done in the Commerce Department for this very purpose. Now we are told that appropriations must be made for the Federal Trade Commission in order to take care of our export trade.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, evidently the Senator does not have in mind the provisions of this export trade bill. It provides, with respect to controversies which may occur with regard to the character of the trade, that there shall be investigations and adjudications. The Commerce Department does not look into that branch of the work at all.

Mr. SMOOT. No; nor will this department ever do so, either.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, I am not a prophet.

Mr. SMOOT. Evidently, Mr. President, when an appropriation is cut in the case of any of the commissions or bureaus or departments, within a few minutes after the cut is made somebody knows it has been made. Beginning at 6.30 o'clock this morning I have had representatives come to see me from the departments of the Government, pleading that the cuts that were made in this bill should be reinstated. I say now that there is not a bureau but that, if a reduction is made in the appropriations of that bureau, will find some Senator pleading their case upon the floor. It is the duty of the Appropriations Committee to look into these things. We thought that as to this cut of $100,000 we could go into conference and take the testimony of the members of the commission and, if $1,000,000 is required, give them the million dollars, but, if not, let us save the $100,000, for I tell you now that unless the expenses of this Government are reduced the people of this country are going to hold us responsible for unnecessary waste of the people's money.

Mr. President, the chairman of the committee says he is perfectly willing that this amendment should be rejected. So far as I am concerned, I have said all I care to say; and if that is what the Senate wants to do, let them reject it.

Referring to the question of the $300,000, that came up in the last hours of the consideration of this bill; and, mind you, we did not receive this bill until Wednesday morning, and we must have it passed at any rate by to-morrow, if it is to be passed by the 1st of July. We must remember Congress has been called upon to pass appropriation bills amounting to nearly $3,000,000,000—yes; over $3,000,000,000—within a very few days. We have given all the consideration to the different items that it was possible to give. There may be some mistakes.

I want to say to the Senator from Colorado that so far as the Tariff Commission item is concerned it was stricken out, so that it can go to conference. I say now that the amount of the appropriations for the Tariff Commission right along, year after year, has been about the same. We all know that because of the war, and the unsettled conditions existing in the world, an investigation in Europe or anywhere else to-day would cut very little figure as to what the tariff rates should be in the future; and still is there any reduction in the appropriation? Is there a commission that has ever asked for a reduction? Why, no. If we are going to reduce the expenses of the Government, Congress has got to take the matter into its own hands and reduce them, or I tell you there is not going to be very much reduction in the cost of running the Government.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? He is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and has been for some time. May I ask the Senator if there is a single great supply bill coming over to this body from the House that has not been increased? In some instances I admit that the increase was necessary; subsequent recommendations from the departments and new investigations made it necessary; but in every instance they have been increased, and I think in some instances unjustly. I will ask the Senator if it is not true that almost every one of the great supply bills has been increased, some by a few millions, and others by hundreds of millions?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there never was an appropriation bill that I remember, with the exception of one, since I have been a Member of the Senate, that was reduced from the amount of the House appropriations—just one in all the time that I have been a Senator of the United States. I do not claim that the Senate is to be criticized for that, because after the bill passes the House it becomes public, and then all of the questions involved of requests for increased appropriations that have not been acted upon favorably by the House are presented to the Senate, and they pick up the loose ends, so to speak; and the Senate appropriation bill always carries an amount greater than that of the House.

I do not want the Senate to think for a moment that our action in striking out the provision for the Tariff Commission means that there is not to be an appropriation made for that commission. That is not the intention of the committee; but if we strike out the whole item, the whole question is in conference, and we can then decide as to whether the full amount is required or whether it is not.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator there, with his permission.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the Senator certainly can.

Mr. NORRIS. One of the objections that I made refers to just what the Senator says he proposes to do, not only on this item but on the Tariff Commission item. He says that they were in a big hurry; that they "had" to get this bill out as soon as possible. That is true. I realize that that is so. He says that for that reason the committee struck this out, and the matter will go into conference, and then they will have a hearing. They have struck out the Tariff Commission item also, and that will go into conference, and then they will have a hearing. That is one of the systems of legislation to which I object as a Member of this body—that instead of permitting the hearing to be held by the committee beforehand, so that it can be reported to the Senate, the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Utah and another Senator upon that side, representing the Democrats in this body, will go into a conference committee and have a hearing and legislate for the country. That is not right. Now, that is just what the Senator says he proposes to do.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly right, if conditions were normal.

Mr. NORRIS. It would not take any longer to have a hearing in the first place, before you report the bill, than it will to have a hearing after the bill is passed, and to have the hearing in conference.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it takes not more than half the time, because we have the representatives of the two Houses together, and that is where it is thrashed out.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will not claim, will he, that that is a good way to legislate?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I said the Senator was right in ordinary times; but here we have one more day in which to pass this bill, and we have worked at night on it ever since the bill came into the Senate of the United States on Wednesday. The time of the committee has been given every night to get it into the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not any doubt but that the committee has worked hard; but if the committee wanted to save time and get through so quickly, it could have avoided putting this amendment on, about which it had had no hearing, and that would have avoided all of this discussion.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am concerned, if the discussion will cease, the $400,000 can be restored, and we will consider future appropriations when we have time to make an investigation.

Mr. NORRIS. That is better.

Mr. SMOOT. We have not time now. I want to say to the Senate in closing, though, that I know it will be done sooner or later. Appropriations are piling mountain high in all of the departments; and if you cut the appropriations of any of them by a single dollar you have not only the members of that department but all of the organizations of the country directly interested in the appropriation sending telegrams, not by the dozens but by the hundreds. To prove this it would be only necessary for me to to look at my desk this morning and see the telegrams that I have received about the items in this bill from people who know no more about the appropriation referred to than they do about a last year's bird's nest, and yet demanding that their Senators support the appropriation. We always find an organized propaganda; and if the Senators of the United States can not stand against such, God help the taxpayers of this country!

Mr. NORRIS. Well, He will.

Mr. CUMMINS and Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question? Does the Senator mean to say that there has been a propaganda in the country in reference to this amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think I have had a telegram about this particular one.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has not had a single telegram with regard to this one, has he?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not think so, because the action of the committee was not known until this morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly. I have not, either.

Mr. SMOOT. But I take it for granted that before the day is out we will receive telegrams about it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Utah a question, inasmuch as he has grown so virtuously indignant in regard to this appropriation. How has it happened that the committee have increased the appropriations over the House bill something like $300,000,000? Why did they not reduce the bill below the House bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will tell the Senator why. We have got to take care of the allowances for the families of our soldiers. We have got to take care of paying the compensation to the soldiers. We have got to take care of paying the soldiers their insurance and prepare for carrying out our shipping program. These are the great bulk of the increase in this bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Therefore the Senator does recognize that there are some expenditures of the Government that are entirely right?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no question about that. The Government can not run without any appropriations whatever.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that there is another item of increase of $10,000,000 in this bill for the Cape Cod Canal? That is an item that some people think might wait for a while.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will be good enough, as he always is, to permit me to say a word just here, there have been allusions made on both sides to the fact that bills coming over from the House are changed here and added to. This bill contains thousands of items, and very, very few in number have had any additions made in the Senate. We have accepted the House figures in almost all—probably in 98 per cent—of the items. When, however, you take such items as the $215,000,000 increase here in one item, $13,000,000 in another, $46,000,000 in another, $10,000,000 in another, $3,000,000 in another, and $9,000,000 in another, of course the total is very greatly increased. They are large matters, however, and I will not take the time of the Senator from Colorado now to state what they are. The report will show, and later I may allude to them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the amendment striking out the Tariff Commission appropriation has been drawn into this discussion, I shall say something upon that subject, particularly in view of the fact that the two amendments are of a kindred character.

I share the desires of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] for retrenchment. They are very commendable; but I notice that when it comes to a question of pensions his ideas of retrenchment evaporate. Upon that sort of legislation the Senator seems perfectly willing to throw wide ajar the doors of the Treasury vaults and invite all pensionaries to help themselves.

This bill with others contains an enormous increase to meet the expenses of the war, including care for the soldiers. I am not complaining of that, for it is necessary. I merely emphasize the fact that the Senator's views of economy has its limitations as have my own. But that is here unimportant. Surely the Senator can not mean that the way to secure conference action upon an important provision of the bill is to strike it out altogether. That is one way, but it is not the way that has been taken with a number of other amendments; for example, the Trade Commission item.

The trouble with reference to this sort of legislation has been depicted very graphically by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. Any amendment having behind it the committee report has a great advantage, particularly with Senators who do not attend and listen to the discussion.

When a vote is announced and the bell rings, Senators on both sides of the Chamber, from the cloakroom and from other retreats, enter the Chamber and ask, "How shall we vote to sustain the committee?" They have no information regarding the merits of the subject under discussion, but naturally support the committee.

Generally speaking, it must be confessed that a vote for the committee is apt to be a vote in the right direction. But to defend the amendment upon the ground that it is made in form to bring the matter to the attention and within the jurisdiction of the committee of conference is to assume an untenable position. The purpose is to destroy the commission.

Mr. President, what is the Tariff Commission? Regardless of its personnel, and of possible defects in the law creating it, its mission is to study the tariff, revenue, and economic problems, and secure needed data for the use and benefit of legislators. I do not believe that the average member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the average member of the Senate Committee on Finance knows much, speaking generally, of the details of most subjects asking protection, the amount of duty to be imposed, or whether any amount is required to maintain its existence and do business under competition.

We all have our general ideas and convictions with regard to a protective and a revenue tariff policy. There is a fundamental line of division between the two great parties upon the subject considered academically, politically, and industrially; but tariffs are like the poor—they are always with us. They may be high or they may be low, they may be just or they may be unjust, but the policy is woven into the fabric of our national legislation and necessarily constitutes one source of revenue. The need for information requires that it emanate not from interested sources, not from men who are clamoring for duties or from men resisting the imposition of duties, but from official sources which ought to be, and, generally speaking, are reliable.

It is not a new thing. Many administrations, Republican and Democratic, have recommended the creation of a tariff commission, notably that of Mr. Taft. The Congress then responded by the appointment of a so-called Tariff Board, having comparatively little power and ultimately shorn of their authority and deprived of their existence by this identical process of legislation. That administration asked for something substantial and obtained something highly unsatisfactory. But the board, incomplete as it was, hampered as it was by the limitations upon its authority, performed a great public work and earned the thanks of the Congress for the very thorough investigations and reports they were permitted to make. As one of the members of the Finance Committee having in charge the Underwood bill, I want to pay my tribute of obligation to them. They obtained more satisfactory, reliable information concerning the subjects which they were permitted to analyze and investigate than we could obtain from any other source whatever.

For that reason, Mr. President, I felt that the previous recommendations of administrations to Congress for a tariff commission were well founded, and I became in consequence a convert to the principle. The result was the enactment of legislation creating this tariff commission and defining its duties. It came into being two years ago, and it has endeavored to function as the law required. Its responsibilities were numerous and important. They were required to investigate—

(1) The administration and fiscal and industrial effects of the customs laws of this country now in force or which may be hereafter enacted.

(2) The relations between the rates of duty on raw materials and finished or partly finished products.

(3) The effects of ad valorem and specific duties and of compound, specific, and ad valorem duties.

(4) All questions relative to the arrangement of schedules and classification of articles in the several schedules of the customs law.

(5) The operation of customs laws alike in relation to the Federal revenues and their effect upon the industries and labor of the country.

(6) The tariff relations between the United States and foreign countries.

(7) Commercial treaties, preferential provisions, and economic alliances, including the Paris economy pact and similar organizations and arrangements in Europe.

(8) The effect of export bounties and preferential transportation rates.

(9) The volume of importations compared with domestic production and consumption.

(10) Conditions, causes, and effects relating to competition of foreign industries with those of the United States, including dumping and cost of production.

(11) On special subjects when requested by the President, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Finance Committee of the Senate, or by either House of Congress.

Since this commission was created Congress has enacted possibly four, certainly three, very important revenue laws. The chairman of this commission is Dr. Taussig, as well informed as, if not better informed than, any man in public life upon the problems of a tariff measure. This gentleman, responding to the request of the Senate Finance Committee while considering these measures, brought to them a wealth of information, a large number of valuable suggestions. He collaborated and cooperated with that committee throughout its deliberations, and was largely instrumental in the accomplishment of much that is good and the elimination of much that would have been bad in our existing revenue laws.

This has been a busy commission, Mr. President, since its appointment. I have here a number of reports made by it upon various subjects which it has been requested to examine. Here is a Report on Dyes and Related Coal Tar Chemicals, of 1918, consisting of 127 pages. I will refer to another in a moment. It has given Congress abundant and impartial information upon this great subject, and it is a great subject, Mr. President, requiring the interposition of protective duties of a high standard in order to enable the industry to find a firm footing and foundation in this country and to resist the overwhelming competition of the Germany industry. We had no dye industry here before the war. How many people know that it was strangled to death in its infancy by a combination between German dye and American textile manufacturers, and that every effort made to establish it before the war was resisted by the combined textile manufacturers of the United States. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with abundant experience and information upon everything connected with tariff legislation, will, I am sure, corroborate that statement. That we had no dye industry was due not to Democratic free trade or to Democratic opposition to a living tariff but to the manufacturers interested in the purchase of the finished product. That information has been largely disseminated through the activities of a public commission.

Here is a report of the potash industry, covering 52 pages. Here is another containing information concerning optical glass and chemical glassware, 35 pages; a report upon the brush industry, 76 pages; a report upon interim legislation, 37 pages; Schedule M, Papers and Books, 48 pages; first annual report of the Tariff Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917; The Dyestuffs Situation in the Textile Industries, 1918, consisting of 28 pages; Schedule L, Silk and Manufactures of Silk, a report consisting of 166 pages; The Button Industry, a report consisting of 125 pages; The Surgical Instrument Industry of the United States, a report consisting of 54 pages; a report upon Revision of the Customs Administrative Laws, 1918, consisting of 209 pages; a report regarding trade with Japan during the war, consisting of 147 pages; another upon Dyes and Other Coal-Tar Chemicals, 1918, consisting of 83 pages; second annual report, 1918, consisting of 118 pages; Outline of the Tariff Commission's Work and Plans, a report consisting of 13 pages; Cost of Production in the Sugar Industry, 1919, a report consisting of 55 pages; Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, 1919, a report consisting of 46 pages; a report in 1919 of our reciprocity and commercial treaties, consisting, with the index, of 532 pages; Senate committee print of a report on Free Zones and Ports of the United States, being a letter from the Tariff Commission in compliance with a request of the Senate Committee on Commerce, printed upon paper equivalent in size to that used in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, consisting of 92 pages; the second annual report, 1919, to the Congress.

This commission, Mr. President, has been hard at work, as this large number of very important reports must indicate. I am told, and I have no doubt it is true, that it is the intention of the present Congress to revise the tariff, if possible, upward, if it can. It may be all right, it may be necessary, but, whether necessary or not, must be determined not by the interests of those who are to be benefited by the duties but by Congress legislating for the benefit of the people and in the interest of justice.

Mr. President, I do not believe I overstate the fact when I assert that no single member of the Ways and Means Committe of the House or the Finance Committee of the Senate, having jurisdiction of this great subject, has one-tenth of 1 per cent of the reliable information vouchsafed to them by this commission in their reports upon subjects of vital importance, every one of which is clamoring for protection lest the overwhelming tide of a returning German commerce should sweep them out of existence. We can not depend upon their assurances, their apprehensions, or their cupidity for the truth; we must have some disinterested source of information.

Some complaint has been made because members of the tariff commission, or the greater number of them, have recently visited Europe and at public expense. That is merely to find fault with the commission for doing its duty. Among the subjects they are required to investigate and report upon are the tariff relations between the United States and foreign countries. Of course, there are Members of the Senate——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield in just a moment. There are Members of the Senate doubtless endowed with information and with the ability to study and determine these questions at long range and apply the scientific process of absent treatment to treaties all over the world, but unfortunately an ordinary, every-day commission can not do that. They are obliged to visit those countries to ascertain from both viewpoints, ours and theirs, the effect of the trade systems and tariff regulations upon the commerce between the two countries.

I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 35 of the last report of the commission they show that a large part of this traveling was specially designated by the President for war services and work assigned to them under the Overman law.

Mr. THOMAS. I was about to refer to that, and emphasize that Dr. Taussig has been in France at the elbow of the President and at his direction throughout all the negotiations of the peace treaty, and, whatever may be said to the contrary, the President could not have had a more efficient, capable, and vigorous assistant and expert along all lines of economic negotiation than Dr. Taussig. He is there performing his duty while we are here depriving him of his salary and making it practically impossible for the Tariff Commission to do anything further under the law creating it.

Mr. President, this commission is also under some degree of censure in that it, too, made a refund to the Treasury of $100,000 during one of the years since its creation, and it being one of the war years. I shall not take time to read it, but I ask permission to introduce the letter of the commission dated June 4, 1919, to Mr. GOOD, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations; the letter of February 3 to Senator MARTIN, chairman at that time of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and the letter of January 21 to Senator MARTIN from the commission, calling attention to the proposed legislation then pending in an appropriation bill which failed because of our adjournment without taking action upon it. I suppose these letters were before the present Committee on Appropriations.

Without objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 14, 1919.

Hon. JAMES W. GOOD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In response to the courteous invitation of yourself and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I venture to supplement my personal statement of yesterday on behalf of the tariff commission.

In the act creating the commission the following provision (construed at the time in the debates in Congress as providing for a permanent commission) was embodied:

"SEC. 709. That there is hereby appropriated for the purpose of defraying the expense of the establishment and maintenance of the commission, including the payment of salaries herein authorized, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated the sum of $300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for each fiscal year thereafter a like sum is authorized to be appropriated."

Shortly after the commission's organization, about April 1, 1917, war was declared, and by way of aid to the Government, in response to patriotic and official suggestion, the commission in the fiscal year 1917–18 voluntarily restricted its expenditures to $200,000, returning $100,000 of its appropriation to the Treasury. For like reasons of economy Congress in 1918 limited the commission's appropriation for the present fiscal year to the amount expended under our earlier vol-

untary reduction, and to that extent the expectation and intent of Congress as to the commission's normal expenditures again suffered curtailment.

With the close of the war an essentially different situation was at once presented. The war had directly operated to minimize the importance of most imports and to postpone tariff applications. Tariff problems are already, and are certain more and more hereafter to be, the subject of daily and growing legislative discussion. The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives at this very time is engaged in holding hearings on the conditions in important American industries. The results of the work already done by the commission are at this hour being requested by and furnished to that committee. These results have been obtained through the employment of an increasingly expert staff, which has been steadily engaged in research work in Washington through correspondence and, so far as possible with the limited funds available, through public hearings before the commission and field investigations in this country. A large and varied amount of additional information so assembled is likewise available in the commission's files. It has been collected wholly independent of tariff policies which the commission recognizes continue to be subject solely to congressional determination.

Nothing is more evident than that increasing and far more detailed information calling for more exhaustive research in the wide field of American industries will be required of the commission in the near future. The magnitude of the tasks imposed on this body may be somewhat gathered from the mere enumeration of its chief powers and duties.

The commission is instructed and empowered by law to investigate:

(1) The administration and fiscal and industrial effects of the customs laws of this country now in force or which may be hereafter enacted.

(2) The relations between the rates of duty on raw materials and finished or partly finished products.

(3) The effects of ad valorem and specific duties and of compound, specific, and ad valorem duties.

(4) All questions relative to the arrangement of schedules and classification of articles in the several schedules of the customs law.

(5) The operation of customs laws alike in relation to the Federal revenues and their effect upon the industries and labor of the country.

(6) The tariff relations between the United States and foreign countries.

(7) Commercial treaties, preferential provisions, and economic alliances, including the Paris economy pact and similar organizations and arrangements in Europe.

(8) The effect of export bounties and preferential transportation rates.

(9) The volume of importations compared with domestic production and consumption.

(10) Conditions, causes, and effects relating to competition of foreign industries with those of the United States, including dumping and cost of production.

(11) On special subjects when requested by the President, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Finance Committee of the Senate, or by either House of Congress.

From experience acquired under conditions of scrupulous economy in research work of the past two years, the commission is in duty bound to state that under a restricted appropriation such as that of the year 1918, it will be impossible either to enlarge its force or reasonably to meet all or any considerable portion of the congressional purposes above specified. The overhead expenses of the commission are fixed by law and are proportionately large. The continuing high prices of the war period have distinctly limited beyond the original contemplation of Congress the commission's employing and other expense capacity. Indeed, during the present fiscal year we have been forced to impair our efficiency to a marked extent by reducing salaries and transferring a substantial number of our employees to another department of the Government as a means of keeping within our appropriation. It is indispensable, if the work outlined is to be reasonably done, at once to increase the commission's staff to an effective basis not only for the labors requiring constant attention in Washington, but even more for the immediate promotion of field investigations. Our expert force should be enlarged without delay. Extremely significant, cost, field, and factory investigations already fully planned are entirely dependent on our ability to engage the necessary experts and assign them to their tasks.

Without wishing to be wearisome through detailed specifications, it may be pardonable if we refer to one or two important permanent phases of our duties: First, the investigation of costs and competitive conditions, and, second, the preparation of general tariff information reports for the convenient and up-to-date use of the legislative and executive departments of the Government.

Cost investigations manifestly require the most thorough technical equipment and painstaking accuracy in detail. The difficulties surrounding the correct allocation of such items as capital account, overhead, interest, depreciation, and current expenses, particularly in industries with joint products, are evident and numerous. Standardization is important and accounting skill indispensable. In many industries cost records are unequal and unsatisfactory. Such difficulties in the home field are multiplied in foreign investigation. It is impossible adequately to execute these duties without at times incurring expenses as unexpected as they will be legitimate.

Serviceable reports on the thousands of articles concerning which tariff legislation may at any time be sought likewise demand in increasing degree training and experienced skill. Frequently accurate results can not be obtained without confirmation through field and factory investigations and without far more than familiarity through documents and statistics with conditions of manufacture, trade, and competition. In many cases for dependable reports on the facts in industry months of work by specialists closely applying themselves are required. The ex parte statements of interested persons must be patiently and systematically criticized, analyzed, and corroborated or rejected. Unassailable conclusions must, if possible, be presented. All information must be regularly supplemented and kept up to date. It must be presented in form convenient for ready reference and clear understanding. Such continuous and balanced treatment is called for in the case of articles subject to tariff legislation far too numerous for listing on this occasion.

Without referring to the other duties and powers of the Tariff Commission, we therefore say without hesitation that the reasonable fulfillment of the tasks imposed upon us by Congress not only require an annual appropriation equal to that originally assigned, but make advisable such increase of appropriation as will enable the commission without delay to broaden its investigations and enlarge its usefulness, especially to Congress. For the coming year such an appropriation should not be less than $400,000.

In a separate communication from this commission you have already been furnished a list of the commission's reports hitherto prepared, both published and unpublished. That enumeration will convey a general impression concerning the work already accomplished.

Very respectfully,

_____,
Vice Chairman.

—

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, February 3, 1919.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: The Tariff Commission desires briefly to explain its request for a deficiency appropriation of $100,000 for the fiscal year 1918–19.

Section 709 of the act of September 8, 1916, creating the commission, providing for the appropriation of the sum of $300,000 for the first fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, contains the further clause "and for each fiscal year thereafter a like sum is authorized to be appropriated."

The commission was not organized until April 1, 1917, and it operated under its first appropriation only during three months in the year 1917. For the fiscal year 1917–18 Congress appropriated $300,000, but in response to the general request for economy in governmental expenditures during the war the Tariff Commission deliberately limited its expenses approximately to $200,000, turning the balance into the Treasury. For the fiscal year 1918–19, the war being still in progress, Congress appropriated but $200,000 for the commission's work.

With the signing of the armistice prior to the termination of the first half of the fiscal year, the commission at once proceeded to the urgently necessary expansion of its work, in order to prepare its files and records as adequately as possible for the service of Congress. Simultaneously the commission applied for the deficiency appropriation.

The act creating the commission gives sweeping authority to investigate both the tariff laws of this country, their operation and effect, and foreign tariff relations, including commercial treaties, preferences, alliances, bounties, dumping, and the conditions, causes, and effects of foreign competition, as well as cost of production. It further provides that the commission, by its members or agents, may prosecute its inquiries in the United States or foreign countries. Attention is directed to these broad specifications, because the assumption is occasionally entertained that cost of production is the one subject for investigation in foreign countries within the commission's scope. The act further gives the commission full power to summon witnesses and take testimony, and apparently contemplates extensive conferences and hearings with reference to the conditions in the various industries in the United States.

From the beginning the commission has proceeded systematically to make inquiry and accumulate information for the use of Congress along each of the lines mentioned. It has engaged a highly competent, though limited, staff of experts and assistants. It has held numerous conferences and public hearings. It has investigated many outstanding cases of war disturbances. It has conducted comprehensive inquiries on reciprocity treaties and commercial relations and on the administration of the customs laws. It has begun the accumulation of reliable information with respect to the thousands of articles likely to come within the scope of future tariff legislation. All the work mentioned is of continuing importance and significance; much of it needs constant supplementing to bring it down to date; and the general information is necessarily of such great detail and importance as to require expansion of the staff if it is to be given anything approaching satisfactory range within the time when Congress may require it.

A brief survey of the work already done will be found in the first and second annual reports of the commission. They sufficiently answer the suggestion that the commission has been inactive during the war period. The following are among the printed reports already published:

Interim Legislation.
The Dyestuff Situation in the Textile Industries.
Census of Dyes and Coal-Tar Chemicals, 1917.
Dyes and other Coal-Tar Chemicals, suggesting amendments to Title V of the act of September 8, 1916, to give effect to the intent of Congress therein expressed.
A proposed complete revision of the customs administrative laws of the United States, the first thoroughgoing attempt of this sort since the founding of the Government.
Free Zones in Ports of the United States, in compliance with the request of the Senate Committee on Commerce.
The Glass Industry as Affected by the War.
The Surgical Instrument Industry.
The Brush Industry.
The Button Industry.
Silk and the Manufactures of Silk.

Among other publications and reports of the commission now in the hands of the printer may be mentioned:

Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties, an exhaustive study of the experience of the United States.
Japan's Trade During the War.

The following are some of the other reports of the commission in course of preparation and well advanced toward publication:

Sugar Production, Imports, and Competitive Conditions.
Minor Acids.
Heavy Chemicals.
Cotton Goods.
Cotton Yarns.
Agricultural Products.
Preferential Tariffs within the British Empire.
Foreign Colonial Tariffs.
The Tariff System of Japan.
Industrial Development of Japan Prior to and During the War.
The Tariff System and Trade of China.

The commission also has assembled and is steadily engaged in compiling much unpublished tariff information, several specimens of which are set out in Appendix IV of the commission's second annual report.

It should be added that the commission has furnished the American peace conference commissioners much material provided from the commission's inquiries into foreign tariff systems and commercial relations.

This communication does not aim to specify or even outline all the activities of the commission. Its purpose is simply to bring to the attention of your committee the comprehensive nature of the commission's tasks and plans. On many of the subjects mentioned the com-

mission, acting within the limits of its present appropriation, has been able to make no more than a beginning. Its plans are well matured for comprehensive investigations to be carried through when the needed funds are provided. Without such supplementary support requisite conferences and hearings can not be undertaken; the gathering of information on domestic conditions must be restricted; and inquiry into conditions and expectations abroad, such as the general state of trade, wages, and labor efficiency, the results of foreign embargoes, changes in organization, and Government control of prices, is out of the question.

The commission feels impelled to state frankly to your committee that the limitations now existing are crippling the commission's efficiency and are seriously impairing its ability to satisfy the intent of Congress expressed in the act authorizing the commission's work.

Very respectfully,

F. W. TAUSSIG.

—

$240 INCREASE FOR EMPLOYEES.

JANUARY 21, 1919.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: The Tariff Commission would call to your attention section 6 of the legislative, executive, and judicial bill passed by the House on January 18, 1919.

This section as amended provides that—

"All civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia who receive a total of compensation at the rate of $2,500 per annum or less, except as otherwise provided in this section, shall receive, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, additional compensation at the rate of $240 per annum."

After certain provisos it is declared:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply to the following: * * * Employees paid from lump-sum appropriations in bureaus, divisions, commissions, or any other governmental agencies or employments created by law since January 1, 1916 * * *."

The obvious intent of this exclusion is to prevent payment of the bonus to temporary war emergency commissions and agencies. But the fixing of the limiting date (Jan. 1, 1916) leads to discrimination against the employees of the Tariff Commission, which seems clearly unjust and, as appears on consultation, was not intended.

The act creating the Tariff Commission was approved September 8, 1916. The commission is not an emergency creation, but an independent, permanent agency of the Government. Its legal status is exactly equivalent to that of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, employees of which benefit under the proposed bonus.

In the previous annual appropriation bill for the same purpose a bonus of $120 was allowed to the same end—that of tending to equalize Government salaries with the cost of living. The Tariff Commission employees were inadvertently omitted from that classification. The Tariff Commission, out of its appropriation, made up that amount. This action, while resulting in equal pay for our employees, did not bring full justice, inasmuch as it did not give them a status equivalent to that of employees of similar departments and agencies of the Government.

We have conferred with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, who had charge of the bill in the House. He states that the exclusion of our employees was inadvertent and considers our contention just, and he has promised to speak to you about it. We believe that the discrimination is so obvious as not to require the Senate committee to take up time in a hearing. We hope and trust you will feel disposed to recommend a remedy whereby employees of this commission shall be treated on a parity with those of similar permanent agencies in the Government service.

Yours, truly,

F. W. TAUSSIG.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. THOMAS. If this commission, Mr. President, is a useless one, if it is an inefficient one, if it shows signs of being a partisan one, and I have seen nothing of that sort yet, then let us abolish it in proper form, but the Appropriations Committee here propose to torpedo it by depriving it of the possibility of functioning through cutting off its appropriation.

The Senator from Utah says that this is done for the purpose of getting the matter in conference. It is not necessary to do that in order to get the subject in conference. I am not particular about the amount of the appropriation so long as it is sufficient, but I protest against this method of hamstringing a commission because it does not meet with the approbation of certain interests. Instead of attacking it directly they resort to this method of getting rid of it. It may be remembered that in precisely this way was the Taft board asphyxiated, in precisely this way its usefulness brought to an abrupt and untimely end.

A board, to perform its duties, must be able to meet its necessary expenses; and to interfere with the activities of such a commission upon the very threshhold of a purpose by the Ways and Means Committee of the House to report a tariff bill is to justify the suspicion that its purpose is to free the committees of both Houses from what may be the embarrassing consequences of inteligent and impartial information upon this great subject.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And frame a bill without information.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; framing a bill without the information, as others have been framed. I do not want to see it done, and so far as it is possible for me to prevent it I shall see that it is not done.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if, in his opinion, it would not be wise to refer this question to the Finance Committee of the Senate before the commission is abolished, and whether the Finance Committee ought not to have some very definite views in regard to the purposes and efficiency of the commission?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course this commission was created by the enactment of a law which was reported to the calendar from the Finance Committee of the Senate. It constitutes a part, as I now recall, of the revenue act of 1917. I do not remember whether it was created by a Senate amendment or whether the provision appeared in the bill as passed by the House, but the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico is very appropriate in that it calls attention to the fact that the Senate committee, having the responsibility of revenue legislation and which reported and approved the creation of this commission, will have its work undone, paralyzed, if you please, by cutting off the funds necessary to enable the commission to continue to function, and that of itself should cause the Senate to reverse the action of the Committee on Appropriations, which has assumed to interfere with the work, the value of which is presumably best known by that committee than by the Committee on Appropriations. I say this, however, with becoming humility, because I am aware the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], now on that committee, the best-informed man upon all phases of the tariff and revenue upon the Democratic side of the Chamber, the celebrated committee chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and leader in the House for so many years, doubtless concurred in this amendment. But with all due respect to his superior learning and intelligence and to the unquestioned purity of his purposes, I must, nevertheless, protest against the exclusion of this appropriation from the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish merely to submit a remark or two in reply to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], but before doing so I want the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to an observation just submitted by him.

I called attention to an appropriation carried by this bill of $10,000,000 for the Cape Cod Canal. Some of us when the river and harbor bill was under consideration opposed that item as well as some other items carried in that bill. I have forgotten whether my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska, was here upholding our hands or not. If he was not, I am very sorry that we did not have his moral support and his splendid ability in defeating what I believed then and believe now to be an improper scheme.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I called attention to the Senate committee amendment in this bill appropriating $10,000,000 to buy the Cape Cod Canal in answer to the claim that was being made that it was necessary to reduce expenditures. The committee were claiming that these two items, cutting out the tariff commission and crippling the Federal Trade Commission, were necessary for economy, and I called attention to the fact that the bill was liberal and glittering with committee amendment increases; that they only felt economical when it came to the Federal Trade Commission and the Tariff Commission, and all the time were extravagant. I mentioned the Cape Cod Canal as one of the items where the increase is $10,000,000 on a proposition that a great many people, at least with some humility perhaps, honestly believe might just as well wait until our Federal Treasury is in a little better shape. But if we want to practice economy that would probably be a good place to commence, rather than on the Federal Trade Commission and the Tariff Commission.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] refers to the Cape Cod appropriation carried in this bill. I express the hope that he will join hands with those who opposed the provision authorizing the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal in the river and harbor bill in opposition to this item. But when that bill was under consideration I do not recall that the Senator from Nebraska assisted in defeating the provision.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator from Utah mean that as a criticism of the conduct of the Senator from Nebraska for not doing his duty?

Mr. KING. Oh, not at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I probably did not speak, and confined my activities to a vote, and thereby accomplished a great deal more probably than if I had been active in debate.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that the Senator from Nebraska was not in the Chamber at the time, for I know that he would have been one of the earnest supporters of the Sen-

ator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and others who were opposing that proposition, but we were defeated, and that project went into the river and harbor bill. It constitutes perhaps an obligation requiring the Government to ultimately acquire the canal. However, I shall be glad to join with the Senator from Nebraska in opposing the appropriation of $10,000,000, which is carried in the bill for that purpose.

I rose, however, Mr. President, to briefly reply to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I accept with due humility the verbal chastisement administered by him. As I understood his remarks, he criticized the position which I had taken with respect to Federal legislation and the views which I had expressed concerning the limitations upon the power of the National Government. It is true I have opposed what I conceived to be invasions by the Federal Government of the rights of the States and infringement of the rights of individuals. I have attempted, as best I could, to defend the Constitution of the United States and prevent the triumph of influences manifesting themselves in the land, which, in my opinion, are subversive of the rights of the States and destructive of representative government. I have opposed a policy which I believed would place the Federal Government in the States and destroy the dual form of government which comes to us as the most precious gift a free people ever enjoyed. The Senator, as I recall, stated substantially that he believed that the Federal Government should undertake to discharge responsibilities which the individual could not perform. I may have misunderstood the language of the Senator and may have misapprehended the meaning of the words he did employ, but I interpreted the position of the Senator to be that it was the right, if not the duty, of the National Government to undertake responsibilities and obligations resting upon the States or upon individuals within the States, if such individuals or the States were unable to discharge them. As I understood the Senator, the Federal Government, and by that, of course, it would mean the officials of the Federal Government, was to be the judge of whether the States or the individuals therein were competent to discharge their duties and responsibilities. Of course I would not do the Senator an injustice, and apologize if I have misconceived his attitude. His position, as I have interpreted it, would bring gratification to the most extreme Hamiltonian and Federalist of the school of a hundred or a hundred and twenty-five years ago. It is as extreme an exposition of the new Federalism, of the modern view of centralization and consolidation of power and governmental functions in the Federal Government, as I have heard enunciated.

Mr. President, I believe that our form of government is the wisest and the best form bequeathed to man, and that a strict adherence to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and the working out of the great political and economic problems that will come to the American people will be a sure guaranty that we and our children after us will enjoy the fullest liberty, and that the the inhabitants of this land will be the standard bearers of progress and civilization and attain heights of influence more glorious than were ever trodden by any peoples of the past. But it is manifest to those who come in contact with the people and read the signs of the hour, that there is lacking upon the part of many that strong affection for the organic law of this Republic and that deep devotion to the principles of liberty that should guide the American people and the triumph of which are indispensable if this Republic would endure. Contending influences have always existed in governments as well as in the affairs of men; there have always been forces working for liberty and freedom and the preservation of the rights of the people against the aggressions of bureaucrats and those who have exercised authority and power among the people. The struggle is on in our own land. There will always be a contest between the centralizing and consolidating forces and the spirit which seeks to preserve individual liberty and the rights of the people. The destruction of free government is not the work of a day or a year; and the knowledge of the centralizing tendences which exist among us should prompt every patriotic American to resist with courage and determination every effort that in the end will diminish the rights of the people and compass the overthrow of local self-government. It is not the province even of the States to discharge the duties which must be met by the individual. There are certain duties which individuals must perform if they would be a strong, progressive, and free people. Even a benevolent State, in assuming the obligations of the individuals, is doing them a grievous harm and imperiling their liberty. It is so easy for individuals to pass on to the State obligations which they should discharge, and it is likewise an easy thing for the States to abdicate their sovereign powers and permit the Federal Government to discharge their obligations. The Federal Government has no right to perform any task or assume any obligation which under our form of government belongs to the individual or the State, and if the individual or the State fails to discharge such obligations it is nevertheless an infringement of individual right and State right for the National Government to intervene. Apathy by the individual or the State and refusal by either to perform their duties must not be made the pretext by the Federal Government to transcend its powers and enter the domain of individual or State activity.

If it be conceded that individuals or States fail in their duties, then it does not follow that the assumption by the National Government of their obligations will make for liberty or the ultimate good of the individual, the State, or the Nation. The Nation, after all, is no better than the individuals and the States. If they lack the spirit of liberty and freedom and progress and are devoid of those qualities essential to preserve this Republic, the chances for the preservation of the Republic are not increased by a usurpation of power by the Federal Government. The flower of liberty blooms in the hearts of the individuals and the fruits of freedom are gathered in the homes and in the local communities and find expression and development in strong and vigorous local self-governing communities. I am more interested in the preservation of the rights of individuals, in the maintenance, unimpaired, of the powers of the States, than I am in building up a State socialism or a strong central and paternalistic government. I am more concerned in preventing the growth of an imperialistic form of government and in opposing extremes that seem to be carrying the people into dangerous nationalism.

I regret to hear the distinguished Senator from Iowa express the views to which he has just given utterance. I regard him as one of the ablest men in public life, one of the best and ablest legislators of this body. There is no better lawyer, here or elsewhere, than the Senator from Iowa. He is a student of our form of government and knows the limitations placed upon the Federal Government—that it is a Government of enumerated and delegated powers, and that it may not transcend the limitations expressed in the Federal Constitution. The Senator from Iowa knows, as all students of our Government know, that the assertion by the Federal Government of power and authority and prerogatives not delegated to it must result in striking down the States and in the destruction of this Republic. It must be obvious to every student that a strong, virile individualism and the maintenance of strong, vigorous States are indispensable to the preservation of this Republic.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. I want to ask the Senator if he implies that the Senator from Iowa has studied the form of the Federal Government only to subvert it?

Mr. KING. Oh, certainly not. The Senator from Iowa, patriot as he is, studies the Constitution with a view of preserving it; but, in my humble opinion, the views which he just expressed as to the duty of the Federal Government, under my interpretation of the Constitution, would lead ultimately to a subversion of our form of government and the superimposition upon the people of a great federalism or a state socialism, perhaps as oppressive and tyrannous as that which Prussia imposed upon the people of that land.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KING. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CUMMINS. I very deeply appreciate the compliment which the Senator from Utah has paid me, and lest he should misunderstand my position in regard to the subject he is discussing, permit me to say that I respect, I revere, I yield to the limitations put upon the Federal power by our forefathers quite as fully as he possibly can. I do not believe in transgressing on any account the rights of the States and the jurisdiction of the States over the matters which have been reserved by them or which have been committed to them by the people, but the Senator from Utah must perceive that a great many things have become national now that were local at the time our Constitution was adopted, and that things that have become of Federal concern are necessarily covered now by the Constitution in the same terms that the national things were covered by that instrument when it was adopted. All that I am pleading for or all that I have ever stood for is that as the development of the country makes a particular subject national it shall receive the national attention, just as was true in the early days

of the Republic. I would not consciously go a hair's breadth beyond the limit which divides the sovereignty of the State from the sovereignty of the General Government.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the views just expressed by the Senator from Iowa, if I understand them, can be accepted even by one who believes in a strict construction of the Constitution, if there were no controversy as to what were "national questions" or matters of "national concern." The difficulty, though, is in determining what is a matter of national concern. The Senator might believe that a certain subject, for instance, the construction of local highways within the States, was a subject of national concern; the Senator might believe that the question of education in the States was a matter of national concern; that the subject of marriage and divorce was a question of national concern; that any subject which relates directly or remotely to the health, the education, the welfare, the well-being, the intellectual or physical advancement of the people, was a matter of national concern; others might take the same view, and with that frame of mind I can conceive of such a progressive destruction of the States by the assumption upon the part of the Federal Government of responsibilities and obligations of the States under the guise that those duties which were performed by the States were national rather than local, as that in the end the States would be atrophied, individual initiative would be lost, and people and States would be appealing to the Federal Government to perform obligations resting upon them, upon the theory that those obligations were national rather than individual and local in character.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have very much sympathy with the view of the Senator from Utah with regard to roads and education, although I recognize that there are some things that can be done in both fields properly by the National Government; but I was speaking with regard to the activities of the Federal Trade Commission. The Federal Trade Commission was organized for the purpose of further regulating commerce among the States, and all their power was of that character. I assume that the Senator from Utah does not deny that the regulation of commerce among the States and with foreign nations is a subject of national jurisdiction and concern.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the statement made by the Senator and to which I referred when I first arose—the statement which was to the effect that where the individual was unable to discharge his duties and obligations, the National Government should intervene—was intended as a generalization regarding the power of the Federal Government to create a Federal trade commission and define its duties, then I have no quarrel with my distinguished friend. I agree with him that Congress, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, has the power to create a trade commission and confer upon it such authority as is found expressed in the enactment under which the Federal Trade Commission was given life.

One further remark, Mr. President, and I am through. As I understood the Senator from Iowa, he labors under the impression that my position would preclude the Federal Government from the assertion of authority conferred upon it by the States in matters that are purely national. I do not recall any position which I have taken which would justify the Senator in entertaining that opinion. Since I have been in this body I have insisted that the States should maintain, unimpaired, their reserved powers, and that the people within the States should assert upon all occasions the rights and authority which they have reserved to themselves. I have opposed the aggressions of the Federal Government—aggressions which I conceived would in the end destroy the States and establish an autocratic form of government. France passed through the condition of absorbtiveness and the provinces were shorn of their authority, and Paris became the center of almost imperial power. I refer to the growing disposition of the people to invoke Federal aid in purely the local concerns and the strong manifestations to augment the power of the Federal Government, though in so doing there be a clear invasion of individual and of State rights. I have contended that the danger was not that of weakening the central government and aggrandizing the State governments, but the supreme and overshadowing question of the hour was to preserve the States against the centralizing forces which are so powerfully sweeping the people and the States from the foundations of safety. I have insisted upon a new statehood, and have deplored the efforts to govern the people of this Nation in their local and domestic affairs by Federal officials and by a strong bureaucratic and autocratic power sitting in this Capital of the Nation.

The Federal Government has national powers; it is clothed with national authority; and in the execution of such authority it acts as a sovereign Nation would act. But I have also attempted to show upon various occasions the limitations placed upon the Federal Government and to point out the duties of the States and the people within the States. I have insisted that the Federal Government should not invade the rights of the States, and have deplored the tendency of the hour, manifested upon so many occasions and with respect to recent proposed legislation. I have deplored the socialistic, paternalistic, and bureaucratic tendencies of the time and the advocacy by many of government by commissions and bureaus. I regret the appeals so often made for the strong, oppressive hand, or the benevolent hand, of the Federal Government to be outstretched to aid the people and the States in the discharge of the obligations resting exclusively upon them.

I believe that the perpetuity of free institutions depends upon the development of a splendid individualism and upon the maintenance by the States of the powers reserved to them and to the people, respectively. I believe we ought to set our faces against this sweep of paternalism and of socialism which demand the nationalization of public utilities and, in the end, the nationalization of mine and factory and field, and which would finally reduce this Government to the chaotic and anarchistic condition in which we find Russia and other States of Europe.

This Nation has been placed on the glittering heights of the New World as a beacon light to all nations, and in this hour of darkness the light of this Republic gleams throughout the world. Nations have turned to us, as peoples have, for inspiration and for guidance, and have joined their prayers with those of patriotic Americans for the preservation of this Republic and the liberty for which it stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	McCormick	Sheppard
Calder	Harris	McCumber	Sherman
Capper	Harrison	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Henderson	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Smith, Md.
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smoot
Dial	Jones, Wash.	New	Spencer
Dillingham	Kellogg	Newberry	Stanley
Edge	Kendrick	Norris	Sterling
Elkins	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Fletcher	Keyes	Overman	Thomas
France	King	Phelan	Trammell
Gay	Knox	Phipps	Underwood
Gerry	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gronna	Lenroot	Ransdell	Warren
Hale	Lodge	Robinson	Watson

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 42, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$900,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment the yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, the vote is directly on adopting the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, with reference to this particular amendment, I intend to vote with the committee to reduce the amount. I know it is very difficult to cut down the running expenses of the Government. It is not always wise to cut out Government endeavors by the mere dropping of appropriations; but, of course, every agency of the Government like the Federal Trade Commission can expand without limit,

and every time they are allowed to expand and build up new divisions they reach their tentacles out in a new direction and find work to do. The Federal Trade Commission is largely an investigating body. We can go on and expend the cost of the Great War in investigating the world if we desire to spend it.

Some of our Republican friends on the other side of the Chamber, when we reported the appropriation bills at the last session, were disposed to criticize us because of the very extravagant appropriations. We were reaping the harvest of a war; we could not trim down then, for we had to pay our war bills. I am not going to criticize the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, as they criticized us, for not cutting these bills to the bone, because I know they can not do it; and it would be a very unjust criticism if we stood here and said, "Although you criticized our procedure, you bring in these large bills and neglect to cut out or reduce appropriations that ought to be cut out or reduced." I know perfectly well that many of these items relate to Government enterprises which the majority inherited since the war, and it is no more their business to smash the machine than it was our business. For proper appropriations I am willing to stand with the majority in control and take the responsibility; and when the committee comes in here and, in respect to an endeavor that is not functioning at a direct object—because this commission is largely a "feeling machine," and it will keep on reaching its tentacles out as long as we will fertilize it with money—says, "We will cut out $100,000 and draw in and start the process toward economy," I am going to vote with them. I do not believe the Senate is going to stand up to it and put it through; I believe that it is going to desert the committee and raise the amount; but, so far as I am concerned, I am not going to desert the committee when it is making a reasonable effort to bring about some economy in public expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee, on which the Senator from Nebraska demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, before we vote on this question I wish to call the attention of the friends of the $1,000,000 appropriation to the statement read by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] from the testimony. I am disposed to support the Federal Trade Commission and give it all it needs, and I thought I was squarely against the committee in its effort to cut the appropriation down; but the statement from the Federal Trade Commission itself that they only wanted a little less than $900,000, read by the Senator from South Carolina from the testimony, has put me in a position where I should like some explanation to justify a vote against the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. The committee gave them more than they asked for.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. According to this testimony, they did not ask for quite $900,000.

Mr. NORRIS. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the testimony before the House committee.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the date of it?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That was the March testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is found on page 1178, part 2, hearings on sundry civil bill, H. R. 1920, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the date of the testimony?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will look and see. It was January 31.

Mr. SMOOT. That was testimony on the bill which failed at the last session of Congress?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that was testimony taken on the bill that failed at the last session.

Mr. SMOOT. But it was in relation to this same bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would like to state, if the Senator will allow me, that I looked in the testimony that was taken by the House committee after the reconvening of Congress at this session, and I saw nothing at all there pertaining to the Federal Trade Commission. So, evidently, the testimony given in January has been relied on for the present legislation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Georgia will allow me to say a word to the Senator from South Carolina, when a board or a commission comes before the Appropriations Committee of the House or the Senate and expresses its views as to what it needs, what appropriation it wants, and action is taken on it, and it does not come back any more, the committees undoubtedly have a right to indulge the presumption that that is all the money they want.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no question about that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Georgia permit me to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the statement that was made by the Senator from South Carolina of the estimate or request of the Federal Trade Commission for an appropriation the last representation on the subject that has been made to the committee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They did not come before the Senate committee at all, and, as far as I know, that is the only matter on which they appeared before the House committee. If they appeared before the House in any other respect, I do not recall it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have searched the record of the present hearings, and there is nothing.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the Senator from Nebraska any information that the Federal Trade Commission has, since the date of the request referred to now by the Senator from Georgia, made a subsequent or additional request?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is my understanding. I have not talked with the members of the House committee with regard to it, but my understanding is that when they made up this bill they either had a letter or some conversation with some members of the committee, and that this appropriation was made in this bill by the House from that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, what I rose for was to say that I want to support the Federal Trade Commission. I want to give them the million dollars if they have shown that they want it, and I thought I was going to vote that way until I saw this statement from them; and what I was asking the Senator to do was to give me something since that, if there is anything, to show that they really need the million dollars.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator, I know, did not intend just what he said—that he was willing to give them this money if they wanted it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure the Senator meant, if they needed it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If they showed that they needed it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Surely. There is nothing here to show that they need it. They all want money.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But this statement is that they have brought their expenses down to $890,000, and they made an estimate of just a little over $800,000 as to what they needed, and I want to be justified in voting the million dollars.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in reply to his question whether any subsequent request was made, that I have the second hearing on the sundry civil bill for 1920 at this session, and there is not a word in it on the subject.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON. I simply want to state that the reason I asked the question is this: If the Trade Commission's representatives appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House and submitted their estimates and requests for an appropriation, and have not since formally called the matter to the attention of the Appropriations Committee either of the House or of the Senate, my judgment is that the action of the committee is justified, and should be sustained by the Senate, in not allowing an amount in excess of the sum asked for by the Federal Trade Commission; and somebody who proposes an increase over the amount asked for by the Trade Commission ought to justify it by something more than a mere general argument as to the value of the Trade Commission. Like the Senator from Georgia, I believe that organization is one of great value to the country and to the industries of the country, and I want to support it; but when the Federal Trade Commission tells me, or a committee representing the activities of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, that it only requires a definite sum to perform its service to the Government during the coming fiscal year, I feel that I am almost estopped from increas-

ing the amount of that appropriation unless some evidence is brought to bear that the commission does not know what it really needs.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has made no investigation of this matter at all?

Mr. ROBINSON. I made no such statement. I made the statement that of course, under the procedure that prevails in both Houses of Congress, these respective departments and bureaus of the Government submit their estimates and the evidence supporting them to the Appropriations Committees of the respective bodies, and it is not customary for any committee to allow a sum in excess of the amount requested. I can not understand yet why the committee at the other end of the Capitol allowed the Federal Trade Commission more than it said it needed, and I should like to have some member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations explain to me that circumstance.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is just what I was seeking to get at. It seems that according to the testimony here the Trade Commission would be satisfied with $600,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. No; $900,000, if I remember the statement correctly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Eight hundred and twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. ROBINSON. Eight hundred and twenty thousand dollars, and the House committee actually allowed a sum in excess of that amount; I assume that what actually occurred is that the Senate committee, in hastily reporting the bill under the pressure of the expiration of the present fiscal year, made no special investigation of the subject, there being no demand made upon that committee that they should investigate it. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate does not go into questions of this character unless the fact is called to their attention that there is a necessity for investigating an item.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator says no demand was made. I presume the Senator was not here earlier in the debate; and that is one of the difficulties of our method of legislation. The debate takes place when there are very few Senators here, and the bell rings, and the other Members come in, and the statements that have been made in debate have to be repeated. I am not surprised; but it has already been established on the floor of the Senate that the reason why there is not anything in the hearings of the Senate committee in regard to this matter is because the Senate committee did not hear these gentlemen. They asked to be heard, and the committee was too busy, and there was not time to hear them.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, they did not ask to be heard on this item at all. On the other item of $200,000 they asked to be heard after the bill was ready to be reported. Nevertheless we invited a written statement; we have that here before us. It contains no reference to the $1,000,000 item.

Mr. ROBINSON. I did not understand, Mr. President, that a request had been made by the Federal Trade Commission or its representatives for a hearing before the Senate committee in order to present the request, and the estimates supporting it, for additional appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that there was no request coming from the Federal Trade Commission upon this item. There was a request upon another item in the bill, as to the amount of last year's appropriation that was to be turned back into the Treasury.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has stated the course of the argument as I comprehended it when I made my statement which was criticized by the Senator from Nebraska. I can not, of course, determine the question of accuracy between the statements of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Nebraska; but my observation and experience on the Committee on Appropriations leads me to the conclusion that the Senator from Utah, a member, usually knows what he is talking about when he makes a statement to the Senate touching figures or facts involved in an appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I did not hear the observation which the Senator from Utah made to the Senator from Arkansas, wherein the Senator takes his statement instead of mine; so I should like to have it repeated for my benefit.

Mr. ROBINSON. No, Mr. President; the Senator will not put me in that attitude.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I do not want to.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator will pardon me if I correct the statement he has just made. I distinctly said that I would not choose between the accuracy of the statement made by the Senator from Utah and the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska; but the Senator from Utah being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and having announced to the Senate that the Federal Trade Commission did not submit to the Committee on Appropriations any request for an increase in this item, I said that I believed that the Senator from Utah usually knew what he was talking about when he made a statement of that character concerning facts and figures involved in an appropriation bill reported by a committee of which he is a member; and I repeat that statement, with no intentional offense whatever to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the misunderstanding occurred because the facts are that up to this hour we have received no request upon the part of the commission to be heard upon this item; but upon the other one, after the bill was nearly finished we got a letter, and the bearer of that letter offered to come before us, and, as I say, it was late, and the bill was about ready to be reported out. There was, however, nothing as to this one item at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suppose that a member of the Federal Trade Commission who wanted to be heard by a Senate committee, in order to avoid any technical question that might be raised here in the Senate, would have to be explicit in his request for a hearing, and state absolutely in detail and in writing, and swear to it, perhaps, every particular item that he was going to talk about if he was given a hearing. Now, the committee back down on the proposition that, technically speaking, they did not ask for a hearing on this particular item. The probabilities are that when they asked for that hearing they did not know that the Senate committee had cut this item from $1,000,000 to $900,000. The probabilities are that they only knew of the other one, and that they assumed that the appropriation made by the House would not be cut unless they were given notice, and an opportunity to be heard. I do not know what the facts were. I was not there. Now, however, it develops that they asked in writing for a hearing, and that they mentioned in that letter another item as to which I think it is conceded even by the committee now that the commission was right and they were wrong; and yet they were not given a hearing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. When the statement was made on the floor a few minutes ago that the Federal Trade Commission had not been heard from since it made its estimate for $900,000, I immediately went to the telephone and called them up. I was not able to get into communication with the chairman of the commission. He will be in in a few moments, I am informed. But a member of the commission advised me that they did appear before the House committee and did make an estimate and urged an appropriation of $1,000,000, and that they need that amount for the work which they have in hand and which they contemplate.

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to that the House committee and the House gave them $1,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; and it must have appeared to the House committee that the request for that amount was a reasonable request, and it is evidenced by the fact that the House appropriated that amount of money to them.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin makes that plain. I understood that they either had a conference informally, or at least that there was an understanding with the House committee that they should have $1,000,000, and that the House committee agreed that they should have $1,000,000; and I am borne out in that, because the House committee gave them $1,000,000, and the House passed the bill in that form. I do not pretend to know personally, but I have no doubt whatever in my mind that when the Federal Trade Commission wrote that letter and asked for a hearing they had not any idea on earth that the $1,000,000 was cut down to $900,000. If they had had a hearing and had been told that, they would have been able to explain it and show why they ought to have had it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee upon what evidence, if any, the committee made this reduction from $1,000,000 to $900,000?

Mr. WARREN. In looking at the only thing that we had before us—the hearings before the House—we ascertained that they expected to get along with a little over $800,000, and that soon they would be able to cut it down to $600,000, and we assumed, when there was $300,000 to go back because they found it not useful to them last year, taken with the other facts, that $900,000 would be sufficient for this year.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I, of course, am not on the Committee on Appropriations, and I do not know anything about the merits of this controversy. I am one of the Senators who must rely, in great measure, upon the committee's action for my action upon a matter of this sort; but I must confess that I am left in the dark as to how I ought to vote on this proposition. It seems to me that the merit of supporting the commission is admitted by all, and the question is: How much does the commission need?

We find that testimony was taken back in January of this year, which has been read to us, which indicates that the commission might get along with less than even $900,000; but the House, for some reason—and it must have been for some satisfactory reason—increased the appropriation to $1,000,000. Now, we have not before us the testimony on which the House made that increase; but it made the increase, and we must assume that it made it for some very substantial reason, because I do not believe we have a right to assume that the House at this time, when everybody is talking economy, would raise an appropriation to a million dollars except for some reason which appeared potent to it.

The matter comes back here to the Senate committee, and the Senate committee, without making any inquiry whatever, according to the statement of the chairman of the committee, undertakes to reduce this appropriation by $100,000, and seeks to justify it by going back to a statement which was made in last January or February, when the war situation was entirely different from what it is now.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in this condition of affairs we ought to have something to justify this reduction of 10 per cent of the appropriation for that commission. It is true that we all want economy; but I admit that the people of this country do not want economy at the expense of one of the activities of this Government which is doing things for the Government and for the benefit of the people of this country.

In the absence of some showing from the committee as to why this reduction should be made, I shall have to vote in favor of the House appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is far from me to object to the Senator's voting exactly as he pleases; but his argument would seem to indicate that the Senate committee, whenever they undertake to reduce anything that comes from the House, must be almost in contempt, because necessarily they can not know anything about it. The Senate committee believed they had sufficient testimony, and I have seen nothing since that has changed my mind.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I now have before me the hearings of January of last year. I find that at that time the Federal Trade Commission made an estimate for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1919, of $1,481,000. That was the amount they asked for, and that was divided in their estimates as follows:

To the administrative division, $323,000, in round numbers.

To the legal division, $337,000.

To the economic division, $820,000.

Reading from page 1192 of the hearings, it appears that there was appropriated to them last year $802,920, and they received from the President's fund $720,000 additional, making the toal expenditures of the commission $1,608,865; while under the bill that is now pending, with the $1,000,000 appropriation, it will be $600,000 less, as I take it, than was expended by them last year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? Does not the Senator know that during the war there was devolved upon this activity—to use the expression of the Senator from New Mexico—considerable work which theretofore had been performed by other departments and which since the armistice is being performed by those same departments?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not doubt that that is true. That would account for the reduction in the estimates.

Mr. KING. I gave an illustration a moment ago of the activities of the Bureau of Mines, and a number of the bureaus and divisions in the War Department. During the war some of these duties were devolved upon the Federal Trade Commission. Since the armistice, or perhaps within the past few months, those duties have been performed by the divisions that formerly discharged them; and very much of the work of the Federal Trade Commission during the past year has been of an abnormal and extraordinary character, and work which bureaus and divisions of the Government and the departments are equipped to perform. There has been duplication during the war by some of these departments, and if we give this organization all that it might ask for I have no doubt that there would be further duplications. It would be a very unsafe policy for us to give to bureaus and departments and divisions whatever they said they needed. Congress must determine, because we know that the needs of some of these organizations are like the needs of a Frankenstein—they never end.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the only point I was making was that $1,000,000 is 33⅓ per cent less than the Trade Commission asked for and said they needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], which I transfer to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have voted, but my pair is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. FERNALD. Has the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. FERNALD. I will withhold my vote, being paired with that Senator. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I inquire if the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Virginia is necessarily absent on business of the Senate, and I am paired with him during his absence. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (after having voted in the negative). I voted without noting the absence of my pair, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—43

Beckham	Gay	Myers	Smith, Md.
Calder	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Hale	New	Smoot
Culberson	Harding	Newberry	Spencer
Dial	Harrison	Overman	Stanley
Dillingham	Keyes	Page	Sutherland
Edge	King	Phipps	Trammell
Elkins	Knox	Reed	Underwood
Fall	Lodge	Robinson	Warren
Fletcher	McCumber	Sherman	Watson
France	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Harris	La Follette	Poindexter
Borah	Henderson	Lenroot	Pomerene
Capper	Hitchcock	McCormick	Ransdell
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	McKellar	Sheppard
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Curtis	Kendrick	Nugent	Thomas
Gerry	Kenyon	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Gore	Kirby	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.

NOT VOTING—21.

Ball	Jones, Wash.	Penrose	Wadsworth
Bankhead	Kellogg	Shields	Williams
Brandegee	McLean	Simmons	Wolcott
Fernald	McNary	Smith, Ga.	
Frelinghuysen	Martin	Swanson	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Townsend	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that I shall ask for a separate vote on this amendment when the bill gets into the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire to give the following notice of a motion to suspend the rules. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Notice is hereby given that under Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I shall move, when the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, is before the Senate to

suspend subdivisions 2 and 3 of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, prohibiting the adding of new items of appropriation and prohibiting the proposing of general legislation on any general appropriation bill, for the purpose of offering an amendment in the form of a new section to the said H. R. 6176 making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which said proposed amendment in the nature of a new section is as follows:

"To enable the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled 'An act to create a Department of Labor,' to continue to foster, promote, to develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official station, together with their per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, $950,000: *Provided*, That not more than $150,000 shall be expended in maintaining in the District of Columbia an administrative office and an organization to act as a central clearing house for cooperation with the States and the political subdivisions thereof, including a director general, at $6,000 per annum; an assistant director general, at $5,000; three chiefs of divisions, at $4,000 per annum; not more than four persons at rates of compensation from $3,000 to $3,500, inclusive, per annum; not more than five persons at rates of compensation from $2,500 to $3,000, inclusive, per annum; and not more than eight persons at rates of compensation from $2,000 to $2,500, inclusive, per annum."

The next amendment was, under the head of "Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board," on page 42, after line 6, to strike out:

The unexpended balances on June 30, 1919, of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1919 contained in sections 5, 6, and 7 of chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act approved July 9, 1918, are reappropriated and made available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1920: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the sum of $100,000 in section 7 to be used under the direction of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, books of reference and periodicals, printing and binding, traveling, and other necessary expenses of the board in the administration of the provisions of chapter 15 of the said act.

And insert:

That sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of chapter 15 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board: That there is hereby created a board to be known as the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury as ex officio members, and of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, or of representatives designated by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. The duties of the board shall be: (1) To make rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter; (2) to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under sections 5 and 6; (3) to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purpose of this chapter by their respective departments; and (4) to direct the expenditure of the sum of $100,000 provided in section 7 of this chapter. The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect annually one of its members as chairman, and shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business."

SEC. 2. That the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board is hereby authorized and directed to adopt measures for purpose of assisting the various States in caring for civilian persons whose detention, isolation, quarantine, or commitment to institutions may be found necessary for the protection of the military and naval forces and the civilian population of the United States against venereal diseases.

SEC. 5. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this chapter: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein made shall not be deemed exclusive, but may be supplemented by other appropriations of a more general character which are applicable to the same or similar purposes.

SEC. 6. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,400,000 annually for two fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1918, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of $1,000,000, which shall be paid to the States for the use of their respective boards or departments of health in the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board; this sum to be allotted to each State in the proportion which its population bears to the population of the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska and the Canal Zone, according to the last preceding United States census, and such allotment to be so conditioned that for each dollar paid to any State the State shall specifically appropriate or otherwise set aside an equal amount for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases, except for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, for which the allotment of money is not conditioned upon the appropriation or setting aside of money by the State: *Provided*, That any State may obtain any part of its allotment for any fiscal year subsequent to June 30, 1919, by specifically appropriating or otherwise setting aside an amount equal to such part of its allotment for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases: *And provided*, That where a State has no legislative session between the date of this law and the 1st day of January, 1920, the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board may, in its discretion, allot to said State for the period from July 1, 1919, to December 31, 1919, the monthly proportion of the sum allotted to it in accordance with the provisions of this section of this chapter. In case any State receiving such allotment fails to appropriate or otherwise set aside on or before February 14, 1920, an amount equal to its allotment or such part of allotment as it may have received between July 1, 1919, and December 31, 1919, then it shall be within the discretion of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board to discontinue all other allotments to such State from each and every fund under this chapter until such appropriation may be made by the legislature then in session in such State: *And provided*, That an allotment refused by any State or States shall be available for the purposes of any of the appropriations made in this chapter; the sum of $100,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions, as in the judgment of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, more effective medical measures in the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases; the sum of $300,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions or organizations, as in the judgment of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering and developing more effective educational measures in the prevention of venereal diseases, and for the purpose of sociological and physiological research related thereto.

SEC. 7. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of $200,000 to defray the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the Division of Venereal Diseases in the Bureau of the Public Health Service; and the sum of $100,000 to be used under the direction of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board for miscellaneous expenses of that board, including personal services and rent of offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, actual or per diem in lieu of subsistence; printing and binding, periodicals, law books, and books of reference.

Any unexpended balances appropriated under this chapter are hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, not exceeding $500,000 for any purpose for which any of the appropriations made by this chapter are available.

SEC. 8. That the terms "State" and "States," as used in this chapter, shall be held to include the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator from Wyoming to let this amendment go over to be voted upon later. This provision constituted a part of the Army appropriation bill, and I then raised a point of order against it, and I shall now reserve a point of order.

Mr. WARREN. I understand the wish of the Senator, and I have no desire to hurry action upon it.

Mr. KING. I desire to raise a point of order against it, but, if amended to conform to what I think is just and fair, I will withdraw the point of order; otherwise I shall insist upon it.

Mr. WARREN. I trust the Senator will not raise the point of order at this time. He can reserve the privilege of raising it. If raised, it would have to be decided at once, and some information may be given in the meantime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. KING. If by passing it over I waive my right to raise a point of order——

Mr. WARREN. No; you have reserved that.

Mr. KING. If it is understood I may raise the point of order later, I have no objection to having it passed over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 47, line 20, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "not exceeding $1,500 for printing other than that done at the Government Printing Office," so as to make the clause read:

For all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, $1,100,000, of which sum there may be expended not exceeding $50,000 in the employment of counsel, not exceeding $3,000 for necessary books, reports, and periodicals, not exceeding $100 in the open market for the purchase of office furniture similar in class or kind to that listed in the general supply schedule, and not exceeding $70,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 8, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and including not exceeding $15,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, $2,000,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rise to say a word against the amendment just read by the Secretary and proposed by the committee.

Mr. WARREN. In deference to the wishes of the Senator, if he thinks it should be $2,500,000 I am willing, as chairman of

the committee, on my part that the amendment may be disagreed to and left as it stands in the House bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to hear the chairman make that suggestion. I have a good deal of information with regard to this subject, and I know that the valuation work of the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to be pressed with the greatest possible speed, for there is nothing this country wants to know or needs to know just now so much as the value of the railroad properties of the United States.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think any of the work that has been done by this board to which he refers will be of any value?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it is of infinite value. I can not understand how Senators or the public should fall into the impression that the work that has been done by the Interstate Commerce Commission or by the Valuation Bureau of that commission is not of value. It is impossible to overestimate the value of that work. We have reached the time when in railway reconstruction or readjustment we must know what these properties are worth. However, I ought not to trespass on the time of the Senate, because if the chairman of the committee agrees with me about it, I am sure there will be no difficulty in the matter.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say that I agreed not to pass the amendment because I thought it was unnecessary to debate it now. The chairman feels personally this way: There is the greatest need that we should know the value of railroads, but I believe it ought to be done very much as we take the census, done all at once. I do not believe that matters 8 or 10 years old, where changes have been made since and the terminals, and so forth, are changed in value, are very valuable for present consideration. I think the $15,000,000 and over we have spent is not worth 10 cents on the dollar, but I think to spend that much quickly, or twice that much, would give us value.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course I disagree entirely with the Senator from Wyoming with regard to that point. The idea that the taking of an inventory of all the railway properties of the United States is of no worth in ascertaining the value of that property is utterly inexplicable to me.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, but, Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. That is just what the Interstate Commerce Commission is doing now. It is making an inventory of the railway properties of the country.

Mr. WARREN. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me. We will take a merchant buying goods and selling them all the time. He takes his inventory in one or two or three days, because it is the only way he can get a correct inventory. These railroads are constantly changing, and materially, in values; and when you come to going back 10 years and taking an inventory where along the line of the roads there were once only whistling posts and no towns at all, and where now there are great towns, and where the terminals have been increased or doubled in value, and where the railroads have, instead of 65 and 70 pound rails, been putting in 90 and 100 pound steel rails, I think the Senator will grant that an inventory of the various systems taken almost simultaneously would be more valuable than one extended over a period of years.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am perfectly willing to discuss the matter with the Senator, but it is an unnecessary waste of time unless the Senator persists in the committee amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I do not.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator from Wyoming will not withdraw the amendment, because before he does I want to move to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. CUMMINS. Why not strike it out entirely?

Mr. KING. I should like to do so.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure the Senator from Utah would like to strike it out entirely.

Mr. KING. I have a bill pending for that very purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply want to say that I voted in committee for a reduction to $1,500,000, because I believe information collected eight years ago or six years ago or five years ago——

Mr. CUMMINS. Not eight years ago, because the law was passed in 1913.

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I remember it, but whatever time it is, information collected then would be of no avail, as I believed; but Judge Prouty, I will say, explained to the committee their system of arriving at the valuation of the railroads. In other words, they take an inventory of a road. There are so many pounds of rail, so many ties, so many box cars, so many engines, so many passenger cars, so much property in the terminals. They take an inventory of every conceivable thing that is needed and owned by the railroads. That then becomes a basis of valuation, and whenever the final valuation is to be arrived at they know just the number of tons of rails they have, just the number of cars they have, because all the improvements and additions that are made in the meantime are taken note of, and the inventory is kept complete. As to the ultimate value of it, that will depend upon the price which the material is worth at the time the final decision is reached. It convinced me that the appropriation was absolutely necessary so that if they want to know the valuation in a year or at any time, it will be merely a matter of figuring what the cost of the railroads would be at that particular time.

I want to say that my mind was made up on this matter, just the same as has been expressed by other Senators, until I saw the whole system that they have adopted and worked out. I think is is the only possible way it could be worked out to have any value, and I think it is of value.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Will the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I would merely suggest that the law on its very face requires the adoption of that plan.

Mr. CUMMINS. The law requires the Interstate Commerce Commission to take an inventory of all the property of the railway companies, to ascertain the cost of reproduction new, to ascertain the cost of reproduction with depreciation, and to ascertain the original cost to-day. The law specifies the way in which the Interstate Commerce Commission shall do its work. While there will be very great differences of opinion among economists and students of the subject with regard to the rule which should be applied in ascertaining the value of the property, the impression that the work of the commission up to this time is of no value must, I am sure, disappear upon reflection. If we are ever to solve the railway problem which now confronts us, we must have some fair appreciation of the value of the property which renders the public service.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield just for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I ask for information. Does the Senator have any information as to when the work will be performed as contemplated by the act to which attention has been invited?

Mr. CUMMINS. The head of the valuation bureau, Judge Prouty, than whom there is no more faithful public official in all this country, believes that in two years the work of the commission will be completed. The appropriation for the next year will probably be much less than the appropriation for this year, because the work will then be largely done by the commission, whereas now it must be done by engineers and skilled men in the various fields of industry covered by railway materials. But I shall hope that within the next two years the work will be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the amendment will be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the apparent view of the Senate I shall not press the amendment which I suggested a moment ago to reduce this appropriation to $1,000,000. Indeed, in my reply to my friend from Iowa I stated that if I had my way I should strike out the entire appropriation. I believe that this work is practically valueless. My own observations are that several roads which heretofore have been physically valued by this commission have now become bankrupt and are not within millions of dollars of the value they were physically or otherwise when the physical valuation was made. I can not conceive of any corresponding advantages that will be derived from the large expenditure which will be made in order to complete this work or that the Government has derived any advantages from the large expenditures which have heretofore been made.

It is only a short time ago when the market value of railroads in the United States was approximately $21,000,000,000; that is, the value of the stocks and bonds. To-day the railroads of the United States are not worth any more than $12,000,000,000, and they have shrunk in value as they will shrink in value under present conditions. A physical valuation, in my judgment, will be of no advantage to the Government in any legislation which will be enacted by Congress, and I deem these expenditures as worse than useless; they are wasteful.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 17, to strike out:

ROCK CREEK AND POTOMAC PARKWAY COMMISSION.

To enable the commission created by section 22 of the public-buildings act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., p. 885), to continue proceedings toward the acquisition of lands required for a connecting parkway

between Potomac Park, the Zoological Park, and Rock Creek Park, $250,000, to be available until expended and to be payable one-half out of the Treasury of the United States and one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the total area of lands finally to be acquired for said parkway shall not exceed the area and parcels described and delineated in the map No. 2, contained in House Document No. 1114 of the Sixty-fourth Congress, first session: *Provided further*, That the expenditure of the funds appropriated herein shall be subject to all the conditions imposed by the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1916.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rose to say I hoped this amendment would not be pressed; but the chairman, I am informed, is going to ask that it be disagreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say that since this amendment was made in the bill the committee has some additional information as to the probable expenditure of it, and I ask that the committee amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Did the Senate committee have a hearing on the proposition?

Mr. WARREN. There was not a hearing.

Mr. NORRIS. Was there any hearing after the Senate committee passed on it and debated this amendment?

Mr. WARREN. There was not; but the committee or the individual members of the committee had obtained information from papers and books and statements that we had.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know that I have any objection to disagreeing to the amendment, but if the Tariff Commission or the Federal Trade Commission were involved here the committee would be justified in cutting it out without a hearing, just on the simple ground of reducing expenses. It seems that here, moved by the same patriotic spirit to reduce expense and the same feeling of economy to save money for the taxpayers, the committee struck out an item of $250,000 and then afterwards, without reconvening and without taking it down in writing and without any formal hearings so that the evidence could be read by the Senate or individual Senators, or anybody else, individually and perhaps collectively they gathered some evidence that seemed to satisfy them that they ought to take out the House proposition.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps the Senator from Nebraska expects the committee to read all these matters to the Senate [exhibiting]? Here is what we have on this bill.

Mr. NORRIS. How much of that is on the item we are considering now?

Mr. WARREN. Not an inch of it.

Mr. NORRIS. Then we will not waste any time in reading on that proposition.

Mr. WARREN. I am glad to say that is only a small portion of the information the committee has.

Mr. NORRIS. That is information that was printed?

Mr. LODGE. There was a House hearing—a full hearing.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not talking particularly about this amendment. These are not House hearings which the Senator from Wyoming exhibited.

Mr. WARREN. Both House and Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. What part of them are Senate hearings and what part are House hearings?

Mr. WARREN. I am delighted to say that the smallest volume is Senate hearings. The House had a year or something more and we had from Monday afternoon to Thursday afternoon to consider this measure.

Mr. NORRIS. There is nothing in that magnificent volume here about this amendment?

Mr. WARREN. There is not. My thanks to the Senator for his "magnificent volume."

Mr. NORRIS. This amendment is not described in the Senate committee hearings.

I only rose, Mr. President, to bring out the fact that, in an item that will be demonstrated in the days to come and which will come home to plague us and be vital, without a hearing—denying a hearing—the Senate committee, in a great gush of economy, undertook to start out on a program of slaughtering one of the great commissions of this country, and in another breath, when they forgot about their economy, without any hearings but by individual talks of individual Members with different people, they put back into the bill an appropriation of $250,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this appropriation is simply the carrying out of a law which was passed by Congress in 1913. It is not to pay employees. It is to purchase land that has been considered necessary by the Government for the park roadway.

Mr. NELSON. How much an acre?

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator every appropriation we have made and every square foot of ground that we have purchased. July 1, 1916, we appropriated $50,000; July 1, 1917, $100,000; July 1, 1918, $150,000, a total of $300,000; and for that $300,000 we have purchased 842,084.14 square feet of ground.

Mr. NELSON. How many acres is that?

Mr. SMOOT. In round numbers I should say 20 acres.

Mr. NELSON. Three hundred thousand dollars for 20 acres?

Mr. SMOOT. Two hundred and eighty-six thousand three hundred and four dollars and sixty cents was paid for it. We must remember it is right in sight of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge. The lands which were purchased are among the very highest-priced lands required. The lands that have been considered desirable for this purpose amount to 157.94 acres, and we have purchased of that 20 acres. The other lands are not going to cost as much per acre as the lands we have already purchased.

I wish to say to the Senator in this connection that in the purchase price of this land there has been saved $18,943.72, or 6.61 per cent less than the assessed valuation of the land in the District.

Mr. President, the land has been decided upon, and it is to be purchased sooner or later. As to the time when it shall be purchased, that can only be done as the appropriations are made. This appropriation is simply to buy land that is a part of that which has already been selected. This will not be the only appropriation made for this purpose. If we are going to appropriate in the end enough to buy it all, of course we can not say exactly how much it will be, but the total paid for the 20 acres which have already been purchased was $18,943.72 less than the assessed valuation.

I will say to the Senator that it would be very much better if the Government of the United States should appropriate the money to purchase what they have to purchase at once, with this one single exception, and that is, if it were already appropriated, then the commission would not have time enough to deal with the individuals who own the land that is to be purchased, and perhaps they could not purchase it at as low a price as they can under the present plan.

Mr. NELSON. I understood that the whole tract had been condemned.

Mr. SMOOT. But there is a great deal of land that belongs now to the Government.

Mr. NELSON. Has the particular quantity of land that is appropriated for been condemned?

Mr. SMOOT. It will be if necessary.

Mr. NELSON. What is the total amount of the condemnation price?

Mr. SMOOT. We have all the land——

Mr. NELSON. No; I mean of this particular tract for which this appropriation is made. How much more will be needed to carry out the plan and pay for all the condemned land?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator this is not for any particular piece of land. It is only a part of the general scheme, and they will use this $250,000 to purchase the land at the best possible price.

Mr. NELSON. How much does the general scheme that you refer to cost? How much, approximately, will the entire scheme cost?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say offhand just what it would cost. It will all depend on the amount at which they can get the land. But the whole cost, I will say to the Senator, over and above the $300,000 we have already appropriated, and the $250,000 in this bill, will be around $1,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Originally the law provided for $1,300,000.

Mr. SMOOT. That would be my offhand opinion.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the Senator from Utah think in view of the economic conditions of the country and the high taxes, it is a piece of extravagance to buy this land at these high figures? Can we not postpone this matter until we get out of debt and get into better shape?

Mr. WARREN. That is exactly the reason we are putting this in. It is because these pieces of land that we can get to-day are like others, rising in value every day. We should have acted more quickly. Some of the land costs more now than it did when this plan was first contemplated. The price of the land goes up according as improvements are made in that part of the town.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will remember that adjoining this land there are some beautiful homes going up and land is increasing very rapidly in price.

Mr. NELSON. I make these brief remarks for the reason that I have for a long time been conscious of the fact that there is a real estate crowd in this city. Some would call it a ring. They are all the time working the Government; and wherever they have any property that they can not unload on individuals they unload it on the Government, and at exorbitant prices. If we took some lands here condemned by the Government and the figures were given to the public, they would shock the public. We have a ring here in the city constantly at work trying to

make money out of the Government. Where they have some real estate they can not dispose of to individuals or they have a lot and a building that has become useless, they want to unload it on the Government. I have seen so much of that in my 24 years in the Senate that I feel, when appropriations of this kind to buy real estate are up, it is always of a suspicious character, and I feel that it is a manifestation of the efforts of the real estate ring.

By what I say I do not intend to criticize any Member of this body; but I do know, and Senators know who have taken notice of the fact, that there has been a constant effort here among the real estate men of the city not only to work the tenants as they worked them during the war period, but to work the Government of the United States. See how we have been worked. Look at all this property we condemned between the Capitol and the Union Station. The real estate men made a move on the Government that said buy this ground, pull down these old buildings, and make a Government park between the Union Station and the Capitol, and they unloaded all that real estate on us. Now, lo and behold, after pulling down many fairly good brick buildings, we have covered the ground with stucco buildings; and the Government has lost millions of dollars by the operation. I trust that hereafter the Appropriations Committee will have their eyes on the real estate men in the District of Columbia and will not allow them to take advantage of the Government as they have sometimes done in the past.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am a new member of the Committee on Appropriations and, of course, I want to be as loyal to the committee as possible, but I concur in the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. This appropriation should not be made at this time, and no business man would make such an expenditure of money, if he had to invest his own money. We all know that real estate is higher here to-day than it will be in the near future; any man who has any idea about business knows that instead of real estate advancing it will in all probability decline. We can get along without this land at the present time. We are compelling the American people to buy Victory bonds and Liberty bonds at full value, when they are worth little more than 90 cents on the dollar; and then we are compelling them to pay enormous taxes on top of that. There is not a Senator on this floor who can justify that proposition.

I do not know all the particulars in this case, but I do know there is no necessity for the Government of the United States putting a quarter of a million dollars, as an investment, in real estate which we can get along without.

I want to say further that the Senator from Minnesota has touched upon a subject of which I know something. When we purchased the land between the Capitol and the Union Station we did, as he stated, tear down the buildings which were located on it. They were good buildings. We had before the Committee on Appropriations the other day the so-called Housing Corporation. They admitted that the loss to the Government would be twenty-six or twenty-eight million dollars, representing what the Government has lost in paying more wages and paying more for material during the war than the material and the wages were worth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question about certain houses that border along the Capitol Park. The Senator says that he is familiar with the real estate situation. I understand as to a number of those houses that the Government has been renting them during the period of the war at $5 per month.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator is misinformed.

Mr. McKELLAR. My information comes very directly; I do not know whether it is misinformation; I hope I am misinformed; but I understand that there are a number of brick houses, 10 or 12 room houses, down on the next street, whatever it is—B Street, I believe—fronting the Capitol Park, that have been rented all during the war for the sum of $5 a month.

Mr. GRONNA. If those houses have been rented at so low a price, I am sure it has escaped the notice of the Housing Corporation, because, let me say to the Senator, it was stated to the Appropriations Committee that this corporation had practically adopted the rates charged by corporations and by individuals in the city of Washington, so that if individuals and corporations profiteered the United States Government profiteered also.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know whether the buildings to which I refer are within the charge of the Housing Corporation or just how they are handled—in what department are they handled?

Mr. GRONNA. I am sorry to say I do not know to which buildings the Senator refers, and I have not gone into that particular phase of it; but I do know that the Government of the United States will lose between thirty and forty million dollars in the construction of buildings, there being some 6,000 of them.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator from Tennessee alludes to one or two wrecks of buildings which were purchased years ago. There were condemnation proceedings against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and some other parties; the awards were made, but the President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, intervened as against the sales, and the property has been "up in the air," so to speak, ever since. That is my information. I think Elliott Woods, probably, has the care of those particular buildings to which the Senator from Tennessee alludes.

Mr. McKELLAR. My information is that down near the Driscoll Hotel or the Maltby Building the Government owns a number of very excellent brick houses.

Mr. WARREN. It does.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that those houses have been rented for a number of years at a rental of $5 a month.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator has been misinformed.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that they are being subrented at fabulous prices.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator is misinformed as to the rates at present or in the immediate past.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the situation now is that the committee desires to recede from its amendment?

Mr. WARREN. The question now occurs upon the committee amendment striking out Rock Creek Park, and on further information the committee desires that the proposed amendment be disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. NELSON. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has produced figures showing that the price agreed to be paid for this land is reasonable, that it is below the assessed valuation. I am sure the American people believe in economy, but I do not think they believe in economy at the expense of the proper development of the Capital City. Senators are fond of saying in their public speeches that they want to see Washington made the model city of the world, and yet when we have an opportunity to develop the great parkway system that has been planned for Washington we hear all sorts of suggestions as to imposition and fraud.

In my judgment, nothing is more essential to the progress of this city, nothing more necessary to make it the ideal city it should be, than to have the parkway system completed at the earliest possible date, and completed in accordance with the plan already approved.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just a moment. It has been six years and more since this authorization was put in the statute, and certainly I think this is an opportune time for the Senate to carry it out.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator state how much land in the city of Washington is now included in parks?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That I do not know.

Mr. GRONNA. Fifty-five per cent of the land in this city, I will say to the Senator, consists of parks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think that is a most praiseworthy feature of the Capital City. That percentage of land here and perhaps more should consist of parks and playgrounds for the American people. The object of this particular proposition is to connect Potomac Park with Rock Creek Park, making one of the most beautiful driveways in the world.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator if he does not think Rock Creek Park and Potomac Park, connected as it is proposed to connect them, will make the most attractive park in the United States?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Undoubtedly; and I think that Congress ought to adopt the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I had intended to say a few words in opposition to the proposition of the committee to strike out this appropriation. Undoubtedly there have been cases, such as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has described, where lands have been put off on the Government by real estate men at exorbitant prices. I know of one on Sixteenth Street, where 10 acres which were taken for a park cost half a million dollars, and yet walls have to be built and terraces made before it can be made fit for use. There have been such cases as that undoubtedly; but I desire to say a word in

favor of retaining this appropriation, because, in the first place, it is required under an act of Congress. The expenditure was authorized, a commission was appointed, and the law provides for the creation of the park to connect the riverside drive and Rock Creek Park. It will rescue the lower part of Rock Creek from the condition it is now in. It will be the greatest benefit to the city and to the people of this city that has ever been provided by putting in proper order that stretch between the two parks. It will be of the greatest value to the people, for those parks during the summer are particularly popular; thousands of people go there and picnic, taking their children and letting the children play there under the trees. The completion of this project will make access possible and will be a great improvement to that part of Georgetown and Washington.

I am very warmly in favor of this improvement and have been in favor of it from the time it was started. It was carried through the Senate and warmly supported by former Senator Root and former Senator Wetmore, who were greatly interested in it. There has been delay on account of the war and the appropriations have been held back, although condemnation has taken place. Under the law the appropriation should have been made. We are getting the land, as a matter of fact, below the assessed valuation. I hope the amendment of the committee to strike out the appropriation will be rejected.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has probably noticed that the land which it is proposed to convert into a park is that most easily accessible not to the people who go out in automobiles but to the working people who go out in the street cars or on foot.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we hear much about beautifying the city of Washington and making it a model city; in all that I concur; but the people of Washington who are so anxious to have this city beautified and enlarged, and also to secure immunity from taxation, as they do, when it comes to beautifying the city and acquiring lands for parks or for other purposes, have no mercy. They are anxious to work the Government of the United States to the limit.

I remember some years ago, Mr. President, an appropriation was reported from the Committee on Appropriations of this body to purchase the old Globe Building down on Pennsylvania Avenue and to purchase a rookery, a temporary brick building that had been put up for a post office and rented to the Government for a rental which in two years paid the whole cost of the building. It was desired to unload those two buildings and that property onto the Government at an enormous price, and it took quite an effort on the part of the then Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Gallinger, and myself and one or two others to block that scheme, which was a part of the real estate operations of the real estate men in the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] referred to some buildings near the Capitol that are still owned by the Government. I think he is right. Their whole scheme was to take everything between the Capitol and the Union Station down to the street that passes north and south, bisecting the Peace Monument, clean up everything, and make a grand park of it. The Government secured, I think, all but one block, a part of which, containing the building to which the Senator from Tennessee refers and which the Government has rented, was obtained. There is another square right below that that is a part of the scheme in connection with which Senators will find there will be beautifying efforts to have Congress purchase it and secure control over it.

In these times of high taxes, in these times when the Government has to borrow money, in these times when we ought to economize, it seems to me the Government ought to avoid going into real estate purchases.

I was very much disappointed, Mr. President, with the provisions of the Army appropriation bill which passed a few days ago, and which carried appropriations for the purchase of three or four great bodies of real estate at enormous prices for so-called aviation fields. In one case, I think, 300 acres were involved, and in another case 400 or 500 acres. All the items were put together, so that it looked to me as though there were a pool. There were three groups in practically one paragraph—one in Buffalo, N. Y., another in New Jersey, and another out in Ohio. In these piping times of peace, when we are supposed to have peace perpetuated and made permanent by the league of nations, when we are to get rid of the big increase in the Navy which the Secretary of the Navy recommended at the last session of Congress, when we are to be relieved of all that, and, after we have had men flying across the Atlantic, why, in God's name, is it necessary to buy four aviation fields in this country? It seems to me that for aviation purposes we could carry on all of the experiments we need to carry on at one aviation field, instead of buying land for four of them. The Army appropriation bill, as I have said, contains three such items in one group, and there is another one added by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. I repeat, I was very much disappointed when I saw those items in the Army appropriation bill; but I can readily see why Senators were enthusiastic for them, and I forgive them, for we are all creatures of circumstance and of environment, and when our friends come to us and say, "Oh, we have some real estate which would make a good aviation field for the Government; I wish you would help to have the Government buy it," it is sometimes difficult to refuse.

The other day I was reminded of this when a gentleman from a foreign country came to me and said: "I have an elegant place which I will sell and which the United States Government ought to have for its embassy over there." Well, he did not make much impression on me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is a great deal of good sense in what the Senator has said. There is always good sense in what the Senator from Minnesota says. These aviation fields were authorized in the bill, as the Senator has stated; but not all of them should go out. Some of them are all right. I wish to call his especial attention to some of the provisions in the Army appropriation bill, in reference to experimental stations and the like, which ought to be stricken out. I refer particularly to the Wright-Dayton plant, at Dayton, Ohio. It ought not to be purchased, and I hope the Senator will help us strike it out should the conference report include it when the report comes back.

Mr. NELSON. I shall do what little I can. While the war was going on, Mr. President, I was very enthusiastic for it, and was ready to shut my eyes and gulp down everything and vote for everything; but now that the war is over, and especially since we are face to face with the covenant of the league of nations, with that breastwork in front of us, the spirit of economy has taken possession of me, and I trust and hope that the Committee on Appropriations will acquire some of that spirit and will have a little mercy on the Government of the United States.

I was very glad to-day to see the committee had cut down the appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission. That commission has done nothing but investigate. They have hundreds of clerks—I do not know how many—and want more, I take it. They have investigated and made reports, but I am not aware of any case where the commission has succeeded in affording any relief beyond giving us their report.

I do not think the friends of that commission can point to any concrete case where they have ever effectively relieved the people of the United States from any combination or trust. I looked upon the Federal Trade Commission act at the time it was passed as a breastwork for the big interests against the operations of the antitrust law, and I think, to a large extent, the commission has served that purpose and will continue to serve that purpose. It is a sort of breastwork. Large business interests can bring their cases before that commission and assure an almost endless investigation, an investigation as long as that made in connection with the lumber schedule of the tariff bill some years ago when revenue legislation was under consideration. That commission was supposed to make an investigation of the lumber schedule and give us information, but I think it took a whole year for them to make the investigation. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who is an encyclopedia of information, can tell me whether or not I have stated the fact correctly.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator has understated rather than overstated the time consumed by the commission in making its investigation and report.

Mr. NELSON. I know it was a long time before any report was received; the lumber question seemed to have been in cold storage for a long time, for we did not get the report until the tariff legislation was passed and the storm had blown over.

We have heard a great deal about the packers' investigation. The commission may have performed valuable work in that case, but did they follow it up with any effective proceedings, as they might have done, to cure the evil complained of or to restrain the packers in their operations? If they did, I have never heard of it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. What authority of law would the Federal Trade Commission have had to go further than they did in the packers' investigation?

Mr. NELSON. They could have gone further and instituted legal proceedings.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator, if he will consider the matter, will realize that they could not do that. The facts are that in that investigation they turned all of the evidence over to the Department of Justice, as was their duty under the law, as I understand.

Mr. NELSON. They have a right to institute proceedings where they find there is unfair competition. Can the Senator from Nebraska point to a single instance of relief that commission has afforded us outside of making reports and investigating?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; the Federal Trade Commission have made a great number of investigations in connection with which they have given relief.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; they have investigated, but that is all.

Mr. NORRIS. The case to which the Senator refers is one instance, in my judgment. There is not a particle of doubt that the evidence which developed in the packers' investigation showed conclusively violations of the antitrust law that would, if the law had been enforced, have put in the penitentiary the men who were guilty.

Mr. NELSON. Well, why did they not start the operation?

Mr. NORRIS. It is not their business, and they have not the authority to do so.

Mr. NELSON. Oh, yes; they have.

Mr. NORRIS. No; they have not. They turned it all over to the Attorney General, and it is in some pigeonhole, I presume, now in the Department of Justice.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, perhaps I can give the Senator from Minnesota a little information about the work of the Federal Trade Commission if he will allow me.

Mr. NELSON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Many of us were rather grievously disappointed and waited with some degree of impatience until, as the Senator from Minnesota now suggests, some tangible evidence of their work could be disclosed. Some time ago they instituted proceedings against the firm of Sears, Roebuck & Co., engaged in the mail-order business, as the Senator well knows, charging them with misrepresentations in advertisements which they put out concerning their products. A hearing was had, and an order was made enjoining that company from carrying on that deceptive method of conducting their business. The company elected to attack the order, as provided in the act, and brought proceedings in the circuit court of appeals for the eighth circuit, in Chicago, to restrain the commission from enforcing the order. The matter came before the court there for hearing. The court was called upon first to determine upon the constitutionality of the act, a question, as the Senator remembers, which was very stoutly debated here upon the floor of the Senate when the bill was under consideration. I am glad to say that the court sustained the constitutionality of the act, and, with a slight modification, upheld the order of the commission directed against the company.

Mr. NELSON. May I interrupt the Senator right there?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. The proceedings to which the Senator refers were initiated by the commission, were they not?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. If they could initiate proceedings in that case, could they do the same thing in the packers' case?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have no doubt they could.

Mr. NELSON. Have they instituted any proceedings against the packers?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not know; I think not; I have no information about that. I simply rose to give the Senator a little information as to some things that they have been doing.

I should like to add that a similar proceeding was instituted against a corporation that was engaged in the business of manufacturing and selling bagging and cotton ties. That company adopted a rule under which it declined to sell cotton bagging to any person who did not buy his cotton ties of the same corporation. It had control of cotton ties, but it did not have of cotton bagging. Cotton bagging could be bought anywhere; and this company, for the purpose of securing a monopoly of the trade in cotton bagging, established a rule under which it refused to sell cotton ties to anybody who did not buy cotton bagging of it. The commission made an order in that case enjoining it from continuing that practice. That company instituted like proceedings in the Court of Appeals of New York, and I regret to say that the order was by that court vacated. In matters of that kind, under the law authorizing the commission to institute proceedings in cases of unfair competition, action has been taken by the commission.

Mr. NELSON. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Montana for calling my attention to those cases. I have some recollection of the cotton bagging case to which the Senator refers, but the Sears Roebuck case had escaped my memory. What the Senator has said, however, goes to show that for which I have contended, namely, that the commission is not limited simply to investigations, but can institute proceedings of a remedial nature.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator is quite right. Will the Senator indulge me just a little further?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have referred to these two cases as illustrations of the character of the work they are doing. A large number of similar orders have been made, and my information is that there are now pending before the commission something like 150 similar proceedings directed against various firms and corporations throughout the country, charging them with unfair practices. As to the results of those cases, of course, I am not informed.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senator may be right; I have not kept as close track of the matter as I ought to have done. I only remember that a great feeling of gratification was expressed by many—and I shared in that feeling myself—when the commission instituted an investigation against the Beef Trust and the packers; but I was greatly disappointed when it all ended merely with the investigation without the commission taking any affirmative steps to relieve the people, as they have done in the cases which the Senator from Montana has cited.

I am taking up the time of the Senate longer than I intended, but there is another provision in this bill to which, although it has not been reached, I should like briefly to refer. I refer to the amendment striking out the provision in reference to the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course I do not wish to cut the Senator off, but does he himself not think that we ought to finish as we go along? We will come to that in a few minutes.

Mr. NELSON. I can say what I have to say about it in a moment or two, and then will not take up any further the time of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. NELSON. There has been no tariff legislation for a number of years, and I do not apprehend that there will be any general revision of the tariff in the near future; and I look upon this Tariff Commission at this time as a useless luxury. I have noticed in the past, away back, ever since I was a Member of the House, that we had a tariff commission, but whenever a tariff bill was introduced little attention was paid to the findings or work of the commission. They have been of no value; and therefore I think that under present conditions the Senate committee is justified in eliminating that provision. I think the Tariff Commission at this time is a useless luxury.

We have just disposed of another item; and I will refer to that, because it is customary here to refer to matters after they have been disposed of, but I shall be very brief. I refer to this railroad valuation. They have been at work at it for somewhere about six years, and have spent over $15,000,000, and only a small proportion of the roads, mainly the smaller roads, have had a valuation put upon them. The great work of valuation covering all of the railroad systems of the country is yet to be done, and to complete it on the plan they have been proceeding upon will probably, at the rate they have been moving, take them from 6 to 10 years more. Here is my criticism about that: I think it is a waste of money, because when that work is completed it is obvious that the valuation will be obsolete, and when proceedings are instituted either before the commission or by appeal from the commission to the courts the valuation will be of little value for two reasons—first, neither the railroads nor the public are bound by that valuation in legal proceedings. The most that can be said is that it might be prima facie evidence, and, more than that, on account of the age of the valuation it will be of little value in a country where values change and fluctuate so rapidly as they do here.

While I was in favor of the proposition originally, and it looked fair on its face, yet I regard the way in which it has been carried on and the cost it has involved to the country as a needless expenditure of money, but I may be out of fashion. It may be all right to keep up this work; but we will squander perhaps twenty-five or thirty million dollars more before the work is completed, and when it is completed it will be of little practical value.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has referred to real-estate agents in the District

of Columbia, and I fully agree with what he says; but does the Senator from Minnesota know that we are appropriating money to pay clerks to assist the real-estate agents in the District of Columbia to rent the houses which they may have for renting?

Mr. NELSON. No, Mr. President; I was not aware of that fact; but, as Solomon said, "There is nothing new under the sun."

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senate's attention to what is going on.

I have here a copy of a letter dated May 26, 1919, and this is what I find in the letter:

Phone North 1054. Department of Labor, United States Housing Corporation, Washington division, homes registration service, 1816 Twelfth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Then there is the address of a real-estate agent; and each one of the agents in the District of Columbia, I understand, has received a similar letter:

GENTLEMEN: That the United States Homes Registration Service may be able to cooperate with you and the properties (houses and apartments) that you have for rent to colored people may be placed at their disposal we request that you send to us as soon as possible a complete list of houses and apartments for rent.

We have no desire to rent these accommodations direct, but will send all applicants to you, without charge, as agents for the owner. This increases your opportunity to rent housing facilities listed with you.

Hoping for your cooperation in this matter, we are,

Yours, very truly,

F. A. BYRON,
Twelfth Street Branch, Homes Registration Service,
1816 Twelfth Street.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, as to the Tariff Commission, I should be very willing indeed that it remain if I could see any tangible good accomplished. It has been in existence for some time. If it has given a single original thought on the tariff, either for or against a tariff for revenue or for protective purposes, I have been unable to find it anywhere.

I have read some of its productions. The distinguished economist on the commission, Prof. Taussig, has written a book. It is a very good one indeed; but, without the Government's paying him a salary on this commission, the book is perfectly accessible to every Member of Congress. Every member of the Finance Committee of the Senate or the Ways and Means Committee of the House can have for $1.75 a copy of the book, if he wants to buy it, and keep it himself. He can have all of the information that has been given on the commission. It is just as current in the book as it is from the member of the commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to suggest to the Senator that, as I understood the duty of the Tariff Commission, it is not to favor either a tariff for revenue or free trade or a high or a low tariff, and that they would be going contrary to their duty if they took a position of that kind; that their duty is to furnish the evidence and the facts upon which Congress can make a tariff bill along any line that Congress desires.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I have heard of nonpartisan tariff experts for more than 40 years, but I never saw one in my life. By the time one has reached the point where he can give any Member of the Senate instruction, if he is not on one side or the other of the question he is utterly unfit even to collect statistics. He has arrived at some conclusion on this mooted question which I never expect, as men come and go, to be settled. Members who favor one particular economic school will vote that way, regardless of the Tariff Commission. Those of the reverse order will vote some other way; but the Tariff Commission itself will be sure to present views that, unconsciously to themselves, will be biased views.

Take the personnel of the commission. Take this gentleman whom I have mentioned as the author of a very good textbook, and a very competent economic writer, and a gentleman of high character. He serves the Government no better on this commission than he does as an author, copyrighting his book and selling it. We get it at much less cost. Then take another distinguished gentleman, who used to live in my particular jurisdiction, but is now a citizen of California. He is likewise a man of very high character; but if anyone says that he can make an unbiased tariff investigation, I respectfully beg leave to differ from that authority, whoever opines that way. He could not make one of that kind. They all have a preconceived opinion before they start on an investigation, and, unconsciously to themselves, they will collect the data that way.

There is another distinguished gentleman on this commission, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland. He belongs to the ancient and honorable order of the lame-duck brigade. All of us run the chance of becoming eligible to this fraternity. He was put there because he had been defeated as a candidate for Senator from the State of Maryland. He had once been, in the House, supposed to be a very distinguished authority on postal matters. That distinguished authority always wound up with Government ownership. Any kind of an enterprise that had any considerable amount of capital, that it was worth while to pay attention to in a Government way, when he got through with it was always a Government undertaking. He is one of the commissioners. When he concludes, everybody knows what the result of that investigation will be. It will be to put the Government, as far as possible, in control of everything. Even if there is a tariff investigation it will wind up with Government ownership. Logic does not cut any great figure in his investigation. He was once chairman of the Post Office Committee in the House, and I failed to read any public document he evolved for several years—it made no difference what it began about—that did not end up with Government ownership. You could start a discussion of Fourierism, or free love, or anything else, and by the time he had investigated the subject to its ultimate conclusion it would be a question of Government ownership of both parties to the transaction. He was placed in charge of telegraphs and telephones when the Government took them over. The illustrious mess he made of it seems to have satisfied him to let his hobby stay in the rest room a while.

You need not tell me that, with this kind of a personnel on this commission, you will get anything from it that is of value to the Government. They have collected a vast amount of data. In my leisure moments of rainy days I have read some of it when I could not be otherwise more profitably employed, and that has not been very often, Mr. President. In my reading I have failed to discern a single original thought, much less a single original fact, that we could not have found at some other place without an investigation by this commission.

I know a number of distinguished gentlemen—some of them editors of magazines of more or less prominence, some of them magazines principally owned by freaks and edited by obsessions—who had great theories about what a tariff commission would do if the Government would just create one and pay its members adequate salaries. They have besieged me at great length, because some of those gentlemen live in Chicago and vicinity. According to them, if the world just had a tariff commission it would end everything. It was a nonpartisan question—certainly. Why, the tariff never ought to figure in a campaign. Such a question as that never ought to be debased with a partisan reflection of any kind. If you would just create a tariff commission and make a nonpartisan body out of it everything would be forgotten and the free traders, the tariff-for-revenue advocates, and the protectionists would all fall on each other's necks in one glad, long, loving embrace. But they wanted $10,000 a year salary in order to consummate the transaction.

I informed these distinguished authorities—some of them editors of magazines, as I have suggested, and others editors of newspapers—that I would never support anything that paid a larger salary than a Member of Congress got. Maybe that is a sort of an obsession with me, but I have reached that conclusion. "Oh," they said, "you can not get anybody that is worth while—no distinguished authority of any kind—for $7,500 a year." "Well," I said, "what do you think of Congress? Is there anybody in Congress fit to fill one of these places if they would resign to serve on such a board?" Well, they never heard of a Congressman resigning. "It happens once in a while, however," I said. "You pay $7,500 a year to Members of Congress and they keep on running." "Well," they said, "they take it out in honor." I said, "Let this Tariff Commission take it out in honor; $7,500 is enough." And these eminent authorities persisted that $7,500 would lead only to the appointment of scrub politicians on the Tariff Board.

I submit, with a few shining exceptions, that that is exactly what it is now. They were better guessers than they thought. I am not saying that it would be any better under any administration. It would be a rendezvous for political cripples, a sort of lodging house for political bankrupts who could not be elected to anything. That is what it is now, except when some essayist or air-castle architect drops down to earth and defiles himself with an office. It will be that to the crack of doom. You can go on and appropriate money for it if you want to, but I am through with such governmental experiments myself.

They said, "You can not get anybody that is competent for less than $10,000 a year." Maybe that is what is the matter with Congress. Every once in a while I read an editorial in some metropolitan paper which says, in substance, "Congress has degenerated." I heard that, also, long before I ever came here. I never believed it; but if there is any degeneration it is on the part of these distinguished authorities who think that

the less you pay a public official the worse quality of service you get. It is not our fault on this argument. Raise our salaries and see how vigilant we will be and how much more of our cerebral activities you will get for the money.

This is a commission that ought to perish on its merits. It is like the Housing Commission; the sooner it dies, the better for the public. It is like the Trade Commission. It not only ought to have a reduction of $100,000, but it ought to suffer the same heroic operation that I hope the Tariff Commission will receive; it ought to be snuffed out. If it has accomplished anything, I fail to have heard what it is.

I referred this morning to the fact that the chairman of the commission, Mr. Colver, had been abroad at Government expense, and engaged principally in denouncing the industries of the United States and advising English authorities to stop the export of our products into British markets. He is doing that on the people's money. He will come back home. He ought to be met with a band, of course; but we will be so busy that we will not have time to welcome him home after such exploits, because, in all justice, Mr. President, we ought to prepare for a most auspicious event which, some time around the 4th of July, or shortly thereafter, will occur.

I understand that the peace conference has quite 1,400 gentlemen of various degrees connected with it. All of them are abroad, serving in greater or less capacities on the peace commission at public expense. When they touch our shores again we ought to give them a public reception, with brass bands discoursing martial music, with distinguished Senators acting on the reception committee with House Members. We ought to have, in addition, all of the presents, the decorations, the orders of nobility that have been conferred, all the silver and gold plate, all the statuary, the paintings and engravings, snuff boxes and garters that have been presented to this distinguished band of patriots while abroad.

An Associated Press report that was supposed to be of enough importance to be cabled across said that 17 carloads of those were in existence at that time. That was last winter. What has been accomplished in collections since then nobody knows, but we ought to inventory and meet them. We ought to give them a welcome befitting such a royal assembly. Fourteen hundred is no mean procession. Put them in the van of the entire multitude. I would suggest, too—as a constituent writing to one of my brother Senators, whom I will not mention without his permission, suggests—that there be put at the head of this distinguished procession, when we welcome them home again after an absence of more than six months, George Creel, Lincoln Steffens, and George D. Herron. This trio that have been abroad, giving advice to this Republic and to its Chief Executive, ought to be put where, on Pennsylvania Avenue, they can once more be seen of men. I am sure they can be secured. They will not shrink from the spot light. I hope the President's advisers will, by cablegram, suggest that this trio of distinguished worthies be brought here in due season, so that we may pay royal honors to them on their return. They will attract attention.

While we are thinking about these things, let us abolish some of these commissions. Thereby we will save money. We will have enough covered into the Treasury to pay the expenses of this welcome some time about July 4 or shortly thereafter.

The Tariff Commission never ought to be heard of again. I hope it will be defeated not only in the interest of economy but in the interest of a general rest to the question. The only thing I could ever suggest that it had any use for at all was to act as an anæsthetic. It might possibly drug somebody into the belief that there was no use in ever paying any attention to it again; that by the time a tariff commission got hold of a question it was as dead as anything could be.

There are some of these other economies in regard to which some criticisms were made. I think I will raise some points of order on some of them, even if I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. About all we can do in many cases is to sit about and listen; and I can not listen very well, unfortunately, a good deal of the time. But these appropriations appear to be propelled by some unseen, mysterious, irresistible force coming from outside of the Senate, outside of the subcommittee and the committee. From what source they derive their propelling power I do not know; but by the time they reach the committee they have such a vast degree of momentum that nothing short of an earthquake would arrest their progress. I think it is time we began to economize, not only in the Housing Corporation, to which the Senator from Minnesota referred, but in everything along the line.

Take the Housing Commission, which erected these stucco buildings out here on the Plaza. The Plaza was condemned when I came here, six years ago last spring. It has been condemned ever since, not only by the commission that condemned it, but by everybody that knows anything about it. It hangs fire, of course, like every other Government operation; and so long as there is a salary connected with it there will be a Plaza Commission. It will endure, not only through Democratic administrations, but it will endure through every Republican administration, unless somebody rises up and cuts off the appropriation. That is the only way to reach it. The Housing Corporation is taking care of some 1,800 people. The Government is running a hotel. It will soon have a moving-picture show, if it has not already. They have stewards, and cooks, and waiters, and all the paraphernalia that goes with a hotel. It is called a Government hotel. The Housing Corporation has a pay roll of $301,000. It is like Warren Hastings on his impeachment trial. When it was proven that he only took a certain sum of money, replied, "I ought to be commended for my moderation." They could have had a pay roll of half a million dollars or $600,000 as well as $300,000, and perhaps we ought to commend them for their moderation.

But here in this city it is said to be necessary. I do not think it is. It is necessary to keep the pay roll alive, and that is all the necessity there is in it. It ought to go out in due time. The Federal Trade Commission ought to go out, the Tariff Commission ought to go out, and then the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to be inspired with a little more vigorous life and some power and be given enough encouragement to do something and to have enough backing to make it useful in the railway and general transportation situation.

I am quite satisfied that if we had had an Interstate Commerce Commission to deal with the railroad question, backed up sufficiently by public sentiment and by the Congress, we would have had better results. Congress has never given it the support it ought to have.

Just as soon as the Government took over the steam railways it was seen what was the matter. The Interstate Commerce Commission ought to have seen it long before. Every steam railroad in the country had been working in a strait-jacket for years. There was no opportunity for a railway to live, to make any progress, to do things in the interest of the public service. We are going to travel the same road in many other things if we do not look out. We have learned by experience. We could have modified the antitrust law; we could have permitted traffic agreements under rigid supervision; we could have increased rates; we could have pooled many of the instrumentalities, the terminal facilities and everything used in the operation of a steam road, long before the Government did it, and effected economies without the tremendous cost we have incurred under Government operation. But the Interstate Commerce Commission did not feel justified because they did not think public opinion nor the powers given them by Congress or the appropriations would make it possible.

So these items, Mr. President, ought to be cut out. It is economy. If we do not omit them, it will be because we made the promise to the public to economize, but never keep it in our votes.

I inquired awhile ago, in asking the Senator from Utah about our appropriations, if we had decreased any in this body, and he replied no, as every member of the Appropriations Committee knows. We know there is a good reason for that. I am not criticizing the committee. I am as responsible for it as any other member outside of the chairman himself likely. The House passes a certain appropriation bill with items at a total aggregate. It comes to this body and goes to our committee. The departments or bureaus come to us with after-discovered items, items they had overlooked or that have been made necessary by developments since the estimate was made in the department. So additions are made, and some of them are properly made, because they are necessities in the committee itself. But there are some I do not approve of; there are some I have not voted for in the committee, and others I shall not vote for on the floor of the Senate Chamber. We can get along now without those provisions. Like everybody recovering from a very great strain on their business resources, whenever the Government can live, whenever we can get along by any means in a department or in a commission or without a commission, then we ought to strike out that appropriation and live as economically as we can until we get back to a sound business pay-as-you-go basis.

We are living on credit now, not only on credit from the Government or investing public, but we are living on credit money. When we begin to contract our currency, to get back to a safe foundation, when our money returns to a gold basis and this enormous expansion of credit that we have in everybody's pocket,

more or less, and in every business transaction, when we begin to return to a normal basis, then we will begin to understand that pay day has come, and we had better prepare for it now by cutting our appropriations every dollar we can.

I do not think the Senate Appropriations Committee—and sometimes the Senate itself—has done its whole duty in reducing these charges. This side of the Chamber is to blame as much or more than the minority side. I believe this is a good time to begin with items that we can get along without. The Tariff Commission is not a war necessity, neither do we need it to get back to a normal level in our business affairs. It is a good place to save $300,000. If somebody hereafter wants to establish a Tariff Commission, let it be done; but it serves now no useful purpose, because the tariff question will be an entirely different problem when we get to it, and it will be settled in this Chamber and at the other end of the Capitol; it will not be settled by a Tariff Commission. Call it what you like, but the same precaution that leads the President to suggest that we ought to take care of our dyestuffs, manufacturing, and sugar and matters of that kind will suggest itself in other essential industries. We may call it a temporary policy, if you will, lasting only until normal conditions are restored or until we are able again to appeal to a very full force of manufacturers and workmen. Call it whatever we like, the truth still is that we will finally come to a solution of the tariff question as a matter of revenue or protection or both outside of the Tariff Commission. It will collect nothing that every Senator does not know anyhow, that every Member of the House does not know. It will be matters of current information coming from abroad and gathered in our own country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the committee amendment will prevail.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand, the question now to be voted on is not the Tariff Commission item—it has no relation to the Tariff Commission—but is the request of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that the amendment as to the completion of the Rock Creek Park system be disagreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. I am surprised that the Senator from Texas after listening to the able speech of the Senator from Illinois should not understand that all his remarks were devoted directly and immediately to a discussion of whether or not additional land should be purchased for Rock Creek Park.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee, on which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. NELSON. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency shipping fund," on page 52, line 9, after the word "law," to strike out "$276,000,000" and insert "$491,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For purchasing, requisitioning, or otherwise acquiring plants, material, charters, or ships now constructed or in the course of construction, and the expediting of construction of ships thus under construction, and for the cost of construction of ships, within the limit of cost authorized by law, $491,000,000; and the unexpended balances of the appropriations for the housing of shipyard employees and their families, the taking over of certain transportation systems, and the transportation of shipyard and plant employees, the purchase of ships under construction or to be constructed in shipyards in foreign countries, and the operation of ships, contained in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $150,000,000 for the purchase of ships contained in the deficiency appropriation act approved October 6, 1917, are reappropriated and made available to meet obligations already incurred within the purposes of the appropriation herein made.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, after consuming about three hours of time in endeavoring to save $100,000, I was wondering if it might not be possible, by a little investigation, to save $215,000,000. I see by the committee amendment the appropriation for the emergency shipping fleet is raised $215,000,000, or to a total of $491,000,000.

As a member of the Committee on Commerce I would like to get a further explanation. We received, after several hearings, a report of the chairman of the Shipping Board, Mr. Hurley, which in effect announces their policy as discontinuing the construction of a merchant fleet when they had completed those ships now under contract. Following that thought and that definite decision on the part of the chairman of the Shipping Board, I notice in the hearing before the House committee on this same subject Mr. Hurley appeared and, on page 504 of the testimony, he states that in his judgment it will require about $300,000,000—that is, $300,000,000 more of the sum originally authorized by Congress—to complete those ships the contracts for which have not been suspended.

I presume it was on that testimony that the House adopted the amendment providing for $276,000,000. The Senate committee have raised it to $491,000,000. I am discussing the question simply on the evidence I have recently referred to. If the figures as presented in this report are incorrect and they require approximately $300,000,000 more to complete those ships now in course of construction or the contracts for which have not been suspended, I personally am in favor of completing what is in hand. But if this testimony is correct, I can not see the reason for the additional $215,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. We had quite extensive hearings on this shipping business. As it is rather concise, perhaps it ought to be read at the desk. However, this is the situation: They testified, as the Senator from New Hampshire has stated, but it seems that they were figuring on the selling of ships for cash, that were turned in under previous legislation, and it is found they have to sell them on time in order to get the price they should get, with some credit allowed, perhaps half or two-thirds of the stated price. So they have made another estimate in which they undertook to correct it, and they state regarding the sale of ships that if they only sell to those to whom they can sell for cash it will be difficult to dispose of them and they would have to dispose of them at only, I will not say a fraction, because that means small, but only a part of the value.

On the other hand, on the basis upon which they are selling them they will get a very good value. As this is a large matter and a matter of much importance, of course, I think this evidence ought to be read, and I will send it to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to reading the hearings, but it seems to me to be unnecessary. The explanation is very plain. The committee recommended this increase of appropriation because of a misunderstanding on the part of the House committee, and some of the arguments——

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me, I think I ought to have stated the House committee afterwards admitted to me that they had probably miscalculated and misunderstood some of the testimony which they had received.

Mr. FLETCHER. The fact is that on the hearing before the Senate committee Mr. Ackerson, vice president of the Fleet Corporation, said:

I think I can state this very briefly, gentlemen, because there is no difference of opinion between the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the House committee as to the purposes of the estimates for which we have asked. We asked for $704,000,000 with which to carry out our net program. We had a gross program at the time of 3,184 ships, at a dead-weight tonnage of 17,393,000 tons. We canceled or suspended 754 ships, with a tonnage of 3,798,000 tons, which leaves our net program, which is our minimum program, beyond which we do not think we can go, of 2,394 ships, 13,595,000 tons.

The purpose of the House was to enable them to complete that, and the Senate committee has agreed that that should be done, and in order to complete it they need the amount which the Senate committee has allowed.

Mr. Ackerson said, on page 37 of the Senate committee hearings:

In a nutshell, we want that $276,000,000 changed to $491,000,000, which is the net amount of $704,000,000 less the $213,000,000 which we told the House committee we could deduct.

So there is no real conflict, but a sort of misunderstanding of certain deductions, or whether certain deductions could be made, and which the House figured might be made under the statement to that committee.

Mr. EDGE. Then there will be a credit. As I take it, following the statement of Chairman Hurley in his report, though he does not name the number, I understand generally they have sold 20 or 25 ships, and they are selling them on time. Even after they complete their obligation for ships now under contract in course of construction, the Government will certainly have a very large credit.

Mr. FLETCHER. They have already made contracts for the sales that they propose to make.

Mr. EDGE. I understood the chairman of the committee to state that they could not use this money to build ships because they can only sell ships on time.

Mr. FLETCHER. They propose to make that deduction. If the Senator will turn to page 34 of the Senate committee hearings he will see that the deductions from the amount they originally estimated of $704,000,000 are stated in this way by Mr. Ackerson.

We stated that we could reduce that amount by the unexpended balance which we have:
Housing, $6,000,000.
Transportation, $10,000,000.
Foreign-ship construction, $4,000,000.
Plant appropriation, $25,000,000.
And an unexpended balance from foreign-ship purchase, $118,000,000, which made a total of $163,000,000. We stated that we could further reduce the appropriation by the sale of ships which had recently come about, and that we thought we could get $50,000,000 cash from the sale of ships during the next year, which would apply to the reduction of the appropriation to be made.

So they have estimated all that in the amount from the sale of the ships and from these other items, and taken it from the original estimate of $704,000,000. The House wanted to make them deduct from that also the reduced program and cut down the program still further $80,000,000, additional ship sales $25,000,000, working capital $60,000,000. They ought not to take all the working capital and apply it toward the construction of ships. The House also wanted to deduct the capital stock $50,000,000, making a total of $215,000,000, which the House supposed they might further deduct from the $704,000,000, and that would bring it down to the House estimate. But to do that it would require deductions which it is naturally economically possible for them to make. They require, in order to complete their net program after cancelling 754 ships, reducing the original tonnage to 3,795,000 tons. They now need this amount in order to complete the remainder, and I submit that they ought not to be denied it.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. There is just one question that occurs to me, and that is why the capital stock should not be used as working capital, and if so, why could it not be reduced by that amount?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not see how you could use it in that way.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not understand it requires $100,000,000 working capital, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not state accurately, because I did not hear the question stated, but I do not think it an unwarranted assumption to say that it does take that amount. When the principal cost of the shipping is in supplies and labor and in building this vast amount of shipping which is going to be in this bill, of course, you have to have a large sum of money for the turnover.

Mr. FLETCHER. If you will allow me to read from page 36, there is another reason why, shown in the hearings, at page 36, where Mr. Ackerson said:

> The working capital of $60,000,000 was provided by the Congress in an appropriation providing a working fund with which to operate these vessels.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true.

Mr. FLETCHER (reading)—

> That money has actually been drawn from the Treasury and is not in cash at the present time.

Mr. SMOOT. May I say to the Senator this explanation was given, as I remember it: On the sale of these ships they are disposed of by payments to be made, about 33⅓ per cent down and the balance of the purchase price to be paid in payments at different dates thereafter. I think the balance over and above 33⅓ per cent or thereabouts is to be paid within a period of, say, two years, or in some cases three years.

Mr. LENROOT. What capital is required to carry time sales?

Mr. SMOOT. What I mean to say is that the capital has been used in the construction of the ships, and no doubt will be returned from later payments which may be made on the purchases.

Mr. LENROOT. That has nothing to do with working capital.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand it has to do with working capital. I am speaking of the capital stock of $50,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. I was wondering whether this $50,000,000 of capital stock of the Emergency Fleet Corporation is utilized at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it has been utilized.

Mr. LENROOT. That was the query. I very much doubt whether it has been.

Mr. SMOOT. If it has not been utilized, then this statement is incorrect. The estimated amount of the cash receipts during the year from sales of ships, the amount to be deducted from the original program is, among other items, $50,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. But that has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SMOOT. I say that has nothing to do with this question, but that $50,000,000 makes up one-third, because they expect to get one-third, and therefore there will be $100,000,000 they have got to carry in some other way if they get the ships built and paid for. It is claimed they are using the capital stock, $50,000,000, and they are also using the working capital of the operating department of the Shipping Board amounting to $60,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. What is the statement the Senator has showing they are using the capital stock of $50,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. It comes in in this way: The original program called for $704,000,000. Now they deduct from that $213,000,000, leaving $491,000,000, which is necessary to carry out the program. The $213,000,000 that was taken off by the House they claim should be restored for this reason:

> Reduction of aforesaid minimum program $80,000,000—
>
> As provided for above in the figures I have just quoted—
>
> Addition to estimate of cash receipts from ship sales, $25,000,000.

In other words, the Shipping Board does not think they are going to get the amount of first payments for the sale of ships that the House thought they would. The House thought it would be $75,000,000 instead of $50,000,000.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. EDGE. I want to ask a question right in connection with that statement.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. We understand, then, that the Shipping Board discovered during the 8 or 10 days intervening between the hearings before the House committee and the Senate committee that they had made a mistake of 50 per cent, or $215,000,000, in their estimates. That is practically what it amounts to.

Mr. FLETCHER. They claim that the Members of the House did not understand their position.

Mr. SMOOT. The members of the House Appropriations Committee—at least some of them—have stated that there was justice in some of the claims made by the Shipping Board.

I am not prepared, because I have not gone into the investigation, to say that is so; but I am simply saying what the members of the Shipping Board claim, that that makes the difference of $213,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true; and I merely speak of this matter so that it may be considered when the bill gets into conference. I think the position of the House was that they should use this $50,000,000 of capital stock, and the question is whether they should be required to use that $50,000,000 of capital stock which they have, which, if not used, has been lying idle, and which has never been used. There is no reason why it should not be used.

Mr. SMOOT. That is absolutely true; but I think the Senator will find that it has been used in the construction of ships.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; I am sure of that, because every dollar for the construction of ships expended by the Emergency Fleet Corporation has not been expended under the shipping law, but upon authorizations and appropriations to the President of the United States. They have been acting merely as the agents of the President of the United States in this whole program, and not in their capacity under the law as the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will remember that the original appropriation of $50,000,000 for the capital stock of the corporation was not only for the purchase but for the building of ships; and it does not seem possible that that corporation has held $50,000,000, and not done anything with it. I think that this increase of $50,000,000, as provided here, is for the very purpose of covering the $50,000,000 which has already been made use of.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think that is true; but, in addition to that, they do not want to use up every dollar of their current resources in the construction of ships. The Shipping Board is not going out of business the minute this appropriation is made. The Shipping Board was created under the act of 1916, and it will have something to do after this building program is complete. That program will not be completed within the next few months by any means, and it is scarcely advisable to use up the entire capital of the concern as if it were going to wind up its business right now.

But aside from that, the testimony shows, and particularly with regard to this working capital, that the Shipping Board, for instance, paid out $45,000,000 for charters for vessels which they requisitioned and which were then turned over to the War Department for operation. That is still outstanding and has not been returned to them. They have had no return from those vessels; they do not get any of the proceeds from the vessels. The War Department does not pay anything for the use of the vessels for charters of which the Shipping Board paid. That is an investment which they have made. A part of their working capital has been consumed in that way. They have bills payable and bills receivable. It is a tremendous business and a big going concern. It does not mean to go out of business just because the present building program may be finished.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will turn to page 36 of the hearings he will find this statement:

> The working capital of $60,000,000 was provided by the Congress in an appropriation providing a working fund with which to operate these vessels. That money has actually been drawn from the Treasury and is not in cash at the present time.

That is the $60,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. Ackerson continues:

The bills receivable of the division of operations of the Shipping Board are far more than enough to cover that, but the bills are not readily collectible. For example, we have $45,000,000 due from the War Department which we have not been able to obtain, but may possibly obtain after the urgency deficiency bills are passed, which make certain claims payable by the War Department, but even then I do not know that we are a preferred creditor.

Senator SMOOT. Did you loan $45,000,000 to the War Department?

Mr. ACKERSON. No, sir; we have paid $45,000,000 in actual charter of vessels which we have requisitioned and which have been turned over to the War Department for operation, and of course since 1918 we have not been allowed by law to bill the War Department for those charges. Prior to that date we did, but we have not received the money itself.

Senator SMOOT. You will get that all right.

Mr. ACKERSON. We hope so.

We have $22,000,000 in the Division of Operations due from foreign governments.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Utah, of course, understands I was raising no question as to the $60,000,000 working capital.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator to the testimony of the chief of operations of the Shipping Corporation, who stated that they had between two and three hundred—over 200—wooden ships; that they had cost on an average of $200 a ton; and that a large number of those ships had been sold at a loss of $100 a ton.

Mr. SMOOT. They sold 45 wooden ships, as I remember.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; and they sold them at a loss of $100 a ton. They did a little better on the steel ships. They got a certain proportion of cash from the sale of those ships and they have that fund. Their plan, as I understand, is to sell all of the wooden ships as fast as they can. If they continue to sell them, they will get a lot of money out of those ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. They allow $50,000,000 for that.

Mr. SMOOT. Their estimate shows they expect to get $50,000,000 out of those ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. And that is as many as they should sell.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that the testimony showed that they have sold steel ships for a little more than they cost.

Mr. NELSON. They have not figured anything for overhead expenses.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be true; or interest on the money.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as I understand the situation it is this: They estimated before the House committee that it would take $704,000,000 to carry on their net program; that is, the program that was left after they had canceled or suspended all of the contracts they felt they should suspend, even, perhaps, going a little bit further than they thought they should go. They advised the House that under certain conditions they could reduce the $704,000,000 by $6,000,000 that they could get from housing, $10,000,000 from transportation, $4,000,000 from foreign ship construction, from plant appropriation $25,000,000, and an unexpended balance from foreign ships of $118,000,000, or a total of $163,000,000. They say that they could get this amount from other sources, and therefore could reduce the $704,000,000 by that amount. Then they also stated to the House that if they could sell a certain number of ships they could secure in cash payments an additional $50,000,000, making $213,000,000 that they could stand as a reduction from the $704,000,000. The House reduced the $704,000,000 by $213,000,000, and, in addition to that, made a further reduction of $215,000,000. That reduction was made as follows: The House figured that, instead of reducing $50,000,000 because of the cash coming in for ship sales, they would reduce it $75,000,000, or $25,000,000 more. Mr. Ackerson stated that if that action was confirmed it would compel them to sell a much larger number of ships than they thought it would be possible to sell. Furthermore, that if to get the benefit of that amount of money they were compelled to sell a larger number of ships, it would probably reduce the price, because if purchasers knew the Shipping Board must sell a certain number of ships they would be more apt to hold off and pay less than if they were a little bit uncertain about that. So the reason we did not allow that $25,000,000 was because we did not want to force unduly the sale of ships.

Then the House further reduced the amount $80,000,000 on the shipbuilding program. In other words, if they must stand that, they must cancel further contracts, which would result, in my judgment, in very great loss to the Government, because it is a very serious question if they have not gone further in the cancellation of contracts now than they ought to go, and if the Government would not lose more by reason of cancellation than it would by completing the contracts and then selling the ships for what it could get out of them. So the committee did not think that they ought to make that $80,000,000 reduction.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. EDGE. I wish to make my position clear. I entirely agree with the Senator's viewpoint just expressed, that all ship contracts which have not been suspended or canceled should be completed by the Shipping Board, and then the Shipping Board go out of business; but this testimony, as I read it, is so far away from the figures that have been presented that it is very difficult to dovetail them. If I may be permitted, I will read. It is only five or six lines. The chairman speaking to Mr. Hurley asked this question:

Five million dollars that can be used for the construction program. Now, the original act made an appropriation of $50,000,000 for capital stock. That has never been used?

Mr. HURLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. So that if that were used, your estimate could be reduced by that amount?

Mr. HURLEY. Yes. That was invested.

The CHAIRMAN. By what authority was that invested?

Mr. HURLEY. There is a provision in the act. It came from the sale of Panama Canal bonds, and it is invested in stock of the corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. Your authorization for construction total is $2,884,000,000?

Mr. HURLEY. Mr. Ackerson can speak about that.

Mr. ACKERSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent will you use that authorization, having in mind the cancellations as your program now stands?

Mr. ACKERSON. I should say within about $300,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not the exact figure?

Mr. ACKERSON. I have not, but I will put it in, but it is roughly $300,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you contemplating entering into any new contracts at the present time?

Mr. ACKERSON. No, sir; We have none under consideration, other than any replacements that Mr. Rosseter and Chairman Hurley have spoken of. When we sell a ship, we may replace it with a more desirable ship. We have no new contracts under consideration and have awarded none since last October.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator I have not examined that testimony, but I am inclined to think there is some little confusion over the question of authorizations and appropriations. An authorization is not an appropriation. The House reduced the authorization by $120,000,000, and the Shipping Board made no objection to that. All that they asked for is necessary appropriations to carry on the net program, and I feel satisfied that those ought to be given.

The $50,000,000 capital stock, I am inclined to think, has been appropriated for, but I may be mistaken about that; I am not sure of it. As the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] suggests, I think it is well to consider that phase of the matter in conference.

The other $60,000,000 working capital that the House further deducted has, I think, been fully explained, so that Senators will make no question with regard to that.

That is the situation as I understand it. I think that we should make this appropriation of $491,000,000 and that the conferees should especially consider the question of the $50,000,000 capital stock, although I believe they will find that that has actually been used.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, let me say that it comes right down to this proposition: If we deny this appropriation as recommended by the committee and stand by the House provision, then we further reduce the shipping program and necessitate further cancellations. They have already canceled nearly one-fourth of their original program; they have canceled wherever there was a possibility that the Government might save money by the cancellation. The contracts remaining, therefore, are contracts in process of performance; the ships are under way, being constructed, and about four a day are now coming out all over the country. In every instance where the contract has not been canceled the keel has been laid, the material is on the ground, in large part fabricated ready to go in the ship, and in large part paid for; so that if the contract is canceled we will lose money and get nothing in return, whereas if we permit the contracts to be performed the net program will be completed and we will have the ships at a figure which will in all human probability make the investment perfectly safe, if we do not, as is now being done according to the testimony before the committee, make a profit on those ships. That is the whole question.

The Shipping Board have testified before the Commerce Committee that—and it undoubtedly is the case—they have canceled contracts where keels have not been laid, the material is not on the ground, and so forth, and that they can not cancel any further in the interest of the Government with-

out its costing an enormous amount of money for which there can be no possible return to the Government. They ought not to be forced to cancel contracts by failing to appropriate money to carry them out.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say that if the $491,000,000 appropriation is agreed to by the Senate I think it ought to be distinctly understood that if it is found that the capital stock of the Shipping Board, amounting to $50,000,000, which has been taken into account in arriving at this figure, is still invested in Panama bonds, we ought in conference to deduct the $50,000,000 from the $491,000,000. That can be done, as the House bill only carries $276,000,000. I myself think it would be very much better policy, if they have their capital stock invested in Panama bonds, that they should sell those bonds and use that money for building ships. This amount takes care of every ship that is on the ways, the contract on which has not been canceled.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Does this program involve the final sale of all of the ships and the discontinuance of Government ownership and operation?

Mr. SMOOT. This provision does not, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON. I mean, the program?

Mr. SMOOT. This is simply an appropriation to complete the ships that have been contracted for, and that are on the ways, and the contracts for which have not been in any way canceled.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; I understand the object of this immediate appropriation, but I was asking about the general policy of the Shipping Board. Is it to be a policy of continued Government operation and ownership or is it to be a policy of selling the ships as fast as they are constructed?

Mr. SMOOT. From the testimony that has been given, it is said to be the policy to wind up the affairs of the Shipping Board as soon as possible.

Mr. WATSON. And how long will it take to do that?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think anybody can determine that now. That will depend upon how quickly they can sell the ships.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator that Congress probably will determine the policy that will be followed with reference to that.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely. That is the point I was trying to find out about.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Committee on Commerce has started hearings on that matter to get all the facts and conditions, with a view to determining the policy just as soon as possible.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, in the meantime the Shipping Board, as I understand, have full authority to sell ships.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They have authority to sell ships.

Mr. EDGE. They could, then, entirely dispose of the present merchant marine if they found purchasers?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, answering to some extent the question that has just been asked, I understand that in the original appropriation for the Shipping Board there was a fund of $50,000,000. That was given before we entered the war; and under the terms of that bill the ships that were built with that $50,000,000 must be sold within five years. After entering the war, Congress made very large appropriations for the building of ships, due to war conditions; and as to the sale of those ships—I mean the ships constructed with the funds that were given to the Shipping Board after we entered the war—there was no limitation placed in the law with reference to the sale. They were given the authority to sell, but they might hold them for a long time or they might sell them immediately.

As the Senator from Washington has just suggested, it is in the power of Congress at any time to order the sale of these ships, because they are Government property; but the policy of the board seems to be, and they are carrying it out, to put these ships on the market and sell them as expeditiously as they can without breaking the market for ships.

I think up to this time they have been very successful in this matter. When they commenced building ships under war prices, I thought, of course, we would make a very considerable loss when we came to sell the ships; but up to this time the ships they have sold have been sold for a slight amount above the war-time cost of building ships.

I think this item undoubtedly ought to be agreed to. Last year, when the war was practically over, about the time of the signing of the armistice, in connection with one of the appropriation bills the Shipping Board came before the Senate committee with a program for further extensions beyond what had been contemplated up to that time, asking $120,000,000 in addition to the program they already had. The committee refused to allow that, and the Congress ratified the decision of the committee; but the committee did authorize, and gave them to understand, that such funds as were needed to complete their then program would be furnished. Now, the committee is carrying out that understanding, and merely giving them the amount of money that is necessary to carry out the program that was agreed on. It does not seem likely at present that there is going to be any great loss in this matter; certainly not in the cost of the ships.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. Does not the question of loss, while perhaps it does not enter into the consideration of this amendment, depend entirely upon the system of bookkeeping? As I understand, the sale of these steel ships is being made at approximately $210 a deadweight ton, which is very near the price they have figured that they cost—in the neighborhood of $205 or $206, as I recall—but that does not take into consideration the overhead expenses of running a great, big, expensive department of the Government. I think that is correct. I do not say that as a matter of criticism, but as a matter of keeping the record straight.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not say whether the overhead charges are included in the cost price of these ships or not; but the ships are being sold for a small amount over what they consider to be the cost price, and, as every Senator knows, the overhead charge in a well-managed concern ought to be, and usually is, a very small percentage of the cost. Therefore, if it is run on a reasonable basis for a large concern, the overhead charge ought not to add greatly to the cost given.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in this case the overhead charge will be materially larger than it is in other cases, for the reason that the Government in many instances—especially in the case of Hog Island and two or three other yards that I can think of—contributed a lot of money to the construction of the yards. In fact, I think probably over half of the yards of the country have been aided by the Government in one way or another, either by direct contributions or by the loan of money advanced to them, and those items have not been figured into the cost of these ships. Therefore the overhead expense in the case of these vessels is far more than the overhead expense would be in an ordinary shipbuilding plant.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would not call that an overhead charge. The losses at the Hog Island shipbuilding plant would not be an overhead charge. They might be a charge against the capital stock in an ordinary corporation, or loss of investment, but they would not come in as an overhead charge. That item may not be figured in this cost at all; but if it is figured in, in an ordinary shipbuilding plant you would not figure your capital in against your ships, and your loss on capital against the ships. It might be that these particular ships ought to contribute some portion of that loss, but certainly not over the amount of a fair interest rate on the money invested.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. There have been several inquiries as to whether we should have a night session. I want to say that I shall ask, a little later on, that the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night.

Mr. NELSON. What I wanted to say, if the Senator will allow me a moment, is that the cost the commission has estimated as to these vessels does not include the expenses they have been put to in the matter of the yards. Let me give the Senator an illustration.

In the case of the Hog Island yard, the land was purchased by the company that was building the ships at a certain price. The Government is to pay 6 per cent interest on that price; and then, in addition to that, the Government pays the cost of constructing and building the yard and getting the ways and everything ready. In the case of the Hog Island yard, it was estimated that it would cost $21,000,000. It turned out that it cost between $50,000,000 and $60,000,000 to complete that yard. That is an extreme case; but there are many other cases where the Government in like manner has contributed to the construction of the yards in one way or another, and that is not figured in the cost of the ships. So that when the Shipping Board tell us that these vessels cost only so much a ton that is simply the cost of

the material for building the ships and the labor involved and nothing more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. A charge against capital, of course, ought to be included in the cost of the ships, but not the losses on capital. If this were a private concern, the investment at Hog Island would have gone into the capital stock account and not into the overhead charge. If we have lost money on the capital stock account—as we undoubtedly have—that is a charge against capital stock; but that is not the problem that confronts us in reference to whether we shall proceed to complete these ships, because that loss was due to war conditions. There is hardly an enterprise that the Government went into during the war that you have not got at least a third to mark off because you made the development during the war period, with war prices; and that is a part of the cost of the war, like the powder that we expended on the battle field. We have got to recognize that, and charge it off to war account.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I am entirely in favor of completing our shipping program as to all ships where the contracts have not been canceled. I think the ships should be completed as fast as possible, and I agree with the view of the Shipping Board, as stated before our committee, namely, that they cancel all of those contracts where the work has not been entered upon or the materials purchased. They have a few contracts still under suspension, where it is a question as to whether they will restore them or have them finally canceled, but they are acting on the principle that if the Government would save money by using the material on hand and completing the ships instead of canceling the contract, they will go on and complete the ships; but if the Government would lose, then they will cancel these suspended contracts also.

While I am on my feet, with the indulgence of the Senator, I will add just one word more.

Of course, the question of whether or not these ships shall be operated by the Government, as the Senator knows, is not involved in this appropriation bill; but, so far as we can ascertain the views of the members of the Shipping Board and their leading subordinates, none of them are in favor of the operation of the shipping by the Government. They all believe, I think, with possibly one exception, that the Government should dispose of the ships to our own citizens, and set them to work in our merchant marine. I think we will come out fairly well on the steel ships; but we built a multitude of wooden ships—small wooden ships, comparatively speaking—I think of a tonnage of 4,000 tons. In the case of those that have been completely timbered, the estimated cost, Mr. Rossiter stated, was about $200 a ton; and they are selling them and probably will not be able to sell most of them at much more than $100 a ton. There will be a good deal of loss on the wooden ships, but on the steel ships we may fare better and get out better.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am in accord with what the Senator says about that matter. So far as I know, the wooden ships that have been sold up to this time have been sold at a slight profit above the cost of building ships; but there are probably some other wooden ships that can not be sold at cost. That is due to war conditions. My understanding is that they are not building any further wooden ships in this program, and that on the ships that they are building to completion the Government will get the money back. If that is the case, with the entire world short of ships, with a need for ships in every country in the world, and not having in this program more ships than our own country needs to carry on its commerce, it seems to me it would be folly to tie the hands of these men and delay the carrying out of the program that has been agreed upon.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. I want to repeat that my object in opening this discussion was not with the thought at all of cutting down the appropriation, if it has been clearly demonstrated that this is needed to complete the program; but I made the observation because of the large difference between the House appropriation and the Senate appropriation, after reading the testimony as I understood it. Personally I am not so sure but that it would have been better for the Emergency Fleet Corporation to arrange for the construction of a number of additional ships over the program, because they have the yards. We have spent millions of dollars in constructing and equipping them, hundreds of thousands of men are employed, and the ships can be ultimately used; so that my observation was not with the thought at all of stopping the shipbuilding program. This board, however, on the testimony of the chairman, wants to cease operations, and I frankly feel that the continuation of ship construction can be better carried on through private sources than through a governmental agency. So that if they need this amount to complete the program, taking into account all ships that have not been canceled, then I think they should have this full amount.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the situation; that is the purpose of this amendment, to give them enough to complete their program. When the program is completed the Government will find itself with some very valuable yards on hand, and then the question will be as to whether the Government itself shall go on and build more ships or whether we shall dispose of those yards to shipbuilding corporations that can take them off the hands of the Government and carry on the work as a private endeavor.

Mr. EDGE. That, of course, is a matter for Congress to determine.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So far as I am personally concerned, when we have completed our program, if we have an opportunity to dispose of the yards to private operators at a fairly reasonable price I think that would be the wise thing to do. This, however, is not the time to commit ourselves to that proposition, and I am not in favor of disposing of these yards until we can have a proper investigation by the committees of Congress or a commission to determine what is a just and fair value and see that the Government gets what they are reasonably worth when we dispose of them.

Mr. EDGE. I entirely agree with the Senator in those observations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. KING. If the Senator's position is correct, that these ships are being disposed of so that there will be little, if any, loss to the Government——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said up to this time. Of course, I do not make any predictions for the future, because I will not reach into the realm of unknown matters.

Mr. KING. Why was it that Chairman Hurley or the board recommended a short time ago the charging off of at least $1,000,000,000, which was assumed to be a loss, even if the ships were sold at the highest possible prices?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not give the Senator an answer as to Mr. Hurley's reasons, because I have not them in mind, but I think possibly two questions are involved there. One is largely the cost of these shipbuilding yards, where there is a loss, and that must be charged off to war conditions before you can reach a reasonable value for the yards. It might have been due to the fact that the board may not have realized what a demand there would be for ships, and I think none of us were so optimistic a few months ago as to believe these ships would sell for cost. It really was a very agreeable surprise to me when I found that the ships up to this time were selling for cost price.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey. I think it is a question of bookkeeping. I venture the prediction now, and I have made some little investigation, that when we have ascertained the full expenses of the Government for the construction of ships, ascertained what these ships have been sold for or will be sold for, and then figure up the value of the yard and the property on hand at a fair cash value, the Government will have lost considerably more than a billion dollars, and the ships instead of being sold at a profit will have been sold at a very great loss.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The only difference between the Senator and myself is that he is charging to construction what is chargeable to capital account. I think everybody admits there will be a considerable loss on capital account—that is, the building of the plant to produce ships—but up to this time there does not seem to be a loss on the actual construction of the ships. Largely the loss that is due to capital account—that is, the construction of the plant—is due to war conditions, war prices, war labor, rush of work. I do not know of any plant that we have built in the United States where we have not found the condition to exist that the plant is not worth so much to-day as it cost to build; and we knew that when we built it, because we knew that we were building under war conditions. There is no use of complaining against the Government about that or charging it to the value of ships. It is a question that you have to charge up against war, exactly as you have not any assets left for the powder and shells you threw behind the German lines. You recognized the fact you were going to lose that money when you embarked in the war.

Mr. KING. I do not quite agree with the Senator; but, waiving that, I do not think it is a very clear method of presenting the matter to the public, or at any rate the presentation made by the Senator and others as to the cost of the ships will mislead the public. They will think, from the Senator's statement and the statement of others——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not see how they can from my statement be misled, because I have stated very conclusively

that I thought there was a loss on capital account. The proposition before the Senate is whether we shall complete a shipbuilding program, and when it is demonstrated that the money we are putting in ships we are building to-day will come back to us in the sale of those ships, not looking into capital account and cost of yards or cost of new buildings, but the mere production of the ships, that the dollar we put into the production of the ships will come back into the Treasury, and when we finish it we will have our ships on the seas and flying the American flag and carrying American commerce, it seems to me it is a practical, reasonable, businesslike thing to do.

Mr. KING. I am not questioning the wisdom of continuing the construction or at least completing the construction of some of these ships, but I do insist——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is all that is involved in this question. The other question is a matter that has already gone over the dam.

Mr. KING. I do insist that in representing to the country and the people the cost of the ships to the Government it is fair to take into account the total expenditure of the Government, so that the people will know that these ships, instead of costing the Government $210 a ton, will probably cost the Government $300 or more per ton.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator's position is just as unfair as he thinks the other is. I think it would be absolutely unfair to say to the American people, because the Government lost a considerable amount of money in building a plant, when the plant was put in operation the losses in completing the plant should be charged up to operation. I think that would be equally misleading to them, because it is admitted that we lost money in building the plant. Nobody is trying to conceal that fact.

Mr. KING. It is not the loss in the plant. It is an expenditure in order to produce the ship.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If you build a pig-iron furnace and it costs $1,000,000 to build it, and you find that some part of the structure is weak and you have to put in another $500,000, you will charge that to capital account and charge against your production a reasonable interest on your capital account, but you would not charge the total loss because of that mistake in building to the pig iron that came out of that furnace in one year's time. You have a capital account to charge it against.

Mr. KING. When you wound up your business, you would charge it again.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You would charge the loss to capital account. Nobody disputes that.

Mr. KING. So it is wholly immaterial whether you call it capital account or charge it to some other head in your bookkeeping.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator wants to say that in the entire ship endeavor, from beginning to end, there was a loss and will be a loss, nobody denies that fact.

Mr. KING. This is the matter I rose primarily to ask the Senator about: I find on page 52 there is an authorization of $2,884,000,000 for the construction of ships. The same paragraph states that $120,000,000 has been reduced. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not the authorization of $2,884,000,000 less $120,000,000 exists?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure about that. I have not refreshed my memory since last year, and it is pretty hard for a man to attempt to make a statement from figures that he had in his head last November. My understanding of that is—and I will state it only as my understanding, because I may be mistaken—that up to November there were authorizations amounting to $2,884,000,000. At that time the Shipping Board wanted to go on to the fullest extent of that authorization and have the money for it, but they did not have contracts out for $120,000,000, and at that time the Congress cut out of this authorization $120,000,000, and therefore the authorizations up to date would have amounted to $2,764,000.000. I am merely saying this from my memory of the statement made six months ago, and it may mislead the Senator.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator one other question?

Mr. LENROOT. Is it not a fact that the authorization of $2,884,000,000 does exist to-day, but has never been exercised by the Shipping Board?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I think the authorization has been reduced by $120,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. But the purpose of this item is to reduce it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it had already been reduced, if I recollect right. It is mighty hard for me to remember what we did last November without refreshing my mind.

Mr. LENROOT. We refused the new contracts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We refused to go ahead with this $120,000,000. Whether we reduced it directly by law or whether they are doing it now I can not remember.

Mr. KING. I am not quite sure now, after having heard the explanation of the Senator, of the exact amount, if the bill is passed which is now before us, which will be authorized to be expended by the Shipping Board. Is the four hundred and odd million dollars which the Senate bill proposes to carry to be added to the $2,884,000,000 less $120,000,000, or is it a part of the $2,000,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not so understand it. I do not understand that that is in addition to the authorization. I think the total authorization for all would be $2,164,000,000, but this makes the last appropriation to carry out that program. I am not saying that that is accurate, the Senator will understand, because I have not looked at the figures in six months; but that is my understanding.

Mr. KING. Is it the Senator's understanding that with the appropriation carried in the bill the entire amount expended by the Shipping Board will be $2,884,000,000 less $120,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. No; there is still $100,000,000 between the amount that has actually been obligated and the authorization with this $120,000,000 reduction.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator whether that appropriation is to continue contracts that have already been made for the construction of ships or for ships they have already started, or does it involve beginning additional vessels?

Mr. UNDERWODD. I think it involves practically only material bought for ships and ships under construction. I think there are a few contracts that have not been made, but I understand all the material is on hand, and the proposition is to go on and finish them and use up the material.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is not simply to complete the program they have on paper, but a program which they had begun to execute by the purchase of supplies or by letting contracts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is right; which they could not stop without loss.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just one question further. The plant is paid for?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And the real question of economy is whether they may complete these vessels now with what they have and make the vessels worth more than they are still going to cost them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is a business proposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think if we stop right now and do not give them any more money, the loss of material would be a great deal more than it would cost to carry out the contracts. That is the reason why we go ahead, and then we will get ships under the American flag.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The overhead charges the Senator talks about have all been made?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly. They are not overhead charges; they are capital accounts.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Everything that stands whether you build these vessels or not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say that has nothing to do with it. It is charged against the capital account. It is all water that has gone over the milldam.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I say with confidence I believe it would be unwise to cut off this appropriation. This is one of the most important subjects to come before Congress. If we intend doing anything, if we want the ships to carry our goods to foreign markets, we must go ahead, and I hope we will not stop, but will continue and build more ships.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. WARREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I was about to move for a recess until 8 o'clock. However, I will withhold that motion for the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. We are very near that item in the bill striking out the House appropriation for the Tariff Commission. I have not any particular objection about that item coming up to-night, but that will require a quorum, and I would like to suggest to the chairman that——

Mr. WARREN. Let me relieve the Senator's mind. I have said to the Senator it is my intention to ask to have that go over until to-morrow, although I expect a quorum to-night and I hope the Senator will be one of those who will form the quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. I will be here, but I do not expect a quorum.

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to know if the Senator does not think we can reach a vote on this amendment. The discussion on it is about concluded, I believe.

Mr. WARREN. I am advised to the contrary. There will be some further debate, and I think it wise to stop at this point for the recess.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator think it wise, when we have met at 11 o'clock and worked steadily throughout the day, to continue on and meet at night, as he suggests?

Mr. WARREN. We have not gone a quarter of the way through the bill. The members of the committee have worked night and day for a week, and the clerks have worked night and day and until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning for a longer time than that. I hope the Senator will agree with me that we ought to work to-night at least.

Mr. FLETCHER. I had hoped we could pass the bill without taking so much time.

Mr. ROBINSON. Pending the request which I understand the Senator from Wyoming is about to submit, I ask leave to present an amendment to the bill and that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to submit a request for a unanimous-consent agreement before the Senator moves for a recess until to-night.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the Senator is not going to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement the effect of which might be to have no quorum to-night.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is going to wait until to-night to get unanimous consent to put it over, somebody will object to it, probably. I would not, but it may be objected to. If he is going to ask it, he will have to ask it at the beginning of the night session, and if it has that effect it would dispose of the quorum question then just as it would now.

Mr. WARREN. I have never known a Senator in charge of a bill to request that an amendment be passed over that it has not been granted.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be, but if the chairman is going to do it by depending upon to-night's session it will have the same effect on a quorum to-night as though he made the request now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we do not hear on this side what the unanimous-consent proposition is.

Mr. NORRIS. I am asking that the Tariff Commission question, if it is reached to-night, shall not be taken up, but that it shall come up to-morrow upon the convening of the Senate the first thing. I have no desire to postpone it and I have no desire to interfere with the night session. I am making the request because of a fear that there may not be a quorum here to-night. If there is not, we can just as well dispose of amendments of less importance, but when it comes to the Tariff Commission there will probably have to be a roll call.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand the Senator from Nebraska favors the retention of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will be here to-night, and I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I expect to be here to-night, but it is not anything on my account, and I do not want to break up the meeting to-night by suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WARREN. It is rather unusual to have discussion on such a matter. If the Senator wishes to ask unanimous consent, he may do so now.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I wanted. I ask unanimous consent that if at to-night's session the provision of the bill with reference to the Tariff Commission be reached, it be postponed for consideration until immediately after the convening of the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I think if we are going to have a meeting of the Senate to-night—and I am anxious to have one, this bill being a matter of considerable importance—we ought to have a quorum. If there is a quorum we ought to attend to business in an orderly way. If there is no quorum we ought to adjourn. There is no use in attempting to transact business without a quorum, and I think we ought not to have a night session unless we have a quorum and go ahead in the regular orderly conduct of business. If we are going to let it be understood that anything objected to to-night will go over, of course we will not have a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Nebraska has announced his purpose of attending the meeting to-night.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He is coming and I am coming.

Mr. NORRIS. The only object I have is to expedite business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator might assume that other Senators will attend.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it has always been customary heretofore for the chairman of the committee who has charge of a bill to state under such conditions that he will have the amendment passed over.

Mr. WARREN. That I have already stated.

Mr. NELSON. And when the chairman of the committee states that, I think we ought to accept it as sufficient.

Mr. NORRIS. I am willing to accept that. I wanted the chairman to make the request instead of myself, but I do not want to run any risk of having that upset to-night. It would take unanimous consent to do it to-night, and we might just as well agree now as after supper if we are going to agree to it at all. If we are not, then we will go ahead and do the best we can, whatever may happen.

Mr. WARREN. I understood the Senator to accept my statement that if that amendment comes up to-night I will use every effort to have it go over.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator make that request now?

Mr. WARREN. No; because it is not necessary to get unanimous consent. It never has been done, and there is never any necessity for doing it.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the Senator need not do it now unless he wishes. I understand that if that amendment comes up to-night and a Senator makes an objection to the request it will not go over. I expect to be here; I do not want to take any chance. I only want to find out now while we have a quorum so that we may possibly expedite business to-night.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska if there is a quorum present what objection there would be to considering that amendment to-night?

Mr. NORRIS. I would not have any.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Are we not going to have a quorum to-night?

Mr. NORRIS. That is a very probable condition.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Very good.

Mr. NORRIS. That happens dozens of times.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If we know beforehand we are not going to discuss the important features of the bill, of course we will not have a quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. We will not have a quorum if it is known now that the important features of the bill are not going to be taken up. If that request is made at the beginning of to-night's session it will disperse a quorum just as quickly as though it were made now. There will not be any difference in that respect.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think we had better go ahead and understand that we are coming here to discuss the bill without any request being made for any of it to go over, and discuss it as though we were in a morning session.

Mr. NORRIS. If that is taken as an objection, it is ended, of course; I can concede that.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator from Wyoming if he will yield until I can have the conference report on the District appropriation bill, which I submitted earlier in the day, acted upon. There has to be a further conference. It will only take a minute or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WARREN. I will, most assuredly, if it does not lead to protracted debate.

Mr. CURTIS. If it does, I will withdraw the request. I ask that the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to House bill 4226, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, be taken up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report has already been read and the question is on its adoption.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator what are the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. CURTIS. The two amendments in disagreement are the one involving the half-and-half principle and the Keller amendment, being amendment number 45. There is an agreement with respect to all of the other amendments.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, would a motion to recede from the Senate amendment on the 50-50 principle be in order?

Mr. CURTIS. It would not be in order now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments still in disagreement and request a further conference with the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

RECESS.

Mr. WARREN. I renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendment to the bill providing for the appropriation of $491,000,000 will be adopted.

At the beginning of the World War there were about 41,000,000 dead-weight tons of shipping on all the seas. Of that 41,000,000 England owned about 19,000,000 tons. She came first. Germany came second, owning about five and one-half million tons. The United States came third, owning between two and three million tons, a very poor third. When the armistice was declared the situation had greatly changed. England had lost almost half, if not quite one-half, of her tonnage by capture or by destruction. That reduced her tonnage to between nine and ten million tons. However, she had added to her tonnage, by capture or by purchase or by building, between six and seven million tons, and the amount of her tonnage at the close of the war when the armistice came was about 16,000,000 tons. Germany lost half of her shipping. She built or bought about 1,000,000 tons during that period, and when the armistice came she had about 3,500,000 tons. The United States bought or built or captured enough to make her tonnage when the armistice came about 7,000,000 tons. She had under contract at that time enough to give her at the end of the next fiscal year, July, 1920, a little more than 16,000,000, or almost as much as England would have at that date. In all these figures I only give them in round numbers.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. I should like to finish this particular statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The result was that at the date the armistice came we had already built and under contract enough to put us almost on a parity with England in the matter of shipping at the end of the ensuing fiscal year if we had carried out the entire plan.

There have been canceled, however, by the Shipping Board contracts for about 3,000,000 tons of shipping, which will reduce the amount, if this amendment is adopted, to a little more than 13,000,000 tons which we will have by July 1, 1920. I think our Shipping Board made a mistake in canceling those shipping contracts for this reason: We have in this country to-day 441 shipyards. We have to-day 1,284 shipping ways. We have twice as many shipyards and shipping ways as all the rest of the world put together. There never was such an opportunity for this country to build up the kind of merchant marine that I believe she ought to have as there is at this very moment in our history. We have more than double the shipyards and shipping ways of all the rest of the world put together, and contracts under way, with the great expense already had, to increase our shipping equal to that of England. It is easy to see that we can do it, and my own view is that we ought not to let anything deter us.

Senators talk about whether $50,000,000 is included in the capital of the Shipping Corporation or not. That is a big sum, and we ought to look into it, but we ought not to hesitate about taking this great step at a time when we can take it, and take it effectually, $50,000,000 or no $50,000,000.

So far as I am concerned, as everybody knows, I am what is termed down South a "yellow-dog" Democrat; I despise anything in the way of a governmental subsidy just as the devil despises holy water. I never voted for one and never expect to vote for one. But I say to you in all frankness that I believe so thoroughly and firmly that this Nation ought to be first in the ocean-carrying trade that if I thought we could not get that trade in any other way I would be willing even to vote for a subsidy in order to obtain it. This shows the limit to which I would go to accomplish this great result. I believe, however, we can accomplish this result without a subsidy. The plan will be forthcoming after we get the ships. What we want now is ships.

I think the only objection to this bill is that it does not provide more money to get the ships we need.

The greatest mistake the Shipping Board has made is that it has canceled the contracts which it has canceled. It ought to have retained every single contract that it had, and this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol should furnish what money may be necessary. It is the greatest opportunity the Nation has ever had to establish the kind of merchant marine to which she is entitled, and we ought not to fail to take advantage of it. The time is ripe. The opportunity is here. If we delay we may repeat our mistake made just after the Civil War, when we let our merchant marine disappear from the seas.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, though I promised to yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] first.

Mr. SPENCER. I want to ask a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to answer the Senator's question if I can.

Mr. SPENCER. In stating the tonnage of shipping under contract at the date of the armistice, does the Senator mean the construction of the shipping already begun?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it was the shipping under contract. The greater part of it, I think, has been done. As I understand the policy of the Shipping Board, where ships had actually been started or the materials placed and plans arranged, they have continued those contracts, but where the materials had not been placed they canceled the contracts. They had canceled the contracts for certain wooden ships that perhaps were very properly canceled. I go too far—I do not mean to say whether it was wise or not, as there is some dispute about that on which men may differ; but so far as the steel ships are concerned, the permanent ships, I do not think any of them should have been canceled.

Mr. SPENCER. Will the Senator be good enough to yield for another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SPENCER. I heard the Senator state that the total tonnage of the world at the beginning of the war was 41,000,000 tons.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SPENCER. Has the Senator any figures as to what the total tonnage of the world was at the date of the armistice?

Mr. McKELLAR. I can not say, but the Senator can figure it out from these figures. I am glad the Senator asked the question, because it recalls to my mind some facts which I think the Senate ought to know.

The average annual increase in shipping throughout the world is about 5 per cent, perhaps a trifle less. Therefore, if England had increased her shipping year by year and if there had been no war and she had increased her shipping in the ordinary way, she would have had about 24,000,000 tons of shipping to-day instead of about 16,000,000. You can see what an opportunity there is before this country, with England minus one-third of her shipping at the close of this war, and that is what the facts really are when you take into consideration what she naturally would have built if there had been no war. We like England, but that is no reason why we may not compete with her on the seas and for business wherever we can get it.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator two or three questions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to answer if I can.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator can answer them and I am anxious to get the information. First, in the American shipping which the Senator has given us, does he include the German ships interned in our harbors and taken over when we declared war?

Mr. McKELLAR. I got these figures from various sources, largely from the Shipping Board. My recollection is that in-

cluded in the American shipping at the time these figures were given out, which was after the armistice, was the tonnage that we received from Germany that was interned here.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] tells me they were included.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, in giving the total tonnage of Germany, that amount would be excluded from her tonnage.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. Germany has now about 3,000,000 tons. I am not so sure about that statement. I wish to recall that. I do not know what arrangements have been made about the transfer of some of her shipping to certain of her allies under the peace arrangement, but exclusive of that she would have had a little over 3,000,000 tons, probably 3,500,000.

Mr. SPENCER. May I say to the Senator, in the last publication of the War Department, which has just been issued, the total tonnage of the enemy nations, which would include whatever Austria might have or whatever tonnage Turkey might have, was 4,360,000 tons as of December 31, 1918.

Mr. McKELLAR. Germany had the greater portion of that.

Mr. SPENCER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. McKELLAR. She had quite considerably over 3,000,000 tons of it.

Mr. NORRIS. When the Shipping Board says——

Mr. McKELLAR. One moment, please. While that is so, Germany has only about one-half of what she had before the war. See what an opportunity there is for America to get this business if we go out after it, and we must go after it.

Mr. NORRIS. When shipping that is constructed by the Shipping Board or this corporation is delivered to private parties, are there any reservations in the sale?

Mr. McKELLAR. Do you mean about flying the American flag?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. My understanding is that there is. It would never do in the world if that were not the case. If it is not the case, if there is any doubt about it, we ought to pass a law prohibiting the sale of these ships unless by agreement they shall remain under the American flag. We should not build ships by the Government and then permit them to go under the flags of other nations.

Mr. NORRIS. I had some doubt about the propriety of selling them at all. I presume that they have authority of law to do that?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have.

Mr. HARDING. They have now.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] inquired about the total world tonnage at the beginning of the war and what there remained after the signing of the armistice. He can get an idea of that when he understands that there were 21,000,000 tons sunk by submarines and lost during the war by marine risks other than by sinking. In all, 21,000,000 tons have been taken from the total world tonnage, which the Senator mentioned in the beginning. That, I think, meant gross tons, while the sinkings probably mean dead-weight tons. My understanding is that Germany at the beginning of the war had as much as 6,000,000 tons, 4,000,000 tons of it being in foreign ports and 2,000,000 tons in her home ports.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not quite that. It was a little less than 6,000,000 tons.

There is one other observation I want to make——

Mr. SPENCER. Since I asked the question a moment ago, I hold in my hand what I referred to as the last authoritative production of the War Department. I find that the total net loss, as the result of the war, was approximately 5 per cent or a little over. There were in the world 42,615,000 tons July 1, 1914, and there were in the world 39,605,000 tons December 31, 1918. So the net loss from the war would be first the failure to normally gain what would otherwise have been gained in tonnage——

Mr. McKELLAR. Which is about 5 per cent.

Mr. SPENCER. And then the difference between the figures I have given.

Mr. McKELLAR. The figures the Senator gives include tonnage other than ocean-going tonnage, of course?

Mr. SPENCER. No; these are only seagoing merchant ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Exclusive of construction during the four years of the war?

Mr. McKELLAR. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Tennessee, assuming that we are going to have 13,000,000 tons of shipping, what are we going to do with it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Haul our goods to foreign ports and haul the goods of other peoples to our ports. We have more to haul both ways than any other nation. Surely we ought to haul what we have in our own ships.

Mr. HARDING. Is the Senator aware that the Commerce Committee have testimony from the Shipping Board that if we haul all our own commerce and almost an equal amount of foreign commerce in the form of imports to this country, 9,000,000 tons would suffice?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do know about that testimony, but those who so testify, I am sure, are inaccurate for this reason: It is perfectly apparent that England alone is short 8,000,000 tons, and Norway's losses on the seas have simply been enormous. The Danish losses have been enormous. Many other European countries have had severe losses. In addition, the natural increase has not taken place, and it is perfectly apparent from the figures I have given that America could find a use for every single ton of her 16,000,000-ton program.

Mr. HARDING. If the Senator will make that clear to me, I am interested.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber when I first began, or, if so, whether he was listening. I mentioned the immense losses during this war, and then the losses of an average of 5 per cent a year by reason of the fact of new shipping not being built because of the war. Those two losses will make a need for all America can build up to 16,000,000 tons without doubt, and then, besides, our business is increasing with every nation in the world. The war has put us in commercial touch with all the world. We expect our trade to increase, and it will increase. During this war we became the financial center of the world. We are the greatest creditor Nation that ever existed on the earth, and there is no reason in the world why we should not have our part of the commerce of the world and carry it in our own ships on the seas if we would just go out and get it. That is all that it takes—just to go out and get it: If we do not get it, we will be sleeping on our best rights.

There is one other proposition, and then I am through——

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest at that point, in response to the observation of the Senator from Ohio, that the testimony was to the effect that we would have enough tonnage, if the program was carried out, to carry 50 per cent of our commerce, and that is all they estimate they need to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I did not hear the testimony, and I do not know what it was, but I think the informant of the Senator from Ohio was incorrect. I am glad to have the statement from the Senator from Florida.

The other proposition is as to how we are going to manage our merchant marine—whether we are going to keep it in the hands of the Government or in private hands. I think it ought to be put in private hands, if possible; but we must make it a success, it does not make any difference in whose hands it goes. The people of this country, the rulers of this country, knowing that it is for their best interests to build up this merchant marine, will surely evolve some plan that will make it effective and give this country the business. Nor will it be necessary to give a subsidy to make it a success.

Now, just one further thought. I think it ought to be so arranged as to be coordinated with our railroad systems, our inland waterway systems, and inland road systems. There ought to be some way of coordinating these four great branches of transportation—the ocean shipping, the inland transportation on the waterways, the railroads, and the roads that the Government is helping to build. Just how it can be done is a matter for Congress to work out; I have no preconceived plan, but this country, in order to reach that place in the commerce of the world to which it is entitled, must work out the plan, and I am sure it will do it.

Mr. President, the only objection I have to the committee amendment increasing the amount to $491,000,000 is that we can not increase it to a larger amount, so as to carry out the original program of building up the greatest merchant marine on the seas.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall only say a word in regard to this proposition, but I do think that the Senate in voting for this increase ought not to be under any misapprehension of what the results will be. The increase ought to be made; it is good business for the Government that it should be made; but the Senate ought not to understand that we can go on and complete this program and sell the ships for what they cost. No one who is familiar with the situation, no one upon

the Shipping Board, no one upon the Committee on Commerce, believes that that is so.

It is true that at the present time, where we have ships for immediate delivery, we can sell them at cost and perhaps for somewhat more, but as to deliveries that will not be made for several months or a year or 18 months hence, we can not expect to receive, and we shall not receive, if we sell the ships, the cost of the ships. That is not the theory upon which this program is continued. The theory of this continuing program is just this:

The Shipping Board has suspended all contracts where in the opinion of the Shipping Board there would be a greater loss to the Government through completion than there would be to the Government through cancellation. That means this: They have assumed that wherever it would cost the Government $50 per ton to cancel it will be cheaper for the Government to complete the ships. So when the ships are completed we can sell them down to $50 a ton below their cost, and yet be money in pocket, rather than to have canceled the contracts. That is all there is to it. We can not expect when contracts are being made in England to-day for from $140 to $160 a ton, when contracts are being made in this country to-day for $170 a ton, to pay from $200 to $250 a ton and a year from now sell these ships for what they cost.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has stated that he regretted only that there were any cancellations and that the entire program was not to be continued. I want to say to the Senator that if that action had been taken, we not only would not have any better merchant marine than we shall have, but we would simply have a greater loss.

The trouble with this fleet now, as admitted by the Shipping Board, as admitted by all shipping men, is that it will not be a well-balanced fleet; that now we shall make too many ships of the same character, slow-going ships of limited cargo capacity. The Shipping Board is very desirous, if it can do so, of reinstating some of the suspended contracts so as to get a well-rounded and well-balanced fleet; but every member of the Shipping Board admits that if anything we shall, from a purely business standpoint, have too many ships of the character that are now being built.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. When I got to my office this afternoon I found a telegram from my home city urgently requesting that ships be sent to New Orleans and to Savannah, as I recall, saying that the senders of the telegram had had their goods at those ports for some time and had been utterly unable to get ships.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, of course, ships are making splendid profits now, and they will probably do so for another year; but just as soon as this shortage commences to be made up, just as soon as the shipyards can commence to make deliveries at these low prices, and the Army ships are released, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] suggests, the high freight rates are not going to continue; and we might as well face this situation; it has got to come to us, and many of the ships we are now building will eventually have to be sold at a loss.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin, who has spoken of a well-balanced fleet, if he can give us information as to the average tonnage and speed of the fleet which has been built in the last two years?

Mr. LENROOT. I think the speed will average about 11 knots an hour. Of the tonnage, I think we have about three classes of ships outside of wooden ships—the ships which are built upon the Lakes, which average about 4,500 tons dead-weight; then we have the 7,500-ton class, and we have the 9,500-ton class.

I am speaking of dead-weight tonnage. They are, however, all slow ships. We have no fast ships, and for a very substantial portion of the present commerce we shall have to have a very considerable percentage of fast ships if we are going to compete with foreign merchant marines.

I merely desired to make the statement which I have made in order that hereafter, if the ships that we shall now complete under this appropriation shall be sold at a loss, no one shall at that time be able to say that it was promised at the time when the appropriation was made that these ships could be completed and the Government would not lose any money. The fact is that the Government will lose money compared with the cost of building the ships, but it will save money compared with the difference in cost of cancellation and the cost of completing the ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I want to say only this in connection with the ideas which have been advanced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. Not only is the situation as indicated by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] acute on the Gulf and in the South Atlantic but it is the same on the Pacific. They are crying for ships on the Pacific. The trade is waiting for us toward the east; it is waiting for us to the south; it is waiting for us clear over to Africa and the Mediterranean. Whether we sell these ships at all or not does not concern me very much. It may be possible that if we offer them on the market a year or two from now, although they are earning a fair profit on the cost of $300 a ton now, according to the testimony, they might be sold at a loss. Later on rates will decline, I have no doubt.

The rates ought to decline; we ought not to burden our commerce with the excessive rates that now obtain; but if we have the ships we can operate them ourselves; we need not sell the ships; I am not clear that we should sell the ships. That is a question not involved now; but I am not uneasy about that, because the main purpose now, in my judgment, is to put ourselves in a position to seize the trade that is waiting for us from one end of the earth to the other. All we need is the ships to go after it and establish the leadership of the United States in world commerce, and we can do it when we control the ships.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, just a word in reply. Again I wish to warn the Senate that the completion of the shipping program ought not to be considered from the standpoint that we need these ships. There is not any doubt, I think, even in the mind of the Senator himself, that if we could choose a type of ship, if we were not under obligations to so large an extent as we are in connection with the very ships which would be involved in cancellations, if we could begin our shipbuilding program anew, we could build very much better ships at a very much less cost.

So far as the intimation of the Senator is concerned that the trade is crying and waiting for the ships, that is only true so far as present delivery is concerned, because, if it were not, then why should a shipowner be willing to pay $220 a ton for spot delivery to-day and only $170 a ton for a ship of exactly the same character to be delivered a year from now?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I had not expected to take any of the time of the Senate in this debate, if, indeed, debate it may now be called, but the statement of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] of his willingness to accept the policy of ship subsidy or Government aid or subvention, if necessary to keep our merchant marine afloat, is so pleasing to me in the light of my own experience that I can not fail to note my gratification.

From 1800 to 1810 the people of the United States carried in their own ships and under their own flag 92 per cent of their foreign commerce. This condition continued until the Civil War.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator, of course, remembers that this magnificent business was then conducted without any subsidy.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that; I will explain why a little later on, and, I trust, to the satisfaction of my friend from Colorado.

The condition of affairs to which I have referred continued until the Civil War, when we carried something over 70 per cent of our commerce in our own ships and under our own flag. The defeat of the *Merrimac* by the *Monitor* changed not only naval warfare in the world, but as well ocean transportation, for after that it was not possible to operate the wooden ship. First came the iron ship in a limited degree, and later the steel ship; and the difference in the cost of production and maintenance as between this and competing countries of the world practically swept from the seas the commerce that was carried in our own ships and under our own flag, for, on the average, it cost at least 25 per cent more to build a ship in the United States than to build it on the Clyde; in fact, the difference was even greater than that by reason as time wore on of the increasing difference between wages paid the men who constructed American ships and the wages paid the men in the construction of the material that entered into our ships and the wages paid their competitors. Then after the ship was constructed, there was a further difference in the cost of maintenance and operation in that we were compelled to pay higher wages, and, further, under our navigation laws, our seamen

were entitled to larger rooms than the seamen of our rivals; and, furthermore, under our laws a certain bill of fare was provided which was better than that and superior to that of our competitors. So the difference in the cost of construction and the difference in the cost of maintenance and operation after construction did not enable us to compete on an even keel, and our commerce was swept from the sea until the American flag became almost a memory on the oceans of the world. To such a degree was this true that it will be recalled that, when Secretary Root went on his voyage to South America and came back, he testified that the only American flag he saw during the entire course of his journey was the one that flew at the masthead of his own ship.

We all understand these conditions, and yet the trouble about it was that we never had the courage to meet them, and to meet them in the only way in which this condition could be met and overcome.

When the war came on we were spurred on by stern necessity to do something, but, instead of stopping at a ship subsidy or Government aid or subvention, we went to the extreme of Government construction, governmental operation, and, for the time being, Government ownership. The only question is as to whether that policy shall be pursued or we shall dispose of these vessels, as I understand the policy is to be, to private owners, to be operated under their control.

I do not agree with my friend that all we need is to have the ships. I think that the honorable Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], as well informed as he is on this question, will be compelled to revise his statement that all we need is the ships, for it still costs us more to build here than it costs anywhere else in the world. That difference must be made up somehow. I do not know and I do not think that any man can intelligently predict what the next 10 years will develop along that line.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator that, while it is true that during 1914 it cost less to build in foreign yards than in the yards of the United States, that condition no longer exists, for two very important reasons: In the first place, the scale of wages on the other side has changed, and has gone up to a plane approaching ours; in the next place, we have the raw materials. We are to-day furnishing in the United States steel plates at $57 a ton that cost $67 a ton on the other side, and steel shapes for $49 a ton that costs $66 a ton on the other side. In addition to that, we have yards and facilities we never had before, and we are in a position to build in the United States just as cheaply as the ships can be built anywhere in the world, and, I believe, cheaper and better. We have skilled labor in addition to the advantages I have mentioned, that we did not have before. That is clearly demonstrated, I think, if I may call the Senator's attention to what he may have already noticed, by the fact that certain shipbuilders from the Clyde have come to this side, Canada especially, for the purpose of building ships here.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I can not agree with the Senator. We have always had the raw material in the United States. There is no difference between this period and previous periods in that respect, and it is only a question of speculation as to future development that we can here discuss. What I am saying is that we have no assurance that present conditions, growing out of the abnormal war situation, will continue for the next decade.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATSON. Pardon me just a moment. I do not believe that even now you can build a ship in the United States as cheaply as the same kind of ship and the same type of vessel can be built on the Clyde. My recollection is—and if I am in error the Senator can correct me—that we were paying from $220 to $225 a ton to construct ships over at Hog Island, when the same type and character of vessel was being constructed on the Clyde at less than $100 a ton.

I yield now to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that there is quite a difference between the two.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The yards on the Clyde were completed, while Hog Island was a marsh that had to be transformed into a shipyard, and of course that initial cost was very large; but that should not be added to the cost of the shipping. As a matter of fact, the figures I have seen show that the cost of building is practically the same in England as it is in America to-day. The wages are practically the same. There is practically no difference.

Now, the Senator says he does not want to embark on this course until he has some assurance about the matter, as I understand. He says we do not know what may happen in the next 10 years; we have no assurance of what the next decade will bring forth. Surely, the Senator does not mean to say that he is not willing to go forward without an assurance. That is the trouble now.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator entirely misapprehends my position.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know that.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. HARDING. The Committee on Commerce has been pretty diligent in its inquiries on this particular subject; and we have yet to hear an authority from the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation who will say that shipping in this country does not cost from $20 to $50 more than it does in Great Britain or any other foreign country.

Mr. WATSON. That is my information. I do not know upon what my friend from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] bases his statement; but after very diligent inquiry I want to say that while I am not now a member of the Committee on Commerce, as I once was, I have found no such facts and ascertained no such figures and have come to no such conclusion.

But be that as it may, even if it costs no more to construct a ship here than it does abroad, and even if it costs no more to maintain it after construction here than it does abroad, there is another problem that enters into it, and that in my judgment is all-persuasive and all-conclusive; and that is the problem of the use of oil in propelling our ships.

We know from the testimony of these shipping men that if we can use the Diesel internal-combustion engine, 1 ton of oil is equivalent to 5 tons of coal, and that 1 ton of oil used in a Diesel internal-combustion engine to propel a 10,000-ton ship is the equal of 3 tons of oil when it is converted into steam for the purpose of propelling the vessel. So that we must have the oil.

In other words, if we have oil and England is compelled to use coal, we can far more than make up any difference in the cost of construction and of maintenance, even if there were a difference, especially when we take into consideration our superior American efficiency; but if England has the oil and we are compelled to use the coal, then a vast sum must be taken from the Treasury every year, in order to make up that difference, which will be most decidedly against us.

We produced in the United States last year, at the peak of production, 345,000,000 barrels of oil, and to a very great extent we exhausted our surplus supply, because of the tremendous demand occasioned by the exigencies of the war; and, therefore, the question that is closely pressing upon us who believe in this American merchant marine, who believe in its maintenance, who believe in transporting American-made goods in American-made vessels and under the American flag, is as to where we are to get the oil that is to be consumed by these ships. And that leads me to say, Mr. President and Senators, that there is in my judgment but one adequate source of supply, and that is in Mexico. The Tampico oil fields, if my information be correct, can be made as productive in a single year as all the oil fields in the United States combined; and, therefore, it is a matter of supreme importance for us to see that the Tampico oil fields are protected, if necessary, by the American Army and by the American soldiery in order that we shall retain this tremendous advantage which we have in the production of oil.

Of course, England has sources of supply, but those sources of supply are away on the other side of the sea. They are not so readily accessible as is this source of supply, right at our very shore. Therefore it is essential, if we are to maintain our merchant marine on anything like an equal basis with the merchant marines of our competitors, that we must have control of this oil supply, and we must use this oil in our vessels. Does the Senator from Florida agree with me on that proposition?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I quite agree that that gives us an immense advantage when it comes to the question of operation.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we are in a much more favorable position than our competitors upon that very basis. I quite agree with the Senator that it is very important to develop this oil-burning motive power, and I insist that we are in a better position with regard to that than any other country.

Mr. WATSON. And does the Senator further agree that the protection we must afford must be to American oil-well owners and oil producers in Mexico?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not mean to advocate any aggressive position on that point; I do not know how far the Senator might lead me there; but I venture to suggest that Texas is doing pretty well now, according to the last reports, and we have a good many sources of supply, I think, even in the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Oh, that is quite true; but, after all, our supply does not compare with the demand that will be made upon us, because the use of gasoline is becoming greater and greater with each succeeding year, and we must have these Mexican oil fields in order to enable us to operate this vast merchant marine that we are building at so great cost.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. POMERENE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WATSON. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I fully agree with the Senator that we ought to protect every American owner of oil, either in Mexico or anywhere else, or any other property; but the Senator's last statement, it seems to me, is too broad. It almost intimates that we are going, if necessary for us, really to take possession.

I do not suppose the Senator would say that we have a right to insist that Mexico should give our nationals any advantage over the nationals of any other country. In other words, would we not have to be satisfied, and ought we not to be satisfied, if we were treated the same as the nationals of any other country?

Mr. WATSON. Why, certainly; but we have not been in the past. We have been discriminated against.

Mr. NORRIS. I think there is something in that, too.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; precisely. Of course, what I want is that we shall be put on a parity with other nations in Mexico. They have great oil possessions there, but we have the greatest of all the oil possessions there, already owned by Americans, and all we need to do is to protect what is ours and to protect our own citizens who are there in their lawful rights and in their possessions guaranteed by a sacred treaty with Mexico. That is all we need to do to guarantee this supply of oil to us in the days that are to come.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield again to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Shipping Board has announced that all the ships that it is building now are being built upon the principle of being oil burners.

Mr. WATSON. Certainly; I understand that.

Mr. FLETCHER. They contemplate using that fuel in the future.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; and that makes all the more important the possession of this oil. That is why I rose to speak on this question, to say that, no matter how many ships we build, if we can not have the oil supply the old difference in the cost of operation will still exist between us and competing countries, and that it is essential that we shall do more than simply have great ships in large numbers. We must eradicate this other difference, and the only way in which that can be done is to possess these oil fields, and the way to possess them is to protect the Americans who are already in possession.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, like my friend the Senator from Indiana, I had no intention of taking any part in the discussion of this feature of the bill; but I am unable to let some of the statements of the Senator go unanswered, and particularly those which indicate the necessity of a subsidized foreign commerce, for that would be the character of it if the ships engaged in that commerce were subsidized by the Government.

The Senator's review of the period when American commerce was carried in American bottoms, and when the flag of this country was quite as apparent in every harbor of every land, is entirely above criticism. It was a glorious period in our history, and perhaps the most prosperous of all times in our foreign commerce. I do not think, however, that it was due so much to the construction of the vessels, to the cost of their construction, or to the wages paid to sailors, as to the fact that it was the period during which the enterprise, the ambition, and the investments of the American people were turned in the direction of the sea. There can be no question but that the change from wooden to iron vessels and the piracies which so injured American shipping during the Rebellion had much to do with transferring the carrying trade from the United States to other countries, and particularly the latter, for every vessel which could do so, fearing the results of privateering and apprehensive of destruction, very naturally changed its register and transferred its ownership to the protection of a foreign flag. The consequences of these conditions were injurious; but it must be remembered that during this great period of our merchant-marine expansion there were no features of Government protection, either by way of subsidies or otherwise, stimulating the business and prompting investments in that line of national effort.

Immediately after the Rebellion the country entered upon what I think was a distinct phase of its national existence. Enterprise, ambition, and capital all sought development in a different direction and were attracted by the vast domain lying beyond the Mississippi River and by the tremendous profits which were apparent in the development and extension of land transportation. The national bent, in other words, was away from the sea and to the land. Greater gains were apparent by the diversion of the principal industry of the country from the ships to the railroads and from the forests to the western plains; and ever since that time, down to the declaration of war against Germany, the general trend was away from navigation and to the development of our interior resources.

The great captains who up to 1860 had invested their money and made their fortunes through the merchant marine became the equally prominent owners and builders of railroads; and the men who sailed at the masthead at sailors' wages found greater profit and development in the extension of railroad lines and in the settlement of the then pioneer West.

I contend that if in 1865, after the end of the rebellion, the United States Government for the purpose of stimulating the merchant marine and in an effort to restore that marine to its proud position prior to the war had entered upon the policy of granting subsidies, the only result would have been the virtual establishment of lines of ocean-going vessels sailing from subsidy ports to subsidy ports and transacting as little business as the subsidized lines of France have transacted from the time when the French entered upon that policy down to the present hour. We will have a merchant marine again if we ever do at all, and I fervently hope that it will be restored, not alone through the construction of American vessels, but through their operation by American captains and American sailors. We may expend hundreds and thousands of millions in ship construction and in the end we will have to sell them to ship-using nations, unless we can induce Americans to become their crews and sail them, and to give them the proud position which their predecessors held in the good old antebellum days. In other words, we will have sailors when American workmen can make as much, if not more, money upon the seas as they can make upon the land. We will have American sailors and a merchant marine when the Americans receive the same inducements to turn their efforts to the seas that existed in 1836 and 1846 and in 1856, the golden age of the American merchant marine. We must pay, therefore, modern wages, we must give the American workmen modern conditions upon our vessels. We must make the sea as attractive as the land. Until that is done our merchant marine will be second, third, or fourth class.

The great merchant marine nations are island nations or nations virtually island nations like Norway, or nations which are barren of internal attractions and resources. The inhabitants of such countries naturally and necessarily turn to the ocean. Hence it is not at all strange that England, Japan, and Norway are the great maritime nations of the world. Their people are naturally seafaring men. The competition among them for existence enables the operation of vessels at the lowest possible cost consistent with the transaction of the business, a cost which repels instead of attracting the Americans, a cost with which we can not compete unless there be established maritime conditions under which the wages of the seamen become more uniform than they were before the war.

I heard former Senator Burton, of Ohio, some years ago deliver an address in opposition to a proposed subsidy. To my mind it was unanswerable. He demonstrated to my satisfaction at least that until Americans could profitably operate vessels along American lines by the payment of American wages and the giving to the seamen those comforts of life upon the sea as far as possible to which they were accustomed upon the land we might pile subsidies mountain high, and the only result would be that instead of promoting the extension of American commerce subsidies would merely exist as an additional burden upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado if he does not think the difference between a subsidized or protected American merchant marine and an unprotected American merchant marine is clearly shown in the difference between our vessels in foreign commerce and vessels in our coastwise trade during all these years?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not.

Mr. WATSON. Let me finish the question, please. We had no protection for our vessels engaged in foreign commerce. They were subject to the ruthless competition of foreigners. But in Washington's administration Congress passed an act, which has never since been repealed, providing that no foreign vessel should ever engage in our coastwise trade. Behind that protecting wall there has been built up the greatest coastwise trade of which the world has knowledge. It is tremendous. I do not know what the figures are, but they are perfectly astounding. It has been built up because of this protection given by the American Congress to that particular branch of American shipping. If we had had the same conditions existing with reference to our ocean commerce, would not the American merchant cross-ocean traffic been correspondingly increased and upbuilded?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think so. In the first place, we can not, by subsidizing American vessels, monopolize the carrying trade of the world. We can, by prohibiting foreign bottoms from participation in our coastwise trade, control that trade absolutely and convert it into an absolute monopoly, as has been done. That is one reason and, I think, the principal reason.

It is true, Mr. President, that there has never been such a thing as competition in our coastwise trade, and I regret that that is and has been the fact.

Of all the monopolies in the United States, unbreakable, invincible, and oppressive, I know of none, with the possible exception of the present packers' combination, to be compared with the coastwise shipping monopoly. I am not going into the particulars of it. You know what happens or what would happen if a coastwise vessel engaged in trade between certain ports had the temerity to do business between other ports. We know that since the days of Washington our coastwise navigation laws have been restricted and restricted until as a consequence the traffic is now in the hands of comparatively few, who do business upon their own terms, and who in consequence have made it absolutely necessary for the construction of many lines of railway which otherwise could have been dispensed with.

Mr. President, I think when my friend from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] takes occasion to carefully and deliberately study the history of ship subsidies he will come to the conclusion that it is not only unnecessary for the establishment of an American merchant marine that this new form of taxation for private purposes should be imposed upon the American people, but that if it were resorted to, instead of producing the desired result, it would only end in that lamentable condition of affairs so conspicuous in the French maritime history of the last half century.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, this is a very interesting field, but I am not going to enter into it at this time. The whole question of the policy to be pursued with reference to our shipping, I hope, will come up in a concrete way before this session is over. I simply want to state, with reference to the question raised a while ago regarding the $50,000,000 of capital stock, that I have just talked with a representative of the Shipping Board, who states that at least $40,000,000 of that stock has been put in what has been termed an impress fund and put to use in connection with the various shipyards in the country, so that it is actually represented as an investment in connection with those yards.

I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee inform me if the committee has taken under consideration the question of enacting some legislation relative to the disposal of the houses built during the past year by the Shipping Board for occupancy by ship workers? I notice in the bill some legislation providing for the disposition of houses built for the Labor Department. Can the chairman tell me?

Mr. WARREN. We provided for the housing proposition and it will come up by itself, as the Senator has said, as to selling. The housing connected with this, I understand, though I may be wrong about it, is the same as the shipping that is for sale as fast as they can dispose of it. Does the Senator know about it?

Mr. CALDER. I have visited several of the housing developments of the Shipping Board. Some of them impressed me very favorably and others did not. I propose, unless the committee has something in mind, before we get through with the bill to offer an amendment requiring the Shipping Board to dispose of all these houses within a given period.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that that question will arise a little later in the bill.

Mr. CALDER. I have examined the bill and do not find anything in it dealing with the Shipping Board houses.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be true.

Mr. CALDER. I will look the bill over further, I will say to the Senator from Utah, and see if I can not suggest something to cover the question before the bill is finally disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is right. I do not think there is any provision in the bill covering the Shipping Board houses, but the Housing Corporation have constructed some 6,000 buildings. That is provided for. I have observed that in the bill, and I should like to have the Shipping Board houses provided for somewhat in the same way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 3, after the word "material," to insert "or plant," so as to make the clause read:

Any material or plant as defined under the emergency shipping-fund provision of the deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, acquired by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, may be disposed of as the President may direct.

Mr. KING. I beg the chairman's pardon and the Senate's pardon. I intended to inquire of the chairman whether in the paragraph just acted upon it was intended that there should be any purchasing, requisitioning, or otherwise acquiring of plants or materials for ships. Is there an authorization to extend all or any part of the large appropriation of $491,000,000 for purchasing or requisitioning plants or materials for ships?

Mr. WARREN. Of course they must procure materials to carry on the work to finish the ships under way, and the intention is pretty plainly shown by the amendment which has just been read. They asked us and we have inserted in line 3 the words "or plant" where "material" is defined, and so forth, and provided that it may be sold.

Mr. KING. They may be disposed of, but the point that I am trying to get at is this: Is any part of this appropriation to be used to purchase, requisition, or acquire additional plants for ships?

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to my colleague that this is the exact wording of the original act. There is no intention of requisitioning or purchasing ships, nor does the amount appropriated contemplate such action. The amount provided here is for the purpose of paying the actual contract prices of the unfinished ships that are to be turned over to the Government, but not a dollar of it, I will say to the Senator, is for the requisitioning of additional ships or the purchasing of a plant.

Mr. KING. That was my understanding, but I wanted it clearly understood.

Mr. WARREN. In what line does the Senator find the language to which he refers?

Mr. KING. In lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 52.

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has said, that is merely a repetition of the law. Perhaps the Senator has noted also that where it speaks of the unexpended balance of appropriations the same language is used.

Mr. KING. I supposed it was the language carried over from the act, but I wanted it to expressly appear in the RECORD that that is the understanding, and that this appropriation is made with the clear understanding that it is to be devoted solely and exclusively to the completion of vessels now in process of construction.

Mr. WARREN. Or under contract, and then to clean up and dispose of them as fast as possible. No other intimation came to us in the hearings, and nothing from any direction but what would lead to the conclusion the Senator has just stated.

Mr. KING. I would feel that an amendment should be offered limiting the expenditure to these uses unless it is clearly understood.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Smithsonian Institution," on page 53, line 19, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

International exchanges: For the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including necessary employees and purchase of necessary books and periodicals, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 25, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "$42,000" and insert "$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

American ethnology: For continuing ethnological researches among the American Indians and the natives of Hawaii, including the excavation and preservation of archæologic remains, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including necessary employees and the purchase of necessary books and periodicals, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 13, to strike out:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "for observation of the total eclipse of the sun of June 8, 1918, etc.," is reappropriated and made for observation of the total eclipse of the sun of May 28, 1919, visible in Bolivia.

Mr. NORRIS. Before that amendment is agreed to, I want to make some inquiry of the committee. How much is the unexpended balance that is reappropriated for the observation of the eclipse.

Mr. WARREN. I think it is between thirteen and fourteen hundred dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. The House proposed, as I understand this language, that they would reappropriate that for the observation——

Mr. WARREN. The observation of what is expected to be a total eclipse observable in Bolivia.

Mr. NORRIS. That time has already passed.

Mr. WARREN. Of course.

Mr. SMOOT. That was May 28, 1919, and it has already passed.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the idea of the House in a provision of that kind?

Mr. WARREN. That is exactly why we struck it out. We wish to ask the House conferees what the House meant by it.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that that is a good reason to strike it out.

Mr. WARREN. It is possible they made a mistake in the date; but we felt that that ought to be the all-governing reason for striking it out.

Mr. NORRIS. I should think that was sufficient. A Senator suggests to me it may have been in the other bill that failed, and was reprinted in this bill through oversight.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, it was getting toward midnight when we acted on this item, and we could not get in touch with the Members of the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 23, after the words "telephonic service" to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$55,000," so as to make the clause read:

For heating, lighting, electrical, telegraphic, and telephonic service, $55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 10, after the words "National Museum" to strike out "$382,500" and insert "$387,500," so as to make the clause read:

In all, National Museum, $387,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 22, to strike out:

TARIFF COMMISSION.

For salaries and expenses of the United States Tariff Commission, including the purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, books of reference and periodicals as may be necessary, as authorized under Title VII of the act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916, $300,000: *Provided*, That the disbursing clerk of the Treasury Department shall act in a similar capacity for the United States Tariff Commission.

Mr. WARREN. Let that be passed over. Several Senators desire that it shall go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 11, on page 58.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask for information purely. In the various large appropriations made a few days ago in the Army appropriation bill there were a number of items for arsenals, and so forth. Why does this bill carry appropriations for the same purpose?

Mr. WARREN. Is the Senator sure there were any items there for arsenals?

Mr. KING. That is my recollection.

Mr. WARREN. There was one item only, I think, and that was regarding the Frankford Arsenal, for the employment of some men, and so forth. The arsenals have always been provided for in the sundry civil bill, and they are provided for in this bill and not in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. That does not seem right to me.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "War Department," subhead "Quartermaster Corps," on page 59, line 20, after the words "national cemeteries," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the work of furnishing headstones of durable stone or other durable material for unmarked graves of Union and Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines in national, post, city, town, and village cemeteries, naval cemeteries at navy yards and stations of the United States, and other burial places, under the acts of March 3, 1873, February 3, 1879, and March 9, 1906; continuing the work of furnishing headstones for unmarked graves of civilians interred in post cemeteries under the acts of April 28, 1904, and June 30, 1906; and furnishing headstones for the unmarked graves of Confederate soldiers, sailors, and marines in national cemeteries, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engineer Department," on page 68, line 11, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

To provide for the increased cost in park maintenance, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 19, after the words "bathing beach," to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$20,000," so as to make the clause read:

For extension of the bathhouse at the Tidal Basin bathing beach, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 5, to strike out:

For commencing the construction of a reflecting pool in west Potomac Park, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 20, to insert:

Cape Cod Canal: The Secretary of War, in pursuance of authority heretofore conferred on him by law, having caused proceedings to be instituted for acquiring by condemnation the Cape Cod Canal and all the franchises, property, and rights of property appurtenant thereto, the United States shall have the right to take immediate possession of said canal and appurtenances and maintain and operate the same in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1909, which are hereby made applicable to said works. The sum of $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for the acquisition and improvement of this waterway, including the payment of any awards which may be made in the aforesaid condemnation proceedings: *Provided, however*, That said awards shall be subject to approval by Congress; and if within two years from the final entry of judgment in said proceedings Congress has failed to so approve, the Secretary of War shall relinquish the possession of said property to its owners in as good condition as when taken over by the United States under this act; and the said owners shall have just compensation for its use and occupation as provided herein.

Within 30 days after the passage of this act the Secretary of War and the said owners may agree upon the amount and method of payment for the use and occupation of said waterway. In default of such agreement, the matter shall forthwith be determined by three arbitrators, one to be selected by the Attorney General, one by the owners, and a third by the two arbitrators so selected. Should the two arbitrators so selected fail within 60 days from the passage of this act to agree upon the selection of the third, then the third arbitrator shall be appointed by the judge of the district court of the United States for the district of Massachusetts; or should either party for any reason fail to select their arbitrator within said 60 days, then the said judge shall appoint the arbitrator for the party or parties so failing to select; and the said arbitrators when so selected or appointed shall, within 60 days thereafter, fix and determine the just compensation to which the said owners shall be entitled and the method of payment thereof. The decision of any two of said arbitrators shall be final and binding upon both parties as to the just compensation to be had for the use and occupation of said waterway under this act. The amount so awarded shall be paid by the Secretary of War out of the funds herein appropriated. The appointment of the said arbitrators shall be deemed a waiver of any right either party may have to a trial by jury or any other procedure authorized by law for the determination of such just compensation.

The fees and reasonable expenses of the arbitrators shall be paid, one-half by the United States and one-half by the owners, out of the funds herein appropriated, and the Secretary of War shall deduct the one-half payable by the owners out of the compensation to which they may be entitled for the use and occupation of said waterway.

Nothing done under the provisions contained herein shall be used by either party as evidence or otherwise in the condemnation proceedings hereinbefore referred to. The judgment in said proceedings shall not include any compensation for the use and occupation of the property for the period for which compensation may be allowed by the Secretary of War or the arbitrators under the provisions contained herein.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment may go over.

Mr. KING. I raise the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Let the Senator from Utah reserve the point of order and let the amendment go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Utah has made the point of order on the amendment?

Mr. KING. I raise the point of order against the amendment, but I shall not ask the Chair to pass upon it now in view of the suggestion of the chairman of the committee. I desire, however, to have the point of order considered as pending.

Mr. WARREN. Let the amendment go over. The Senator from Utah may reserve the point of order, if he wishes to make it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In conformity with the request of the Senator from Wyoming, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Medical Department," on page 77, line 8, after the word "disabilities," to strike out "$500" and insert "$1,000," so as to make the clause read:

Appliances for disabled soldiers: For furnishing surgical appliances to persons disabled in the military or naval service of the United States, prior to October 6, 1917, and not entitled to artificial limbs or trusses for the same disabilities, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 13, after the date "1879," to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500," so as to make the clause read:

Trusses for disabled soldiers: For trusses for persons entitled thereto under section 1176, Revised Statutes of the United States, and the act amendatory thereof approved March 3, 1879, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," subhead "Surveying the public lands": On page 94, line 8, after the word "Interior," to strike out "$675,000" and insert "$700,000," and on page 96, line 12, after the word "appropriation," to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; so as to make the clause read:

For surveys and resurveys of public lands, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $700,000: *Provided*, That in expending this appropriation preference shall be given, first, in favor of surveying townships occupied in whole or in part by actual settlers and of lands granted to the States by the act approved February 22, 1889, and the acts approved July 3 and July 10, 1890, and to survey under such other acts as provide for land grants to the several States and Territories, and such indemnity lands as the several States and Territories may be entitled to in lieu of lands granted them for educational and other purposes which may have been sold or included in some reservation or otherwise disposed of, except railroad land grants, and other surveys shall include lands adapted to agriculture and lands deemed advisable to survey on account of availability for irrigation or dry farming, lands subject to disposition under mineral land laws where survey thereof is not otherwise provided for, lines of reservations, and lands within boundaries of forest reservations, and including such retracements and re-marking of State boundaries as shall be found necessary in order to close the public land lines thereon. The surveys and resurveys provided for in this appropriation to be made by such competent surveyors as the Secretary of the Interior may select, at such compensation, not exceeding $200 per month each, as he may prescribe, except in Alaska, where a compensation not exceeding $300 per month each may be allowed such surveyors, except that the Secretary of the Interior may appoint not to exceed one supervisor of surveys, whose compensation shall not exceed $300 per month, and not to exceed 10 surveyors who may be employed in a supervisory capacity, whose compensation shall not exceed $250 per month each, and such per diem in lieu of subsistence, not exceeding $3.50, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and actual necessary expenses for transportation, including necessary sleeping-car fares, said per diem and traveling expenses to be allowed to all surveyors employed hereunder and to such clerks who are competent surveyors who may be detailed to make surveys, resurveys, or examinations of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, and inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, and for making, by such competent surveyors, fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States: *Provided further*, That the sum of not exceeding 10 per cent of the amount hereby appropriated may be expended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purchase of metal or other equally durable monuments to be used for public-land survey corners wherever practicable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $10,000 of this appropriation may be expended for salaries of employees of the field surveying service temporarily detailed to the General Land Office: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation shall be used for the survey, classification, and sale of the lands and timber of the so-called Oregon and California Railroad lands and the Coos Bay Wagon Road lands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, after line 20, to insert:

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Of the sum of $150,000, which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 to withdraw from the tribal funds of the Crow Indians in the State of Montana to be expended for making necessary improvements to the irrigation systems in the Big Horn Valley on the Crow Reservation in Montana, said sum, or such part thereof as may be used for the purpose indicated, to be reimbursed to the tribe under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $25,000 of this amount shall be available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I desire to inquire how this item comes to be in the bill and why it was not taken care of in the Indian appropriation bill?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I observe that the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs [Mr. CURTIS] is present, and I will ask him to explain the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this item was placed on the Indian appropriation bill, and I thought it was agreed to in conference as were other items of a similar character in several cases; but for some reason or other, either in the enrolling of the bill or the making up of the conference report, by mistake, the item was left out. It only provides for the use of $25,000 of the appropriation to pay expenses largely for the month of June and is reimbursable.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I did not fully hear the explanation which has just been made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], his face being turned in the other direction; so I desire to ask him this question: Was this proposition voted down on the Indian appropriation bill?

Mr. CURTIS. No; the item was inserted in the Indian appropriation bill and went into conference, and my understanding was that it was agreed to in conference. It only makes $25,000 available for the expenses for this year, mostly in the month of June.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the same explanation apply to the next two items on page 97?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know what those two items are.

Mr. McKELLAR. The first is to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches across the Two Medicine River and the other provides for the construction of a bridge across the Santa Clara River, in the State of Utah.

Mr. CURTIS. No; those items were not considered by the Indian Committee, because they were not brought to the attention of the committee when the Indian appropriation bill was under consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator from Kansas recall whether or not they were offered on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CURTIS. They were not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Neither one of them?

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that they were matters which were brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations during the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. WARREN. They were brought before the subcommittee and duly considered by that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 97, after line 8, to insert:

For the construction of a bridge and approaches across the Two Medicine River, in the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, State of Montana, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior, $8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, after line 12, to insert:

That the $10,000 for construction of a steel bridge and approaches across the Santa Clara River on the Shivwits Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and the $5,000 for construction of a wagon road through the said reservation, appropriated by the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (40 Stat. L., p. 587), are hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, reimbursable as provided in the act aforesaid: *Provided*, That should the cost of the proposed bridge exceed $10,000 no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of Utah satisfactory guaranties of the payment by the said State of any and all expenses above that amount and that the proper authorities of the said State shall assume full responsibility for, and will at all times maintain and repair, said bridge and approaches thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Geological Survey," on page 99, line 4, after the word "forests," to strike out "$289,000" and insert "$425,000," so as to make the clause read:

For topographic surveys in various portions of the United States, including lands in national forests, $425,000.

Mr. KING. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee what was the reason for increasing this appropriation from $289,000 to $425,000?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, during the war these surveys which had previously been made annually and which it seemed should be made annually were cut down to a very small percentage. There is a demand for this work and the office is behind with it. So we thought we would bring it up not to the prewar but very nearly the prewar standard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 100, line 7, after the word "Survey," to strike out "$1,425,353.50" and insert "$1,561,353.50," so as to make the clause read:

In all, United States Geological Survey, $1,561,353.50.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is this amendment made to conform to the change on page 99?

Mr. WARREN. It is made in accordance with the change in the preceding item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Bureau of Mines," on page 100, line 25, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "$402,210" and insert "$422,210," so as to make the clause read:

For investigation as to the causes of mine explosions, methods of mining, especially in relation to the safety of miners, the appliances best adapted to prevent accidents, the possible improvement of conditions under which mining operations are carried on, the use of explosives and electricity, the prevention of accidents, and other inquiries and technologic investigations pertinent to the mining industry, and including all equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel and subsistence, $422,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 7, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$160,000"; so as to make the clause read:

For investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient mining, preparation, treatment, and use, and to recommend to various departments such changes in selection and use of fuel as may result in greater economy, and including all equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel and subsistence, $160,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I thought that I could succeed, I should move to strike out this entire appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let me call my colleague's attention to the fact that this increase of $25,000 over and above the amount carried by the House bill is for the purpose of investigating the smoke nuisance in the United States, an investigation of that character having already been started by the bureau. I am quite sure the Senator knows that in certain parts of this country to-day it is necessary for some one better prepared than the cities in the States themselves to find some way of abolishing the smoke nuisance. The $25,000 increase, as I have said, is for that purpose.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have no doubt that the smoke nuisance is a nuisance in many of the cities throughout the United States. I do not conceive, however, that it is a duty resting upon the Federal Government to go into the States and municipalities, examine this nuisance, and devise some means of abating it. The same plea for Federal action might be made with respect to many unpleasant odors and many other matters which we know constitute nuisances which are offensive to the senses and perhaps injurious to life; but they are subjects for the municipalities and for the States to investigate. The thing against which I have been declaiming for days is the invasion by the Federal Government of the functions of individuals and municipalities and States.

Mr. SMOOT. I will assure the Senator that this is only a $10 appropriation as compared to hundred-dollar appropriations for other similar services carried on in the States, to many of which the Senator himself has referred. For example, take the Public Health Service of our Government, and see the millions and millions of dollars that have been appropriated for that service, all of which practically are expended within the States. This item is for the investigation of mineral oils and unfinished mineral products and has been appropriated for for a number of years past. I am sure that, in connection with the universities, this money has been of immense value to the western section of the country. As I have stated, the $20,000 increase over and above the regular amount which has been appropriated in years past is for investigations concerning the smoke nuisance.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I agree with my colleague. As he has stated, millions are carried in this bill and have been carried in other bills for matters that relate purely to the domestic and the local concerns of the people and of the States. I presume the precedents have piled up so high that it is impossible now successfully to attack this intrenched evil.

I do not think we can justify the wrong by the benefits which have been derived. I can conceive of many benefits derived by individuals and by the States from the expenditure of money wrung from the people by the Federal Government by taxation, placed in the Federal Treasury, and then filtered back to the people; but that wrong is not sanctified or justified by some of the benefits which may be derived by the people. I object to these appropriations; I think they are wrong, and I think in the end they will end in the destruction of the States, in the abdication of their duties, and their failure to assert their sovereign rights and to carry out the responsibilities resting upon them.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONTROL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the conference report on Senate bill 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will say that if it leads to any considerable debate I will not ask that its consideration be continued.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator is always considerate. I have no objection to taking up the conference report now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "to take effect at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "not to exceed four months"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "supervision, possession, control, or operation therein specified"; and on page 2, line 25, of the engrossed bill, after the word "fully" insert "adjusted and"; also on page 2, line 25, of the engrossed bill, after "paid," strike out the words "and adjusted"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "ninety"; and on page 3, line 5, of the engrossed bill, after the word "made" insert "to the Congress"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "each separate"; and on page 3, lines 9 and 10, of the engrossed bill, strike out the words "under the proclamation referred to in section 1"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "system from August 1, 1918, up to"; and the House agree to the same.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
ATLEE POMERENE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN J. ESCH,
E. L. HAMILTON,
T. W. SIMS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think it is due to the Senate to make a very brief explanation of what the conference report really does. As the Senate passed the bill repealing the act under which the President took possession of the telegraph, cables, and telephone systems it was to take effect forthwith upon its passage. The House amended the Senate bill so that it would take effect upon the last of the month in which it was approved. The reason for this amendment on the part of the House was, as stated, to make the accounting between the companies and the Government more simple and easy. The Senate yielded to the House amendment, and the act will take effect upon the last day of the month in which it is approved, and we assume that it will be approved during the month of July.

The only other difference of any importance whatever was with regard to the time during which the increased rates

established by the Postmaster General shall continue. As the Senate passed the bill it was provided that these rates should continue for a period of 90 days. As the House amended the bill the period during which the rates should continue in force was six months. We compromised the matter and agreed to a continuance of these rates for a period of four months.

These were the only material differences between the House and the Senate, and they have been composed in the manner seen in the report of the committee. While there were a great many other amendments in form, they were all related to the two which I have already suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the Chair is that the committee amendment on page 101, line 8, has been agreed to. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 101, line 26, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,000," so as to make the clause read:

For inquiries and investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, with a view to economic development and conserving resources through the prevention of waste; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting the industry, including equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel, and subsistence, $125,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$125,000" and inserting "$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the committee, $125,000, it is proposed to insert "$150,000."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the matter, of course, is within the estimate. This is a very important industry; and as far as the chairman of the committee is personally concerned, he will make no objection to its going in.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will merely say that I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated the 21st of May, recommending it, and also a letter from the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 103, after line 6, to insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to establish and maintain three mining experiment stations in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of mining experiment and mine safety stations for making investigations and disseminating information among employees in mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1915, and the sum of $75,000 is hereby appropriated therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, after line 9, to insert:

That the act approved October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of same, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"In the interest of public safety, that it shall be unlawful to manufacture, distribute, store, use, or possess powder, explosives, blasting supplies, or ingredients thereof, except as in this act provided.

"SEC. 2. That the words 'explosive' and 'explosives' when used herein shall mean gunpowders, powders used for blasting, all forms of high explosives, blasting materials, fuses, detonators, and other detonating agents, smokeless powders, and any chemical compound or mechanical mixture that contains any oxidizing and combustible units, or other ingredients, in such proportions, quantities, or packing that ignition by fire, by friction, by concussion, by percussion, or by detonation of or any part of the compound or mixture may cause such a sudden generation of highly heated gases that the resultant gaseous pressures are capable of producing destructive effects on contiguous objects, or of destroying life or limb, but shall not include small arms or shotgun cartridges: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the manufacture, under the authority of the Government, of explosives for, their sale to, or their possession by the military or naval service of the United States of America.

"SEC. 3. That the word 'ingredients' when used herein shall mean the materials and substances capable by combination of producing one or more of the explosives mentioned in section 1 hereof.

"SEC. 4. That the word 'person,' when used herein, shall include States, Territories, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and other dependencies of the United States and municipal subdivisions thereof, individual citizens, firms, associations, societies, and corporations of the United States and of other countries at peace with the United States.

"SEC. 5. That from and after the passage and approval of this act no person shall have in his possession or purchase, accept, receive, sell, give, barter, or otherwise dispose of or procure explosives or ingredients, except as provided in this act: *Provided*, That the purchase or possession of said ingredients when purchased or held in small quantities and not used or intended to be used in the manufacture of explosives are not subject to the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That the superintendent, foreman, or other duly authorized employee at a mine, quarry, or other work, may, when licensed so to do, sell or issue to any workman under him such an amount of explosives or ingredients as may be required by that workman in the performance of his duties, and the workman may purchase or accept the explosives or ingredients so sold or issued, but the person so selling or issuing same shall see that any unused explosives or ingredients are returned, and that no explosives or ingredients are taken by the workman to any point not necessary to the carrying on of his duties.

"SEC. 6. That nothing contained herein shall apply to explosives or ingredients while being transported upon vessels or railroad cars in conformity with statutory law or Interstate Commerce Commission rules.

"SEC. 7. That from and after the passage of this act no person shall manufacture explosives unless licensed so to do, as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 8. That any licensee or applicant for license hereunder shall furnish such information regarding himself and his business, so far as such business relates to or is connected with explosives or ingredients, at such time and in such manner as the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or his authorized representative, may request, excepting that those who have been or are at the time of the passage of this act regularly engaged in the manufacture of explosives shall not be compelled to disclose secret processes, costs, or other data unrelated to the distribution of explosives.

"SEC. 9. That from and after the passage and approval of this act every person authorized to sell, issue, or dispose of explosives shall keep a complete itemized and accurate record, showing each person to whom explosives are sold, given, bartered, or to whom or how otherwise disposed of, and the quantity and kind of explosives, and the date of each such sale, gift, barter, or other disposition; and this record shall be sworn to and furnished to the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or his authorized representatives, whenever requested.

"SEC. 10. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to issue licenses as follows:

"(a) Manufacturer's license, authorizing the manufacture, possession, and sale of explosives and ingredients.

"(b) Vendor's license, authorizing the purchase, possession, and sale of explosives or ingredients.

"(c) Purchaser's license, authorizing the purchase and possession of explosives and ingredients.

"(d) Foreman's license, authorizing the purchase and possession of explosives and ingredients and the sale and issuance of explosives and ingredients to workmen under the proviso to section 5 above.

"(e) Exporter's license, authorizing the licensee to export explosives, but no such license shall authorize exportation in violation of any proclamation of the President issued under any act of Congress.

"(f) Importer's license, authorizing the licensee to import explosives.

"(g) Analyst's, educator's, inventor's, and investigator's licenses authorizing the purchase, manufacture, possession, testing, and disposal of explosives and ingredients.

"SEC. 11. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines shall issue licenses, upon application duly made, but only to citizens of the United States of America, and to the subjects or citizens of nations that are at peace with them, and to corporations, firms, and associations thereof, and he may, in his discretion, refuse to issue a license, when he has reason to believe, from facts of which he has knowledge or reliable information, that the applicant is disloyal or hostile to the United States of America or liable to misuse explosives, or that, if the applicant is a firm, association, society, or corporation, its controlling stockholders or members are disloyal, hostile, or menacing to the United States of America or may permit the misuse of explosives. The director may, when he has reason to believe on like grounds that any licensee is so disloyal, hostile, or menacing, revoke any license issued to him. Any applicant to whom a license is refused or any licensee whose license is revoked by the said director may, at any time within 30 days after notification of the rejection of his application or revocation of his license, apply for such license or the cancellation of such revocation to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall make his order upon the director either to grant or to withhold the license.

"SEC. 12. That any person desiring to manufacture, sell, export, import, store, or purchase explosives or ingredients, or to keep explosives or ingredients in his possession shall make application for a license, which application shall state, under oath, the name of the applicant; the place of birth; whether native born or naturalized citizen of the United States of America; if a naturalized citizen, the date and place of naturalization; business in which engaged; the amount and kind of explosives or ingredients which during the past six months have been purchased, disposed of, or used by him; the amount and kind of explosives or ingredients now on hand; whether sales, if any, have been made to jobbers, wholesalers, retailers, or consumers; the kind of license to be issued, and the kind and amount of explosives or ingredients to be authorized by the license; and such further information as the Director of the Bureau of Mines may, by rule, from time to time require.

"Applications for vendor's, purchaser's, or foreman's licenses shall be made to such officers of the State, Territory, or dependency having jurisdiction in the district within which the explosives or ingredients are to be sold or used, and having the power to administer oaths as may be designated by the Director of the Bureau of Mines, who shall issue the same in the name of such director. Such officers shall be entitled to receive from the applicant a fee of 25 cents for each license issued. They shall keep an accurate record of all licenses issued in manner and form to be prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of Mines, to whom they shall make reports from time to time as may be by rule issued by the director required. The necessary blanks and blank records shall be furnished to such officers by the said director. Licensing officers shall be subject to removal for cause by the Director of the Bureau of Mines, and all licenses issued by them shall be subject to revocation by the director as provided in section 11.

"SEC. 13. That the Secretary of the Interior may appoint under civil-service regulations one chief explosives inspector, experienced in the use and effects of explosives, at $5,000 per annum, and 14 expert explosives inspectors, whose duty it shall be, under the direction of the Director of the Bureau of Mines, to see that this act is faithfully

executed and observed. Each such inspector shall receive a salary of $3,600 per annum. He may at any time be detailed for service by said director in the District of Columbia or in any State, Territory, or dependency of the United States. All additional employees required in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be appointed by the Director of the Bureau of Mines, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 14. That it shall be unlawful for any person to represent himself as having a license issued under this act when he has not such a license, or as having a license different in form or in conditions from the one which he in fact has, or without proper authority make, or cause to be made, issue, or exhibit anything purporting or pretending to be such license, or intended to mislead any person into believing it is such license, or to refuse to exhibit his license to any peace officer, Federal or State, or representative of the Bureau of Mines.

"SEC. 15. That no inspector or other employee of the Bureau of Mines shall divulge any information obtained in the course of his duties under this act regarding the business of any licensee, or applicant for license, without authority from the applicant for license or from the Director of the Bureau of Mines.

"SEC. 16. That every person authorized under this act to manufacture or store explosives or ingredients shall clearly mark and define the premises on which his plant or magazine may be and shall conspicuously display thereon the words 'Explosives—Keep of.'

"SEC. 17. That no person, without the consent of the owner or his authorized agents, except peace officers, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, and persons designated by him in writing, shall be in or upon any plant or premises on which explosives are manufactured or stored, or be in or upon any magazine premises on which explosives are stored; nor shall any person discharge any firearms or throw or place any explosives or inflammable bombs at, on, or against any such plant or magazine premises, or cause the same to be done.

"SEC. 18. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying into effect this act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 19. That any person violating any of the provisions of this act, or any rules or regulations made thereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 20. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to investigate all explosions and fires which may occur in mines, quarries, factories, warehouses, magazines, houses, cars, boats, conveyances, and all places in which explosives or the ingredients thereof are manufactured, transported, stored, or used, and shall, in his discretion, report his findings, in such manner as he may deem fit, to the proper Federal or State authorities, to the end that if such explosion has been brought about by a willful act the person or persons causing such act may be proceeded against and brought to justice; or if said explosion has been brought about by accidental means, that precautions may be taken to prevent similar accidents from occurring. In the prosecution of such investigations the employees of the Bureau of Mines are hereby granted the authority to enter the premises where such explosion or fire has occurred, to examine plans, books, and papers, to administer oaths to, and to examine all witnesses and persons concerned, without let or hindrance on the part of the owner, lessee, operator, or agent thereof.

"SEC. 21. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to create and maintain in the District of Columbia, a laboratory and testing station for the investigation and examination of bombs, infernal machines, and other devices designed for use with malicious intent.

"SEC. 22. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines, with the approval of the President, is hereby authorized to utilize such agents, agencies, and all officers of the United States and of the several States, Territories, dependencies, and municipalities thereof, and the District of Columbia, in the execution of this act, and all agents, agencies, and all officers of the United States and of the several States and Territories, dependencies and municipalities thereof, and the District of Columbia shall hereby have full authority for all acts done by them in the execution of this act when acting by the direction of the Bureau of Mines.

"SEC. 23. That for the enforcement of this provision and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and including supplies, equipment, expenses of traveling and subsistence, and for the purchase and hire of animal-drawn or motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and upkeep of same, and for every other expense incident to the enforcement of this provision. there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in addition to which the unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made for the control of explosives are hereby reappropriated and made available for the purpose of this provision for the fiscal year 1920: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000 shall be expended in the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is a very long amendment, but I will simply say what it means.

During the war we undertook to provide for our protection in the way of explosives. We provided that manufacturers and dealers should take out licenses, and so forth. With the ending of the war—or when, as we supposed, it had ended—we had passed that by. This really makes that provision applicable to peace times, and provides that as to these explosives the Department of Mines shall issue licenses.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what theory the committee has for giving Congress jurisdiction of this subject as a peace measure?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, before the committee Mr. Manning, who has been the head of the Mines Bureau, came in and proposed this legislation. The legislation is substantially the same legislation that is now on the statute books in reference to the licensing of the sale of explosives. I am free to say that there may be some question about how far the Federal Government can go in time of peace in reference to the regulation of explosives in this country. Undoubtedly, under the war powers of the Government we have the right to regulate explosives. This is not a compelling act in the way of making men do anything except account for the explosives that go into their hands, and to whom they sell them. It carries the necessary machinery for that purpose, and the war statute is so modified as to meet peace conditions. Of course the war statute would go off the statute books as soon as peace is declared if it were not for this enactment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator says there is nothing compelling in this amendment; but a maximum penalty of 10 years in prison is provided for its violation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I mean, there is nothing compelling a man to do more than report what explosives he receives and to whom they are sold. It is an effort on the part of the Government to keep up with the explosives.

Of course, I recognize that this amendment is subject to a point of order. The committee brings it here knowing that fact; but we know the unrestful conditions of Europe. We know that anarchy and disorder are stalking abroad through the Old World. We know that the men and women of America are not safe in their houses to-day, and that organized bands of anarchists are roaming about the United States defying law, defying the Government, seeking to destroy and to tear down. One of the checks against those evils, and one of the measures for the protection of life and property in the United States to-day, is carefully to conserve the sale of explosives, to require the manufacturer to report to whom he sells explosives, and to require the retailer to say to whom he sells explosives so as to enable the Secret Service agents of the Government to keep up with the explosives and protect life and property throughout the United States.

In my judgment, Mr. President, this is no hour for the Government of the United States to hesitate in these matters for one moment. Under our Constitution every opportunity is given in this free Government to change it by legitimate and constitutional means. If the people of America desire a change of our institutions, no revolution is needed and no anarchist bomb is necessary to carry the change into effect. It is within the power of the people of this country to work out such changes as they desire; and any band of men who are combined in the United States to terrorize the American people for the purpose of destroying their Government should not be allowed to exist for one moment.

The only way to face this question is with the strongest hand the Government can use. Your committee has reported in this bill an appropriation of $500,000 in addition to the regular appropriations to the Attorney General of the United States to track down and drive out of this country the anarchists who are in it. We have appropriated over $300,000 to deport from the shores of this free land every man who claims to be an anarchist or belongs to an anarchist society or distributes anarchist literature.

The enactment of this legislation in this appropriation bill is merely to hold up the hands of the Government, and give the officers of the law a chance to follow the sale of explosives, and to protect the people, the men, women, and children, and the firesides of this conutry.

I can not see how the Congress of the United States can hesitate for one moment in this hour to enact legislation of this kind.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am not going to make the point of order on this amendment, although, of course, it is clearly subject to a point of order. I am somewhat amazed, however, to find the Senator from Alabama urging legislation which I think he must admit is clearly unconstitutional as a peace measure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No, Mr. President; I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not admit that it is unconstitutional. I have some doubts about it. It is the kind of legislation which is within that twilight zone where nobody except the Supreme Court of the United States can pronounce whether it is within the power of the Federal Government or not. I would not put it in here if I knew that it was clearly unconstitutional; but I think it probably will be sustained by the court.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if it is constitutional, then we needed no constitutional amendment for prohibition. That is absolutely clear. If Congress has the power, as a peace measure, to legislate upon this subject in this way, there is very little left of the rights of the States.

There is one theory, possibly, upon which it would be sustained at this time. We are still technically at war, and it certainly would be valid until the peace ratifications have been exchanged; but beyond that point I feel very clear that if it should be attacked it would not be sustained.

I say what I have said simply because I do not think the country should regard this as a precedent of Congress, believing that it has power, for what it may choose to say is in the interest of the public safety, to legislate upon matters that are clearly and solely within the jurisdiction of the States.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in this country to-day there are a large number of people who are banded together and conspiring for the purpose of bringing about the overthrow of this Government. Your committee which, by direction of the Senate, investigated the question of German propaganda and Bolshevism in this country realized the fact and set out in their report that some legislation like this war legislation ought to be enacted at this time. The Secretary of the Interior, in recommending this legislation strongly, sets out the recommendation of the committee, your Committee on the Judiciary; and they also have recommended this legislation in the strongest terms. We realize that it is necessary for the very protection of our own Government to keep in touch with these explosives and for the Government to keep their hands on them all the time, to prevent this Government being destroyed.

Now is the time when we ought to keep our hands on this character of explosives which are intended to be used by these anarchists and the I. W. W.'s to destroy lives and property. If it was important for this Government to keep its hands on these explosives during the war, it ought to do it in time of peace under these conditions, and that is one of the best ways to protect our Government from their dastardly designs.

I read from the report of the committee:

> Never have the Federal statutes provided adequate security against an unlawful and promiscuous use of high explosives. During the period of American neutrality the representatives of the German Government, as well as many criminally inclined residents of our own country, resorted to the use of explosives for the destruction of life, property, and transportation facilities, and, except for the provision in the interstate-commerce act which prohibited the shipping or carrying of explosives in interstate commerce, the offenses could not be reached by the Federal Government, and when reached under this act the penalties were entirely incommensurate with the offense. The act of Congress of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," was enacted by Congress as a purely war statute and becomes inoperative upon the restoration of peace. The efficacious effect of this legislation during the period of the war has not only justified its enactment as a war statute, but has impressed upon the people of the country the merit of its provision in times of peace as well as in times of war.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the committee on making this provision in this bill.

I agree heartily with what has been said by the Senator from North Carolina and by the Senator from Alabama. This is no time to deal gently with the I. W. W.'s and the Bolsheviki in this country. We had one experience in this city, and a similar experience in the city of Cleveland some time ago, when a bomb was thrown into the mayor's home and he and his little son just barely escaped injury. There is at the present time threatened throughout the country another outbreak on July 4; and perhaps a dozen or more of these men are under surveillance now in the city of Cleveland and in that vicinity. There are a vast number of these outlaws in the various industrial centers of the country, and they ought to be dealt with with a mailed fist; and the Senate will fall short of its duty if it does not adopt every piece of legislation that will help in the least to drive these people out of the country.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just one word in regard to this amendment. I have not had an opportunity to compare the amendment proposed by the committee and the original act; but, as I understand it, the main provisions of the original act are contained in the amendment. I had the honor of being one of the subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining that framed or helped to frame the original explosives act. I want to say that I was impressed at the time with this thought, that if an act like this could be made to apply in times of peace as well as in times of war it would be a good thing for the country. It is true there is some question, as indicated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], as to the constitutionality of the act; but, passing that, there is a difficulty, so far as the State legislation is concerned, in not having uniformity throughout the several States in regard to explosives and the ingredients that enter into them. I think now, in the face of recent occurrences and the developments in this country, we should, if possible, keep the substance of the original explosives act upon the statute books. I quite agree with what has been said by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] in that respect. I do not believe that now is the time when we should abate one jot or tittle of the explosives act.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would not make any observations whatever in regard to this amendment had it not been for the statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I was a member of the committee from whose report he just read. The inference from the statement made by my distinguished friend was that the parts of the report which he read were the views of all the members of the committee. I joined with my associates in the finding of facts reported by the committee, but I stated at the conclusion of the report that I did not assent to some of the recommendations made by the committee, and I did not assent to that part of the report to which the Senator from North Carolina has just called the attention of the Senate.

In a general way I concur in the views stated by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. Much as I would like effective and drastic legislation dealing with the criminals referred to by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], I can not agree with all of the provisions of this measure. Some of its provisions I believe to be unconstitutional, and the general plan suggests an effort to deal with a subject which is within the police powers of the States. This legislation was warranted when we were at war and could be defended under the war power of the National Government. I am not willing to go as far as the distinguished Senator from Alabama and say perhaps the court, or probably the court, will sustain it. Jurists and many statesmen, among them Thomas Jefferson, as I recall, have stated that when there is a doubt as to the constitutionality of a proposed enactment the legislative body should resolve the doubt against the measure.

Mr. President, the people of the States appreciate the evils arising from the army of enemy aliens within the United States who are seeking the destruction of our Government, and nearly all the States have passed drastic legislation dealing with the activities of this class. The patriotic people of the States will grapple with these enemies of law and order and enact statutes that will be just as effective as any that might be enacted by the Federal Government. I believe we can rely upon the States and the legislatures of the States to enact such police regulations, such State statutes, as will preserve the rights of the people and the integrity of the States, as well as the integrity and honor of the Federal Government.

I want to make just one observation by reason of the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. We already have now upon the statute books a law under which many of these aliens could be deported. For some reason, and I do not want to be critical, those charged with the enforcement of the law have not, in my opinion, proceeded with that vigor that should have characterized their enforcement of its provisions. This law, which we passed in 1918, provides that aliens belonging to certain classes may be deported from the United States. Unquestionably the Bolsheviki, those who believe in the destruction by force of organized government and of this Government, can be deported under that statute. And yet in New York City there are Mr. Martens and representatives of Lenin's Russian Soviet. Martens claims to be the representative of the Bolshevik government, and he and his supporters are holding meetings almost nightly and proclaiming the destructive and deadly creed of the Bolshevists and receiving the plaudits and encouragement of hundreds of misguided followers. Organizations exist in this country giving aid and comfort to Martens and the Russian Soviets and their representatives here. The Department of Labor should stretch forth its hand and seize Mr. Martens, an alien enemy, and the other aliens, members of the Russian Soviet, and deport them from the United States.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Appropos of what the Senator is now saying, at a recent meeting in Cleveland there was something over 100 arrests and convictions, and out of more than 100 arrests there were less than one-half dozen of them who were native-born Americans.

Mr. KING. I think the statement of the Senator from Ohio would be verified if arrests were made among this class in other parts of the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to my friend.

Mr. STERLING. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio would say how many of them were aliens and subject to deportation?

Mr. POMERENE. The larger portion of them, but I am not able to give the number.

Mr. KING. I think the investigations which have been made by agencies of the United States and of States will prove that the greater number of the I. W. W.'s and extreme radicals are aliens. My recollection is that of the more than 100 who were put on trial in Chicago a short time ago before Judge Landis charged with violation of law, the great majority of

them were aliens. One hundred and twenty-odd were convicted, Haywood among them. Mr. Haywood is not an alien, but a majority of those who were convicted were aliens.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. In the case of a man who is an American citizen, for example, one of those to whom the Senator from Ohio refers, engaged in the work of seditiously and unlawfully undermining his country's government and preaching its overthrow, what would the Senator do with him when the time came for deportation? Where is he going?

Mr. KING. There is no authority for deporting an American citizen. The law to which I refer, passed in 1918, applies only to aliens.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand; but it is not exactly a distributive justice to take one of two men engaged in the same infamous and criminal conspiracy and deport one and let the other remain in the country. The thought which I had in mind is that other legislation is needed, perhaps, in order to meet that situation.

I have had some little experience with the I. W. W.'s in years gone by, and that experience teaches me that it was organized and that it is officered by American citizens, and the bulk of its leadership to-day are unquestionably citizens of the United States. It simply indicates, Mr. President, that the possession and dissemination of these modern notions of a certain element of the people, destructive of society, tending to undermine and overthrow the Government, is not entirely of foreign origin. It is a home product as well. Indeed, one of the boasts of the Bolshevists is that the movement had its origin and birth in New York City.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if, when he refers to the I. W. W. as being foreigners, he means to draw a distinction between foreign and native born, or foreigners who have taken out naturalization papers, or those who have become naturalized but are of foreign birth?

Mr. KING. Perhaps I did not speak accurately. What I intended to say was that the great majority of those who are engaged in criminal activities in the United States, activities having for their object the overthrow of the Government, the assassination by bombs and explosives of officials of the Government, the establishment of a class government, are alien born and never have been naturalized.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The reason why I made that inqury was that I think the time has come when, in conjunction with the punitive statutes which we are passing for the restriction and the extermination of this element in this country, we should also supplement it by the strictest form of immigration laws, so that we can stop this melting-pot business, which comes so near melting the pot in the process.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt that the views so elucidly expressed by the Senator from South Carolina will receive the support of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate.

But recurring to the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], of course we can not deal with native-born Americans as we would deal with aliens. Whether aliens may come to this land is purely a question for the Federal Government to determine. Under what conditions they may be permitted to remain here is a matter for the Federal Government to determine. It may permit them to remain a long time or for a limited time. It may prescribe certain conditions to which they must subscribe while they are here, failing which it may deport them. Unquestionably the Federal Government has the right to enact statutes providing for the deportation of those who lift their hand against the Government and seek its overthrow and destruction.

When we come to deal with men engaged in the same diabolical work, who were born in this country or who, born abroad, have obtained citizenship in this country, a different question is presented.

They can be punished and imprisoned. They may violate laws calling for the death penalty, but it is not within the power of the Government to send them to some other country. It is quite likely that the United States could send persons convicted of violating Federal laws to some distant island or place of isolation over which it had jurisdiction. Indeed, it might incarcerate them in a State penitentiary, with the consent of the State. But in the usual sense of the word "deport," it would not have authority to deport them.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. With the remark which the Senator from Utah just made as to the extent to which sedition is preached in this country, I desire to make a suggestion. State Senator Lusk, of the New York Legislature, who is chairman of the committee investigating sedition and anarchy in the State of New York, has stated that in the city of New York there are 500,000 people who are openly in favor of overthrowing the Government by force, and frequently as many as 100 meetings at night in a week are held in the city of New York in which the overthrow of the Government is openly advocated.

Mr. KING. And yet there are men throughout the land who are declaiming against a reasonable statute that would curb the seditious utterances of men who seek by violence the destruction of this Republic.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that we should enact certain legislation, and then should let them buy all the explosives they want to blow people up? Is it possible the Federal Government can prevent the use of propaganda against the Government and not prevent men from buying explosives to destroy officials and the lives of citizens of this country, that we can prevent the spread of disease among people and animals, because it is in the interest of the whole country, but we can not prevent an anarchist from going broadcast over the land and buying explosives? Must we rely on each State to pass legislation? One State might do it and another State might not do it, and the anarchists could go over the land and buy explosives and you would never stop it unless you knew who is was who bought the explosives.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota, in the questions he has propounded, has made the strongest argument that could be made in favor of legislation of this character. I confess that it is a very persuasive and powerful argument. And yet an examination of this bill discloses that it possesses features with respect to licenses and other purely police regulations which remove it from the domain of Federal power. As I stated, as a war measure it can be justified, and technically it can be supported, so long as the status of war exists. But I have no purpose to enter upon a discussion of the constitutional features of the measure, and, therefore, shall not follow the path suggested by the questions of the Senator from Minnesota.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated it is in the twilight zone, and I admit that it is sometimes difficult to draw the line of demarcation with respect to some measures presented for our consideration between the Federal Government and the sovereign States of the Union.

But, Mr. President, this bill, as I suggested a moment ago, establishes a system of licenses within the States with respect to all forms of explosives and prescribes penalties in their nature of a purely domestic and of a police regulatory character. I am afraid that legislation of this character carried into peace times would prove a dangerous precedent and would be a justification for the invasion of the States by the Federal Government with respect to matters purely local or intrastate—matters affecting the health and the welfare of the individuals within the State.

In conclusion, I want to repeat that we have statutes now that authorize the deportation of aliens who are confessedly seeking to accomplish the destruction of the Republic. I hope the Department of Labor will enforce the statute and will see to it that Martens and the members of the New York Russian soviet and the alien radicals who announce their purpose to overthrow this Republic are speedily arrested and deported.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say, if the Senator will yield to me, that in the report of the committee the Senator from Utah did dissent to that part of the report of the committee, but did not agree with the committee in all its recommendations. The balance of the committee signed the report, and the Senator signed with that reservation.

Mr. KING. While I am upon that point, Mr. President, I want to state that in a recent meeting held in New York City under the auspices of this Russian Soviet an official of the United States, Mr. Frederick C. Howe, the commissioner of immigration at the port of New York, presided as chairman. In my opinion any person who would preside over a meeting of this character and sit with these people and listen to denunciations of our form of government and to the speeches there made without protest, is not fit to hold a position under the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, do I understand that Mr. Howe presided at such a meeting? If that is true, does not the Senator from Utah intend to introduce an amendment here to provide that no money whatever shall be paid out of the Federal

Treasury to Mr. Howe? If what the Senator says be true, it is the duty of every Senator here to vote for that amendment. Offer an amendment. Let us stop talking and let us do something. Offer an amendment that no money in the Federal Treasury shall be paid to that man if he did that.

Mr. KING. He did preside over the meeting. Martens, a Bolshevik, and other radicals spoke. It was a meeting ostensibly to present the truth respecting Russia, but it was a meeting in the interest of radicalism, in the interest of the Russian Soviet, in the interest of class government, in the interest of those who are seeking the overthrow of organized government, including the Republic of the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Senator from Utah if this same official is also not the author of a book which is known as "Socialistic Germany," which is a textbook for every violent red who does not want to go the limit of anarchy and bloodshed?

Mr. KING. He is the author of five books, to my knowledge, all of which I now have in my office, and all of which I have examined.

Mr. SHERMAN. I regard it as a seditious and dangerous book.

Mr. KING. Mr. Howe ought to be removed from office by the President of the United States or whoever has authority to remove him.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I will be very glad to hear the Senator after he offers the amendment. I am anxious to have him offer an amendment to that effect now so that action will be the result of our meeting this evening.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I inquire of the Senator from Utah what has become of some 54 or 55 aliens who were gathered up in various parts of the country, and who the last time I heard of them were in the port of New York?

Mr. KING. They are still there, and there are some in other ports or cities of the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. Have any of them been actually separated from our shores?

Mr. KING. No; not recently to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that the 54 men to whom the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] refers are being held under a writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. KING. Not all of them.

Mr. THOMAS. Not all of them; some have been discharged by the United States court upon a hearing upon a return of the United States marshal to that writ. The others, if my recollection is not at fault, have been remanded to the custody of the Government, which intends to proceed according to its original purpose.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the very fact that some or all of these disturbers, nearly all of whom are of alien birth, are able to invoke a writ of habeas corpus and remain within the limits of the United States is a reason why, notwithstanding my views favorable to the protection of all the rights reserved to the States, I can go as far as the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] or any other Senator in this Chamber and take the chances of the constitutionality of legislation. I shall prefer to leave it to the courts of my country to decide if we have exceeded our constitutional power in order that we may exhaust our full authority here in framing legislation that will separate seditious aliens from our shores and send them back to the country of their origin.

Mr. President, let me read from an issue of the Chicago Tribune of April 25, 1919, under the head of advertisements. It says:

> The Russian soviet government proposes to establish trade relations with the United States.
>
> It will buy manufactured goods for the needs of 150,000,000 people as soon as trade relations between the United States and Russia are established. Satisfactory methods of payment will be arranged.
>
> Mr. A. A. Heller, director of the commercial department of the Russian Soviet Bureau, will be glad to confer with manufacturers, exporters, and producers on Friday and Saturday, Room 1709, Hotel La Salle.

That is one of the well-known hotels in the city of Chicago.

> Russian Soviet Bureau,
> 110 West 40th Street,
> New York City.

This same advertisement was inserted in a number of daily papers published in New York City and in Chicago. It is dated the 25th of April, 1919, as I have stated.

On the 28th of April, 1919, a cablegram from Archangel contained the following information:

> American and British troops at Kurgman, on the right bank of the Dvina, repulsed a strong Bolshevist attack on Sunday night, taking 13 prisoners. The provisional government of the Bolshevists are making arrangement to repeat the attack.

This, with other cablegrams of a like kind, indicates that at the time soviet agent was endeavoring to open up trade relations with the United States our soldiers with those of the allied governments of Europe were engaged in battle with soviet soldiers. I am utterly at a loss to understand why the agents of this soviet government could be seeking to open up trade relations with our country at the same time our soldiers were engaged in battle with their military forces.

Something is wrong in this country in the actual administration of our affairs. Mr. Heller and his associates, the agents for the Bolshevik government, the same day were in the lobby of the La Salle Hotel in Chicago approaching jobbers and business men of the city of Chicago in pursuance of this advertisement, seeking to establish trade relations, Mr. Heller saying that he had at his credit $200,000,000 in gold in order, as he said in a further interview, to arrange "for the exportation of foodstuffs, clothing, agricultural and other machinery and other of the city's products, to be made when trade relations with this country are established."

He continues in this same interview with the reporter of the Chicago Tribune:

> "We are prepared to bring $200,000,000 in gold—
>
> This is aside from the advertisement—
>
> to this country, to be paid for manufactured products on delivery," said Mr. Heller yesterday at the Hotel La Salle.
>
> "Soviet Russia, through the department of national economy, is to do all of the purchasing for its 150,000,000 people.
>
> "Russia has hides, flax, and other products on hand ready to export as soon as trade relations are established."

At the same time that was occurring and the agent was seeking to establish trade relations with us, our soldiers with those of our allies were engaged in battle in northern Russia against the forces of the soviet. When this agent, assuming to represent the Russian Government, was making these overtures, one of two things ought to have been done: He either ought to have been arrested as the agent of an alien enemy in our country, or we ought to have withdrawn our troops who were in Russia instanter. There was no question about one or the other of the positions being utterly untenable. We instantly ought to have done one or the other. We did neither. The agent is still in the United States; the soviet bureau is still established in New York City; they are still undertaking to purchase commodities here. I can not conceive of any use to which they could be put except to fight our soldiers in northern Russia—selling our supplies and provisions and machinery to raise crops to victual their soldiers, to equip their forces.

Now, let me go a little further. I read from an advertising page that I cut from the Atlantic Monthly, a well-known periodical of this country:

> The Bolsheviki and World Peace, by Leon Trotski, with an introduction by Lincoln Steffens, the man who knows and understands him, is the most important and sensational book of the war. It opens the eyes of the war-ridden world to the real aims and aspirations of the Bolsheviki and the remarkable man who wrote it. The man, who six months ago was living in a Bronx tenement, who is now paying off old furniture bills and small loans made to send him back to Russia, is the only man in the world who could get a definite statement of peace terms from the military-mad autocrats of Prussia. History will perhaps place the name of Trotski alongside that of Woodrow Wilson.

If I had framed this advertisement myself I would be regarded probably as a sensational fabricator.

I now read from a current news item that—

> Messrs. Bullitt and Steffens were the special personal representatives of the President on an errand to Russia to communicate with the soviet government. Their report is known only to him, but something of its character may be gathered from a review of the past histories of those gentlemen. Steffens has been a pronounced socialist for years. He is the man who made a survey of Mexico, and wrote that the Mexican peon represented the ideal of democracy, and that the salvation of America lay in following his example.

I follow that up by a radio message that seems to have aroused Paris. It is dated February 3, 1919, and is as follows:

> PARIS, *February 3.*
>
> This afternoon the Paris papers reveal a peculiar situation which has grown out of the peace-conference invitation to all the Russian factions to attend a conference on the Princess Islands. Upon receipt of the wireless invitation Leon Trotski sent a message from Moscow to Jean Longuet, the French leader of the extreme Socialist Party in the Chamber of Deputies, asking for verification of the wireless invitation.

Longuet, who is an internationalist, attempted to send a reply, but M. Pichon, French minister of foreign affairs, refused to permit Longuet's message to be sent over the wires or wireless, both of which are controlled by the French Government.

To-day several evening papers in Paris expressed more than mild alarm over the revelation that Longuet had succeeded in having this same message sent to Trotski through or by President Wilson.

La Liberte says: "We are sure Mr. Wilson is incapable of being responsible for what has been done. We can only presume that the message was sent in his name by irresponsible clerks."

We now have the difficulties presented to be remedied by the amendment of the committee. It is to stop the traffic in explosives. The Senator from Utah was correct when he suggested that those who used explosives improperly and for the destruction of life and property are, in almost every instance, aliens. They are in our country by courtesy; they have no lawful right to remain here even under existing laws if those laws were vigorously enforced. There ought to be no writs of habeas corpus that could stop the deportation of a quantity of this vermin that infests our shores.

I quite agree with the Senator from Utah when he deplores the lack of vigorous action under existing laws. For that very reason, Mr. President, I would go with every Senator in this Chamber to the extreme limit of constitutional authority, exhaust it, and let the courts take the responsibility in this matter of grave concern to every quarter of our land of declaring that we have transcended our limit of legislative power.

A majority of the aliens in all the large centers of population as a rule, even the unnaturalized ones, have been loyal and law-abiding. An inconsiderable minority belonging to many nationalities, some from southern Europe, some from the Balkan Provinces, some unhappily from the newly created State of Poland, some from Bohemia, and of names that indicate that they are the unhappy specimens of those nations, though not representative of them, are abusing the name of the country of their origin, and are abusing the courtesy which we have extended to them thus long in permitting them to abide within our borders. The time is at hand now for drastic remedies to be applied. When the truth is known it will be of the character referred to by the Senator from Utah; it will be found that it was an alien of that lawless character who carried the explosive to the dooryard of the Attorney General of the United States not long since, when in the northwest section of this city we had an explosion which shook window frames, as it did mine and the room where I was at work. I know what it means; and when such a violation of the right of sanctuary occurs, whether those who enjoy it are political refugees or merely aliens within our limits—when such violence occurs, when an officer of the United States, a Member of the Cabinet whose only offense, if any, to this brood is that he is prosecuting them under the laws of our country for gross crimes committed—when such lengths are reached in our country it is time that in this Chamber we go to the extreme limit of constitutional authority in order to rid our shores of their unwelcome presence.

I wish to preserve as zealously as any Senator in this Chamber the reserved rights of the States. I will go as far and have as many scruples as any upon that question, but when it comes to a question of ridding ourselves of these dangerous pests, murderous in character, destructive of our laws, and destructive of property, it is time, I think, that we exhaust every constitutional limit in our power.

Mr. President, explosives are the easiest thing to get in the world. A man can buy them easier than he can a revolver. It ought to be made, as provided in this proposed amendment to the bill, an offense to be dealt with by the strong hand of the Federal Government.

The offense is a mighty one. It strikes at the vitality of national authority. It is one that is spreading far and wide. Everybody knows—he does not have to be connected with the Secret Service of this country to know—that there is an organization that is as well established as the nihilists of old in Russia, succeeded by the Bolshevists of later days; that it is in our country; that it would be as dangerous to us as it is to any country in the world were it not for the stable American character, which is the only barrier that is built up against that force in our country. If we had the same conditions presented, if we had some forty nations and thirty-two languages, instead of being a homogeneous American people under one language, if we were as Russia is to-day, with no more general information and no more experience in the art of self-government, Bolshevism and this vile organization in this country would be as dangerous to us as they are to Russia. It is because of the character of the American people that we are safe, and not because of the strength of our laws.

I therefore think that we can go to the extreme limit in prohibiting the traffic, the carriage, and the use of explosives. We have all read the literature. My files are full of it. Unhappily, I have lived in close quarters with many men who have practiced just what the one who was taken to the coroner's office in a basket practiced a few weeks ago in the city of Washington. Every great center of population has the element against which the provisions of this bill are leveled. They are carrying dynamite with them constantly. No one knows, if he sends his family on a sleeping car radiating out of any of the large cities of this country, whether some suit case in the hands of some murderous ruffian, alien to our shores, may not blow the sleeping car into atoms and his family into eternity the same night after he parts from them.

There is no security in this country under present conditions. If there is any strength in the strong arm of the Federal Government, if there is any limit under the Constitution, let us reach that limit, and let us empower that authority. The emergency is here. It is a pressing danger. It is a great one, not only for those who are in active life in public place, but for everyone who travels or goes abroad. The time is here now for the Senate to exercise its authority. The danger is national. The power we oppose is far beyond the reach of the States, powerful as some of the States are. It is time that the strength of the National Government reached out, with every ounce of strength that it possesses and every ounce of energy that it has, in order that it may smite this evil with a power that is commensurate with the greatness of the evil itself.

Mr. President, if we do not prosecute under existing laws, it is not the fault of the Senate; it is not the fault of the House; it is the fault of the law-enforcing department of the Government, if there be any fault. If we do not legislate, however, to bring the regulations up to keeping pace with the development of this evil, then it is our fault. I think the time is now pressing for the enactment of such legislation, to the end that we may effectively meet the evil that is developed, and the organization that is in our country, and the use they are making of explosives, and their brazen proclamations that they propose to bolshevize and turn into a red wave of ruin our own country. It is time to meet it with the lawmaking power of the Government to the very fullest limit, so that those who are charged with the enforcement of the law will have no lack of statutory authority.

Then, I wish to see the Executive, when he returns to our shores, separate himself from just such men as were mentioned by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. There are too many men going to the Bolshevist government of Russia from this country who are not of the proper type to represent the Senators on the minority side of this Chamber or those upon the majority side. They do not represent the American people. Mr. Steffens does not represent the American people. Mr. Bullitt does not represent the American people. Mr. Howe does not represent the American people. All of them have a tender spot in their bosoms for Bolshevism itself. That is the trouble. The President hears too much about him of the sentiments of men who themselves are tender on Bolshevism.

You remember when one of the characters in Julius Cæsar said:

> Let me have men about me that are fat;
> Sleek-headed men and such as sleep o' nights.
> Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look;
> He thinks too much; such men are dangerous.

The associates that an Executive has about him, whose opinions and thoughts constantly percolate into his mind, whose busy and buzzing voices are continually explaining their peculiar economic ideas, going upon the notion that most of the unfortunates of the world, everybody that has not a fortune, is a victim of society, that society made him poor and wretched and miserable, and that he represents a debt which the social conditions owe; that it is the infamous laws of the country that made these miserable unfortunates—Bolshevism has preached that and is preaching it from the office in New York. It took a State investigation and State authorities, backed by the forceful will of the New York State authorities, to reach into the den of this infamous crowd of alien vermin, take their documents, and expose them for what they are and the danger they propose. If there had been as much vigor displayed by the Federal authorities in rounding up and deporting those alien pests from our own land as was displayed by the New York State authorities, there would have been a mighty cleansing of our population from these great perils. I am not confining myself to the amendment especially before the Senate in Committee of the Whole, but, in a larger sense, the amendment I am considering is before the Senate until the bill is voted on. No apologies are required, therefore, for enlarging my remarks.

Therefore I shall support this amendment, Mr. President, even though I might have some constitutional scruples, in the hope that the court, facing the great emergency, knowing that war

conditions in this particular still exist in our own country, will construe even constitutional limitations liberally to meet the great peril that confronts us, to the end that they will hold valid this amendment and give to the executive officers of the country, and especially the Department of Justice, power to meet the peril in a way that will provide an adequate remedy.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending amendment because I feel certain that it will materially help the enforcement of the law in regard to explosives; but I am constrained to occupy the time of the Senate for a moment to refer to a statement made by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] a moment ago.

I understood him to say that there are 500,000 people residing in the city of New York who are organized for the purpose of overthrowing this Government whenever the opportunity presents itself. New York City has a population of 6,000,000 people. Of that number, nearly 2,500,000 are of foreign birth. Unquestionably there exists in that city, as in every other great center of population where there is such a large proportion of people of foreign birth, an element of people who have yet to become familiar with and appreciate our splendid system of government. There are men there unquestionably who are banded together, scheming in every way they can to do something to destroy our Government; but that there are 500,000 of them I deny most emphatically. That there may be 25,000, or some such number, perhaps is so; but there could not be 500,000 under any circumstances without everyone in that great city knowing it.

We are having the investigation to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] refers conducted by a committee of the State senate, and they are bringing to the attention of the people of that State and of the Nation the conditions existing there. I can assure the Senate that that investigation will be pursued to the very end, with the result that the country will know all there is to be known regarding this subject.

I do hope, however, that before the consideration of this bill is concluded we will write into the law of the land legislation which will enable the Federal Government to lay its strong hand upon any man who will resort to any measures that may threaten the existence of this wonderful Nation of ours. I shall join with any Member of the Senate to bring about that result.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New York that the statement which I made I read in the newspapers a short time ago. I think it was reported by the Associated Press, and it purported to come from State Senator Lusk, of New York, who, it seems, is chairman of a committee of the New York Legislature which is investigating anarchy, sedition, and disloyalty in the State of New York. Personally, I know nothing about the matter. I simply stated it on the strength of a newspaper report that I had read, and I have never seen it contradicted.

Mr. CALDER. I can assure the Senator and the Senate that the statement that there are 500,000 people in our city who are disloyal is untrue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee beginning on line 10, page 106, and concluding on line 4, page 117.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was on page 117, line 5, after the word "Mines" to strike out "$1,141,897" and insert "$1,361,897," so as to make the clause read:

In all, Bureau of Mines, $1,361,897.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reclamation Service," on page 122, line 4, after the word "investigations," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

Secondary projects: For cooperative and other miscellaneous investigations, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 123, line 3, after the word "Service," to strike out "$7,275,000" and insert "$7,325,000," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for the Reclamation Service, $7,325,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee with reference to a number of these irrigation and reclamation projects. I see the names of a number of these projects which I understood had been completed some time ago. Are these appropriations for projects which are not completed?

Mr. WARREN. They are projects that the department has asked appropriations for on the ground that they are not completed, and I think it is correct. In fact, the department has asked, I think, for almost everyone considerably more than the House put in. The Senate has taken the figures of the House because, as I assume the Senator knows, under the law we can only distribute the funds that have been taken in for the public land—the proceeds of land sales.

Mr. KING. As I understand, then, this is merely the utilization of funds which have come to the Treasury?

Mr. WARREN. Under the law, they are distributed.

Mr. KING. Under the revolving fund?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. Under the law, the money has to go into the Treasury and be appropriated out.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, does not the Senator think we have done a pretty fair day's work, so far as hours are concerned?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that there are quite a number of small matters that I thought perhaps we might dispose of in 15 minutes or so, and then I will ask that we may go over until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Territory of Alaska," on page 124, line 2, after the word "expended," to strike out "$2,038,029" and insert "$12,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

Alaskan Engineering Commission: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 12, 1914, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," including expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations in Alaska, to continue available until expended $12,000,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator the reason for this great increase from $2,038,000 to $12,000,000 for the railroads in Alaska?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, we have heretofore enacted legislation providing for the building of this road. The men, animals, and materials are there, and if we wish to go on economically we have got to spend money enough to complete this road under the law. It is highly necessary for them to have enough money now, immediately, to enable them to go on and work to advantage the men that they have, and those that they can get, now that the war has closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was on page 125, line 11, after the word "heads" to strike out "$215,000" and insert "$250,000"; so as to read:

Education in Alaska: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, to provide for the education and support of the Eskimos, Aleuts, Indians, and other natives of Alaska; erection, repair, and rental of school buildings; textbooks and industrial apparatus; pay and necessary traveling expenses of superintendents, teachers, physicians, and other employees, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under the above special heads, $250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 13, to insert:

BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

Educational extension: For the investigation and development of methods of educational extension through cooperation with State departments of education, universities and colleges, and other public educational agencies in the States; the preparation and circulation of materials for class instruction, correspondence instruction, and visual instruction; the promotion of community organization and public discussion; and for cooperation otherwise in the development of educational extension, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, printing and binding, stationery, office equipment and supplies, purchase and distribution of documents, telegraphing, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith, $75,000.

Mr. KING. I ask that that item go over. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator means the item about the Bureau of Education?

Mr. KING. The item on page 127.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the item will be passed over.

Mr. KIRBY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. WARREN. Do I understand the Senator to move——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has moved that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator if he will not withdraw that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KIRBY. I will yield, but it seems to me that we have been here long enough this evening. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. Before the Senator makes any further observation, the Senator understood that I reserved the point of order?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly. If the Senator and others are tired, I do not wish to keep the Senate longer. Senators have attended very generously, and I am obliged to them, especially those upon the other side, a large number of whom have been present. I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. GERRY. Will the Senator withhold the motion that I may make an announcement?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday, immediately after the close of morning business, or as soon thereafter as I can obtain the floor, I desire to make a few observations on the league of nations.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock p. m. Friday, June 27, 1919) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, June 28, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *June 27, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee our Father in heaven for the hopes and promises which have come down to us out of the past and which are confirmed by the hopes and promises ever welling up in our own hearts; that the fruitions of a well-ordered life in consonance with the laws Thou has ordained are fulfilled; that not a sparrow falls to the ground without Thy notice; and whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward. So may we live, so may we pass to the larger life. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

POINT OF NO QUORUM.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is no quorum present——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Emerson	Larsen	Randall, Wis.
Andrews, Md.	Fairfield	Lever	Reber
Bacharach	Focht	Linthicum	Rowan, N. Y.
Baer	Fordney	Longworth	Rucker
Barkley	Freeman	Lufkin	Sabath
Benson	Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Sanders, N. Y.
Blackmon	Gallagher	McGlennon	Sanford
Bowers	Gallivan	McKinley, Ill.	Scully
Browne	Garland	McPherson	Sherwood
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	MacCrate	Siegel
Burke	Goldfogle	Maher	Sinclair
Burroughs	Goodall	Major	Smith, N. Y.
Caldwell	Goodykoontz	Mann	Steele
Carss	Graham, Pa.	Mansfield	Stephens, Miss.
Casey	Hamill	Mead	Sullivan
Copley	Haskell	Merritt	Tilson
Cullen	Haugen	Moores, Ind.	Tinkham
Curry, Calif.	Heflin	Morin	Treadway
Dallinger	Hernandez	Mudd	Vaile
Davis, Tenn.	Hutchinson	Murphy	Voigt
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Neely	Ward
Dooling	Kelly, Pa.	Paige	Watson, Pa.
Dunn	Kiess	Pell	Wise
Dupré	King	Phelan	Woodyard
Eagan	Kleczka	Porter	
Eagle	Knutson	Purnell	
Ellsworth	Kreider	Ragsdale	

The SPEAKER. The roll call discloses 335 Members present, a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1213. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918; and

S. 409. An act to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments and had appointed Mr. PAGE, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. HALE, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of one secretary and one clerk whose names shall be placed on the rolls and paid in monthly installments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to amend public resolution 33 approved June 20, 1918, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara Falls.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 13 to the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 2954. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BUTLER. To ask unanimous consent of the House for the privilege of taking off the Speaker's desk the naval appropriation bill with Senate amendments thereto, to disagree to all Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the naval appropriation bill, to disagree to all Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve the right to object for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I desire to ask the gentleman if the Senate has placed any riders on the bill in the way of legislation changing the law?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has put upon the bill about 95 amendments. There is some legislation, and I presume some of it changes existing law. The gentleman from Illinois will understand the opportunity to look through those amendments has not been very extensive. The bill passed the Senate yesterday afternoon, and I have no doubt some of those Senate amendments change existing law. I think that is the purpose of them.

Mr. DENISON. Well, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will be kind enough to direct my attention to any one, I might be able to answer.

Mr. DENISON. I have not had an opportunity to look over that, Mr. Speaker, but if there is any amendment made by the Senate that changes existing law and is not germane to any change of law included in the House bill, unless the chairman of the committee will state to the House that he will refuse to accept such amendments, I am going to object to the unanimous consent.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I can not do that; that would be impossible. I can not make that promise, Mr. Speaker, because the Senate has amended the bill. We who expect to

be conferees have met and we have considered the amendments, and I ask the House to have faith in us. We will do the best we can. There is no doubt some of these amendments do change existing law. There is no doubt some of these amendments put on this bill by the Senate do not relate to legislation that we put on the bill which the House passed two weeks ago.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania and those who will be his colleagues on the part of the House in the conference on this bill understand fully the attitude of the House with regard to this bill. I think they fully, clearly, and definitely understand that the House will insist upon the naval bill in approximately the form and in the sums provided by the House, and in view of that fact and in view of the fact of our belief that they will carry out the will of the House and report to the House if the Senate declines to accept a fair agreement on these matters, I think no gentleman should object to the bill going to conference. I have confidence that the House conferees will insist upon the position of the House in regard to these matters of appropriation and legislation, and I am sure that the House conferees will give the House an opportunity to express its will if there is not an early agreement approximately on the lines of the House bill. I do not think we ought to bind our conferees. We have confidence enough in them that they ought to go into conference free in order that they may get the best agreement possible.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, still further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman if he agrees with the sentiments expressed by the leader [Mr. MONDELL]?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I will say to the gentleman from Illinois there is a good deal in this bill I have my own views on, but I am only one Member of this House, and I am going to retain that view as long as I know how to do it.

Mr. DENISON. I desire to state this, still further reserving the right to object, that I have as much confidence in the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other conferees as any Member of the House. It seems to me the House must stop some time these legislative riders tacked on appropriation bills at the other end of the Capitol. I am not going to object at this time, but I am going to object hereafter to any legislative rider placed on an appropriation bill at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is right, and I hope he will stand by it.

Mr. DENISON. I am going to stand by it.

Mr. BUTLER. And hereafter the naval appropration bill will come here without legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if there is any increase in the amount appropriated over and above what is appropriated by the House; and, if so, how much?

Mr. BUTLER. About $44,000,000.

Mr. ALMON. Is that all?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BROWNING, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, Mr. PADGETT, and Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

CONFERENCE REPORT—MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina was given permission to address the House at this time, but I would ask the gentleman whether he will kindly refrain for about 5 or 10 minutes until I can bring the Army appropriation bill before the House?

Mr. KITCHIN. If it will not take over five minutes, and I do not think it should.

Mr. KAHN. It may take us as much as 10.

Mr. GARNER. If you ever get started, you are gone.

Mr. KAHN. It is very essential that we shall go into conference as soon as possible.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will not take over five minutes, go ahead, because either the regular order will be demanded at the end of that time or——

Mr. KAHN. I will try to get through in five minutes if I possibly can.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized.

Mr. KAHN. I desire to call up the conference report on the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. What is the request?

Mr. KAHN. To consider the disagreement on the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, of course everybody recognizes the importance of these conference reports, but this is twice that a fixed time has been set for Mr. KITCHIN to make his speech. Now, you know, and the gentleman from California knows, and I know, that if we start in on one of these conference reports it is liable to run all day.

Mr. KAHN. I do not think the House will take all day on this report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you simply want to get it to conference, go on.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees and the Senate conferees could not agree. Much depends upon the size of the Army agreed upon. The Senate is willing to come down to a figure of 350,000 men. An average Army of 350,000 men for the fiscal year would give us 1,039,000 men on the 1st of July, 748,288 men on the 31st of July, 472,288 men on August 31, 258,940 men on September 30, and that number of men for the entire balance of the fiscal year. The House conferees feel that an average Army of 225,000 men for the nine months after September would be an ample force for this country under existing conditions for the next fiscal year, and 312,000 men will give us such a force. I would like the instruction of the House to this effect: That it is the sense of the House that an average Army of 312,000 men for the next fiscal year be agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is only an informal instruction of the House?

Mr. KAHN. That is all.

Mr. WALSH. It is not a binding instruction?

Mr. KAHN. No; an informal expression of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to lay before the House the Army appropriation bill and further insist on the House disagreement to the same and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. KEARNS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. You say that the proposition is to have an average Army of——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman does not have to have unanimous consent to lay the conference report before the House, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] can not reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman does have to obtain unanimous consent from the House. It is a conference report of disagreement. What the gentleman now wants to bring up is the Army bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Unanimous consent to consider the conference report has already been given.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The gentleman from North Carolina has said he would not object if it was finished within five minutes, but the Chair does not interpret that as consenting to it. The question before the House is for unanimous consent to take up the Army appropriation bill and disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a further conference. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I further insist on the disagreement of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair put that in the motion. Will the gentleman from California send up the names of the conferees?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from California made a motion that the House further insist on its disagreement.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair put before the House.

Mr. MONDELL. On that motion I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already put it, and it was passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman made a motion——

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I did ask for an informal expression of opinion on the part of the House as to the size of the Army.

Mr. MONDELL. And then he made a motion to further insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear such a motion; but if the gentleman asks it, the Chair will put it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. That unless the conference report is called up and laid before the House, it is not proper to make a motion to further insist on anything. The conference report has been printed in the RECORD, reporting a disagreement. Now, if the conference report is laid before the House, then the motion for the House to insist on its disagreement and for other conferees to be appointed is in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is mistaken. The conference report is simply a disagreement. The House does not act on that. No action is necessary in the House. The gentleman calls up the bill again and proposes to start again with a new conference.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Do I understand that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] insists on a vote on the motion in regard to the attitude of this House toward the disputed size of the Army?

Mr. MONDELL. To further insist on the disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand that; but the only disagreement involved in the statement of the gentleman from California is on the average size of the Army during the year.

Mr. MONDELL. And there are many other disputed points.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. He says he wants an informal expression. How can you get an informal expression on a motion when the House has expressed itself by formal vote?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to further insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment. Those in favor of the motion will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty gentlemen have risen in the affirmative. Those opposed will stand until they are counted. On this vote the "ayes" are 220 and the "noes" are none. The Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. KAHN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DENT. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I trust I may be able to proceed without interruption until I make my full statement, because it will take the 30 minutes allotted to me to correct the misinformation and false impressions which have been propagandaed to the country by the speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, and by the statement issued on Saturday through the press to the people by the distinguished Republican leader of the House, Mr. MONDELL. If I shall not have consumed my 30 minutes I shall be glad, after I have finished my statement, to answer any questions and permit interruptions. And after I have consumed 30 minutes if gentlemen on the left will extend my time, I will be glad to permit any interruptions and answer any questions.

I hold in my hand a copy of the statement recently issued to the press and the people by the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MONDELL, of Wyoming. In it he attempts to show, and in substance asserts, that the Republicans within the first 30 days of this session were able to pass six general supply bills, the deficiency bills, and the railroad deficiency bill, which the Democrats at the last session of Congress, after three months' effort, failed to pass. In other words, that the Republicans in this House in 30 days have accomplished what the Democrats in the last session, after three months' effort, failed to accomplish.

He states, and attempts to show, that the Republicans of the House by their economy and retrenchment program in the passage of these appropriation bills had saved to the people of the United States approximately a total of $1,500,000,000; that is, they saved, he claims, to the Government and the people in the Army bill at this session $400,000,000, in the naval bill $225,000,000, in the sundry civil appropriation bill $385,000,000, and in the railroad deficiency bill $450,000,000, totaling, in round numbers, $1,500,000,000.

His statement had its intended effect. The press of the country, especially the Republican press, teemed with such headlines as "'The Republicans of the House save the Nation $1,500,000,000,' says Mr. MONDELL, Republican leader," "The Republicans in the House in 30 days have lopped off $1,500,000,000 of Democratic extravagance," and so forth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I take it from that applause that all the Republicans on that side approve and verify this statement of their House leader. I am going to show that there is not a word of truth in it from beginning to end. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say here that for the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the majority leader, as he knows and as my colleagues know, I entertain and for years have entertained the highest opinion. In the possession of the virtues of courtesy, candor, integrity, and truth, I have served with no man in this House his superior. If Mr. MONDELL were to state to me, man to man, a thing as a fact, I would have no doubt; I would know it was true. If Mr. MONDELL were to make me a promise, I would no longer bother; I would know that it would be performed, in the spirit and to the letter. Entertaining for him the highest opinion, which I have expressed, I must believe that he was imposed upon, or that in the rush of his manifold and important duties as majority leader, looking at the figures alone, without analyzing these appropriation bills, he was misled into making this remarkable political statement—a statement which for false impressions, for wrong inferences, for gross misinformation, has never had its equal from a public man since I have been a Member of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Intentional or unintentional, it is a barefaced fraud upon public information. Intentional or unintentional, in all of its inferences and impressions it is a masterpiece of deception.

Let us analyze this remarkable statement. He says within 30 days the Republicans in this House have accomplished more in passing these supply bills for the Government than the Democrats did in the whole three months of last session; that they accomplished in 30 days what the Democrats failed to accomplish during the three months of last session. Was there ever a more unfair and more unjust inference than that? Why did he not go further, unless he was imposed upon, as I said, and tell the whole truth by informing the public that the Democratic House in the last session passed every single one of these appropriation bills, and that the Democratic majority in the Senate was ready and anxious and willing to put upon the statute books every single one of these supply bills, but was prevented from doing so by a plotted and deliberate filibuster of a few Republicans in the Senate in the last few days of the session. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No man knows that better than Mr. MONDELL. No man knows that better than Dr. FESS, the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, who made substantially a similar statement in a speech on the floor on June 14. Every intelligent man in this House—and that includes some Republicans [laughter]—knows absolutely that every one of these bills would have been written into the statute had it not been for the indecent and unwarranted Republican filibuster in the last days of the last Congress. [Applause.]

The papers all over this country, including many Republican papers, condemned that filibuster and condemned the Republicans in the Senate for defeating the supply bills.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] says that within 30 days the Republicans in this House passed these supply bills. If the Democrats in this House at this session had resorted to the indecent tactics of the filibuster that the Republicans in the Senate did in the last session, you could not have passed them in three or six months; but the Democrats did the patriotic thing. They cooperated to a man with you Republicans in the quick passage within 30 days of these bills. [Applause.] Let me remind the House that the hearings and hard work and framing of these supply bills and railroad deficiency bill were done by the committees at the last session, and many of them were introduced and reported this session just as they were framed and reported or passed at the last session. This was a most invaluable aid in the quick introduction, reporting, and passage of them at this session.

The gentleman from Wyoming further says:

> The House has effected a saving of approximately a billion dollars in the amounts carried in the same bills which failed in the session that expired March 4 last. These savings were in the main on three bills, though there were some reductions on all, and on these three bills—the Army, Navy, and sundry civil—reductions in round figures were approximately as follows: Army, $400,000,000; naval, $225,000,000; sundry civil, $385,000,000.

Let us analyze these items, the first being the $400,000,000—the Army bill item. I state here and now that this did not effect the saving of a single penny to the people of the United States. Why not state the facts? Mr. KAHN, the distinguished, skillful, and able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee knows, and every Republican member of the Military Affairs Committee knows, yes, absolutely knows, that the reduction in the appropriation bill of this session of $400,000,000 does not save to the Treasury and to the Government or the people one single penny.

What are the facts? When the Democratic committee of the last House framed and the Democratic House passed the Army appropriation bill, to which he refers, the committee, Repub-

licans and Democrats, every one of them, and the War Department estimated that, with the big Army then in France and here, amounting to about a million and a half men in France and half a million or more men here, before they could possibly be returned to this country, before they could possibly be demobilized, the average Army for the next fiscal year would amount to 500,000 men. They did not authorize 500,000 men. They did not authorize 200,000 or 300,000 men. They—that is, the bill the committee reported and the House passed—authorized no number, but there was an Army of over 2,000,000 men that had to be reduced by demobilizing. A million and a half had to be brought from France. Now, the proposition before the committee and the House and the War Department was this: We have this immense Army. How long will it take us to demobilize them, and how much will that make this big Army we started with average for the fiscal year for which we were bound to appropriate? All concluded that by as rapid a demobilization as then seemed possible the Army would average during the year 500,000 men. Every Republican on the committee and in the House voted for that. So did every Democrat. But four months have elapsed since the adjournment of Congress.

The committee at this session found that, owing to the wise, diligent, and efficient administration by the War Department and the Navy Department in bringing back the boys from Europe and demobilizing the Army so much more rapidly than was anticipated at the last session, the average Army, instead of being 500,000 for the next fiscal year, would be only 400,000, and the House believed that it would be only 300,000, and so they reduced the amount of the appropriation to provide for these three or four hundred thousand men instead of the 500,000 men, as in the last session it appeared to the committee and House was necessary. That made the difference in the appropriation figures. Not a cent would have been saved, not a cent was saved, by that difference. Suppose the bill of the last session had been written into the law, the appropriation to provide for the average Army of 500,000, and the administration had brought them back from France and demobilized them as rapidly as it has for the last four months, and this would continue. Why, we would not have had the average of 500,000 men, but an average of 400,000 or 300,000, and the $400,000,000 difference would not have been expended but turned back into the Treasury as an unexpended balance. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], the able and distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, in his speech on this floor and in his report clearly substantiates this. Let us see what Mr. KAHN says in his report:

> The work of demobilization is progressing somewhat faster than was anticipated by the War Department at that time—

The time we framed and passed the bill at the last session, with Mr. KAHN's vote and that of every other Republican in the House—

> The committee therefore felt warranted in appropriating for an army of an average strength of 400,000 enlisted men and 22,149 officers for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

So states his report. He shows that that is the reason that they could and did reduce the appropriation.

But as stated before, the bill of last session was for an army of an average strength for the next fiscal year of 509,909 enlisted men and 28,579 officers, as then estimated, whereas the bill of the committee this session provides for an average of 400,000 men. Why? Because the Democratic administration was bringing the boys back home and demobilizing the Army so much faster than the committee or anybody in the House at the last session anticipated could possibly be done. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], a very skillful, shrewd, partisan Republican, during the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] tried to get him to state or intimate that this was an economy reduction and that the more rapid return of the boys from France and demobilizing of the Army was not really the cause. Let us see. Mr. MOORE asked Mr. KAHN:

> The Secretary of War asked for an army of 500,000 men in the last session, did he not?
>
> Mr. KAHN. Five hundred and nine thousand.
>
> Mr. MOORE. And provision was made in the passage of the bill, if I remember, for that number?
>
> Mr. KAHN. Yes. The committee—

Remember, the Democratic committee, the Democratic House, with all the Republicans joining in—

> Mr. KAHN. The committee was justified at that time in appropriating for that number, because it seemed to the committee that it would not be possible to demobilize our forces as rapidly as they have been demobilized.
>
> [Applause.]

So let me repeat again: If that bill had become a law and they were demobilizing as they have been doing and as they are going to do, we would have had that $400,000,000 difference between that bill and the present bill as it passed the House, unexpended by the War Department, to turn right over to the Treasury Department; so that in that reduction referred to in Mr. MONDELL's statement the country, the Government, the people, the taxpayers, pay not a cent less and there is not a cent saved.

Mr. KAHN knows it. Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. MCKENZIE, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. MORIN, Mr. HULL, Mr. CRAGO, Mr. SANFORD, of the Military Committee of the last and this session, know it, and every man on that committee knows it. Justified at the last session in providing for an estimated average Army of 500,000 men? Certainly they were. Every Republican on the Military Affairs Committee and every Republican in this House in the last Congress voted for that appropriation—for that average Army—every one. [Applause.] In the interest of truth and accurate public information, would it not have been fairer in this statement and in the statement that Dr. FESS, the chairman of the Republican national congressional committee, made on this floor to have stated those facts? I have often heard that when one withholds a part of the truth it is worse than stating a falsehood. Ah, gentlemen, the truth is—the plain, uncontestable fact is, and every honest Republican must admit it—if in this reduction of figures in the Army bill there be a saving to the American people, if there be an economy, it is not Republican economy but the Democratic administration's efficiency that enabled the House to effect it. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. KITCHIN. I wish the gentleman would wait until I get through, and then I will be glad to. The next item of the so-called savings in the political statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is $225,000,000 in the naval bill. This is absolutely untrue, and there is not a Republican on the Naval Affairs Committee that will approve that statement, because every single, solitary one of them knows that it is not true.

The gentleman from Wyoming has been imposed upon. There is no doubt about it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], the able and distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, I have known well since I have been in Congress. There is not a man of higher character or sense of truth and candor in this House or ever sat in this House than Mr. BUTLER. [Applause.] Mr. BUTLER makes no such claim. Let me show you how inaccurate these figures of the majority leader are. Mr. MONDELL says that "the saving" was $225,000,000. Mr. BUTLER's report shows that there was only a reduction in the amount of appropriation of $119,000,000—not $225,000,000. But what matters a little difference of $106,000,000 when political advantage is sought to be reaped? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. BUTLER does not attribute that reduction to Republican economy in this House. I will tell you what Mr. BUTLER in his honest and candid report shows. He shows that these reductions were caused by "conditions, plans, or events occurring subsequent to the adjournment of Congress." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What is the change in the events and conditions, mentioned by Mr. BUTLER in his report, since the passage at the last session of the naval bill, for which every Republican on the committee voted and for which every Republican, including the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr FESS], chairman of the Republican congressional committee, voted last session? It was estimated last session by the committee and the House that the average of the enlisted men in the Navy for the year would be 225,000, and an appropriation to take care of them was made, but on account of the changed conditions, the Democratic administration's efficiency in bringing the men in the Army back from France and demobilizing them faster than was anticipated, so that a larger number of the Navy personnel could be dispensed with, at this session they were enabled to reasonably estimate an average naval personnel of 193,000 men and to provide for that number instead of the 225,000 men estimated at the last session. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If Mr. MONDELL had not been imposed upon by some one, a man with his love of the truth and fair dealing would never have issued that statement to the American people. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

That reduction was only $119,000,000, and not $225,000,000, as Mr. MONDELL states. Mr. BUTLER, chairman of the Naval Committee, will verify this; he does so in his report. This reduction in personnel of the Navy to which I referred will reduce the expenditures fifty or sixty millions. Another reduction in the appropriations for the Navy was about $25,000,000 in the appropriation for construction and machinery, in the shape of deferred payments, and also about $21,000,000 for arms and armament, all liabilities of the Government, and must be paid

by a future appropriation. It was considered by the department and the committee that these might be deferred to another appropriation bill. And yet, with the facts of the record, the gentleman from Wyoming issues this propaganda throughout the length and breadth of the country that the Republican House saves $225,000,000! His own committee will not sustain such a statement.

Mr. BUTLER never claimed anything for political advantage. Mr. BUTLER was not chairman of the Republican congressional committee, like Dr. FESS is. He was not speaking for the Republican Party as its leader, like my friend from Wyoming was. He was for telling the House and the country the facts and the truth. His report on the naval bill repudiates the misleading and untrue statement of the gentleman from Wyoming, the Republican leader of this House.

He says, further, that the Republicans of the House have saved $450,000,000 to the people in the railroad deficiency bill, and Dr. FESS, chairman of the Republican congressional committee made that identical statement on June 14 of this year in a speech on this floor. Mr. MONDELL's statement was made after that, and Mr. MONDELL in the rush of important duties was imposed upon by some one. Dr. FESS, on the floor on June 14, declared that the Republicans had cut down the railroad deficiency bill from the bill of the Democrats, which passed the House last session and failed to pass in the Senate, $450,000,000, and thereby saved to the people that amount. Mr. MONDELL, as I said, in his statement declares the same thing. Ah, gentlemen, partisan though I am—and I am as partisan as anybody—partisan politics, partisan feeling, even the mad desire to take political advantage, ought never to prompt us to state in the RECORD or on this floor that which is impossible to be the fact. There was no such reduction in the railroad deficiency bill; there was no reduction, absolutely none.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. For just a question; my time is short.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman wants to quote me accurately, and in the main he has, but he did not quote me accurately a moment ago. I called attention to the fact that the reduction in the Railroad Administration item was a reduction below the estimate.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is a fact, and if the gentleman had let it stay that way in his statement, it would have been all right. Here is where the gentleman from Wyoming misled the public:

These savings—

And the total mentioned includes the $450,000,000 so-called railroad deficiency savings—

These savings taken all together total nearly one billion and a half dollars as the approximate net reduction on appropriations by this first session of the Republican Congress below the proposed appropriations of the closing session of the Democratic Congress.

That part of the gentleman's statement compares the appropriation bills of last session which passed the House and failed in the Senate, and it includes the railroad deficiency bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman kindly quote the three words he left out?

Mr. KITCHIN. I left out no three words. I read the gentleman's whole sentence without omitting a word. That is a clear impression; that is a clear statement that the Republicans of this House saved $450,000,000 in the railroad deficiency bill from the appropriation bills which the Democratic House passed at the last session and were defeated by the filibuster in the Senate. If the gentleman will give me time, I will read the whole statement and make the gentleman admit that it is wrong from beginning to end. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

What a bald inaccuracy and misrepresentation my distinguished friend was led into in making that statement. But Dr. FESS, of Ohio, the chairman of the Republican national congressional committee, had no equivocation about it. In his speech of June 14, at page 1120 of the RECORD, he states that the Republicans of this House saved the $450,000,000 in their bill from the bill which the Democrats passed at the last session. I do not attribute this thing to my distinguished friend, Mr. MONDELL, but somebody imposed on Dr. FESS and Dr. FESS then imposed on Mr. MONDELL. [Laughter.] However, notwithstanding this imposition of one upon the other, the point I make is that the public was absolutely deceived. They saved $450,000,000 in their railroad deficiency bill over our bill, they declare. I have here in one hand the Democratic bill as it passed the House last session and failed in the Senate, and in the other I have the Republican bill as it passed the House. With the exception of the change in the number of the Congress and the name of the introducer of the bill and the number of the bill, if these two bills are not exactly alike in every word, in every letter, in every sentence, and in every figure, dollar for dollar, I will resign as a Member of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, Mr. Speaker, will not gentlemen on the Republican side be generous enough, out of their love for the truth, to give me 20 minutes more?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. The same bill, the same words, the same amount, the same figures. Everything in this world that the Republican committee did in introducing the bill this session was to go and get the old Democratic bill, have it printed again, changing the number of the bill and the session of the Congress, put Mr. GOOD's name as the introducer instead of Mr. SHERLEY, as in the last session—and there you have it. And it passed this session in exact form with the exact amount of appropriation, with the exact words and figures, as it passed in the Democratic House at the last session.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania arose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, let me get through——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Before the gentleman concludes with the railroad bill——

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, I am going to get through in a moment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for this point?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield when I get through with this statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has plenty of time now, and he could yield at this point.

Mr. KITCHIN. As I said, the bill passed this session is identical, word for word, with the Democratic bill passed by the House last session. The amount of appropriations, every figure in it, is exactly alike, but the gentleman from Ohio [Dr. FESS], the chairman of the Republican national congressional committee, takes the floor and deliberately puts into the RECORD the statement that they, the Republicans of the House, have in this session saved the people $450,000,000 in their bill over the bill passed in the last session by the Democratic House, and this deception goes out as a political campaign document.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Just for a moment, quick—I have only about 10 minutes left.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Under Democratic efficiency and economy, had not the Railroad Administration proceeded so far that in order for them to perfect their economic management they had to ask for $450,000,000 more than they asked for when the Democrats were in power, and did not the Republican bill cut that out?

Mr. KITCHIN. It was never in a Democratic bill. The Railroad Administration is controlled by Republicans. More than three out of every four connected with the Railroad Administration are Republicans, and if there has been any mismanagement or any waste it has been by Republican officials. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was a saving of $450,000,000 over Democratic economy and efficiency.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; not a word of it is true. But if everything the gentleman said were true, it would not affect the truth of my statement about this deception in the statements of Dr. FESS, the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, and Mr. MONDELL, the majority leader.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But we saved the $450,000,000 just the same.

Mr. KITCHIN. You did not; that was never in a Democratic bill. A billion and a half they say has been saved! Of course, this little mistake of $450,000,000 in this one item is of small consequence, in the statements of the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. FESS, the Republican national congressional chairman, and Mr. MONDELL, the Republican leader; but what in the thunder did they care about a little difference of $450,000,000 in one item when they wanted to elect Republicans to office on it? What did they care about a $450,000,000 misstatement and deception if it will help the Republican Party in which Dr. FESS, the original author of the statement, is the chairman of the national congressional committee?

The gentleman from Wyoming, the majority leader, further says in this wonderful statement that in the sundry civil bill they saved $385,000,000. Really, when we compare only the figures apparent, without analyzing the bill, there is a difference of only $367,257,000. This is according to the report of the

distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. GOOD. But a little matter of $17,500,000 is of small consequence to the distinguished majority leader. And how did they save this amount? They saved it, according to the report of Mr. GOOD, in cutting down the appropriation from the Treasury for the Shipping Board or Fleet Corporation by $384,903,000.

Mr. MONDELL further states that in addition to these items to which I have referred they made further saving in the several other appropriation bills they have passed, but he did not specify. Let me put this to Mr. MONDELL and to Dr. FESS. With the exception of this Shipping Board item, which I shall later satisfy you about, there is an actual increase in the sundry civil appropriation bill over the bill that we passed at the last session of over seventeen million, and in the other bills passed, exclusive of the four items I have discussed and which Mr. MONDELL mentioned in his statement, there is an increase of more than $30,000,000 over the appropriation in the Democratic bills passed last session and failed in the Senate.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, wait until I get through.

Mr. GOOD. I know the gentleman does not want to make a misstatement.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no; and I am not going to, because I have the gentleman's report here, and I am reading from it.

Mr. GOOD. But the gentleman has already made a misstatement.

Mr. KITCHIN. I said that the gentleman said in his report that there was a reduction of $367,257,000, and the figures given in the report show $367,257,000 of difference. I have the gentleman's report now before me.

Mr. GOOD. But the gentleman said that the way we arrived at the reduction in the Shipping Board was by a reduction of estimates.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I have not come to that yet, but I am going to show you how you did it. In the sundry civil bill they did reduce the amount of appropriations from the Treasury from the amount carried in the bill of last session, which Mr. GOOD voted for, which Mr. MONDELL voted for, and which Dr. FESS voted for at the last session, which every Republican in the House then voted for, to the amount of $367,257,000. How did that come about? Because they made a large part of the appropriation available out of the Shipping Board or Fleet Corporation funds and by reappropriating the unexpended balances in the hands of the board or corporation, and not out of the Treasury, as we did. They, in the bill passed at this session, provide for a construction program of $704,000,000. We, in last session's bill, provided for a construction program of only $649,000,000.

Now, let us get at the real truth about these things. It does not make any difference in actual savings to the Government whether you appropriate or take from a Government fund which is in the Shipping Board's or Fleet Corporation's hands or from a Government fund in the Treasury. Both funds belong to the United States Government and to the people—the taxpayers. Every dollar, every cent, the Shipping Board and Fleet Corporation have, whatever they have now, whatever they will have in the future from the sale of ships or otherwise, belongs to the United States Government. And when the Republican committee and House provided for a $704,000,000 program, and Mr. GOOD said in his speech here that Mr. Hurley can get from the sources he indicated that amount for such a program, they provided for a program of $55,000,000 more than we did. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They have taken it out of one fund of the Government; we took it out of another—out of the Treasury fund.

They need not complain about this. These appropriations were made in the shape they were made, I would guess, with the idea of enabling the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to make their political statements. The Shipping Board or Fleet Corporation declare they needed $215,000,000 more from the Treasury than the amount allowed by this session's bill. Well, if the committee had put in that $215,000,000 which they do need to carry out the $704,000,000 program, why these political gentlemen could not have made these political statements. Oh, these gentlemen knew about what would happen. When the sundry civil bill got to the Senate the Senate committee put in the needed $215,000,000 appropriation from the Treasury, the exact number of dollars and cents the Shipping Board told Mr. GOOD it needed.

Mr. ALMON. A Republican Senate.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; a Republican Senate. Now, is there any saving, any reduction? Not a bit. There is an expenditure provided from another fund of the Government of $55,000,000 more than we appropriated from the Treasury if Mr. GOOD's statement in his speech is correct. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Is not that so?

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not so; it is absolutely false. The gentleman does not mean to make a false statement, but the statement the gentleman has made is not borne out by the facts at all, because the bill we reported only permitted them to take $80,000,000 from the sale of ships, and we found that board had $118,000,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. But when our bill was reported, for which the gentleman voted, and his committee, the ships had not been sold and no ships were contemplated being sold.

Mr. GOOD. But this fund was already appropriated——

Mr. KITCHIN. I decline to yield further.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not want the facts.

Mr. KITCHIN. I wish I had the time to yield. I stated what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] said on this floor. They provided for a building program of $704,000,000. This bill of last session provided a building program of only $649,000,000. The total of the appropriation for the Shipping Board was only $660,000,000; $11,000,000 was for purposes other than construction. Let me read from the speech of Mr. GOOD on June 19, page 1400 of the RECORD, and see if I misquoted or misconstrued him:

> The estimate of the Shipping Board is that they can expend under no circumstances more than $704,000,000 this year. The authorization has nothing to do with the amount carried in this bill, except they do not exceed the authorization, and there will then have to be additional appropriations during the next year, but to what extent we are not able to ascertain at this time.

The gentleman knows there is to be an additional appropriation and his bill was not enough. I will read further——

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield a minute out of the 20 minutes which we gave him, 1 minute out of the 20, for a little information?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not now; wait until I get through with this.

Mr. LITTLE. If I had known the gentleman would not yield I would not have given unanimous consent for the 20 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman does not want real information——

Mr. LITTLE. Why, I was one of the men "hollering" for an extension of the gentleman's time.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not think the gentleman wants information. If so, let him wait until I get through with the point I am trying to make.

Mr. LITTLE. I want a little information right now.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is an important thing that Mr. GOOD says that bears me out exactly, that they were providing from other sources—but remember such sources belong to the Government—instead of taking it from the Treasury, $704,000,000 for a building program, whereas we provided for $649,000,000. Now, listen further to Mr. GOOD's speech:

> Mr. Hurley will get $704,000,000 from the sources I have stated, unless he falls down on the sale of ships or on his operating income.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

All of those sources belong to the Government, just like the sources from which we were going to appropriate, with Mr. GOOD's, Dr. FESS's, and Mr. MONDELL's votes, $649,000,000.

I am surprised at the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in attempting to impeach Democratic extravagance with respect to the Shipping Board's appropriation by his statement. Gentlemen, I beg your attention, and especially the attention of Mr. MONDELL. He was a member of the Committee on Appropriations last session that reported out this Shipping Board appropriation. Not only that, but Mr. MONDELL, the Republican House leader, who issues this political document for political purposes, to reap political advantage, was on the subcommittee with Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina that prepared the items of appropriation for the Shipping Board in the bill passed at the last session. He had that bill before him, read all the hearings, investigated every item. They—Mr. BYRNES and Mr. MONDELL—marked up the bill together, and Mr. MONDELL marked up $649,000,000 for the construction program of the Shipping Board, the very program and the very amount of appropriation for such program that was put in the Democratic sundry civil appropriation bill of last session. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not only that, but Mr. MONDELL sanctioned and approved and voted for it in the subcommittee, in the full committee, marked it up, and voted for it on the floor, and when that item in the bill reached consideration here Mr. MONDELL got up on the floor of the House and said that the appropriation of $660,000,000—$649,000,000 of which was for the construction program—was right, and urged the House in the interest of

economy to pass that item of $660,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It was passed, just as the gentleman urged. And the gentleman from Wyoming can not and will not deny it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have only two or three minutes. Let me say to the Republicans——

Mr. LITTLE. Has the gentleman time to answer a question now?

Mr. KITCHIN. I would like to make this statement, and then I will answer your question.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Six minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Ask the question quick, now.

Mr. LITTLE. How much less would the appropriations have been at this session as compared with those of the last session on the very bills which did not go through the Senate, no matter how? How much were they less?

Mr. KITCHIN. How much were they less?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me see. On the face of the bills, $400,000,000 less in the Army, $119,000,000 less in the Navy, and the sundry civil $367,000,000. That is all. You can figure that yourself. They are not savings, however. The total is far from $1,500,000,000, as stated by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. LITTLE. And if they had passed the Senate every dollar would have been spent.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; it would not; it could not under the existing situation and conditions, as I have explained.

The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] know that it would not have been spent.

Mr. LITTLE. I know it would.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no. It could not be spent.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield to the famous chairman of the Republican congressional committee.

Mr. FESS. I understood the gentleman to say that the reduction in the Army of 300,000——

Mr. KITCHIN. I said 400,000.

Mr. FESS. Three hundred thousand men was due to the fact that the demobilization was more rapid than was expected.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is what the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs said in his report.

Mr. FESS. Wait until I ask the question.

Mr. KITCHIN. Ask it quick.

Mr. FESS. That the reduction of 300,000 was not due to the action of the Republican committee of the House but due to the fact that demobilization was more rapid than was expected.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is what the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] says, but it was due to the Democratic administration's efficiency in bringing back the boys from France and demobilizing the Army more rapidly than was anticipated at the last session.

Mr. FESS. Let me say——

Mr. KITCHIN. I must decline to yield further, as my time is so limited.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. Just a minute. I do not yield now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KITCHIN. If you give me the time I will answer your questions all day. We can afford to have the truth and declare the truth when we know it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LITTLE. Why do you not do it, then?

Mr. KITCHIN. Instead of impeaching the Democratic bills in the House last session under the then existing conditions and situation, every honest Republican ought to approve them. Why? Because for every one of these supply bills, the Army, Navy, sundry civil, railroad deficiency, and other deficiency bills, the Republicans—all of them—voted just like the Democrats did.

This is a fact. Under the then existing conditions if the Republicans had had control of the House, as they now have, these bills which they now criticize in their political statements, would have been reported and passed exactly like we Democrats passed them, because every single Republican on each one of the committees and every Republican in the House, including the distinguished chairman of the Republican congressional committee, Dr. FESS, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] voted for each and every one of them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FESS. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent——

Mr. FESS. Reserving the right to object, I would not object, but may I have five minutes at the close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FESS. I object.

Mr. KITCHIN. Gentlemen——

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will suspend until the unanimous consent request is put before the House. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that the gentleman's time may be extended 10 minutes? [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KITCHIN. I knew you did not want the truth.

Mr. CARTER. Who objected?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] wants five minutes.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois (continuing). And if the gentleman from Ohio does not get five minutes, I object.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] can have his five minutes any time he wants it. Before my time is out I wish to refer to one other so-called "savings."

In the speech he made on the floor and no doubt sent out as a campaign document he stated as a fact that the deficiency bill passed by the House this session saved the country $5,000,000 from the bill passed by the Democratic House last session but which failed in the Senate.

Instead of the deficiency bills which they passed this session being $5,000,000 less than the deficiency bill passed at the last session and failed in the Senate, they are $40,000,000 more than that deficiency bill of last session, to which he refers. He referred to and compared the Democratic deficiency bill of $26,000,000, for which he and all other Republicans in the House at that time voted, with the one deficiency bill of $21,000,000 which passed at this session; but he overlooked and failed to state in the RECORD that they passed another deficiency bill at this session of $45,000,000, the two deficiency bills at this session making $40,000,000 more of deficiencies than the deficiency bill of last session. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, may I have one minute more?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I object. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky will state his question of privilege.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wyoming rise?

Mr. MONDELL. I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky rises to a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Kentucky is entitled to the floor to present a question of personal privilege.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. For the present, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming to the fact that by unanimous consent 20 minutes have been set aside for me after the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will have his 20 minutes. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we may have order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we can not hear a thing over here.

The SPEAKER. There is so much confusion at the right of the Speaker that we can not hear. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is a good deal also over there on the left. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. And there is a good deal on the roof. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may have order. It is impossible to hear anything.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. Much of this disorder is on the roof, owing to the storm outside.

REVIEW OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the first 30 days of the session I made a statement, brief and concise, as to the activities of the House up to that time. I want to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]——

Mr. KITCHIN. You are very welcome——

Mr. MONDELL. For having so clearly shown how absolutely accurate that statement was. [Applause and laughter.] And in order that its accuracy may be fully appreciated by all, I desire to have a copy of the statement read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

"The special session of the Sixty-sixth Congress has been in session one month. During that time the House of Representatives has considered and passed the six general supply bills and the railroad deficiency and general deficiency bills which failed in the closing hours of the last Congress at the end of a three months' session.

"In the consideration and the passage of these bills the House has effected a saving of approximately a billion dollars in the amounts carried in the same bills which failed in the session that expired March 4 last.

"These savings were in the main on three bills, though there were some reductions on all, and on these three bills, the Army, Navy, and sundry civil, the reductions were in round figures approximately as follows:

"On the Army appropriation bill, $400,000,000.

"On the Navy appropriation bill, $225,000,000.

"On the sundry civil appropriation bill, $385,000,000.

"In addition to these reductions the bill to supply deficiencies in railway revenues, as it passed the House, carried $750,000,000 instead of $1,200,000,000, as estimated by the Railroad Administration—a reduction of $450,000,000. These savings, taken altogether, total nearly one and one-half billion dollars as the approximate net reduction on appropriations by this first session of the Republican Congress below the proposed appropriations of the closing session of the Democratic Congress and the estimates.

"Not only has the House made an unprecedented record during the 30 days of the session in disposing of appropriation bills, but the bills have received careful and businesslike consideration both in committee and on the floor. The reductions have not been made recklessly but after due consideration.

"Notwithstanding the very great savings that have been accomplished in the appropriations, it can be said without fear of successful contradiction that no legitimate, essential, or useful public service has been injuriously curtailed by the reductions that have been made. The Army and the Navy and the civil services of the Nation will all be adequately cared for and provided for under the appropriations that have been made by the House.

"At the beginning of the session the Republican majority of the House in conference promised speedy action on these appropriation bills and also prompt consideration of a program of legislation and investigation. There can be no question but what this pledge has been splendidly kept as far as appropriations are concerned, and in the matter of legislation the House has considered and passed the woman suffrage resolution, the daylight-saving repeal, and the bill returning the wires to their owners, and the various committees of the House are actively engaged in the consideration of other important legislation.

"A committee has been constituted to make an audit and study of the expenditures of the War Department during the period of the war, totaling $16,000,000,000. This committee has organized, subdivided into subcommittees, and is prepared for work.

"The temper and attendance of the House has been good and the membership is evidencing a disposition to earnestly and carefully consider problems before them.

"The record up to date is unsurpassed and the outlook for the future highly promising of results, useful and helpful in the public interest."

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have placed this statement in the RECORD in order that its absolute accuracy, as attested by my friend from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], may be evident to all who read the RECORD.

The gentleman from North Carolina has propounded the extraordinary proposition that it does not make a particle of difference how much we appropriate; that in any event only a certain sum will be expended. I have heard a good many criticisms of Congress at one time and another, but I never heard anything so severe as that from any quarter. If that be true, let us disband all of the appropriating committees and put on the statute books laws carrying all the estimates as presented by the administration. If we were to have done that, we would have added not $1,500,000,000 to the amount carried by the bills we have passed this session but over $2,000,000,000 more than they carried as they passed the House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from North Carolina has stated that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] said the reductions in the Army bill were made possible by the rapid demobilization of the troops. The gentleman from North Carolina did not accurately quote the gentleman from California. What he said in his report on the Army bill was that demobilization was progressing somewhat faster than the War Department anticipated when it made its estimates last January for an Army of 509,000 enlisted men and 28,000 officers. If it were true, as the gentleman from North Carolina contends, that the reduction in the Army bill, or any other reductions that we have made, were made possible by the action of the departments of administration, how does it happen that the administration agents at this very hour are knocking at the doors of the Senate, insisting that all these sums which have been lopped off the various bills shall be restored? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman knows that the Secretary of War is still demanding an average Army of 509,000 men [applause], and that he is asking for supplies for an Army of 509,000 men; and he knows that the House refused to give him more than 300,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Not only that, but the Shipping Board and the Navy and every department of the Government is at this hour haunting the corridors of the Senate with their agents, lobbying with Senators in an effort to get them to restore every dollar not only of the former appropriations but of the estimates, and in some cases even to increase the appropriations above the estimates presented to the House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If we had followed the recommendations and demands of the administration as presented in official estimates and urged before the committees, we would have carried in these bills more than two billions more than they carried when they passed the House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Ah, the gentleman from North Carolina, my good friend and good fellow, a trifle careless in his statements of fact sometimes, I am sure does not want to have the country understand that he believes it makes no difference how much we appropriate. We on this side feel our responsibility to the people, and we propose to cut these bills as low as is consistent with good public service. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS], by special order, is recognized for 20 minutes.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of privilege.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I desire to say to the Chair, in advance of stating the question of privilege and personal privilege, to both of which I rise, that after stating it I shall submit a parliamentary question to the Chair, upon which I desire him to rule—not now, but to take it under advisement, so that I may know in advance to what extent I may speak.

I shall now state the question of privilege and personal privilege to which I rise. Both are contained in Senate resolution 94, which was submitted to the House yesterday and which reads as follows:

Senate resolution 94.

Resolved, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, pages 1785 and 1786, in the report of an address to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio, Mr. POMERENE, is unwarranted, unjust, and untrue, and that said language constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to

create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives and that the House be requested to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry which I wish to submit to the Chair for the purpose of having him take it under advisement is this: The Senate having by a resolution, referred to this body, called me by name, and having called a Senator by name, and then having said that my statements were "untrue," I want the Speaker to take under advisement the question as to whether or not I, too, shall have the privilege, in return, of calling the name of the Senator who is named in the Senate resolution and of substantiating in detail and by documentary evidence the truthfulness of every word I said in the complained of remarks.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman allow a question? It does not appear by the gentleman's statement that this resolution was adopted by the Senate. Can the gentleman state whether it has been?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am advised that the RECORD shows that it was adopted. In addition to that, I desire the Chair to take under advisement the question as to whether or not I can call by name him to whom I referred as "a distinguished man from the State of Ohio" and show by documentary evidence that he has been guilty of the worst piece of sabotage ever committed in this country?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. A question of order. The matter to which the gentleman from Kentucky refers is not a debatable parliamentary question. The gentleman from Kentucky well knows that the rule forbids the naming of a Senator in connection with the matters to which he has referred. He is repeating certain charges in connection with the request that he be permitted to name that Senator. That is not a parliamentary question. I submit that it is out of order and that at this moment he is abusing the privileges of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, just one moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman has a right to make a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair will be glad to have the gentleman submit it, so that the Chair can decide it at leisure; but the Chair would caution the gentleman, of course, that it is not in order in the course of his parliamentary inquiry to make unparliamentary statements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, let me invite the attention of the Chair to the resolution again, please. The resolution not only names me, but it names Senator POMERENE. If the Senate can name Senator POMERENE in a resolution and send it to this House for consideration, I want the Speaker to take under advisement the question whether or not I, too, may not be permitted to mention his name. The Senate, by the resolution, has thrown down the gauge of battle and I propose to meet it and to substantiate everything I have said, and more, even by documentary evidence, if the Chair will only give me the opportunity. Yesterday this resolution came here——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman knows that I feel very kindly toward him. It does appear to me, however, that his remarks are not in order; and, without regard to the past—I understand there has been no action upon the resolution of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that there has been action.

Mr. CANNON. After all, I think under the rules of the House it is best that peace should be kept between the House and the Senate according to the rules. I say that to the gentleman in all kindness. He has no better friend personally than I am.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, just one word. I wish to say that I shall not ask the Chair to take the question up to-day, because I have some authorities which I wish to present. This resolution came over here only yesterday. We were in session until night, and every evening I go twenty-odd miles out into the country, over into Virginia, and come back here in the morning, and I have not had time to get the documents which I wish to use in discussing this question of privilege and personal privilege; and I wish to submit the authorities to the Speaker, in chambers if he prefers, in order to save the time of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to take up the question with the gentleman and rule upon it later.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] is recognized for 20 minutes by special order of the House.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope to entertain this House as the eloquent gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] did in his nonpartisan (?) speech. Yet it seems to me that the people of this country are pretty well satisfied with what the Republican Party has done so far, and I would like to say something in which all men of all parties are deeply interested. If the league of nations will abolish war, why does the Democratic Secretary of War ask to have an Army of 509,000 men? If the league of nations will function, why should a Democratic administration ask for $130,000,000 more money for aeroplanes?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Not now. I have only 20 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I want to raise the question of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman raise the question of no quorum?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I do. Gentlemen who belong on that side ought to be here to hear what is being said.

The SPEAKER. It is obvious that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I make the point of order that the gentleman can not raise that question when the gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he can.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Fairfield	Linthicum	Ragsdale
Bacharach	Fordney	Longworth	Randall, Wis.
Baer	Fuller, Mass.	Lufkin	Rayburn
Bankhead	Gallagher	McAndrews	Reber
Blackmon	Gallivan	McClintic	Riordan
Booher	Ganly	McCulloch	Robinson, N. C.
Bowers	Garland	McGlennon	Rowan
Browne	Godwin, N. C.	McKenzie	Rucker
Browning	Goldfogle	McKiniry	Sabath
Brumbaugh	Goodall	McKinley	Sanford
Burke	Goodykoontz	McPherson	Scott
Burroughs	Gould	MacCrate	Scully
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Sherwood
Caldwell	Griffin	Major	Sinclair
Campbell, Pa.	Hamill	Mann	Smith, Ill.
Cantrill	Haskell	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Caraway	Heflin	Mason	Stedman
Carss	Huddleston	Mead	Steele
Carter	Hutchinson	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Casey	Jacoway	Moores, Ind.	Sullivan
Copley	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morin	Summers, Wash.
Cullen	Johnston, N. Y.	Mudd	Sumners, Tex.
Dallinger	Kahn	Murphy	Tilson
Davis, Minn.	Kelley, Mich.	Neely	Tinkham
Dent	Kennedy, Iowa.	Nichols, Mich.	Treadway
Donovan	Kettner	Nolan	Upshaw
Dooling	Kiess	Oliver	Venable
Doremus	King	Padgett	Vestal
Dunn	Kleczka	Paige	Volstead
Dupré	Knutson	Pell	Ward
Eagan	Kreider	Phelan	Watson, Pa.
Eagle	Larsen	Porter	Watson, Va.
Emerson	Lever	Purnell	Wise

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). On this roll call 298 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the point of no quorum was made the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] had the floor and had occupied 1 minute. The gentleman is recognized for 19 minutes.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, when interrupted I remember that I asked the question, If the league of nations will abolish war, why does this Democratic administration ask for an Army of 509,000 men? If the league of nations will function, why should the Democratic administration ask for one hundred and thirty odd million dollars for aeroplane service? After spending $600,000,000 for aeroplanes, I was amazed the other night to learn from an article I read in the Star that we have no air service now comparable with what Gen. Pershing had when he started that remarkable chase after the bandit Villa. But if the league of nations and the treaty of peace shall not prevent war, what sort of preparations are we going to make to guard against the contingency of their failure to avert war? This country will not favor a large standing Army. It never has and never will in time of peace. It is proposed that we have

military training in our schools and colleges. I have seen much of the work of military trainers in our colleges, and I do not think we may ever expect much from that source.

Then we have a proposition for universal military training. That is certainly a misnomer. There can never be universal military training. About 900,000 boys become of military age every year. You could not train all of them, and a great many would not make soldiers with any amount of training. Some are flat-footed and some with weak hearts, and it would be far better to train many of them as farmers and mechanics, because in the event of war five men out of every six would be required to remain at home and man the farms and factories, in order to support the one man at the front.

What plan will you adopt? I have one in my mind to which I invite your attention and for which I will introduce a bill later on.

Briefly stated, it authorizes the President of the United States to organize a public-service corps consisting of young men 18 to 21 years of age, who shall be trained, equipped, disciplined, and handled under Army regulations, officered by men appointed by the President. They shall be employed like troops in a campaign—not in barracks—like troops in a campaign, and employed in building roads, levees, and other public works, and paid the going wages for the work they do.

They probably would be selected by draft. But that is a detail. The result would be that the officers who commanded them would have, what they never yet have had in the time of peace, and that is the experience of handling masses of troops. The young men after a year in the open, at the end of the year, would be discharged and a new force would be selected.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. I will.

Mr. GARD. Would the gentleman make his plan optional or compulsory?

Mr. HULINGS. I have said that that is a detail that I have not yet settled in my own mind. My own idea is that it should be compulsory and the men selected in each congressional district by selective draft. Boys after a year in the open under military discipline would be of improved physique. They would have respect for constituted authority, with habits of promptness, personal hygiene, and be altogether better men, and in a few years you would have thousands of miles of good roads at practically no cost above the training of the men, and you would have a great body of young men trained as soldiers, ready in case of need.

But do we need any preparedness at all? Before the war we were lulled into a false sense of security. The possibility of war was scouted. The Democratic Party and the Republican Party, too, for that matter—the great majority of the people—believed that preparedness was a useless expense. We have learned that it was a very costly mistake. Why, even when the world was ablaze with war we were told to be neutral even in thought. And with the spoliation of France and the rape of Belgium going on the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, was touring the country and telling the people at Buffalo not to be nervous or hysterical, that the "President would keep us out of war," when at that very time, I am informed, he was privately saying that the war was bound to come and that they were mining New York Harbor as a defensive measure.

We may not pretend to ourselves that we went into that war for any altruistic motive. We were told to be neutral. The rape of Belgian women, the mutilation of children, the slaughter of noncombatants, the barbarities, and atrocities that made the whole world shiver with horror moved us not at all. We were neutral. It is too late now for us to pretend that it was any highly altruistic motive that took us into that war or that we sent our boys to France with the idea of establishing a comradeship of nations or a league of nations. It was not until the Kaiser hoisted the black flag and crossbones of the buccaneer and declared war on American rights that we went to war; it was not until he was sinking our ships, blowing up our factories, murdering American citizens on the high seas, conspiring here, almost under the Dome of the Capitol, in the German Embassy to raise up foreign enemies against us. It was not until we realized that we had to fight the Hun "over there" or we had to fight him "over here" that we went to war.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Did not President McKinley also try to keep the Americans out of war before the Spanish-American War?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes, he did; but he never was—I was going to say guilty, but I must not say that—he never said that we were too proud to fight. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. LAZARO. He may not have used that language, but he did try to keep the American people out of war, did he not, until we were forced into it?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes. It was not until he realized that we had to fight the Hun over there or else fight him over here that we dropped all this nonsense about "watchful waiting" or "too proud to fight" or neutrality even in thought and got a "move on," and we quickly proved that the American soldier is the greatest fighting man that the world ever produced. [Applause.] Our place in that war was when the *Lusitania* was sunk.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I have always had great admiration for President Wilson's lofty idealism and for his splendid vision of that time when war shall be no more. For very many years I have believed that a community of nations ultimately would be established just as communities of individuals have been established, and that tribunals would be created where the rights of disputants would be decided. I have believed that through the evolution of human nature the time would come when man would be too proud, too wise, to fight and lie and steal, and that perhaps even in that good day we would reach the time when the only function of the policeman would be to help lame ladies over crowded crossings. But evolution is a slow process, and I have wondered whether in the present state of human nature the league of nations would work any better than "watchful waiting." I have wondered whether the league of nations, if ratified and adopted, would keep us out of war any better than the President kept us out of war. [Applause on the Republican side.] The war is over, they say, and yet war is going merrily on in a score of places in the world—in Mexico, in Russia, in Egypt, in the Balkans war is raging, the Greek and the Turk, the German and the Pole, the Jugo-Slav and the Austrian—they are all at each others' throats, and I gravely doubt whether this is a good time for Americans to make an entrance into European politics.

Three or four gentlemen distinguished for many things took the map of the world, and, in pitiless secrecy, carved out 30 or 40 nations and established the boundaries. They doubtless did the best they could; but it is not strange that the people who were to be affected should promptly quarrel; and it would be marvelous, indeed, if the people in those countries where they have established these boundaries did not fight. But we did not go over there to make maps. We went over there in defense of American rights. We went over there to lick the Hun. It was a mighty job, and we did it in the American fashion. I think our boys ought now to come home and bring all of their belongings with them. Incidentally they have relieved Europe from the menace of German militarism, but I think they ought now to come home. I believe this country can do more in the way of preventing war simply by attending its own business and letting the European nations attend to theirs. [Applause on Republican side.] We have no right, we have no duty to go into a guardianship of the world. European diplomats are a compound of tiger and rabbit and hog, striving to monopolize the swill, and the American dove has small chance in that company.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I take it from the gentleman's speech that he is against the league of nations, and as he seems to have tumultuous applause on the Republican side, I am wondering whether the gentleman is speaking for the Republican Party, and whether, as a party, it is against the league of nations.

Mr. HULINGS. Oh, I do not know how that is. I do know this, that if I were running the Republican Party, and I had votes enough, I would not ratify that treaty in its present shape; but I see that some of the best Democrats they have over in the Senate and some of the Republicans alike are opposed to the treaty.

I see that Mr. Hays, of the Republican national committee, says that it is not a party question, while Senator BORAH, on the other hand, says that it must be a party question, because that is the only way in which the people of the country can express themselves. So, from this variety of views, I can only speak for myself. I think the time will surely come when there will be a league of nations, but its mandates will be backed up not by the sword but by the power of public opinion. I do not think this league of nations has that sort of a backing now, because the world is still ablaze with war in a great many different places. As I say, I believe America can do more to abolish war by going along in her good old American way, keeping aloof from European politics. Let peace be established; let this blood lust that seems to have taken the world like a fever be dissipated; let the human mind be established in its normal course again; and let this America of ours hang out the lamps

of beauty and splendor upon her high places of power and glory, and I believe she can do more through sheer force of public example, that she can do more by the moral power of this great people, to establish peace in the world than ever she can do by any surrender of the control of her armies and navies, of her rights and destiny, into the hands of any foreign authority whatever. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood the gentleman to make the complaint a moment ago about the change in the map of Europe. Do I understand the gentleman to object to restoring Alsace-Lorraine to France, to Poland that territory which was taken away in 1793 and 1795 , and the restoration to Denmark of the Provinces of Schleswig-Holstein?

Mr. HULINGS. Now, if you will ask one more question, I can tell you a good reason why I am opposed to the league.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have asked a question.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield for a question in that connection——

Mr. HULINGS. I am going to answer. The robbery of China that was made in order to induce Japan to join the league of nations [applause on the Republican side] is something——

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield in that connection for a question?

Mr. HULINGS (continuing). That I do not believe the people in the Province of Shantung will ever acquiesce in. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Will not the gentleman answer the question I asked him? I do not care for any information about China, but I want him to answer my question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULINGS. I am in favor of giving Alsace-Lorraine back to France.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about the other?

Mr. HULINGS. I did not follow the whole series of questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the Democrats in favor of the treaty that the President brought back the last time or the one he is supposed to bring back next week?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULINGS. I would like to have two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. I ask that it be extended five minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Make it 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, my question was brought forth by the question asked by the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, and I ask the gentleman who is addressing the House if he has any advice as to whether the Democrats are now in favor of the league of nations as brought to us in the last trip by our President or the one he is supposed to bring us next week.

Mr. MAYS. Which one does the gentleman favor?

Mr. HULINGS. No one should express his views about anything until he knows what it is. Nobody yet knows exactly what the league means. The man that made it does not know what effect it will have.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentlemen on that side of the aisle seem to be good at propounding questions, but very slow in answering them.

Mr. CURRY of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. I do.

Mr. CURRY of California. Is there any Democrat on that side of the aisle here who will commit the Democratic Party to any league of nations that we know anything about or they know anything about which we have received or we may receive in the future? Will they commit the Democratic Party to any league of nations whatsoever as a party issue?

Mr. AYRES. I am on this side of the aisle, but I belong on the other side, and I say yes, I will.

Mr. CURRY of California. Commit yourself and your party?

Mr. AYRES. For myself and my party and the platform.

Mr. FOSTER. Which one?

Mr. AYRES. It is only one. Would the gentleman commit the Republican Party?

Mr. CURRY of California. I am opposed to the league of nations, now and forever.

Mr. HULINGS. In answering the gentleman, I can only speak for myself, and yet in saying that I have always believed that some day in the evolution of human nature we would have a league of nations that would abolish war or make war very difficult. I have not receded from that at all. I still believe that, but I do not believe that in the present state of human nature it is time to make the experiment, especially since the proposition that is put to us is one which the President tells us is absolutely perfect, that can not be amended, and we must take it as it is without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." Now, I do not believe that. I do not believe President Wilson, with all his power and glory, has any right to commit the people of the United States to something which may lead the people into war without consulting the people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to get into this long controversy about the league of nations. I simply hoped to express in a modest way my own ideas about a topic which the people of the country should be considering. Unfortunately nobody has been able yet to say just what the league of nations is. I believe if the President comes home he will go out on the stand and, with that beautiful wealth of rhetoric and that charming smile of his, he will go before the people, and he will almost make them believe that black is white. And then there are a lot of barnstormers over on the Senate side, and they will go over the whole proposition, and I am in favor of giving these Democratic wheel horses full swing. You can imagine what effect a man like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] would have up in our country barnstorming around like that. Why, he would have everybody holding up their hands and agreeing to everything he said. Well, let them go. Let the people get both sides. It is greatly desired to have this whole proposition discussed and thrashed out, so that the people will know what the league really means, and once the people have definitely said they are for ratifying the treaty the Senate will ratify it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But if I know anything of public sentiment, from my going up and down the country, the people, who are all in favor of a league that will prevent war, are gravely suspicious of a league that so many wise men believe will cause war, and they will say to men like LODGE, and KNOX, and REED, and BORAH, and JOHNSON, in the United States Senate, who are opposed to this ratification, "Stand by your guns until you know American rights are protected." [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is what they are going to say, and what I think the Republican Party ought to say.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

RETURN OF WIRE SYSTEMS TO OWNERS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on Senate bill 120, for restoring the control and ownership of the wire systems be now laid before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the conference report on the bill S. 120, the wire-control bill, be laid before the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not require unanimous consent. He has the right to bring it up. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise and take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved June 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement be read down to the bill as reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that in lieu of the report the statement be read down to the bill as reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 15, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "to take effect at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "not to exceed four months"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "supervision, possession, control, or operation therein specified"; and, on page 2, line 25, of the engrossed bill, after the word "fully," insert "adjusted and"; also, on page 2, line 25, of the engrossed bill, after "paid," strike out the words "and adjusted"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "ninety"; and, on page 3, line 5, of the engrossed bill, after the word "made," insert "to the Congress"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "each separate"; and, on page 3, lines 9 and 10, of the engrossed bill, strike out the words "under the proclamations referred to in section 1"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House insert "system from August 1, 1918, up to"; and the House agree to the same.

JOHN J. ESCH,
E. L. HAMILTON,
T. W. SIMS,
Managers on the part of the House.
ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
ATLEE POMERENE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes, beg leave to submit that the Senate conferees accepted the amendments of the House to this bill in nearly every particular. The only changes made by your conferees were to clarify the language of the law.

On amendment No. 3 your conferees provide that the toll and exchange telephone rates shall continue in force for four months instead of six as passed by the House.

On amendment No. 7 your conferees provide for the return of these systems, lines, and property at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved.

On amendment No. 11 your conferees provide that the President shall report to the Congress within 90 days after this act takes effect a detailed account of all his acts and proceedings in connection with this matter.

The bill as proposed to be enacted into law and as agreed to by your conferees is here printed, as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That chapter 154 of the acts of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor,' approved on the 16th day of July, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, to take effect at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved: *Provided, however*, That the existing toll and exchange telephone rates as established or approved by the Postmaster General on or prior to June 6, 1919, shall continue in force for a period not to exceed four months after this act takes effect, unless sooner modified or changed by the public authorities—State, municipal, or otherwise—having control or jurisdiction of tolls, charges, and rates, or by contract or by voluntary reduction.

"SEC. 2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, at midnight on the last day of the calendar month in which this act is approved, to return and deliver to the respective owners thereof all of the systems, lines, and property taken possession of or received, operated, supervised, or controlled by him under authority of said joint resolution.

"SEC. 3. That the first proviso of said joint resolution prescribing the just compensation to be paid for and on account of said supervision, possession, control, or operation therein specified shall continue in full force and effect until such just compensation shall be fully adjusted and paid in the manner and according to the terms and conditions therein set forth.

"SEC. 4. That within 90 days after this act shall take effect the President shall cause to be made to the Congress a detailed account and report of all his acts and proceedings in connection with the supervision, possession, control, and operation of the telephone, telegraph, and marine cable systems of the United States, and of all moneys received and expended, and all property and assets acquired or held, and all liabilities or obligations incurred, including contracts relative to compensation awards, such report to show in detail the financial results of the operation of each separate wire system from August 1, 1918, up to the date when the said systems shall have been returned."

JOHN J. ESCH,
E. L. HAMILTON,
THETUS W. SIMS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand it the change that has been made is from six months to four months as affecting telephone exchange rates and that the power is still reserved in the commissions of the State to modify or change those rates before that time?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And the amendment of the House and the language of the bill in that respect have not been at all affected?

Mr. ESCH. No. The contention of the House that the repeal should become effective on the last day of the calendar month in which the bill was approved was retained in the conference.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

DIVERSION OF WATER AT NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and under the special order of the House, I ask to have House joint resolution 139 laid before the House, which I will ask the Clerk to report.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] calls up House joint resolution 139, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 139, amending public resolution No. 33.

Resolved, etc., That public resolution No. 33 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, approved June 29, 1918, be, and is hereby, amended by striking out in the first proviso the words "the 1st day of July, 1919, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate unless sooner revoked or unless the," and by striking out also the words "before that date," so that the public resolution as amended shall read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue permits, revocable at will, for the diversion of water in the United States from the Niagara River above the Falls for the creation of

power to individuals, companies, or corporations which are now actually producing power from the waters of said river, in quantities which in no event shall exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second: *Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until Congress shall enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect. Any individuals, companies, or corporations violating any of the provisions of said permits or diverting water from said river above the Falls for the creation of power, except under a permit issued under the authority of this law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year nor less than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same."

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue permits, revocable at will, for the diversion of water in the United States from the Niagara River above the Falls for the creation of power to individuals, companies, or corporations which are now actually producing power from the waters of said river, in quantities which in no event shall exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second: *Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until the 1st day of July, 1920, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate, unless sooner revoked, or unless the Congress shall before that date enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect.

"Any individuals, companies, or corporations violating any of the provisions of said permits, or diverting water from said river above the Falls for the creation of power, except under a permit issued under the authority of this law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year nor less than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, there is on the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 63, which was passed by the Senate on Wednesday of this week and which is very similar in purport, although slightly different in language, to the resolution which has just been reported. In order to expedite the passage of this legislation I ask unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution 63 be considered in lieu of House joint resolution 139.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] asks unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution 63 be substituted for House joint resolution 139, which has been reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the Senate resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution No. 63 to amend public resolution No. 33, approved June 29, 1918, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River.

Resolved, etc., That public resolution No. 33, of the Sixty-fifth Congress, approved June 29, 1918, be, and is hereby, amended by striking out in the first proviso the words "the 1st day of July, 1919, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate, unless sooner revoked, or unless the," and by striking out also the words "before that date," so that the public resolution, as amended, shall read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue permits, revocable at will, for the diversion of water in the United States from the Niagara River above the Falls for the creation of power to individuals, companies, or corporations which are now actually producing power from the waters of said river, in quantities which in no event shall exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second: *Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until Congress shall enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect. Any individuals, companies, or corporations violating any of the provisions of said permits, or diverting water from said river above the Falls for the creation of power, except under a permit issued under the authority of this law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year or less than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body, the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out all after the resolving clause and substituting in lieu thereof the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS moves the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue permits, revocable at will, for the diversion of water in the United States from the Niagara River above the Falls for the creation of power to individuals, companies, or corporations which are now actually producing power from the waters of said river, in quantities which in no event shall exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second: *Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until the 1st day of July, 1920, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate, unless sooner revoked, or unless the Congress shall before that date enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect. Any individuals, companies, or corporations violating any of the provisions of said permits, or diverting water from said river above the Falls for the creation of power, except under a permit issued under the authority of this law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year nor less than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body, the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment if accepted will be to put the Senate joint resolution when agreed to by the House in exactly the same form and language as the law agreed to by Congress a year ago. The amendment which has just been reported is identical with the resolution which the House passed on the 29th day of June, 1918, and which expires on next Monday, the 30th day of June. I explained somewhat fully in the House yesterday the purpose of this resolution, and unless some Member has some question to ask I do not care to take any time on it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution as amended to its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the resolution to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the title amended so as to read:

Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for diversion of water from the Niagara River.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS offers the following amendment: Amend title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River."

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ROGERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. ROGERS, the House joint resolution 139 was laid on the table.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the day on which private pension bills are in order, and I move that the bill H. R. 6639 be taken up and considered in the House now as in the Committee of the Whole. This will take but a very few minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged motion that I am instructed by the Committee on Labor to submit to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOHN B. DENSMORE.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the House House resolution No. 128 and move its adoption as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan presents a resolution which the Chair thinks is privileged over the report of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER]. The gentleman from Michigan calls up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 128.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be, and he is hereby, requested to promptly report to the House of Representatives at the earliest date practicable the following facts:

(1) What connection in behalf of the Department of Labor, if any, has John B. Densmore, now Director of the United States Employment Service, had with the case of Thomas J. Mooney, convicted in California of crime, stating in detail the activities of said Densmore concerning said case, and the expenses of same itemized that were paid by the Government, and upon what authority of law, attaching copies of all reports concerning same made to the Department of Labor by said John B. Densmore.

(2) What connection in behalf of the Department of Labor, if any, since the punishment of said Thomas J. Mooney was commuted to life imprisonment, has any employee of said Department of Labor had with the said case of Thomas J. Mooney, stating such activities in detail, the purposes thereof, the expense itemized in connection therewith that has been paid or is to be paid by the Government, and upon what authority of law, attaching copies of all reports made to the Department of Labor concerning said case.

(3) What requests on the Department of Labor, if any, have been made by a grand jury or a court in California for said John B. Densmore to appear in California to give evidence, and what action concerning same was taken by the Department of Labor.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Strike out the language in lines 9 and 10, of page 1, "and the expenses of same itemized that were paid by the Government, and upon what authority of law."

In lines 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, on page 2, strike out the language "the purposes thereof, the expense itemized in connection therewith that has been paid or is to be paid by the Government, and upon what authority of law, attaching copies of all reports made to the Department of Labor concerning said case" and insert "in so far as the same are not incompatible with the public interests."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the amendment relates to the reporting of the expenditures in connection with certain investigations made by the Department of Labor.

Now, there is a committee of the House, a regularly established committee, for the purpose of investigating the expenditures of the Department of Labor, and we thought in the Committee on Labor that it would be a duplication of the work of that committee to ask the Secretary of Labor or the Department of Labor to make a report of the expenditures in connection with this resolution. For that reason we have asked to amend it by striking out the duty that would be performed by that committee or the duty that is devolved upon that committee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In a moment. Then there is another inquiry. Of course there was a little diversity of opinion as to whether or not this is properly before the committee anyway. But the gentleman who is the author of the resolution [Mr. BLANTON] and also the Secretary of Labor appeared before the committee, and the Secretary of Labor, in order to comply with it, stated that he would report in favor of the resolution. It occurs to me that the resolution as amended will furnish the House with all the information asked for in the resolution. If it does not, then that committee that is appointed expressly for investigating the expenditures of the Department of Labor can furnish the House with the information of all expenditures as far as the House would wish to know.

Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH of Micliigan. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I notice that on the second page of the resolution the committee has inserted a committee amendment, which reads "in so far as the same are not incompatible with the public interest." The gentleman, as chairman of the committee, is doubtless familiar with the unusual character of that amendment in connection with a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of a department other than the President. I wondered what the grounds were that led the committee to insert this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that personally I am not in favor of trying the Mooney case in the House of Representatives, and am not in favor of trying the Debs case, and I think the whole resolution ought to be rejected by the Secretary of Labor. I do not care anything about Mooney or his case. I am informed by the parliamentarian of the House that it is a proper amendment, and I think that any proper information that is called for from the Secretary of Labor, judging from his statement when he appeared before the committee, will not be kept back, and we do not want the Members of this House—and I do not want, as chairman of that committee—to be put in the position of trying the Mooney case over again here in Congress. I stand for our courts, for good government, and for the maintenance of good order. I have no sympathy with the Bolsheviki, I. W. W.'s, or anarchy.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman allow me to read a sentence from the Manual of the House?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If it will not take too much time, I will.

Mr. ROGERS. It will take only a moment. I read from section 835 of the House Manual:

It has been considered proper to use the word "request" in asking for information from the President and "direct" in addressing the heads of departments. It is usual for the House in calling on the President for information, especially with relation to foreign affairs, to use the qualifying clause "if not incompatible with the public interest."

In other words, my understanding was that under the precedents the House invariably omitted the qualification in addressing inquiries to the heads of departments, with the exception of the President, and in matters relating to foreign affairs.

Mr. GARNER. The universal practice, if the gentleman will permit me, is to ask for information, and if found to be incompatible with the public interest they will say so. But for Congress to be so scrupulous as to ask the heads of departments for information with that proviso, "if not incompatible with the public interest," is, in my judgment, not good policy, and it ought not to be adopted. [Applause.] If the inquiry called for is incompatible with the public interest, the department will make that fact known to Congress, and I think we should not be backward in asserting our rights in securing information.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think you will get all the information desired about Mooney and his case. In fact, the information asked for by the resolution has appeared already in the public press.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. Is it proper to offer a motion to strike out the words "in so far as the same are not incompatible with the public interest"?

The SPEAKER. That is the second amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment. As the author of the resolution, I desire to be recognized in my own right to oppose the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has control of the time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] five minutes. Of course, the gentleman has been here with eight speeches in relation to the conduct of this investigation already.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not making this speech out of the little five minutes that I have been given?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the adoption of any one of these amendments by the House would destroy the purposes of the resolution. In last Tuesday's RECORD, June 24, 1919, page 1712, Mr. Densmore stated:

In the meantime when I returned to Washington, in November, 1917, I was, as before mentioned, asked to take charge of the establishment and direction of the United States Employment Service, and I resigned as solicitor to do so. This new work engaged all my time, and it was not until the middle of October, 1918, that I found myself able to leave this work even for a few weeks to go to San Francisco and assist the district attorney in the prosecution of the cases. I was then Director General of the United States Employment Service, but I went to San Francisco at that time solely for the purpose of assisting in the Government's prosecution of the people indicted as a result of my investigation as solicitor, and not at all for the purposes, as universally charged, "to investigate the Mooney case." Such investigation as was made was carried on by the two inspectors of the department who remained in San Francisco, and no person connected with the United States Employment Service had anything to do with it.

The investigation was practically finished when I arrived in San Francisco last October to assist the United States attorney in the trials, and the report of the investigators was transmitted by me to the Secreary of Labor. Unfortunately some of this report fell into the hands of the publisher of a local paper, who published it without any authority whatever.

I happen to have a copy of this report of Mr. Densmore in my possession that he made to the Secretary of Labor on the first day of last November, wherein he tells the Secretary of Labor that "pursuant to your instructions received from time to time during the past six months, I have the honor to report that I have conducted a secret and altogether informal inquiry into the Mooney case in California," right in the face of the contrary statement he put in the RECORD here last Tuesday.

Why is it not a proper inquiry? I remember that a Member of Congress stated before the committee—a member of the gentleman's committee—stated to him yesterday on the committee hearing that he had tried to get a copy of this report from the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Labor had told him, in effect, to go to—that he could not get it.

Let me show you how Director General John B. Densmore begins this momentous report of his efforts to free a convicted

anarchist and dynamiter, made to the Secretary of Labor, a Cabinet officer of the United States of America.

I copy from the San Francisco Call of Saturday, November 23, 1918, on page 1, the following excerpts:

HERE IS TEXT OF DENSMORE REPORT.

Following is the report, in full, of John B. Densmore, Federal Director of Employment, to Secretary of Labor Wilson:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *November 1, 1918.*

Hon. W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to instructions received from time to time during the past six months I have the honor to report that I have conducted a secret and altogether informal inquiry into the Mooney case and beg leave to submit herewith the results of my investigation. * * *

The case of the people of the State of California against Thomas J. Mooney et al., charged with perpetrating a bomb outrage in the city of San Francisco during the Preparedness Day parade, on July 22, 1916, thereby causing the deaths of 9 or 10 persons and the injury of numerous others; * * * Mooney and Warren K. Billings were found guilty, Mooney now being under sentence of death. * * *

I had at this time two trusted assistants in San Francisco, and to these I confided my plan of operations. * * * It was absolutely necessary to the success of the operation to install a dictaphone in the office of the district attorney, Mr. Charles M. Fickert. This task was a seemingly impossible one, owing to the fact that Fickert keeps himself barricaded behind double-locked doors on the fourth floor of the Hall of Justice, in a private office, to which only one other man has the keys. The full details as to how this dictaphone was finally installed will probably never be divulged. * * * Some idea of the difficulties involved will be gained when it is stated that more than two months of careful and clever work were required before the installation was complete and the machine in actual operation.

Fickert's office in the Hall of Justice is a very large room in the southwest corner of the building, on the topmost floor. (See diagram, Exhibit "A.") It is lighted by two arched windows, one overlooking Portsmouth Square to the west and the other fronting Merchant Street on the south. The district attorney's desk is in the extreme southwest corner of the room, between the two windows. Besides the desk, the room contains a large, oblong table; otherwise there is little furniture. On the floor and table, in picturesque disarray, are countless exhibits alleged to relate to the activities of the I. W. W.'s, the Mooney defendants, and other reputed agitators and dynamiters. For dictaphone purposes the location was by no means an ideal one. * * *

And then, in a report covering several pages of the Call, this renowned Director General of the United States Employment Service, who on said November 1, 1918, was drawing a salary of $6,000 per year, fixed not by Congress but by the Labor Department out of blanket appropriations, and who was presumed to be preparing to find jobs for soldiers, went on to relate the strenuous efforts he made, not to help a district attorney and his Government ferret out and punish crime, but to eavesdrop a district attorney who had convicted an anarchistic dynamiter, for the purpose of trying to assist such dynamiter to escape the law and just punishment.

And, remember, at Atlantic City, a few days ago, Secretary Wilson stated that he himself was still giving much time to this Mooney case, which the newspapers reported was for the purpose of obtaining a new trial.

Why can not a Member of Congress have a copy of this report? A member of the gentleman's committee has been denied a copy of this report. Why should the chairman of this committee insist on these amendments, which would constitute an excuse for the Secretary of Labor to continue to refuse to give Members a copy? Why should we not be told by the Secretary of Labor how much money Director General John B. Densmore has expended in assuming the functions of the Department of Justice, not in trying to help a department of the Government in prosecuting crime but to assist a dynamiter to evade judgment and escape law, but Mr. Mooney, in this report which I have read—I mean Mr. Densmore; I get those two names mixed, for they are so similar, Mr. Mooney and Mr. Densmore, that when I think of one I naturally think of the other. Has our Committee on Labor come to the conclusion that we have to ask permission of Mr. Secretary of Labor Wilson, who says in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Tuesday, page 1712—

I am a trade-unionist and I believe in trade-unionism—

Has our Committee on Labor come to the conclusion that we have got to ask the permission of a servant of the people to get information for this Congress? I say this Congress ought to assert itself, and my good colleague from Texas [Mr. GARNER] was correct in his statement a moment ago, and I approve of it.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I have only five minutes.

Mr. GARNER. I do not know a thing about the merits of this resolution. I do not know a thing about the advisability of passing it, but I do want to make myself clear on this point that the House of Representatives ought not to say, "If not incompatible with the public interest" every time that the House asks for information from a department of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman is as sound as a dollar on that proposition, and I commend him for it. I say we have a right to the information, and I hope this House will strike out every single one of the amendments of the committee, because they destroy the purpose of the resolution. Here we have just appropriated $1,400,000 to detect anarchists, who in the dead hour of night have placed bombs on the doorstep of our Attorney General. While we are doing that we have another department of the Government, we have Secretary Wilson telling the people of this country at Atlantic City a few days ago that he is still working on the Mooney case, and the newspapers say that he is doing it to get a new trial. Now, if my friends in the House, on the Democratic side and on the Republican side, want to keep on truckling and are not willing to ask for something to which they are entitled that is not my fault. I for one am willing to make any sacrifice necessary to free my Government of dynamiting and anarchy. I have prepared and offered this resolution, which requires Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Labor, and his nephew, Mr. Densmore, the Director General of the Employment Service, to furnish us all with a copy of his Mooney report, to show what he was doing in California for six months, to show by whose authority he went there and spent two whole months, as he says in that report, in installing a dictaphone in the district attorney's office, not to help prosecute criminals or apprehend them but to help turn convicted dynamiters loose on the honest people of this country, and I hope all amendments will be voted down. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield me one minute?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas one minute.

Mr. GARNER. I want to take that minute to make my position plain. I never heard of this resolution until a few moments ago. I do not know anything about its merits or the advisability of passing it, but the thing to which I want to direct the attention of the House is that the dignity and privileges of this House is involved in the question of directing the head of a department to furnish certain information that we may need, and I think it is a little bit out of place to say in each instance, "If not incompatible with the public interest." If it is advisable to pass resolutions directing them to send us information, we ought not to say, "If not incompatible with the public interests." I want to make myself perfectly clear on that, differentiating between the merits of the resolution and the amendment suggested by the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] who introduced this resolution that all the information that he asks for is promised by the unanimous report of the committee on this resolution. The report that he wants to get from the grand jury in the Mooney case was long ago published in a newspaper called the Call. The gentleman has made the bald statement that Mr. Densmore is a relative of the Secretary of Labor. He is not his relative any more than any gentleman of the House. The gentleman has made other statements about which he knows nothing. We are now sitting jointly with the Senate Committee on Education and Labor every day and have been for more than a week, and everything is being brought out in connection with that hearing. The gentleman offers this resolution while this hearing is going on——

Mr. ROGERS. In view of the opinion of this resolution entertained by the chairman of the committee, why did the committee report the resolution at all?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman is expressing his own opinion. I do not know about that.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I happen to be a member of that committee. There is before the committee a bill to make an appropriation of quite a large sum of money for this Federal Employment Bureau, is there not?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There are two questions involved in that bill. That is one of them.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. In connection with the consideration of the bill by the committee, and the House later, does not the gentleman think it is important that we have the information from the Secretary of Labor that this resolution calls for? Furthermore, does not the gentleman think we ought to have it regardless of whether he thinks it is for or against the public interest?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that the door at those hearings is not closed, that the latchstring is out, and everybody on both sides who has a word to say concerning the establishment of a free Federal employment bureau is welcome to come over to the Senate Office Building and be heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman said that the report was obtainable in the Call. I will give the gentleman $25 for a copy of the Call containing that report if he will produce it in three days.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman has got one copy.

Mr. BLANTON. What I have got is not the property of these Members.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman brought an edition of the Call before the committee and read two or three extracts from it. That report covers some two pages of a printed newspaper. I asked him to put the whole of it in the testimony. He said it was not his, that he borrowed it of Mr. WOOD of Indiana, and I could get it from him.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want a separate vote on each amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the first committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out the language "and the expenses of same itemized that were paid by the Government, and upon what authority of law."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Michigan) there were 16 ayes and 51 noes.

So the committee amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the second committee amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separation of that amendment. The committee amendment involves both striking out and inserting, and I ask that a vote be had on the proposition to strike out and another vote on the proposition to insert.

Mr. BLANTON. Let the committee amendment be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the following language: "the purposes thereof, the expense itemized in connection therewith that has been paid or is to be paid by the Government, and upon what authority of law, attaching copies of all reports made to the Department of Labor concerning said case," and insert "in so far as the same are not incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, does the Chair rule that you can divide a committee amendment consisting of a proposition to strike out and insert?

The SPEAKER. No; the motion to strike out and insert is not divisible.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I undertand the general rule of parliamentary procedure. But I submit that the rule applies only when there is one subject matter involved in the striking out and in the substitution. In this case the Speaker will notice that the striking out involves one subject matter and the insertion involves an entirely different subject matter. There is no connection between the two, and I submit, therefore, that the rule invoked has no application in this case.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman's proposition is directed rather against the wisdom of the rule than the rule itself. Paragraph 7 of rule 16 says, "A motion to strike out and insert is indivisible, but a motion to strike out being lost shall neither preclude amendment nor motion to strike out and insert." The Chair does not find any exceptions, although the gentleman's argument is plausible that there ought to be exceptions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts substantially was that this was two amendments, one amendment to strike out and another to insert. If they are two amendments, one to strike out and another to insert, of course you could have a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that it was a motion to strike out and insert, and it is so reported. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Michigan, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 6639, a pension bill.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a question of order. I think the Water Power Committee has precedence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the agreement under which the water-power bill is to be called up and finds that in that agreement the gentleman from Wisconsin asked that it be taken up subject to conference reports and other privileged business. This being Friday, the Committee on Pensions has privileged business, and therefore the water-power bill is subject to that.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of John Paul, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and Tenth Regiment Michigan Veteran Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Taylor, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. Crain, late of Company E, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Tipton, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pleasant Timberlake, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles O. Smith, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Lindquist, late of Company L, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis C. Mills, late of Company A, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Woods, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Martin, late of Company K, Eighty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Rose, late of Companies D and E, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur E. Gilligan, late of Company C, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mordecai F. Riley, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hobart, late of Company H, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Smith, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward N. Marx, late of Company H, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Newell B. Clark, late unassigned Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Yohe, widow of Adam Yohe, late of Company C, Second Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Francis Schaeffer, helpless and dependent son of Daniel W. Schaeffer, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Juliann Fyock, widow of David Fyock, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary Fyock, helpless and dependent daughter of said David Fyock, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Juliann Fyock, the name of said Mary Fyock shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Juliann Fyock.

The name of George Adams, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Smith, late of Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Belle P. Wolfe, widow of William J. Wolfe, late of the Eighteenth Battery, Eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha R. Been, widow of Benjamin F. Been, late of Company F, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie L. Hubbard, former widow of Abijah L. Hubbard, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment, and Company C, Second Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of William J. Whipple, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rodolph Matthews, late of Company G, Eighty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Johnston, late of Company A, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Herbert A. York, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas F. Duffy, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phebe A. Hand, widow of John W. Hand, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hamilton W. Manner, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis Melcher, late of Company A, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William O. Fraser, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kate Peck, widow of Alfred Peck, late of Company D, Fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month.

The name of John Bishop, late of Battery L, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ann Brooks, former widow of Garrett Gordon, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James H. Thomas, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Smith, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward O'Flaherty, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Aye, late of Company G, Seventy-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph T. Earl, late of Company H, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard L. Rusk, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Bradfield, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward A. Lane, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Dempsey, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Huffine, late of Company I, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel L. Ensminger, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Smith J. Dutton, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Blackburn, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Hitchcock, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Morgan A. Harris, late of Company F, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Darwin H. Hamilton, late of Company F, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Seebers, late unassigned, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Edward Boehmler, late of Company A, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Caswell, late of Company G, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Porcupile, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nason B. Cunningham, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Georgianna L. Smith, widow of Frank W. Smith, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mabel E. Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of said Frank W. Smith, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Georgianna L. Smith, the name of said Mabel E. Smith shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Georgianna L. Smith.

The name of David G. Bliss, late of Battery F, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Vermeulen, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Graham, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry and Sixteenth Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Deibert, widow of Jacob Deibert, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Mary A. Adams, widow of James F. Adams, late of Company D, One hundred and sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of George S. Tillson, late of Company C, Two hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Stuart, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Ready, late of Company L, Second Regiment, and Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, Kansas Volunteer Cavalary, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ella Thatcher, widow of John W. Thatcher, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Louisa Sheldon, dependent mother of George W. Sheldon, Company E, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albert H. Cleaveland, late of Company A, One hundred and fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anne E. McGrew, widow of William T. McGrew, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth G. Young, former widow of William H. Green, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of George W. Bagley, late laborer, construction corps, quartermaster teamster department, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Soren V. Kalsem, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Burgess, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archibald T. Lea, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane Cory, helpless and dependent child of Charles Cory, late of Company I, Sixtieth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Oliver Orn, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Nale, late of Company G, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Gagan, alias James Dillon, late coal heaver, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Purkapile, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Lovell, widow of Lewis Anderson, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Wesley A. Taylor, late of Company C, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter R. Sines, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey Stultz, late of Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Race, late of Company E, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sidney S. Canter, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seymour Norman, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Davis, late of Company G, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Schooley, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph H. Woolaston, late of Battery D, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Reis, late of Company G, Thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Erasmus B. Manahan, late of Company E, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McCormick, late of Company E, Sixty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A Johnson, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthew M. Eshelman, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Uriah J. Favorite, late unassigned, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment, and of Company G, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Queen, widow of Thomas Queen, late of Company B, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John Queen, helpless and dependent son of said Thomas Queen, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth A. Queen, the name of the said John Queen shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Elizabeth A. Queen.

The name of William Alligee, late of Company K, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John I. Amy, late of unassigned Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of William T. Ritchison, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Lampkins, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Burnetta Dayton, former widow of Hilliard I. Baldwin, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indian Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John L. Clifton, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi H. Brown, late of Company B, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ferdinand W Merrill, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Disbrow, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George T. Totman, late of Company G, Sixty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi W. Easton, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Scott Lone, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Donahue, widow of Philip Donahue, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of Leonora Stewart, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John W. Whitbeck, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Cartwright, late of Company F, Seventy-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Clark, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Hall, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Rader, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Fetters, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Fry, widow of William Fry, late of Company I, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Oscar Fry, helpless and dependent son of said William Fry, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Fry, the name of said Oscar Fry shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Fry.

The name of Mary E. Cutts, widow of James M. Cutts, late of Company C, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jacob L. Helms, late of Company A, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 569. John Paul.
H. R. 571. James Taylor.
H. R. 573. George B. Crain.
H. R. 595. David Tipton.
H. R. 609. Pleasant Timberlake.
H. R. 675. Charles O. Smith.
H. R. 721. John Lindquist.
H. R. 725. Francis C. Mills.
H. R. 726. John W. Woods.
H. R. 727. John T. Martin.
H. R. 751. Frank Rose.
H. R. 764. Arthur E. Gilligan.
H. R. 769. Mordecai F. Riley.
H. R. 772. John Hobart.
H. R. 791. John T. Smith.
H. R. 817. Edward N. Marx.
H. R. 905. Newell B. Clark.
H. R. 918. Margaret Yohe.
H. R. 919. Charles Francis Schaeffer.
H. R. 922. Juliann Fyock.
H. R. 927. George Adams.
H. R. 940. Samuel Smith.
H. R. 964. Belle P. Wolfe.
H. R. 965. Martha R. Been.
H. R. 1018. Addie L. Hubbard.
H. R. 1202. William J. Whipple.
H. R. 1261. Rodolph Matthews.
H. R. 1262. John C. Johnston.
H. R. 1286. Herbert A. York.
H. R. 1287. Thomas F. Duffy.
H. R. 1289. Phebe A. Hand.
H. R. 1291. Hamilton W. Manner.
H. R. 1334. Louis Melcher.
H. R. 1721. Kate Peck.
H. R. 1724. William O. Fraser.
H. R. 1731. John Bishop.
H. R. 1756. Ann Brooks.
H. R. 1758. James H. Thomas.
H. R. 1759. Robert Smith.
H. R. 1835. Edward O'Flaherty.
H. R. 1871. Henry H. Aye.
H. R. 1897. Joseph T. Earl.
H. R. 1899. Richard L. Rusk.
H. R. 1909. John T. Bradfield.
H. R. 1913. Edward A. Lane.
H. R. 1916. George Dempsey.
H. R. 1917. William A. Huffine.
H. R. 1924. Samuel L. Ensminger.
H. R. 1951. Smith J. Dutton.
H. R. 1978. Richard Blackburn.
H. R. 1979. George A. Hitchcock.
H. R. 1997. Morgan A. Harris.
H. R. 2000. Darwin H. Hamilton.
H. R. 2004. Henry Seebers.
H. R. 2006. Edward Boehmler.
H. R. 2008. John D. Caswell.
H. R. 2011. James H. Porcupile.
H. R. 2386. Nason B. Cunningham.
H. R. 2388. Georgianna L. Smith.
H. R. 2451. David G. Bliss.
H. R. 2475. John A. Vermeulen.
H. R. 2750. Henry C. Graham.
H. R. 2752. Caroline Deibert.
H. R. 2818. Mary A. Adams.
H. R. 2820. George S. Tillson.
H. R. 2984. William C. Stuart.
H. R. 2992. Andrew Ready.
H. R. 2995. Ella Thatcher.
H. R. 2996. Louisa Sheldon.
H. R. 2997. Albert H. Cleaveland.
H. R. 3072. Anne E. McGrew.
H. R. 3073. Elizabeth G. Young.
H. R. 3233. George W. Bagley.
H. R. 3273. William Burgess.
H. R. 3507. Archibald T. Lea.
H. R. 3512. Soren V. Kalsem.
H. R. 3526. Jane Cory.
H. R. 3558. Oliver Orn.
H. R. 3774. James H. Nale.
H. R. 3796. James Gagan, alias James Dillon.
H. R. 3813. John Purkapile.
H. R. 3826. Hannah Lovell.
H. R. 3830. Wesley A. Taylor.
H. R. 3831. Peter R. Sines.
H. R. 3832. Harvey Stultz.
H. R. 3972. John L. Race.
H. R. 3975. Sidney S. Canter.
H. R. 4031. Seymour Norman.
H. R. 4213. Matthew M. Eshelman.
H. R. 4223. Uriah J. Favorite.
H. R. 4326. Elizabeth A. Queen.
H. R. 4331. William Alligee.
H. R. 4332. John I. Amy.
H. R. 4334. William T. Ritchison.
H. R. 4335. George W. Lampkins.
H. R. 4338. Burnetta Dayton.
H. R. 4340. James W. Davis.
H. R. 4351. William Schooley.
H. R. 4376. Joseph H. Woolaston.
H. R. 4560. John Reis.
H. R. 4569. Erasmus B. Manahan.
H. R. 4736. John McCormick.
H. R. 4915. John A. Johnson.
H. R. 4963. John L. Clifton.
H. R. 5188. Levi H. Brown.
H. R. 5241. Ferdinand W. Merrill.
H. R. 5313. George W. Disbrow.
H. R. 5323. George T. Totman.
H. R. 5352. Levi W. Easton.
H. R. 5470. Scott Lone.
H. R. 5558. Margaret Donahue.
H. R. 5601. Leonora Stewart.
H. R. 5789. Thomas J. Cartwright.
H. R. 5791. Henry Clark.
H. R. 5794. Charles E. Hall.
H. R. 5797. Henry Rader.
H. R. 5801. Samuel Fetters.
H. R. 5857. Mary E. Fry.
H. R. 5973. John W. Whitbeck.
H. R. 6128. Mary E. Cutts.
H. R. 8244. Jacob L. Helms.

The following amendments were severally offered, severally considered, and severally agreed to:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "Rose" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Ross."

Page 17, strike out the following:

"The name of John McCormick, late of Company E, Sixty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will state that, in the case of John McCormick, the beneficiary is dead.

Page 20, line 21, after the name "Stewart," insert the words "widow of Joseph H. Stewart."

Page 22, line 11, strike out "$12" and insert "$20."

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state the reason for striking out "$12" and inserting "$20"?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. The $12 is an error in the print.

Mr. WALSH. The usual amount is $20?

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. In such cases; yes. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FULLER of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers

and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, I desire to make an arrangement, if we can, as to time.

Mr. SIMS. How much time does the gentleman think would be proper on this bill?

Mr. ESCH. I have demands for one hour.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman use one hour?

Mr. ESCH. I think I shall need the whole hour.

Mr. SIMS. I will be glad to have the same amount, although I may not use all of it.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by myself and the other hour by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that general debate be confined to two hours, one hour to be controlled by himself and the other by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman to go into the reading of the bill to-night if this request prevails?

Mr. ESCH. Our intention is to read possibly the first section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3184.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, owing to the fact that there have been extensive hearings on this water-power bill within the year, and the further fact that there was a very long consideration of the bill in the House under the five-minute rule a little over seven months ago, I do not feel that it is necessary to go into an extensive explanation of the bill. Under the five-minute rule I hope there will be opportunity to explain any sections of the bill to the satisfaction of all Members of the House.

I wish to impress upon the House the necessity of prompt action in connection with this very important legislation. If we had had this legislation six or eight years ago, we would have been in an entirely different situation when we entered the war. One of the great needs of the war, one of the great shortages of the war, was the matter of power; had the situation been such as might have been possible under the bills which have heretofore been passed in this House, we would not have suffered from that shortage as we did and we would have had greater production. I hope the time is near at hand when the repeated efforts of the House of Representatives to secure adequate water-power legislation may bear fruit, and that there soon may be placed upon the statute books this important legislation.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I heartily concur in everything our chairman has said. I expect later on to use some little time in reference to a general explanation of the bill, but for the present I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I will only refer to one section of this bill in the few remarks I shall have to make, and that is to section 21. That section provides that when the licensee is a municipal corporation, or a political subdivision of a State, or a public-service agent of a State, or a public utility or service corporation, and can not acquire by contract or pledges the right to use or damage the land or property of others, then it shall have the right to go into the United States district court and condemn under the right of eminent domain. Now, I think that should be limited as to the amount claimed by the man whose property is being condemned. The United States district court is limited in its jurisdiction to all cases exceeding $3,000, but you take a man with a 50-acre tract of land worth $1,000 and they propose to condemn it and take him into the United States court, probably 200 miles from home, with his lawyers and his witnesses. It is a hardship which would make a practical confiscation of small holdings of land, and therefore the same rule which applies as to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States as to amount should apply here as to the amount claimed by the man whose property is being condemned. Now, that amendment, if the committee will consider and offer it, will make that section satisfactory to me. That is all I care to say at this time about the bill. Unless they do so, I shall offer that amendment that it shall apply when the claim made by the owner exceeds $3,000.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLACK. I was wondering what reason there would be for the Federal court to confer on any municipality or subdivision of a State the right of eminent domain as to property within its own State. What good reason can there be for that provision?

Mr. STEVENSON. I am just calling attention to the limitation which certainly should be put on it.

Mr. BLACK. I appreciate the limitation the gentleman has in mind, and the thought occurs to me that unless the State itself will confer on the municipality or subdivision of a State the right of eminent domain it is very doubtful as to whether the Federal Government ought to come in and do it.

Mr. STEVENSON. I appreciate that position but will not discuss it at the present time.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; for a question.

Mr. KINKAID. This places the jurisdiction in the State court when not in the Federal court——

Mr. STEVENSON. This section puts it in the State court as well. They can refer it either to the State court or the Federal court, under the section which I have cited, and I desire to limit them so that they will not go into the Federal and can not go into the Federal court unless there is at least $3,000 involved, according to the claims of the man whose property is to be condemned.

Mr. KINKAID. My view concurs with that of the gentleman. I did not understand the section.

Mr. STEVENSON. I think everybody will see the reasonableness of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire for a few minutes to review the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] on June 19, page 1408 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He challenges the statement of the Secretary of State that there is no precedent for the demand, made by the Senate, on the President for a partially completed treaty to be laid before it. He cites certain instances where the President has consulted the Senate during the course of the negotiations, but these instances were the voluntary act of the President, and not yielding by him to the attempted coercive action of the Senate. Let us look at the cases cited:

First, the Mexican treaty. (Ex. Jour. XII, p. 122.) Report of Charles Sumner, chairman Foreign Relations Committee: "In a dispatch dated at Mexico June 29, 1861, Mr. Corwin inclosed to Mr. Seward the project of a treaty between the United States and Mexico by which the United States was to lend to Mexico $5,000,000." Page 123, the President, by his message of December 17, 1861, submitted the draft of this treaty to the Senate for their advice; afterwards by another message, of January 24, 1862, he called their attention to it in the following language: "Have therefore submitted to the Senate a request for its advice upon the question pending by treaty for making a loan to Mexico which Mr. Corwin thinks will in any case be expedient."

So it was pending by treaty negotiated by Mr. Corwin, then in Mexico, and was amended by the Senate. It was also a financial matter ultimately to be submitted to Congress, whose action was necessary to complete it. But the President submitted it. The Senate did not call for it.

Second. As to the convention with the Dominican Republic, the President's message says (Ex. Jour., Vol. XVI, p. 163): "The advice and consent of the Senate to the transfer, upon the terms proposed in the draft of a convention with the Dominican Republic, are requested."

Evidently the convention had been agreed on between our representatives and the Republic. The agreement was not being remodeled and changed overnight, but was a convention awaiting ratification.

Third. The reciprocity treaty with Great Britain and Canada (Ex. Jour., p. 355, Vol. XIX) Gen. Grant's message opens: "The plenipotentiary of Her Britanic Majesty at Washington has submitted to the Secretary of State for my consideration a draft of a treaty for the reciprocal regulation of the commerce and trade between the United States and Canada, etc." and he asks that the Senate give its consent "in such form as is proposed by the British plenipotentiary or in such other more acceptable form as the Senate may prefer."

It was a treaty already agreed on by the other power and satisfactory to the Government, subject to approval by the Senate. It was discussed and rejected with closed doors, and

in all respects treated as a treaty. The RECORD, page 502, volume 19, states at the end of the vote: "The doors were opened." So these cases were all on practically completed treaties.

Fourth. President Polk, in 1846, sent an incomplete proposed treaty to the Senate. It advised that it be concluded, and it was so concluded and ratified again. Evidently all it lacked were the signatures, as it was concluded as approved by the Senate, and certainly no material change in the text was made after a senatorial approval, or it would have failed of ratification. A treaty reduced to form is concluded by the signatures of the high contracting parties. So the cases cited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] seem to all be cases where the treaty was agreed on but not concluded and the advice of the Senate was voluntarily sought by the President, except those early cases by Washington. Three of these cases are cited, two of attempted treaties with Indians and one with the Regent of Algiers. Washington and Jefferson construed the Constitution to mean that the Senate's advice and consent were to be taken pari passu with the negotiations, but in these cases it was proved so impracticable that he abandoned it, and when he nominated Jay to negotiate the treaty with Great Britain he declined to give even the subjects of negotiation, though there was an unsuccessful attempt on the part of some of the Senators to get the information. The author, Crandall, "Treaties, their making and enforcement," says, at page 59:

These first attempts of the Executive to follow out the evident intention of the provisions of the Constitution in consulting the Senate prior to the opening of the negotiations have been followed only in exceptional instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. Can I have three minutes more?

Mr. SIMS. I will yield the gentleman such time as to enable him to finish his remarks.

Mr. STEVENSON. The Jay treaty was the first treaty with any foreign power, and Marion Mills Miller, the editor of The Life and Works of Abraham Lincoln, in volume 2 of Great American Debates, page 33, says as to the former attempted treaties, cited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE]:

The President had in person attended the Senate and requested their advice as to the terms he was about to propose. In this mode of proceeding serious difficulties had arisen, and on reconsideration it has been deemed most consistent with the Constitution not to consult the Senate in a formal manner until a treaty had actually been made. The Senate, therefore, in this instance was not previously consulted by the President as to the terms of a treaty with Great Britain. This has ever since been considered the true construction of the Constitution, and the course then adopted has been invariably pursued.

Hence the precedent established by Washington was by him overturned, and therefore is no longer a precedent. But this is not a parallel case to those cited even if they were conclusive and binding. Here the Senate undertakes to break into the negotiations and require the President to lay before it an imperfect and uncompleted draft of a proposed treaty for its consent and advice. No such case has heretofore arisen, and those cited are not in point. The President there voluntarily sought the counsel of the Senate. Here the Senate attempts to project itself into the negotiation prematurely, and the President and the Secretary of State say it is premature and without precedent and that is correct.

The nearest to a precedent that exists is in the case of the Jay treaty referred to heretofore, when the House of Representatives, as a condition to making the appropriations to carry out the treaty, passed a resolution calling on Washington for all papers and instructions in the hands of Jay while negotiating with England, except such of said papers "as an existing negotiation may render improper to be disclosed." Washington in a dignified but stern answer refused to comply with this demand, which he evidently deemed impertinent and offensive. In his reply, found in volume 5 of Marshall's Life of Washington, page 655, he makes the following significant statement:

The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion, a full disclosure of all measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic; for this might have a pernicious influence on future negotiations or produce immediate inconveniences, perhaps danger and mischief, to other persons. To admit then a right in the House of Representatives to demand and to have as a matter of course all papers respecting a negotiation with a foreign power would be to establish a dangerous precedent.

These words were followed by vituperation of unparalleled bitterness and public threats of impeachment, as stated by Marshall, which probably exceeded anything yet accorded Woodrow Wilson, and he conducted himself in the same dignified way, with the consciousness of the righteousness of his cause. This was the nearest to a precedent for the Senate's demand found in our records, and the reply of Washington justified and sustained the reply of Wilson.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. The time of the gentleman has expired. How much time did the gentleman use?

The CHAIRMAN. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. ESCH. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota——

Mr. SIMS. I understood the gentleman was to speak about something not pertaining to the bill, and I think we had better keep as close to the subject matter of the bill as we can.

Mr. ESCH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am very sorry that we have so few Members of the House present. I would like very much to discuss the question I have arisen to speak about while a good House membership was here. On page 16 of the bill, beginning in line 17 and ending in line 21, there is a proviso as follows:

Provided, That licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge to the extent such power is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes.

It so happens that the State of Illinois has voted $20,000,000 out of its public treasury to build a waterway and incidentally to create water power. They began to construct this waterway sometime ago. They are now at work. The legislature has enacted a law which has the sanction of the War Department, and in that law it is provided that the State shall not only maintain the channel which it constructs at its own expense but it shall also maintain the dams and the locks which are constructed in connection with the waterway. The waterway itself is to be open to navigation free, as navigable waters are, but I want to remind the House membership that the State of Illinois is expending the money to construct this waterway. Now, of course, in the construction of the waterway and the building of dams there will be more or less water power developed, and this water power will be later used to light the streets of cities along the line of the waterway up to and including Chicago. There may be more water power than will be needed for the lighting of the streets of those municipalities, in which case, of course, the State will want and should have the right to sell it for industrial purposes, but this bill provides that if the State should by any chance have a surplus of power which is sold for industrial purposes the Government of the United States shall levy a tax upon the State.

I maintain that the Government of the United States ought not to have the power to levy a tax upon a State. That is the first proposition. Then I maintain that if the State, out of its own treasury, has opened navigation to the travel of the public from any of the States, anywhere, that State has been a public benefactor, and if by any chance after the expenditure of its money it has created a source of revenue from the sale of power, it ought to be entitled to the revenue from that source without paying a tax to the Government of the United States.

But it will be said, perhaps, in reply that it might establish a bad precedent to permit the States to compete with private enterprise in the sale of power; and it might be able to sell power for less than private individuals or corporations could, and thereby it might be able to reduce the cost of the power sold to the consumer, which would not be a very bad proposition if it should happen to be so. But even assuming it is not able to sell the power for less or that it would not sell for less, even assuming that it would sell for more, surely the Government of the United States ought not to be permitted to take such revenue as the State could derive from this source out of the State's treasury and thereby compel the State to increase the taxes against its people for the maintenance of the government of the State. Now, the Member of Congress from Illinois proposes to try to strike out the language on lines 20 and 21, page 16, to the extent that such power is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes and that would then permit the State to use it not only for State or municipal purposes but also for industrial purposes.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. The gentleman from Illinois said that this waterway is in process of construction and has already been commenced. Is the waterway as being constructed using a navigable stream?

Mr. MADDEN. Part of the way it is and part of the way we dig it through the solid rock, connecting it along the side of a river which is said to be navigable but which, in fact, is not. But the navigability will be complete when we connect the waters of the two rivers.

Mr. DEWALT. Does it use any portion of the lake water?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; water comes through from the lake and will in any case whether we build a waterway or not.

Mr. DEWALT. I presume the gentleman will also appreciate the fact that the United States Government has control of all the navigable streams as well as the water in the lake?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. DEWALT. Does the gentleman contend the United States Government should not receive revenue, in view of that fact?

Mr. MADDEN. I certainly do, because the United States Government is not expending a dollar in connection with the development of the waterway, and without the expenditure of millions of dollars by the State there will be no navigation. Now, then, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania contend that, because the State of Illinois is willing to expend this money for the accommodation of the public from every State that may wish to ship through the waterway created, that because of its generosity in doing this thereby the Government of the United States should be enabled and ought to be permitted to levy a tax against the State?

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I thoroughly sympathize with all the gentleman has been saying; and as a member of the Water Power Committee I was opposed to putting any limitation at all—I mean anything in the way of a charge—on the power created by the investment of a State or municipality, regardless of whether it was all used for municipal purposes or not. But we finally passed the bill without providing for either minimum or maximum charge, and exempted the States or municipalities from any charge whatever on the power used for State or municipal purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand about that.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask whether the gentleman feels that we should require the commission to put, say, 1 cent, or some other nominal charge, on power produced by a State or municipality?

Mr. MADDEN. From the financial standpoint that would not make any difference whatever to the State; but I think the principle involved is of more importance than the money involved. I do not believe that the power ought to be legislated to the Government to tax the State where the State itself expends the money to develop the means of navigation.

Mr. SIMS. Or municipality?

Mr. MADDEN. Or municipality. Of course, I will say this, that I believe it is altogether likely that all the power developed by the construction of this waterway will be used for municipal lighting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman from Tennessee has some unallotted time. Will he give the gentleman from Illinois five minutes? I have all my time allotted.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman is confining himself to the bill, and I feel justified in yielding him five minutes. And in this connection I would like to say that I did my best to have the bill reported, as the gentleman now proposes, and also the definition; but the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] proposed an amendment to the definition which I thought pretty liberal and better than the bill, and I yielded.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. HICKS. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman's contention, but I would like to ask him this: The original river there, as I understand, flowed into the lake, and now you have changed the source and it is flowing out of the lake?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all. This river is so far away from the lake that it never could find its way to the lake. The current runs the other way.

Mr. HICKS. Did it ever run into the lake?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Is it not a fact that the excess that would be obtained by reason of this canal, to be sold to other than municipalities, would not take any more away from the lake than before?

Mr. MADDEN. It does not make any difference as to what power we develop; it will not make any difference as to the flow from the lake. All the water that is being taken from the lake is being taken under an agreement with the Secretary of War. That agreement will continue until it is changed.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but I do not want the gentleman to take up too much time.

Mr. DEWALT. Only to ask a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well.

Mr. DEWALT. If this provision were stricken out, would the municipalities or States be permitted to engage in the sale of power?

Mr. MADDEN. The States would be permitted to engage in the sale of power to the extent that they are entitled to do it now under this law.

Mr. DEWALT. It would not extend the privilege further?

Mr. MADDEN. Not a bit. So far as I am concerned, if this language could be stricken out of the bill I would be willing to amend the language in some way so that it would be effective, say "the use of such power by said State or municipality where the primary purpose is navigation."

That is the primary purpose in constructing this waterway, and the incidental purpose connected with it is the development of power. You can not help but develop power in connection with the construction. Gen. Black, of the Army Engineers, insisted that in the enactment of the law by the Legislature of the State of Illinois it should be provided that the waterway should be maintained at the expense of the State, the locks should be maintained at the expense of the State, and the dams should be maintained at the expense of the State, so that there never will be any expense saddled onto the Federal Government. And in the face of this, with the vast expenditure that the State is now making, surely it is not unreasonable to ask that the Congress of the United States shall permit the State, if it has any surplus power as the result of its expenditure, to use the surplus power.

What do you want to do? Let it flow over the dam, and not be used at all? Or would you rather tax the State than let it use the power? If by any chance the city of Chicago develops to twice the population it has now—and I look for that at no very distant day—they will use more power than the State can make. All the municipalities intervening may use the power, as they are using it now; we may not have any surplus. But if we have any, we ought to be able to use it for the development of the industries of America and of the State, and surely the Government of the United States would not say that it insisted on putting its hands into the treasury of the State of Illinois and taking out what the State put in as the result of its investment. Surely it will not say to the State of Illinois, "You can not develop your industries. If you insist upon the development of your industries after you have spent your own money, you will have to pay the Government of the United States a tax for the privilege."

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOREMUS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether the effect of his amendment would be to encourage the development of water power by the State?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it would; and if there is anything that ought to be encouraged by the States that is it.

Mr. DOREMUS. I agree with you.

Mr. MADDEN. Then you will have added to the transportation facilities of the United States and to the development of the industrial institutions of the United States by giving them cheaper power than they can now obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I am very sorry, but I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his courtesy.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I rather hesitate even to express my opinions on this great question of water power and water transportation, particularly when these opinions that I may have do not harmonize entirely with those of the caliber of men that are sponsoring this proposition.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], the chairman of this committee, made the statement that there was need for hurry, if I correctly understood him, in getting this bill through Congress, as it has been before the Congress for a period of years. I should like to call the attention of this Congress and particularly the attention of the new Members of this Congress, as I am one of those, to this fact, that it does not make any difference whether the Congress had consideration

of this water-power bill for 5 years or 50 years. We, as the new Members of Congress, have had no opportunity to investigate it, and I, for one, would like to hear it, by its advocates and those opposed to it, thoroughly and clearly and unlimitedly discussed.

I do not mind saying to this House that I am not in favor of omnibus bills of any kind, and I can not conceive of this being anything other than an omnibus bill. If I get the right interpretation of it, it turns over the control absolutely of all water power and every bit of navigable water there is in the United States under the direct and absolute control of three men, with a few provisions and limitations added thereto.

I want to direct the attention of this Congress to this fact: If I have made a correct interpretation of the law as it is offered in this bill, the rights of the States to develop their water power are abrogated until after they get their permission from these three commissioners, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior. And I should like to direct the attention of my new fellow colleagues to this fact, that this commission is probably unique in this respect. Being made up, as it is, of three of the Cabinet members, it is of necessity a partisan commission.

It does not have a tenure of office as long even as that of the President of the United States, as evidenced by our present Secretary of War. He has occupied that position only a short time, and, so far as anyone knows, he may resign and relinquish his duties, when in will come a new man to assume this responsibility.

I want to call attention to another feature of this bill to which I strenuously object. That is the time limit for which a license may be granted to an individual or corporation. It says "not to exceed 50 years." As I interpret that, 90 per cent, if not all, the licenses will be granted for a period of 50 years. We have a number of great cities on the lakes. I want to present to you a problem that I see confronting those cities if this bill goes through. The chairman of the committee [Mr. ESCH] said that power was one of the things that we needed in the war. I grant all that, and I am in favor of developing the water power of this country so far as it is possible. But power was not the only thing of which the United States found herself short. Transportation was another line of endeavor that the Government was compelled to take hold of; and according to the figures that have been produced before this Congress since this session began, while some men differ as to the amount, all agree that the loss to this Government runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars because the transportation facilities of this country were not adequate to meet the emergency. If this bill goes through, with this power granted to this commission to license a corporation for 50 years, a permit may be granted to the Niagara Power Co. at Niagara Falls to utilize all the water that may be diverted from the Falls under our treaty rights with Canada, which, if I am not mistaken, is 20,000 cubic feet per second, or thereabouts. Let us see where we are putting the people of the West, who must seek an outlet for their products through that channel if they go by water.

If that privilege is granted to the Niagara Power Co. without any restrictions other than those that are carried in this bill, for a period of 50 years, suppose that the cities on Lake Michigan, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario see that it is to their commercial advantage to get an outlet from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario by digging a wider and deeper canal—and may I say, in passing, that there is a movement on foot to-day on the part of a number of the Lake cities to do that very thing, to make it possible to load boats at the inland ports and unload them in the ports of the world, a thing that has not been done up to date with any great success. If this grant is given to the Niagara Power Co., or any power company—I only use the Niagara Power Co. as an illustration, because they are there, and in all probability will stay there, and we want them to stay there—if we give them a grant to utilize the power of all the water that can be diverted for any purpose under our treaty rights, how could we get a canal big enough to take ocean-going vessels from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario without going first to Canada and getting a new treaty granting us permission to divert more water than we are privileged to divert under the present treaty? If we go to Canada and ask for that treaty they may say, "You can use our canal"; and I have been informed that there is a movement on foot in the Canadian Government at the present time to deepen and widen the Welland Canal. That would furnish us access around the Falls and from lake to lake if we wanted to subject ourselves to the control of a canal in another country. Now, I believe that is bad policy. I believe it is bad business for this Congress to go on record as favoring the centralizing of the control of all the water power and all the navigation in this United States Government in any commission composed of any three men of any political party in this country. I believe it is wrong. I am averse and opposed to granting to any corporation a 50-year franchise for the use of a commodity with the privilege of a renewal, which makes a thing almost a perpetuity.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I was hardly able to understand just the line of reasoning on this question. I do not understand why the granting of this license would prevent the construction of a canal. I do not know the situation there, and I am asking for information.

Mr. BEGG. I will try to answer the gentleman to the best of my knowledge. If I understand our treaty rights with Canada correctly, we are privileged to divert approximately 20,000 cubic feet per second from going over the Falls. If you grant me the privilege of utilizing all that water for the purpose of making hydroelectric power, how are you going to get any of that water for the purpose of filling a canal for transportation purposes?

Mr. DENISON. If we should build a canal, we would have to go to Canada anyway to get permission, would we not?

Mr. BEGG. I will say frankly that I can not answer the gentleman whether we would or not. If we built an all-American canal, it is possible that we would not have to do that.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. How much water would be diverted for us in the locks of this canal? It would be a very small amount, would it not?

Mr. BEGG. If we were entitled to use 20,000 cubic feet per second, that does not mean 21,000 cubic feet, and I doubt if Canada would consent to our using enough to fill the locks one day if we were using the maximum amount of water which we are allowed to divert. That is one thing I think ought to be safeguarded.

I am not averse to granting power to corporations or individuals to develop hydroelectric power. I am in favor of it, but I am also anxious that this Congress, the men who have been here for years and know how to do these things, see to it that we make no mistake—I am anxious that these men investigate and find out if we are compelling the people of the West who may want canal rights to go to any power company and buy enough water to get them through. That is the thing I want to safeguard. I think that can be safeguarded. I think a 50-year franchise, in the face of the development that this country has made in things material in the past 50 or 100 years, is entirely too long a time to give to any one individual or corporation to have exclusive control over any particular commodity.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Has the gentleman read the testimony before the Water Power Committee as to the financing of water-power development?

Mr. BEGG. I am frank to say that I have not read it all. I tried to get through all I could. I did not know that this bill was coming up until yesterday, and being a new man it takes me some time to know how to get at these things. I may be wrong in my supposition. If I am wrong in that, there is one thing that I know I am right in, and that is in calling the attention of the House to these very things that we are supposing may be there. I read the bill through carefully two or three times. I can not discover any safeguard against that very condition which I have depicted might arise. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to calling the attention of the committee to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois is to strike out, on page 16 of the bill, line 20, the following words:

To the extent such power is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes.

That would make the proviso read as follows:

Provided, That licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge.

I do not know what the disposition of the gentlemen of the committee is in reference to any such proposed amendment. I was not a member of that joint committee, nor have I consulted any of them in regard to their wishes or thought in reference to this particular matter.

Let us see what striking out these words would actually result in. I concur in the sentiment expressed by the gentleman

from Illinois, and also that expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, that the striking out of these words would lead to a larger development of water power. In other words, that States or municipalities which received this privilege without paying therefor would naturally be inclined to go into the business, and so far as that thought is concerned I concur with it. I also concur in the thought expressed in the language of the bill, that when the power is to be used by a State or municipality for State or municipal purposes exclusively they should not pay any license. But I do strongly object, upon economic reasons, that these words should be stricken; and I think the committee ought to insist on the provisions of the bill as now written, and for the same reasons—that privileges granted to States or municipalities which go into the business and furnish power to private parties should pay for the license. Why?

In the first place, you are against monopoly if you are against anything which is undemocratic, and not republican either. In the second place, you do not believe in paternalism of government if you are basically right according to our idea of government. Therefore, when these two propositions are settled you ought to be against public ownership of private utilities or utilities of this kind. By striking out these words you would allow any State or any municipality to use the water power for purposes of generating power and selling it to individuals, thus competing with people or corporations who have invested money in similar enterprises throughout the States and Territories in which you live. You would destroy private enterprise by State monopoly. It may be that in this particular instance cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] this is very necessary in regard to that particular locality, but I am not confining my remarks to a criticism respecting the wants of that particular locality. I am trying to reason out the question upon the broad lines that it applies not only to Illinois, not only to Chicago, but to the whole Union. Every State in the Union and every municipality in every State might be privileged, if you strike out those words, to go into the enterprise of selling power and thus destroy the industries that are already established and have their capital in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, in the next place there is another basic statement which is a proposition of law, which I think no one will refute. Municipalities are, in the first instance—and I emphasize the words "first instance"—not permitted by their charters, nor are they permitted by the laws of the State under which they exist, to engage in the private enterprise of selling power or any other commodity of this kind to the general public.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In the particular instance that the gentleman is referring to now the municipality would have nothing more to do with the use of the power than to take it from the State and utilize it. This does not give them the power to sell it or manufacture or create it in any way. It simply says that the State of Illinois—if that is the State to which we refer—shall be taxed if by any chance it should happen to use the power for any purpose except municipal or State purposes.

Mr. DEWALT. Yes; but the wording is—

That licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge—

And so forth.

Enjoyed how? If you agree with my proposition that municipalities, in the first instance, are not permitted to engage in selling power or any similar commodity to private individuals outside of their corporate limits and for municipal purposes, then I say that there will be no harm in this. But the gentleman's argument was, as I understood it—and if I am wrong I wish him to correct me—that they might sell the surplus of power, to wit, the State might sell the surplus of power to anyone anywhere. That is the very thing that, in my judgment, ought to be avoided. Why? Because in this very bill on the same page, to wit, page 16, line 9, we find this:

That the licensee shall pay to the United States reasonable annual charges in an amount to be fixed by the commission.

That is true, whether the licensee be a State, a municipality, or a corporation. I ask, then, what harm could there be in paying for the license? It is not a tax; it is a reasonable payment for a privilege.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I largely agree with the gentleman's proposition of law, and I largely agree with him in regard to leaving these words in; but what we want to do in order to protect the particular case in mind is to either strike them out or add other words that will not allow the Government to tax the State of Illinois in this particular case. In this connection I will say that we have amended the constitution of the State of Illinois for the express purpose of permitting the State to expend this money and operate these power plants for that purpose.

Mr. DEWALT. I grant the gentleman that there may be particular features in this particular case which would possibly modify the thought that I have in mind, but I am not trying to reason this matter from that particular case nor by the confines of that State. I am trying to meet the broad, general proposition that there should be a license granted to the authorities for the manufacture or the control of this power, and when this bill says that the charge for that license shall be an amount to be fixed by the commission, and that it shall be a reasonable annual charge, you have the provision in the bill that the commission itself may fix the charge, and if they want to make it 1 cent for the State of Illinois under these peculiar circumstances, they have the privilege of so doing, and if the circumstances in this particular instance are of such a particular and peculiar character that they appeal to the reason of the commission, I have no doubt that it would be granted. To make it a general proposition, however, that every State and every municipality in every State should be granted a license without charge I think is absurd upon the face of it, and that would be the effect of striking out these words, as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I listened with much interest to the very eloquent speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. He started by saying that he agreed with the chairman of the committee that it was important that we should have water-power legislation, and he said that the chairman of the committee has urged that that was one of the crying needs during the war, but he said that while that was a necessity it was not the only necessity, that there are many lines that broke down during the war that were of equal importance, and he called attention to the transportation problem. Why, does not the gentleman realize that the power problem is indissolubly and intimately connected with the transportation problem and that the very instant that you solve the power problem you have solved the transportation problem? Does not the gentleman realize that in this country of ours we have 60,000,000 horsepower of primary power and 200,000,000 of secondary power? Does he realize that we are only using 6,000,000 of this horsepower and that we are devoting the transportation facilities of the country to the carrying of coal to the manufacturing industries throughout the country and that the instant you utilize the water power you solve the fuel question and you have solved the transportation question as well? It will not be necessary to carry this fuel to the manufacturing plants and in that way you relieve the railroads from that burden, and the instant you relieve the railroads from that burden you make it possible for your railroad lines to carry fuel to warm the homes and do the other things that can be done with fuel. So the two things are not in opposition; the two things are united and one, and when you have solved, as this bill will solve, the transportation problem by putting all this water power at work, you have solved the fuel problem and you have added to the wealth of the country.

And then the gentleman said that we want to beware because of the fact that we are going to tie up the transportation facilities of the country in another way—we are going to make it impossible to build a canal connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. Well, now, as I understand the treaty between Canada and the United States, there are expressly excepted from the operation of that treaty canals and municipal and sanitary uses of the water. That you can use water ad libitum for those three purposes, but you can not use for direct power purposes in excess of 56,000 cubic feet per second. The limitation is, as I understand, as to the use of water for power purposes. The limitation is not upon canal purposes or sanitary purposes or municipal purposes. The gentleman next said that we are going to send vessels down from the lakes to the ocean. Why, that question has been considered in the last Congress. It was considered before the various committees and we investigated that question and we found this: We found that when you come to construct vessels you find them of three kinds. You find first the barge, and you call that factor 2; you find next

the lake-going vessel, and you call that factor 4; you find, third, the ocean-going vessel, and you call that factor 6, and when you have taken those three factors and applied them to actual use you find that those figures measure the relative costs of construction of these three kinds of vessels, and you find the difference in cost and the difference in maintenance is so great between these different kinds of vessels that from a practical standpoint it has been found economically absolutely impossible to use a lake-going vessel for barge purposes, or a seagoing vessel for lake-going purposes, much less for barge purposes. That is illustrated in a very practical way. Go down to the city of New York to-day and you will find that the great Hudson River has been made an ocean-going stream for 125 miles above the metropolis, and the great vessels that go upon the ocean can go up that river, but they do not go above the city of New York. Why? Because the difference in cost of construction and maintenance is so large that it has been found absolutely and utterly impossible. So the dream of a vessel which shall start at Duluth and end in Liverpool is an absolutely impossible dream from an economic standpoint.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield there for a short question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Surely.

Mr. PLATT. The last time I was at my home in Poughkeepsie, which is 75 miles above New York, on the Hudson River, I saw an ocean ship there unloading lumber from Australia or somewhere on the Pacific.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say that Gen. Taylor, who is, perhaps, the leading authority in the United States, says as a practical question they have tried that out, and that you can not get them to go above the city of New York.

Mr. PLATT. That is an exaggeration, for ships go to Yonkers all the while with sugar.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We have in this House a gentleman who is connected with the ocean-going trade, and who has been connected with commerce all his life and has made a practical success of it, and who knows it from a practical standpoint. He was present at this hearing, and he said that what was related by this authority accorded absolutely and in detail with his practical experience of a lifetime, with his observation upon the Hudson and from the city of New York.

Mr. PLATT. I will say to the gentleman that that is, generally speaking, true, but ships do go up every year on the Hudson, a considerable number of them.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I say that they can go and do not go, and I am contrasting the fact that they can go with the fact that they do not go, and I point to the reason why when they can go they do not go, and I say that the reason is an economic one, and it relates to the condition in overhead arising out of the cost of construction and the cost of maintenance.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman know that there was cleared from the Chicago Harbor this year a vessel loaded for Liverpool?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not say that there are not freaks; I do not say that there are not white elephants; I do not say there are not solitary exceptions to every rule. All I do say is that experience and observation of both engineers and practical men concur in what I have told you.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, the gentleman realizes, and this gentlemen must realize, that at this time it is possible to load a boat at Chicago and send it down to New York, due to the fact that freights are about four times as high as before and commodities about two or three times as high.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me tell you how this question arose. It came in this way: A Senator at the other end of the Capitol introduced into the Senate a resolution for the cooperation of the United States with Canada for the use of the Canadian canals——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman give me a minute or two?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, my time is allotted. I do not know whether the gentleman from Tennessee can give the gentleman a minute or two or not.

Mr. SIMS. Some of the gentlemen to whom I have promised time are not here. I do not want to use up all my time, but I will give the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The State of New York having expended, as that great Empire State has, an enormous sum of money, all of us were interested in preserving the usefulness of that great inland waterway, the Erie Canal, and we began to investigate the question. As a result, we found what I have told you.

Now, let me tell the gentleman something that is practical, something that is being contemplated, something that is likely to come in the very near future. There is at present in contemplation and under way—and there probably would have been negotiated before this day but for the necessity of settling immediately certain other questions—a new treaty with Canada for the diversion of additional water from the Niagara River; and it is contemplated by the War Department that that additional water shall be used not alone to generate power but shall be used as well for canal purposes. And the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army has told me personally that that canal would not be justified for canal purposes only, but that connected with power, as it will be, it will be justified, and that it is certain to come.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. BEGG. Does not that statement you make right there justify all that I have said?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not see how it justifies anything that you have said. You have said, first, that transportation would suffer if we passed this bill; and I say to you, first, that you are entirely wrong about that in that it will solve the transportation problem. You said, second, that we were going to send ships from Duluth over to Liverpool, and I say to you that the observation of practical men shows that never will be done.

Mr. BEGG. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I did not say what he says I said. I know he wants to quote me correctly. I put the statement I made as a supposition.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I say to you, next, that the treaty with Canada does not exclude canal purposes. As I understand it, it includes them, and you have the right to-day to build your canal. And I say, next, you have to have some way to execute these powers; you have to have some one in whom to repose the execution of the powers granted by a bill of this kind. Whom can you choose who would be better, whom can you choose who would administer this law more wisely, than the heads of three great departments? The committee has found itself unable to make any better choice. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wanted to say a few words in connection with what was stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] and also what was stated by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. On page 16 the bill contains a proviso to the effect that "licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge." Then there are added the words, "to the extent such power is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] argued that that proviso, inasmuch as it was limiting the right of free power for municipalities and States to cases where it is used only for municipal purposes, ought not to be stricken out, because he said he does not believe in the principle of allowing municipalities or States to use this power and sell it to private persons and thereby make a profit.

Now, with that proposition I agree, but he went ahead and used an argument that fully answered his first argument, and that was that municipal authorities have not the constitutional right, as a matter of law, to sell power for private purposes. I stated on the floor awhile ago, while he was speaking, that I agreed with him on that principle; he effectively answered his own argument, and that is a reason why this exception should not be in the bill, because it would only apply to cases like the State of Illinois, where the State can develop and sell the power to private parties by constitutional amendment.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DEWALT. The faultiness of the gentleman's argument lies in this, that immediately after the passage of this bill, should it become a law, your State might then pass a law permitting your municipalities to engage in the sale of this very product.

Mr. DENISON. But, as a rule, States can not do that without amending their constitutions. If there is a probability that that might be the result, for that reason I might agree with

the gentleman from Pennsylvania that those words should not be stricken out of the bill. The State of Illinois is not interested especially in striking them out. That was only a suggestion made in the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. What we want is some provision that will permit the State of Illinois to go ahead with the plans it has arranged and develop and sell this power without being taxed.

The State of Illinois has amended its constitution by a vote of the people so as to authorize the State to construct this canal and develop this power and use it and sell it in order to pay the expenses of doing so, and we do not want the Federal Government to prevent us from doing that. And if the Federal Government taxes the power that we use or sell, of course that will prevent us from doing it.

Here is what the State of Illinois is doing, as was stated by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]: There has been constructed from Lake Michigan by the Chicago sanitary district a canal 200 feet wide and 20 feet deep, connecting with the Illinois River or Desplains River at Lockport, a distance of 37 miles. From Lockport to La Salle, 65 miles on the Illinois River, the river is not navigable as a matter of fact; but what the State of Illinois is going to do is to spend this money, that it is going to raise by an issue of bonds, to deepen the river and make of it a navigable stream with at least 8 feet of water, for the benefit of the whole country, and thereby there will be provided a navigable channel complete from the Great Lakes down the Illinois and through the Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico; so that all we want is not to allow the Government of the United States to charge for water power where the State or municipality, in developing the water power, also provides a navigable channel for the free use and benefit of the public. That is all.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Suppose the gentleman thinks of this, that if the lines or words are stricken out and if your corporation or your State is given the license without payment, then if there be a surplus of power other than that required for State or municipal purposes, the charge for such power or the charge for such light shall be regulated by this commission in conjunction with your State utilities commission.

Mr. DENISON. Yes; but——

Mr. DEWALT. Permit me to continue just a moment. The reason for that is very plain to my mind, and I think I can make it plain to the gentlemen's mind.

Mr. DENISON. You will have to be pretty brief. My time is limited.

Mr. DEWALT. If you do not do that, your State might charge less than those who are now engaged in furnishing power, and you would destroy all those who are now engaged in furnishing it.

Mr. DENISON. I think the gentleman is imagining a great deal right there. When a State goes to an enormous expenditure to give to the country free a navigable stream that will connect the Great Lakes with the Gulf of Mexico for the purposes of commerce and navigation, and does it at its own expense, and does not ask the Federal Government for a dollar, it ought to be allowed to sell the power that it creates or develops in order to maintain the channel deep enough for navigation and to pay the interest on its bonds and create a sinking fund to retire the bonds. The idea of allowing the National Government to tax the State for the power it sells under such circumstances is wrong in principle and will not only tend to discourage the development of water power by the States, but in Illinois, at least, will prevent the opening by the State of the long hoped for Lakes-to-the-Gulf waterway.

Mr. DEWALT. That is all right, but does the gentleman think that ought to be done to the detriment of the other citizens of Illinois who are not residents of this community?

Mr. DENISON. No; I do not think it ought to be done to the detriment of anybody, and I say it will not be to their detriment, because we are giving to all the people free a channel for navigation. There will be no tolls charged on it. So all we are interested in is not to have any provision in this bill that will, by the levy of a tax, prevent the State of Illinois from going ahead and completing this great work, which no other State in the Union has ever attempted to do before; and that is all we ask. We do not want to be taxed for the power we develop when we are also providing this new facility for transportation free to the world. It has been a dream of men of affairs for a hundred years that at some time, in some way, the Great Lakes would be directly connected with the Gulf of Mexico for commercial transportation purposes; we can not even conceive of the great benefit that is coming to a large part of the United States whenever that channel of navigation is opened up to commerce. That is what the State of Illinois is proposing to do. There is a link there of 65 miles that is not navigable now, but we are proposing to make it navigable by this issue of bonds and this expenditure of our own money, and we want the privilege of getting the money by the development and sale of water power in order to maintain it in a navigable condition, to pay the interest and overhead charges, and to pay back to the people of the State of Illinois the money they will so liberally spend for the improvement. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], a member of the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, on February 28 last this House, after very full and careful consideration of the conference report, passed this identical bill by a vote of 263 for to 65 against, showing that at that time, after long consideration in conference and long consideration here the sentiment of the House was overwhelmingly for this bill then. I assume it is now.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. At that time the State of Illinois had not engaged upon the enterprise——

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, I am not going to foreclose the gentleman at all. I am not going to talk on the gentleman's proposition. While I do not intend to go into that now, I have a plan that I think will be acceptable to him when he gets to it, that will fix Illinois like she wants to be fixed, without doing violence to other States out West.

I am proud we are getting up the water-power bill early in the session. I hope the Senate will take it up at once—it is so important. For example, the engineers who have examined the subject assert that we have in the United States potential water power ranging all the way from 35,000,000 to 200,000,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy. The fact remains that only 6,000,000 horsepower of that entire amount is in use. The rest is running idly to the sea, doing no one any good. It is a great natural resource, to my way of thinking, the greatest of all natural resources. It differs from all the rest, nothing is consumed in the using. After its use to generate electricity the water runs on for irrigation and other public purposes, and nothing is extracted and nothing lost except in the wear and tear of machinery through which it passes.

Apparently there is not going to be very much controversy about it in the House. The trouble has never been here. So often it has passed the House only to fail at the other end. I assume that everyone on both sides of the aisle feels the same way about it. In my opinion the House has been right on the matter all the time. The trouble has been at the other end of the Capitol, and the trouble is not over with yet so far as that end of the Capitol is concerned. We may pass this bill to-morrow, as we probably will, by a unanimous vote, but the chances are that the Senate will alter it and tear it all to pieces and make of it a bill that no one over here can afford to support. I hope that will not occur, but 12 years' experience leads me to have that fear. If that is done, I want to urge, as far as I can, to strengthen and make strong the arms of the men in charge of it, to see that a correct water-power policy is kept in all things intact. The main facts and salient features concerning our water-power policy are pretty well understood. There is not very much controversy any longer about it. I think it may be summed up in a few sentences, and I think this bill contains the correct features of a water-power policy. I would suggest as number one that any water-power policy that is agreed to by the Congress ought to reserve the title to the dam site in the Federal Government, and should not do more than grant a franchise or license or lease of it for a given term of years. It is too much of a natural monopoly to turn over in fee to anybody. I think the House is very well agreed upon that, and I think the Congress is very well agreed upon that. I think the country is very well agreed upon that, and I do not believe any bill which departs from that can ever become a law. This bill does not depart from that. It adheres to that, and I think it is the proper course. We must, however, beware of changes and modifications which are vital and which, slight in appearance, may be far-reaching in effect.

The second suggestion which I would make is not a suggestion of my own. It has been arrived at after long hearings and long consideration of the principles of the problem, covering a period of 12 years.

I have had to do with water-power legislation in one form or another for the last 12 years. The Public Lands Committee for many years has been bringing in a bill, passing it, sending

it to the Senate, and it has been killed over there. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been doing the same thing.

The second suggestion I would make is that no franchise issued should run more than 50 years; not all should run that long. The larger ones, perhaps, where the expenditure was great to install the plant, should perhaps run as long as 50 years.

Third. To my mind the most important provision of all is to get a correct recapture clause or to lay down a correct measurement of damages that the Government, municipality, or whoever takes it over must pay at the time of the termination of the lease. Now, that is the thing we had very serious difficulty with in the House sometimes, always in the Senate, and always in conference. These bills have been in conference a number of times. The question of getting a correct recapture clause means everything to the public, who for the next 50 years are to pay some power companies for this water power. Correct and adequate water power means cheap electric fans, cheap electric light, cheap cooking, cheap fuel, cheap locomotion; water power means cheap traffic, and it means everything to the poor people, and the rich ones as well, of the country. And to allow an incorrect water-power policy to be installed or engrafted upon the people would be something which, to my mind, is criminal. It would be doing the thing for which future generations could not and would not forgive. It is at best a natural monopoly to start with. Why? Because only at a very few places in the country does water fall from the highlands to the lowlands where it can be harnessed and made to turn the turbine wheel and thereby made to generate electricity. For this reason the Congress should at all times be very careful—yea; be more than careful—that they do not allow the people to be saddled with a corporation control of this natural monopoly, with such provisions so difficult to understand that we can never get the property away from those who now are permitted to have it under license.

I think this bill deals admirably with that, and if we can only retain it through the Senate, through the conference, when it becomes a law the American people will be proud of the Congress that brings this legislation into effect. The future generations will be proud of it—we will be proud of it—and it will be a day's work well done. It is going to mean a great deal to the country to get a correct and adequate water-power policy in operation. So many places the people are abused and extortion practiced upon them that it will be hailed as a boon and a blessing to all.

The fourth suggestion I would make would be that there should be a strong, very well-understood provision throughout the leasing contract and throughout the leasing legislation for the revocation of the permit for a violation of the terms of the permit so that when we grant away these great power sites to private corporations, as will be done for development, we ought to be able to hold a tight line on them to see that abuses might not be practiced upon the people who use it.

Fifth. Provision should be inserted, and it is inserted, in the lease requiring diligence and prompt construction of the plant so that the water-power monopoly which already had first hold on the water-power situation might not be allowed to hold the permit or lease in cold storage to keep down development.

Sixth. To my way of thinking, and I think that has become the established policy of this House—and it has been voted on here nine or ten times in this House in one form or another—the Federal Government should at all times reserve the right—do not understand me to say they should at all times exercise it—but I do say that they should at all times reserve the right to make some sort of charge for the water power which they license and lease.

Seventh. The Federal Government at all times should make certain in the legislation and in the leasing contract of its complete supremacy in the handling of this water power. It is too important to give away this most important of all resources without having a tight line on the control of it.

Eighth. I would suggest that annual reports be provided for, and they are provided for in this bill, so that the Congress and the commission granting authority will at all times know what is going on.

Ninth. The Federal Government should reserve to itself the power to fix the rates of service so that abuses may not grow up. I know some water-power developers say that would keep down development, but I do not think so. The present law is but a revocable permit which the President, Congress, or the Secretary of the Interior, or Secretary of War can sweep off the statute books without rhyme or reason. That was not fair to development. It has retarded development. What I do say is to give the lessee a fair, well-understood contract, preserving the rights of the people, making certain the rights of capital that is invested in it, and above all make it certain to get the property back at the end of the term.

Gentlemen of the House, this legislation is so important—no bill that will come up will surpass it in importance—the membership will do well to give careful study to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERRIS had leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, you have been listening to a discussion of the water-power bill. I ask your indulgence while I digress for a few moments from this bill and speak on another subject; and yet, perhaps, what I have to say may, after all, come under the general subject of water bills! I want to talk a few moments with reference to an immediate phase of the prohibition question, which I think should have some attention at this time upon this floor.

There was reported into the House to-day from the Judiciary Committee what is commonly being referred to as the enforcement code, a piece of legislation to make effective war-time prohibition and to put into effect the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution.

At the same time we find the liquor interests in some parts of the country openly defying the law, and there appears in the papers to-day a report from various cities to the effect that liquor dealers have taken out licenses beginning the 1st of July, and that they do not intend to observe the law. Not only that, but I read from the Washington Times to-day this statement:

> Prominent officials and Members of Congress still believe the President will take some action to repeal the war-time prohibition act as it affects light wines and beer.

In the Washington Post of yesterday was a long article, with this heading:

> Drought to be broken. Relief expected from Wilson. He may even before Monday set aside war-time prohibition.

It is difficult to credit these reports, and I would not pay any attention to them were it not for the fact that they are being given wide publicity over the country, and I think a statement should be made on this floor with reference to the proposition.

This Congress has shown no disposition to follow the President in his recommendation that the ban on beer and wine be lifted. Two committees at least have turned down the proposition. And now, believing that Congress offers no hope, lawyers and others from certain moist centers have been imploring the President, by cable, and telling him he has the power to come to their relief. Now, it is very well for these lawyers to jolly their clients with these comforting opinions, but I submit that they should not impose upon the mellow mood toward the liquor interests, in which the President appears to find himself in these Parisian days, by giving him that sort of bum legal advice. The provisions of the war-time prohibition act are so plain that anyone ought to understand them, no matter how "dry" he may be. And I assert here that the President has no right under that act to lift the ban at this time. If he does do it, it will be an indefensible usurpation of power.

What does the law provide? It provides that prohibition shall remain in effect—and here I quote the exact language—"until the conclusion of the present war, and thereafter until the termination of demobilization, the date of which shall be determined and proclaimed by the President of the United States." Whether the present war is concluded with the signing of the peace treaty, or not until the treaty is ratified, may be a debatable question. But even assuming that the war is now over, within the meaning of the act, there yet remains the phrase "termination of demobilization." Before war-time prohibition can cease to operate the President must have solemnly determined and proclaimed that demobilization has terminated. Can the President in good conscience issue that sort of a proclamation while hundreds of thousands of boys are waiting, patiently or impatiently, for their discharge?

But lawyers for the wets point to a proviso of the law which says that—

> nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with the power conferred upon the President by section 15 of the food-control act.

And upon that peg it is sought to hang the power of the President to act at this time. The argument will not bear analysis. The food-control act has nothing whatever to do with the sale of intoxicating beverages. It has to do solely with the manufacture, the production. Its purpose was simply to conserve foodstuffs, and not to conserve liquors already produced. There is not a line in the food-control act which either directly or by implication gives to the President or to anyone else the slightest power either to restrict or to extend the sale

of intoxicating liquors. The argument is hardly to be taken seriously. It simply indicates, I am inclined to believe, the distressing condition of aridity in which various gentlemen find or are about to find themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOCH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that all these statements are based on newspaper talk and rumor, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the afternoon paper of to-day—I think the Star—it stated that nobody in Washington has received any advice from the President or knows what he intends to do in reference to this matter.

Mr. HOCH. I am sure we are glad to hear that; but these statements have been given wide publicity over the country.

Mr. RANDALL of California. I want to say that the President said in his message that he found himself without authority.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOCH. For a question; yes.

Mr. FESS. Reverting to the question of when the war is over, is it not the custom that the first step is the signing of the treaty, then the ratification, then the exchange of treaties, after which comes the proclamation of the President?

Mr. HOCH. That is my understanding. I do not think that even under this first phrase—"the conclusion of the war"—the President has any power; but even though we assumed that the war is concluded with the signing of the treaty, the President must make solemn proclamation that demobilization has terminated before prohibition ceases to operate.

It is high time for the liquor interests to reconcile themselves to the mandate of the Nation. War-time prohibition went into effect last November, and these interests have had due notice. Permanent prohibition goes into effect under the constitutional amendment next January, and all concerned might as well buy now a through ticket on the water wagon! For gentlemen to contend that national prohibition was hasty legislation, that it was snap judgment, is to talk the veriest nonsense. No legislation was ever more fully considered. The eighteenth amendment was ratified by 45 States and came as a culmination of a long, long contest, with the prohibition forces having to fight for every inch of the ground. The victory must be clinched by the enactment of an enforcement code with teeth in it. No plainer duty confronts this Congress.

And coming from the State of Kansas, pioneer in this great movement, I want to predict that when national prohibition has been made effective and time has had its chance to demonstrate, the very men who now "view with alarm" will bless the day that doomed the liquor business. Kansas has tried prohibition for nearly 40 years. Financially, socially, morally it has proven itself a sound governmental policy. That will be the experience of the Nation. No one imagines, of course, that complete enforcement will be attained all at once. The complete enforcement of any penal law is a slow process. There will doubtless be situations, in industrial centers particularly, where the adjustment will be difficult. But in time the adjustment will come. And a fair trial will abundantly justify the law. The laborer's family will be better clothed, better fed, and enjoy more of the comforts and pleasures of life than they did in the days when, in many cases, the saloon got a large part of the pay check.

This fight has been long and hard. It is no time now to beat a retreat. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to discuss the bill in detail, but wish to say that I approve everything the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] said in regard to this bill, and in the little time that I have I shall use in general debate. I want to say that the bill provides for all practical possible developments. There is no compulsory provision in the bill as to any one plan of improvement over another. Under this, development can be made by the United States Government, States, and municipalities, and preference for license is given to States and municipalities, and provision is made for development by private corporations, individuals, or associations of individuals. I have been studying this matter for several years, and I think the bill as it was agreed to in conference during the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress was the best bill that ever has been introduced in either House. I hope, therefore, that there will be no amendment to this bill in the House, as it is an exact copy of the bill as it passed the House last winter, and as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] has said, it ought to pass by a unanimous vote.

No bill of this kind can be exactly what a Member himself may determine it should be. If I had the power I would provide for compulsory amortization during the period of the license, so that Congress would not have to make an appropriation at the end of the license period to pay anything, for the reason that unless Congress becomes more liberal in the next 50 years in the making of appropriations I believe it will not make any appropriation out of the public funds of the United States to pay the net investment or any sum that might remain unamortized at the end of the license period. We have provided that it can be done, however. We provide, further, that the Government may take over a property at any time before the license expires by paying just compensation for it.

Considering the different views of different men of learning in the United States with reference to all the many plans, I think we have a bill that no man will have to apologize for supporting, and that will provide all the development at present that the country needs for its present and immediate uses. I hope there will be no substantial amendment, no amendment that will in any way bring on a controversial state of thought or opinion—not that I think this committee or the past Congress is endowed with all wisdom. I do not think so at all, but here is a bill under which development may take place by the United States, by the States, by the municipalities, by the corporations, by partnerships, or by the individuals. Therefore I hope the bill will pass without amendment.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROSE].

Mr. SIMS. And I yield to the gentleman the remainder of my time, five additional minutes, at the end of which time general debate shall be considered closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss the matter under consideration, but want to bring to the attention of the House an entirely different matter.

A situation has developed in Everett, Bedford County, Pa., a part of the district which I have the honor to represent, and I feel it a duty incumbent upon me to present the matter to the Members of this House and to have it made a matter of record in order to avoid the possibility of a recurrence of such shameful and heartless treatment of the dead body of any soldier who offered his life in defense of our country and in the hope of securing a democracy for the world.

My purpose is to give a recital of the facts in the case without any attempt at embellishment or coloring.

On the 9th day of May I received a letter from the Hon. Joseph E. Thropp, one of the leading citizens of the town of Everett and a former Representative of the nineteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. ROSE: There has developed in our town this week an evidence of the most inhuman and outrageous treatment of a young soldier that one could possibly imagine, and I am sure if it were properly brought to the attention of Congress would cause a feeling of horror there that would lead to a speedy and vigorous investigation.

I am writing you to suggest that you come at once to Everett and get all of the data in connection with the death, treatment of the body, and the condition in which it was shipped, etc., for burial here.

The whole community is excited, and I think you can render effective service to the cause of proper treatment of the sick and wounded of our heroic boys. As Congress will meet on the 19th, I have no doubt you will be in Washington prior to that date. I write at once to suggest that you come immediately to Everett to ascertain the exact facts.

I have suggested that a number of affidavits be prepared at once and these can be furnished you, but your personal investigation of the matter and interviews with those prominent citizens who know the facts would very much strengthen you in presenting the matter to Congress.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very truly, yours, JOSEPH E. THROPP.

To the letter of Mr. Thropp I replied as follows:

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *May 12, 1919.*

MY DEAR MR. THROPP: I have your letter of the 9th instant with reference to conditions surrounding the death and burial of a soldier.

The harrowing details as mentioned by you should be the subject of a rigid investigation, and the guilty parties be made to answer before the proper tribunal.

As I am now obliged to go to Washington on Thursday next, it will be impossible for me to make a personal visit to Everett for the purpose of investigation. If, however, the matter is presented to me I shall bring the whole case to the attention of the department and urge that an investigation be made.

Very truly, yours, JOHN M. ROSE.

On the 10th day of May I was called on the long-distance phone by Mr. E. E. Bowen, sr., and was requested by him to arrange for a personal interview with the Secretary of War. I consented to this, although I was not made aware of the purpose of the meeting at that time.

On May 16 there was published in the Everett Republican, one of the leading papers of Bedford County, an article setting forth the facts in the case as developed up to that time, the article being headed, "An investigation demanded without delay," as follows:

AN INVESTIGATION DEMANDED WITHOUT DELAY.

We regret exceedingly that we are compelled through an act of justice to call attention to the painful circumstances in connection with the death of Sergt. Ramon A. Bowen, a brave young soldier boy of our town, who died recently at Camp Eustis, Va., while on his way home

from the battle fields of France, after having served his country faithfully and well as a member of Battery E, 43d Artillery, C. A. C., a brief history of his services being published in this paper last week.

The circumstances connected with the death and the condition in which the body reached Everett is so heartrending as to be almost unbelievable.

From letters received by home folks the young man was not in any dangerous condition, when a telegram was received by his father that he had died in the hospital.

But the saddest part of all was the condition of the body when it reached Everett, after a delay of five days after death in getting here.

Persons who viewed the corpse have made affidavit to its condition, as follows:

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Bedford, ss:*

On the 10th day of May, 1919, personally appeared before me, the subscriber, a justice of the peace in and for said county, who, being duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say that on the 7th day of May, 1919, at Everett, Pa., on the arrival of the body of Sergt. Ramon A. Bowen, deceased, of Battery E, 43d Artillery, C. A. C., who died at Camp Eustis, Va., on May 2, 1919, and whose body arrived here on Wednesday, May 7, 1919, and that said body was not embalmed and was in a decomposed condition, almost beyond recognition, and that said body was without clothing of any kind with the exception of being wrapped in a unclean sheet.

W. S. BOWEN, M. D.
BYRON B. LEFFLER.
ROBERT M. BOWEN.
D. S. GUMP.
STANLEY S. GUMP.
E. E. BOWEN, Sr.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 10th day of May, 1919.

GEORGE W. RICHEY,
Justice of the Peace.

As everyone knows, conditions of this kind should not be tolerated at an Army camp, and we feel assured if the matter is brought to the attention of President Wilson, as Commander in Chief, or Secretary of War Baker, there will be a thorough investigation and the guilty persons given the punishment they so richly deserve.

As a soldier of his country Sergt. Bowen was entitled to be properly prepared for burial and should have been clothed in a soldier's uniform, of which it is said a new one had been allotted to him at the camp. What became of this uniform is another matter for investigation.

Action in this matter by the proper Government officials to bring the guilty parties to an accounting is demanded by the bereaved family and our citizens generally.

The conditions surrounding this death are mystifying to say the least, and we refrain from making further comment until the whole affair is placed before the proper war officials, which we have been informed are being done by the distressed father and family, in which are two other brave sons, the one a twin brother, who enlisted and served with his brother and who was but recently discharged from the service and came home with the expectation of soon again joining him, and the other is with the Army of Occupation along the Rhine unaware of the death and treatment of his brother.

There is not a man, woman, or child in this community but feels sorely grieved about this matter, and one and all demand a prompt investigation and that the person or persons responsible be punished.

On the 17th of May Mr. E. E. Bowen, the father of Sergt. Bowen, came to the city of Washington in company with a Mr. Horton, one of his friends, and I arranged for a meeting with the Secretary of War, the Hon. Newton D. Baker. Mr. Baker very kindly consented to the interview and we placed before him all of the facts in the case, together with affidavits in support thereof.

At that time, in addition to the written evidence submitted, Mr. E. E. Bowen, a son of a Civil War veteran and the father of three sons, all of whom saw service in the late war in France, one of whom is now discharged and practicing his profession in the town of Everett, and another who is in France, and the deceased soldier who was in France for at least 15 months before being sent to this country for discharge, informed the Secretary of War that about one week before the death of his son he received a letter from the son wherein he made mention of the fact that he was then enjoying good health. On Friday of the week preceding the delivery of the body in Everett the father was notified by telegraph of the death of his son, and on the same day Mr. Bowen telegraphed to Camp Eustis and requested that the body be shipped to Everett for burial. The day of the funeral was set for the following Tuesday, but the body failed to arrive at the appointed time and did not reach Everett until Wednesday, the following day.

On the box in which the coffin was placed notice was labeled "do not open"; but Mr. Bowen concluded that as he had signed for the body—that of his own son—he was privileged to have the same opened in order that he may be absolutely certain that the body inclosed therein was that of his own son.

In the presence of the citizens, who subscribed to the affidavit which I have read in your hearing, the box was opened. The disclosure presented upon the opening of the box is fairly well described in the statement made by six prominent citizens of Everett, and to which your attention has already been called, so that it is not necessary for me to dwell further upon that feature of the case. I may say, however, that the family were prevented by reason of such condition to have funeral services conducted either in the church or at the late home of the deceased, a state of affairs which could have easily been avoided had the persons in charge of the corpse performed their plain duty in the premises.

It is not to be wondered at that the people of Everett were horrified beyond expression and are determined that a thorough and complete investigation shall be made of all the facts surrounding the case.

I desire to say on behalf of the Secretary of War that he treated us with the greatest courtesy and extended his thanks for bringing to his personal attention the history of the treatment of the body of a dead soldier within the United States of America, and which almost surpasses belief. Mr. Baker gave us to understand that he had been mayor of a large city, and that during his incumbency of the office he had come in contact with the personal element which sometimes asserts itself, and he much regretted the fact that it appeared at a time like the present. In our presence he dictated a letter to the Inspector General demanding an immediate and thorough investigation of all of the facts and directed that a report thereon be made to the Secretary in person. The humiliated father, Mr. E. E. Bowen, assured the Secretary of War that he presented this matter to him in order that other parents having sons stationed at the various camps throughout the United States may not be called upon to suffer as he has done in the present instance.

I beg to say, further, that I obtained the consent of the Secretary to make the matter public, and I give that as my reason for presenting the facts to this House.

That the indignation is widespread is shown by resolutions passed by the Josiah Baughman Post, No. 131, Grand Army of the Republic, at Everett, Pa., which are as follows:

At a meeting of Josiah Baughman Post, No. 131, Grand Army of the Republic, at Everett, Pa., the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

"Whereas Sergt. Ramon Alvy Bowen, late of Battery E, Forty-third Artillery, Coast Artillery Corps, offered his services to the Government during the recent war with Germany and spent almost 18 months in France in the service of his country, and having an honorable record for his valiant service; and

"Whereas the said Ramon Bowen, having died at Camp Eustis, Va., on May 2, 1919, under questionable circumstances, the body was held at Camp Eustis until May 6, and when it arrived in Everett, on Wednesday, May 7, it was in such a decomposed condition as to be almost unrecognizable; the body had not been embalmed, not washed or clothed, and was wrapped only in an unclean sheet: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of Josiah Baughman Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 131, are justly indignant over such unnecessary and disgraceful treatment to one who gave his services so willingly to the Government, and we demand that an investigation be made immediately and the persons guilty punished. Further, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congressman from this district be requested to demand that the War Department punish the officials guilty of such injustice."

R. W. COOK, *Commander.*
M. D. BARNDELLER, *Adjutant.*

NOTE.—A. B. Bowen, grandfather of Sergt. Ramon Bowen, is a member of Post 131, Grand Army of the Republic, having served his country during the Civil War.

An inspection of the body disclosed the fact that a postmortem examination was likely held for the reason that a deep incision was found on the neck of the soldier, and some of the witnesses who viewed the remains informed me that the stitching was done in a haphazard manner and that the work could not have been done by an experienced surgeon.

The certificate of death which accompanied the remains shows that death was the result of pulmonary tuberculosis, not a contagious disease, which offers a more potent reason for the embalming of the body before shipment to the place of burial. I make this matter public with the consent and knowledge of the father of the deceased soldier, who declined to make a further investigation at Camp Eustis by reason of the fact that the Secretary of War gave his unqualified consent for an investigation and gave orders that one be immediately made.

On another occasion the dead body of a soldier was shipped to Conemaugh, Cambria County, Pa., which must have been thrown into the casket without any attention whatever, as the clothing was covered with mud and the body bespattered with blood. This matter was also called to my attention, but as no affidavits were produced in support of the statements, although made to me by thoroughly reliable men, I did not feel warranted in bringing the matter to the attention of the Members of the House.

It pains me to bring before you such disclosures, as I never entertained the thought that conditions which would hardly obtain in a heathen country could be brought to light in a civilized nation claiming to be the leader in education and civilization.

The promised investigation has been made. It was conducted by an officer of the Inspector General's Department, and while the official making the investigation recommends the discharge of the officials found to be derelict in their duties, the Inspector General greatly modifies the findings of that official and recommends that the officials found guilty of neglect be relieved from their present duties and assigned to duties more in keeping with their ability, and that a copy of the memorandum be furnished the commanding general at Camp Eustis, Va., with instructions to take such steps as will prevent a repetition of such willful neglect.

JUNE 20, 1919.

Memorandum for the Secretary of War.
Subject: Report of investigation of complaint in the case of Sergt. Ramon A. Bowen (deceased), Battery E, Forty-third Artillery.

1. The basis of this investigation is letter of May 10, 1919, signed by various citizens of Everett, Pa., in which it is alleged that Sergt. Ramon A. Bowen, Battery E, Forty-third Artillery, died at Camp Eustis, Va., on May 2, 1919, under questionable circumstances; that the body was not shipped home until May 6, 1919, and that it arrived "in a condition which was a disgrace to the body, the family, and the country in whose service he died"; that the body was not embalmed, washed, or clothed, but was wrapped only in an unclean sheet.

2. The complaint has been investigated by an officer of the Inspector General's Department, whose report and the accompanying evidence disclose the following facts:

In January, 1919, the organization of which Sergt. Ramon A. Bowen was a member was demobilized. When he appeared before the examining board, he was suspected of having pulmonary tuberculosis and was not recommended for discharge. He was admitted to the camp hospital for observation and treatment on January 21, 1919, and after further examination, including X ray, his case was diagnosed as "pulmonary tuberculosis." He remained in the hospital under treatment until May 2, 1919, on which date, after a consultation between the medical officers and under the direction of the chief of service of the hospital, the ward surgeon attempted to aspirate Sergt. Bowen's chest. This operation was performed after administering a local anesthetic. When the needle was pushed in part way through the pleura Sergt. Bowen suddenly collapsed and died very quickly. Because of these circumstances an autopsy was held, as a result of which it was determined that the cause of death was "status lymphaticus." The medical officers testified that Sergt. Bowen's ailment of pulmonary tuberculosis would probably not have resulted in death for some years, but that "as regards the status lymphaticus he might have stepped under a cool shower and promptly died or run for a car or had his finger pricked with a needle or pin or knife and death resulted"; that the condition is so very rare, and especially rare in adults, that physicians are very seldom led to suspect it. Late in the afternoon of the day of death the body was embalmed. The embalming was not done by the contract undertaker but by an enlisted man of the medical detachment on duty at the morgue, who was not a licensed embalmer. The testimony shows, however, that during the past winter he embalmed and assisted in embalming the remains of more than 150 enlisted men who died at the camp, and that this is the first complaint regarding his work. The reason given for having this enlisted man embalm the body is that the contract undertaker lived some miles away, in Newport News, and it was considered mandatory that as the body had been autopsied it be embalmed as quickly as possible.

The following morning, May 3, the body was inspected by the medical officer assigned to that duty, was found by him to be in good condition, and it was then ready to be taken over by the Quartermaster for shipment, except for clothing. On this same morning (May 3) the hospital authorities received telegraphic instructions from the parents of the deceased to ship the body home. The hospital authorities sent a copy of the telegram with shipping instructions to camp headquarters, where it was received at 11.40 a. m. and promptly sent to the office of the camp personnel adjutant for the purpose of preparing an order for an attendant to accompany the body. No commissioned officer in the office of the camp personnel officer had any personal knowledge of the case, it having been handled by the chief clerk of the office, Sergt. W. F. Cross, who treated it as a routine matter. He did not request the commanding officer of Sergt. Bowen's organization to designate an attendant until the following morning (May 4), which was Sunday. By noon of that day the name of the attendant was communicated to Sergt. Cross by the battery commander; but the attendant's order was not issued on that day, as "there was no one in the office on Sunday afternoon to get out the order." The following morning, May 5, the orders were issued, and a copy of them furnished the escort the same day. In the meantime, the body had been resting in the morgue unclothed, because of the fact that clothing had not been received from Sergt. Bowen's organization. The organization commander testifies that he phoned the hospital on May 2 and again on May 3, requesting information as to when the body would be ready for shipment, and that on each occasion he was told by some noncommissioned officer at the hospital, whose identity is unknown, that the body was not ready, as the undertaker had not yet embalmed it. On the other hand, the registrar of the hospital testifies that either on May 2 or May 3 the organization commander phoned to the hospital in regard to the body and was told to send over the clothing as soon as he was ready. On Sunday, May 4, the battery commander directed the company supply sergeant to carry the clothing to the morgue, which was done the following morning, May 5. When the morgue attendant opened the morgue on the morning of May 5 he found that some one, whose identity can not be established, had turned the steam heat into the building, evidently for the purpose of heating the chapel, which is in the same building. The radiators in the chapel were open. Those in the morgue were closed, but there were large overhead steam-carrying pipes which had raised the temperature in the morgue to about 100 degrees. The morgue attendant found the body of Sergt. Bowen practically in a state of decomposition. The contract undertaker was immediately called, and an effort made to reembalm the body, but decomposition had progressed to such an extent that nothing could be done other than stay decomposition of the face and head. The body was so badly decomposed that it could not be clothed. It was wrapped in a sheet, which, as testified to by the officer who inspected the body, was clean. The sheet, however, was saturated with antiseptic solution to arrest decomposition as far as possible, and this probably accounts for its dirty appearance when the casket was opened by relatives. The body was placed in a sealed casket, marked "Do not open," and shipped to the parents of the deceased May 6 at about 6 p. m.

3. The hospital at Camp Eustis is a camp hospital. The camp surgeon is Maj. Henry Tucker, Medical Corps, and the commanding general of the camp states that he requires all papers, including the hospital morning report, to be submitted over the signature of Maj. Tucker. In other words, Maj. Tucker, as camp surgeon, is commanding officer of the camp hospital. The executive officer of the hospital is Maj. R. T. Devereux, Medical Corps, having held that position since April 7, 1919. When he entered on duty as executive officer he was given verbal orders by the camp surgeon, Maj. Tucker, that he (Maj. Devereux) was in direct command of the hospital. Maj. Tucker further informed him that the duties of the surgeon as outlined in paragraph 87, Army Regulations, with respect to embalming and preparation of remains for burial or shipment, devolved upon him (Maj. Devereux). Maj. Devereux himself testifies that it was his understanding that the duties of arranging for embalming and of the care and preparation of remains rested upon him. The duty of inspecting remains after preparation for burial or shipment was specifically assigned to the chief of the laboratory service, these orders having been issued when the hospital was a base hospital. Lieut. O. F. Bradford, Medical Corps, was the chief of laboratory service, and when the hospital was changed to a camp hospital, although no orders, written or verbal, were then issued to that effect, he continued to perform the duty of inspecting bodies. Lieut. Bradford himself testifies that it was his duty to inspect the body of Sergt. Bowen, and that he did inspect the body on May 3 and again on May 4, on each of which days it was in good condition. First Lieut. George W. Glass, Adjutant General's Department, who is now the personnel adjutant of the camp, and who signed the travel order, as assistant personnel adjutant, for the escort to accompany the body of Sergt. Bowen, testifies that the responsibility for the issuance of that order rested with his immediate office.

4. The conclusions of the inspector with respect to responsibility in this case are, briefly, that Maj. Henry Tucker, the camp surgeon, and First Lieut. George W. Glass, personnel adjutant, are responsible for the delay in shipping the body of Sergt. Bowen, and for the consequent bad condition of the body when it was shipped. He also concludes that First Lieut. Joseph B. Hafer, commanding officer of Sergt. Bowen's organization, displayed a lack of proper appreciation of his relation to a deceased member of his battery by not going in person direct to the surgeon, or to those in charge of the remains, and finding out the cause of delay in shipment. He further concludes that the misunderstandings and attendant delays in this case are a reflection on the administration of the camp.

5. The inspector recommends:

(a) That Maj. Henry Tucker, Medical Corps, be discharged from the service.

(b) That First Lieut. George W. Glass, Adjutant General's Department, be discharged from the service.

(c) That a medical officer of experience be sent to Camp Eustis for duty as surgeon.

(d) That the facts in this case be communicated to the commanding general Camp Eustis, Va., and that he be informed that the misunderstandings and attendant delays in this case are a reflection on the administration of his camp, in order that proper steps may be taken to insure prompt administrative action in such cases in the future.

6. The inspector's recommendation concerning Maj. Tucker is based upon the opinion expressed by him (the inspector) that Maj. Tucker could not legally turn over to Maj. Devereux, the executive officer, the duties and responsibilities of surgeon, which include those laid down in paragraph 87, Army Regulations, with respect to embalming, caring for, preparing, and inspecting dead bodies. Maj. Tucker was undoubtedly the actual commanding officer of the hospital, and as such was responsible for its general administration, but it is manifestly impossible for him to have performed each and every duty placed upon the surgeon by orders and regulations. While it is true that he could not delegate all the duties and responsibilities of surgeon to Maj. Devereux, he was well within his rights in delegating to Maj. Devereux and to Lieut. Bradford the specific duties laid down in paragraph 87, Army Regulations.

The recommendation of the inspector that Lieut. Glass be discharged the service appears too drastic. The delay in issuing the order for the escort was due to lack of judgment on the part of his chief clerk, who took the matter into his own hands without bringing it to the personal attention of Lieut. Glass until the morning of May 5, the day the order was issued. Lieut. Glass has been guilty of no willful neglect, and the recommendation for his discharge is based upon the fact that on one occasion the office force for which he is responsible failed to function properly and promptly.

To summarize, the following mistakes or irregularities are disclosed by this investigation:

(a) Failure of the personnel adjutant's office promptly to issue orders for the escort.

(b) Failure of Sergt. Bowen's battery commander, Lieut. Hafer, personally to interest himself in the case, and failure to send the clothing to the hospital until May 5, as the delivery of the clothing was in no way contingent upon the embalming of the body.

(c) Lack of action of the hospital authorities in allowing the body to remain in the morgue unclothed for a period of two days without communicating with the organization commander and with camp headquarters in an effort to secure clothing and to hasten shipment of the body.

(d) Failure of the hospital and camp authorities to write a letter to the parents of the deceased, to be delivered by the escort, setting forth the fact that the body was in no condition to be viewed by relatives, with a full and frank statement of reasons for this condition. To label the casket "Do not open," with no explanation thereof, would naturally excite suspicion and result in the opening of the casket.

In addition, it might possibly be considered a mistake of judgment on the part of Maj. Devereux in having the body embalmed by an enlisted man instead of calling in the contract undertaker. In view, however, of the necessity for embalming the body at once, and of the fact that the enlisted man who embalmed the body had embalmed and assisted in embalming some 150 bodies with no resultant complaint as to his work, it would appear that Maj. Devereux's mistake in this respect, if any, was slight.

7. There has been no willful neglect or carelessness in this case, while it reflects upon the efficiency and competence of all involved as well as upon the administration of the camp.

8. It is recommended:

(a) That Maj. Henry Tucker, M. C., Maj. R. T. Devereux, M. C., and First Lieut. George E. Glass, A. G. D., be relieved from their present duties and assigned to duties more in keeping with their ability; that they be admonished for the inefficient and lax manner in which they performed their respective duties connected with this case, and that notation thereof be made upon their efficiency records.

(b) That a copy of this memorandum be furnished the commanding general Camp Eustis, Va., with instructions to take such steps as will insure prompt administrative action in all such cases in the future.

JOHN L. CHAMBERLAIN,
Inspector General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROSE. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by adding the report of the investigation of the case of which I have just spoken? It has been made by an officer of the Inspector General's office, approved by the Inspector General and also by the Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by including the documents indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the Federal power commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission), which shall be composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture. Two members of the commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the commission shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed. The President shall designate the chairman of the commission.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, on page 1, after the word "of," in line 5, the words "the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture," and insert in place thereof "three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission to be designated by the President."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 1, line 5, after the word "of," strike out the words "the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture," and insert in lieu thereof "three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to be designated by the President."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KLECZKA, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days, on account of death in family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, June 28, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior Department submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Patent Office to pay premiums of insurance on consignments of British patents forwarded to the Patent Office (H. Doc. No. 137); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of the Interior in order to comply with the provisions of House resolution No. 67 (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NOLAN, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3754) to amend sections 8 and 21 of the copyright act, approved March 4, 1909, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 79), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 400) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 77), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 396) to authorize the payment of certain amounts for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 78), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2774) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Scott; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2796) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Parrish; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3587) granting a pension to Patrick Lehan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3800) granting an increase of pension to William Koehn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6788) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Grant, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6789) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Whitehall, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6790) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Leland, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6791) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Beulah, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6792) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lake City, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6793) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Baldwin, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6794) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hart, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6795) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of White Cloud, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6796) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Traverse City, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6797) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cadillac, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6798) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manistee, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6799) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ludington, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6800) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Muskegon, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 6801) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Hollister, Calif., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 6802) to regulate insurance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6803) to repeal sections 630, 800, 801, 802, and sections 900 to 907, inclusive, of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 6804) to facilitate the naturalization of persons who served in the military or naval forces

of the United States since April 6, 1917, and who have been or who may hereafter be honorably discharged therefrom; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 6805) to authorize the county of Dougherty, State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Flint River connecting Broad Street, in the city of Albany, said State and county, with the Isabella Road, said county and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 6806) to amend section 25 of the Federal reserve act for the purpose of encouraging foreign trade; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin (by request): A bill (H. R. 6807) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and adjudicate claims of the La Pointe Band of Chippewa Indians against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6808) to incorporate the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 6809) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Belleville Park and Playground Association of the village of Belleville, county of Wayne and State of Michigan, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be mounted by said village in Victory Park in said village; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol, and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6811) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6812) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to issue a certain character of discharges for officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the wars of the United States with Spain and with the Imperial German Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6813) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6814) to provide revenue for the Government and promote the production of potato flour and potato starch in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6815) for the purpose of encouraging home ownership and the building of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 140) providing for the consideration of H. R. 6323; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolution (H. Res. 141) providing for compensation of Joel Grayson in the document room of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RAMSEY: Resolution (H. Res. 142) authorizing the appointment of additional clerks to the Committee on Enrolled Bills; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 143) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information; to the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Resolution (H. Res. 144) authorizing an investigation of truthfulness of Senate Resolution 94 transmitted to the House of Representatives June 26, 1919; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 6816) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Dutch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 6817) granting a pension to David J. Hanger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6818) granting an increase of pension to Simon J. Fought; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 6819) to correct the military record of James W. Hitchens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 6820) granting a pension to Charles J. Gilbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6821) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 6822) granting a pension to Sarah S. Cannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 6823) for the relief of the Davis Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 6824) granting a pension to Anna Boone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6825) to correct the military record of George C. Hussey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 6826) granting an increase of pension to Milton Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6827) granting a pension to Herbert L. Ellsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 6828) granting a pension to Mary Ann Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 6829) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Mosher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6830) granting a pension to William D. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6831) granting a pension to George W. Malin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 6832) granting a pension to Israel J. Weakley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6833) granting an increase of pension to Martha C. Igo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 6834) for the relief of Henry H. Staub; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 6835) granting a pension to Stella Archer Simson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6836) granting an increase of pension to George W. Heator; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 6837) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Fisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6838) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Schonhoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 6839) granting a pension to John Haight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 6840) granting an increase of pension to Harvey H. Bonham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 6841) granting a pension to John A. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6842) for the relief of William Hensley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 6843) for the relief of the heirs of James Henry Taylor and Angie Taylor, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 6844) granting an increase of pension to John Maloney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6845) granting an increase of pension to Levi G. Saffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6846) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Wiend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6847) granting a pension to Susan C. Kendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 6848) for the relief and reimbursement of Cora T. Dering; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6849) granting a pension to Lizzie Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6850) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Carpenters' District Council, of Springfield and vicinity, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of employees of Wright & Ditson Victor Co., against any repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of employees of Bullock Manufacturing Co., Springfield, Mass., against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of Board of Aldermen of city of New York, against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of employees of Agawam County, Mass., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of Sons of Veterans, United States of America, Lima, Ohio, for making America safe for Americans; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, New Orleans, La., advising the abolishment of office of Comptroller of the Currency in order that power may be exercised by the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also (by request), petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association for increases in statutory salaries in Bureau of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of employees of the Home Insurance Co., New York, protesting against the repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association, urging increases in salaries in bureau for more complete organization of district office service of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of American Hampshire Sheep Association, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of legislative committee of the National Association of Retail Druggists of the United States, asking for repeal of sections 630 and 907 of revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COADY: Petition of Second Branch City Council, Baltimore, Md., investigating the price of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Second Branch City Council, Baltimore, Md., urging the rescinding and repeal of orders and laws relative to the so-called war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Glove City Lodge No. 641, and Rescue Lodge No. 643, of International Order of Good Templars, at Gloversville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of laws providing for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, and also definitely defining intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of numerous residents of the city of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of numerous residents of the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of numerous residents of Broadalbin, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of La Salle County, Ill., opposing repeal or modification of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of Texas Wholesale Fruit and Produce Dealers' Association, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Farm Mortgage Bankers' Association of America, relating to the Federal farm-loan act, and against any repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Protective Association, urging retention of zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of teachers of the Benton Harbor city schools, asking for a favorable consideration of House bill 7; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of El Centro Chamber of Commerce, El Centro; Fresno County Chamber of Commerce, Fresno; and the Lompoc Valley Chamber of Commerce, Lompoc, all in the State of California, praying for a high protective tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Petition of officers of the National Shakespeare Federation, for a national Shakespeare peace memorial in the city of Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of 4,000 women of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, in support of the Smith-Towner bill (H. R. 7) providing for a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, protest of the United Presbyterian Church of Beaumont, Calif., against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Baugh Chemical Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of House bill 5215; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Confectioners' Association of Chicago, Ill., for the repeal of the tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. A. Bokel, relating to the zone advances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Manufacturers' Export Association, relating to the request of the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Petition of Hawthorne Division 8, Brotherhood of Railroad Station Employees and Clerks, in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Mrs. Sue Donohue, Mrs. J. F. Lappin, Mrs. Mattox, Mrs. G. H. Dodd, Mrs. John Dicked, and Mrs. Charlie Harris, all of Buffalo, N. Y., asking for enforcement of eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of employees of the Thread Agency of Philadelphia, for the retention of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Resolution adopted by United States soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the late war, in mass meeting assembled at Indianapolis, Ind., on June 16, 1919, under the auspices of the Tenth Infantry Association, praying for immediate ratification of peace treaty, together with covenant of the league of nations upon presentation to the Senate of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Superior, Wis., with reference to the Polish pogroms and outrages against the Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of National Metal Trades Association of New York and New Jersey, protesting against the renewal of any appropriation for United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: Petition of members of First Presbyterian Church, Paterson, and many citizens of Paterson and Sussex, N. J., for strong enforcement of prohibition act in China as well as America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of citizens of Belknap, Iowa, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of the seventeenth district of Illinois, against modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition in behalf of the repeal of taxes on candy, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Sunday school convention of Armstrong County, Pa., protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from citizens of Ouray, Colo., protesting against the present war tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice creams, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, opposing league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of West Newton, Pa., asking for repeal of luxury tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Emanual B. Petersen and E. S. Braid, Rockford; Trade Union Liberty League, Chicago; Keyes-Aherns Furniture Co., Dixon; Rev. G. C. Gasser, secretary Ministerial Union of Evangelical Association, Chicago; H. W. Trueblood, chairman temperance committee Federation of Churches, and others, Quincy; Leo Schmitt, pastor Lane Park Evangelical Church, and others, Chicago; P. F. Eckerle, cashier First National Bank, and others, Lanark; Dennis Cross, rural route No. 1, and others, Rockford; W. W. Emmert and others, of Mount Morris; Rev. J. L. McGiffin, pastor East Park Baptist Church, Decatur; L. K. Evans, cashier Bank of El Paso, El Paso; Irvine Kilpatrick, Mendota; Harry C. Hyland, Naperville; Church of the Brethren, Mount Carroll; First Church, Evangelical Association, Peoria; Rev. G. A. Winker, pastor, and congregation of New Athens; Methodist Episcopal Church of Freeburg; Charles Scanlon, general secretary Board of Temperance, Pittsburgh, Pa.; T. A. Coffey, pastor Baptist Church of Bunker Hill; Rev. John M. Schneider, pastor Galena Methodist Episcopal Church of Aurora; A. F. Shockey, Woodstock; Russell May, of Wilmette; Edwin Phelps, Wilmette; George L. Finke, Bensenville; George M. Bergen, Woodstock; Alex Dawson, Hillsdale; Hester and Mary McCormick and others, Verona; W. H. Young, Pontiac; Frances C. Slifle, pastor Baptist Church, Wilmette; Farmers' Grain & Coal Co., Saybrook; A. J. McKinney, Kempton; and W. S. Evans and other citizens, Wellington, all in the State of Illinois, for enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *June 28, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Local Branch No. 9, National Association of Letter Carriers, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the reclassification of salaries of postal clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. FERNALD presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Maine, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHIPPS presented petitions of the Commercial Club of Fort Collins, of the Delta County Live Stock Association, and of the Gunnison County Stock Growers' Association, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the retention of the forest-reserve lands under the control of the Department of Agriculture, instead of under the control of the Department of the Interior, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, of Chico, the Woman's Club, of Monrovia, and of Santa Monica Chapter No. 113, Order of the Eastern Star, all in the State of California, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and point resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 2292) for the relief of the William Gordon Corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 2293) for the relief of the legal representatives of John T. Brickwood, deceased, Edward Gaynor, Theodore Gebler, Lee W. Mix, Arthur L. Peck, Thomas D. Casanega, Joseph de Lusignan, and Joseph H. Berger (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2294) to amend subdivision 8 of the act to amend the naturalization law approved May 9, 1918; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to relieve the owners of mining claims who have been mustered into the military or naval service of the United States as officers or enlisted men from performing assessment work during the term of such service; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 46).

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we have the Senate document here presented by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] which contains the original draft of the league of nations and the covenant as printed. The Foreign Relations Committee asked Acting Secretary of State Polk to compare the draft of the second covenant with the authentic official copy. He returned to the committee the copy which I hold in my hand with certain corrections made. They are all verbal really, but I think the Senate ought to have a corrected copy, and I ask that the document may be reprinted as corrected by the Department of State.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator that it be printed as a new document, because if it is not marked by two numbers there will be some confusion.

Mr. LODGE. To change the number will be right, but I want it to stand in the name of the Senator from Nevada, because it is what he offered. I only want to get it as corrected by the Department of State.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I inquire of the Senator whether the corrections are in the original draft or in the revised draft?

Mr. LODGE. You mean the first draft?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The corrections are in the second draft and were made under the direction of Mr. Polk for the use of the Senate. They are all verbal so far as I can see, but there were mistakes in the transmission of the newspaper print.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 6639. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "National parks," on page 129, line 10, after the word "work," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.: For administration, protection, maintenance, improvement, and development, including not exceeding $2,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of a motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicle for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, $50,000.

Mr. KING. What disposition was made of the amendment on page 127?

Mr. WARREN. It went over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 127 was passed over.

Mr. KING. I do not like to interrupt proceedings here, but does the Senator from Wyoming think that with the large and enthusiatic attendance of the Senate we ought to proceed without calling for a quorum?

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator desires to delay the bill, but I thought that we might go along with the smaller items.

Mr. KING. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 130, to insert:

After the passage of this act the Hot Springs Reservation shall be known and designated as Hot Springs National Park.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, after line 20, to insert:

For beginning the grading and construction of an automobile highway not to exceed 20 feet in width from the end of the Northern Pacific Railroad branch line east of Fairfax, Wash., to and through the Mount Rainier National Park, to a point in the vicinity of the Carbon Glacier, 12 miles, at a total cost not to exceed $100,000, $20,000.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the exigencies of the moment require that appropriation?

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator ask that it shall go over?

Mr. WARREN. If the junior Senator from Utah has any objection to it let it go over until the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is here. It has been waiting on account of one of the additions.

Mr. KING. It is in one of the national parks.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; for a long time, and it has had very light appropriations. It is one of the noted places in the country.

Mr. KING. Let the amendment be agreed to, with the understanding that we can move to reconsider it if any Senator desires to call attention to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, line 10, after the word "improvement," to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.: For protection and improvement, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 10, after the word "season," to insert: "*Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriations for Yellowstone National Park for the fiscal year 1919 are hereby made available for the fiscal year 1920," so as to make the clause read:

Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including not to exceed $7,500 for maintenance of the road in the forest reserve leading out of the park from the east boundary, not to exceed $7,500 for maintenance of the road in the forest reserve leading out of the park from the south boundary, not to exceed $15,000 for a bridge over the Buffalo Fork of the Snake River on the Lander approach, not to exceed $7,600 for the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and including feed for buffalo and other animals and salaries of buffalo keepers, $255,500, to be expended by and under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That not exceeding $2,000 may be expended for the removal of snow from any of the roads for the purpose of opening them in advance of the tourist season: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriations for Yellowstone National Park for the fiscal year 1919 are hereby made available for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. KING. I notice the practice seems to be followed quite generally in some of these appropriation bills of continuing

balances, reappropriating them. I ask for information because a number of Senators have——

Mr. WARREN. The item alludes to the matter of the Yellowstone National Park. The Senator is very well acquainted with that part of the country and he will appreciate that the inclement weather comes very early and remains very late. The bill will not become law earlier than July 1. They are undertaking to get all the work done and the expense money for the year ofttimes fail to become available because of the early snows in September. This is a small balance, and it could not be used during the fiscal year, although the necessity was very great.

Mr. KING. I am not challenging the item at all, but I was just wondering if it would not be a wiser policy to convert into the Treasury the unexpended balances and then make appropriations direct.

Mr. WARREN. Undoubtedly wherever we can, but there are some instances where we can not very well apply that rule.

Mr. KING. I have noticed so many balances of this kind at least in the military and naval bills, and it is a practice it seems to me that we ought to avoid if possible.

Mr. WARREN. As to deficiencies, we want to avoid them always, but the war has led us into some strange places and it takes time to get out of the byways.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital," on page 133, line 11, after the word "business," to strike out "$875,000" and insert "$1,000,000," and in line 18, after the word "patients," to strike out "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to adjust the compensation of officers and employees at St. Elizabeths Hospital on the basis of rates which shall not exceed the compensation paid for similar services in other hospitals in the country of like size and character," so as to make the clause read:

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital of the insane from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, civilians in the quartermaster's service of the Army, persons transferred from the Canal Zone, who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, including exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, $1,000,000; and not exceeding $1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding $1,000 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and papers as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding $1,500 for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients.

Mr. KING. Not being familiar with this item, may I inquire the reason for striking out the proviso? It seems to me to be establishing a proper precedent.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the Senator will pardon me if I am rather brief, because there is a pretty long story connected with it.

Mr. KING. I do not desire to delay the bill.

Mr. WARREN. The superintendent of the hospital is not only a very able man but a very economical one. He has a great institution there. He has been paying smaller prices, if anything, for labor than are paid at other places where the cost of living is much less.

The conditions there, owing first to the large number of patients that have come out of the Army and Navy and the civil service and, now from the war, have caused a great inflow of responsibilities, and, naturally, patriotic, generous people, especially the women of the country, have become interested in the institution. I suppose I have had calls from probably 40 or 50 ladies of fortune here, who give their time and their money to charitable pursuits, and they pleaded with us not to undertake the care of those patients by means of a class of incapable attendants, but to give them a little more pay, so that capable attendants might be secured.

The superintendent has presented a schedule. I do not happen to have it here. It is a schedule of wages that would be considered very low compared with other wages in the service, and this schedule he would like to inaugurate. They have to vary there and have some room between the high and the low. The House put this language in, the Senator will notice. We proposed to strike it out so that we might consider the item in conference and perhaps include this schedule. I think the Senator can feel assured that the money we intend to afford to that institution will be well expended.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state another reason to my colleague. Under the wording of the provision of the House it is very doubtful whether the auditor will pass on the payment of the officers and employees of St. Elizabeths until an investigation has been made as to whether it complies with the compensation paid for similar services in other hospitals. An investigation of one hospital may show one thing, and of another hospital may show another, and the effect of it would be to hold up the pay of the employees.

Mr. WARREN. I shall say further, along that line, that the Assistant Secretary of the Interior came here and expressed a doubt about this provision, and the intention is that they will approach the auditing officer, and we shall know more about it before we get out of conference.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 9, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations contained herein for St. Elizabeths Hospital shall be used so long as soldiers or sailors are detailed as orderlies, guards, or in any other capacity.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 21, to insert:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, ice and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than $1,500 shall be used for normal instruction, $76,437.75.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that this item is desired by the House?

Mr. WARREN. It was inserted by the House and was knocked out on a point of order. That often occurs there. It is simply the objection of one person and is a defect in their legislative procedure. We have every year appropriated for this purpose. The Senator knows what it is, of course.

Mr. KING. Yes. I have felt for some time that the appropriation for that institution ought to be found in the District bill. We can find justification perhaps for this appropriation; but why not attach it to the District bill and make it a part of the institutions of the District?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that the students in this school come from all over the country.

Mr. WARREN. It is national entirely.

Mr. SMOOT. It has always been carried in this bill and has taken the same course for years and years in the past. One Congressman always makes a point of order against it in the House and when the bill comes to the Senate it is put back.

Mr. KING. If it were not for the exceptional character of the item I would feel constrained to raise a point of order, because obviously the Federal Government ought not to make appropriations for educational purposes generally.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 3, to insert.

For tools, materials, fuel, wages of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 6, to insert:

For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 8, to insert:

For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 10, to insert:

Medical department: For part cost of needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, $7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 13, to insert:

For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, biological, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the science hall, including cases and shelving, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 16, to insert:

Fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, including necessary labor to care for and operate the same, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 19, to insert:

In all, $121,937.75.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 136, after line 8, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

For the following force in the office of the Attorney General: Clerks—three of class 3, three of class 2, three of class 1, one $1,000; messenger, $840; in all, $14,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings," subhead "Miscellaneous objects, Department of Justice," on page 139, line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$2,000,000"; so as to make the clause read:

Detection and prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; the investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, clerks, referees, and trustees of the United States courts and the Territorial courts, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the official papers, records, and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney General at any time; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice or the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General; hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, including not to exceed $140,000 for necessary employees at the seat of Government, and including a Director of the Bureau of Investigation at not exceeding $7,500 per annum, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General; in all, $2,000,000.

Mr. KING. Before proceeding to the consideration of this item I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether the item on page 136 can be considered as temporary, and will not fasten indefinitely and permanently those additional officials upon the rolls.

Mr. WARREN. It stands for one year. Of course, if they list and estimate them for another year, then it is within our power to take them off. They asked for twice as many as that and insisted that it was necessary. We did not give them quite half and as temporary, although we can not tell, of course, whether the estimate will be given next year or not.

Mr. KING. I should be glad to see an amendment if one could be attached that would clearly express the purpose of the Senate to limit the duration of their tenure for one year, and that at the expiration of that time they should be automatically separated from the service.

Mr. WARREN. The title of the bill handles that. It goes for this year only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judicial," on page 142, after line 9, to insert:

SUPREME COURT.

For nine law clerks, one for the Chief Justice and one for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding $3,600 each, $32,400.

Mr. KING. I ask that this amendment may be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," on page 153, after line 13, to insert:

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

The proviso contained in the paragraph appropriating $325,000 to further promote and develop foreign and domestic commerce of the United States to be expended under the Secretary of Commerce found in "An act making apropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1919, be amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That no more than $60,000 of the foregoing sum shall be used for the expenses of branch offices, of which $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for maintaining branch offices on Puget Sound, Wash."

Mr. KING. I should like to have an explanation of this item. It seems to me if we make provision for the opening of offices in all parts of our country there will be no end to that program and we will soon have a multitude.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator does not mind, I will ask that the amendment go over, because the chairman of the Committee on Commerce happens to be absent at the moment.

Mr. KING. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over without objection.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 160, after line 13, to insert:

For completion of one new vessel, including its equipment, authorized in sundry civil act of July 1, 1918, at not to exceed $354,000, to replace the *Gedney*, $354,000.

Mr. KING. I ask that that amendment may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment being passed over? The Chair hears none, and it is passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Bureau of Fisheries," on page 173, line 10, after the word "therewith," to strike out "$7,500," and insert "$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

Statistical inquiry: For collections and compilation of statistics of the fisheries and the study of their methods and relations, including travel and preparation of reports and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 173, after line 18, to insert:

Development and improvement of the herring fisheries of Alaska: For the instruction of fishermen and packers in the best methods of curing and preserving herring, and to provide for the inspection of cured herring on the request of either packers, brokers, or dealers, and with the consent of the owner thereof, under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, $25,000.

Mr. KING. I reserve the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. WARREN. There can no point of order lie against that amendment. It is estimated for by the department; it is recommended by a standing committee; and it is for a service provided for by law. So a point of order can not properly be made against it.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the proposed appropriation been estimated for?

Mr. WARREN. It has.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the amendment go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is passed over, without objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 175, after line 5, to insert:

STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Contingent expenses: For fees to witnesses; traveling and other expenses when on official business of the Supervising Inspector General, supervising inspectors, traveling inspectors, local and assistant inspectors, and clerks; instruments, furniture, stationery, janitor service, and every other thing necessary to carry into effect the provisions of title 52, Revised Statutes, fiscal year 1919; $5,550.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if this is the only appropriation that has been made or which is proposed in order to execute the provisions of the Revised Statutes referred to in the proposed amendment?

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator from Utah refer to the Steamboat-Inspection Service?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; this is the only appropriation for this purpose which the committee has proposed.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that there has been some other appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. WARREN. Not in this bill.

Mr. KING. If not in this bill, then in some other bill.

Mr. WARREN. Such an appropriation as that to which the Senator from Utah refers was probably made in the appropriations regularly made in the legislative bill, providing for the service which has been established by statute. This is for the contingent expenses which could not be known a year ago when the other appropriation bill was passed.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that there would be duplications; that the subject having received consideration in a former appropriation bill, it ought to be dealt with there in its entirety; but dealing with it in part there and dealing with it here will necessarily cause overlapping and duplication and result in augmenting the expenses.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah must give the committee credit for having examined that matter before inserting the item in this bill, which is for the purpose I have stated to the Senator. In fact, the appropriation should have been inserted at some point in the deficiency appropriation bill; but that not having been done, it was deemed proper to place it in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Department of Labor," subhead "Immigration Service," on page 177, after line 13, to insert:

Enforcement of laws against alien anarchists: For the enforcement of the act approved October 16, 1918, entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes" and acts amendatory thereof, to wit: Salaries of officers and employees, $75,000; transportation, $75,000; per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act of August 1, 1914, $22,000; maintenance and deportation expenses, $100,000; supplies and contingent expenses, $26,000; membership fees, $2,000; in all, $300,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming at this time recall the appropriation which has heretofore been made to the Department of Labor for the enforcement of any statutes which we have enacted for the deportation of aliens?

Mr. WARREN. To just what does the Senator from Utah refer?

Mr. KING. I am calling attention to page 177 of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that; but I did not catch the exact point of the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that the Department of Labor has a considerable fund for the enforcement of all laws within

its jurisdiction, including the enforcement of the act of 1918, to which reference is made in this amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah knows that very little had been said about anarchists in the past until the occurrences of the last year or two have brought the matter prominently forward. There has recently been a great deal of criticism; in fact, the Senator from Utah knows that on the floor last night criticisms were indulged in to a considerable extent; I think perhaps the Senator himself participated in the discussion.

The Department of Labor no longer ago than this morning, I may say, in a conversation I had with officers of the department which is taking care of this matter, requested that the appropriation be increased to $600,000 instead of $300,000. They stated that during the war, when submarines were afloat, they did not feel that they ought to send insane aliens, anarchists, and so forth, out of the country. They have now many they desire to deport, and they desire to deport them as fast as the question of the propriety of their deportation may be determined under the law. We have only given them a portion of what they have asked for. Very probably they should have more for this purpose.

Mr. KING. I know that the funds at the disposal of this department are not sufficient for the proper execution of all the laws respecting the deportation of aliens and for the enforcement of such deportation. I know that the department now has more than 3,000 persons under its supervision, if not its physical control, ready for deportation, but because of the war it has been unable to secure vessels in which to deport them.

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator for reinforcing what I said about this matter.

Mr. KING. The Department of Labor has not been able to secure sufficient vessels for enforcing the act providing for the deportation of these persons and sending them to their respective countries. The point I made inquiry about was whether, in making this appropriation, cognizance had been taken of any preceding fund which had been appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, yes; but there has been no specific appropriation for this purpose, and this is specific and can not be diverted, but must be used for this purpose.

Mr. KING. I think there ought to be an ample fund provided for such deportation.

Mr. WARREN. There probably will be a move made not to enlarge this particular branch but along the same line, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming, in passing, that I have made some efforts to try to obtain a vessel for the Department of Labor, so that they may speedily begin the deportation of anarchists and aliens who are infesting our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is agreed to, without objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Naturalization service," on page 179, after line 14, to insert:

Any person of foreign birth who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, after final examination and acceptance by the said military or naval authorities, and shall have been honorably discharged after such acceptance and service, shall have the benefits of the seventh subdivision of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, Thirty-fourth Statutes at Large, part 1, page 596, as amended, and shall not be required to pay any fee therefor; and this provision shall continue for the period of one year after all of the American troops are returned to the United States. The authority to promote instruction in citizenship and English now being exercised under the supervision of the director of citizenship is hereby extended to include soldiers and sailors and all persons of the age of 18 years and upward, and those in penal institutions. The provisions of the ninth subdivision of section 4 of the act above referred to are hereby made applicable to this added authority. In discharging this responsibility the director of citizenship shall disseminate information regarding the institutions of the United States Government in such manner as will best stimulate loyalty to those institutions, and secure the aid of civic, educational, community, religious, racial, and other organizations, and shall compile statistical information as to aliens in their relation to citizenship; and for expenses incidental thereto, including the rental or purchase of motion pictures and the transfer of any motion-picture negatives from branches of Government organized specially for war activities remaining in their possession, or in the possession of the Government, and such transfer to be without charge upon any appropriation. Credit for such transfers shall be given upon the records of the Treasury Department in the final accounting by such specially organized branches of the Government.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will say that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] is very much interested in the amendment which has just been stated. He is not here; so I ask that the amendment go over until he comes in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 181, to insert:

UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION.

Salaries: For officers, attorneys, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia necessary to carry out the provisions of the acts of May 16, 1918 (Public No. 149, 65th Cong.), and of June 4, 1918 (Public No. 164, 65th Cong.), $477,700.

Contingent expenses: For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices at Washington, D. C., including purchase of blank books, maps, stationery, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, and soap; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; telegraph and telephone service; printing and binding; and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, and necessary to collect loans made to corporations and associations, $99,100.

Rent: For buildings and part of buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, $22,000.

For dwellings commandeered under the act of May 16, 1918 (Public No. 149, 65th Cong.), $24,620.

In all, rent, $46,620.

Valuation of property: For compensation and expenses of independent expert boards to appraise the buildings and lands owned by the corporation for the purpose of establishing a basis for rental rates and for fixing sales basis, $100,000.

Operation of projects: To equip, manage, maintain, alter, rent, lease lands, houses, buildings, improvements, local transportation, and other general community utilities, including the maintenance and operation of hotels owned by or leased to the United States or the United States Housing Corporation, and commandeered by the United States, as provided by the acts of May 16, 1918 (Public No. 149, 65th Cong.), and June 4, 1918 (Public No. 164, 65th Cong.), including the cost of premiums on fire insurance policies, fidelity bonds, public and employer's liabilities, as follows:

HOUSES.

Aberdeen, Md., $7,620.
Alliance, Ohio, $9,570.
Bath, Me., $10,450.
Bremerton, Wash., $32,260.
Bridgeport, Conn. (site 4, Crane tract), $25,600.
Bridgeport, Conn. (site 5, Mill green), $25,000.
Bridgeport, Conn. (site 12, Grassmere), $12,700.
Charleston, W. Va., $12,000.
Erie, Pa. (east tract), $6,700.
Erie, Pa. (west tract), $24,700.
Hammond, Ind., $19,300.
Indianhead, Md., $11,600.
New Brunswick, N. J., $23,150.
New London, Conn., $12,330.
Groton, Conn., $2,540.
Newport, R. I., $5,070.
Niagara Falls, N. Y., $19,130.
Niles, Ohio, $8,000.
Philadelphia, Pa., $66,500.
Portsmouth, Va., district: Cradock, $70,600; Truxton, $18,600.
Pompton Lakes, N. J., $1,330.
Quincy, Mass., $48,000.
Rock Island district: Davenport, Iowa, $20,000; Moline, Ill., $12,000; East Moline, Ill., $12,340; Rock Island, Ill., $22,000.
Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $27,100.
Washington, D. C., navy yard, $1,500.
Waterbury, Conn., $6,140.
Watertown, N. Y., $10,530.
In all, houses, $584,360.

HOTELS.

Bremerton, Wash., $220,000.
Kittery Point, Me., $99,000.
Washington, D. C., Government hotel for Government workers; to equip, manage—including personal service—maintain, alter, rent, lease houses, buildings, and improvements owned by the United States and or the United States Housing Corporation and to operate and maintain restaurants therein, as provided by the acts of May 16, 1918 (Public, No. 149, 65th Cong.), and June 4, 1918 (Public, No. 164, 65th Cong.), including the cost of selling the same or any part thereof; premiums on fire insurance policies, fidelity bonds, public and employers' liability, $925,940; in all, hotels, $1,244,940.

RESTAURANTS.

Quincy, Mass., $3,500.
Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $149,700; in all, restaurants, $153,200.

APARTMENTS.

Bremerton, Wash., $8,000.
Bridgeport, Conn. (site 1, Black Rock), $44,000.
Bridgeport, Conn. (site 14, Connecticut Avenue), $20,800.
Erie, Pa. (West tract), $1,400.
Portsmouth, Va., district: Cradock, $8,000.
Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $760.
In all, apartments, $82,960.

DORMITORIES.

Indianhead, Md., $8,200.
Quincy, Mass., $96,000.
Vallejo, Calif. (Mare Island), $38,300.
Washington, D. C.: Navy yard, $5,000.
In all, dormitories, $147,500.

Finishing property environment: For expenses of finishing the yards and improving the immediate environments of the properties by planting trees, shrubbery, and sowing grass seeds, $133,735.

In all, $3,070,115.

Section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the power and authority granted herein shall cease with the termination of the present war as formally proclaimed by the President, except the power and authority to care for, rent, operate, and sell such property as remains undisposed of; to conclude and execute contracts or other obligations made or incurred during the war or in carrying out the provisions of this section; to collect the principal and interest of loans made or other sums due under obligations entered into under this act; and to take such other steps as are necessary to

protect the interests of the Government and to fulfill the obligations duly incurred in carrying out the powers granted by said act. All property shall be sold at its fair market value as soon after the conclusion of the war as it can be advantageously done, and a reasonable effort shall be made to sell the houses direct to prospective individual home owners for their own occupancy before they are offered for sale in bulk or to speculative investors. Full power and authority is hereby given to sell and convey all such property remaining undisposed of after the termination of the present war. All deeds, contracts, or other instruments of conveyance executed by the United States Housing Corporation by its duly authorized officer or officers where the legal title to the property in question is in the name of said corporation, and by the United States of America by the Secretary of Labor where the title to the property in question is in the name of the United States of America, shall be conclusive evidence of the transfer of title to the property in question according to the purport of such deeds, contracts, or other instruments of conveyance, and in no case shall any purchaser or grantee thereunder be required to see to the application of any purchase money: *Provided, however,* That no sale or conveyance shall be made hereunder on credit without reserving a first lien on such property for the unpaid purchase money: *Provided further,* That in no case shall any such property be given away, except that any part thereof may be transferred without consideration to any other department of the Government in need thereof, with the consent and approval of the President; nor shall rents be furnished free, but the rental charges shall be reasonable and just as between the tenants and the Government. The United States Housing Corporation (a corporation organized by authority of the President of the United States pursuant to the provisions of an act approved May 16, 1918, entitled 'An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs,' and an act approved June 4, 1918, entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes') shall wind up its affairs and dissolve as soon as it has disposed of said property and performed the duties and obligations herein set forth."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether this item makes provision for the perpetuation of the Plaza buildings and others, which the Senater, after investigation, practically unanimously resolved should be discontinued?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in explanation of the matter, without going back to the original legislation, whether it is good or bad, it has been enacted, and these buildings are in existence. In the deficiency bill it was provided that $34,500,000 of the money which had been placed at the disposal of the Housing Corporation should be turned back into the Treasury. An amendment was also adopted, offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], whom I do not see in his seat just now, under which all the money taken in hereafter by the Housing Corporation should be turned into the Treasury. That, of course, leaves them without a dollar to buy food, to pay help, and so forth. So we must appropriate the money. We are following the plan which I think the Senator approves. Instead of having a revolving fund and allowing the use of left-over balances, and so forth, the corporation officials are compelled to put their money into the Treasury, and we appropriate it out.

Then we have added a clause giving them the privilege, which they already have up to July 1, of selling houses as they can hereafter sell them to advantage. They would be debarred from doing this longer except by act of Congress. We have covered that, so that they can go on and dispose of these houses as fast as possible. I am speaking now of houses and buildings in various parts of the United States. The ones near the Capitol will undoubtedly be torn down at some time, as they are on Government land and entirely within the control of the Government. If the Senator will notice, this item alludes to restaurants, hotels, and houses scattered pretty much all over the United States, and those buildings the corporation promises to dispose of as fast as possible. If, however, the Senator would like to have the amendment go over, I shall make no objection.

Mr. KING. I should like to have it go over.

Mr. WARREN. Very well, I ask that the amendment be passed over.

Mr. KING. If I could have my way, the whole item would be very greatly modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 187, after line 17, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Additional for rent in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1920, $41,509: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if in the Agricultural appropriation bill, which recently passed and which carried $35,000,000 or so, ample provision was not made for the rental of necessary buildings?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the estimate for rent, which in the past has always been granted, amounted for the Agricultural Department to about $158,000. The House reduced that to $100,000, and as the bill passed the Senate $100,000 was appropriated for this purpose. That was based upon an order which had been issued, or was expected to be issued, by the Public Buildings Commission under which space in the Interior Department to the amount of $58,000 was to be given to the Agricultural Department; but upon the final survey it developed that that space could not be given to the Agricultural Department; it had to be given to other departments in order that they might be enabled to hold all of their employees together as nearly as possible. We did, however, reduce the amount of $58,000 to $41,509, as provided in this amendment. This amount is absolutely necessary, based upon the order issued by the Public Buildings Commission.

I wish to say further to my colleague that now that the first orders have been issued by the commission I will when the committee amendments have been disposed of offer other amendments at this point to take care of the Post Office Department, the State Department, and one other department. With the transfers which have been made, we will save hundreds of thousands of square feet of space, but in the adjustment of the whole program the amendments that I shall offer will show where we have fallen short in providing space for the different departments. Nearly all of the rent provisions in the past have been stricken out of various bills, and the amount that appears here is merely to take care of all that is found absolutely necessary for the present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 188, after line 8, to insert:

The statement of appropriations, new offices created, offices omitted, and so forth, required by law to be prepared under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, for the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, shall include the statement of appropriations, and so forth, required by law to be prepared for the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 188, after line 23, to insert:

For purchase and installation of new boiler to replace three old ones, including personal services and labor, $1,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 189, to insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to transfer, free of charge, any unused motor equipment suitable for the use of the Botanic Garden.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, to save recurring to an item which is not an amendment, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the item on page 189, commencing in line 4, for an additional uniformed police force for the protection of the Capitol. My recollection is that during the war, because of the necessity of fully protecting the Capitol from alien enemies, the police force was increased. Is this for the perpetuation of that increase?

Mr. WARREN. This is for the continuance for a year of that increased force. It is thought to be necessary on account of occurrences about the country and in Washington; in fact, as the Senator knows, a bomb was exploded in a part of the Capitol sometime ago. As a matter of precaution it was thought best that this provision should be made.

Mr. KING. I will not dissent from the committee, but it seems to me that there is no necessity for maintaining the increase.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 189, after line 14, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, and for all necessary personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules, $65,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is this amount of $65,000 in addition to the usual appropriation for the maintenance of the Senate Office Building?

Mr. WARREN. This is the only one for maintenance proper. Of course, a few of the employees who are there the year around are carried in another bill; but, if the Senator will notice, this is the omnium gatherum that takes care of the extra help and takes care of all supplies. It might be referred to as covering extraordinary expenses.

Mr. KING. Was there no provision in the House bill for this purpose?

Mr. WARREN. There never is anything in the House bill for our part of it. They put in the necessary items for their part and expect us to put in those for ours, always.

Mr. KING. Does this cover all of the expenses of the building?

Mr. WARREN. We intend that it shall cover all except what are otherwise noted; and the Senator will notice from the other items what we have inserted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 189, after line 19, to insert:

For furniture for the Senate Office Building and for labor and material incident thereto and repairs thereof, window shades, awnings, carpets, glass for windows and bookcases, desk lamps, window ventilators, name plates for doors and committee tables, electric fans, etc., $23,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 189, after line 24, to insert:

For the Capitol: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended by the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, United States Senate, $41,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 190, after line 4, to insert:

For continuing the work of restoring the decorations on the walls of the first-floor corridors in the Senate wing of the Capitol, to be expended under the direction of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 190, after line 8, to insert:

That the chauffeurs who drive the cars of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President of the United States are hereby declared to be employees of the United States and entitled to the $240 per annum additional compensation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 190, after line 13, to insert:

For additional amount to pay the storekeeper of the Senate a salary of $2,500 for the fiscal year 1920, $280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 191, line 25, after the date "1920," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$65,000," so as to make the clause read:

Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries: For an additional amount to enable the commission to complete the reclassification of salaries in accordance with the requirements of section 9 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, $65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amenment was, on page 192, after line 5, to insert:

For payment to James J. Britt for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Britt *v.* Weaver, Sixty-fifth Congress, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 3, $2,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is entirely a House matter, but it seems that it escaped their notice or else they did not have the figures, so the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House addressed to the Senate committee a letter covering it, which is the usual method of procedure when one House desires the other House to insert anything particularly within its jurisdiction that has been overlooked.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Panama Canal," on page 204, line 8, after "$9,099,939," to strike out "to be immediately available and," so as to make the clause read:

In all, $9,099,939, to continue available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 207, line 15, after the word "That," to insert "except as otherwise provided by law," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 4. That except as otherwise provided by law the President is authorized to transfer to the custody and care of such of the departments or independent establishments as he may determine the files and records of the agencies created for the period of the war upon the discontinuance of such activities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 207, after line 20, to insert:

SEC. 5. The Secretary of War is authorized to transfer any unused and surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment of any kind, the payment for same to be made as provided herein, to any branch of the Government service having appropriations available for the purchase of said vehicles and equipment: *Provided*, That in case of the transfers herein authorized a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage, shall be determined upon and an equivalent amount of each appropriation available for said purchase shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt, and the appropriation in each case reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of each official of the Government having such purchases in charge to procure the same from any such unused or surplus stock if possible: *Provided further*, That hereafter no transfer of motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment, unless specifically authorized by law, shall be made free of charge to any branch of the Government service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 208, after line 14, to insert:

SEC. 6. A joint commission to report to Congress a plan for a national budget system is hereby established. Its membership shall consist of the Secretary of the Treasury and two other officials of the executive department of the Government, to be appointed by the President; three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, to be appointed by the presiding officer of the House and Senate, respectively.

That no compensation shall be paid to any member of said commission.

That said commission is hereby empowered and directed to report by December 1, 1919, a plan for the adoption of a national budget system for the Government of the United States, and showing therein what changes, amendments, or adjustments the adoption of said budget system would cause in the rules of the Senate and the House in the laws now in operation relative to revenues and expenditures, in the organization of the Treasury Department, in the forms and method of preparation of the departmental estimates, in the method of presenting said estimates to the Congress, in the methods of accounting and aduit, and such other and further information as said commission may see fit to lay before the Congress.

That said commission is authorized to employ such experts and such clerical assistance as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

That the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section.

That said commission shall expire on the 1st day of January, 1920.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have no objection to this particular item in the form in which it has been inserted. There is only a small appropriation made for this particular work. I do not want to let the item go in, however, without stating my position.

I believe it would be an unfortunate thing for the country if Congress should be guided solely by the estimates made by the persons holding these official positions in the various departments. I believe that this is one of the most important matters that we have to consider in an appropriation bill. I realize to some extent at least, I believe, the benefit of a report from a commission which would be in a position to give us an itemized statement of what money each and every department of the Government ought to use; but we find fault with the estimates made by the various departments and various bureaus now. In my judgment, Mr. President, the budget system, if strictly followed in a Government like ours—because, thank God, we are not yet a kingdom or an empire—would mean the destruction of representative government in a free Republic. There is no place nor is there any way in which the people and Congress can control matters otherwise than by either increasing or limiting an appropriation; and to say that the power of Congress should be left in the hands of men who are occupying positions in bureaus and in the departments seems to me to be a violation of the fundamental laws of our land.

Mr. President, perhaps I am taking this matter too seriously. I may have read my history wrongly; but I believe, sir, that bureaucracy was the beginning of the destruction of the great country of Rome at the time it was a republic. I believe that to follow out this proposition would mean the undermining and ultimately the destruction of the fundamental principles of our Government. I have no objection to allowing this small appropriation to be used in order to determine whether or not it is possible to arrive at some method whereby the appropriations of the various departments may be limited; but, Mr. President, it goes much farther than that. If we are to understand that in the future Congress shall have no authority and no power either to reduce or to increase appropriations, what is Congress for? What is the use of having a Congress? Why not abolish it?

I am simply making these few remarks, Mr. President, because I fear that this is simply an entering wedge to take from Congress the power which the fundamental law of the land gives to Congress. I have been much impressed with the correspondence which I have received, not from men in the ordinary walks of life but from men engaged in what we call big business, indorsing this proposition; and I am somewhat surprised that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], who is known to sincerely believe in reforms which will benefit the people of the country, has taken this proposal so seriously.

Mr. KENYON. What does the Senator mean—that the Senator from Iowa is advocating this in behalf of big business?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from North Dakota will simply repeat what he said—that I am somewhat surprised that the Senator from Iowa advocates this proposition, because I do not believe that the Senator himself has received a single letter in behalf of this proposition from his farmer constituents in his

own State; but I know he has received, because I have received, thousands of letters from men engaged in big business advocating this proposition.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I would not be prejudiced against a proposition even if I did receive letters from big business in favor of it. I would still try to consider it fairly and on its merits; but I have received letters from farmers and merchants, and I suppose from big business men, all advocating a budget system. I have never received a letter from anybody who was opposed to trying it, at least. This amendment, however, does not provide any budget system. It merely asks for an inquiry and a report to Congress. How can anybody object to that? Both political parties in 1916 declared for a budget system, I think, without knowing much about it. It was the popular thing to talk about a budget. This is simply to get at the facts. How can the Senator object to that?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not object to this particular provision.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator is going ahead, then, building up a straw man to knock down.

Mr. GRONNA. No; there is no straw man about it, Mr. President.

Mr. KENYON. Well, hay, then. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRONNA. I am simply calling attention to what is going to occur in the future. I am simply calling attention to the fact that this is an entering wedge for a proposition to take from the Congress of the United States and from the people of the United States the right to appropriate money and either to increase or to decrease appropriations.

Mr. KENYON. It is an entering wedge to stop the wasteful and criminally extravagant appropriations of Congress.

Mr. GRONNA. If that were the purpose, and it would only lead to that, I should not object to it.

Mr. KENYON. That is the only purpose that I have; and I hope the Senator will not feel that I am trying to help the great business interests of Wall Street. I suppose big business is for it. I hope so. Any business man would be against present methods.

Mr. GRONNA. I fear that the Senator from Iowa was not in his seat when I commenced my remarks.

Mr. KENYON. Yes, I was.

Mr. GRONNA. I said that I had no objection to this particular item. I found no fault, as the Senator knows, with it in the committee. I said I was perfectly willing to let this provision go in and let it be tried out; but I wanted it understood that so far as I am personally concerned I am not going to let the proposition of a budget system go unchallenged. I am only calling attention to that, Mr. President.

Mr. KENYON. I imagine there will be plenty of time to challenge it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say, except that I believe that if this plan should be ultimately followed out, leaving to the departments the building up of a bureaucracy, such as has destroyed all liberal governments in days past, it will simply spell the destruction of free democracy in America.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) to amend pubic resolution No. 33, approved June 29, 1918, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6639) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

WATERS OF NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the amendments of the House to the joint resolution be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) to amend public resolution No. 33, approved June 29, 1918, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue permits, revocable at will, for the diversion of water in the United States from the Niagara River above the Falls for the creation of power to individuals, companies, or corporations which are now actually producing power from the waters of said river, in quantities which in no event shall exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet per second: *Provided*, That this resolution shall remain in force until the 1st day of July, 1920, and no longer, at the expiration of which time all permits granted hereunder shall terminate, unless sooner revoked, or unless the Congress shall before that date enact legislation regulating and controlling the diversions of water from the Niagara River, in which event this resolution shall cease to be of any further force or effect.

Any individuals, companies, or corporations violating any of the provisions of said permits, or diverting water from said river above the Falls for the creation of power, except under a permit issued under the authority of this law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year nor less than 30 days, or both in the discretion of the court; and each and every day on which such violation occurs or is committed shall be deemed a separate offense: *Provided*, That where such violation is charged against the company or corporate body, the offense shall be taken and deemed to be that of any director, officer, agent, or employee of such company or corporate body ordering, directing, or permitting the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River."

Mr. LODGE. I think I can state it in a moment to the Senate. The present law expires on the 1st of July, and the Senate passed an act extending the time until Congress should enact legislation. The House has returned the joint resolution exactly in the same form, except that it is limited to one year. I think the Senate arrangement is better, but this meets the immediate need and extends the power of the Secretary and the use of the water for one year.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to inquire what statement was made as to the reason why the House took this position.

Mr. LODGE. It made no statement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Was it because of the pendency of other waterway legislation?

Mr. LODGE. They have sent no message with it. I did not look at the debate. I have not talked with the committee. But the change is not of sufficient consequence to delay the passage of the joint resolution. If we do not get it through before the 1st of July, everything will stop.

I ought to say that except for that change the legislation is precisely the same as it left the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I think I can state the reason why the House has always taken the position for a definite limitation, and undoubtedly it has done so in this case for the same reason. With a definite limitation, it is to the interest of those who are benefited by the legislation to assist in securing permanent legislation, or at least not to defeat it. With the form in which the Senate passed it, it would be to the interest of those parties to defeat permanent legislation, because until Congress did act they would have the right to continue under the existing terms.

The amendments were concurred in.

CABLEGRAM FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the following cablegram has been received from the President of the United States, dated at Paris, June 28:

MY FELLOW COUNTRYMEN: The treaty of peace has been signed. If it is ratified and acted upon in full and sincere execution of its terms it will furnish the charter for a new order of affairs in the world. It is a severe treaty in the duties and penalties it imposes upon Germany, but it is severe only because great wrongs done by Germany are to be righted and repaired; it imposes nothing that Germany can not do; and she can regain her rightful standing in the world by the prompt and honorable fulfillment of its terms. And it is much more than a treaty of peace with Germany. It liberates great peoples who have never before been able to find the way to liberty. It ends, once for all, an old and intolerable order under which small groups of selfish men could use the peoples of great empires to serve their own ambition for power and dominion. It associates the free governments of the world in a permanent league in which they are pledged to use their united power to maintain peace by maintaining right and justice. It makes international law a reality supported by imperative sanctions. It does away with the right of conquest and rejects the policy of annexation and substitutes a new order under which backward nations—populations which have not yet come to political consciousness and peoples who are ready for independence but not yet quite prepared to dispense with protection and guidance—shall no more be subjected to the domination and exploitation of a stronger nation, but shall be put under the friendly direction and afforded the helpful assistance of governments which undertake to be responsible to the opinion of mankind in the execution of their task by accepting the direction of the league of nations. It recognizes the inalienable rights of nationality; the rights of minorities and the sanctity of religious belief and practice. It lays the basis for conventions which shall free the commercial intercourse of the world from unjust and vexatious restrictions and for every sort of international cooperation that

will serve to cleanse the life of the world and facilitate its common action in beneficent service of every kind. It furnishes guarantees such as were never given or even contemplated before for the fair treatment of all who labor at the daily tasks of the world. It is for this reason that I have spoken of it as a great charter for a new order of affairs. There is ground here for deep satisfaction, universal reassurance, and confident hope.

WOODROW WILSON.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 208, in the committee amendment, strike out lines 18, 19, 20, and 21 and insert:

Others to be appointed by the President, by and with the consent and advice of the Senate, five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House, to be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate and House, respectively.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I am going to take only a very short portion of the time of the Senate to discuss this question now. I would not have taken any time this morning to discuss the simple amendment, because, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has observed, that only goes to the extent of an investigation and preparing ultimately, I hope, a law which would be submitted to both Houses of Congress, and then, of course, it is entirely a matter for Congress to decide. But the suggestions made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] appeal to me that they should to some extent be answered even at this time.

I consider the installation of a budget system for a government perhaps the most important constructive legislation in these days it is possible for us to agree to. It radiates and influences every department of government. Instead of being an entering wedge to do away with democratic government, from my experience it is an entering wedge to assure efficiency and economy, and, better even than that, real business control and management of national responsibilities.

The Constitution prevents, without constitutional amendment, the taking away from Congress of its power to appropriate, and I am sure the only idea of those Senators who have been particularly interested in establishing a budget—I know it is my idea—is to establish a system that provides that appropriation bills will come to this body after a careful investigation of the necessities of the various departments of the Government.

It seems to me the experiences of the last five weeks in this Chamber furnish the best argument possible for a budget system. We have been asking the chairmen of the various committees what this particular item means or that particular item means. They have done their very best, they have worked day and night, but they can only tell us what the testimony says that was taken before their committees and what the representatives of the department have stated. Naturally, the average representative of a department is properly enthused in the possibilities of his department. It is human nature that he is going to try to get as much of an appropriation as possible for that department. His testimony is going to be along the lines of least resistance to an extent in order to try to make his case a good one to secure the appropriation that he has asked for. We have absolutely no opportunity to investigate beyond that. It is too one-sided in the appropriation of billions of dollars.

The installation of a budget system means in a general way, from my experience in having helped install one in a State government, that for one solid year before we consider the sundry civil appropriation bill before us, for instance, the military appropriation bill, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and so on, the budget commission, employing men who, through experience, know the requirements to a great extent at least of the various governmental activities, shall be investigating often the requisitions which have been made by the departments and the necessity for such appropriations, and who are not connected with the departments at all, but who endeavor, by reviewing one department after the other, to see where overlapping exists, and we know it exists here in hundreds of divisions and bureaus in the departments of the Government. You can not discover that when each department is working separately from the others. To-day we have had evidence, in the past days at least, of actual contention between subdepartments within a department.

The only way possible to some extent to bring this great business of government under one general head, so that the Congress can legislate with a feeling of some confidence on the requisition through appropriation bills that are presented to them, is to have a commission of that character, not directly connected with any department, but representing Congress and the Chief Executive, the latter the business manager of the business of the country. The result of such investigations can be presented through one appropriation bill or a dozen appropriation bills, if Congress finally decides that that is the best method the results should come to the Congress.

I feel, Mr. President, that if we can adopt a budget system along those lines we will not only save millions of dollars to the Government, but that we will increase the efficiency and do away to a great extent with the lost motion that exists to-day. It can not be otherwise.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has referred to the installation of a budget system in his State, with which I know the Senator himself as governor of the State had a great deal to do. I wonder if he would be willing to tell Congress how it has worked and what the result has been where it was established.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska asked me for concrete evidence as to the operation of the budget system in New Jersey. I will just take the time of the Senate to mention one illustration.

In New Jersey, as I think in most other States of the Union, we had separate boards of managers for the many penal, correctional, and charitable institutions. Most of those boards were nonsalaried. In some few cases the members of the boards were paid salaries. Since the installation of the budget system, the budget commissioners and auditors go around to the various State institutions to look over and check up the requisitions of the boards for appropriations, which made it possible for us to introduce in the legislature the year following the first year of the budget a bill to consolidate all those boards into one central, nonsalaried board. This legislation has been in operation now for over a year. To-day in New Jersey that one board without salary is managing all the correctional, penal, and charitable institutions, having subcommittees, of course, for the various activities, with the result that appropriations were at once greatly equalized, except for physical improvements, which, of course, speak for themselves, but appropriations for management and control and ordinary maintenance, comparatively speaking, have been greatly reduced, and at least the whole system and management standardized.

That is one concrete example of a budget. If we had not had the budget and something to tie together and bring together these activities, we never could have gotten public opinion sufficiently enthused or interested to have made possible the passage of an act rather revolutionary in the legislation.

We have gone further than that. We had thirty-odd boards and commissions of various kinds, as you have in all the States. We have consolidated them into five main departments, and every one of those departments now is managed by a nonsalaried board. The governor of the State, just as the President of the United States, the latter, of course, on a larger scale, becomes, as I said before, the business manager of this great big business. He can not personally, of course, go into all the details, but he has them, through his commission, brought to his attention and becomes more familiar with the actual business of the government which he is elected to administer.

To me, it is the modern method of transforming, to some extent at least, purely political government into common-sense business government. We talk about terrific taxes and the burdens of taxes. We can only reduce them in one way, and that is by cutting down appropriations. We can not reduce them in any other way in the world except through some new source of income, and that indirectly of course is some type of taxation. This reform, of course, need not go to the extreme suggested by the Senator from North Dakota.

But the present waste and extravagance can only be reduced by one general body with investigative powers, constantly in existence, with cooperative functions, and prepared to recommend consolidations and eliminations.

Congress can continue 10 or 12 appropriation committees, if they feel that it is wise, although personally I do not; but so far as having the power to increase or decrease departmental appropriations, there is nothing to prevent this in the ordinary budget plan, as now practically adopted in some States, or that

would in any way take anything away from Congress that they do not want to give up. That is certainly self-evident. So I believe the adoption of this amendment is a step in the right direction.

I recall, in the military bill the other evening, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], was asked why it was that we had to have separate storage houses for the Ordnance Department, the Engineers, and the several other departments of the Army. They are separate. They have absolutely no connection with each other. Without a general authority over them, they would resist cooperation. Why should we have separate storage houses for every department and every subdepartment of the Government? What an improvement if all these demands could be considered in their relation to each other—in the Agricultural Department, with all its ramifications; in the War and the Navy Departments, and so forth—and the committee be informed by unprejudiced sources where the waste and extravagance is being permitted, and with the result that it can be naturally eliminated. It never can be eliminated under the present system. It is practically impossible. The chairman of the committee can not possibly absorb and secure the information necessary in order, from a business standpoint, to approach and solve a problem of this kind.

I trust the House will, if the Senate adopts this amendment, concur in the amendment. They passed last year a similar amendment, but it is necessary, in my judgment, if we are going to evolve a budget plan, to have all three elements represented—the House, the Senate, and the departments—establish the round-table method, give and take, and when they get through with a budget plan, then it is reasonable to assume that the House and Senate, through their representatives, and the executive departments, through their representatives, are naturally committed to the plan. The Senate can not prepare a budget plan and go through with it, and neither can the House alone. It is a matter you must consider with that combination around the table, and then when the bill is approved by such a conference there is reason to expect it to become a law.

I sincerely hope that our conferees, when they are appointed, in conference with Members of the House, will absolutely insist on this amendment being adopted in the conference report.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I have discussed this budget question too many times on the floor to take more than a moment of the Senate's time now. As I have said in response to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], it is simply a plan to report something to Congress as the basis for action. I assume the great objection which will be raised to it in conference will be that we have had enough investigation, that Congress knows enough about it now, and we ought to act instead of investigating. I have a great deal of sympathy with that view. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] introduced a bill here for a budget system. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House introduced a bill there. Both are bills of splendid merit. The very fact that those bills, together with others and resolutions, are coming in and not acted on evidences the fact that Congress is not quite ready to act on this question because of a lack of knowledge, and I say in no spirit of disparagement that very few Members of Congress have given any study to the question of a budget system.

Bills are before the Senate and bills are before the other House which establish this system, so that Congress can go on with their discussion and the bills can possibly be enacted. That will not interfere with the work of this commission or this commission with that work. This commission is not proposed in any spirit of delaying action on the matter. For that reason, to make that perfectly plain, and to meet the objection which is raised to commissions because oftentimes they bury matters and never get action, a provision has been inserted in the amendment that the commission must report by the 1st day of December of this year.

It will take time of certain Members of the Senate and of the House who may be appointed and of the economists or experts who may be selected by the President. I have seen men who came entirely across the United States ready to devote their time to this subject without any compensation. There is no compensation to be paid to anyone under this amendment. There are Senators here, I know, who regard this as the greatest question before the American Congress, and are willing to give their time and attention in an honest, patriotic effort to work out some plan that can be submitted to Congress. If Congress does not want to accept the plan, they do not have to do it. It is full of constitutional difficulties; it is full of practical difficulties; it is going to be a matter of time and earnest thought and conscientious work to evolve a plan that, when it is evolved, if adopted, will result in great saving in our methods of expenditure.

The amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from New Jersey, it seems to me, is one of value, that the membership, instead of three members of the Senate be increased to five, and that instead of three members of the House the membership from that body be increased to five. If that is adopted, as I am sure it will be, I earnestly hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate will insist upon the amendment remaining in the bill. If the argument is made, as it will be made, by the conferees that a commission is merely a way of delaying and burying this matter, the answer to that is that the bills before the Senate and the bills before the House to establish a budget system can be considered and passed if Congress wants to do so, and the work of this commission will in nowise interfere with such action. Both parties are committed to this in their platforms. Did they mean it? The result on this amendment will answer.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on its face it seems as though it would be very easy and simple to establish a so-called budget system; I am in favor of it; but it seems to me that the advocates of this system have not gone to the root of the matter.

The budget system has only been in effective operation in those countries which have a parliamentary government, where the cabinet, so called, acts as a unit; where the government as an entirety brings in its recommendations for appropriations, and where the appropriation bills in those governments are brought in by the representatives of the cabinet as the acts of the government.

Under our system, what are the conditions? Each department prepares its own estimates and each is anxious to get all it can. The departments send their estimates to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury transmits them to Congress.

Before a budget system can be established the first step is to get the Government to act as a unit, to provide some body that will scan and consider all the estimates and send them to Congress as an entirety, and not have estimates from each department.

In the next place, Mr. President, in order to establish a budget system appropriations must all come from one committee; in other words, a budget system can not be established without first creating an authority in the executive department, some board or tribunal, which will act as a unit to present the estimates for the entire service of the Government in one plan and in one scheme, and even though the estimates be received from the Government in that form, all of the appropriation bills must necessarily come from one committee. Unless those two additions be made to the plan a budget system can never be successfully established and operated.

I am heartily in favor of the establishment of a budget system. I have simply called attention to the difficulties in the way and have tried to draw the attention of other Senators who are heartily in favor of that system to some of the questions which ought to be considered in connection with it and to admonish them that it is not such easy sailing as they seem to think it is.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, some years ago I attempted to encourage the adoption of a budget system in the House of Representatives; that is, to coordinate action on all of the appropriation bills arising in that body. At that time the sentiment had not grown sufficiently to carry through the measure.

I do not think there is a doubt in the world that the lost motion in this country costs the American people hundreds of millions of dollars a year. I do not think that that is directly traceable to any one source or that any one man or set of men are responsible for it. It is because we run our Government under our system at loose ends and do not draw them together.

I would be the last man in this Government to consider an amendment taking away from the legislative branch of the Government the control of the pocketbook of the Nation. The pocketbook of the Nation should stay in the Congress. The Congress must control the supply bills or we may endanger the very foundation stones of the Government. We might overthrow the liberty of the people unless we kept in the hands of their representatives the power to control the finances of the Government; but I think that can be done and yet a budget system be adopted.

This Congress has no power to divorce from the Congress the control of appropriation bills. That is vested in the Congress by the Constitution of the United States, and only a constitutional amendment can take it away from us. That power, however, relates to final action. Between the initiation of the bills by estimates coming down from the departments and the final action of Congress there is an intermediate field in which I

think a budget system, if properly organized, could operate and function to the very great benefit of the American people and to economy in public expenditures.

I recognize that it is a very difficult problem to work out; one that must be surrounded with many checks and balances. I also realize that it is very difficult for either House of Congress, or both Houses combined, or for Executive action alone, to work out a plan that would be acceptable.

The only way that the end can be accomplished is the way which is proposed in this bill—to appoint a commission to deliberate on the question and make a proposal next winter. There is no final action to be taken; we are not committed in any way to any plan by the passage of this amendment. It may be greatly helpful in accomplishing the final result, and, of course, if it is not, it can be rejected when the report comes before Congress. So I hope the proposal of the committee may pass without any opposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 208, after line 17, it is proposed to strike out lines 18, 19, 20, and 21, and, after the words "and two," at the end of line 17, to insert "others, to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House, to be appointed by the presiding officer of the Senate and House, respectively."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I notice that the additional words are inserted after the words "and two." "Two" what?

The SECRETARY (reading). "And two others."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment to the amendment is to require those members of the proposed commission appointed by the President to be confirmed by the Senate, and also increases the number of Members of the House and Senate on the commission. It seems to me the commission is large enough without any increase, and, since the appointees of the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House do not have to be confirmed by anybody, I do not see any use in requiring the President's appointees to be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have absolutely no pride of opinion as to that. I simply put that provision in because it is the usual language employed as to presidential appointments. I may explain that the idea of changing the text so as to read "and two others" rather than "two officials," as I recall the original language, is to enable the President to appoint, if in his judgment or that of the Secretary of the Treasury it should be deemed advisable, some expert accountants or men of similar qualifications instead of appointing an official of the Government. Under the amendment I have offered he would not be confined to appointing an official.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Florida has raised the question, I am entirely satisfied to strike out the words requiring confirmation upon the part of the Senate of the appointees of the President.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is perfectly proper to have the appointments made by the President confirmed by the Senate. I think the wording of the amendment as offered by the Senator from New Jersey is proper. Those appointments ought to be confirmed by the Senate, and I hope the Senator will not withdraw those words.

Mr. EDGE. Then, let the amendment be voted on as I originally introduced it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 209, line 20, to change the number of the section from 5 to 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the reading of the bill, with the exception of the amendments passed over.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, on page 210, line 4, I move to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$200,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 210, line 4, in the item relative to the Federal Trade Commission, it is proposed to strike out "$300,000" and in lieu to insert "$200,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee why the reduction from $300,000 to $200,000 is made in connection with the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. WARREN. I suggest that amendment on the information which was conveyed to us by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who is the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and who presented figures to show that the Federal Trade Commission had on hand less than the amount of $300,000 required to be returned to the Treasury. This is to make the amount correspond more nearly to that which they can return than would otherwise be the case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. On behalf of the committee I have several short amendments which I desire to offer. Before offering those amendments, however, I wish to ask that the Secretary be instructed to arrange the totals according to the amendments which have been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARREN. I now ask for the adoption of the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That none of the appropriations made herein for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall be expended to reimburse any expenses incurred by any Government-owned hospital or hospital under contract with the Public Health Service for examination, care, or treatment of beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. There is an evident typographic mistake in the print of the bill on page 12, and I ask that it be corrected according to the memorandum which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 12, line 6, after the word "building," it is proposed to insert "$200,000" in Roman type as stricken out and make the "$220,000" inserted by the committee in italics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. On page 87, after line 4, I ask the adoption of the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 87, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to turn over to the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers a sufficient number of ambulances and trucks from the surplus now on hand to provide two of such ambulances and of such trucks for each of the branch homes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I send to the desk another amendment, which, I think, comes in on page 204, after line 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 204, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

For completing in every detail two seagoing coal barges, now under construction by contract entered into by the United States Shipping Board, Emergency Fleet Corporation, acting for the Panama Canal, to the extent that it was acting within the limits of the authority of the Panama Canal under the act approved June 12, 1917 (40 Stats. L., p. 177), $364,949 each, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in addition to the $800,000 each appropriated for two seagoing barges in said act: *Provided*, That the limitation contained in said act that the total cost of each barge shall not exceed $800,000 each is hereby removed, $729,898.

And, in line 8, to correct the total to read "$9,829,837."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is not this appropriation within the authorization of $2,844,000,000, less $120,000,000, and within the appropriation which the bill carried yesterday of $446,000,000?

Mr. WARREN. No; it comes under an entirely special appropriation made by an act which carries the amount stated. It is for coal barges that are necessary to furnish coal to be delivered, as we must deliver it to vessels going through the Panama Canal, our own vessels as well as those of other nations. The necessity for these barges is very great; they can not be built for the amount of money originally appropriated, and so the matter has been arranged in the way suggested by the amendment.

Mr. KING. Do I understand that those vessels are in process of construction now?

Mr. WARREN. So far as they can be under the appropriation which has been provided; yes.

Mr. KING. If they are not undertaken, it seems to me, with the large number of vessels which we have on hand, those which we have acquired by purchase and those we have requisitioned, as well as those we have constructed, there will be no necessity for these.

Mr. WARREN. I am sure the Senator would not object if he knew the condition of affairs in connection with this matter on the Panama Canal. I will not take the time to go further into it at this time, but the barges are considered very necessary.

Mr. KING. I will rely upon the statement of the chairman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I should like to say just one word with reference to these barges.

No private persons are allowed to carry coal to the Panama Canal. It is entirely a governmental endeavor to sell coal there and control the price. The coal is carried there in coal tramp steamers. Now, for the purposes of economy, it has been proposed, and I think carried out, that each one of these ships shall carry a barge attached to it under the same steam power. These particular barges have been designed for the transportation of coal in connection with these steamers. The class of barges that have been built by the Government Shipping Board and provided otherwise are smaller barges. A ship can only carry one barge, and if you have the smaller barges it will result in a loss of facilities. These particular barges are very large barges, and designed so that one ship carries one barge and increases its capacity.

It has been stated, and the record shows it, that under present prices the saving to the Government in the cost of transportation on each one of these barges amounts to $400,000 per year. In each year that would be nearly one-half the cost of each barge; but, to be perfectly fair, I should say, of course, this is based on the high cost of transportation to-day, and as transportation goes down in the future that saving would be not as great; but there will be a very material saving in building these large barges. More than that, one of the barges is actually under construction. The shapes have been made and they are prepared to go ahead with it. If it were stopped now, it would mean a loss of probably more than half the cost of the barge, whereas if it goes ahead the Government will get the use of it. Therefore I think this amendment is very important in the interest of economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the committee has one further amendment to offer. On page 26, I move to strike out the entire paragraph from lines 10 to 18, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, it is proposed to strike out lines 10 to 18, inclusive, in the following words:

During the fiscal year 1920 all proceeds derived from work performed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, not covered and embraced in the appropriation for said bureau for the said fiscal year, instead of being covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as provided by the act of August 4, 1886 (24 Stats., p. 227), shall be credited when received to the appropriation for said bureau for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. WARREN. This is the paragraph in which it is proposed that the money that comes in shall be used in the department, without turning it into the Treasury. We desire it to go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to call the chairman's attention to the committee amendment on page 179 that proposes to extend the amendment that was added to the naturalization laws, looking to the education of aliens.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that that amendment has been passed over, and it will come up in its regular course.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It has already been reserved?

Mr. WARREN. It has been reserved; yes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And it will come up in the order of reservation?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. The committee is now ready to ask that these reservations may be taken up.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, I should like to make an inquiry. Do I understand that the amendments on page 41 in relation to the appropriation for vocational training have been adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have been.

Mr. KENYON. Before asking to reconsider them, it may be that an explanation will render a reconsideration unnecessary; but if not, I shall ask to reconsider them. This is a matter in which I am very much interested, and I know the Senate is interested in having it right. There is no difference of opinion, probably, about it.

The bill passed 10 days ago by the Senate, and a few days ago unanimously by the House, for vocational rehabilitation of soldiers, sailors, and marines, carried $6,000,000. That was to go entirely to the subsistence of these men. Heretofore they had received a certain amount under the war-risk insurance act. That act took away from the War Risk Insurance Bureau these payments, so that that $6,000,000 represented no greater outlay on the part of the Government, not a cent. It was simply the money that otherwise would have come through the War Risk Insurance Bureau. I think, however, I am a little in error in that statement.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator will not be able to verify that statement exactly, because——

Mr. KENYON. No; I am going to change it, because I am thinking aloud about it, and I am wrong. The difference between the thirty-five or forty dollars a month that would be paid by the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the $75 a month that the Vocational Board would pay would represent an additional amount; but the whole $6,000,000 would go for the subsistence of the men, leaving absolutely nothing to carry out the act.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator bases that statement upon what—upon the estimates?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, of course, has not anything but the estimates upon which to base it?

Mr. KENYON. I have the testimony before the committee and the statements made to me by the board.

Mr. WARREN. They are estimates, however.

Mr. KENYON. They are estimates—the approximate estimate that in a very short time there will be 7,000 men in training.

The subsistence has been advanced now to $80 a month by the House amendment. That would be $560,000 per month, or $6,720,000 per year, for the subsistence alone. Now, instead of that, they estimate that by the 1st of October there will be 16,000 men in training.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it is true, is it not, that under the bill passed a few days ago the allotments to these injured soldiers will be paid by the Vocational Board and not by the War Risk Bureau?

Mr. KENYON. Not by the War Risk Bureau; not even the former amount paid by the War Risk Bureau, $35 or $40 a month, will be paid.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The entire allotment to these injured men must be paid by the Federal Board for Vocational Education?

Mr. KENYON. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And that amounts to the $6,000,000?

Mr. KENYON. It will amount to more than that, on the basis of 7,000 men under training. There are 4,200 now in training and 2,100 more that already have been approved for training. Now, I say to the chairman, that if the $6,000,000 which is provided here can be used for the purposes expressed in the act which we passed the other day, and if there is no question about that—if it can be used not only for subsistence but for maintenance under the former act—then the board, of course, can go ahead as long as they can under this $6,000,000, which will not be more than the first of the year. I am anxious to know if that is the understanding of the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Utah as to what can be done with this $6,000,000?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that that is the understanding of the chairman. The Senator from Utah, of course, can speak for himself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that if the bill mentioned in this paragraph, and designated as the "act approved July —, 1919"—that is, the bill which passed the Senate and also passed the House, and which the Senator reported here—is signed by the President before this appropriation bill is signed, then there is no question but that they can use the money for all purposes.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. But I quite agree with the Senator that if the appropriation bill now under consideration by the Senate is signed first and then the rehabilitation bill, so called, is signed following this bill, I doubt whether the $6,000,000 could be used for any other purpose than just as enumerated in this bill.

Mr. KENYON. If that is true—and I think it is—then this work can not be carried on, and there will be five or six thousand soldiers who are asking for vocational training who can not receive it.

Mr. SMOOT. Technically, I think the Senator is right. I think this could be done, however, without doubt: If the Senator will call the attention of the Secretary to the President to this matter, and ask him to see that the President signs the "act of July —, 1919," first then there will be no question at all about it.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator speaks of soldiers. He does not mean that, does he?

Mr. KENYON. No; soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator means those who have been discharged, of course?

Mr. KENYON. Well, yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I have not any doubt but that if the Senator from Iowa will just drop a note to Secretary Tumulty and ask him to request the President to sign the "act of July —, 1919," first—that is the rehabilitation act, which has passed the House and the Senate, and is now awaiting the signature of the President—he will do so, and if the President will sign that bill before he signs this appropriation bill, then there is no question but that the $6,000,000 can be used for all purposes. I do believe, however, that the statement made by the Senator from Iowa is correct—that if this appropriation bill should be signed before the "act of July —, 1919," then the $6,000,000 could be used only for these specific purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield? I am interested in the statement made by the Senator from Utah, and I think there is a great deal in it, that it may depend upon which one of these bills is signed first. The other bill has passed both Houses, and this question has arisen in my mind:

By the time this bill is finished the President will be back at the White House here in Washington, and this bill will probably go directly to him; and the danger is that he will sign this bill first, because the other bill very likely is on its way now to the European capital of our country, and by the time it gets there the President will have left the White House over there to come to the White House over here; and the result will be that the bill that ought to be signed last will reach the President first.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator——

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, why does not the Senator change the language so as to specify and identify this act as the one which passed Congress on a certain date, and which is entitled so-and-so?

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator think we could provide here for payment under a bill subsequently to become a law? I do not believe we could.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think so. I think it could be identified by the title and the date of its passage. It would not make any difference about the date of its approval by the President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, why is it not better to amend this bill now and put it into such shape that the language it contains takes care of it? Is not that the safest way?

Mr. KENYON. I should be glad if the Senator from Georgia would furnish that language. I have tried to think out the language, but it seems to me we can not provide an appropriation here to apply to a bill that has not become a law.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am informed that the bill that passed the House day before yesterday, I think, or Wednesday, is being held here, and that it was not sent to Paris, and that the President will sign it on his arrival here. Therefore I think, Mr. President, that the easiest way out is for the Senator from Iowa simply to call Secretary Tumulty's attention to it, and I have no doubt that bill will be signed first.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that the matter is receiving attention, and a memoranda is being prepared and will be lodged with the White House before the day is over inviting attention to the signing of these bills in the proper order.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am perfectly satisfied that when the President understands the situation, if it is brought to his attention, there will be no trouble about it.

Mr. KING. I can assure the Senator that the matter will be properly cared for.

Mr. KENYON. I am disposed to risk that, then, and rely on the Senator from Utah bringing it to the attention of the President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of this provision, I wish to call attention to a letter which I have received from the Secretary of Commerce. I will read the letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Will you be good enough to read at your early opportunity (prior to the passage of the sundry civil act) the inclosed correspondence from the Federal Board for Vocational Education?

Apparently without inquiry * * * an amendment has been placed in the bill which will substantially disorganize the work and still further delay the matter of rehabilitation of the injured soldiers.

As a member of the board, and as one long familiar with industrial education, I can assure you that the statements made by the vice chairman of the board in the inclosed letter are well within the truth.

Mr. President, without stopping to read these letters from the vice chairman of the board, I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
OFFICE OF THE BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: After a very satisfactory hearing before the House Committee on Appropriations, they unfortunately incorporated into the sundry civil appropriation bill some limitations brought over from the last Congress, which would throw our work into chaos. After making an appropriation of $4,000,000, the section in the sundry civil bill states:

"*Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, not more than 20 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation in excess of $3,000 each per annum, and not more than 30 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation from $2,500 to $3,000, inclusive, per annum."

We tried to get opportunity to appear before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, but all we could secure was an invitation to send a letter, a copy of which I inclose. In that letter I have not exaggerated the situation, and the condition is one of real gravity. We have got in touch, of course, with all our friends in the Senate, and are moving heaven and earth to get the objectionable proviso amended. I am calling the matter to your attention in the belief that you will want also to take steps to see that our work is not hampered in this way.

Yours, very sincerely, JAMES P. MUNROE,
Vice Chairman.

—

JUNE 23, 1919.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As requested over the telephone, I am addressing, for your earnest consideration and that of your committee, the following memorandum relative to the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, found on page 39 of Union Calendar No. 15, H. R. 6176, report No. 48. While, as far as we can foresee, the appropriation of $4,000,000 therein made will not be sufficient, we accept this amount in the belief that it will carry the work well into the next calendar year, when, if necessary, we can again approach Congress with full confidence that they will not hesitate to provide all that is necessary for the rehabilitation of men who have been injured in the service of their country.

We desire to call to the attention of your committee, however, the fact that the limitations placed by the proviso in the last seven lines of this appropriation will result in a complete disorganization of the work of this board at a moment when it is approaching its highest load; when the Congress is about to place upon us, through the proposed amendment to section 2 of the vocational rehabilitation act, greatly enlarged responsibilities, and at a time when every minute's delay will greatly aggravate the unrest, and even bitterness, of disabled boys all over the country, whose rehabilitation has already, through circumstances over which the Federal Board for Vocational Education had no control, been exasperatingly delayed.

Up to the 1st day of June the district offices of the board had registered a total of 112,281 disabled men, had established personal contact with 28,200 of them; medical surveys had been made of 25,308 of these men, vocational surveys of 73,368. The number of additional undischarged men reported in Army and Navy hospitals in this country on the 1st day of June was approximately 59,000. This does not count the number in France nor the number not yet reached in the field in this country. Thirteen thousand and fifty-one men had been recommended for training by the district case boards, and 7,500 men had been assisted in one way or another in the securing of employment. At the present time approximately 4,200 men are in training; about 6,000 cases are ready to be placed in training as soon as legislation before Congress, which passed the Senate unanimously last week, has become law.

So far as we can now foresee, the above figures represent less than half of the task of getting at every disabled soldier, sailor, and marine wounded or diseased in the service of the Government and providing either for his direct placement or for his training and placement. But the essential element in the remaining task is speed, and speed can be secured only by utilizing to the fullest limit the services of men already familiar with the work and trained to carry it forward effectively. Such a force we have succeeded in building up by taking men from permanent positions in which they were earning good salaries and inducing them to take up this temporary service. This involved, in most cases, the leaving of their homes and the added costs and difficulties which that involves. Nevertheless, many of these men have been secured at salaries no greater than they were receiving in their permanent positions, and of the others, the increased salary, averaging not more than $300 a year, does not begin to cover the increased expenses under which these men find themselves. The work involved in dealing wisely and efficiently with disabled soldiers requires men of experience, of standing in the community, of ability to handle difficult situations, and of power to meet out in the field in our 14 district offices and our 7 subdistrict offices every sort of administrative problem. Cheap men can not do this work, and were they to undertake it disastrous results reflecting

seriously upon the efficiency and good faith of the Federal Government in carrying out this important piece of work would follow.

Were this limitation in regard to the appropriation to stand, the board would lose nearly 200 members of its staff—men of ability and tried experience; and worse than that, would lose its 14 district officers who, even were their salaries not cut down, would refuse to attempt to carry on the work in the States with the inefficient and untried men who would have to be brought in to take the place of those resigning as the result of this congressional action. Ninety-two members of the staff would be affected by the provision limiting the number to be employed in excess of $3,000 to 20, and 193 would be affected by the provision limiting the number to be employed between $2,500 and $3,000, to 30, and these men so affected are the framework of our organization, the very bone and sinew of the vocational rehabilitation service. With these gone, the work would be in chaos for six months, disabled boys to the number of tens of thousands would be left uncared for, and the results would be in every way disastrous.

Under this proposed limitation it would be impossible to retain these essential men, because all of them have permanent positions at higher salaries than those permitted under this limitation would provide; and it would be out of reason to expect such men to keep a temporary position at a lower compensation than they could elsewhere get. Moreover, their places can not be filled, because, in the first place, no untried man can fill the place of one who has had months of experience in a difficult work of this kind, and in the second place, because competent men can not be induced to take up this temporary, high-grade work at the salaries imposed by the suggested limitation.

In view of the above it is respectfully suggested that in the section referring to vocational rehabilitation the words in the last seven lines following the word "provided" be stricken out, and that the following words be substituted:

"that not more than one person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, and that his salary shall not exceed $6,000, and that not more than three persons shall be employed at rates of compensation in excess of $4,000 each per annum."

It seems to us that this simple change would safeguard, as they should be protected, the Federal funds without throwing into hopeless chaos the work for disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines which it is clear that the Congress and the people of the United States desire to be promptly and efficiently performed.

Very respectfully, yours,

JAMES P. MUNROE,
Vice Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Now, Mr. President, just one word further. The difficulty about the House provision was its limitation of salaries practically to below $3,000, with the exception of 20 persons. I want to say that the board now have engaged on short employments, lasting for about 12 months, a number of expert physicians and other experts. They can not keep them at $3,000. They can not keep the force of experts employed for the next 12 months to study these various injured men and classify them at the pay of an ordinary clerk in a department or an extra good clerk. They are experts, and specialists, many of them physicians. I want to say that what the board really desires is embodied in a resolution which they suggested as a substitute for the House language. I read it to the Senate that the Senate can understand that the board is not trying to force exorbitant salaries. They want one man at $6,000, and they want the limitation of their pay put at $4,000, because they have these physicians and experts employed for only a short time; they can not keep them if the pay is put down to a $2,500 basis. The statement is contained in the letter that none of them are getting more than they were making when they withdrew temporarily from private life to do the work largely done in these trial places, in which the condition of the soldier and his possibility for work is being tried out, in which he is being tested out to see what he is physically capable of doing, before advising a line of work for him.

I put the letter in the RECORD that the committee and the conference may have the benefit of the information and see what is really the trouble.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the program seems to be virtually agreed to to-day, and if the Senate amendment is agreed to in conference, then that very question will be solved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; if the Senate amendment is agreed to in conference we are safe; but I want to put the letter in the RECORD so that the danger to the board of breaking up this force of experts, who are temporarily employed for the next few months—12 months at the lowest—may be realized by the conferees on both sides.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, Congressman GOOD no doubt will approve of the amendment as it is now agreed to in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment of the committee passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The first committee amendment passed over will be found on page 35, line 19, where in the total of the items for rural sanitation the committee proposes to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I asked to have this item passed over. I do not know whether this effort to have the Federal Government take over the functions of the individuals in the rural communities and the States can be thwarted or not. It does seem to me that the work for which this appropriation is made is purely a local and State concern. If the Federal Government is to go into every community and point out the methods of sanitation, there is nothing, it seems to me, that the Federal Government may not do. It is extending its functions too far, and the burdens which in the end will rest upon the Federal Government will be so stupendous that no tax bill could be prepared which would meet the requirements of these various times.

I hope the committee will not insist upon increasing the amount. If I thought that an assault could successfully be made upon the entire item, I should move to strike it all out. It seems to me we are extending the functions of these boards and commissions and agencies and executive instrumentalities entirely too far and are intruding into the minor activites of the individuals and of the States.

The amendment was rejected.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 42, under the heading "Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I prepared hurriedly an amendment the other day dealing with this question and sent it to be printed. There are some inaccuracies in it, and I ask the chairman of the committee to let this go over until I have had time to redraft the proposed amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator apply himself to that work, so that we may get at it at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. KING. I shall, consistent with the discharge of other duties.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to offer an amendment to section 2 of this particular amendment. I shall not insist upon it being discussed, however, until the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is through with his proposed amendment and the chairman of the committee is through with the committee amendments.

Mr. WARREN. The chairman of the committee was unable to hear the Senator. What is he proposing?

Mr. KIRBY. I am proposing an amendment to section 2 of this committee amendment, the same that I offered before to the same section of the same provision in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. Is this an amendment to the committee amendment that has already been accepted?

Mr. KIRBY. No. The amendment was adopted by the Senate to the amendment to the Army appropriation bill and then the amended amendment was stricken out on a point of order. The chapter is again proposed as an amendment here, and I am proposing the amendment to the same section. Let it lie on the table until the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah is presented. I will not insist upon it now, but I want to urge this amendment to the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps if we could have it read now it would give information to other members of the committee and to the Senate.

Mr. KIRBY. I can state briefly what the amendment is.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. KIRBY. I have offered this amendment to section 2 of the committee amendment, which the Senator from Utah proposes to amend, so as to provide that this board may spend $50,000 of this money appropriated to assist in the construction of an industrial home or school for women near Camp Pike, Ark., in accordance with an agreement heretofore made by the board with the local authorities.

Mr. KING. I am familiar with the Senator's amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. The board agreed to put up $50,000 for the purpose if the State contributed a like amount to take care of conditions produced by the establishment of the Army camp there and the resulting collection of women of easy virtue, many of them diseased, making it necessary to take such action to relieve the city and the camp of the menace. The board failed to carry out its agreement notwithstanding the State authorities provided the like amount for the purpose in accordance with the agreement, because it was held it did not have authority to do it under the law. This proposed amendment confers such authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 43, line 26, add to section 2 the following:

The allotment to the States and any funds under the control of said board not otherwise allotted by this chapter may respectively be expended by said States and said board for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of lands for sites; for the construction, enlargement, repair, improvement, equipment, furnishing, stocking, maintenance, and operation thereon and on lands already owned by the United States, or by the States or others, of buildings, hospitals, quarantine stations, industrial farms, and schools for the purposes of this chapter: *Provided, however*, That for sufficient cause shown or upon failure to carry out the conditions prescribed therefor any allotment or appropriation of funds made under any section of this chapter may be revoked in whole or in part in the discretion of said board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. KING. I understand it will be passed over until the entire amendment is considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 55, to strike out the heading "Tariff Commission," in line 23, and all down to and including line 7 on page 56.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I sincerely trust the Senate will reject the amendment of the committee now before the Senate. The amendment proposes to strike out all the appropriation for the Tariff Commission. If agreed to, and then agreed to by the House, it practically means the elimination of the Tariff Commission from any activity whatever.

I understand that the amendment of the committee striking out the appropriation was adopted without giving anybody a hearing, without any evidence having been taken, and without any information laid before the committee from any source whatever. The only explanation I have heard given by the committee is that it was their idea to put it into conference, and when they got it into conference they could legislate and change it in any way and bring in what legislation they might deem proper.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator got that idea, he is, of course, mistaken. It is this way: They have been having a much smaller appropriation than is carried in the item as it came from the House, and it was assumed that in addition to what information we had, the House committee had some also as to what was intended to be done this year and whether the $300,000 was necessary or $100,000 or $200,000. Conditions as the Senate knows are somewhat in a turmoil abroad and here in transportation, and so forth, and the committee had no information which seemed to indicate that this was the year when we should expend 50 per cent in salaries, and so forth, for the office here in Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. The committee had no hearings upon it?

Mr. WARREN. It had not.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senate ought to realize that if this amendment is agreed to by the House it means practically the abolition of the Tariff Commission. It will put it in conference, it is true, but if the House conferees agree to it, and the Senate conferees, of course, agree to the amendment, it is all out.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps the Senator got the idea expressed a moment ago from what I stated yesterday.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is where I got it.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to state to the Senator that the appropriation for last year for the Tariff Commission was $200,000. The House increased that to $300,000. The Tariff Commission asked for $400,000. That was their estimate as to the amount required for this year.

This amendment was agreed to, I will say to the Senator, about 10 o'clock Wednesday night. There was very little discussion in relation to the item. The question arose as to why they should have an increase over $200,000; and if there was a reason, what was it. Also why the estimate of $400,000 was reduced by the House to $300,000. The committee desired to have the bill printed Wednesday night in order to get it before the Senate Thursday morning. It was nearly midnight before we got through with the bill, and it was printed after that time and delivered to the Senate Thursday morning.

I want to say to the Senator and to the Senate that the action of the committee, so far as I understood it, was that it was to go out, so that we could discuss the question and, perhaps, after a conference with the House agree to $300,000 or perhaps $250,000 or $200,000, or whatever the amount may be.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator from Indiana as soon as I get through yielding to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATSON. I want to ask the Senator from Utah a question.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. WATSON. Was there a disposition upon the part of the committee to abolish the Tariff Commission?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think that was the idea of the majority of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we take all of this appropriation away from them, do we not abolish them?

Mr. SMOOT. I have explained the conditions, and I do not want to go into it again.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. You ask us to vote for a proposition that will take the appropriation away, so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire, at the risk of repeating, briefly to refer to what I said yesterday about the danger of legislation by a conference committee.

Mr. SMOOT. And I agreed with the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. If we are going to go on the theory that the committee followed in making this amendment, then the Senate and the House ought to abdicate and turn the legislation of Congress over to conference committees. Everybody admits that we ought not to confer jurisdiction to legislate on conference committees if we can avoid it, and that we ought to narrow their activities just as much as possible. That is where jokers get into legislation. Everybody knows it is a dangerous thing to do and that it ought not to be resorted to if there is any possible way to avoid it. This puts it all in the hands of the conference committee. As I said awhile ago, if the House conferees agree to it the Tariff Commission has been wiped off the face of the earth. That is not the right way to get rid of the Tariff Commission. We ought to meet it manfully and squarely if we want to do away with the Tariff Commission and by the proper legislation repeal the law.

Mr. President, I realize the difficulties of the committee. I said yesterday that nobody realizes more than I the difficulties that confront not only this committee but all other appropriation committees. In a great bill like this that has to go through the two Houses, it is a physical impossibility for ether the committee of the House or the committee of the Senate, if we were to get the bill through before the 1st of July, to give it careful and candid consideration in all its details.

I sympathize with the difficulty that confronted the committee, but under the circumstances what should a committee of the Senate do? It seems to me if we are crowded for time, as I know we are, the doubt should have been resolved in favor of the bill as it came from the House where they had hearings, where they had consideration. The Senate committee had only an hour or two to consider it. Of course, they would have had more time if they arbitrarily wanted to consume it, but they were anxious to get the bill out, and I commend them for that. Then the doubt ought to have been resolved to let such an appropriation for any such institution as this stand as the House put it. It does not seem to me that the committee, in the darkness of the night just before they were going to report the bill, without hearings, without evidence, should strike all that out and blot this commission off the face of the earth. We would have saved time and the committee would have saved time if they had accepted the judgment of the House instead of yielding to a judgment without evidence and without consideration and without notice to anybody.

Mr. President, I believe in a tariff commission. But before I take that up I want to refer to what the Senator said about the amount of money that was appropriated for last year and for this year. I believe it was stated that last year while the war was on the Tariff Commission could not do very much in some branches of its work. It could do a great many things in other branches here, and it did. I have evidence here on my desk showing the laborious and painstaking work of that commission. Handicapped as they were since it has been in existence, it has furnished information that can be used by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate to a greater extent and with better authority and with more wisdom than any of these committees in the history of the United States have ever had in the making of a tariff bill.

If I wanted to spend the time of the Senate I would go into detail and show a great many of the things that have been done by way of looking up costs and other conditions of manufacturing in this country, some of which have never been printed, but which are at hand and ready for the information of either branch of Congress or the executive department at any time, information that has been verified, after it has been carefully compiled and worked up by the commission, by various manufactures all over the United States. It is the most reliable information that has ever yet been gathered, treating the subject of tariff legislation.

How did we get a Tariff Commission, Mr. President? I remember 16 or 17 years ago there began an agitation for a tariff commission. People who had studied the tariff had became disgusted with the methods Congress used in the enactment of tariff legislation. Members of the House and Members of the Senate who had worked, and worked diligently and faithfully, in the making up of tariff bills saw that they were handicapped for the lack of reliable and first-hand information, and that agitation began to spread. I remember the time when in the Republican

Party there was only a small faction, a small part of the party, who favored it. It gradually grew in sentiment until the party indorsed the proposition. The Democratic Party, like the Republican Party, a majority of it opposing the proposition at the beginning, gradually came over to the idea and they indorsed it. After years of agitation and trial of prior methods used in the history of the country in making tariff bills, there came almost a unanimous sentiment from students of the tariff in Congress and out, in both the great political parties, that we ought to have a tariff commission to supply this evidence. It was in answer to that sentiment that we finally got the Tariff Commission. It exists now. Some of the personnel have been criticized, criticized, I believe to a great extent, wrongfully; but we must recognize the fact that we never can get a tariff commission or any other commission the personnel of which will suit everybody.

Criticism was made of the Tariff Commission yesterday on this floor, because in all the time of its existence it had never taken a stand on the different kinds of tariff, such as revenue, free trade, or protection. Yet, the students of the subject know that that is one of the things that we have been trying to avoid in getting the Tariff Commission; that it would be outside of its duty if it did recommend any particular kind of tariff. The Tariff Commission have not done that. It is their duty to get the truth, to get the facts, to get first-hand information and supply it to Congress, and Congress makes the tariff bills. If it wants a free-trade bill, the information is there and it can draft it. If it wants a tariff for revenue bill, the same information will enable it to draft that kind of a bill and do it scientifically. If it wants a protective-tariff measure, the same information coming from this board will enable it to draft a scientific protective measure. That was the object of it. It never was intended that it should control the judgment of the people's representatives as to whether they should have free trade, a tariff for revenue, or a tariff for protection.

Everybody, no matter what kind of a tariff he wanted, has long recognized the fact that when a tariff bill was made it came mostly from men who were biased, directly interested in the tariff one way or the other, and the difficulty was to get unbiased testimony. No matter how honestly the committee might desire to work out a bill along any particular line, every man who has had experience recognizes the fact that they were handicapped. This commission was intended to relieve that situation that everybody condemned.

Mr. President, I do not know whether it was an accident, but I have an idea it will be news to the Senate if I tell them that there has been discrimination in the past in other laws that we have passed, I think innocently, against the Tariff Commission. Does the Senate know that in the law which we passed increasing the salaries of various employees of the departments of the Government it was so worded that it did not apply to the employees of the Tariff Commission? And yet that is true. To my mind it was an injustice, and I believe it will be recognized at the first glance to be unjust.

I do not believe I will violate any confidence when I say that between $4,000 and $5,000 of expenses in carrying on the work of this Tariff Commission has been paid out of the private money of two members of the commission. They have been handicapped before because of lack of funds.

The committee said they could not quite understand how they were going to use the money; that conditions now are abnormal. It is true that they are abnormal. The world is rather upset; but, Mr. President, I believe that immediately upon peace being declared is the time for the Tariff Board to get to work. It seems to me in the coming year it will get a very great deal of valuable information.

I have never before heard criticized any of the work that has been done by the Tariff Commission. Take, for instance, something that goes into the production of sugar, something around which there has always been a fight in every tariff bill. I believe the volumes that they have gotten out on its cost and the conditions surrounding it are far superior to anything that has ever been produced on the subject in the history of the United States. It will be exceedingly useful. If we want the right kind of tariff, it will, in my judgment, be vital.

I intended, Mr. President, to go over somewhat and analyze to some extent the various publications—40 or 50, perhaps—which I have here, but they were referred to briefly yesterday in the able address of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and I am not going to take the time to go into it.

I think it is a hardworking, conscientious commission and that they are doing a wonderful work, one that we can not afford to get along without in the making of tariff bills and some other legislation about which they will give us very valuable information.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, would the Senator from Nebraska mind an interruption?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HARDING. I do not want to take issue with the Senator about the desirability of the Tariff Board, but I wonder if he could say what these conventions would be, in view of the statement contained in the message of the President, in which, speaking of the treaty, he says:

> It lays the basis for conventions which shall free the commercial intercourse of the world from unjust and vexatious restrictions.

I am wondering what the function of the Tariff Commission will be under that idea.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know whether it will have any function to perform in relation to that particular sentence in the President's message which has been read to the Senate to-day. If it has something to do with the tariff question, in any of its ramifications, or is related to it in any legislation that may come before either branch or both branches of Congress, then it will have something to do with it.

So far as I know, Mr. President, no one has ever charged the members of this commission with being partisan, with trying to give evidence that would bolster up one kind of a tariff or another. So far as I know, no one has ever charged them with violating their duty either in spirit or in letter.

I heard it said the other day that the Tariff Commission has more than 400 employees now. No man with authority is saying that. I made inquiry from a member of the Tariff Commission, and I have a list of the employees among the papers I have here which shows the number of those employees, which, if I thought it were necessary and if I desired to take the time of the Senate to do so, I could read; but I found on investigation that the Tariff Commission had fewer than 60 employees. I was given the actual number. It was something over 50; I have forgotten the exact number, but it was at least less than 60.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that those of us—and that includes most of us—who in various parts of the country have been advocating for years the establishment of a tariff commission are going to vote now to give it its death stroke. If we do, then are we willing to admit that we were only practicing deception for political or other purposes upon the people when we advocated such a commission? Are we going to kill it before a tariff law is made from the evidence which it has produced; before the time comes when the real usefulness of its work can be appropriated by legislation in Congress? Were we practicing deception upon the American people when from one end of the land to the other we advocated the establishment of a nonpartisan tariff board? It seems to me we are now up to the proposition, we are about up to the time when we are going to show by our votes whether or not we have been acting in good faith or whether we were only indulging in camouflage.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if we adopt the report of the committee we simply vote to abolish the Tariff Commission by indirection. We do not meet it squarely by voting to repeal the act establishing the Tariff Commission, but we say it shall have no money with which to run; that it must on the 1st of July discharge its force of employees because no appropriation has been made to pay any of them; that it must abandon its work. If we mean to kill the commission, if we want to abolish it, a franker—and I had almost said a manlier—way would be to introduce a bill and pass it abolishing the commission.

Mr. LENROOT rose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. I quite agree with the Senator; but might I suggest that possibly the committee—and I am not in accord with that view—were merely following the course pursued by the Democrats in killing the previous Tariff Commission.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They killed it by failing to make an appropriation.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Georgia yield there?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. But when they did it every Republican everywhere—and I was one of them—denounced them for doing it; and I think they ought to have been denounced; yet we now find a Republican committee bringing in a report here to commit the same sin that the Democrats committed and for which we justly condemned them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I was on the Finance Committee of the Senate that reported to the Senate, as a part of a measure pending before it, the provisions creating this Tariff Commission. I think it was the unanimous opinion of the Finance Committee that we needed a tariff commission. I know, if I had continued to serve on the Finance Committee, I should have needed their help. It was utterly impossible for us, especially those of us who were comparatively new in the

service, to investigate with thoroughness or to acquire the detailed information that in many instances we needed before voting upon questions before us.

If I had had the experience which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] had for 20 years, specializing on this subject, I might possibly have been in a position to get along without a tariff commission, but I felt on the Finance Committee the need to lean upon the investigations and study and the facts that could be furnished by such a commission. I cordially supported the bill to create the commission. It did not make any difference to me whether it had been of Republican origin or Democratic origin. I thought it was a necessity; I thought it was a way to help us act intelligently upon the detailed provisions that must be passed upon in making up a tariff bill, and I think so still.

If a Senator votes for the report of the committee, he does not vote simply to throw the matter into conference. The conferees might agree with what we do. We vote to kill the Tariff Commission; that is what we vote to do if we vote for the committee amendment. We send our conferees not to confer with the conferees of the House as to how much is to be appropriated to the Tariff Commission, but we send them there commissioned by us to vote for no money to support the commission. This is not a question of how much. The committee says no money, which means to kill the commission. We do not authorize them to confer with the House conferees as to what sum should be appropriated; we do not say, "We appropriate $200,000; you go and confer as to whether it should be $200,000 or $300,000." We do not say, "We appropriate $100,000; go and confer with the House conferees as to whether it should be $100,000 or $300,000 or some intermediate sum." We tell them, "Go and kill the Tariff Commission if you can." When we vote for this report, we vote to kill the Tariff Commission. The Senate conferees may yield and not kill it; the House conferees may yield and kill it, and then the work will be done.

If the House conferees feel as our committee in the Senate felt, they will agree with them, and your Tariff Commission will be dead. So no Senator can vote for this committee report except for the purpose of killing the Tariff Commission. I want to get that point clearly made and emphasized. It is not a vote as to how much we are going to appropriate; it is a vote as to whether we want to appropriate nothing, which is a vote to kill the commission.

Mr. President, the Tariff Commission was not created as an administrative, legislative, or judicial body; it was given no administrative, legislative, or judicial power or duty; it was a body for investigation. The statute creating it provides:

> That the commission investigate and report on the administrative and fiscal aspects of the customs laws; their effects on the industries and on the labor conditions of the country; the relations between rates of duty on raw materials and those on finished or partly finished products; the working of ad valorem and specific duties; the arrangement of the schedules and the classification of articles.

The commission was created for investigation, for the acquirement of detailed information. We passed the bill in the fall of 1916. We thought that perhaps the war was going to close in a short time and that it was essential that we should have a body of men devoting their time exclusively to gathering for Congress information that would be needed when we came to consider a new tariff bill, which we all agree must be considered within 12 months after the end of the war. During the war there were few foreign products to come into our country, and the tariff problem was not a serious one; but what we had in view in the creation of this commission was a body of men, devoting their entire time to the subject, who should gather the detailed information incident to the close of the war, and particularly incident to changed conditions resulting from the war and the peace that would follow the war, and have that information in shape to lay down before the Members of the House and of the Senate who would serve on the revenue making bills and have it also for the benefit of Senators.

Now, we hear the announcement that the peace treaty has been signed, and the time has now come when especially it was contemplated that this Tariff Board would serve the country. It is to serve us by giving us facts applicable to the general interests of the country, applicable to the general conditions, not simply to help without regard to the general welfare, to take care by exorbitant charges of some favorites, but to throw the light of information, based upon investigation, upon the problem broadly that it may be dealt with for the public good, not for private good or private gain. I can not believe that the Senate is ready to kill this commission just at the time its usefulness is in front of us. What I wanted to emphasize was that voting for this committee report is a vote to kill it, and nothing else.

The commission has been criticized. Well, it is hard to get together a board that somebody would not criticize. It would hardly be possible for any Senator here to pick a board that somebody would not criticize, and yet at the head of this board, as chairman, is a gentleman whose life has been given to the study of problems of this character, whose integrity nobody questions, and the vast store of whose information fitted him to head the commission, certainly as well as any man in the land.

Those of us who have come in contact with him have all been impressed with the perfect mental integrity of the man and his absolute purpose to follow where truth, as he saw it, would lead him. I would feel the utmost confidence in any statistical presentation he might make on any subject. I would feel that it was uninfluenced by any desire to force a conclusion, and that it was solely inspired by the purpose to obtain the real facts, the real truth, leaving it to free consideration after being presented.

I hope we will have a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment. I do not desire to take up any more time upon the subject.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the present tariff-commission law was enacted after a very long struggle and after much discussion not only in Congress but throughout the country. It was eventually enacted, if my recollection now serves me, by substantially the unanimous action of both Houses of Congress. I am unable to speak about the sentiment upon the other side of the Chamber, but I know there was at the time the present tariff act was enacted, in 1913——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think I can say to the Senator that the Tariff Commission was created under a unanimous report of the Finance Committee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I believe so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If anyone dissented, I can not recall it now.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I recall that there was on this side of the Chamber when the tariff act of 1913 was under consideration some very decided opposition to the general idea of a tariff commission, but so many of us found ourselves utterly at sea as to what to do with reference to the innumerable items in that bill concerning which we had no information whatever and could secure no information that opposition to it very rapidly dissipated after that experience on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, I believe that a tariff commission is as essential for the drafting of a bill founded upon the idea of a tariff for revenue only as it is in the preparation of a bill founded upon the idea of protection. We need these facts in any event, no matter what the form of the bill is or what principle it represents.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. On the question of the unanimity of action, of course, the Democrats were for it, and I wish to read just two short excerpts at this point from the platform of the Republican Party and from the platform of the Progressive Party in 1912. The Republican Party had this to say:

> Readjustment should be made from time to time to conform to changing conditions and to reduce excessive rates, but without injury to any American industry. To accomplish this, correct information is indispensable. This information can best be obtained by an expert commission, as the large volume of useful facts contained in the recent reports of the tariff board has demonstrated.
>
> TARIFF BOARD INDORSED.
>
> The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a Tariff Board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it.

From the Progressive platform I quote the following:

> We pledge ourselves to the establishment of a nonpartisan scientific tariff commission, reporting both to the President and to either branch of Congress, which shall report, first, as to the cost of production, efficiency of labor, capitalization, industrial organization and efficiency, and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protection from Congress; second, as to the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of Government; and, third, as to the effect of the tariff on prices, operations of middlemen, and on the purchasing power of the consumer. We believe that this commission should have plenary power to elicit information.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the particular point to which I desire to invite attention is that under our system it so happens that a tariff bill is ordinarily presented for the consideration of Congress upon a change of administration. The administration in power expresses its policy in a tariff bill, and when it goes out of power and the other party comes in it is altogether likely to express its peculiar views upon the subject of legislation. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, in a statement in the public press some time ago, indicated that it was his purpose at a very early day to present a bill for the revision of the tariff. I do not know whether that will take place or not, but it is altogether likely that the Republican Party,

having control of both branches of Congress now, will tender a bill which will represent its ideas in relation to tariff legislation. That is just the occasion, Mr. President, for which the Tariff Commission was created. Changes in the tariff laws ordinarily, while the same party remains in power, are not important; they are not of any great consequence. The really important change is ordinarily a general change and comes with a change of the political complexion of Congress. When a tariff measure, if such a measure is presented for the consideration of Congress, is brought before us we shall have occasion for the use of the services of the Tariff Commission. So the purpose is, Mr. President, to put the Tariff Commission out of business at the very time when it is most needed and when its services are likely to be brought into use.

Without regard to that, it may be necessary in the very near future, from general national considerations, to institute some revision of our tariff rates, in view of the fact that some of the great nations of the earth are contemplating material changes in their existing tariff laws. The idea of a preferential tariff, by which the dependencies of Great Britain would be accorded a preference in the markets of Great Britain over those of other countries seeking those markets, has been presented here in an official way. I submit for the RECORD and for the information of the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress a review of the proposition in that regard made by H. G. Brock, trade commissioner, and printed in an official British paper on the 9th of May last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW BRITISH BUDGET PROVIDES FOR IMPERIAL PREFERENCE.

[Trade Commissioner H. G. Brock, London, May 9, 1919.]

The introduction of Imperial preference rates into the budget submitted to the British Parliament on April 30 was the outstanding feature of Mr. Austen Chamberlain's proposals. While terming the new rates a "small beginning," the British Chancellor said that he considered it the most important factor of the new budget, though legislative action would be needed if Imperial preference should become an established principle in the fiscal program of the United Kingdom. For the present, however, his suggestions were merely intended to give effect to the declaration made over two years ago by the Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference, at which the representatives of the British Empire agreed that some form of preference duties should be introduced, at a suitable period, for goods of Imperial origin.

Mr. Chamberlain explained that only three products are at present imported in large quantities from British colonies and possessions into the United Kingdom, viz, tea, cocoa, and rum, but that there were others such as coffee, sugar, tobacco, and wine to be considered, and as it was the desire of the British Government to assist by every means in its power the development of Empire trade, it was hoped that the somewhat limited scope of the present proposed preferential duties would ultimately develop into a wide structure of inter-Imperial trade. In working out these preference rates four considerations were kept in mind: (1) That the preference given should be substantial in amount; (2) that the rates be few and simple; (3) that existing excise duties on domestic produce be proportionately altered to suit the new rates; and (4) that the interests of Great Britain's allies should be considered, as far as practicable, so as to avoid increasing taxes on their products by giving preference rates to British goods. The new preferential rates, which are to take effect June 1 for tea and September 1 for all other articles, may be summed up under the following heads:

CLASSES OF GOODS TO WHICH NEW RATES APPLY.

Class I.—Goods on which no excise duties exist, i. e., cinematograph films, clocks and watches, motor cars, and musical instruments. On these the preferential reduction is one-third, and is given by way of reduction of existing duties on colonial manufactures.

Class II.—Consumable commodities, apart from beer, wines, or alcohol. The preferential reduction here has been fixed at one-sixth, and is also arranged by way of reduction of existing duties on colonial produce. The articles chiefly affected by this preference are:

(a) Tea, 90 per cent of which before the war came from Empire sources. The present duty is 1s. [$0.24] per pound, the preference amounts to 2d. [$0.04]. The estimated British revenue from tea is £16,000,000 [$77,864,000], and estimated loss through preference about £3,000,000 [$14,600,000] in the current year, or £1,800,000 [$8,760,000] in a normal year.

(b) Cocoa, 50 per cent of which is colonial produce, and the preference amounting to 7s. per hundredweight [$1.70 per 112 pounds]. The estimated revenue from this article is £2,400,000 [$11,680,000], and estimated loss through preference £200,000 [$973,000].

(c) Coffee, of which about 20 per cent is Empire produce. The estimated revenue from coffee is £650,000 [$3,163,000], and estimated loss through preference about £20,000 [$97,000]. A limitless expansion of this commodity within the Empire is considered possible. Chicory follows, the excise duty being proportionately reduced.

(d) Sugar, of which only about 7 per cent comes from the Empire. The preferential reduction amounts to 4s. [$0.97] per hundredweight. The estimated revenue is £39,000,000 [$189,794,000] and estimated loss through preference £500,000 [$2,433,000]. Excise duties on beet produced in Great Britain are similarly reduced, i. e., protection to British sugar-beet industry, and dried fruits are included in this category.

(e) Tobacco, of which only about 2 per cent comes from Empire sources, but a large expansion is considered possible. The preference rate is 1s. 4d. [$0.32] per pound on unmanufactured tobacco and the excise duty is similarly reduced. The estimated revenue is £47,000,000 [$228,726,000]. In the case of both tobacco and sugar preference is based on the amount of the British-grown crop of the imported article.

(f) Motor spirit, of which about 18 per cent comes from the Empire. The preference rate is 1d. [$0.02] per gallon. The estimated British revenue from motor spirit is £2,200,000 [$10,706,000] and estimated loss through preference £60,000 [$292,000].

Class III.—Beer, wines, and spirits.—There is no importation of colonial beer. Of wines, about 7 per cent comes from Empire sources, but the industry is believed capable of great expansion in South Africa and Australia. In this case, in order not to injure the trade of British allies, notably France and Portugal, preference is again given by way of reduction of existing duties on colonial importations of wine; the present duties of 1s. 3d. and 3s. [$0.30 and $0.73] per gallon are reduced, respectively, by 6d. and 1s. [$0.12 and $0.24] on colonial wines, while the reduction is 6d. and 9d. [$0.12 and $0.18] on the existing supertax of 1s. and 2s. 6d. [$0.24 and $0.61] per gallon. Spirits are divided into five classes, all subject to customs dues. Over 80 per cent of the rum imports come from the Empire, and whisky is practically a homemade spirit. The preference rate on all spirits is fixed at 2s. 6d. [$0.61] per gallon, and is given not by a reduction of duties on colonial imports but by a surcharge on foreign spirits.

ESTIMATED LOSS OF REVENUE—PRESS COMMENT.

The estimated loss on all articles to the Britsh exchequer through the proposed preference rates is given as £2,500,000 [$12,166,000] in the current year and about £3,000,000 [$14,600,000] for a full year, the main loss being taken on tea imports.

In the British press comment generally takes the form of a more or less qualified approval of the part of the new budget dealing with Imperial preference, and journals of widely differing policies appear to agree that if this question is surveyed mainly from the standpoint of Imperial interests the Empire will benefit by an extended application of the principle of preferential rates to its products and manufactures. As may be expected, however, there are papers which apparently hold the opinion that the interests of Britain's allies in this war should be considered before those of its colonies and possessions; such views are applied chiefly to the reduction of duties on colonial wines, together with the increased duty on imports of foreign spirits. Taken as a whole, however, it is considered satisfactory that preference is more generally given by reductions of duty in favor of Imperial products rather than by increase of taxation in the case of foreign imports; in this respect the new duties may be looked upon as a compromise between the principles of tariff reform and free trade.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Dominion of Canada also has under consideration at the present time a revision of its tariff laws, and contemplates some very material advances in the rates upon important products of this country going into that territory, particularly the metals, a matter of no little consequence to this country. I also have here a table submitted by the Tariff Commission, showing the present rates upon copper and lead, together with the imports into and exports from the Dominion of those two commodities. I ask that that also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Lead—Old, scrap, pig, and block.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA, ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, FISCAL YEARS ENDING MAR. 31.

From—	1914		1917	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Cwt.		*Cwt.*	
Great Britain	91,277	$378,171	4,722	$34,609
United States	19,600	82,953	115,812	770,891
Total	111,927	464,842	120,658	805,649

TARIFF RATES.

Old rates:
General—15 per cent ad valorem and 7½ per cent ad valorem surtax.
Preferential—10 per cent ad valorem and 5 per cent ad valorem surtax.
Rates in new bill:
General—1 cent per pound; no surtax.
Preferential—¾ cent per pound; no surtax.

Canada—Exports of Canadian produce.

LEAD, METALLIC, CONTAINED IN ORE, ETC.

To—	1914		1917	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Cwt.*	
United States and total	274,760	$7,562	174,620	$1,188,282

Copper—in blocks, pigs, or ingots.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA, ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, FISCAL YEARS ENDING MAR. 31.

From—	1914		1917	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Hundredweight.		*Hundredweight.*	
United States	49,995	$778,094	49,817	$1,450,774
Other countries	961	14,767	.....	.....
Total	50,956	792,861	49,817	1,450,774

TARIFF RATES.

Old rates:
General—Free; surtax of 7½ per cent ad valorem.
Preferential—Free; surtax of 5 per cent ad valorem.
Rates in new bill:
General—1½ cents per pound; no surtax.
Preferential—1 cent per pound; no surtax.

Canada—exports of Canadian produce.

COPPER, FINE, CONTAINED IN ORE, MATTE, REGULUS, ETC.

To—	1914		1917	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Hundred-weight.*	
Great Britain	6,805,093	$512,093	144,613	$1,080,633
Germany	1,300	150		
United States	76 443,805	8,977,486	1,120,285	21,664,692
Total	83,250,198	9,489,729	1,264,898	22,744,825

Copper, in bars or rods, not less than 6 feet in length, unmanufactured.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA, ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, FISCAL YEARS ENDING MAR. 31.

From—	1914		1917	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Hundred-weight.		*Hundred-weight.*	
United States	270,051	$4,333,471	189,182	$5,591,748
Other countries	231	4,728		
Total	270,282	4,338,199	189,182	5,591,748

TARIFF RATES.

Old rates:
348—
General—Free; surtax of 7½ per cent ad valorem.
Preferential—Free; surtax of 5 per cent ad valorem.
Rates in new bill:
348c—Copper, in bars or rods, not less than 6 feet in length, unmanufactured, n. o. p.—
General—10 per cent ad valorem and surtax of 7½ per cent ad valorem.
Preferential—5 per cent ad valorem, no surtax.
348d—Copper, in bars or rods, when imported by manufacturers of trolley, telegraph, and telephone wires, electric wires, and electric cables for use only in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.
General—Free; surtax of 7½ per cent ad valorem.
Preferential—Free; no surtax.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the work of the Tariff Commission for the past few months; but reflection has been made on the members of that commission, and I should like to say a few words because of my association in the public service with certain members of that body.

The Federal Trade Commission was trying to find the ablest man it could to send to South America to study foreign trade and customs duties in November, 1915. Former Representative William M. Howard, of Georgia, who was on the Taft Tariff Board, wrote me and recommended Mr. W. S. Culbertson for that work. Mr. Howard, I may say parenthetically, is admitted by all who know him to be one of the ablest public servants from the South and is at the present a law partner of Judge E. H. Callaway, a distinguished lawyer of Georgia, and a former associate in the practice of law with the late Justice Joseph R. Lamar. Mr. Culbertson is now a member of the Tariff Commission. He had been with the old Tariff Board under Mr. Howard, and Mr. Howard told me that he understood the tariff question better than any man they had connected with the board. If Senators will read the report of the Federal Trade Commission on "Trade and tariffs in South America," which was written by Mr. Culbertson, they will not doubt his ability for this work.

Mr. Steuart is the secretary of the Tariff Commission. Mr. Steuart and Mr. Culbertson are both Republicans; they differ with me in politics. When Congress appropriated $1,000,000 to gather the statistics of manufactures during the time when I was Director of the Census we tried to make a record on that work, which we did. I looked over all the able employees of the Census Bureau to find the best man I could who would finish that work in the shortest possible length of time and do it most efficiently. I selected Mr. Steuart, who is now the secretary of the Tariff Commission, and I state—and I think my statement will not be questioned, especially amongst those who have been associated with him—that he is as able a man in his line as there is in the public service to-day. Due in a large degree to Mr. Steuart's work and the work of his able associates, the census of manufactures of 1915 was completed more expeditiously and at a less cost than any previous investigation of a similar character. In fact, I may add that there are no more efficient and loyal and, I am sorry to say, more poorly paid employees of the Government than those of the Census Bureau.

The other members of the Tariff Commission, Dr. Thomas Walker Page and Prof. F. W. Taussig, are so well known that it is useless for me to say anything of them; but I do feel, in justice to these men, after the unjust attacks which were made on the persons connected with the Tariff Commission, that I should say that they are economists of national and international standing and public servants of undoubted ability whom we may count ourselves fortunate to have in public office.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment striking out the appropriation for the Tariff Commission will not be agreed to; I hope the House provision will prevail. I know from our experience of the last few years in the Finance Committee how that committee has had to turn toward expert opinion in drafting legislation. I know that the people of the country, when a new tariff bill is introduced, will want to feel that it is a bill of experts and fair-minded men, and not simply a bill drafted on the old theory of each industry obtaining the greatest advantage it can for itself.

The standing of the men on the Tariff Commission is such that they will have the confidence of the country when future tariff legislation comes before the House and the Senate. I believe that they should be continually studying these questions; for we can not tell when the conditions of Europe will be such that it will be necessary to go into that subject.

For these reasons I feel that it is highly important that the present Tariff Commission should not be done away with.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, it is apparent that the committee amendment, which would, in effect, abolish the Tariff Commission, will not prevail, but I am interested with respect to the number of votes, especially upon this side of the aisle, that this recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations will receive.

Mr. President, it is a most unusual thing, to say the least, for the Committee on Appropriations, where positive law exists with definite salaries provided, through a failure to appropriate, in effect, recommend the repeal of the law; but it is unprecedented, I think, that the Committee on Appropriations has ever taken such action without a hearing before the committee, without some evidence before the committee as to the necessity of it.

The Committee on Appropriations in this particular instance have acted without investigation, and their recommendation, in so far as it is concurred in by members of the committee, amounts to nothing more than the individual opinions of the members of this committee with reference to legislation that ought to be enacted by Congress. This is surprising, too, at this time, for whatever might have been said last year or the year before, when we were at war, as to the value of continuing the work of the Tariff Commission, that certainly is not true to-day. If any Member of the Senate ever believed in a tariff commission, if he ever believed that the work of a tariff commission was of value, this, above all times, is the time when he should be in favor of it, because not only will information be necessary for the enactment of a general tariff bill, which we all realize must come within a year or two, but I think it is apparent to every Senator that within the next 12 months, within the period covered by this appropriation bill, there will be, there must be, changes in certain items in the tariff schedules; and when these changes do come, unless we continue the work of the Tariff Commission, the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House, aside from the members of the Finance Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means, will be acting wholly without information.

The real substance of this proposition is, Mr. President, that by this action it is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations that we shall again go back, in the enactment of tariff legislation, to the old, old days when tariff rates were based upon the showing made by interested parties only, without the public or any one representing the public having any information whatever. Indeed, so far as the members of the committees are concerned that have the responsibility of framing this legislation in the first instance, they, as well as other Members of the Senate, need this information.

In the last tariff bill, the Underwood tariff bill, notwithstanding the fact—and I was a member of the House at that time—that some of the leaders who framed that bill were against the Tariff Commission, nevertheless, upon two important schedules—the wool schedule and the cotton schedule—that committee was compelled, because of the information that that Tariff Board furnished to Congress, to shape that bill in a large part in accordance with the facts found by that Tariff Board. And so it will be with any tariff legislation, Mr. President, whether it be in the immediate future, with reference to specific items, or whether it be a little later on, with reference to a general revision. If the work of this Tariff Commission con-

tinues, the Committee on Ways and Means in the House and the Committee on Finance in the Senate, if they wish to get a bill through, will be compelled to pay attention to the facts found by this Tariff Commission and report them to Congress.

Indeed, Mr. President, I am amazed at the action of the Committee on Appropriations in recommending this action, in violation of our own party platform, in violation of the Democratic Party platform, in violation of the Progressive Party platform, without one syllable of evidence before them with respect to it. Indeed, if this committee had sought evidence as to the value of this Tariff Commission and of the work it has performed even during this period of war time, they would have found that there is no department of this Government that has rendered more efficient service or rendered more valuable service in proportion to the money expended than the present Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, I hold here in my hand information furnished by this commission to the Ways and Means Committee of the House upon several subjects, which have already been utilized, information which has already found its way into law in some cases. One of them is the report upon the dye industry; and we now have available whenever the question may be reached, printed for the information of the Committee on Ways and Means, reports on the magnesite industry, the optical glass, and chemical glassware, and the potash industry—which I may say, as every Senator knows, is an immediate question now. The Committee on Ways and Means has just concluded hearings upon the question of the potash industry, and whether or not the rates of duty upon potash shall be raised. There also are reports upon the tungsten-bearing ores, and the manganese ores; and then, for the Committee on Commerce, we have a very exhaustive report upon the question of free zones, a matter that is now pending before the Committee on Commerce. The bill has been referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, and next week that subcommittee and a like subcommittee from the House expect to begin hearings upon this very important question. Yet, in the face of this evidence, this committee recommends the abolition of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, I not only hope that this recommendation of the committee will not receive the vote of a single Republican Member, who is not a member of the committee, but I do hope that before the vote is taken the members of the committee themselves will reconsider their action, and make this vote unanimous to retain the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I had intended to submit some remarks this morning in opposition to this amendment, upon the theory that it was the purpose of the committee amendment to abolish the Tariff Commission; but we have been assured this morning by members of the committee that such is not its purpose, that it intends only to throw the matter into conference.

Mr. President, that is a most unusual request. I believe this is the first time, certainly within my observation or information, that a committee has requested the Senate to take action which the committee itself believes not to be advisable. As stated by the Senator from Georgia, the effect of sustaining the committee here is to abolish this commission. No more effective way of abolishing the commission can be conceived than by cutting off the appropriation.

Reference has been made here this morning to the abolishment of the Tariff Board by declining to make an appropriation for its continuance. Some reflection was made upon that method of abolishing the Tariff Board; but I submit that when that was done it was understood that that was the purpose of the Senate in declining to make a further appropriation, that it intended to abolish the Tariff Board; and no more effective way could have been found to carry out that purpose. Here, however, we are asked to do a thing which would in effect be abolishing the Tariff Commission when we are told that there is no such intention upon the part of the committee; and I submit that we would be recreant to our duty to cast a vote here which would have the absolute effect of doing a thing which nobody claims ought to be done.

In other words, Senators, shall we transfer our action in this matter to the Committee on Appropriations or to the members of a conference committee? Shall we put it in their power, backed up by a vote of the Senate, to say to the conferees that the Senate wants to abolish this Tariff Commission? It seems to me that such a procedure is decidedly unwise, and I have no recollection when any committee of the Senate heretofore has ever made any such request of the Senate. Shall we put it in the power of a few conferees to abolish the Tariff Commission?

Suppose these conferees were to go there with this vote of the Senate, declining to make any appropriation for the commission, and suppose they could induce the conferees on the part of the House to agree with them, as they would be compelled to ask them to do. When the conference report came back here, then the question would be whether we should defeat the whole sundry civil bill or agree to the report. Do we want to be put in any such attitude as that? I submit not; and I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. I believe that the committee itself should withdraw its recommendation and let us have the unanimous support of the Senate for some appropriation for this most important agency of the Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, a statement was made on the floor yesterday, I think, to the effect that this information which the Tariff Commission was collecting was very unreliable and would be of little assistance in the formation of tariff legislation in the future. I submit that it will be of some value.

I rose, however, to call attention to the fact that it was reported in the public prints some days ago that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee contemplated a general revision of the entire tariff schedule in the near future. I am not advised as to whether that information is accurate or not, but I think I can fairly say that it is within the contemplation of the majority in both Houses to have a revision of the tariff. It may not be in the immediate future, but it will take place before a great while. That being so, why should we not continue this Tariff Commission?

My study of the tariff question has indicated to me that in the past, at least, those who had charge of some tariff bills did not want accurate information; and if they do not want accurate information, I think that if we are to cripple the Tariff Commission they will probably not get what they do not want.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has referred to the fact that the parties all favored tariff commissions in the past. I can not understand why this change of heart should occur now. It is little short of a crime to cripple this commission now by failing to provide the necessary funds with which to conduct its work; and, for one, I protest against the Senate amendment. To deny the commission the necessary funds to pay salaries and expenses of investigation is the equivalent of repealing the law creating the commission.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I just want to call attention to one feature that has not been emphasized.

I understood the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to say the other day, in making his explanation of why this appropriation had not been made, that it was on account of the fact that the war had practically suspended the operation of all tariff laws along prewar lines. It seems to me that if ever there was a time when we needed a body of men set aside for the purpose of acquainting us with conditions, now is the time, because the World War has affected the commercial relations of every nation on earth, and necessarily, as indicated by the Senator from Montana, there is going to be a change of the relations of other countries to us, necessitating a change of our commercial relations with them. In the very beginning we may rest assured of one fact—that the great combinations of organized business and capital will be thoroughly acquainted with the advantageous points to them in this new order of things that is now to the fore. We may rest assured that every line along which personal advantage can come to them will be followed, and if ever there was a time when we needed a commission of strong, nonpartisan men to acquaint this body with the world conditions, so as to meet them intelligently, now seems to be the time. Instead of reducing their compensation, it seems to me that it would be the part of wisdom for us to provide ample compensation for them to meet the varied and vexed questions which necessarily will arise in addition to the ordinary tariff questions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee in striking out all appropriations for the Tariff Board will be voted down so decisively by both sides of this Chamber that it will be an admonition to committees hereafter not to attempt to repeal important statutes by abrogating or annulling or wiping out the appropriations which permit the execution of the law.

The struggle for a tariff commission has been a long one. It goes back over many years. It has fought its way through Congress after Congress, until finally it so impressed itself upon the country and the Congress of the United States that its enactment could not be longer resisted.

If it were possible for me to do so in a graphic way, I should like to take you back to the session of the Senate of the United States on July 8, 1909. It was a late hour. There had been a struggle upon this floor for the enactment of some law to create a tariff commission. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. Dolliver, that brilliant advocate of the rights of real democracy, had offered, as an amendment to the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, an amendment

for the creation of a tariff commission. We discussed that amendment. It was voted down. Then the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Beveridge, offered another, and that was voted down. The power of the old method of making tariffs on the Republican side was pretty strong at that time. Then, Mr. President, I offered an amendment providing for a tariff commission, and that was discussed. All of these debates had led that memorable session on the night of the 8th of July well into the early hours of the next day. Finally, Mr. President, as a concession to that insistence that we should have a basis for tariff making that was an approach to something that was scientific, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich, and the Senator from Maine, Mr. Hale, proposed an amendment to that bill by which was enacted into law the provision under which President Taft created the Tariff Board.

I do not think I go one step beyond the limits when I say that the element upon the Republican side of the Chamber known as the conservative or reactionary element did not want anything approaching a tariff commission. I think a review of what took place upon that night, as shown in the proceedings of July 8, 1909, which I have before me on this desk, will plainly show that what may fairly be called the reactionary or the conservative element in the Republican Party did not want the creation of a tariff commission or of any body of experts who should, as a result of investigation, furnish the facts upon which tariffs ought to be made. But, Mr. President, we had then been fighting over the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill for many months, and as a result of that protracted contest the conservative element upon the Republican side of the Chamber had learned some lessons. They had become convinced that there was in the Republican Party a progressive force strong enough and representing voters enough to insist upon tariff bills being made thereafter upon some other basis than what the manufacturers wanted.

And so, Mr. President, out of the contest of the long hours of that night came a provision under which President Taft appointed what was known as the Tariff Board. It was only about six lines, it was not very definite, but to the credit of President Taft let it be said that under that indefinite and somewhat vague provision in the law he did appoint a Tariff Commission, a Tariff Board, as it was called. Prof. Emery, of Yale University, was placed at the head of it. It was a Tariff Board of five members. Besides Prof. Emery there were two Democrats, one of whom had served on the Democratic side of the House upon the Committee on Ways and Means. They had familiarity with and knowledge of tariff matters, and President Taft put them upon that board. He appointed two other members, Mr. Saunders and Mr. Reynolds, men of considerable knowledge and experience in matters of business and in special lines of production which tariff legislation affected.

Mr. President, that Tariff Board did a very important work. It did such an important work that the Republican Party in its platform commended it very highly. It did such an important work that Congress enacted legislation based upon it and sent it to the President of the United States. That board made special investigations of many of the schedules of the tariff bills with regard to costs of production, which were of very great value not only in this country, but which received the commendation of foreign countries as having been conducted and based upon thoroughly economic and scientific lines of investigation.

I think, Mr. President, that it reflects somewhat upon the present administration and on the Democratic majority of the Congress that when they came into power they destroyed that Tariff Board. They withheld the necessary appropriation from that Tariff Board, which was doing good work. It was a well equipped and well balanced and efficient organization, and yet you Democrats in 1912 took away from that board salaries and appropriations for its maintenance which destroyed and abolished it.

Mr. President, that is but another evidence that in tariff legislation there is so much of partisanship that it is almost impossible when you touch that subject to secure from the Congress a law that represents the interests of all the people of this country. The Democratic Party always will have to explain its reasons for destroying the nonpartisan Tariff Board that was created under the Taft administration, upon which there were representative men with the views of both the extremes in tariff legislation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the Senator give us the names of the members of that board?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Under President Taft?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will so far as I can remember them. There was Prof. Emery, of Harvard University, and Mr. Howe, a former Member of the House of Representatives. I have no doubt Members here can supply any defect in my memory in calling off at once the members of that Tariff Board. There was Mr. Saunders, of Chicago, the editor, owner, and publisher of the Breeders' Gazette, who represents probably better than any other one man the live stock, the sheep, and cattle industry of this country. There was also a Mr.——

Mr. SHEPPARD. I suggest that the Senator put the names in the RECORD.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will be glad to do that. I will supply the names in connection with what I have to say. It is rather important as a matter of history, I think. That board was organized as follows:

Henry C. Emery, chairman, of Yale University; Alvin H. Saunders, vice chairman, editor of Breeders' Gazette, Chicago; James B. Reynolds, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, of Massachusetts; William M. Howard, former Member of Congress, Georgia; and Prof. Thomas Walker Page, University of Virginia.

It was an entirely nonpartisan commission. I think there were three nominal Republicans upon the commission, but Prof. Emery and Mr. Saunders, of Chicago, while they were members of the Republican Party, could not be called partisans. Perhaps the one of the Democratic members of the Tariff Board who had been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means might be called a partisan.

I think it is fair to say that the Taft Tariff Board was a reasonably nonpartisan tariff board; and I think, Mr. President, it is fair to say that it did important work, that it investigated tariff matters wholly without regard to the issues that arise between free trade and protection, but solely with reference to the elements that ought to be considered by a Committee on Finance of the Senate or a Committee on Ways and Means of the House in making a tariff bill; that is, the relative cost of producing the articles in foreign competing countries and producing the articles in this country. They did some remarkable work.

Take the paper schedule, which comes to me now as an example. The report which that Tariff Board made upon the cost of production of paper in this country was one of the greatest contributions that has ever been made to the study of cost production. It was so important that it elicited the encomium of foreign countries as a valuable contribution to economic science. The same is true of the cotton schedule and the same is true of the woolen schedule.

That Tariff Board, known as the Taft Tariff Board, did contribute to scientific tariff investigation and the determination of what should be fair rates in order to preserve either the Democratic idea of a competitive tariff or that of a reasonable protective tariff, which should measure only the difference in the cost of production between this and foreign countries. I say that Tariff Board of Mr. Taft made a remarkable contribution to the intelligent and scientific solution of that problem. They were cut off in the midst of their study. They had not investigated all the schedules of the tariff. They had investigated many of the very important ones. And then, with what I apprehend to have been something like the same sort of partisan feeling as prevailed in the Committee on Appropriations, when they struck from this present bill the provision we are now considering, the Taft Tariff Board was annulled, wiped out of existence by the Democratic Party, by the Democratic Committee on Appropriations.

They withheld from that board the necessary appropriations for continuing the work. I think it was a very great mistake. I think it was the result of an undue partisan feeling, of a disposition not to trust a Tariff Board appointed under a Republican President.

Mr. President, I am inclined to think that partisan opposition underlies the attack made upon this Tariff Commission by the Committee on Appropriations. It is composed of three Democrats or of three men who have the bias of Democrats with regard to tariff legislation, and Republicans. I know the two men on that Tariff Commission of Republican antecedents who hold what I conceive to be the soundest sort of protective tariff views.

After the Democratic administration wiped out the Taft Tariff Board what happened? They preserved up in the Treasury Department all the records of that Tariff Board and all the good work that they had done. When we came to the making of the Underwood tariff bill I went to President Wilson and said to him, "Mr. President, I know that there is a lot of important work that has been done by the Taft Tariff Board. It is not complete. It is complete as to certain schedules, it is not complete as to the whole tariff. It cost the Government a lot of money. I think it is entirely unprejudiced work. I believe it is work that can be used in the making of a new tariff bill in the interest of the public. I recognize, Mr. President, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives is entitled to that information, all the records of the un-

finished work and the finished work of the Tariff Board under the Taft administration, if they want to use it, and if they do not want it then the Finance Committee of the Senate is entitled to it, and if they do not want it, I think as a member of the Finance Commitee of the Senate I should be permitted to have access to it."

Mr. President, neither the Ways and Means Committee of the House nor the Finance Committee of the Senate asked for that information, and therefore the President turned it over to me. I had it carted down to the Capitol. I was fortunate enough to secure the services of one of the experts employed by the Taft Tariff Board during its existence to aid me in my work in applying the data to the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill.

I am going to make a full confession here. The member of the staff of the Taft Tariff Board whose services I secured for a period of several months, who aided me in my study of the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill, is now a member of the Tariff Commission—Mr. Culbertson of Kansas; and if I may be permitted I want to say for him that there is not a more ardent protectionist on the Republican side of the Chamber than is Mr. Culbertson. But he is sane all the while in his application of the principles of a Republican protective tariff. He does not think it should be prohibitory. His idea is that it should measure approximately the difference in the cost of production in this country and in the competing countries. His work as an expert employee of the Taft Tariff Board had been so very good and efficient that President Wilson selected him as one of the members of the Tariff Commission of the present administration. I had the benefit of his services in applying the work of the Taft Tariff Board to the Underwood tariff bill.

Mr. President, I pass now from that phase of the situation to the present phase of it. Let me say that when the Democratic administration wiped out the Taft Tariff Board I think they did a most partisan and indefensible thing. I do not think that the Tariff Commission which has been appointed under President Wilson is one whit different, so far as consistent and scientific study of applied economic principles to tariff legislation is concerned. You simply have got a different personnel there. I think the wiping out of the Taft Tariff Board helped to destroy confidence in the present commission, and in my judgment that action was a very great mistake upon the part of the Democrats.

I think if we should in some way or other get rid of partisan politics and consider this question as a business question in which all the people of the country are interested alike, regardless of politics, it would be a mighty wholesome thing. I do not know whether that will ever be possible or not. I very much doubt it.

Mr. WARREN. It is a little Utopian.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; a little Utopian, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations suggests, and he has been here so long that I think he knows practical politics a whole lot better than I do. The tariff is a business question, not a political question.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party made a mistake when it wiped out the Tariff Board under Taft by denying it money to keep it in existence. But it did it, and there followed in 1916 legislation which resulted in the appointment of another tariff commission. I do not believe that between the Taft Tariff Board and the Wilson Tariff Commission there is a shade of difference as far as the work of that commission relates to the facts which will be produced before Congress to guide it to a correct solution of the tariff problem in any legislation which may be enacted. It is true that Prof. Taussig is what is known as a free trader. It is true that Prof. Emery, who was a professor at Yale University and who was the head of the Taft Tariff Board, is what would be known as a protectionist. But both of them are scientists, and as scientists they seek for the truth. Prof. Emery would furnish nothing but the truth to the Congress of the United States on costs of production and every other element that enters into correct tariff making, and Prof. Taussig would furnish nothing but the truth upon those subjects.

Mr. President, we have passed beyond the stage of making tariff laws according to the old method. I have had fair sort of an experience as a man in public life in tariff making. When I was about 30 years of age I was appointed a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. I went through the experience of making a tariff bill over there. I have been a Member of the Senate of the United States through the making of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill and the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill. In a period of something like a generation of time, Mr. President, I have participated in three of the five general revisions of the tariff which have occurred in that period of time.

So, Mr. President, without any egotism or self-assertion, I just want to be permitted to say this, and I address myself in particular to Members of the Republican Senate. I will digress just a minute to say so. There is an element in the Republican Party known as the progressive element. It has only a few representatives on this floor, but it represents, Mr. President, a very much larger constituency than its members on this floor would indicate. That is always so in a transition period. It takes some time for the people of a State to get rid of a reactionary Senator and elect a progressive or democratic Senator—one who represents the people. Sometimes it happens, Mr. President, that when the people do succeed in doing a thing of that kind they find they have made a mistake, and they have a man on their hands who will go back on them and serve the special interests instead of the public interests. He is in for six years, and they have the battle to fight over again and work out the same long process of trying to be represented according to their actual views by some man on the floor of the United States Senate.

While I am talking about it I will just pause to say that that is one reason why I have been in favor of the recall and the initiative and the referendum. It is because men who are once installed in positions for four years or six years or two years betray the public and serve other interests that are hostile to the public. I do not believe that you will ever get any fair correction of that, I do not believe you will ever get any true representative government in the United States, until there is in the hands of the people the power to recall the representative who betrays them.

Every business institution in America has the right in the case of an unfaithful employee, be he a cashier in a bank, the manager of a big trust concern, the president of a railroad, it does not make any difference how long the term of office or the term of contract of such a man, if it be found that the man failed to serve faithfully under the terms of his contract and had betrayed the party to whom he has made obligations in his contract of faithful service, he can be thrown out of his position.

But the United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives and the other gentlemen who may get in under false pretenses, pretending to represent the public interest, and who then betrays the public interest, can not be driven from power for six years or four years or two years—I think that is unfair to the public. So, Mr. President, as I have been for many years in favor of a change in our Constitution which will admit of taking any man out of his public place whenever that man is recalled by a majority of the people who elected him.

Now, Mr. President, coming back to the matter under consideration, we have gotten along in tariff legislation to the point where no party can afford to stand up against the maintenance of a tariff commission. The Republicans did not dare to do it, and the Democrats did not dare to do it, both parties yielding to the universal demand that we stop making tariffs according to the old system, of giving the manufacturers just what they want. The people demanded that tariff schedules be based upon production costs scientifically ascertained. Everybody had come to that view, so that no political party dared to go into a political campaign in 1912—certainly not in 1916—without agreeing that they favored a tariff commission empowered to get all the facts and to lay them before Congress with respect to their making of the tariff. Nobody can dispute that. I have here the platforms of the different parties upon that subject. Senators are estopped from denying that the Republican Party is committed to a tariff commission that shall ascertain the difference between the cost of production in this country and abroad as a measure of fair protection.

I have the Democratic and the Republican platforms here, and, Mr. President, I shall ask leave to put the tariff plank of each into my remarks without taking the time now to read them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Without objection, leave to do so will be granted.

The portions of the platforms referred to are as follows:

[From the Democratic National Platform of 1916.]

TARIFF.

We reaffirm our belief in the doctrine of a tariff for the purpose of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the Government economically administered and unreservedly indorse the Underwood tariff law as truly exemplifying that doctrine. We recognize that tariff rates are necessarily subject to change to meet changing conditions in the world's production and trade. The events of the last two years have brought about many momentous changes. In some respects their effects are yet conjectural and wait to be disclosed, particularly in regard to our foreign trade.

Two years of a war which has directly involved most of the chief industrial nations of the world and which has indirectly affected the life and industry of all nations are bringing about economic changes

more varied and far-reaching than the world has ever before experienced. In order to ascertain just what those changes may be, the Democratic Congress is providing for a nonpartisan tariff commission to make impartial and thorough study of every economic fact that may throw light either upon our past or upon our future fiscal policy with regard to the imposition of taxes on imports or with regard to the changed and changing conditions under which our trade is carried on. We cordially indorse this timely proposal and declare ourselves in sympathy with the principle and purpose of shaping legislation within that field in accordance with clearly established facts rather than in accordance with the demands of selfish interests or upon information provided largely, if not exclusively, by them.

[From the Republican National Platform of 1916.]

TARIFF.

The Republican Party stands now, as always, in the fullest sense for the policy of tariff protection to American industries and American labor and does not regard an antidumping provision as an adequate substitute.

Such protection should be reasonable in amount but sufficient to protect adequately American industries and American labor, and so adjusted as to prevent undue exactions by monopolies or trusts. It should, moreover, give special attention to securing the industrial independence of the United States, as in the case of dyestuffs.

Through wise tariff and industrial legislation our industries can be so organized that they will become not only a commercial bulwark but a powerful aid to national defense.

The Underwood Tariff Act is a complete failure in every respect. Under its administration imports have enormously increased in spite of the fact that intercourse with foreign countries has been largely cut off by reason of the war, while the revenues of which we stand in such dire need have been greatly reduced.

Under the normal conditions which prevailed prior to the war it was clearly demonstrated that this act deprived the American producer and the American wage earner of that protection which enabled them to meet their foreign competitors, and but for the adventitious conditions created by the war would long since have paralyzed all forms of American industry and deprived American labor of its just reward.

It has not in the least degree reduced the cost of living, which has constantly advanced from the date of its enactment. The welfare of our people demands its repeal and the substitution of a measure which in peace as well as in war will produce ample revenue and give reasonable protection to all forms of American production in mine, forest, field, and factory.

We favor the creation of a tariff commission, with complete power to gather and compile information for the use of Congress in all matters relating to the tariff.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Nobody will dispute that both parties are on record in favor of a tariff commission, and a tariff commission that shall be directed to find out what it costs to produce things in this country and what it costs to produce the like things abroad.

You had exactly such a tariff commission under President Taft, and the Democrats did a partisan and indefensible thing when they abolished it, just the same thing that this committee has done in proposing to abolish this commission, simply because it was appointed by President Wilson. Mr. President, I long for the time when the public service will get onto a higher plane than that of serving political parties, and come to serve the public interest instead.

Mr. President, there is no mistaking what this provision in the bill means; there is no mistaking the attitude of the Appropriations Committee toward this useful Government board. I do not want to be accused of making any personal attack upon individual members of the committee, but, as a committee, I want to say that in the framing of this bill it has given evidence of bias against those departments and bureaus that have been doing work admittedly of value to the public.

In the first place it has assailed the appropriation made for the Federal Trade Commission. I was a little bit sorry yesterday that the cover was not taken off more completely, and the public permitted to see the interests that brought about the cut in that appropriation.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] tilted it somewhat.

Mr. President, reducing the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission by 10 per cent does not seem like very much of a cut. I can see how many Members on either side might vote for it, and particularly when somebody gets up here and reads something from the hearings indicating that the Federal Trade Commission only wanted $900,000, or a little less than $900,000. But on either side of the Chamber could be heard remarks from Senators, to the effect that "It is a good time to give them a swipe and teach them to go a little slower."

Such remarks could be heard on this floor yesterday afternoon while that amendment was pending.

Mr. President, the Federal Trade Commission is one of the best productions of the Wilson administration. It has done some good. One of the best things that it has done is the investigation of the packers' organization conducted by Francis J. Heney for the commission.

No more ruthless and reprehensible organization ever existed in the United States than the packers' combination. It has defied the criminal law. It has defied the Congress of the United States. It has defied the President. It has defied executive and legislative authority. It has done what it pleased. It has ridden down the Sherman antitrust law. It is not confined to meat products alone but it has reached out into almost every field of food production and is seeking to control and dominate the prices of food of the people of this country.

Mr. President and Senators, some man will some day gather together the testimony that has been submitted to the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate, and when he throws it vividly upon the screen so that the public may see it as it is a leash will be needed to hold the people in this country in restraint.

Mr. President, as we read from day to day the work of this organization, which is known as the packers' trust, we know that at a time when the people of the country were sending their boys away and were giving and giving to the purchase of Liberty bonds, when the old men and the old women were trying to do the work upon the farms, when everyone was sacrificing the last dollar, we find that this packers' organization was grinding the life out of the people by continually and unnecessarily increasing the cost of the necessaries of life.

Mr. President, we listened yesterday afternoon to a somewhat extended discussion of the value of the Tariff Commission, whether it had done anything, whether it had produced anything that was really worth while. So I am going to ask the indulgence of the Senate while I submit the results of some of its labors.

We are all busy men; I am a little bit busy myself. I can understand and appreciate the situation of every other Senator. A great many things are being done by the different bureaus and departments of the Government of which we have not time to take cognizance at the moment they are turned out. So I can well understand how some Senator might arise on the Republican side, thinking that he was doing a real service in supporting the recommendations of the committee to wipe out this Tariff Commission, and ask: "What is it doing? Show me something?" Well, I am on the job this afternoon for a few minutes to show him, and I regret that those who have asked the question and who ought to be answered face to face do not seem to be here.

If any body of Government employees ever faithfully served the Government, I say that the present employees of the Tariff Commission and those who are associated with them and appointed under them to do this work—if any body of men ever did good, faithful service, these men have done that sort of service. They have turned out documents here that will be invaluable in the study of the tariff.

Now, I ask you to bear with me a moment. I will be as brief as I can. The United States Tariff Commission was created by act of Congress approved September 8, 1916. The powers of the commission are comprehensive, covering both domestic and foreign aspects of the tariff. They include: To investigate the administration and fiscal and industrial effects of the customs laws of this country and to investigate the relation between the rates of duty on raw materials and finished or partly finished products.

Now what was the next duty imposed upon the Tariff Commission?

To investigate the effects of ad valorem and specific duties and compound specific and ad valorem duties.

All questions relative to the arrangement of schedules and classification of articles.

In general to investigate the operation of customs laws, including their relation to the Federal revenue, their effect upon the industries and labor of the country.

To cooperate with the President and the committees of Congress, when requested, in tariff matters.

To investigate the tariff relations between the United States and foreign countries, commercial treaties, preferential provisions, economic alliances, the effect of bounties and preferential transportation rates.

To investigate the importations compared with the domestic production and consumption.

To investigate the conditions, causes, and effects relating to competition of foreign industries with those of the United States, including dumping and cost of production.

The law creating the commission authorized the appropriation of the sum of $300,000 "for each fiscal year" after the enactment of the law.

The members of the commission were appointed in March, 1917, and the commission organized officially on April 1, 1917.

The number of employees of the Tariff Commission, as shown by its second annual report, was 84, including 6 commissioners. The present staff consists of 56 persons, including 6 commissioners.

Mr. President, it is quite apparent that at the time Congress enacted the law creating this commission it believed that it should be a continuing body, and it wrote into the statute a provision in respect to the appropriation fixing the appropriation limit at $300,000 per annum. During the war period, when, of course, the operations of the commission were more or less interfered with, they consented very freely to a reduction in the appropriation. The reduction was made, but as we emerge from that period into a time when the commission, if ever, ought to function and ought to produce material of great value to the Congress and to the executive department, they surely should have that appropriation which at least complies with the law as it was contemplated when the commission was created.

Sir, I am advised by information which has been laid before me that the commission submitted to the committee having charge of the matter in the House that in order to perform the work which manifestly, with the peace conditions that are coming upon us and the tariff legislation contemplated, it will be necessary for them to perform, it would be absolutely essential that they should have an appropriation of at least $300,000. They asked for $400,000, so as to be thoroughly equipped for the work. The House committee cut that to $300,000, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate struck that out of this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. And gave as a reason that by such action they could bring the subject to the attention of the conference committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes, Mr. President, I spent some three or four hours upon the floor of the Senate in the closing days of the last session in criticism of the power which conferees are seeking to take unto themselves in legislation, and, if I remember rightly, I came in for some measure of criticism at the hands of my friend from Colorado for having taken the time of the Senate to put that phase of the danger to legislative integrity before the Senate and the country.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, Mr. President, my criticism was general, not specific.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was pretty general; it was not personal; I concede that.

Many students of economic legislation appealed to Congress to create this sort of a commission to try, if possible, to lift the tariff question a little above the mire of partisan politics. Everybody realizes that the whole country suffers when you make the tariff a question of politics. The creation of a tariff commission that shall ascertain and report as to the facts so that Congress can fix tariff rates to measure the difference in the cost of production or, as my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] once said in his report, "a competition tariff." I do not recall the exact phraseology.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Gladly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I contended that we should have a competitive tariff.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Exactly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. One that would produce results. At one time I advocated and endeavored to secure the adoption of a measure providing for a tariff commission or board. I did vote against this particular Tariff Commission three years or so ago, because I said then that it could not function in time of war, as values were unsettled, and I think it has demonstrated conclusively that it did not and could not function in war time; and for several years to come values will be so uncertain that I do not think it can properly carry out its functions, but I have no complaint to make of what the Senator says, that when the proper opportunity comes the more information Congress can gather the better it is. The only issue is whether we shall send a man out to sow his seed in a snowstorm, when it is impossible for the seed to come up, or conserve our seed or our money until we can plant it in a fertile field.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, we will come to the question of seasons in a few minutes. I am going to put before this body just what this Tariff Commission has been doing, and instead of being engaged in sowing grain in a snowstorm it has been conducting its operations according to the seasons as they exist.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure of that, and that is the only complaint I have to make. The seasons that exist are war seasons, and we want the seasons to operate as peace seasons when we write our tariff bills.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, Mr. President; but there are some conditions that prevail between countries both in peace and in war, and I am prepared to lay before the Senate information that has been collected and published by the Tariff Commission during this war period that, as a modest student of the tariff question extending over a period of thirty-odd years, I undertake to say is information that no man in search of the truth can afford to brush aside. It is pretty good material to have in your library, and pretty good information to familiarize yourself with if you really want the truth. Of course that is what all of us want.

Now, Mr. President—and I beg the attention of the Senator from Alabama just at this point—let me show you what they have done in spite of the handicap of the war and the limited appropriations. Notwithstanding the limitations that have been put upon its activities by reducing its appropriations, the Tariff Commission has done a large amount of work.

One of its most constructive pieces of work has been the codification and revision of the customs administrative laws; and its report on this subject is now before the Congress awaiting action. Now, just making such a statement might not signify very much; but any real student of tariff legislation will know that you have got to have that information, that you ought to have it, in order to legislate wisely, in order to digest properly all of the different phases of changes that come from decade to decade in tariff legislation. I was a little surprised myself to find, although I think I have been a bit of a student in a small way of tariff legislation, that no revision covering this subject has been made for more than a century. Many provisions in these laws are redundant, ambiguous, and conflicting. It is just like every other subject of legislation with which Congress deals.

Without a scientific and thoroughgoing study of it Congress is constantly enacting overlapping legislation, and conflicting legislation, and redundant legislation, and foolish legislation, and legislation that confuses the administrative or executive departments of the Government. That is the reason why some of the progressive States of this Union have built up bureaus in the administrative department for a study of the existing statutes of the State and for a proper drafting of the new bills that are brought into the legislatures of those States from session to session, so that they will not conflict with laws that are already on the statute books, so that they shall not add confusion to confusion.

Mr. President, we succeeded in putting upon the statute books as a part of the last revenue-tax bill—the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is now in the chair, presiding here, was in thorough sympathy with myself and others upon that subject—and fortunately we were able, after a long struggle here, extending over years, to write into the statutes of the United States a provision creating a bill-drafting bureau, whose business it shall be to study existing legislation and proposed legislation, and prevent the confusion that I have referred to.

Up in the State from which I come and which I in part represent upon this floor we have had for a period of years what is known as a legislative reference library and a bill-drafting bureau, and it has been doing most excellent work. It has been preventing a conflict of statutes. It has been drafting model legislation upon the various subjects, because its members make a thoroughgoing study of the phrases that have been passed upon by all of the courts of the country, the phrases that have been construed, and they know what they are putting into the bills that are drafted in that bureau; and I think, Mr. President, that accounts largely for the fact that we have had so remarkably few of the laws of that State declared unconstitutional.

Mr. President, this Tariff Commission during the war period put in some time that will be invaluable to those who are members of the various committees that have to deal with tariff legislation and to the Senate when they come to consider the question. They made a comparative study of the various legislative enactments of the last century, so that we may get rid of a lot of rubbish that has been imposed upon us by the thoughtless and ill-considered action of Congress. We can not, as members of the various committees before whom bills come, investigate and determine whether there be not legislation already on the statute books that may conflict with that which is proposed; but it is the business of this commission to look into that subject thoroughly, and that is one of the valuable offices which this commission has performed for the Congress. And, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations must have been in ignorance of the value of the work of this commission or they would not have come in here with a proposition to wipe it off of the statute books, abolish it, or, as they apologetically say, throw the matter into conference, and leave it to six men—three from the House and three from the Senate—to say whether this body of men, created after a campaign of 25 years, should be wiped out, abrogated, annulled, set aside, and all of its work destroyed. That is the proposition. The committee did not have time to deliberate upon it. They could not possibly give it that con-

sideration to which a measure of such importance is entitled. So, sir, I say if there ever was anything that evidenced hostility and a purpose to destroy a great commission created after years of investigation, after years of consideration of the subject, to wipe it out entirely, that is presented in the proposition that we have now before us.

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], speaking yesterday, said that if there is anything that this Tariff Commission has done that was worth while he would like to have somebody call his attention to it. Well, I am engaged in just that sort of business at this particular time; and I want to call his attention and the country's attention to the fact that in 1918, during the war period, the United States Tariff Commission made a report upon the revision of the customs administrative laws, which I hold in my hand here, containing 209 pages, in which they set out the conflicts between the laws that are upon the statute books, the overlapping laws, the laws that introduce confusion one with another, and make their suggestions and recommendations to the Congress of the United States with respect to this jumble of legislation, covering more than a century. Is not that valuable work? Has not this commission been doing something during this "suspended period" which the Senator from Alabama talks about?

I do not want to weary the Senate and protract this discussion, Mr. President, and I am going to ask that instead of taking the time to put it into the RECORD now I may incorporate, without stopping now to present it, a summary report of the Tariff Commission upon the revision of the customs administrative laws, 1918, from page 23 of the commission's second annual report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The need of a revision of these laws has long been felt. No revision covering the whole subject has been made for more than a century. In the meantime statute has been added to statute, sometimes without repeal of those in conflict; and many provisions are redundant and ambiguous. In mere bulk the present laws are almost unmanageable. The proposed revision, while sacrificing no essential point, occupies about one-fourth of the existing statutes.

In the report presented to Congress the statutes as they stand have been printed in one column, and in a parallel column the proposed revision. The main lines of the proposed changes have been summarily explained in a brief introduction. At the same time an index has been provided at the close, enabling easy reference to those sections in which the significant changes are to be found.

While the work has been in the main one of codification and simplification, some important changes in substance are recommended. Most important is that by which the appointment of the chief customs officers is to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury instead of by the President. This would involve the automatic application to these appointments of the rules and regulations of the civil-service law; since under existing statute appointments thus made come at once within the scope of that law. In other words, the Secretary of the Treasury would make the appointments not within his uncontrolled discretion, but subject to the provisions of the civil-service law. On the other hand, the removal of these officials from the list of presidential appointees would bring it about that confirmation by the Senate would no longer be required. It is further recommended that these customs officials should be appointed not for terms of four years, as now, but for terms of six years.

Other important changes, of a more technical sort, relate to the bond and warehouse system, which is not only simplified, but made more elastic; to the application of penalties, and more particularly to the removal of certain unduly drastic provisions for preventing the undervaluation of goods subject to ad valorem duties; to the enlargement of administrative discretion in many cases where at present there is unnecessarily detailed statutory provision; and to procedure before the Board of General Appraisers.

This matter involves no changes in rates of duty, and no matters of economic policy. It is one merely of businesslike and systematic procedure. There is complete agreement among all concerned that a reform in these bulky, confused, inconsistent, and largely obsolete statutes is desirable.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am aware that I have consumed a good deal of time; but, sir, I think there is more pending here, perhaps, than just exactly what is within the limit of the lines that are before the Senate at this time. There is a principle here. We appoint our committees in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to serve the House and the Senate. We do not appoint them to take legislation away from the House and the Senate, and to come in here in the closing hours—for these might be called the closing hours for the consideration of a great appropriation bill, for we must pass this bill before the 1st day of July—with such an important proposition as this. If the committee is sustained, if this appropriation be stricken out, then as a practical matter it would be in the power of the conferees to destroy the work for which men who have a love for the science of government have devoted a quarter of a century.

I have served on every single tariff committee that has made a tariff bill in the last 30 years, except the committee that made the Dingley bill and the Wilson bill, and hundreds of times I have heard the chairman of the committee say to those men who were appearing for some interest and demanding a high duty before the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance: "Well, how much duty do you think you ought to have?" The the manufacturers would answer that they must have certain high duties without furnishing the facts to support their demands. Then when we came to our executive sessions we would be confronted with the statement, "Why, the men who make these products say they can not stand a lower duty than so much." That is practically all the information that the committee would have on the subject—no scientific, no thorough-going information, the result of investigation at home and abroad, as to the cost of production.

The cost of production involves scientific study. It involves thoroughgoing research into every change that takes place between the raw material as God left it in the ground and the finished product as the man turns it out from his factory for sale upon the market. I say that no committee is competent to frame a tariff bill until it knows the cost of all the elements—the material cost, the labor cost, and all the other costs that enter into the change of that material from the way the Creator left it as a raw product until it is turned out as a finished product for the most beautiful home in this country. Any committee that makes a tariff should know all the costs involved in converting it from one material into the other material before it is competent to fix a tariff rate.

Mr. President, that is all that is involved in this question. To call men before a committee on Ways and Means in the House or a Committee on Finance in the Senate and just have from those interested men a statement of what they want as a duty is an unjust and wrongful and wicked thing to do to the people of this country, and it has been the means of exacting from the people of this country untold sums of money. Why, Mr. President, this opens up a field of discussion that tempts me to turn aside.

Do you know what has been done behind such tariffs as have been builded upon that plan? Let me tell you in just a word, and I will try to condense it. You have built up in this country a control of markets and prices that makes the people of the United States the abject bondsmen of those who produce these products for sale. I have said on the floor of the Senate again and again that there is not any way of accounting for the increase in the cost of living excepting that we are in the grip of monopoly. You have built up, in the first place, a protective system and shut off foreign competition, and you have left it to the fellows inside of the tariff wall to fix the prices and, by combination, they have fixed the prices as high as they pleased, and they have destroyed competition, and as a result of that they have taken out of the American public just what profits they pleased, and Congress has sat by and permitted that thing to be done.

There is no justification for it. It is a betrayal of everything that goes to the heart of representative government. It has builded up the conditions that have led a committee of this Senate to put into this bill a proposition to appropriate $2,000,000 to suppress radical criticism in this country. Do you think you could have a government, representing just simply those who have an opportunity to take out of the people of this country whatever prices they please for the things they produce, and not have criticism of your government?

I say, Mr. President, right now that in 20 years this Government has not been representative of the public interests. I think that this Government has been representing the interests of combinations and trusts and great aggregations of capital, and no man can successfully deny that. I do not speak of the war period, because that disturbed prices; but go back of that, and I am just going to say this over again. I have said it a good many times on the floor of the Senate, and I am going to keep on saying it as long as I live, as long as I am a Member of this body.

From 1897 down to the time that the war began, prices advanced every year on the products consumed in this country. Now, I say that is unjust, that is wrong, and this is so only because the Government did not serve the people. It is so because Congress permitted tariff duttes to be builded up so high as to put foreign competition out of business, and because our administrations would not prosecute the trusts and combinations, but allowed them to have their way in fixing prices. Otherwise, you could not have had that increase in the cost of living. Why do I say that? I say that because of this: The cost of living, if natural conditions existed, would fall, fall, fall every year, and not increase; and if you will stop a minute to think and use your minds you know that is so.

Senators draw their salaries, and sit behind these desks, and let this thing go on, and then add law to law to repress criticism because it is so! What are you preparing for the future, I ask you? Am I talking against democracy or in favor

of it? Mr. President, I love this country, our Constitution, this Government, democracy. According to my lights, I have done the best I could to promote democracy in this country for thirty-odd years. Stop just a minute and think about this economic question. Why should the cost of living have increased? I am not talking of the war period, but before the war, from 1897 down to the war period; it did increase every year. Study Dun's and Bradstreet's and you will find that it increased every year. Why should it increase? It increased because the Congress of the United States and the executive departments did not serve the public interests. It increased because the aggregations of capital were permitted to defy the law of competition and fix prices as they pleased. Why? Why did not prices fall? Did you ever know of a period of invention that was comparable to it? There never was. From 1897 down to the year 1914 Yankee ingenuity and invention revolutionized the cost of production, and yet the prices increased upon the people of this country. Tell me if you were doing your duty and the executive department was doing its duty, when you had a law on the statute books that said that there should be no control of prices against the public interest; why were these combinations permitted to ignore and defy the law? You can not name to me a single industry in the United States that has not cut the cost of production in two again and again from 1897 down to 1914, and yet the cost to the consumer has mounted steadily every year. There is a steadily mounting curve of prices.

I tell you, Mr. President, when the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives resort to repressive legislation, to strangle this criticism, thinking that you are salving over and healing the trouble that produces this irritation and this criticism, you never made a greater mistake in your lives.

The Committee on Commerce, in the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, called upon the Tariff Commission to do some work during the period when the war was in progress. The Committee on Commerce did not think it could be dispensed with, and the great Committee on Commerce called upon the Tariff Commission to render a report on bill S. 4153, to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of free zones in the ports of the United States. This report was submitted by the Tariff Commission, and it is the most exhaustive study of the subject that has ever been made. That was surely a valuable contribution. It was a good service for this commission to perform.

So I say that this is not an indolent commission seeking to draw its salary and not to perform any service for the public. It has been ready to do anything that it was suggested it should do. I hold in my hand this report on free zones. It is 92 pages in length, and they are large pages, too—double columns—containing an exhaustive study and report on this subject that was submitted to them by the Committee on Commerce on a bill which was then pending before the committee and upon which they wanted information.

I think, Mr. President, that in itself justifies the existence of this commission. It seemed to the Committee on Commerce to be a useful body, which it could lay its hands upon to secure for it that which it needed in the business of legislating upon matters of great public interest.

But, Mr. President, that is only a small part of what this commission has been doing. I have here the reports of the commission pertaining to international tariff problems. The duties of the Tariff Commission to investigate international tariff problems, to which I have already referred, have really been increased by the war, not diminished, and the necessity for this commission really, Mr. President, is augmented and emphasized and made more necessary by war conditions that have come upon us. The interests that are touched by this subject have been under discussion by the peace conference and the commission has already done great service in this field by assisting other branches of the Government, as well as those who have been attending the peace conference in handling the problems of our tariff relations with the other countries. I wonder if this committee understood that when it sought to wipe out this commission and its work.

This commission, Mr. President, has been in active cooperation with what has been going on at Versailles. I have before me here two volumes, one of 145 pages and the other of 533 pages, on the international aspect of the tariff. They will be useful to the members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Finance of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Is that a work to be dumped into the ash heap, thrown aside, discredited, and the commission bundled out of view and service by a few lines stricken out of this bill hastily by the committee? I trust not.

Mr. President, I am not misled. I have been quite a bit of time in the Senate, and I sometimes think I can tell the temper of the Senate in advance of its vote upon these questions. I have not much doubt but that this provision as it passed the House of Representatives will be left in the bill.

But, Mr. President, there is something more at stake than that. Much of the legislation of Congress is necessarily by committees. That was not so in the early days. As this Government has grown, as its vital interests have multiplied, it has been necessary to build up more and more committees and to load on those committees more and more of the business of legislation, until, sir, it has come to be pretty nearly an axiom that Congress legislates by committees. Books have been written with that as their title, "Congressional Legislation by Committees."

If that is to be the order of business for the future, then, sir, I undertake to say that it behooves this body to admonish its committees to stay within the purview of their power and not to assume to take away from Congress itself the important business of legislating upon vital things, such as the existence of this Tariff Commission, which was the result of a long series of investigations and discussion and campaign and the introduction of bills.

I now come back to the important work of this commission. I want to repeat that the commission has already rendered great service. I have called attention to these two reports, "Japan: Trade During the War" and "Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties." I just say, in order to be definite about it, that among the commission's reports on this subject is the one entitled "Japan: Trade During the War." I submit here the report of the commission upon "Japan: Trade During the War." I do not ask to have it printed. I just ask to have it noted in the RECORD that I submit the report and that the report covers 145 pages, and then the other report, "Reciprocity and Commercial Treaties," covering 533 pages. This is a most exhaustive report, analyzing in greatest detail the reciprocity experiences of the United States, the most-favored-nation clause, and the bargaining tariffs and treaty systems of European States. It makes definite suggestions as to how the United States may adjust its tariff to meet new international conditions.

These are not the only reports which this commission has turned out during the war period. The following reports are not published, but they are well along toward completion:

Colonial Tariff Relations. This is a careful study of the colonial tariff policies of different countries, particularly with reference to preference. It includes a study of the colonial tariff policies of France, Italy, Portugal, Belgium, Netherlands, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States.

Preferences within the British Empire. This is an historical and analytical study of the growth of preferential tariffs in Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and Canada.

Digest of the Commercial Treaties of the World. This report is well along toward completion but not yet ready for publication. Such a digest of all the commercial treaties of the world has never been made, and it will be of extreme value to Congress in the commercial-treaty adjustments which must inevitably follow the war.

I can not think of anything that would be more useful to the committees of Congress than these reports to which I am calling attention here, and, judging from the attitude of the committee and from the views of various Members of the Senate, as stated here upon the floor, the committee could not have known about them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just out of curiosity I should like to ask the Senator a question. I am not reflecting upon the report made by these gentlemen. I read one or two of them. I have not read them all. I concede that they are ably prepared reports. But I should like to ask the Senator how many of these reports he has read through from cover to cover.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not read them through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure of that, but I should like to ask the Senator how many Senators does he suppose are in the Senate who have read any of these reports through. I do not mean glancing at a page or two, but reading them through intelligently from cover to cover?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I doubt if any Senators have, Mr. President, but I think the committee before it undertook to wipe this commission out of existence ought to have called the commission before it and inquired what it had been doing.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not taking issue with the Senator on that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not think the Senator or anyone else can take issue with me on that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that I think if he will look at his own record he will see that he has voted for the withdrawal of an appropriation that ceased the functioning of a great many public bodies. Probably he has done so recently without knowing he was doing it. I think I can turn back within the last six months and show him where by his vote, together with his brother Senators—and there is no reflection on him—by the mere process of withdrawing appropriations we have caused to cease functioning bodies that were performing public service in this country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Alabama call my attention to a specific vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, I do not recall the Senator being present at the vote, but I have no doubt he was, as he is usually present and usually votes when he is present. But within the last six months we have withdrawn from functioning a large number of boards and endeavors that were created during the war for war purposes. Congress reached the conclusion that their functions were at an end. There was nothing improper about it. Their period of existence ceased, but we did not repeal the law; we did not stop to do that. We withdrew the appropriation. I will not say the Senator was here and voted for it, but I have no doubt he did; as I stated, he is usually here and usually votes when he is present. If he will examine the RECORD, the Senator will find he voted along with the balance of us for that very same thing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, Mr. President, the war being over, it seems to me that nobody would think it is a fair criticism of a man who votes to dispense with the services of organizations that were instituted in connection with the war and solely for war purposes. But this body of men was not created as a part of the war organization. I do not care when this commission came into being, it was a successor of the Taft Tariff Board that came in during peace times, and it was the product of the agitation that had taken place in this country more than a quarter of a century. To deny it an appropriation and thus destroy it is an altogether different matter than to deny an appropriation to or to withdraw an appropriation from a body that was created for war purposes. The war body could serve no purpose except to function during the war. The war over, it was wise to immediately withdraw the appropriation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My inquiry did not relate to the specific purpose of this board and its function and the necessity for keeping it alive, but I was directing my inquiry, or you might say a mild question, so to speak, rather to the point that Congress was exercising a power through the withdrawal of appropriations to make the life of a board or Government function cease instead of going back and repealing the original statute. The Senator I am sure knows that there are many officers of the Government created by law and their salaries established by law who for years have not drawn the amount of salary because Congress never put in the statute the amount of salary originally created by law. Of course that comes down from an old practice growing out of the period of the Civil War, when the effort of real economy was practiced in this country. It is an inheritance. Probably men have served under those conditions who did not ever examine the statutes to know what the original salary was but took the appropriation. So there is nothing new or unusual in this action. The question whether it is proper at this time in this specific instance is another question, but to say that this is an unusual precedent and Congress never did anything of the kind before is a mistake, because the appropriation bills are filled with them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I deny that appropriation bills are filled with precedents for this sort of action. I say that, taking the Senator upon his own statement, that there are cases of officers serving under statutes where the service has grown obsolete in the course of time, or cases of officers or commissions that were created just for war purposes, and the war having expired, of course, we have all voted to put them out of business; that is proper enough; but that does not furnish this committee or you, sir, any reason for putting out of commission the Tariff Commission, which came into existence as the result of 25 years of the best thought of the people of this country. It looks too much, Mr. President, as though somebody here wanted tariffs made upon some other theory than that based upon knowledge of the cost of production or of a scientific measure of all of the elements that should enter into true tariff rates.

Mr. President, I certainly do not want to take unnecessary time in the discussion of this proposition. I do want, however, to get before the Senate, if I can—and I should like to do it as speedily as possible—a sort of bird's-eye view of the work of this Tariff Commission, which I think has been remarkable in the period that its members have been in office.

Next I call attention briefly to the domestic aspects of the tariff question and the work which the Tariff Commission has done under that heading. It has not given its attention merely to the foreign but also to the domestic aspects of the tariff, which to-day is becoming of increasing importance. Of course, we all realize that with the change in conditions which have come out of the war we have new problems to face, and that the tariff question is perhaps one that will tax our best thought and our best statesmanship as much as any other; and I think that the demonstration that this commission is making day by day and month by month in discharging the obligations imposed upon it by the law under which it was appointed should make us feel that we are very fortunate, indeed, in having a body of men who for this period of time have been engaged in picking up these various new questions which have grown out of war conditions and concentrating upon them and investigating them and tabulating the results of their work, organizing it, and having it ready to submit to Congress when Congress is ready to consider it.

It seems to me that we should not put aside that work and send from the public service these men who have been trained in this line of thinking for this period of time. It is in a way a sort of disgrace, for I can not think of anything, Mr. President, that would be more to the disparagement of a public official than that he should be electrocuted in an appropriation bill by one of the great committees of Congress, and never called before the committee and asked what he has got to say as sentence is about to be pronounced against him. I understand that this Tariff Commission has never been for one moment warned of what was to befall it until the Senate committee reported out this bill to take away the appropriations which gave it the breath of life for the work that it was to do.

It is a body of men who have given up important work to assume these duties. I know some of the members of this commission; I know that some of them can not return to take up the work they were formerly engaged in. They have made sacrifices, and they have been conscientiously giving their time to the service of the public.

Why, Mr. President, just to show you how this thing has been done, I desire to say that a member of the Tariff Commission sent in his card to me the other day—yesterday it was, or the day before yesterday—and he said to me, "I understand that the Committee on Appropriations have denied to the employees of the Tariff Commission the $240 bonus that other Government employees generally are to receive." He said, "I do not think it is fair, and, besides, it is going to be a great handicap to us in our work. We have difficulty in retaining these employees in our service at the present pay." I said, "Mr. Commissioner, I will go down and see if I can get some member of the Committee on Appropriations"—they were still considering this bill—"to come out of the committee for a moment, in order that you may have the opportunity to present this matter to him." I went to the committee room——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the Senator allow me just a moment to say——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; just allow me to conclude this. I want to get my man down before your committee.

So I went down with the commissioner and called out a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and said to him, "Here is a member of the Tariff Commission who says that you are not dealing the same by the clerks of that commission as you are by the clerks who are employed elsewhere in the Government service." The member of the Appropriations Committee said, "Well, Mr. Commissioner"—he did not say just this in words—"there ain't any core to this apple"—but he said—"You have not got any clerks; we have just wiped out your commission completely—you and the clerks also." That is the first intimation that that member of the Tariff Commission had of the action of the Committee on Appropriations or that any such action was contemplated.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, the Senator is repeating something of which I never heard; but there is nothing in this bill taking the bonus of $240 away from any commission that I know of, and certainly not from the Tariff Commission. The provision in regard to the $240 bonus was contained entirely in another bill a long time ago.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I may have been misinformed about that, but when you wiped out the commission you wiped out the $240 bonus and everything connected with the commission.

Mr. WARREN. We did not wipe out the $240 bonus, for it is not referred to in this bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; but a member of your committee informed the commissioner, "You have not any reason to complain about your employees; you are all gone; you are electrocuted; you are guillotined; you have not had a chance to come before the bar of justice and ask what you have to say why sentence should not be pronounced against you; you are sentenced without a word, and you are executed without a word."

Now, Mr. President, that was not fair to this commission. It should have been permitted to state its case, to tell what it had been doing in behalf of the public. It would have not only been able to show the things to which I have imperfectly called attention here but many other activities. Now, I hold in my hand a few of the handbooks on the tariff published by the commission and illustrative of the character of its work in this field. The following reports are referred to by way of illustration.

Now, look at these reports [exhibiting]. There are six of them, all important, that this commission has prepared and issued.

Schedule M. Paper and books, silk and manufactures of silk, surgical-instrument industry, the brush industry, the cost of production in the sugar industry, and the button industry.

I took a little pains to look up the sugar-industry report, and I undertake to say that we will find right here in the work of the Tariff Commission some valuable material for consideration the moment we come to deal with the sugar duties in tariff legislation.

So with these other reports; they are very valuable. I wish I might take the time to analyze some one of them, to give the Senate an idea of the value of this work that has been performed by the Tariff Commission. I undertake to say that, if there is anything that this administration can boast of as an achievement in the interest of the public, it is the Tariff Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, two of the administrative organizations of the Wilson régime which have been subjected to hostile action by the Committee on Appropriations in this bill.

I did not say anything the other day in regard to the Federal Trade Commission, except to try to get before the Senate some information as to the work of the Federal Trade Commission and the fact that it had appeared before the House committee and had asked for an appropriation of $1,000,000. I am going to say something upon that question, if the occasion requires, when we come to vote upon it in the Senate, and so I refrain from saying it now; but I am confident that the Senate will do wisely if it reconsiders the action which it took as in Committee of the Whole on that appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission and puts it back at the figure at which the House passed it.

I am now going to call attention to the unpublished data of the Tariff Commission. Of course, no one could have much information about that, as we have not had an opportunity to see it.

The real scope of the commission's work is not completely disclosed in its published documents. It has on its files a large amount of unpublished information which, when needed by Congress, will be of the greatest service in legislation. Every tariff schedule from "A" to "M" bristles with technical and complex problems. Since its establishment in 1917 the Tariff Commission has compiled information on many of these schedules. A few illustrations will give an idea of the scope of its work.

The Tariff Commission has prepared data, as yet unpublished, upon minor acids; another upon heavy chemicals, also unpublished. They have made a thorough study of agricultural products. I know that my friend from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] will be interested in that, together with other Senators from agricultural sections of the country. The difficult problem of the tariff on agricultural products has been dealt with by the Tariff Commission, and a large amount of pertinent data has already been gathered. The commission has also given attention to the commerce of the United States and Canada in agricultural products.

It has invaluable data for tariff purposes on wheat, oats, barley, flaxseed, hay, and potatoes. This report shows the effect of tariff duties during the past decade. It includes a careful study of production and prices in both Canada and the United States, and the general course and fluctuations of trade, with a view to ascertaining the cause of importations, and the influence of imports and the tariff on the market, and on producers' prices.

I can not think of any information, Mr. President, that would be more valuable than that to us, if we are to take up a tariff on agricultural products and consider these products with respect to Canada as a competitor. Are we to lose the benefit of that kind of work by the action of a committee of this body without any hearings?

Many of the most bitter tariff controversies have centered around the textile industry. On this subject, the Tariff Commission is preparing a number of important special reports, particularly on cotton cloth and cotton yarn. I remember in the tariff debate of 1909 that quite a scandal developed here because a leading manufacturer of cottons in New England was permitted to write the tariff schedule on cotton; and Representative Payne, of New York, on the floor, after it had been found that he had been "jobbed" in the matter, repudiated it, and said that he had been misled. Are we to go back to that kind of tariff making? Is that what a Republican Congress is going on record to do; or shall we have some guide in making tariffs here that will at least save us from scandal and shame?

What has been said concerning the investigations of the Tariff Commission, however, gives only a partial conception of the diversity and detailed character of its work. In the tariff act there are over 4,000 items, each of which may raise a separate and distinct tariff problem, and which, in any scientific revision of the tariff, should have individual consideration. Recognizing this fact, the Tariff Commission is developing what is known as the tariff information catalogue. Each paragraph of the tariff act of 1913 is being analyzed, and units of information prepared on all significant and important products. These units of information are available for the use of Congress at any time, and may be called for by the Finance Committee or the Ways and Means Committee, and published for the information of Congress. In the second annual report of the commission some typical samples of these catalogues are published, and a list of the items upon which catalogues are prepared, or are being prepared, is also included.

The Tariff Commission has completed tariff-information catalogues covering 357 commodities, and work is in progress on catalogues covering 334 other commodities. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a typical tariff-information catalogue prepared by the commission. It shows detailed information as to bleaching powder or chloride of lime. Now, that is just one subject; but it shows the character of the work of this commission. I have gone through that printed matter very carefully and read it all, and I undertake to say that no man is qualified fairly and intelligently to vote upon a duty regarding that article without the information included in that catalogue, and I do not know any other place where you can get it excepting as it has been worked out by the Tariff Commission.

I reserve the right, Mr. President, without reading, simply to incorporate in my remarks a specimen of the tariff-information catalogue as indicative of the scope of the commission's work.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate briefly to the services of the Tariff Commission as rendered before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives during this very month, services of the greatest value, as I see the matter.

The value and effectiveness of the Tariff Commission was demonstrated at the hearings held a little over a week ago by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The Ways and Means Committee was considering what tariff legislation was necessary in certain industries seriously disturbed by the war. The committee first took up the subject of potash, and called upon the Tariff Commission for information. The following report was sent up immediately, "Information Concerning the Potash Industry."

Now there, Mr. President, this commission was all ready upon that subject. Here is a practical illustration of what it means to have a Tariff Commission and have them on the job. Here is a pamphlet of 52 pages, and only a week or 10 days ago the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, making a study preparatory to legislating upon the subject of the tariff, called upon the Tariff Commission to know if they could furnish any information upon the potash industry. How much do you know about potash? How much do I know about it? I could not get a fraction of 1 per cent on an examination of 100 on potash, and I venture to say that perhaps there is not a Member of the Senate who could. Here is this Tariff Commission, that was ready to furnish this information to one of the legislative bodies of this Congress upon call. They knew in advance that one of the first things the Congress would consider was this subject, so they worked it out, had a report ready

upon it, upon call furnished it to the committee, and the committee had it printed in a pamphlet of 52 pages.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the average senatorial idea of potash is that he is a partner of Perlmutter. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no doubt that that is about the limit of senatorial information on potash.

The committee then took up chemical and optical glass and called on the Tariff Commission for information. The report which I hold in my hand was sent to the committee and printed for its use. Here was a report all ready for them. Mark you, this was only just a few days ago. Why, the practical benefit of the work that this commission is doing for legislation of this Congress was not cold before they were wiped out of existence by the committee of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Submarined.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; sumbarined, without warning.

Here is this pamphlet of information on optical glass and chemical glassware. I have not had time to go through this. It is 35 pages in length. It looks mighty interesting, from the data and the tables and the figures in it, and I have not any doubt but that it would furnish most of us with a liberal education on this subject if we would study it; and any member of the Committee on Finance or Ways and Means who attempted to bring in a tariff bill on this question without this information has no adequate conception of the responsibility that rests upon him.

It is the business of a tariff committee to know these things before it reports upon them to your colleagues, and here is a commission of men, trained, and with the time to do the work of gathering and digest all the pertinent facts. We have not the time to do it. They are doing it, and it is good work, and we ought to keep them at it.

The Committee on Ways and Means then took up tungsten, magnesite, and certain other metals, and called upon the Tariff Commission for information. Similar reports were sent up, including "Information Concerning Tungsten-Bearing Ores," "The Magnesite Industry"—that is another pamphlet—"Zinc Ores," another pamphlet; another pamphlet of "Information Concerning Pyrites and Sulphur," and another pamphlet on "Manganese Ore."

I may also add that the glass, chemical, and metal experts of the Tariff Commission appeared and testified before the committee.

Mr. President, I have here sample copies of these various pamphlets, all presented by the commission and printed by the Committee on Ways and Means, to enable them intelligently to consider these questions.

Mr. President, I am not seeking just to hold this provision in this bill. I have an idea that we are going to do that with a good margin; but I am speaking for the maintenance for all time of a Tariff Commission, which shall continue on the job of doing this constructive work, without which this body can not intelligently legislate upon the subject of the tariff. I do not care so much who appoints that commission, Mr. President. I do not care whether it is appointed under a Republican President or whether it is appointed under a Democratic President. The important thing for Congress and the country is the preservation and perpetuation of a tariff commission.

I have had a little of experience in public life. I have had something to do with commissions appointed and serving under administrations over which I had no control. I have inherited commissions that were appointed by administrations that were absolutely hostile to my views on public questions. But, Mr. President, while I know that some bad appointments are made on these commissions, I have come to believe that as a rule men who come to service upon these commissions endeavor to serve the public interest. I speak from some knowledge of the proceedings of the Taft commission. President Taft, in selecting the two Democrats who went upon that commission, selected men who had Democratic ideas of the tariff. He gave the Democrats fair representation.

I know something of the personnel of this Tariff Commission selected by President Wilson, and I know that there are men upon that commission who hold as strong views upon the protective-tariff policy as any man upon this side of the Chamber, I am sure.

Men take a pride in their work, and particularly after they have withdrawn from their various professional pursuits and have come to public service, like men on this floor; they want to leave a record behind them, a record that will stand the analysis and the criticism of time; and the longer they serve the more devoted they are to ideals and to making such a record as will receive the commendation of time and of the critics.

Finally, Mr. President, the Committee on Ways and Means took up the important subject of coal-tar chemicals, and when it turned to the Tariff Commission for information—I am speaking of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives now—at a very recent date, when it was considering this tariff question, at this very session, when it turned to the Tariff Commission for information, it found exhaustive information on the subject. The commission had already published three reports on the subject—"The Dyestuffs Situation in the Textile Industry," 1918; "Census of Dyes and Coal-Tar Chemicals," 1917; "Dyes and other Coal-Tar Chemicals"—three different publications. I have them here in my hand. They are important, serious, exhaustive surveys of those subjects. In addition the commission sent promptly to the Ways and Means Committee additional data, which was published under the heading "Dyes and Related Coal-Tar Chemicals," 1918—a pamphlet of 127 pages.

A member of the committee working upon the tariff 10 years ago would have considered himself as an heir to a most valuable inheritance if he could have gotten possession of the data contained in these reports.

Why, Mr. President, I served as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in the House and I have served as a member of the Finance Committee here in the Senate, and I know how hard pressed a member of that committee is to get reliable information on which to act, and I know how hungry he would be for this material; and let me say to you that the examination of any of these pamphlets that I have presented here to the Senate will convince either a Republican or a Democrat that they have been prepared from an absolutely nonpartisan viewpoint. They simply give you accurate information on the subject. They are exhaustive treatises. They are not made in favor of a high tariff or in favor of a low tariff. This commission has observed that principle of action strictly, as did the Taft Tariff Board. Now, I think I made as thorough a study of the work of the Taft Tariff Board as any other Senator, and I assert its work was absolutely unbiased and unprejudiced. It was just a presentation of cold facts of which anybody upon either side of the tariff question could avail himself. I undertake to say that so far as I have been able to examine the pamphlets of this commission—the work that the commission has turned out—there is not a man on either side of this Chamber who can take any one of these pamphlets and criticize it as being in the slightest degree partisan on the tariff question. It just gives the facts on both sides. That is what you want if you want to legislate honestly upon this question.

Mr. President, I owe an apology to the Senate for having taken so much time upon this question, but there never has been a time in 30 years when the establishment and maintenance of a tariff commission has not been a matter of great interest to me.

I undertake to say, and I say it as a Republican, that President Wilson has built up a Tariff Commission here with which no Republican has any business to find fault if he wants light and nothing but light, nothing but the facts to enable him to legislate properly upon the tariff. That Tariff Commission should be left standing just as it is created. It should be given an appropriation of not a cent less than $300,000, the amount provided for in the law, and every one of its clerks should be dealt with just exactly as the clerks of other departments and bureaus are dealt with. Let the Senate show that there is no discrimination against this Tariff Commission. Let it wash its hands of everything partisan in this connection. Let us say to the American public that when we come to deal with the tariff question we are going to get on good, high ground; we are not going back in the mire of the old methods of tariff making. We are going to stand for stability, and you can not have any stability, Senators, when you make a tariff just for the benefit of the manufacturers and against the public interest. The only way to have stability in tariff making—and stability in tariff making is just as valuable as stability in railroad-rate making, because it affects the stability of business—is to have your tariff made on a thoroughgoing, scientific, equitable basis between the manufacturer and the consumer.

Mr. President, the commission having accomplished this work which is so helpful at this time, I submit that there is greater need of it in the future.

Much work needs to be yet done by the commission. It must complete the surveys of the various industries of the country affected by the tariff. In particular it includes the investigation of cost of production. During the war the commission made no extensive investigations into the cost of production, partly because of the abnormal conditions created by the war and partly because no funds were available for that purpose.

The commission, however, has recognized the importance of such investigations, both in this country and foreign countries. It has on its staff an accountant, and much preliminary work has been done in preparing schedules and in studying the cost of production in different industries. A few limited cost investigations have been made, particularly in the sugar industry. Schedules have also been prepared in the expectation of making full and detailed investigations into the raw wool and chemical industries as soon as funds are available which will make field work possible. On these two investigations in particular the commission has completed the work so far as it can be done in the office here in Washington, and until funds are available which will permit agents to go into the field nothing more can be done. All parties interested in tariff legislation, however, recognize the value of a careful study of competitive conditions, and if the commission is to carry on its work effectively and to perform the duties laid upon it by the law creating it, it must have sufficient funds to expand its work in this direction.

The commission's work also includes foreign investigations. A few months ago the Tariff Commission planned two foreign trips, one to Japan and the other to Europe. It recognized the desirability of having first-hand information upon the competitive conditions in these countries. It went so far as to select the men who should make these investigations, but the failure of funds made it impossible for the commission to carry out this plan. Some data has been gathered in this country on foreign conditions by the commission. But the necessity for careful studies abroad by well-qualified agents is recognized by all familiar with the problems of tariff legislation. Comparative data is essential to intelligent tariff making. Too often the committees of Congress have been asked to accept information on foreign conditions which they have no means whatever of checking up and which is often based merely on hearsay. In this field in particular the Tariff Commission is indispensable to Congress in carrying through well-advised tariff legislation. If the commission has adequate funds it can send its agents abroad and bring back to us an analysis of competitive conditions there which will throw light on the problem of the American tariff.

APPENDIX.

A SPECIMEN OF THE SURVEYS WHICH THE TARIFF COMMISSION IS MAKING FOR ALL THE ITEMS ENUMERATED IN OR AFFECTED BY THE TARIFF ACTS.

Bleaching powder or chloride of lime.

(Par. 12, act of 1913, one-tenth cent per pound.)

SUMMARY.

Description: Bleaching powder or chloride of lime is a white powder which evolves chlorine when treated with an acid. It is sold on the basis of the "available chlorine" content. Bleaching powder, in spite of many disadvantages, has been the best means of shipping chlorine until within recent years, when liquid chlorine was introduced. As its name indicates, it is primarily a bleaching agent. It is used for bleaching pulp and paper stock, cotton and linen in textile mills and laundries, and for the purification of public water supplies.

Domestic production: The production of bleaching powder in 1914 amounted to 310,380,000 pounds, valued at $2,916,225. This quantity was nearly twice the production in 1909. There has been no census of production since 1914. The United States at the present time (1918) supplies its own consumption of bleaching powder. During the fiscal year 1918 there was exported 13,060,401 pounds of bleaching powder, valued at $558,066.

The manufacture of bleaching powder on a commercial scale was established in this country after the passage of the act of 1897, which placed a duty of one-fifth cent per pound on the article. Beginning with 1897, the industry developed rapidly and soon supplied the greater part of domestic requirements. Since 1915 the imports have been negligible.

The materials necessary for the production of bleaching powder are lime and chlorine gas. The chlorine gas is a joint product in the manufacture of electrolytic caustic soda.

A large part of the bleaching powder is made at Niagara Falls, N. Y. It is also produced by two firms in Michigan and by one firm in California.

There is a marked tendency for the larger consumers of bleaching powder to install electrolytic chlorine plants in which to produce their own bleach in liquid form.

Foreign production: The largest producers of bleaching powder before the war were the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany.

Imports: Previous to 1914 the United States imported each year between 40,000 and 60,000 short tons of bleaching powder; the United Kingdom supplied from 70 to 80 per cent of this, and most of the remainder came from Germany. Since 1914 the imports have declined; in 1918 only 2 tons were imported.

Prices: Before the war bleaching powder sold at a constant price of about $25 per ton. During 1916 it was quoted as high as $240 per ton. At the beginning of 1918 the price had declined to about $50 per ton.

Tariff history: Bleaching powder was free of duty until the passage of the act of 1897, when it was made dutiable at one-fifth cent per pound. This duty was reduced to one-tenth cent per pound by the act of 1913.

Summary table.

Year.[1]	Domestic production.	Imports for consumption.	Domestic exports.[2]	Ratio to production, per cent imports.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	
1909	116,802,000	83,376,089	.....	80.2
1910	.....	93,838,195	.....	.....
1911	.....	99,478,325	.....	.....
1912	.....	72,706,732	.....	.....
1913	.....	76,092,327	.....	.....
1914	310,380,000	48,497,239	.....	15.6
1915	.....	18,402,130	.....	.....
1916	.....	3,289,790	.....	.....
1917	.....	65,564	.....	.....
1918	.....	535	13,060,401	.....

[1] Domestic production is for the calendar year, while imports for consumption and domestic exports are for the fiscal year ending June 30.

[2] Exports of bleaching powder are not shown in Commerce and Navigation of the United States prior to 1918.

IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION.

Year.	Value.	Amount of duty.	Value per unit of quantity.	Equivalent ad valorem rate, per cent.
1910	$750,140.00	$187,676.00	$0.008	25.02
1911	802,015.00	198,957.00	.008	24.81
1912	600,621.00	145,413.00	.008	24.21
1913	619,492.00	152,184.00	.008	24.57
1914	416,898.00	59,237.00	.0085	14.21
1915	197,975.00	18,402.00	.0107	9.30
1916	80,418.00	3,290.00	.021	4.09
1917	3,888.00	66.00	.059	1.69
1918	83.00	.54	.155	.64

GENERAL INFORMATION.

Description: Bleaching powder is also called in commerce chloride of lime. In scientific nomenclature it may be regarded as a double salt of calcium chloride and calcium hypochlorite mixed with 2 to 5 per cent excess of slaked lime and a little water. The chemical formula is generally conceded to be $CaClOCl$. When bleaching powder is dissolved in water it forms a solution of calcium chloride and calcium hypochlorite.

Bleaching powder is a white powder which readily evolves chlorine when treated with an acid. It absorbs moisture and carbon dioxide from the air, and this results in deterioration and decomposition of the product. It must, therefore, be shipped in air-tight containers, such as sheet-iron drums or wooden barrels painted with asphalt paint. Even with these precautions it deteriorates slowly in storehouses, and the shaking during shipment causes more rapid deterioration. Hence the strength of bleaching powder is nearly always guaranteed only at the place of shipment. Lunge states (Lunge: Sulphuric Acid and Alkali, vol. 3, p. 643) that bleach shipped with 35 per cent available chlorine in England should show at least 32 per cent at Hamburg or New York. It is a mistake to demand a high-test bleach for export shipment, as a high-test bleach deteriorates faster than a low-test bleach. In order to reduce the deterioration to a minimum, the bleaching powder should contain 2 to 5 per cent excess of lime. In spite of the fact that bleaching powder contains a low per cent of chlorine—the active constituent—and that it deteriorates during storage and shipment, it has been the best means of shipping chlorine until within recent years, when liquid chlorine shipped in steel cylinders became a rival of bleaching powder. It is doubtful whether liquid chlorine will replace bleaching powder in export trade, on account of the necessity of back shipment of the empty cylinders.

The grade of any product of bleaching powder is determined by its percentage content of available chlorine. Practically all bleaching powder contains at least 30 per cent and is sold on a basis of "35 per cent available chlorine." That is, all price quotations on bleaching powder refer to a product containing 35 per cent of chlorine, and contract prices are usually made on a sliding-scale basis for an article which, on analysis, shows a greater or less per cent of chlorine.

Raw materials: The materials necessary for the manufacture of bleaching powder are lime and chlorine gas. Lime is produced by burning limestone. The lime should be well calcined and should contain over 95 per cent of lime—CaO—but little magnesia, carbonic acid, iron, and insoluble material such as clay and sand. The chlorine which enters into the manufacture of bleaching powder, in this country, is all produced by passing a direct current of electricity through a solution of common salt. This method, known as the "electrolytic process," produces chlorine gas of a high concentration and purity.

The production of bleaching powder, then, is dependent on the basic raw materials—salt and limestone—both of which are available in large quantities in this country. Considerable electrical power is required, but the cost of electrical power is not so vital to this industry as to most other electrochemical processes, and it has been possible to operate plants dependent on steam power.

Process of manufacture: Quicklime of a suitable purity is slaked by slowly adding water until the resulting product contains between 2 and 5 per cent excess of water. The slaked lime is sifted to remove all lumps and then should be allowed to cool, protected from the air. For the absorption of the chlorine the lime is piled on the floor of chambers to a depth varying from 1 inch to 8 inches. In the one-chamber process bleaching powder can be made without turning the lime, if the depth does not exceed 2 inches. The three-chamber process, which is more or less a continuous one, operating on the counter-current principle, permits the lime to be piled 8 inches deep. This system is preferable, as it absorbs the chlorine completely and prevents leakage of chlorine, a common occurrence in the one-chamber process.

The chlorine is admitted slowly to the chambers until the lime is completely chlorinated. The temperature of the lime during chlorination should be kept below 45° C. It is possible to make a stronger bleaching powder during cold weather than in warm weather. After chlorination the powder is packed in drums or wooden barrels for shipment. In France it is the custom to sift the bleaching powder before packing. During this operation the bleach loses in strength, but the resulting product will keep longer and is much better for shipment. The yield of bleaching powder obtained is, in good practice, one and a half times the quantity of lime used.

Hasenclever, an English chemist, overcame serious engineering difficulties in building an apparatus for carrying out this process in a continuous manner. His apparatus is, in essentials, a series of continuous conveyors; the lime is fed into the top while the chlorine is drawn in at the bottom in a direction opposite to the lime. We have no knowledge that this process is being used in the United States.

The foreign and domestic methods of manufacture are not dissimilar, the primary difference being in the manufacture of chlorine. In England and France the Deacon and Weldon processes have been generally used, although recently the electrolytic process has gained considerable headway. Both of these processes obtain chlorine by the oxidation of hydrochloric acid, which has been produced from salt. The Deacon process oxidizes the hydrochloric acid by means of air, while the Weldon process uses manganese dioxide, which is regenerated and used again. Both are more complicated than the electrolytic process. In Germany the chlorine is obtained from the electrolysis of solutions of sodium or potassium chlorides.

Skilled labor, in the manufacture of bleaching powder, is not a necessity so long as the plant is under the supervision of a competent chemist.

Since the manufacture of bleaching powder in this country is dependent on electricity for the production of chlorine, it naturally follows that Niagara Falls should be a center for this industry. It is not, however, confined to this locality, as plants in other parts of the country have been operated successfully on electricity generated from steam power.

Important uses: Bleaching powder, as its name indicates, is essentially a bleaching agent. It is used for the bleaching of wood pulp and other paper stocks, cotton and linen fabrics, cotton for the manufacture of guncotton, and as a bleaching agent in laundries. It is also used in the manufacture of other chemicals, principally chloroform; for the purification of public water supplies; and as a disinfectant, deodorant, and germicide. For domestic uses, it is sold in small tin cans, under the name of chloride of lime.

Substitutes and rival commodities: (a) Liquid bleach: This is a solution of calcium hypochlorite and chloride, produced by passing chlorine into a solution of lime, commonly called "milk of lime." It is easier to make than bleaching powder and is usually produced at the place where it is to be consumed. The numerous paper and pulp mills in this country that make their own bleach furnish instances of this practice. There is a marked tendency for the large consumers of bleaching powder to install electrolytic chlorine plants and produce their own bleach in liquid form. This tendency has been accentuated by the war demands for chlorine.

(b) Liquid chlorine: Since about 1910 this article has become a rival of bleaching powder and is fast displacing it in the purification of water supplies. It is also being used for bleaching in textile mills. It is doubtful whether liquid chlorine will take the place of bleaching powder for export, owing to the necessary back shipment of the containers.

(c) Hypochlorites of sodium and potassium: Owing to the high cost of potassium salts, the hypochlorite of sodium is usually made in this country. It is produced either by a special electrolytic cell at the place of consumption, or it is made from bleaching powder by treatment with soda ash. Sodium hypochlorite is preferred to lime bleach in the bleaching of cotton and linen, because it gives a clear solution and because the salts, formed during the bleaching, are easily removed from the fabric by washing. For this reason it is used extensively in laundries and textile mills.

History of the industry: Bleaching powder was invented in 1799 by Tennant, an Englishman. It was first made in the same year by the St. Rollox Works, England, and was sold at £140 (about $700) per ton. The early development of the manufacture of this commercial product took place in England. Its manufacture on a commercial scale in the United States was not undertaken until after the passage of the tariff act of 1897, which placed a duty of one-fifth cent per pound on bleaching powder. The plant of the Dow Chemical Co., at Midland, Mich., and of the Castner Electrolytic Alkali Co., at Niagara Falls, N. Y., were both started in the latter part of 1897.

The industry developed rapidly from that time on. As shown by the census of manufactures, the production increased from 21,958,000 pounds, valued at $462,949, in 1899, to 310,380,000 pounds, valued at $2,916,225, in 1914. As the American industry expanded to meet our own demands, there was a gradual decline in imports. Owing to an increase in consumption, there was no marked falling off in imports until 1908. Just prior to the outbreak of the war, the imports of bleaching powder had decreased 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 pounds; they have since become negligible. During the 1918 fiscal year only 4,285 pounds were imported. The importation of bleaching powder has been restricted by the War Trade Board and by the War Industries Board. Europe is the only source of imports; and, as we are now shipping large quantities of bleaching powder and other chlorine products to Europe, its importation from that continent would be a waste of shipping space. The fact that we now not only supply our own consumption but exported over 13,000,000 pounds during the 1918 fiscal year, indicates the development of the bleaching-powder industry in the United States.

Largest producers: Although figures on the actual production of bleaching powder in the United Kingdom and in Germany are not available, there are indications that these two countries and the United States are the largest producers of bleaching powder. The import statistics show that from 70 to 80 per cent of the bleaching powder imported into the United States comes from the United Kingdom and that the greater part of the remainder is from Germany. The following table, compiled from the official publications of Germany (Vierteljahrshefte zur Statistik des Deutschen Reichs) and the United Kingdom (Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom), is indicative of the status of the industry in these countries.

Exports of bleaching powder.

Year.	United Kingdom.		Germany.[1]	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Short tons.		*Short tons.*	
1909	51,016	$950,033	31,453	$736,848
1910	56,412	1,021,189	28,734	683,066
1911	51,165	947,858	32,186	961,044
1912	46,254	875,279	35,554	1,170,245
1913	40,678	820,725	40,204	1,284,962
1914	33,561	772,679	.....	.....
1915	27,510	880,501	.....	.....
1916	9,693	694,245	.....	.....

[1] Includes bleaching powder, bleaching lyes, and peroxides of hydrogen and barium. Figures for Germany are not available after 1913.

Lunge states (Lunge: Sulphuric acid and alkali) that the production of bleaching powder in England was 125,000 tons in 1909, with the production decreasing. The production in the United States in 1914 was 150,000 tons. These figures indicate that in 1914 the United States was producing as much bleaching powder as any other country. At the present time (1918) the United States is undoubtedly the largest producer.

That the bleaching-powder industry in Japan has expanded greatly since the outbreak of the war is shown by the following table. The exports of this commodity from Japan during 1917 were nearly seven times the prewar exports (1913). Prior to 1916 over 80 per cent of Japan's exports were to China; during 1916 and 1917 British India took over 50 per cent.

Exports of bleaching powder from Japan.[1]

Country.	1913		1914		1915		1916		1917	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Short tons.		*Short tons.*		*Short tons.*		*Short tons.*		*Short tons.*	
China	916	$55,102	638	$36,163	1,556	$83,954	1,552	$116,278	1,963	$205,258
Hongkong	180	10,990	123	6,768	184	10,509	382	36,768	494	47,956
British India	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	289	20,429	3,185	275,216	4,192	439,386
All others	23	1,457	83	4,806	184	11,405	800	61,836	482	47,283
Total	1,119	67,549	844	47,737	2,213	126,297	5,919	490,098	7,131	739,883

[1] Compiled from Annual Return of the Foreign Trade of the Empire of Japan.
[2] Included in all others.

During the years 1909 to 1913, inclusive, Italy produced about 10,000 short tons of bleaching powder per annum. (Annuario Statistico Italiano.) Special Agents Series No. 65, Chemical Industries of Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden, by Thomas H. Norton, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, contains information on the bleaching-powder situation in these countries. The annual production in Belgium exceeds 6,000 tons. The other three countries are dependent on foreign countries for their supplies.

Production in United States.

[From Federal census. Listed as hypochlorites. Chiefly bleaching powder and chloride of lime.]

Year.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.	
1899	21,958,000	$462,949
1904	39,176,000	535,835
1909	116,802,000	1,786,846
1914	310,380,000	2,916,225

Imports by countries, fiscal years 1895 to 1918.

Imported from—	1895		1896		1897	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
Belgium	1,601,208	$28,562	1,373,706	$20,359	2,444,492	$33,914
France	1,436,825	21,026	4,997,277	66,372	9,511,852	117,299
Germany	2,351,637	33,970	4,893,376	64,089	7,914,934	100,428
United Kingdom	94,642,090	1,554,845	92,760,794	1,428,124	79,236,840	1,121,472
All others	425,114	6,432	28,724	234	166,020	2,447
Total	100,456,774	1,644,835	104,053,877	1,579,358	99,274,138	1,375,560

Imports by countries, fiscal years 1895 to 1918—Continued.

Imported from—	1898 (free).[1]		1898 (dutiable).[2]		1899	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
Belgium	301,435	$4,102	2,361,516	$29,631	1,780,561	$18,063
France	523,356	7,291	9,850,095	121,234	9,785,182	93,652
Germany	953,757	10,998	11,937,839	130,531	11,166,411	112,127
United Kingdom	4,828,090	68,506	83,362,490	1,048,037	89,723,643	928,767
All other	114,000	1,590	.....	.....	651,453	6,662
Total	6,720,638	92,487	107,511,940	1,329,433	113,107,250	1,159,271

Imported from—	1900		1901		1902	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
Belgium	3,412,886	$38,414	1,809,660	$23,119	4,741,616	$62,840
France	10,498,455	102,678	6,911,669	76,082	10,437,496	141,980
Germany	18,563,952	177,682	22,414,748	226,846	28,441,862	344,830
United Kingdom	103,482,859	1,140,559	79,824,194	1,044,977	85,717,633	1,226,346
All other	444,999	4,689	252	4	913,089	12,358
Total	136,403,151	1,464,019	110,960,523	1,371,028	130,251,696	1,788,354

Imported from—	1903		1904		1905	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
Belgium	1,051,519	$12,528	855,453	$6,775	3,874,588	$30,623
France	5,942,375	71,391	614,018	4,843	1,322,348	11,301
Germany	21,161,570	243,074	22,411,069	168,483	20,990,091	144,822
United Kingdom	79,641,953	799,533	74,448,139	585,445	68,581,632	579,385
All other	29,700	140	[3] 756,707	5,986	1,351,052	10,150
Total	107,827,117	1,126,666	99,085,386	772,532	96,119,711	776,281

Imported from—	1906		1907		1908	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
Belgium	2,368,742	$19,637	1,801,484	$15,876	1,802,453	$15,771
France	2,805,452	21,770	1,853,559	14,937	2,120,215	16,098
Germany	22,642,870	154,352	19,813,102	139,531	16,423,545	113,892
United Kingdom	80,630,717	682,554	82,766,399	710,020	69,772,014	607,749
All other	107,535	946	.....	.....	117,488	991
Total	108,556,316	879,260	106,234,544	880,364	90,235,515	754,501

Imported from—	1909		1910		1911	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
Belgium	769,968	$6,723	700,138	$5,706	748,268	$7,862
France	1,656,677	12,881	2,034,259	15,653	4,295,308	32,867
Germany	23,525,844	161,386	24,279,836	150,121	21,092,984	143,883
United Kingdom	57,371,139	502,575	66,689,586	575,897	71,996,482	606,896
Netherlands	76,032	521	300,867	1,981	1,389,017	9,322
All other	.....	.....	.....	.....	40,516	305
Total	83,399,660	684,086	94,004,686	750,358	99,562,575	801,135

Imported from—	1912		1913		1914	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
Belgium	321,847	$3,214	245,628	$2,548	290,785	$3,009
France	3,356,377	23,579	2,146,859	15,873	2,016,324	16,003
Germany	19,487,400	133,980	18,119,803	122,159	10,751,098	76,209
United Kingdom	49,788,020	423,205	54,723,908	473,260	34,287,763	320,890
Netherlands	181,935	1,239	.....	.....	.....	.....
Canada	135,837	1,222	38,120	324	.....	.....
All other	2,610	49	1,900	21	77,681	629
Total	73,274,026	586,488	75,276,218	614,185	47,423,651	416,740

[1] From July 1 to July 24, 1897, under the act of 1894.
[2] From July 25, 1897, to June 30, 1898, under the act of 1897.
[3] Chiefly Italy.

Imports by countries, fiscal years 1895 to 1918—Continued.

Imported from—	1915		1916		1917		1918	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Lbs.		*Lbs.*		*Lbs.*		*Lbs.*	
Belgium	111,887	$1,193	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
France	268,832	2,143	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Germany	2,572,509	19,108	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
United Kingdom	15,174,575	174,134	2,700,975	$49,043	64,711	$3,769	.....	.....
Canada	22,722	425	488,701	31,389	753	113	.....	.....
All other	.....	.....	112	2	100	6	.....	.....
Total	18,150,525	197,003	3,189,788	80,434	65,564	3,888	4,285	$184

Imports for consumption—Revenue.

Fiscal year.	Rates of duty.	Quantity.	Value.	Duties collected.	Value per unit of quantity.	Actual and computed ad valorem rate.
		Pounds.				*Per cent.*
1909	½ cent per pound.	83,376,089	$684,427.00	$166,752.00	$0.008	24.36
1910	.....do.....	93,838,195	750,140.00	187,676.00	.008	25.02
1911	.....do.....	99,478,325	802,015.00	198,957.00	.008	24.81
1912	.....do.....	72,706,732	600,621.00	145,413.00	.008	24.21
1913	.....do.....	76,092,327	619,492.00	152,184.00	.008	24.57
1914[1]	.....do.....	10,720,961	90,003.00	21,442.00	.008	23.82
1914[2]	⅒ cent per pound	37,776,275	326,895.00	37,796.00	.009	11.56
1915	.....do.....	18,402,130	197,975.00	18,402.00	.0107	9.30
1916	.....do.....	3,289,790	80,418.00	3,290.00	.021	4.09
1917	.....do.....	65,564	3,888.00	66.00	.059	1.69
1918	.....do.....	535	83.00	.54	.155	.64

[1] July 1 to Oct. 3, 1913. [2] Oct. 4 to June 30, 1914.

DOMESTIC EXPORTS.

Exports of bleaching powder are not shown separately in Commerce and Navigation of the United States prior to the fiscal year 1918, when there was exported 13,060,401 pounds, valued at $558,066.

PRICES.

Price quotations on bleaching powder.[1]

Month.	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918
January	1.25–1.30	1.35–1.45	1.20–1.30	1.37–1.62	14.00	4.37–6.50	1.25–3.50
April	1.25–1.30	1.30–1.40	1.20–1.30	1.40–1.50	8.00– 8.50	3.75–6.00	2.25–3.25
July	1.50–2.00	1.25–1.30	1.20–1.30	1.40–1.50	5.50– 8.00	1.75–4.00	2.00–3.25
October	1.35–1.40	1.25–1.30	2.25–3.00	2.50–2.75	4.25– 6.00	2.00–2.50	5.50–6.00

[1] From the Oil, Paint, and Drug Reporter. The prices are in cents per pound, spot at New York, for a product containing 35 per cent available chlorine.

Rates of duty.

Act of—		Tariff classification or description.	Rates of duty, specific and ad valorem.
Year.	Paragraph.		
1883	618	Lime, chloride of, or bleaching powder	Free.
1890	635	.....do	Do.
1894	537	.....do	Do.
1897	8	Bleaching powder, or chloride of lime	½ cent per pound.
1909	8	.....do	Do.
1913	12	.....do	⅒ cent per pound.

COURT AND TREASURY DECISIONS.

There are no decisions directly affecting the classification of bleaching powder or chloride of lime. The only questions in issue were whether certain combinations of chemicals constituted the commodity specifically provided for in the tariff acts and whether tin containers were dutiable.

The decisions are:

Tin cans containing bleaching powder or chloride of lime: Held not dutiable as unusual containers under the act of 1883. (Dept. Order, T. D. 6568.)

The following articles were held not properly classable as bleaching powder or chloride of lime:

Chloride of calcium: Held dutiable as a chemical compound or salt under paragraph 92 of the act of 1883. (Dept. Order, T. D. 9008.)

A mixture of soap, carbonate of soda, and saponified resin: Held dutiable as an unenumerated manufactured article under section 4 of the act of 1890. (In re Ross, G. A. 954 (T. D. 12041).)

Sodium perborate, 31.57 per cent, and sodium carbonate, 68.43 per cent: Held dutiable as chemical compound under paragraph 3 of the act of 1909. The term "bleaching powder" was said to have a well-known significance in chemistry and to mean either calcium chloride or a mixture of calcium chloride and calcium hypochlorite, and to be synonymous with chloride of lime. (In re Oberle & Henry, Abstract 35745 (T. D. 34496).)

The following articles were held not to be lime powder:

A mixture of lime, carbonate of lime, and manganese oxide, lime chief value: Held dutiable as lime under paragraph 90 of the act

of 1897. (In re Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., Abstract 21596 (T. D. 29922).)

Similar merchandise: Held dutiable as a chemical mixture under paragraph 3 of the act of 1909. (Strohmeyer v. U. S., 2 Ct. Cust. Appls., 285, affirming Abstract 23840 (T. D. 30865).)

COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS.

Bleaching powder and the electrolytic alkali industry: Bleaching powder has been one of the chief marketable forms of chlorine gas, which is a joint product of the electrolytic alkali industry; the other product is caustic soda. The electrolytic process necessarily produces caustic soda and chlorine in chemically equivalent amounts which are approximately equal in weight. The chlorine in turn will produce roughly two and one-half times as much bleaching powder as the caustic soda produced. In normal times the demand for caustic soda is far in excess of the demand for bleaching powder and other chlorine products, therefore the limit to the amount of caustic soda which can be produced electrolytically is determined by the amount of chlorine (bleaching powder and other products) which can be disposed of.

In an effort to supply a greater portion of the large and profitable market for caustic soda there has been a tendency on the part of the electrolytic alkali industry to overproduce chlorine or bleach. The result has been that prices for chlorine and bleaching powder have ruled so low that manufacturers claim that there has been very little, if any, profit in this end of the business. The normal prewar price of bleaching powder was practically constant at about $25 per ton, which made it one of the cheapest chemical products.

Effect of the war on the electrolytic industry: The war has produced a large, although presumably temporary, increase in the demand for chlorine. A number of important substances used in poison-gas warfare require chlorine in their manufacture. The three of these substances which have been used in the greatest quantities are chlorine gas itself, phosgene, and mustard gas. Even before the entrance of the United States into the war there was a large increase in the capacity of the existing chlorine plants. The estimated requirements, however, became so great and the prospects of disposing of the increased output when war demands ceased were so small that private concerns were unwilling to enlarge their plants on terms acceptable to the Government. The Government is, therefore, erecting a plant to supply a large part of the increased demand resulting from our entrance into the war.

The output of chlorine in 1918 will probably be at least three times the output of 1914, and there is large additional productive capacity under construction (October, 1918). The war has undoubtedly caused a substantial increase in productive capacity in England, France, and Germany.

As a result of this increased capacity to meet war demands, it is expected that there will be a surplus of productive capacity after the war and that there will be keen competition. This competition will be sharper in bleaching powder and other chlorine products than in caustic soda.

The war demands for chlorine have made it necessary for the Government to control the distribution of all chlorine products, including bleaching powder. In addition restrictions have been placed on the use of bleaching powder by the paper and pulp mills.

Foreign competition: Germany in the past has interwoven her chlorine industry with her potash industry which has monopolized the world's markets. Much chloride of potash is treated electrolytically in Germany for the production of caustic potash; the chlorine, produced simultaneously, is delivered free of charge to the manufacturer of bleaching powder. The value of the caustic potash is sufficient to cover all the cost of manufacture of both the caustic potash and chlorine and still leave a large profit. This cheap source of chlorine is largely responsible for the rapid rise of the manufacture of bleaching powder and chlorine products in Germany. Germany, prior to the war, had increased her exports of bleaching materials until they were equal in quantity to the exports of bleaching powder from the United Kingdom.

The firms in England and France, which use the Deacon and Weldon processes, are apparently at a disadvantage in the production of bleaching powder, as these processes are more complicated and require more attention than the electrolytic process. Although comparative cost figures are not available, the Deacon and Weldon processes appear to be more expensive, since the electrolytic process is gradually being installed in England and France.

Germany and England prior to the war controlled the export trade in bleaching powder, while in the United States the industry had developed sufficiently to supply the larger portion of home consumption. The war forced the immediate withdrawal of Germany and later of England from the export trade in this article. The foreign trade of these two countries was thus thrown open to the United States. This country by increased production has been able to supply its own demands and to develop an export trade. During the fiscal year 1918 we exported some 6,000 short tons of bleaching powder.

At the conclusion of the war we may expect a determined effort on the part of England and Germany to regain this trade. A price-cutting war on the United States trade in this commodity will undoubtedly ensue. Our chief advantage in this competition will be our cheap power for electrolysis, but whether this will offset the advantages of cheaper labor in England and the cheaper source of chlorine in Germany is a question.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Rates of duty in foreign countries: The following rates of duty on bleaching powder in foreign countries were compiled from the latest available official foreign publications. In converting the duties to United States equivalents the par value of foreign money was used.

	Cents per pound.
China	0.271
Russia	1.816
Finland	.411
Germany	.108
France	.460
Portugal	.049
Spain	.263
Italy	.350
Austria-Hungary	.332
Switzerland	.088
Bulgaria	.263
Roumania	.088
Serbia	.044
Argentina	.236
Brazil	1.240
Chile	.165

Canada:

In packages containing not less than 25 pounds, 0.15 cent per pound plus 7½ per cent ad valorem.

In packages containing less than 25 pounds, 32½ per cent ad valorem.

Norway, Denmark, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Greece admit bleaching powder free of duty.

Abstracts of tariff hearings.—

(1908–9. Ways and Means Committee.)

The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.: We believe the present import duty will furnish a larger revenue to the Government than a lower duty and that the risk of an American industry being blotted out by a foreign monopoly is less than it would be if the import duty were lower. (Herbert H. Dow.)

(1912. Committee on Finance, United States Senate.)

Mr. Edward E. Arnold, of Providence, R. I., representing the Mathieson Alkali Works, Arnold-Hoffman Co., and the Castner Electrolytic Alkali Co.:

"Labor in this country is more expensive than abroad. The fact that half of the bleaching powder consumed in the United States is made here indicates that the industry is not only established, but if aggressively provided for with means to do its best it could produce the article in a satisfactory manner in this country.

"It is wise to look upon the industry abroad. I venture to say that in England alone there is an idle capacity of 100,000 tons annually of bleaching powder—idle because this country has so quickly come to the front in supplying its own requirements in this line.

"Mr. Arnold stated that he had transported heavy chemicals to this country from Europe at a freight rate of sixty and odd cents per ton.

"To the ordinary workman the wage in England is usually about 3 and 6 pence per day. A dollar and a half is about the lowest we can get any workmen for. In fact, it is the lowest wage I know of in a single instance in the case of workmen in our plant."

Mr. Austin M. Purves, representing the Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.:

"Eighty thousand tons bleaching powder is manufactured by domestic concerns and 50,000 tons is imported annually. Prior to the development of this industry in this country under a beneficial protection the cost of this article to the consumer was largely in excess of the figure brought about by the perfection of our home industry. The seaboard price to-day is about 1½ cents, a reduction of about 30 per cent from the price ruling when bleaching powder was admitted into this country free.

"A reduction would be most discouraging to the industry now established in this country."

Brief of the Hooker Electrochemical Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.:

"A reduction in the duty on bleaching powder would be highly injurious to the industry in this country, and would arrest the progress made in cheapening the price to consumer. From 1892 to the present the price has been reduced from $52 per ton to $25.60 per ton at New York. Chemical research has not found an outlet for the vast amounts of chlorine gas produced in the electrolytic production of caustic other than that of bleaching powder, therefore the American manufacturer must make bleaching powder."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following literature was consulted in the preparation of this catalogue:

Lunge, Sulphuric Acid and Alkali, volume 3.
Rogers, Manual of Industrial Chemistry.
Thorpe, Dictionary of Applied Chemistry, volume 2.
Thorp, Outlines of Industrial Chemistry.

ASSOCIATIONS, ESTABLISHMENTS, IMPORTERS, EXPORTERS, TRADE JOURNALS, DIRECTORIES.

Manufacturers of bleaching powder:
Hooker Electrochemical Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.
Niagara Alkali Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.
Niagara Electrochemical Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.
Isco Chemical Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.
Mathieson Alkali Works (Inc.), Niagara Falls, N. Y.
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa. (plant at Wyandotte, Mich.).
Great Western Electrochemical Co., Pittsburg, Calif.
Michigan Electrochemical Co., Menominee, Mich.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. POMERENE. Is the vote on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. With regard to the Tariff Commission?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suppose the pending motion is on the adoption of the committee amendment to strike out the lines in the bill as passed by the House. I move to increase the $300,000 appropriation to $350,000, and I want to say on that, Mr. President, before I sit down, just this word.

This commission, moved by their desire to do all they could during the time the expenditures were excessive, during the war period, asked for no more than $200,000. They were obliged to curtail their work, very much of it, and they have not been able to keep abreast of things they ought to have done. I believe from talking with some of the members of the commission that we ought to go beyond the $300,000 which the House appropriated and make it somewhat more than that, for I am assured that it is needed by the commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Wisconsin that if he desires to pursue the course indicated, his amendment to strike out and insert would be in order now.

Mr. THOMAS. There is a suggestion made which I wish to correct. The Senate committee amendment is one striking out

a clause of the House provision. Is it not proper for us to first vote upon that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the question is perfectly clear to the mind of the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. THOMAS. It may be clear to the Chair, but it is not clear to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Colorado will permit the Chair to complete his statement, it may be clear to the Senator. It is the well-established procedure of the Senate that a motion to perfect a provision is in order before a motion to strike out is entertained.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true as to an affirmative amendment, but an amendment which strikes out a provision of the bill of the House, I think, we would have to vote upon first.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It occurs to me that the Chair must have in mind the rule which relates to a motion to strike out and insert. Upon such a motion the portion to be stricken out may be amended or the portion to be substituted may be amended, and neither is voted upon until both are perfected. But that has no application when the motion is simply to strike out, as in this case. If the motion to strike out is defeated, and that is the committee amendment, then the original matter will be open to amendment. That would not be the case were the motion to strike out and insert.

Mr. GRONNA. May I suggest to the Senator from Montana that there is no motion pending before the Senate to strike out? It is simply a motion to agree to the Senate committee amendment, and any Senator has the right to perfect that amendment. In my judgment it would be in order to move to change the amount from what it is to any other amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled upon the matter. The House language has not been stricken out, and it is competent for the Senate to perfect that or to change it in any way it desires before voting upon the motion to strike out. The Chair has ruled upon the subject. If the Senators desire to appeal, of course, it will be in order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to say, Mr. President, that we assume a motion is pending to adopt the committee amendment. That is always presumed to be pending. So the first thing we should consider is the pending motion to adopt the committee amendment. If that motion is rejected, then we may proceed to deal with the bill as it came over from the House. The motion suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin will then undoubtedly be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, adhering to the ruling, will state, in view of the position of the Senator from Montana and others, if there be no objection, a vote will first be taken upon the committee amendment, and in the event that amendment is not agreed to it will then be in order to vote upon an amendment to the paragraph in the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Before the vote is taken on this amendment I should like to ask a question of the chairman, if I may. It seems to be rather uncertain what is the purpose of the committee in presenting this amendment and I am uncertain in my own mind, and in view of that fact I should like to ask whether it was simply the purpose to temporarily suspend the operation of the Tariff Commission or was it the purpose in fact to dispose of the Tariff Commission entirely, or, if neither one nor the other, what was the purpose?

Mr. WARREN. The disposition of the committee was to place the recommendation of the committee before the Senate, expecting that the Senate would reduce or increase or strike out as the Senate felt it was its duty and in their interest to do. Of course, if it were stricken out it would then go to conference. If it were passed upon and left as the House sent it over, of course the amount could not be then increased and could not even be reduced. The idea of the committee was that if it could be left so that it could be higher or lower within a certain limit, according to the work that had been laid out, as might be desired by that commission, there would be a little margin in which they could work.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator further, was it the opinion of the committee that the Tariff Commission ought to be abolished?

Mr. WARREN. As to the opinion of the committee, I do not know that the members expressed opinions individually, and I myself have expressed no individual opinion. It was the opinion of the committee that we ought to leave it to the Senate itself to figure on.

Mr. POMERENE. If the appropriation would be denied, the effect would be to abolish the commission, would it not?

Mr. WARREN. It would be suspended for the time being.

Mr. POMERENE. Suspended in the air.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to observe that I received a different impression earlier in the day from that which seems to prevail at the present time. I understood the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] the direct question as to whether or not the committee intended to abolish the Tariff Commission by this report, and the Senator from Utah, as I understood him, made the statement positively that it was not the intention of the committee to abolish the Tariff Commission but to strike out the appropriation, so that the conferees could consider the amount of money necessary to be appropriated for the purposes of the Tariff Commission. I will say the impression I received from that colloquy is not in harmony with the colloquy which has just occurred between the Senator from Ohio and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah simply stated what was his position in the committee; and if the Senator will refer to his remarks as they appear in the RECORD to-morrow, he will see that I said, "So far as I am personally concerned."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I must say I did not hear that part of it. I understood the interrogatory of the Senator from Indiana to go to the attitude of the committee, and that the Senator from Utah undertook to speak for the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not speak for the committee, because if I had I would have made the statement that there were members of the committee who wanted to abolish the commission and other members who did not, but they thought the whole question should be referred to the committee of conference, and for this reason: The appropriation is $200,000 for the present fiscal year. The commission asked for $400,000 for the coming fiscal year. In this bill the House gave them $300,000, as the Senator from New Mexico knows from the bill before him.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Whatever may have been the purpose of any individual member of the committee, the action of the committee abolishes the commission; and if we approve that action and the House conferees agree to it, the commission is abolished regardless of the individual views of the members of the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask to have read into the RECORD, if it has not already been done, a letter from the legislative committee of the National Grange in regard to the Tariff Commission and the desirability of its being continued. The letter is addressed, I believe, to the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1919.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Chairman Senate Committee on Appropriations,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WARREN: May we ask you, in the debate which is now in progress on the question of whether or not the work of the Tariff Commission is to be continued, to read into the RECORD the following resolutions adopted by the National Grange at its annual meeting in November, 1915, at Oakland, Calif.:

"Whereas the tariff legislation of the country for many years has been unfair to agriculture and productive of great economic waste and is a handicap to real progress; and

"Whereas the time has come to demand that the juggling of the tariff for political advantage or in the interest of favored industries shall cease and that future tariff legislation shall be based on ascertained facts and be in the interest of all the people: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this convention that Congress shall at once create and permanently maintain a strictly nonpartisan tariff commission to make a full and impartial investigation that shall bring out all the facts and report the same to Congress from time to time, and that in the make-up of said commission agriculture shall be fully and fairly represented thereon; and

"*Resolved further*, That the legislative committee be, and is hereby, instructed to do all it can to bring about the necessary legislation at the ensuing session of Congress."

That was then, and is now, the position of the National Grange.

May we urge you and all your associates in the Senate not to oppose such appropriation as is just and proper for the continuance of the work of this commission? In making this request I am confident that I speak for the almost unanimous feeling of our membership. Never since a nonpartisan tariff commission was first advocated in our national meeting in 1891 has there been a question but that the grange stood squarely for this commission and its work.

Yours, sincerely,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
T. C. ATKESON,
Representative.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I share the views expressed in the letter presented as respecting the views of the National Grange. I did not derive my views upon a subject from the grange because I was among those who were pioneers in their advocacy of a tariff commission. It seems to me the period of the commission's greatest usefulness is approaching. I think it would be unfortunate and a step backward to abolish it at this time, and I hope that the recommendation of the Senate committee will not be agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate at this late hour by an extended speech on this subject, but I do not think I should let the item go by without some expression of my views, as I am a member of the committee that reported the bill.

Mr. President, the question whether Congress should create a tariff commission or a tariff board has been more or less a question of consideration by various Congresses since 1883. I believe at that time the first tariff board was created. It made a very voluminous and interesting report, recommending a very general reduction of the tariff and tariff rates. But at the time it made its report the party in power was strongly in favor of a high protective tariff, and it entirely discarded the report of the commission that it created. Since that time there have been several attempts to work out tariff legislation with the aid of tariff boards and tariff commissions; but I do not know of any instance in all of these years—nearly half a century—when the Congress as a Congress has ever accepted the conclusion of a tariff commission or of a tariff board that it created.

So far as I am concerned, some years ago, before the Democratic Party came into power either in the Nation or in the House of Representatives, I advocated and stood for the creation of a tariff board. My recollection is that that legislation was passed by the House of Representatives, and at that time failed in the Senate.

There is a very erroneous idea among the people of the United States generally—not with men who have investigated the question and are informed, but among intelligent men generally—that they can take all tariff legislation out of politics by creating a tariff board or a tariff commission, overlooking entirely the constitutional provision that vests that power solely in the Congress of the United States and requires all legislation on that subject to originate in the House of Representatives. So, of course, the viewpoint of the public generally does not reflect the facts as bound in by the Constitution of the United States; but, nevertheless, I am sure that there is no man who has attempted to reorganize, revise, or re-form the customs tariffs of the United States who is not prepared to welcome any real and authentic information that can be furnished to him and aid him in reaching his conclusions. For that reason many years ago I supported a tariff-commission proposal, and I would do so again under proper conditions and circumstances, notwithstanding the fact that I am fairly well convinced in my own mind that the average man in the Congress of the United States, when the report came before him, would discard the report and reach his conclusions entirely independent of it.

President Taft appointed a tariff commission. They were capable men. I think they endeavored to reach their conclusions in a fair and just manner from their viewpoint; and of course there is a great deal in the viewpoint when you come down to writing customs tariff legislation. One man believes that the customs tariff should be levied purely for the purpose of furnishing revenue to the United States Government; another man believes that the primary purpose of a tariff is to protect and build up American industry. Between those two extreme views there are a thousand intermediate views that are expressed and held by various men serving in the Congress of the United States. Any testimony that comes before Congress is liable to be swayed and warped and distorted by the views and conclusions that men maintained before they examined the testimony.

I found when the Ways and Means Committee wrote the first wool schedule during the closing years of President Taft's administration that the conclusions reached by Mr. Taft's Tariff Board were in many respects in accord with my own, although not in every detail. That, however, is not the law that is on the statute books to-day, but that bill was passed by a Democratic House of Representatives and rejected by a Republican Senate. I had the honor of sitting in conference with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who has just addressed the Senate, and trying to maintain in a large degree the basis of working out a wool schedule adopted by that Tariff Board, and I found that I met in combat the views of the Senator from Wisconsin, which were in entire repudiation of those views.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will wait, I will explain what it was.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Alabama surely is incorrect in his recollection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I based my action upon that schedule upon the report of the commission.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then the Senator failed to read the schedule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I did not fail to read the schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state my conclusions about the case. I have them very clearly in mind. The Senator at that time stood—I remember it—for the position that the protective tariff of the farmer on his raw material was entitled to be as high as the protective tariff on the manufacturer's product. Is not that so?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is my recollection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not the fact.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not care to differ with the Senator with reference to the facts, because we can go back and refer to them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I maintained at that time that the conclusions of the Tariff Board that there should be a low tax on raw material and from that build up through yarn and cloth to the finished product was a necessary and right conclusion; and there the combat between the members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate and the members of the conference committee on the part of the House hung for many days. In the end a compromise was reached that reflected fully the views of neither the Tariff Board, the Senate, nor the House of Representatives. That legislation went to the then President of the United States, Mr. Taft, and was vetoed.

I do not wish to say anything that may in any way misrepresent the Senator from Wisconsin, but my recollection—although it is six years ago—is very clear that the main combat we had was in direct conflict with the findings of the Tariff Board. I am not talking about the details now, because I can not carry them in my head, but about the fundamental principles as to how a tariff should be built. I think the record will sustain me.

I make that statement not by way of criticism of the Senator's position, because he is entitled to his position in this matter as well as I am entitled to mine or any other man is entitled to his, but merely to illustrate the fact that the tendency of Congress is not to accept the conclusions found by outside commissions and tariff boards.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. SMOOT. If I remember correctly, the Tariff Board decided that it was necessary to give a protective tariff of 9 cents on raw wool. The House paid no attention to that recommendation in connection with the bill referred to by the Senator during the time he was leader of the majority in the other House, the House being Democratic and the Senate Republican. Nor did it pay any attention whatever to the Tariff Board's report when the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill was under discussion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will recollect, the bill that I am talking about, which was reported to the Senate, carried a tax on raw wool; I am not talking about the present law.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to say that the recommendation of the Tariff Board was not followed by the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; but what I am talking about is not the details, because I can not carry them in my head; I am talking about the principle on which they recommended a tariff bill should be built.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of any advocate of a tariff commission who has ever contended that the recommendations of a tariff commission as to how a tariff law should be built should be absolutely followed? All that has ever been contended is that the commission should get the facts, and then the legislative body construct the tariff bill upon the facts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not controverting that; the Senator only sustains in his remarks the position I am taking, that the Congress does disregard the conclusions reached by tariff commissions and reaches its own conclusions from the facts laid before it. The Senator may not have been in the Chamber when I started—probably he was not—and that is the reason for his asking the question.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator will yield, he was arguing that the value of a tariff commission was very little because their conclusions and recommendations have not been followed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. The Senator was not here when I started, and, for his benefit, I will repeat. I said that I was one of the men years ago who believed that a tariff board or a tariff commission in assembling facts was a useful instrumen-

tality, but I said that the Congress did not follow and would not accept their conclusions, and the Senator sustains me in my conclusion.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator will yield just once more, there is a difference between accepting a finding of facts and accepting a recommendation or conclusion as to what should be done with the facts, is there not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly; but Congress does not even accept the finding of facts, as I have just stated. But I am not arguing against creating a Government instrumentality to find facts and lay them before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. I never have. I myself have often believed that if the present commission or bureau were organized under the dome of this Capitol and were responsible directly to Congress, instead of being an independent bureau, it would be of far more value; but I do not present that as an argument against a tariff board. The question I am discussing, however, is a different one. When the proposal for the creation of this particular Tariff Board came before the Senate three years ago, I voted against it; but it was carried by a very large majority, and, as I have stated, was carried on the assumption by the American people that the creation of this board was going to take the tariff out of politics, and that a nonpolitical, disinterested set of men would make the tariff laws for the country. There is no doubt about that. All a man has to do in confirmation of that is to read the current newspapers of the time, the editorials, and the letters that came to his own desk. In other words, the American people visualized a theoretical proposition, although the Congress knew that in creating a board of this kind its hands would be tied, and that it would be merely confined to the establishing of facts for the information of Congress.

At the time that legislation came before the Senate—the present law—I voted against it, and I stated then why I did so. I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that I had stood for a tariff board, and at times in the future I would probably stand for one again; that I was in favor of gathering all the useful information that was possible to aid the proper committees of the Congress to carry out the functions that were intrusted to their care. But the present Tariff Board was created in the midst of a great European war. Although we had not at that time ourselves entered the conflict, millions of men were being drawn from industry; supplies of raw material were being cut off; the fleets of the seas were being driven from commerce; almost every condition that affected the normal business conditions had been wiped out, interfered with, or destroyed. I stated to the Senate at that time that they were charging men with a responsibility in connection with the tariff commission legislation that it was impossible for them to perform, and would be impossible for them to perform for some years to come. I do not think there is any man on this floor who can deny that state of facts, and the result shows for itself.

The Tariff Commission has done some work in the last few years. I wish to say in passing that I have no criticism whatever of the personnel of that commission. I think it is far above the average of the personnel of the commissions that are generally appointed by the Government. Prof. Taussig is a man who commands my highest respect. He is a man of learning, character, and of long experience in reaching conclusions and drawing conclusions from established facts. The other men on the commission are men of ability, training, and character; but they have presented no information on the customs tariff that can be or is of any real value to the legislative branch of the Government to-day. It is not any fault of theirs. The conditions which surrounded them prevented their doing so.

They have presented, as the Senator from Wyoming awhile ago showed, some excellent pamphlets in relation to the customs tariff laws of the world. They have presented a historic document of value. I must say that I have not read that particular book, but I take it that a compilation of that character is of value. It is of value as a historic document. It may be of value as a digest of the old decisions of the Supreme Court is of value; but it has no relation whatever to the live and living question of writing a customs tariff act—none whatever.

They presented an interesting document on German dyes, largely based on the history and the conclusions of the past. I read that pamphlet. It is an interesting pamphlet, but it does not relate to the conditions of to-day except in a theoretical way. In a theoretical way you may go back and take things that happened in the past and argue yourself to a conclusion that reaches over to this hour; but the most unsafe thing that any man engaged in legislation can do is to reach a conclusion based on a matter of that kind in writing tariff legislation, because the conclusions of yesterday are often wiped out to-day. The basis of fact on which the conclusions of yesterday depended is gone to-day; so there is only a theoretical value to that class of work—no real value.

Mr. President, I will give an illustration. When the present tariff law was written one of the intense issues before the Ways and Means Committee, and afterwards in conference, was the writing of the glass schedule. The real point of competition in window glass was not in the great panes of glass that stand in store windows, but it was in what is called seconds. There was comparatively little importation of great sheets of plate glass into this country, but the seconds were in direct competition with American manufacturers, and drastic competition at times. In making plate-glass windows they break very often. Probably they will make 8 or 10 attempts before they get one perfect piece of plate glass; and when the big sheets break they take the broken parts and cut them up into smaller glass and call them seconds, and those are what really go into the competitive market. That was a difficult schedule to write, and one that brought about great controversy.

That was the condition that existed six years ago. Where did that competition come from? From Belgium. What is the condition to-day? The German armies have wiped the glass industry of Belgium off the earth. The men and women and children who worked in that industry have been driven from their homes, have died on the battle fields, or have gone to other places to work. So that if we were to take the conclusions on which the present tariff bill was written as to what would be the competitive point of this industry in the future we would be far astray. We might say—and probably correctly say—that to-day there is no competition against the American glass producers coming out of Europe, because the great Belgian industry has been wiped out, and that probably would be true to-day. But where is the man who can say that there will or will not be competition in the future? The Belgian glass industry may not survive this war. It may never be developed to a competitive point again; and yet within three or four years from now it may be revitalized, reorganized, and going ahead to a point where it is in active competition with American industries.

Do you propose, when you write your next tariff bill, to write it on the basis of the facts that were laid before the committees of these two Houses when the last tariff bill was written? Do you propose to reach your conclusions from the facts that exist to-day, or are you going to reach your conclusions from the facts that exist at the time when you are prepared to write your bill?

You may not answer the question, but I will answer it for you, and I am willing to stake all I have that my answer will be correct. When you get ready to write your tariff bill, you will write it with reference to the commercial and industrial facts that exist at the time of writing the bill, and not with reference to facts that existed back of that time. They will be the present facts that will come to your attention.

Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. WATSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield first to the Senator from Montana, who, I believe, first rose. Then I will yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That being the case, would it not be advisable to have a commission whose duty it is to study the facts as they exist at that time, and lay them before the committees of Congress?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will answer the Senator's question. I am just coming to that, and I will answer it. Now, I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. The question I had in mind was very much of the same character as that asked by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. To be sure. Now, I thought I had made that clear when I said that I had once before voted for a tariff commission, and would probably do so again some day in the future; but what I am leading up to is this: If you have a long era of normal facts that probably existed between this country and European countries in the way of trade conditions for a decade or two before the last tariff bill was written—normal conditions of labor, normal conditions of supply of raw material, normal conditions of transportation rates that have been going on from year to year without material change—of course then the conclusion of a board based on the facts would be nearly right, because you would only have to inquire into the question as to what changes had been made after their conclusion had been reached.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator will pardon me further, under those circumstances it would seem to me that you would be able then to get the information from innumerable sources.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Surely.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And you would not need a tariff commission so much then as you would if the conditions were constantly changing, and could be known only to those who devoted themselves almost exclusively to that particular subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is not the commission; a commission's conclusions are of no value. It is the facts in industry; and I am not contending against the assembling of facts if the facts are of any value. What I say in reference to this matter is that when you have a period of rest in industry, a period of normal conditions, you can take facts that existed four or five years ago and be warranted, probably, in reaching a reasonable conclusion from them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that the abnormal conditions that now exist, following the war, make it absolutely imperative that we must have some commission or some experts to examine into the facts and report them to the next Congress, in order for the next Congress to pass upon this tariff matter?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will answer the Senator's question very frankly. If the next Congress is going to pass on the tariff question, neither the present Tariff Commission nor any other commission will get the facts assembled by that time that exist to-day; and if they did assemble the facts that exist to-day, just as I have illustrated in the case of the glass industry—and I could do so in a hundred other industries—two years from now the facts that exist to-day may be of no value, because they may have changed entirely.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, is not the logic of the Senator's position, then, that this is no time to revise the tariff law?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, yes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. And that it probably will not be wise to do so during the next session of Congress?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator has merely anticipated what I intended to say. He has reached the conclusion that I have reached about the matter, because I believe it is true not merely with relation to a tariff board, but with relation to the establishment of a permanent tariff system. There are no conditions existing in the world to-day on which a just and fair conclusion can be based for the future. I am not contending for a moment, and I do not want anyone to assume that I think, that the present tariff law should remain continuously on the statute books. As I happened to be the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that wrote the present law, I would not have my attitude misunderstood in reference to that question. I think that was a very just and fair law at the time of its enactment; but I know that the changed conditions in Europe—the great competitive point with the industries of America—are such that they have undermined the entire foundation of the existing customs tariff law. It is just as I said in reference to glass. That was a highly competitive schedule as we left it. With the destruction of the Belgian industry, probably—I have not investigated lately—probably there is no competition at all; and as it stands to-day on the statute books our present tariff law would be such as the advocate of the highest protective tariff would be entirely satisfied with.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Would it not be true, then, that this very condition that the Senator describes in Europe, making it so difficult to follow the changes and to keep the relative scales on a competitive basis, makes it even more necessary that we should have special men who will give their whole time to the study of the subject and furnish us information?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If conditions were normal, yes; but I am stating that industry and business in Euroue are so disturbed, so abnormal, with nobody knowing what the taxes are going to be on industry, nobody knowing what the final wage scale is going to be, nobody knowing what the cost of raw material is going to be, and no possibility of ascertaining that fact as a permanent basis this year or next year, that any conclusions arrived at or work done by a tariff board or anybody else in investigating European industry to-day must be entirely thrown aside to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to ask him another question, because I am really asking for information?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Surely.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. May it not be necessary for us, then, next winter to make changes, and then the next year to make additional changes, due to these conditions that are so uncertain; and, if that is so, do we not need somebody to ascertain for us the facts upon which those changes can be based?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say this: If you are making temporary changes——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I meant.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If you are making temporary changes, and not making a permanent bill, there is a very much better source of information than a tariff commission for that purpose. If you are only making your changes as a temporary matter, either to protect American industry, if you belong to that side of the political family, or if you are making them to increase the revenues at the customhouse, if you belong to this side of the political family, the better gauge and the only reliable gauge that you have to-day is to take your total production in American industry and compare it with the importations coming in from abroad, and you thereby get a standard on which you can base a conclusion as to where the competitive point is or where the protective point is far better than any conclusion a tariff board could draw for you at this hour and at this time.

Now, there is that opportunity; but I want to say this: I am not here to combat the gentlemen who are on this Tariff Commission. I never have done so. They probably have been doing earnest work, but not along the lines for which the American people created them or which they probably think they are working on—the relative facts in reference to industry and the tariff. The larger part of their work is in writing historical documents, writing histories of the past, not reflecting in their reports the actual business conditions of the day. I do not say that these reports are not of value. They are in a historic way, but they would be of no value in writing a tariff.

Now, what I want to say in reference to this matter is that if Congress changes in two years and a Republican President is elected neither the House nor the Senate will wait until it gets the returns from a tariff commission before it attempts to write an entire revision of the tariff schedules. At the rate this commission is going, in the first place, it has not the ground on which it can base its conclusions, and, in the next place, it could not go over the three or four thousand items in a tariff bill and reach conclusions within the next two or three years and bring them before the committee.

I have not seen any report from this commission in reference to the great agricultural schedules of the country. If any document has been published by them relating to the effect of customs tariff on agriculture, I have not seen it. That is the greatest producing industry of the United States. I have seen no report from them in reference to the effect of a tariff on the great iron and steel industry, the woolen industry, or the cotton industry of the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. As I catch the Senator's argument it is that he is opposed to a tariff commission at this time because of the unsettled financial and commercial conditions of the whole world.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is it exactly.

Mr. WATSON. He is not opposed to a tariff commission in normal times?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; not at all. The Senator states my position with great accuracy. I did not oppose it three years ago because I was opposed to the idea, but because I said it could not properly function at the time it was created. I say to-day there will three or four years run by before the condition of the world becomes normal enough for the work of a tariff commission and experts in finding facts to be of any real value in determining these questions.

Mr. WATSON. Then would not the Senator's argument drive him irresistibly to the conclusion that there will be no revision of the tariff at all until normal times return?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. As I said awhile ago, I could write a tariff bill, I think, without a study of the competitive conditions of various countries as reflected from the cost sheet, because there is another point of view from which to get the same reflection, and that is the amount of competition at the customhouse. It may not be as accurate as the cost sheet, but it certainly reflects the view as well as the cost sheet does, and that is being ascertained every hour. I do not know what it is.

I was talking about the glass schedule awhile ago. You can send to the Treasury Department and ascertain how much importation of glass came in last year, and what prices and what sizes, and you can send to the Census Bureau and ascertain the production of American glass last year, and a comparison of the two will show whether practically all competition is cut off or whether a reasonable competition exists in comparison to the amount marketed.

I am not maintaining at all, and I do not wish it to be understood that I am maintaining, that there should be no revi-

sion of our present tariff law. I say and I believe that the tariff bill which we passed some years ago was a just, reasonable, and fair tariff, both for the Treasury and the people of the United States at the time it was written, but war conditions of course have disturbed the entire equation, and with the conclusion of this war the taxation must be readjusted. I am not getting away from that; but I know that if the Senator's party comes into power, and my good friend the Senator from Indiana is called upon to act in this matter and some one on this side of the Chamber challenges him as to why he does not await the report of this Tariff Commission, as possibly he is willing to pay $300,000 for the next two years to enable it to function, he will say, "We can not wait for the Tariff Commission; time is urgent. This law must be written to-day." He will only voice the sentiment of his side of the Chamber, if he says so. I know that perfectly well.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would like to get the Senator's idea as to when he would have the Tariff Commission begin its work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As soon as industry reaches normal conditions after the war. It may be within a year; it may be in five years. I can not say. I can not see into the future.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the Senator thinks a report of the Tariff Commission two or three years after would be of value?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think when business reaches normal conditions along which it functions year in and year out, with wages normal, with raw material normal, with transportation rates normal, a report of the Tariff Commission giving facts three or four or even five years of age might be of value, because they would not have changed. But the Senator knows as well as I know that any conclusions reached to-day are bound to change to-morrow, and that is all I am contending for. You are prepared to spend $300,000 a year to carry a machine that you represent to the American people is going to function on the tariff question when it is really writing history. That is the only thing. We waste a lot of money.

An analysis of the bills that Congress passes will probably disclose a greater waste of money in other matters than possibly this $300,000, but I will not proceed further on a theoretical argument as to whether we ought to have a commission or not. The Senator from Wisconsin wants to largely increase the amount that is given this commission to operate with now. I do not stop to ascertain how much these gentlemen are spending. I know them to be honest men, fair men, and I am sure that they have not made any dishonest disposition of the money. But when you give men who are following theoretical ideas the right to investigate, they usually always spend all the money you give them, and they probably would not be worth their salt if they did not have enthusiasm enough behind the new machine to get at it.

I do not know how many men they have employed. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] this morning stated they have less than 60 men employed. I assume his statement was accurate. You are giving this commission $300,000. That is an average, if it all went to your pay roll, of $5,000 a man. For your clerks and stenographers and messengers and commissioners it would be an average of $5,000 a man. You answer that and say that is not all the expenses. They must be housed and they must have typewriters.

Take the housing item first. According to the information which comes before the Appropriations Committee, the housing item as agreed to by this commission to house the people has assigned 65 feet to the man. I think that is right, may I ask the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. Sixty-five to seventy feet.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Sixty-five to seventy feet, and it averages 72 cents. If you put them on an average, that would make their housing cost about $4,660. But assume that it is not the average. I assume that their housing ought not to cost them over $10,000 at any rate.

Then there are their printing bills. We have been shown pamphlets that probably would estimate 1,000 pages, but suppose they ran 10,000 pages and cost $3 a page, which would be very high and a very large amount, that would be only $30,000.

So if you imagine all the items outside of salaries that this gives them, it is hard to conceive where the cost comes in that would amount to more than $50,000. Then you have 60 men, according to the statement of the Senator from Nebraska, dividing, as salaries, $250,000, or an average of $4,000 apiece.

If the Senate sees fit to give this money, why do so. We all have our favorites. This Tariff Commission has been a favorite among many of us. I am not criticizing my brother Senators. I have fought hard sometimes for my favorites, and probably put them sometimes further up the scale than they should go, and you have fought for yours. That is human nature, and it is not criticism on my part. But when you know that business conditions in Europe are unsettled, and the real basis on which this commission should work does not exist, when you know the amount of expenditures to-day and you know last year they functioned on $200,000 instead of $300,000, why do you desire to put this appropriation back to $300,000 and not leave it at $200,000, or why does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to make it $400,000?

With all due respect to the Senator from Wisconsin, and not criticizing his views, I know this is one of his favorite children, and he may want to adorn it in rich garments and give it great opportunities in life. But I do not think that the child has grown up or that the fields are open yet for it to go out and play. I believe that because we are in combat, whether there should be a tariff commission existing now or not, there is not any good reason why the Senate should go to extremes in this matter. Of course, I have no personal views about it. I have reported items from the Appropriations Committee too often and have been turned down too often to have it make any personal difference to me or to find any fault whether the Senate votes it up or down.

We have talked a great deal about economy, and we even talk about economy when we can not escape it; but when we have a position staring us clearly in the face where there is opportunity for reasonable economy, I really think it is unwise not to take advantage of it to a reasonable extent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not want to take much of the time of the Senate in replying to the Senator from Alabama. It is not to be supposed that the Senator's point of view and mine could well be the same. We came into public life under very different conditions and circumstances, and I suppose that in a material way is likely to affect the point of view of any Senator, so that he unconsciously takes account of all public questions from the standpoint of his evolution and his environment.

Alabama, and particularly Birmingham, is the home of great and powerful industries. Wisconsin is mainly an agricultural State, and that may, in a way, account for the difference in the point of view of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me, to some extent but not entirely, because I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that as to most of the productions in the great Birmingham district when I reported the tariff bill I put the articles they produced on the free list, if the Senator will recall correctly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, Mr. President, the articles——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The raw articles as they exist in Alabama, pig iron, and reduced the entire iron and steel schedule even below the bill the Senator advocated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, no; I can not permit the Senator to go on misquoting the tariff history of a few years ago without some correction.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator has advocated schedules, but I do not know of any schedule——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has not advocated any schedule lower than the schedules I have advocated with regard to the iron and steel products.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. At any rate, the schedules that I proposed in reference to iron and steel are the lowest that have ever been proposed since the Civil War. Is not that true?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think perhaps that is true with regard to certain phases of the schedules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am talking about the whole schedule from one end to the other. I challenge the Senator to show any place where it is not the lowest.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is not possible in the course of this debate to take up all the technicalities and all the details of every tariff bill that has been enacted, but I do challenge the Senator's statement with regard to the wool bill and the revision of schedule K, which was sent to Mr. Taft during his administration and which he vetoed. I had charge of that bill when it was in the Senate. It passed through the Senate with the cooperation of the Progressive element of the Republicans and the Democrats. It was the first revision of schedule K that had occurred, I think, in 30 or 40 years.

I have not any doubt, referring to what the Senator from Alabama said, that he may have contended for lower duties with regard to the raw material in schedule K than I did. But, Mr. President, his ideas of tariff duties are quite different from mine. I believe that the measure of the duty, whether it is the raw wool, so called, as it comes off the back of the sheep or the finished product as it comes from the loom, should always be the difference between the cost of production here and abroad.

The Senator would put all wool in this country, what he calls the raw product, upon the free list. He would put the producers in direct competition with all the producers of wool abroad. I would not do that, and that accounts for some difference of views and some difference of action between the Senator from Alabama and myself upon the question of schedule K.

But if the Senator from Alabama or any other Senator undertakes to say that I ever assented to any proposition in the wool schedule that did not measure the difference in the cost of production, not only upon the finished product but upon the raw wool from the sheep's back to the product as it goes into commercial sales, I say that whoever asserts that is mistaken. That is all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, that particular——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I stood for the same measure of protection for the producer of the wool that I stood for with reference to the producer of the manufactured products.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Exactly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is, the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, wait a minute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then the Senator agrees with my statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETE. No; I do not. That is just what I do not agree with, and I am proceeding to show where you are wrong. The Senator says that I did not agree with the Tariff Commission. All that Tariff Commission did was to show us the difference between the cost of production not only upon the finished product but upon the raw material, and they left it to Congress to fix the rate of duty based upon that information. Does the Senator understand me? When the Senator from Alabama says that I followed the Tariff Commission on a portion of its report and declined to follow it upon another portion of its report he states what is not a fact. I followed the Tariff Commission upon the facts that they produced. That is, as a builder of a fair measure of protection that should just gauge the difference of producing articles here and abroad, I stood for a duty upon raw wool that measured that difference, I stood in the revision of schedule K for a duty upon the finished product that measured that difference, and I stood consistently all the way through for just that measure of protection. All that Tariff Commission report did was to give us the facts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I recall very well when the Senator from Wisconsin and I sat in conference; at one time he and I decided the conference on that bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I remember that very well.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course it is very difficult for men to remember six years back, but my recollection of the issue between us is that the Senator was standing far beyond the difference in production on the wool schedule and the Tariff Board. I have some old documents which I will look up. I can not state their contents from memory, but I will see if I can refresh my recollection on them, and show the facts accurately on them for the information of the Senator. That, however, is neither here nor there. I am stating my recollection of what occurred at that time, and I am sure that as to the provisions put in the bill that the Senator fathered in the Senate, the one that I reported in the House, or even the one that was finally agreed to in conference which we sent to President Taft, none of them reflected the actual views of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, Mr. President, what is it to say that? It seems to me that it is a sort of imposition upon the Senate for a Senator to stand here and say that after conferees have met and done the best they could to arrive at an agreement, the fact that the result of the conference does not absolutely square itself with some great principle is to be taken as a condemnation of some Member of the Senate who stands for such a principle. We all know, if we know anything—and we ought to be honest enough to confess it—that conference reports are, in a measure, a result of compromise. I do not understake to say that the conference report that was finally agreed upon on schedule K, between the Senator and myself, was a reflection of my views or a reflection of the Senator's views; and I would undertake to say that no conference report that was the subject of very much contention was a reflection of the views of either the Senate conferees or of the House conferees; and for the Senator to stand here and attempt to put another Senator in a position of inconsistency on a basis of that kind, I do not think is quite up to his usual standard.

Mr. LENROOT. Will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to suggest to my colleague that one reason why it did not square with those facts was because the eminent Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and his party refused to pass a tariff bill based upon the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The junior Senator from Wisconsin may imagine that to be a fact, but he does not state the facts accurately when he says that we did not approximate that result more closely than the Republican Party has ever approximated it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let me say this—and I defy contradiction with regard to it, though I have not looked at the matter for six or seven years—and I state it with a great deal of positiveness for this reason: I have not been particular in my political career as to whether I won out on a special point or not. I have not squared my conduct with the attitude of my party at some particular time, as a great many Senators have done, but I have tried to adhere to a certain principle. I nailed my flag to the proposition, when we fought here in 1909 on tariff legislation, that the protective tariff should measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, whether it was upon raw wool or finished woolens, whether it was upon the ore in the ground or upon a finished harvester.

Mr. President, of course, on conferences a man has to give way, or else there would not be any legislation. He has to yield a little here and a little there, and do the best he can for the body which he represents. A man represents the Senate when he is a Senate conferee, and he meets conferees of the House, and does as well as he can. I do not believe that it is fair to put an individual up against a conference report, and say that is a test of whether or not he has adhered to a principle. I have invariably, where I could represent myself and not the Senate, stood for that principle up to the present time. I am not saying what I am going to stand for under the new conditions which have come out of the war; I will meet that when it comes; but I have stood in this body for 13 or 14 years for a tariff that measured the difference between the cost of production here and abroad. It may be that as a member on a conference committee I have had to yield a little bit here and a little bit there upon that principle, but I will say—and I say it for the RECORD—that I have been consistent in standing by that principle since I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. President, I do not want to take much more of the time of the Senate, but I really could not let the thing go as the Senator from Alabama has left it. So much for the history of the wool schedule.

I felt a good deal of gratification in the fact that we had put through this body a revision of schedule K, which, I think, was one of the iniquities of the tariff. It stood for thirty-odd years, perhaps for forty years, a reproach to tariff legislation. It could not be squared with protective principles; it could not be squared with anything except a big grab for the manufacturers. I have, however, gone into that very fully before the Senate, and I am not going to take a minute's time on it now.

I seized the opportunity to which the Senator has referred to get a revision of that schedule, which it had not been possible to get for a generation of time. There happened to be a majority of the Democratic Party in the other House in favor of revising it, not upon the principle which I recognize as the correct principle but of lowering the duties. There happened to be a situation in the Senate where there were enough Progressives, combined with the Democrats, to effect such a reduction in that iniquitous schedule as would relieve the people of the exorbitant prices they were paying for woolen goods. Such a condition produced here a situation where it was possible to put through a revision of schedule K, which lowered the duties but left them, according to my idea, where they were fairly protective. The bill went to Mr. Taft and he vetoed it; Senators all know the history of it. But I do not think that it gets us anywhere for Senators to rise and select some particular phase of the matter into which I have not time to go and concerning which I can not tell exactly all of the details. I have made a hasty examination, but I can not tell what all of the details of that conference report were. I will undertake to say, however, and I will, in a general way, stake my reputation on it, that I adhered to the principle that the measure of protection on the raw product and the finished product should be the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. President and Senators, let me say to you that the Tariff Commission did not make any recommendation with respect to rate for the wool schedule.

The Senator from Alabama says that the conference report to which I agreed does not coincide with the report of the Tariff

Commission. The Tariff Commission made a report on the cost of production; it merely reported the facts. That is what the Tariff Commission is for, what it should be for, and when the Senator says that——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Wait a moment——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like merely to say——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment, now—and when the Senator says that because we are in war, and because there has been a spoliation of Belgium, and all of that, the Tariff Commission ought to go out of business, it seems to me that he gives the best evidence in the world of the fact that he does not quite appreciate what a tariff commission is for and the service that it can be to this body of men and to the legislative body over at the other end of the Capitol, because tell me, if you will, how the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from North Carolina, the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Massachusetts are going to get any time to make a careful investigation into the changes he harps so much about, the changes that have resulted from the war.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, if the Senator——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; wait a little while; I will let the Senator in in a little while.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator made a statement with reference to myself a moment ago that is not sustained by the facts, and I want to call his attention to it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will let you in and you can correct it when I get through with this matter. I wish to make this point: If there ever is a time when you need a tariff commission to do this work for you, it is when you are pretty well occupied and when conditions are rapidly changing throughout the world as they affect tariff laws. Then, if ever, you need a body of men constantly on the job.

Mr. President and Senators, let me say to you that the field of tariff legislation is big enough and important enough to occupy every hour of the time of a body of men from morning until night, year in and year out, in order to keep up with the changes that are taking place all over the world. If we ever needed a tariff board, we need it now, when the world conditions are changing. Is any Senator willing to rise on this floor and say that he has leisure time to give to the subject of tariff investigations, a question that will probably not come up until next year? No; you have before you all of the pressing problems of reconstruction; you have the railroad problem; you have everything pertaining to the war and the results of the war crowding upon you from every side, and are you prepared to reject the assistance of a tariff commission composed of gentlemen of studious habits and training, who have an economic foundation in their education to do this work? Do you want to throw away the opportunity to have their help? Oh, Mr. President, it seems to me it is not conceivable.

Mr. President, I think it is a waste of time to go over this matter again, but I have here upward of 20 or 25 different reports [exhibiting] that have been issued by the Tariff Comsion within the last year; and they are not to be set aside by the Senator from Alabama by saying that they are merely interesting historically. They are not historical; they have a present-day economic interest.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the Senator take the one in his hand, and tell me what it is?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it is on tungsten-bearing ore.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What are the conclusions reached?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator knows——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator has not read it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; exactly, Mr. President, and neither has the Senator from Alabama. I do not know the subject covered by this pamphlet; if I did, I could serve as the informer of this body; I could give the Senator the information; and, if he would take it from me as being unbiased, he might be satisfied with it; but I fear he would not, because I sit just across the aisle.

Of course, I do not profess to know what is in this vast mass of literature [exhibiting] any more than the Senator does; but, thank God, we have a body of men, under the wise legislation that has been enacted, who have been at work upon these various subjects, so that when we do get ready to take them up here is an opportunity to quickly get the necessary information. In one evening upon one of these subjects we can become pretty well informed, and will be able to come in here and know something about it, when otherwise we would legislate like a set of dummies or be called out into the Marble Room and take our cues from somebody who was interested on one side or the other. Here is some impartial, just, and honest information upon the subject. I think the Senate of the United States needs that kind of information pretty badly; and I hope that they will provide for this commission and enable them to go forward with the splendid work they are doing, not in a niggardly way, cutting them off and putting them down below other commissions and other departments of this Government, not depriving their employees of the $240 bonus, so that they can not hold them in the service, so that they will want to be transferred to other services. You might just as well vote it out. Have the courage, if you are not going to stand by the commission, to cut it all out. But if you will permit it to continue, put them on a level with the other commissions and with the other departments of this Government and give them a chance. I know one or two of them, and I know one or two of those men who were formerly earning much more money than they are earning now, working for this Government; but it is a matter of pride with them to work out a great problem.

You know there has been a struggle going on in this country for nearly 50 years to see if we could not get this tariff question measurably upon a nonpartisan basis—not wholly; you can not do it wholly upon a nonpartisan basis, but so far as the fund of basic information is concerned. That is all we expect to do. We do not expect these men to tell us how to vote. Anybody that does that does not understand the matter. But if you, with your views on the tariff, can have all of the arguments that can be made upon your side, and I, with my views upon the tariff, can have all the arguments that can be made upon our side, and these arguments unquestioned, these arguments tried by fire, then, Mr. President, we are in a fair way to render pretty good service to the country. Without this assistance we could not do it.

Now, let us not cripple this commission. Let us put them on a good working basis. Let us get the best people we can for the service. If we are going to put any money into it at all, let us give them enough money to do the work they ought to do in the proper way—either that or drop them out. Do not split hairs on the business.

At the proper time I shall endeavor to make this appropriation $350,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have only one word to say. I do not want the RECORD to be inaccurate. I am not criticizing the Senator's argument. When he presented this number of small pamphlets as the work of this commission I have no doubt that those pamphlets were properly prepared; but when I asked the Senator to name one of them and he named tungsten, and I said that the Senator from Wisconsin had not read it and did not know its contents, which he admitted, I merely used that as an illustration of the value that the Senate is putting to-day on the work that is being done by this commission.

It may be said that the question is not pressing right now, and that when the hour comes when it is pressing we will utilize it; and yet I think it can be safely said that when the last tariff act was passed, and the Taft Tariff Board had made its report on certain great schedules, there was not one man in either the Senate or the House who had read those reports. I do not say that they ought not to have been read, and I am not contending that they did not state the facts, and I know that the Senator from Wisconsin read the report on the wool schedule, because I have discussed it with him; but it shows how our memories can lapse. The Senator stated a moment ago that there were no conclusions in that report. It is true that the main findings of the board were of fact, but the board also pointed out certain conclusions in reference to the adjustment of schedules, which the Senator, in the course of his speech, would not let me correct him in reference to.

I do not think the discussion between the Senator and myself in reference to that schedule bears on the question. The whole question involved here is not the personnel of the commission. That is recognized. It is not that they can not do valuable work if they have the opportunity. The sole question is as to whether or not the Senate really believes there is a field in which they can do productive work at this time, in the closing of war conditions, and as to whether, even if they pursue this work, we are carrying on the Government in a reasonable and economical way to allow a body composed of 60 men, masters and clerks, to draw $300,000 a year out of the Treasury.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to propound an inquiry. There are a number of us on this side of the Chamber who are very much interested as to what the chairman of the

committee proposes to do at this juncture—whether he expects to take a recess for dinner or to proceed with the business of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have taken some pains to ascertain the pleasure of the Senate, and while the expression is not unanimous I find that there is a very general agreement with me that we ought to go on and finish the bill to-night.

Mr. ASHURST. Without any recess for dinner at all?

Mr. WARREN. Without a recess. We can get our dinners here, and we can finish much quicker in that way. I hope the Senate will be present, with a quorum, until we finish.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I feel like withdrawing the criticism which I made earlier in the day of the action of the Committee on Appropriations. As you will recall, I stated at that time that I had intended to give the reasons which I thought existed for maintaining a tariff commission; but owing to the colloquy which had taken place between the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Utah, I thought it was unnecessary to enter into that discussion, because, as I understood, the Committee on Appropriations did not intend by its recommendation to cut out all of this appropriation to abolish the Tariff Commission, but did intend to strike out the appropriation, so that the matter of the amount needed for the commission would be thrown into conference.

Since that time my mind has been disabused of that idea. I find that that conclusion was not justified by the statement which has been subsequently made, both by the Senator from Utah and by the chairman of the committee; so when I said that the course of the committee was unprecedented in taking this action, I made that statement with the understanding that the committee did not intend the direct result of the action which it had recommended; that by that action it sought to put the matter of the amount of the appropriation into conference.

Since that time, however, the situation has become clarified, and it was upon that assumption that I criticized the action of the committee in stating that it was unprecedented. I now find that the committee is acting in a way which is well known to legislation, that if you want to abolish an office or abolish a commission one of the most effectual methods is to withdraw any compensation or funds whereby it may carry on its work. So I withdraw those criticisms; and now it is distinctly understood that if the Senate does the thing which the committee recommends, it abolishes the Tariff Commission so far as the Senate has it in its power to do so.

It is true that after the Senate takes such action the conferees may come to the conclusion that the commission should not be abolished. They may come to the conclusion that $100,000 should be appropriated to the Tariff Commission, or $200,000, or even the $300,000 recommended by the House; but it puts it in the power of the conferees, and the Senate directs the conferees on the part of the Senate to vote against any appropriation for a Tariff Commission, and thus abolish it.

Mr. President, while I had intended this morning to express some very firm convictions upon this subject, I shall not at this late hour detain the Senate to do so. I simply want to call attention to the fact that the Tariff Commission was created upon the recommendation of the Finance Committee of the Senate. After much discussion, much evidence, much labor, lasting through months and years, finally, upon the income-tax act, the Finance Committee of the Senate brought in this recommendation for a Tariff Commission. Upon its abolishment the Finance Committee has had no hearing. It has given to it no consideration.

I therefore appeal to Senators to vote an appropriation, so that the Tariff Commission may carry on what I believe will prove to be a most effectual public service to the country and a very great assistance to the Finance Committee as the new problems arise in the near future.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss the merits of this provision. I only wish to make a parliamentary inquiry; and by way of leading up to that parliamentary inquiry I wish to say that earlier in the day I was called out of the Chamber and did not know the parliamentary status, and I proceeded to answer a question propounded by the Senator from Montana.

The parliamentary inquiry is this: The yeas and nays having been ordered, would it still be in order to offer amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The Chair thinks so, undoubtedly.

Mr. GRONNA. Then, Mr. President, if that be true, the pending question is a provision in this bill as it comes from the House which the Senate Committee on Appropriations has recommended to be stricken out. Now, my inquiry is this: Would it be in order to perfect this provision? Would it be in order to strike out and insert or is it too late to do that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the indulgence of the Senate for a moment.

Sometime ago the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] gave notice to the Senate that he desired to present a motion in the nature of a motion to strike out and insert, being a motion to increase the amount in the item as allowed by the body at the other end of the Capitol from $300,000 to some other amount. The Chair, at the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin, indicated to him that in the opinion of the Chair it was in order to offer the amendment at that time. The discussion of the proper parliamentary procedure proceeded for some time. The Chair adhered to his ruling, but suggested that to facilitate the proceedings of the Senate a unanimous-consent order might be agreed to to vote first upon the committee amendment. That was agreed to, with the reservation that the Senator from Wisconsin or any other Senator might offer an amendment subsequently to perfect the House item.

The Chair, since making that ruling, has examined the precedents and finds that the ruling was unquestionably correct. On page 38 of the precedents of the United States Senate is contained this precedent:

In like manner, if it is proposed to amend by striking out a paragraph—

And that is the exact case in this instance, the proposal being the committee amendment to strike out the provision of the House bill—

The friends of the paragraph are first to make it as perfect as they can by amendments before the question is put for striking it out. If on the question if be retained, it can not be amended afterwards, because a vote against striking out is equivalent to a vote agreeing to it in that form.

If it were not for the unanimous-consent agreement under the precedents the vote on a motion of the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from North Dakota to perfect the House provision could not be taken after the vote on the committee amendment had been taken; but that agreement has been entered into.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Chair permit me to suggest that while that is the general parliamentary rule, we do have an express rule in the Senate that does permit a motion to strike out and insert after the rejection of a motion to strike out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Chair was just about to call attention to a further precedent applicable to this case, a case exactly in point, decided January 8, 1915, by the Vice President. The precedent is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, a parliamentary question. I wish to ask whether this amendment (proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia to perfect the text to be stricken out) is in order. We are now considering the amendments of the committee.

The Chair takes the liberty of calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that that is the exact parliamentary situation now.

The VICE PRESIDENT (Mr. Marshall). The Chair rules that the amendment is in order, it being always in order to perfect the part to be stricken out before considering an amendment thereto.

A unanimous-consent agreement having been entered into to vote upon the committee amendment first, that agreement will be carried out unless it is vacated by the Senate. The question is on the amendment of the committee to strike out the paragraph, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does this unanimous-consent agreement imply that the motion which I suggested to increase the appropriation must be made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It may be made if the Senator desires to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It has occurred to me that it might be more serviceable to this commission to extend to it the $240 bonus provision that goes to all other Government employees and let the appropriation stand at $300,000. I have not had an opportunity to say anything to the chairman or members of the committee about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that if that occurs, it will completely upset the whole plan that was adopted in the beginning as to the payment of bonuses. As the Senator will remember, the law provided that the bonuses shall apply only to certain branches and divisions of the Government. To those that were organized after July 1, I think, 1917, the bonus did not apply. Nor does it apply to-day in the Alien Enemy Property Custodian Bureau, and it does not apply to some others. The reason why it was not provided for was that we had a thorough investigation and these new bureaus were

created after the war had been in operation for some time and had been paying the help at a higher rate of compensation than any of the old departments of the Government that were on the statutory roll. I will assure the Senator now that the Tariff Commission falls within that category. I will also say that if this is done——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The information I have is to the contrary.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator says that the information he has to-day is to the contrary, but I will say to him there were days given to a consideration of this matter, and we had representatives of all the departments before the committee. The War Risk Insurance Bureau was given one-half the amount to bring it up to the same level the $120 did, and now the $240 applies exactly the same for the coming year that the $120 did.

Mr. President, I think the Senator will find after investigation that the salaries that are paid by this Tariff Commission are greater than the salaries paid by the department that pay their employees under the statutory roll.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Can not this come up after we vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has reserved the right, and the unanimous consent agreement reserves to him the right, to offer an amendment. The question is on the committee amendment. As many as favor agreeing to the committee amendment striking out the paragraph in the bill making an appropriation of $300,000 for the Tariff Commission will vote "yea," and those who are opposed will vote "nay." The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I note that he is absent, but on this question I think I am permitted to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of California was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. Were he present he would vote "nay."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (when Mr. ROBINSON's name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is unavoidably detained. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. If my colleague were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "nay."

While on my feet I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], all of whom, if present, would note "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]; and

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are detained on official business.

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. He is absent from the Senate. I promised to pair with him. I therefore withdraw by vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I understand he would have voted "nay" on this proposition, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GERRY (when the name of Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts was called). I am informed that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained on important business. If he were present, I understand he would vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—2.

Smoot	Warren

NAYS—57.

Ashurst	Gronna	McCormick	Sheppard
Brandegee	Hale	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Harrison	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Henderson	New	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Stanley
Dial	Kendrick	Nugent	Sterling
Dillingham	Kenyon	Overman	Sutherland
Edge	Keyes	Page	Thomas
Fall	King	Phelan	Trammell
Fletcher	Kirby	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
France	Knox	Poindexter	Watson
Gay	La Follette	Pomerene	
Gerry	Lenroot	Ransdell	
Gore	Lodge	Robinson	

NOT VOTING—37.

Ball	Harding	Nelson	Swanson
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Newberry	Townsend
Beckham	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Underwood
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Wadsworth
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Kellogg	Reed	Williams
Cummins	McCumber	Sherman	Wolcott
Elkins	McLean	Shields	
Fernald	Martin	Simmons	
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Smith, Md.	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have been unable to communicate with any members of the commission concerning the matter touching which I suggested I would offer a motion to increase the appropriation from $300,000 to $350,000. I find from the memorandum which has been furnished me by the commission that they submitted to the Appropriations Committee of the House an estimate for $400,000 and submitted certain reasons why that amount was necessary. Those reasons I have before me. They appeal to me as being strong and convincing. But, Mr. President, in the hurry of the passage of this bill at this late hour I am a bit loath to undertake here just offhand to review the deliberate action of the House committee that took this matter up with this estimate before it and finally agreed upon $300,000 as the amount for the commission. So under the circumstances I am constrained to let the matter stand as it has been approved by the Senate.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 73, the amendment known as the Cape Cod Canal amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I raise the point of order against that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state his point of order.

Mr. KING. That it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear from the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in regard to the point of order, the appropriation, of course, is clearly in order to carry out an existing law. The question arises as to the legislation attached to it. The legislation is all in the nature of limiting and controlling and regulating the expenditure. The legislation was prepared by the Department of Justice and the War Department, and agreed to by them with that object in view. As I said, the appropriation itself is clearly in order because it is

to carry out the act passed in the Sixty-fifth Congress in the river and harbor act approved August 8, 1917. I am anxious for the legislation because it is so essential to the proper carrying out of the work. It seems to me it may be fairly considered in order as limiting and controlling the appropriation.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand the Senator from Massachusetts admits that the language in the bill with relation to the taking over of the canal is not in order, but——

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I said the appropriation was clearly in order.

Mr. LENROOT. I insist that not only is the provision for taking over the canal clearly general legislation, but the appropriation itself is not in order, because there is no existing law that warrants the making of this appropriation.

The Senator from Massachusetts has referred to the rivers and harbors act of 1917. I should like to call the attention of the Chair to just what the provisions of that act are. It authorizes a thorough investigation of the Cape Cod Canal, with a view to its purchase or condemnation. It authorizes, if the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Navy shall agree that its acquisition is desirable, to make an offer of purchase, optional with Congress, the purchase not to be effected until Congress shall ratify the contract and make an appropriation. In case they agree that it should be acquired, but no offer of purchase is made, the law provides that condemnation proceedings may be instituted, but the law expressly states that the acceptance of the award in the said proceedings shall be subject to future ratification and appropriation by Congress. There is no authority for any appropriation for the purchase or improvement of the Cape Cod Canal unless, first, there be an offer to purchase and the contract made and ratified by Congress. It is admitted that does not exist to-day. Secondly, that there has been an award in condemnation proceedings accepted by Congress. It is admitted that that does not exist to-day. Therefore, clearly there is no authority of law for this appropriation.

With reference to the language generally, I take it for granted that the Chair does not care to hear any argument that it is general legislation. If the Chair does care to hear it, I have an abundance of precedents before me which I shall be glad to submit to the Chair. It clearly is general legislation, and it is not in order upon this appropriation bill. I shall not take the time of the Senate to review these authorities unless the Chair may care to hear them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will permit the Chair, in view of the precedents of the Senate, pages 166, 167, 168, and 169, the Chair feels that the point of order should be submitted to the Senate and the Senate itself be permitted to determine whether the legislation is in order. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] may present the matter under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator from Massachusetts desires the floor, I will yield to him.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say a word. I desire to say, in the first place, that an effort was made to purchase the Cape Cod Canal in accordance with the act of 1917. The Government officials and its owners could not come to terms about it, and the matter went to court. Condemnation proceedings are now going on in the district court of Massachusetts, and the case will probably come to trial in October next.

It seems to me that under that situation the appropriation is clearly in order in this connection if Congress sees fit to make it, the matter being at the stage of condemnation. The provision of the bill does not go beyond the act, for it reads:

> That said awards shall be subject to approval by Congress; and if, within two years from the final entry of judgment in said proceedings Congress has failed to so approve, the Secretary of War shall relinquish the possession of said property—

The appropriation, therefore, is still, as in the original act, wholly within the control of Congress. I do not care to discuss the matter at length and will submit it to the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, although I understand that very often the Senate has passed upon questions of this character with reference to the merits of the case and not the parliamentary situation involved.

I submit, Mr. President, that under all of the precedents this is clearly legislation, both as to the appropriations and the legislation contained in it. The pending amendment provides for the taking over by the War Department of the Cape Cod Canal, and provides an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the purpose of improvement and the payment of any award that may be made in condemnation proceedings. Clearly there is no authority of law for anything which is contained in this amendment.

The fact is, Mr. President, that this is a proposition which involves the expenditure of $15,000,000. It is the very bill which is now pending before the Committee on Commerce, which was referred to that committee about two weeks ago, and that committee has appointed a subcommittee to consider it. I happen to be chairman of that subcommittee, and because of the importance of the question involved, because of the very large amount of money involved, and because of the fact that the Board of Engineers last year made an adverse report upon this very proposition, and then having reviewed that adverse report made a recommendation that if the canal is to be purchased not more than $3,500,000 should be expended for it, instead of $10,000,000—because of those facts I insist that the parliamentary situation should be followed, and that the Senate ought to vote that this amendment is not in order, and the committee ought to be given full opportunity to report to the Senate upon the merits, and the Senate then act as it may see fit upon the question.

But if this appropriation of $10,000,000 is made without any investigation, with an adverse report of the Board of Engineers—overruled, it is true, by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War—with that situation I insist that the Senate ought not to appropriate this amount of money at this time. I hope the Senate will vote that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I desire to ask a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not catch from the Senator the exact date of the legislation with reference to this canal. Have we already passed a law to buy it?

Mr. LENROOT. No; this is the legislation: In 1917 there was passed in a river and harbor bill a direction that investigation be made as to the desirability of the purchase of this canal; that if the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce should agree that the Government ought to own the canal the Secretary of War was authorized to negotiate with the owners of the canal and make them an offer, subject, however, to future ratification and appropriation by Congress. The Secretary of War did make an offer of $8,250,000, which was declined by the canal company. Then the Secretary of War proceeded to institute condemnation proceedings. Those condemnation proceedings are now pending. No award has been made. The legislation provides that, if condemnation proceedings shall be instituted, they shall be subject to the future action of Congress by way of ratification and appropriation. So the matter is not in such a status that any appropriation can be made now to carry out this law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And the effect of this legislation, if enacted, will be to suspend the procedure for the condemnation or to anticipate and to decide that we shall purchase the canal?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no. I shall be glad to explain that this legislation appropriates $10,000,000 for the acquisition of this canal. Then, there is a proviso that the award shall not be binding unless accepted by Congress, and that, if Congress does not accept it within two years, the canal, with all the improvements which may be made upon it, shall be turned back to the canal company free of any expense; but if this amendment should be adopted the War Department might expend $5,000,000 upon the improvement of the canal—and that is what the report says will be necessary to make it serviceable for commerce—we might spend $5,000,000 of this $10,000,000 for widening and deepening the canal and then, it is true, that at the end of two years we should have the option of accepting the award or not; but if we give it back we should give them also the $5,000,000 that we had expended.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The insistence of the Senator from Wisconsin is that it is a question for the Committee on Commerce, which is considering the bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Absolutely.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senate that when this matter was considered in the Committee on Appropriations it was generally understood, and was so stated, that the item would go out on a point of order. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] stated that he would make the point. Nearly all of the members of the committee who were present, I think, were opposed to this provision. It

was not considered at all, because we expected it to go out on a point of order, and I hope the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, of course I did not know that the committee put the provision in the bill on that theory; I was not aware of that. I thought they put it in the bill in good faith, and I was not informed of what the Senator stated. If the committee did that, it gives me a very high opinion of the committee.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I think the committee had a high regard for the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should much have preferred that they should have refused to put the item in. It would have saved me a great deal of time and labor if they had refused to put it in, instead of putting it in on such a theory as that.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there were members of the committee who notified the committee that they would make the point of order against the amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I was aware of that. That happens very commonly. The fact that members of the committee make a point of order against an amendment does not make it a good point of order.

At all events, I want to get the facts straight.

What happened with regard to the canal was exactly this: In 1917 authorization was made for an examination and survey and the purchase of the Cape Cod Canal. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce all approved it, and it was also approved by the Board of Engineers. It was taken over for the purposes of the war by the Railroad Administration and has been operated by them and is being operated by them now.

As to the importance of this canal, that was absolutely demonstrated, or three Cabinet officers and the Board of Engineers would not have agreed to its acquisition. So the project comes here with the backing of the department. They said that $3,500,000 was its value on the amount then being earned, but the traffic through the canal since the Railroad Administration has taken it over has increased fourfold.

This canal is going to be taken by the Government; that is inevitable. It is a most important waterway. Twenty million tons of shipping go around outside the cape, and 50,000 tons of shipping are lost every year owing to the dangers of navigation. Sooner or later the Government would have built a canal. What it would cost them to build a canal would be twice what it would cost them to buy the present one, in view of the increase in the cost of labor and of everything else. The question is whether we shall force the Railroad Administration to turn it back to the War Department, which wishes to take it and recommends its purchase, or whether it shall be turned back to the private owners to let it shoal up and require all the work which has been done to be done over again, or whether the condemnation proceedings shall be proceeded with; in fact, they will go on, I suppose, in any event, but the result will be that it will cost the Government more in the end.

I care nothing about the $10,000,000; it is perfectly easy to make it $1,000,000; but the War Department must have money to run it, because the Railroad Administration is operating the canal at their own expense and shipping is now going through free.

Mr. President, as I have said, it seems to me, fairly considered, to be in order. In the first place, I think the appropriation really in order. I do not think there can be any doubt about that. The action of the committee which the Senator from Georgia, perhaps not fully acquainted with the methods of the Senate, has disclosed—the private opinion of the committee—I suppose applied to the whole amendment; but the appropriation I consider to be in order, in any event, and I think the other provisions can be taken fairly as limiting the appropriation.

Now I am going to read one authority:

In 1893, during the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, an amendment was submitted from the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide for and to maintain the redemption of United States notes according to the provisions of the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled "An act * * *" and at the discretion of the Secretary he is authorized to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par, in coin, either of the description of bonds authorized in said act or bonds of the United States bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest * * *.

We authorized a bond loan in the sundry civil bill—

A question of order was raised, viz., that the amendment proposed general legislation. * * *

The Vice President (Mr. Morton) overruled the question of order and decided that the amendment made an appropriation to carry out existing law, limited the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury under existing law, and did not, in the opinion of the Chair, propose new legislation.

On appeal the decision of the Chair was sustained—yeas 28, nays 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has indicated a purpose to submit the question as to whether this amendment is in order to the Senate. During the progress of the debate the Chair has read the provisions of the act approved August 8, 1917, and particularly the first paragraph on page 14, and the Chair will not submit the matter to the Senate, but will rule directly upon the point of order, unless the Senator from Massachusetts insists that it be submitted.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Massachusetts is perfectly willing to accept the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the language of the section referred to, namely, "or, in the event of the inability of the Secretary of War to make a satisfactory contract for the voluntary purchase of said Cape Cod Canal and its appurtenances, he is hereby authorized and directed, through the Attorney General, to institute and carry to completion proceedings for the condemnation of said canal and its appurtenances, the acceptance of the award in said proceedings to be subject to the future ratification and appropriation by Congress," constitutes an express provision in the legislation that future action of Congress is necessary before an appropriation can be had. It is provided that the acceptance of the award shall be subject to the future ratification of Congress. That means legislation by Congress, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House returned to the Senate Senate resolution 94 relative to certain language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, June 24, 1919, imputing dishonorable motives and conduct to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The Secretary will read the conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CHARLES R. DAVIS,
L. C. CRAMTON,
JAMES P. BUCHANAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for the adoption of the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 1 and 45 to the bill, and request a further conference with the House and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. I inquire of the Senator from Kansas what is the subject matter of these two amendments?

Mr. CURTIS. They are the amendments as to which there was a disagreement last night—the half-and-half amendment and the Keller amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland managers at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 107, beginning in line 14, known as the Bureau of Education amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, some time ago I raised the point of order against the amendment found on page 42, but the Senator having the bill in charge asked me to refrain from pressing the point at that time. I wish to say to the Senator that there are many objectionable features to this legislation, but out of deference to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], particularly, and others, I will withdraw the point of order, provided that the Senate will accept the amendment that I have to offer, and which I think will prove satisfactory. I wish to say that the amendment as it is found in the bill provides——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment to which he refers now?

Mr. KING. I beg the pardon of the Chair. I ask that we proceed to the consideration of the amendment on page 42, because the Senator in charge of the bill is anxious to have that disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of the amendment on page 42. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Oregon for a moment, and also the attention of the chairman of the committee, this proposed amendment carries into the bill legislation that was enacted some time ago, and therefore makes provision for years that have already passed. Of course in that respect it would be objectionable. The amendment which I intend to propose will eliminate those objections, and, if the Senate will do me the kindness to follow me, I will state the amendment to the amendment. I assure them that I have gone over the question carefully, and I think that the amendment which I have to tender will make the bill consistent. On page 43, line 15, I move to strike out "$100,000" and insert the word "money"; and in line 16, to strike out the word "provided," in section 7 of this chapter, and insert "appropriated by this chapter," so that it will read:

to direct the expenditure of the money appropriated by this chapter.

If I may state this as one amendment, and proceed and explain them all, I think it will facilitate our procedure.

On line 17, strike out the word "annually," so that it will read:

The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect one of its members as chairman.

Let me say that my amendment provides that this interdepartmental board shall terminate at the end of the year. I want to say that I have talked with Secretary Daniels regarding the matter and have told him my purpose, and I think I may say that his opinion is that at the end of the year it will have practically served its purpose. At any rate, it will be prepared then to submit some concrete recommendations, so that Congress can determine what disposition is to be made of the entire matter.

Then I proceed to page 44, and strike out on line 4 all of the language down to and including the figures "$1,000,000" in line 12, so that it will read:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this chapter—

Then drop down to line 12—

Which shall be paid to the States for the use of their respective boards or departments of health.

It will fit in apparently satisfactorily, and makes it coherent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that he certainly does not know the history of this appropriation in section 6, because if his suggested amendment is adopted there will be nothing at all to carry out the provisions of section 2 of the chapter.

Out of this $1,400,000 that is mentioned in section 6 there has already been paid to the States a little over $1,000,000. The States have received their proportion for carrying this into effect; but through an interpretation of this very section by the Auditor for the Treasury Department the board could not expend the balance of the money for the purpose for which it was originally appropriated; and I notice that the Senator is going to strike out the provision that we put in at the end of this amendment—

Any unexpended balances appropriated under this chapter are hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, not exceeding $500,000, for any purpose for which any of the appropriations made by this chapter are available.

I notice that in his printed amendment the Senator struck that out. Now, I want to say to the Senator that if that is the case, and his amendment carries, the appropriations carried in here will be $100,000 more than the Senate amendment, because of the fact that, as I say, $1,000,000 of the $1,400,000 that he tries to strike out has already been paid to the States; and the amendment here, "not to exceed $500,000," reduces the appropriation of $1,000,000 in section 5. I will say to the Senator that I insisted upon that in the committee; the committee agreed to it; and Dr. Stewart agreed also that for the purposes of the appropriation in section 5—that is entirely different from the appropriation in section 6—he thought he could get along with $500,000; and the amendment now provided by the committee is a decrease in the appropriation found in section 5, but the Senator must not take out the $1,400,000. In fact, it would be wrong to do so, for the reason, as I have already stated, that $1,000,000 and over of that has already been distributed to the States for this work in connection with the Public Health Service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say that the committee intended to have this bill carry $2,700,000?

Mr. SMOOT. No. The way the amendment is reported to the Senate now, this is what it really carries:

In section 5 it carries $1,000,000 less the $500,000 provided for in the last paragraph of the amendment. That is limited to $500,000; so that appropriation is $500,000. Then in the $1,400,000 that is appropriated, under the law they could pay that which went to the States, and that has already been distributed and paid; so this amount would be a little less than $400,000; so that is $900,000. Then the next appropriation is the $100,000 found on the bottom of page 45. That makes $1,000,000. Then the $200,000 in section 7 makes $1,200,000; and if there is no amendment to the first section there is $100,000 more, and that will be $1,300,000, which covers all that has not already been distributed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have no objection to that appropriation; but the language of the bill seemed to imply that an appropriation for 1918 had not been expended and there was an attempt to carry that appropriation which was not expended, and, as I understood, had not been devoted to the States at all, into this bill, and to reappropriate that amount. If the amount has been expended, then, of course, there ought to be a provision covering it.

Mr. SMOOT. Really, if the Senator did not take the original act——

Mr. KING. I have the original act before me.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator did not take it and compare it with this, and also if the Senator did not know that this $1,000,000 has been distributed to the States, then the position of the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator whether on line 16, page 46, the provision reading "$300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," is correct. Ought not that to be "1920"?

Mr. SMOOT. No. We are just reenacting in an amended form the existing law.

Mr. KING. I comprehend that.

Mr. SMOOT. And the only amendment in that whole provision is a change of a word or two that authorized the expenditure of this money.

Mr. KING. Where is the appropriation for the year 1920 that will cover the appropriations that are to be given to this bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. In section 5 there is the $1,000,000 modified now to $500,000.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the $300,000 carried in section 7 will be deducted from the amount provided in section 5?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it will not.

Mr. KING. Then it is in addition?

Mr. SMOOT. It is in addition to that amount.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the appropriation which states upon its face that it is for the fiscal year 1919 may be made for the fiscal year 1920?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it may be made under this language, because it is reappropriated.

Mr. KING. By the last section?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and the amount I have already stated is just what is to be paid out under this amendment. I will say frankly that when this amendment was discussed on the floor of the Senate in the military appropriation bill I had

no idea, and I do not believe anyone else on the floor had any idea, that $1,000,000 of that had been distributed to the States; but when you stop to think it is only an amendment to existing law, and taking the descriptions of the appropriations just as they are in existing law and authorizing the expenditure of the money that the Auditor for the Treasury decided could not be expended under the wording of the original law, then it reduces the appropriation to the amount I have stated.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator think that the appropriation carried on page 36, of $200,000, found in lines 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, to be paid to the Division of Venereal Diseases, is in addition to the appropriation carried in this proposed amendment? It seems to be the same division.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator that that is in a different department. It is so late now that I do not want to enter upon any criticism, but the Senator will find an amendment in this bill referring to the agencies of the Public Health Service, which, we hope, if it is adopted and becomes a law, will reduce the 47 agencies that are spending money for all sorts of purposes.

Mr. KING. I understand that there are 47 agencies of the Public Health Service, and this seems to create another one or perpetuate one that has been created.

Mr. OVERMAN. It has already been created.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator that this has already been created, and the work is more than half accomplished now; and I really think this work ought to go on until it is completed.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the appropriation of $100,000 to this interdepartmental board merely to make the expenditure of the million dollars is required? I have made some inquiries, and the personnel of that organization is so small that, in my opinion, the $100,000 is extravagant.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, if it only applied to the District of Columbia, that might be true, but this applies to all the agents under that agency; and I hope, Mr. President, that this very legislation will call to the attention of the Senate and the country the necessity of stopping this everlasting duplication of work in the different departments of our Government, and duplication of work in the same department.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will accept this amendment:

That the provisions of chapter 15 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, as amended by this act, and creating the interdepartmental hygiene board, shall terminate on the 30th day of June, 1920, and thereafter the duties of said board shall be performed by the Bureau of the Public Health Service.

I should like, if possible, to legislate one commission or one board out of existence. Here in this one bureau or department they have 47 separate agencies.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I think it would be very unwise to do that at this particular time. I am quite sure that there is going to be an investigation of this very thing, and I will assure the Senator that in the next appropriation bill that comes here we are going into this very question of the agencies that are duplicating work in the departments of this Government, and the Public Health Service will be among the first that will be investigated.

Mr. KING. This bill shows the flagrant offenses—if I may be permitted so harsh a term—of the Public Health Service, the duplication, the creation of divisions and agencies ad infinitum. You can not count them, and they are increasing them in every appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KING. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me to draw his attention to an item on page 36, which has already been agreed to, which reads as follows:

That on or before December 1, 1919, the heads of the War, Navy, Interior, Treasury, and Agricultural Departments shall report to Congress a plan for the consolidation of the various health divisions and bureaus of the Government.

Mr. KING. Yes; I am familiar with that provision, and I have talked with one of the Cabinet officers in regard to the execution of it; but it seemed to me that this interdepartmental organization should cease to function in one year from now. If we give one year to this board to discharge the duties which are devolved upon it, then it ought to cease to function.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if we fail to make an appropriation for this board for the next year they will cease to function. What I am afraid of is this: The work is all mapped out; nearly half of it is done; and it seems to me that we should not undertake now to legislate so as in any way to cripple the work that we have got over half done.

I really hope the Senator will not insist upon changing the amendment, because this amendment was given very, very careful consideration.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the assurances of the Senator that there will be some correction of this great abuse and that there will be a diminution in the large number of divisions and organizations and agencies in this one department, I shall not press the point of order, nor press the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am not going to deliver any address on this subject, but I am going to ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement of facts justifying the investment which Congress now proposes to make in this board. Also, Mr. President, I desire to insert in the RECORD the status of these several appropriations. They have not been stated, and but for the lateness of the hour I would discuss this subject a little bit.

I ask to have that statement and also a statement of the number of States that have made appropriations by their legislative bodies for the fiscal year ending in 1920 inserted in the RECORD. I think from these statements we will see not only the work that this board has done, but the possibilities of cooperation between the States and the Federal Government for the eradication of these diseases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Oregon will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

I.

FACTS JUSTIFYING THE INVESTMENT OF CONGRESS IN THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL SOCIAL HYGIENE BOARD.

1. The appropriation carried in section 5 of the Chamberlain-Kahn bill has enabled the board to assist in:

(a) The closure up to November last of 124 red-light districts in America.

(b) The detention and care of over 30,000 delinquent women and girls.

(c) The special study of the causes of delinquency in 9,000 women and girls.

(d) The enforcement of laws and ordinances relating to venereal diseases in communities surrounding all the naval and military camps in America.

(e) The greatest reduction in military venereal disease rates ever recorded in history and the consequent far-better protection of 4,000,000 American soldiers and sailors.

2. The appropriation for the assistance of State boards of health carried in section 6 of the bill has enabled the board to assist in:

(a) The establishment of divisions of venereal disease in the boards or departments of health in 45 States.

(b) The establishment of venereal-disease clinics in 45 States.

(c) The active concentrated attention of the health authorities in the treatment, prevention, and control of venereal disease in 45 States.

(d) The promulgation of laws and ordinances in 45 States for the control of venereal disease.

(e) The securing of legislative appropriations for the control of venereal disease in 31 States (up to June 1, 1919).

3. The appropriation in section 6 for the discovering of better medical methods in the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases has enabled the board to establish 25 scientific researches in 15 of our best medical schools, involving the services of 50 or 60 of the foremost and best-trained scientific men and women in America. These investigations are expected to develop better medical methods of treatment and prevention that will alleviate human suffering, prevent disease, and save life. These improved methods will be at the disposal of the entire world, and are expected to be of incalculable value to humanity for all time to come.

4. The appropriation carried in section 6 for the discovery and demonstration of better methods of education in the prevention of venereal diseases and for sociological and psychological researches related thereto has enabled the board to assist in the establishment of departments of hygiene in 25 normal schools, colleges, and universities situated in 22 States. This appropriation is being devoted very largely to the preparation of superintendents, principals, and teachers, so that they will be as well equipped in the important elements of hygiene as they are in the elements of English or arithmetic. The teachers of our children are the teachers of our future citizens.

II.

If these amendments fail:

(a) The Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board will have no resource for administrative organization. It can not meet its obligations under the law and will disappear.

(b) The service provided under section 5 will discontinue on July 1. Venereal disease rates have been increasing since the armistice. Demobilization has been accompanied by a gradual return of red-light districts. The underworld is reappearing. The uncertainties of the last few months have made the service of the board increasingly difficult. Without resource and without the legislative action requested, this service must stop on July 1. The total number of days lost in hospitals or quarters for venereal disease in 1917 in the Army alone was 875,553, or 2,399 years. For the entire period of the war over 3,000,000 days of man service were lost by the Army and Navy combined. Of the second million draft troops arriving at camp 5.4 per cent were found with venereal disease at the time of examination. The Surgeon General of the Army states that venereal disease constitutes the greatest cause of disability in the Army. Thirty thousand women were contacted by women representatives of the board in 50 cities and towns by 100 representatives. Intensive work was done with 6,000 of these. Of this number 2,933 were arrested, and on examination 70 per cent of these were found to be diseased. Thousands of arrests were stimulated by representatives. One hundred and twenty-four red-light districts

were closed. At the time of the signing of the armistice there was no red-light district within an effective radius of an Army or Navy establishment in the United States. The underworld expects to come back as soon as the Government withdraws its connection with this work. Conditions have already begun to develop seriously. Reports received during the past three months from 41 places indicate that 1,061 houses of prostitution have been detected, with a total of 1,477 women reported living in them. The total number of women noted does not indicate the total population, but only the number of women reported. These conditions will become worse if the present activity is discontinued.

(c) Thirty-one States that have made legisiative appropriations in order to secure their allotments under section 6 will not receive those allotments. The Government will appear to have acted in bad faith, and these States will have just cause for complaint. Seventeen States will be denied an opportunity which for 11 months has been stimulating them to make legislative appropriations or other equivalent provisions whereby they may utilize the governmental cooperation proposed in this section of the law. In addition the appropriations for scientific research and for educational research already set aside for the ensuing fiscal year under this section will not be available.

We have spent millions of dollars taking care of our boys so that they could fight for us. Are they any less precious or any less useful in peace than in war? Have the States and has the Government any less obligation to take care of them now that peace is here?

We must protect our youth—our young men and our young women. We saved a million men or more from these infections during the war. We must continue to conserve our human resource. Conservation of man power and of woman power is as important in peace as it is in war.

The investment which the Government has made in this Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board is for the protection of our boys and our girls and our men and our women against a group of the most subtle and the most merciless agents that destroy human health, happiness, and life. This investment is beginning to produce results, in spite of the unsuspected inadvertencies in the act which these amendments aim to correct. As a business proposition as well as a proposition for the conservation of national vigor, this investment should be given every reasonable support by Congress, and these amendments should be adopted.

Status of the several appropriations under the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board for the year ending June 30, 1919.

Appropriations, payment to States		$1,000,000.00
Amount paid		853,496.01
States that have not applied for their allotments:		
District of Columbia	$3,599.66	
Missouri	35,807.91	
Pennsylvania	83,341.55	
Tennessee	23,754.87	
		146,503.99
Total		1,000,000.00
Appropriation, aid to States		1,000,000.00
Amount paid	$115,000.00	
Liabilities	172,000.00	
		287,000.00
Balance		713,000.00
Appropriation: Educational research and development fund		300,000.00
Amount paid		None.
Liabilities		52,915.00
Balance		247,085.00
Applications under consideration (approximately)		168,000.00
Unencumbered balance (approximately)		89,085.00

List of institutions from which applications are pending:
University of Missouri.
University of Pennsylvania.
University of Indiana.
Wisconsin State Normal School.
University of Utah.
East Tennessee State Normal School.
Cornell University.
State Normal School (colored), Alcorn, Miss.
North Carolina State Normal and Industrial College.
Harvard University.
University of Iowa.
Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania.
University of South Carolina.
University of Mississippi.

Appropriation: Medical measures (scientific fund)	$100,000.00
All liabilities (no balance).	
Appropriation for administration	100,000.00
Unavailable because of inadvertent wording of the law.	

STATES THAT HAVE APPROPRIATED FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1920.
QUALIFYING FOR APPROPRIATION UNDER SECTION 6.

Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to offer to section 2 of this particular provision. It has already been read, and I have stated the purpose of it. This board promised the local authorities in Arkansas $50,000 to be expended in the erection and construction of an industrial school.

Mr. SMOOT. Is this an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. KIRBY. It is an amendment to section 2. It is added to section 2. The sole purpose of the amendment is to enable this board to carry out the promise made to the local authorities in Arkansas that they would contribute $50,000 to the erection of an industrial school, upon the State contributing a like amount, in order to take care of these women who followed the camp and collected there in the city. That promise was made by this board, and they were not able to carry it out because of the peculiar construction of the law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as far as I can, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. It has been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment to the amendment on page 43, after line 26. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 127, line 14, and following lines, known as the Bureau of Education amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. I do not care to contest the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KING. While this is a very meritorious case——

Mr. SMOOT. I simply want to say that this has been estimated for and has been reported by a standing committee, and while the chairman stated he does not want to contest it, I simply want the RECORD to show the history of the item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 142, lines 10, 11, 12, and 13, law clerks for the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 153, lines 14 and the following lines, amendment relating to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was not satisfied with the observations made respecting this item.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KING. I do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will state to the Senator that in the last legislative appropriation bill we appropriated $325,000 for this bureau, and put in a limitation that $50,000 of it only should be used for branch offices. These offices are very important in connection with the work. As I understand and am informed by the department, the plan that they have mapped out for the expenditure of the $50,000 would result in closing the branch offices on Puget Sound, one of the most important collection districts in the country. They asked for a larger sum of money——

Mr. KING. Then this does not increase the appropriation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It does not.

Mr. KING. But prevents the Department of Commerce from closing up one of the most important ports in the country?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It does. The purpose is to keep them from closing those offices.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator give any reason why the Department of Commerce seems to level their opposition against that port?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; unless it is that probably the ports at New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and New Orleans may have been considered as more important, although as a matter of fact the import and export business in the Puget Sound district is next to the New York district.

Mr. KING. This is not to create any additional force?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. KING. Nor authorize additional officials?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not at all.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 116, and reads:

For completion of one new vessel, including its equipment, authorized in sundry civil act of July 1, 1918, at not to exceed $354,000, to replace the *Gedney*, $354,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 173, line 19 and following lines, relating to the development of the herring fisheries of Alaska.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Washington think this appropriation ought to be made?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will state that the Secretary of Commerce came before the subcommittee with reference to this item and made, I thought, a very strong showing. I think the committee was convinced of the importance of this appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the work which has already been done by the Department of Commerce has developed a plan by which the herring of Alaska can be canned and are nearly equal to those which come from Scotland. His report shows that about $10,000,000 worth of foodstuffs have been brought into existence through the experiments and the development of this industry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 179, reinserting line 15 and the following lines, relative to providing education for foreign-born persons who served in the Army and Navy of the United States.

Mr. FRANCE. I believe this amendment is subject to a point of order, because it is undoubtedly general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator let me explain what I intend to do? I am willing to strike out all of the amendment except what is on the first page and a portion of the first line of the next page, including the words "United States."

Mr. FRANCE. I was going to offer an amendment which would have that effect.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not know that there is any objection to that. I would like to state that it is carrying out a provision of the law already included in section 9 of the immigration law. A similar provision was made exactly on the same line, except that it applies to alien soldiers returned. I think that part of it is all right.

Mr. FRANCE. I offer an amendment which will amend the section. I desire very briefly to state my reasons for offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland proposes an amendment to the amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the words "United States," on page 180, line 1, strike out the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is what I understood the chairman of the committee to agree to.

Mr. WARREN. That is exactly what the chairman proposes, to strike out after the words "United States" and leave all before that in.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly why this is done. This section deals with the question of Americanization. It would not be wise at this time to adopt the section, for the reason that there are now pending two bills, one of them not actually before the Senate but in course of preparation, which would place the Americanization work in the Department of Labor and provide an appropriation for carrying on that work, the other bill placing the work in the Department of the Interior under the Department of Education, that bill also carrying an appropriation.

I think it is very important for the Senate before taking final action on this matter to give the whole subject further consideration. I do not offer the amendment in any spirit of hostility to the Americanization work, nor does it prejudice the case so far as the final decision may be concerned, but I think it would be better to leave the whole question open until the bills have come before the Senate.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 181, "United States Housing Corporation."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I make a point of order against this provision.

Mr. WARREN. I hardly think the Senator wants to do that, unless he has something to offer in lieu, because of the situation in which it would leave matters.

Mr. KING. I shall be glad to reserve the point of order and hear the explanation of the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. There are some thousands of employees of the Government who are being furnished room and food in certain buildings that the Government has authorized by legislation, and without this provision after the 1st day of July there can not be a mouthful of food bought or anything else bought, unless we appropriate this money. It is occasioned by some legislation that has preceded it. In a bill passed a few days ago, the deficiency bill, there was carried one item by which we turned back into the Treasury $34,500,000 from the Housing Association. Toward the end of that bill an amendment was offered and unanimously agreed to that hereafter every dollar received by that association should be accounted for and turned into the Treasury. When they come to the 1st of July, of course, they will have no funds to go on with. This amendment simply puts them where they will have money to draw from, and in the meantime they will turn that much and as much more as they can into the Treasury as they go along. If there should be a month when they fell behind, of course, this would cover that. If there was a month where they made a great deal, the Government would be that much further in funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us how these appropriations compare with appropriations that were made for the present year for this purpose?

Mr. WARREN. There has been no specific appropriation heretofore.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. Out of a lump sum, and they could spend more or less as they chose, or do anything they saw fit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator the figures to show about how much has been lost to the Government?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. I think there was a loss of something like $375,000 or $380,000 while they were getting organized and getting under way.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, while the operation of these houses was going on, we have lost about $375,000 or $380,000?

Mr. WARREN. So I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. That applies to those in the District as well as other places?

Mr. WARREN. Very largely those in the District.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand the bill provides for housing employees all over the country?

Mr. WARREN. It does.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it intended to make that permanent?

Mr. WARREN. Not at all. You will notice in the end where we have put in the authorization——

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; you have a disillusion provision at end of page 187.

Mr. WARREN. The original law carriers the right up to July for them to sell, but after July they would have to have an act of Congress. Therefore, we put that in so that they will dispose of these properties as fast as they can without too great a loss so as to close up the entire business.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have made no provision for that in the amount of the appropriation? In other words, we are appropriating on the theory that all these houses will be kept during the year 1920.

Mr. WARREN. As nearly as we can calculate. They did not calculate what it would cost to run them all, because they have a prospect of disposing of some of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the entire amount?

Mr. WARREN. It is something over $3,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, the whole housing scheme, I understand, will be brought to an abrupt end on the 1st of July, 1919, unless this appropriation is made?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; on the 1st of July they will have no funds whatever under the law that we have passed to go on with their business. That is, they would have to turn it over as fast as it came in.

Mr. McKELLAR. What effect would that have on the disposition of the property? Would the property be just as easily disposed of?

Mr. WARREN. The first act would be to turn all these United States employees into the streets.

Mr. McKELLAR. Including those here in Washington?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think a point of order ought to be raised, and I hope the Senator from Utah will not raise the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The provision in line 7, page 187, refers to "An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918," and it reads:

> Shall wind up its affairs and dissolve as soon as it has disposed of said property and performed the duties and obligations herein set forth.

Does that mean that they are now selling the property, to be delivered at some future date, so as not to precipitate the turning out of these employees?

Mr. WARREN. They are disposing of it for cash to-day and possession, if they can dispose of it to advantage, or if they can dispose of it deliverable at a later date they are doing that. It is a great business corporation, similar to a private business corporation, doing business as private parties might do business

and with the intention of closing up and going out of business just as early as they can without sacrificing too much of the money of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What I was afraid of was simply that unless there was some express provision as to a limitation within which it is to be disposed of, this thing will come up every year, because it is a great convenience to have the Government furnish dormitories and meals in the dormitories, together with very good salaries. Unless there is a rigid law enforcing the sale of these properties you will find that next year you will have just about the same number here and the same provision to carry them over to save putting somebody in the streets.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator knows the language and intention of it. We can sometimes take a horse to water and he will not drink.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Of course I understand the emergency now, and I would not vote on a point of order to put these employees who came here under stress of war out into the streets while they are winding up the business incident to the close of the war, but I do not want it to go on indefinitely, because if they get in the habit of coming here and getting Government rooms and Government food, it means that we will have to furnish those as long as we have Government employees.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with the Senator, and I want to say the managers who were before us were admonished by myself, and not alone by the chairman of the committee but by every other member of the subcommittee who was present, that they must proceed with this to a legitimate, honorable, decent, early end.

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to ask the chairman whether, on pages 182 and 183 and 184, if we are operating these houses and hotels and restaurants to supply homes for employees and workmen for the Government?

Mr. WARREN. These were supposed to be either purchased or erected at points where the Government, in its various industries and activities, required housing for their help. They are not supposed to go and, I think, have not gone in the business of building houses for the sake of trying to make money or spending money.

Mr. KIRBY. Is it expected that we shall operate these houses and hotels, too, or are the houses we have acquired to be disposed of?

Mr. WARREN. As I said, they may have built the houses and made arrangements for the rental of them. They may be renting some of them.

Mr. SMOOT. In the first place, I want to call attention to the fact that this item is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. KIRBY. I am not going to raise a point of order. I am just asking for information.

Mr. SMOOT. I will come to that in a moment. This has been estimated for in the regular way, and it has been reported by a standing committee. Therefore the point of order will not lie against it.

I want to call attention to the fact that the receipts from the rent of all these houses are estimated at $3,279,785 per year. You will notice that those receipts will a little more than cover the appropriations that are made in the bill. There is no question but what it would be very unwise to force the sale of the buildings.

To call attention to just what we are going to lose in this whole transaction as it appears to-day, I call the attention of the Senate to the situation. As Senators know, there was appropriated $100,000,000 for this purpose. What we are going to get out of that $100,000,000 will be about this: Completed houses and dormitories, $33,000,000; loans to transportation companies, $8,000,000; transportation property owned, $118,000; loans to municipalities and utility companies, $1,000,000; material held for disposition, $700,000; abandoned property, $1,360,000. These items make a total of $41,178,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think we can get that much out of it?

Mr. SMOOT. The chairman of the corporation says there is no doubt but what they can get that amount out of it; but if the program now suggested by the Department of Labor is adopted—that these houses shall be first sold to those who are at present occupying them, and not at a general sale—then, of course, we will not get $30,000,000; and I do not think we will get $15,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. And we may not get them sold for years.

Mr. SMOOT. Then there is cash to be returned $32,500,000, making $73,678,000 as the estimate we will get out of the $100,000,000, or a loss of about $26,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a fine estimate, and I hope it will be realized.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that he will have to stretch that hope.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am inclined to think so.

Mr. SMOOT. He will be disappointed greatly upon this item, because there is great doubt as to whether we will receive that amount or not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer an amendment to be inserted in line 11, page 187. After the words "shall wind up," in line 10, I move to insert the words "by July 1, 1920." I think that unquestionably there ought to be a time limit.

Mr. KING. Not later than that.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I can convince the Senator that that is a most unwise amendment.

Mr. KING. Let the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 187, line 10, after the words "shall wind up," it is proposed to insert "by July 1, 1920."

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that I think we shall lose money by that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Without any limit being provided, money may be appropriated for this purpose for 40 years.

Mr. WARREN. Not with Senators here looking after it.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say to the Senator from Tennessee that if that amendment is adopted it gives notice to every purchaser not to buy any of these buildings, but to wait until July 1 of the coming year or as near that as possible. I have no doubt if that amendment is inserted that, instead of receiving $73,000,000 as estimated, we might just as well cut off $20,000,000, and I know the Senator from Tennessee does not want to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not want that; but that is not going to take place, for the reason that Congress has the right at any time to extend the provision, but as long as we leave it to the Housing Corporation, in the very nature of the case, the housing appropriation is going to be continued. There ought to be a time limit on it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the law in the first instance did not contemplate and we have not given them any encouragement in that direction. They have been advised what they must do. They have a pretty good list of sales that they have made; and I wish to say to the Senator that if I am here, whatever the position I may occupy, I shall expect to have a report upon this matter; and if they have not proceeded according to their agreement and according to what is good business policy, then I should be willing to make a time limit; but with all the property on hand, if it is understood that some day an option may be obtained to buy it for 10 cents on the dollar, I think the Government would come out very badly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say that the arguments of the two Senators are very persuasive, and I will withdraw my amendment to the amendment and will suggest this one to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee is withdrawn.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest that the corporation shall report the sales made by January, 1920, and again on the 1st of July, 1920; in other words, let them report progress as we go along; because it is not the intention, I am sure, of anyone to continue this Government housing proposition.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the slightest objection to that amendment to the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the committee amendment on page 187, line 13, the following proviso:

Provided, That the commission shall report to Congress on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, as to sales and so forth, of the property.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not each year, but in 1920.

Mr. WARREN. Merely during the year 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that he add the words "sales and the amounts received therefrom."

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the modification of my amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I think December 31 would be a better date for the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I will make it December 31, 1919, and July 1, 1920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated as proposed to be modified.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the amendment of the committee, on page 187, line 13, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the commission shall report to Congress on December 31, 1919, and June 30, 1920, as to all sales made and amounts received therefrom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on page 181, line 6, I move to strike out the figures "$477,700" and to insert in lieu thereof "$400,000." I find that item is for attorneys, clerks, and employees in the District of Columbia. The next item carries $99,100 for contingent and miscellaneous expenses in Washington.

Mr. WARREN. If I understand the Senator's amendment, I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether the renting of buildings in the District of Columbia is needed? I see an item on page 181, beginning in line 17, carrying an appropriation of $22,000 for that purpose. In view of the number of buildings which are to be vacated by reason of the termination of the war, it occurred to me that the Government might furnish facilities and buildings so that it would not be necessary to rent other buildings.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that some of these buildings are rented under contract and rerented. Of course, the rent must continue to the end of the contract.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but I will say to the Senator from Utah that we have assigned every square foot of space in Government-owned buildings in the District of Columbia, and we now lack enough space to take care of all of the bureaus and departments of our Government to the extent of something like 1,000,000 square feet.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is on the theory of the estimates of the departments, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Unquestionably there will be a great decrease in the number of employees in the departments, in the Navy Department and the War Department, especially in the latter, since the Army is to be reduced to 325,000, as I understand it will be, instead of 400,000. Unquestionably there will be a great deal of additional space. I do not care anything about this item. It is not very large, but I think it ought to go out of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. If we had a cubby-hole in which to put our employees in the District of Columbia which was owned by the Government, I care not where located, I should insist that this amendment should go out.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator from Utah understands the situation.

Mr. SMOOT. But I desire to say to the Senator from Tennessee that there is not a single foot of space in the departments left for assignment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. On page 182, under the head of "Houses," there are, I find, various items. For instance, there are houses in Maryland, Ohio, Maine, Washington, Connecticut, Connecticut again, Connecticut again, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania again, Indiana, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Illinois, California, Connecticut, New York, and various other items. Under the head of "Hotels," I find:

Bremerton, Wash., $220,000.
Kittery Point, Me., $99,000.

What do those figures signify? It is not insurance?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not only for insurance, but it is for the maintenance of the houses in those places. I can tell the Senator from Florida just exactly how many houses there are, if the Senator desires.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I do not care for that.

Mr. SMOOT. They require a caretaker, fireman, and a general supervision of the places. That is what these items of appropriation are for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. KING. I notice an appropriation for the item mentioned by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]:

Bremerton, Wash., $220,000.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a hotel and a very large one. There is received from that hotel more than this amount. The Government has had to run that hotel because there was no place at Bremerton fit to accommodate the men who were called there in order to build ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. On the next page is an item for the Vallejo, Calif., restaurant, amounting to $149,700. Does the Senator mean that amount is the expense of operating that restaurant?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and every dollar that is received from the restaurant goes into the Treasury of the United States under the provisions of law passed some days ago.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is in addition to what is received?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all; that is the total expense of the restaurant, the purchase of the food and all expenses attached to it. Every dollar, as I have said, that they take in is turned back into the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, did the Housing Corporation furnish a full report, verified by accountants, as to exactly what had been done?

Mr. SMOOT. They furnished a full report to the committee, but not in detail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Ought there not to be a detailed report? Here is $100,000,000 being used, and ought there not to be an additional proviso to this amendment requiring them on December 31 of this year to furnish a detailed report, verified by accountants, of all moneys paid out and received?

Mr. SMOOT. I can give the Senator the statement as to the totals but not in detail. I think, however—and I am only expressing my own opinion—that there ought to be a thorough investigation of this housing proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would it not be better to have a full report from them by December, in any event? I believe that if expert accountants were to examine their books and they were required to report and show Congress what they had been doing it would be the best possible way of handling it. That is merely my judgment about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that of course a full statement would mean the presentation of all receipts and all expenditures.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not mean that.

Mr. SMOOT. As to the statement which they have made the Senator can get that almost any time he wants to. What I mean is this: I think from all that I have heard and from pretty accurate reports that have come to me the whole corporation ought to be examined into. That, I think, is the proper course to pursue.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is not a committee now doing that?

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate is going to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there is an amendment which I wish to submit on behalf of the committee which was overlooked in the consideration of the bill. Before the amendment is stated, let me say that it contemplates partly taking money that is in the Treasury now and partly money to be paid in for the sale of a site for a public building and to appropriate it for another site. It appropriates no new money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Pittsburgh, Pa.: That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site for a new post-office building at Pittsburgh, Pa., at a cost not exceeding $950,000.

And that so much of section 18 of the public building act of March 4, 1913, as provided that the proceeds of the sale of the former unused post-office site in said city should be deposited in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt is hereby repealed; and the three paid installments of the purchase price of said former site, together with the interest on said purchase price heretofore paid, aggregating $761,108.33, are hereby reappropriated and made available, together with the further sum of $188,891.67, which is hereby appropriated, for the acquisition of said new site under the above-stated limit of cost.

And that the remaining installment of the price of said former site, when paid, together with the interest thereon, shall be deposited in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

Mr. KING. I make a point of order against that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was directed by the committee to find out exactly what amount would have to be appropriated

for rent to take care of all of the departments of the Government that have not already been assigned space in Government-owned buildings. The Senate will remember that we cut out of the legislative appropriation bill nearly all of the rent items that were in the bill; but, since the assignment of space has been made for all of the departments of the Government, we find that we must provide in this bill a few items for rent. I offer an amendment on page 187, after line 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 187, after line 22, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

For rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, $100,000; for operating expenses, $25,000; in all, $125,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. In connection with the amendment just adopted, on page 27, line 4, I move to strike out "$10,000" and in lieu to insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. That, I think, completes the rent items.

Now, Mr. President, on page 194, line 19, after the word "buildings," I move to insert the words "including not to exceed $50,000 for reconstructing garage as warehouse." I wish to say to the Senate that the reason for this amendment is that we have an old garage down at the Public Printing Office and are short of storage room all over the District; in fact, the first thing that Congress ought to do is to provide storage space for the different departments of the Government. We have space used for storage to-day in all of the departments that is well worth four times the amount for the occupancy of employees, but the space is occupied by files and records of all kinds because we have no other place for them. In order to save rent, we wish to authorize $50,000 of this appropriation to make the old garage at the Government Printing Office into a storehouse, and also at the same time put a roof over the alleyway there and then build some floors and use that as storage space. That will allow us to give up the storage building on N Street, and also provide for the storage of the increased files and other papers that are accumulating at the Public Printing Office and which must be kept for years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer an amendment to come in on page 207, line 14. After the Secretary has stated the amendment I will explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 207, line 14, after the word "activities," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That any officer of the Government having machinery, material, equipment, or supplies for printing, binding, and blank-book work, including lithography, photo-lithography, and other processes of reproduction, which are no longer required or authorized for his service, shall submit a detailed report of the same to the Public Printer; and the Public Printer is hereby authorized, with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, to requisition such articles of the character herein described as are serviceable in the Government Printing Office, and the same shall be promptly delivered to that office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on page 39, line 25, there has been an omission, so I am informed by the head of the department. I move to insert, after the semicolon after the figures "$840," the words "one stenographer, $840."

I think the chairman of the committee will accept that amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I understand that that is an error; that it has been left out. On that theory I am willing that it shall go in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I move to change the total to "$92,130."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk an amendment which I am offering on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall have to make a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the amendment be stated.

Mr. WARREN. Pardon me a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Let us hear the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following at the proper place in the bill:

To enable the Secretary of Labor to continue inquiry into methods of betterment of working conditions of wage-earners, to collect and disseminate information and advice for the elimination of causes of strikes and industrial unrest. For the above purposes—for salaries of officers and employees in the District of Columbia and in the field; per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding $4; traveling expenses; fuel, light, and heat; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; supplies and equipment; typewriters; telephone and telegraph service; contingent expenses and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $45,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order against that amendment. So far as the labor question is concerned, there is no disposition on the part of the chairman of the committee, so far as I know, to do anything but the liberal, fair thing; but I presume on account of the pressure of war duties and these various strikes, and so forth, that have taken the Secretary of Labor to many parts of the country, there seems to be a confusion which is unaccountable to me. For instance, there are no estimates for the particular thing that the Senator has offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator is in error about that, because I find on page 821 of the Book of Estimates that it has been estimated for, and in a much larger sum than I am now asking for.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me to go on, it is not estimated as a separate matter, nor for that purpose; but there are, I may say, nine measures, commencing with $14,000,000 and something and going along down, $1,335,000, $1,659,917, $212,820, $300,000——

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the item.

Mr. WARREN. Three hundred thousand dollars again, $1,814,454, $50,000, and $447,512.19.

Now, to take one of the items here, $1,335,000, for instance, it is for a particular subject, and yet we find that this $50,000 is for the same subject. These matters seem to have come up from employees and those attached to the Department of Labor. I can not account for it in any way except that in the multitudinous duties there, and because of the very great anxiety on the part of employees to remain in the employ of the department, and the propaganda that they have gotten up as to Senators, and the letters and other communications that they have poured in on us, they are somewhat confused.

If we can confine this to a reasonable amount, I am perfectly willing to have it go in; but, for instance, we are talking about economy. In these amendments that have been offered there are two or three where there are salaries of $6,000, salaries of $5,000, 15 or 20 salaries of $4,000, $3,500, and $3,000. I do not think I can allow without a protest, and certainly not without a vote of the Senate at this time, matters of that kind to go in.

Take the House of Representatives. They finally managed to get $200,000 into the bill, and that went out and there is nothing in the bill. I do not think we should load this bill up with amendments of that character, and of great amounts, just to go to conference and lose them there, and then the conferees take the usual "cussing" which they are apt to get. I should like to have these matters confined to some one proposition of two or three or possibly four hundred thousand dollars, and try to take care of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, of course this amendment is not subject to a point of order. I call the attention of the Chair to chapter 141——

Mr. WARREN. It is useless to discuss that, because, in the first place, there is no place among the estimates where it specifies that sum. It is not here by the indorsement of any standing committee, which is required, and it increases an amendment on an appropriation bill without having behind it either an estimate or the indorsement of a committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the chairman will excuse me a minute, as I understand, a lump sum has been agreed upon between the chairman and certain Senators in reference to these various propositions.

Mr. WARREN. Not on the very matter that the Senator is talking about; but I am willing, if there is any, that it shall go in.

Mr. McKELLAR. That it may be included?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am acting for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in this matter. He asked me to present it to the Senate. With the understanding that the chairman says there is in reference to it, that will be entirely satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 53, to strike out lines 3 to 7 and insert the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 7, as amended, and in lieu thereof to insert:

All ships constructed, purchased, or otherwise acquired for the Government by the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be retained and operated by the Government through said agencies in carrying our coastwise and foreign commerce.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course I must make the point of order on that. It is legislation which we can not admit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been requested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to offer a very simple amendment, beginning with the end of line 2, on page 154, to change the period into a semicolon and add:

And of which $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for maintaining branch offices at Portland, Oreg.

There is no increase of appropriation. It is a mere distribution of the sum of $60,000 set apart for the purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 2, page 154, after the word "Washington," it is proposed to add:

And of which $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for maintaining branch offices at Portland, Oreg.

Mr. WARREN. I am willing that that may go in for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment to which this amendment is proposed by the Senator from Colorado was agreed to will be reconsidered. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 187, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Labor, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," to continue to foster, promote, to develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official station together with their per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, $400,000.

Mr. WARREN. The chairman of the committee has no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment that is a very important one, and I am sorry that we have not more time to consider it. It deserves the very earnest and careful consideration of the Senate. I am going, however, to take just three or four minutes to call attention to the facts, for the purpose of showing its importance, before I have it read, because the mere reading of it might prejudice some minds against it.

Under the reclamation law we have started quite a number of reclamation projects throughout the country for the irrigation of desert lands. These projects have progressed more or less toward completion. Some few have been entirely completed. Others have not been completed, but units of them are ready for construction if money were available. Under the reclamation act only the moneys that come in from the sale and disposal of public lands are available for the reclamation of these desert lands. During the last three, four, or five years this sum has been very small, so that the amount of money available for carrying on this work has been very limited.

Under the projects we have made water available for about 1,800,000 acres of land. Of this, about 1,500,000 acres have acquired water rights or made contracts for water rights. Under the reclamation act, the money that the Government puts up for these works must be repaid by the settlers; so that as a matter of fact it is simply a loan to the settlers, without interest, for the reclamation of these lands.

It has been said in the past that this money was not to be repaid. I think the record will show now that there is not any question at all but that the money will be repaid to the Government. The settlers have already repaid the Government, on construction charges, over $6,000,000. Several years ago we extended the time and made the payments easier, so that the money from these projects has not been coming in so fast for the last three or four years; but it will begin to come in faster now, because the payments are greater.

Mr. President, there are projects and units of projects that have all been surveyed, the cost ascertained, and the Government will be ready to carry on those projects if the money is available. These additional projects number some 15 or 20. They could be completed within from one to five years if the money were made available. This would result in the reclamation, making water available for almost a million acres of additional land.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to make money available for the immediate prosecution of these works in the reclamation of these lands. The Secretary of the Interior estimates that it will cost about $50,000,000, and with this $50,000,000 the work can be commenced, these projects and these units can be completed within from one to five years, and these lands be made available for settlers.

I want to say that those who are acquainted with the irrigated lands of the West will know that the Government has never made a better investment than in the investment of money put in the reclamation of those lands. In the Yakima Valley in the State of Washington millions of dollars have come from settlers on those lands in the purchase of liberty bonds and the payment of income taxes, and the products of this land alone in that one valley amounts in value to from $30,000,000 to $50,000,000. This land without irrigation is absolutely a desert, absolutely unproductive. The benefit of these loans to the State and the Nation for tax purposes is to get an income upon any sum of money the Government might have invested.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate further. I simply wanted to call attention to these facts.

I desire to offer my amendment on page 123 of the bill, after line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 123, after line 2, insert:

To resume and prosecute work on projects and units thereof under the reclamation act stopped during the war and to begin and prosecute existing projects and units thereof which are practically ready for prosecution, to be immediately available and to be expended under the terms and conditions of the reclamation act, except in the matter of employment, and preference shall be given to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, $50,000,000.

Mr. DIAL. Do I understand the Senator to say there is no interest paid on the money?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; there is no interest paid on the money except after it becomes due.

Mr. WARREN. I do not know of any Senator, or anyone not a Senator, who lives in the West who would like better than I would to have a general consensus of opinion that the time has arrived for us to make these investments, but I feel it my duty to make a point of order against the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon what ground does the Senator make the point of order?

Mr. WARREN. On the ground that it is not estimated for and it is not reported from a committee with an indorsement, and it greatly increases an appropriation bill. Besides, it is general legislation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator is mistaken. This amendment has been reported by the Irrigation Committee of the Senate. I took every precaution to make the amendment in order. The amendment was introduced in the Senate, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and by that committee ordered favorably reported and then referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WARREN. Suppose we grant that, what about the estimate?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Under the rule it does not have to have that. The rule provides that—

No amendment shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the departments.

That is in the alternative. The indorsement of a standing committee of the Senate, is had upon this amendment. That is all that is necessary under this rule.

Mr. WARREN. At the same time it did not come from the Committee on Appropriations with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true, but according to the rule——

Mr. FLETCHER. The rule evidently means the committee having charge of the measure. It does not mean any committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me read from paragraph 2 of this same rule:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

This amendment was moved by the Irrigation Committee of the Senate, reported to the Senate, and then referred to the Committee on Appropriations to comply with the provisions of this rule.

Mr. LENROOT. How could the Committee on Irrigation move an amendment to an appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. What does the rule mean, then?

Mr. THOMAS. I made, or tried to make, precisely that point of order against an item in the Post Office appropriation bill last February, carrying $200,000,000 for public buildings, and the Vice President overruled my point of order upon the ground that it had no force since a division of appropriations among various committees, that when there was but one Appropriation Committee the rule would have been effective; and I recollect distinctly he was sustained in that view by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. What is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander.

Mr. FLETCHER. In that instance the committee reporting the bill was the committee that had made the recommendation.

Mr. THOMAS. That is very true, but the principle is the same.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is a standing committee, but that does not mean another committee outside of the committee reporting the bill, and that was the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we only need I think to read the rule. Senators contend that it must be the Appropriations Committee and that some other committee can not propose an amendment. The rule means the exact thing that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has attempted to do here; otherwise it would have no sense whatever. Section 2 of Rule XVI provides that—

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill or to add new items of appropriation shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

What would be the sense of doing that if the committee that would propose the amendment must be the Committee on Appropriations? Would the Committee on Appropriations consider an amendment, report it to the Senate, and have it referred back to the Committee on Appropriations and let it lie over one day before the Committee on Appropriations could consider it? If that is the contention, this rule is meaningless.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that I have run up against this a number of times in my service in this body. I have a number of times had an amendment for an appropriation the object of which was, for instance, to carry out land matters. I have had it referred to the Public Lands Committee and the Public Lands Committee reported it out and referred it to the Committee on Appropriations. This is an amendment to the appropriation bill, and the bill itself is in charge of the Appropriations Committee. Therefore it has to go to the Appropriations Committee, and if the Appropriations Committee, after recommendation by the standing committee, reports it out, then it is in order; but if it does not, then it has always been held not to be in order.

I will say that when former Senator Hale was in the Senate, the first time I read this rule I thought it meant exactly what the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Washington have stated, but I soon found that it did not mean that according to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. NORRIS. If the contention of the Senator is right, then all this procedure is perfectly foolish.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Let me first answer the Senator from Utah. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator then.

The rule says such amendment should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

And when actually proposed to the bill, no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received.

If it meant the Appropriations Committee, or if it meant what the Senator from Utah now contends, if the Appropriations Committee did not report it, what would be the sense of having it go there and report it back in order to make it in order? That would not be necessary. If the Senator's contention is right, all the Senator from Washington had to do was to introduce his amendment and it would have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations. A man would be foolish to go to another committee and have the subject considered, and they acted favorably on it and suggested the amendment, if when he got all through it would give him no more advantage than though he had introduced the amendment himself and had it referred directly to that committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand the situation, the amendment which the Senator from Washington offered was first introduced in the Senate, sent to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and favorably reported by that committee. Then the Senator from Washington had it referred to the Committee on Appropriations under the rule. It comes here and is offered after having gone through that process. If that is not a compliance with the rule, I do not know how you can go about complying with the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. As I conceive it, at least, you can not possibly put any other construction on the rule. If you follow the Senator from Utah and put the construction on it for which he is contending, let us see what would happen. The Senator from Washington introduces his amendment, and it goes to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands. They have hearings, and because it pertains particularly to irrigation it is supposed, and that was the object of this rule, that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands has jurisdiction over the subject, except that they do not have authority to make appropriations. They consider it and after hearings and after consultation they report it to the Senate. The Senate rule says that shall be in order on an appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that it may be legislation or for some other reason that would be objectionable ordinarily under the rule, and the Senator from Utah contends that if the Committee on Appropriations does not report the bill with the amendment it is dead; that you can not go any further.

Mr. SMOOT. On a point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. That means that it is dead. That is what I meant. I do not think there is any misunderstanding as to what I mean.

I am now again at the point where I was when I was interrupted before. I shall endeavor to proceed. It is referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and they do not report it. That is this case. The Senator from Utah contends that that kills it, that it is ended then, that it is not entitled to this privileged situation. If that is true, what is the use of going through all that maneuver in order to get it in order, which the Senator from Washington in this case has done, as the rule provides he shall do? He could introduce it without sending it to the other committee and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and if they killed it, it would be dead, just like it was in the other case.

It seems to me the theory of this rule is that on various subjects of legislation it may be important, in the judgment of a Senator, to desire to offer an amendment to an appropriation bill, and it requires him to take that subject before the proper committee having jurisdiction of the subject, and after that committee has deliberated on it, after they have considered it, and they say that it ought to be put on the appropriation bill, then it can be reported, sent to the Appropriations Committee, and let it lie one day before the committee under the rule, and then it shall not be subject to a point of order, because it has all the sacredness almost of a judicial determination behind it. Therefore, if it is of such importance in the mind and in the judgment of the standing or select committee of the Senate—in this case a standing committee—it is not subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the rule has been complied with

and overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I just want to say one word. There is no more meritorious measure than the amendment proposed by my colleague. At this time of reconstruction after the war, a time of unemployment, when the experiences of the past have demonstrated that a splendid prosperity for the country comes from such an investment in irrigation, it seems to me there ought not to be any question about the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator not ask for a division?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This proposes a $50,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. Would not the Senator arrive at the same result by a division that he would the other way?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I do not think so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia withdraw his demand?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I do not. I do not think we ought to add a $50,000,000 appropriation from the floor without consideration by the Senate. It has not been estimated for.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator ought to know I am not making the request that he withdraw the call as being in favor of the amendment, because I have already objected to it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But it is a pretty serious proposition to add a $50,000,000 appropriation that has not been estimated for by a department and has not been reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me suggest to the Senator that this provision has gone through all the processes of legislation. It has been referred to a committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What committee?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Irrigation Committee that has charge of irrigation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course, the Irrigation Committee is for irrigation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This amendment is for irrigation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The whole country is interested in the appropriation of $50,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And the question is whether we shall give the $50,000,000 on the recommendation of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands. It is a big appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I concede that it is a large appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Interior Department has not asked for it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have letters from the Secretary of the Interior recommending it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Georgia has taken into consideration the fact that this money that is proposed to be appropriated is reimbursable to the Government. It is really just a loan of money upon the best security in the world.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Some time, somewhere. I do not know that I am finally opposed to it. I believe in doing everything that can be done to develop the great West, but to put $50,000,000 on the bill that the committee has not approved is a different proposition. I do not regard as very serious the recommendation of the Irrigation Committee. That committee is composed of Members all of whom are interested in irrigation. They represent the irrigation side of the question.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Speaking of that committee, the same committee reported a bill out here last year and it was sent to the calendar. It provided for the reclamation of swamp lands of the South as well as irrigation lands of the West. The committee is fair to every section of the country. They are not a western committee by any matter of means.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator spoke about repayment of this money some time, somewhere, as if the Senator entertains a doubt about it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think it has all been paid up that has heretofore been loaned. I think I understand fairly well the system. I suppose the land will eventually be sold and probably eventually the money will come back.

Mr. BORAH. No; it will not come back by virtue of selling the land. It will come back by virtue of payments made by those who own the land. The land does not have to be sold out under mortgage or anything of that kind.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Part of the irrigation projects go through Government land and where they are on Government land it depends upon sale of the Government lands, but where they go through lands privately owned, I understand they charge against such property.

Mr. BORAH. I misunderstood the Senator if that is what it refers to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I had reference to two plans.

Mr. BORAH. There is not any question, in my judgment, and I do not think there is a particle in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, but that all this money will be repaid. As the Senator from Washington stated a few minutes ago, some $6,000,000 have been repaid. The $50,000,000 now being asked for was recommended by Secretary Lane in the first note he ever wrote as Secretary of the Interior. These projects are lying there, some of them partially completed. People have been upon the land for years, waiting for the completion of these works, and it has been delayed and postponed by reason of the situation which has been superinduced by the war and the vast expenditures which have been laid out for the war. It has been put behind, but now we are not only serving the people who are upon the land, we are providing in a way for those who have returned from the war and who want to take up this public land.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This appropriation will be applied to the projects that have been before presented to the Senate, that the Government has made large expenditures and has assumed responsibility for, and that we have heard described as projects where men have settled and the failure of the irrigation has left them in very bad shape.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we know just where it is to be applied—that is, the vast portion of it. For instance, we have a project in our State where the people have been on the land for at least eight years, and it is a condition which is almost cruel, because they went there under the almost express and certainly under the implied invitation of the Government, that the Government would put water upon the land for them. The same situation prevails in other States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am familiar with the condition in Idaho. To what extent does the Senator think the projects to which this money will be applied occupy a similar condition?

Mr. BORAH. My understanding is that practically all of them are projects that have been in a measure begun.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The projects have already been approved?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I know the Senator is seeking information, and it is only because I think I happen to have a little personal knowledge that I have interrupted him for the purpose of giving some information. In the first place, the amendment of the Senator from Washington can not be used in an effort to develop or look up new projects. If the Senator will read the language, he will find that it applies to those that have been commenced, where work has been suspended on account of the war, work that is ready to be commenced that has been approved.

There will be no expense of surveying, of investigating to ascertain the situation, and all that kind of work. We shall commence with propositions that are either partially completed or on which operations have already begun. There will be no loss of money to begin with. Under ordinary circumstances in reclamation operations sometimes a good deal of money is used to investigate and survey, and it may be found, after the expenditure of considerable money, that the particular project investigated is not practicable for irrigation; it is given up, and the money is lost. That can not apply to this $50,000,000.

Let me tell the Senator of an instance where it will apply. I have in mind the development of a part of the so-called North Platte, a project where, on the south side of the north bank of the North Platte River, they have surveyed a ditch. They are working on it now and have completed quite a good many miles. They had some contracts let before the war, but the expense went up very high and they could not do as much with the same amount of money as they could before the war. However, they did this: The water that they had in the completed part of the ditch developed a good deal of electricity. If they could utilize the maximum amount of electricity which is there now—and they have dams constructed and have everything ready to go to work—if they had money enough to carry it out, as they would have done if it had not been for the war causing in-

creased prices, and so on, they would have sufficient electricity to employ three shifts by utilizing the power that this very water which they want in a few years for irrigation purposes now makes, and they could run the machinery to excavate all of the dirt and the material out of the ditch.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. Everybody knows that to do that most economically they ought to be able to utilize every bit of electricity that the water will develop with money obtainable from the reclamation fund; but they can utilize only one-third of the electricity they are able to develop. The remainder, of course, is developed to no purpose. All that overhead expense is wasted. It is a matter of practical economy, for which the money should now be available. If I had known this was coming up to-night, I should have been able to get the diagrams and cuts of this very project and have shown the Senate exactly the amount of electricity and power developed, as well as a survey of the entire project showing how much power they can use with the money that they now have. If they could spread it out, they could use three times as much, as I remember.

Mr. OVERMAN. We have in this bill appropriated for this project $880,000. Will they want more than that?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it will take a great deal more than that; but I was not through with my explanation to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. OVERMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I desire to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I shall be glad to answer any question I can.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wanted to know if the Senator was aware that there is an appropriation of $880,000 for this one project and $7,000,000 for the other projects?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and I want to say that on that particular project, on the portion which has been in operation, there are splendid developments around the ditch.

I wish I could take Senators out and show them what a few years ago was a barren prairie on the north side of that same river—and the same thing is true also of the south side—where now there are modern houses, 80 acres being the unit in that irrigation project, and two-story schoolhouses that are out there in the country on the other side of this ditch. Down at the end of it on the north side for eight years there have been men waiting for the water to be extended on that side. The fact is there is not enough money in the reclamation fund to develop all of these projects fast enough to supply the demand for water. The result is that we are not doing the work economically, because the overhead expenses are just the same as though we had three times as much land under irrigation. The best way to do would be to complete the work as soon as possible and put all this land under cultivation, and let every man who is waiting for crops there, struggling along to make a living, do something for the good of humanity.

Mr. OVERMAN. The bill appropriates $880,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and that is not a third enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must insist upon Senators addressing the Chair.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to ask——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am going to yield the floor. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I do not feel called on under the circumstances to insist upon a yea-and-nay vote that may entirely prevent a vote. I do not know whether it ought to be done or not, but I am going to leave it to the Senators who know more about it than I do.

Mr. NORRIS. This money all comes back.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know it comes back, but——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want information. Here is an appropriation of $880,000 provided for in the bill to be expended in the next fiscal year. Is the $880,000 to be expended on this one project?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. OVERMAN. And the Senator thinks they could spend more money than that?

Mr. NORRIS. That will not be one-third enough. If this bill is adopted, it will not complete that work. The Senator from Georgia does not realize——

Mr. OVERMAN. That is not the question I asked. I know it will not complete the work. The question is whether or not they can spend more money this year than $880,000? We shall have another bill next year giving them another $880,000, I presume. Under our present system, as the Senator understands, I suppose we appropriate this money and divide it between the several projects according to their needs.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. The House has said "this project needs $880,000, which we will give them, and for other projects we have given $7,000,000." The House has investigated all these projects and has given each project the amount of money that they think they can use this year.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, let me explain that. I know Senators are interested in this proposition, and I will make it plain to the Senator from North Carolina.

As he says, the House has investigated the matter and has provided how much each one of these projects shall have and has provided that this particular project shall have $880,000. That is all true, but it does not mean that any of that money comes from taxation. It all comes out of the reclamation fund. It does not mean that when the House divides the money up in that way the House or committee reached the conclusion that that is all this project ought to have; not by any means. It means that is all the money there is in the fund; that is a partial estimate.

I have a letter in my office from the Chief of the Reclamation Bureau in which he says, in reference to this particular project, that there will not be available $880,000, because while the Appropriations Committee has appropriated that amount, they only appropriate out of the reclamation fund, and what is coming into that fund, to a certain extent, as we all know, is an estimate. He said that on account of war a good many people went away and are just now coming back. There will not be as much coming into the reclamation fund as there would be under ordinary circumstances, and hence all of these appropriations——

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. Hence none of these appropriations in this bill mean that there will be that much actual money for the specific projects named. The fact is that none of them will get the amount named in the bill, because it is not in the fund.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to ask the Senator whether or not any of this proposed appropriation would go to any of these projects he has mentioned? As I understand, the projects specified in the bill will each receive what is allowed in the bill, but the proposed amendment of the Senator from Washington would not provide any fund that might be used on the projects that are specified in the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator thinks it would?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then. I should like to ask a further question: What funds are there available for the purpose of irrigation? I do not want to be understood as opposing irrigation, although I believe quite uniformly Senators from the West vote against river and harbor improvements generally. I have always voted for irrigation developments myself; I am in sympathy with that kind of work; but may I ask how much is available for the work that is to be done in pursuance of this amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. Fifty million dollars.

Mr. FLETCHER. How much is on hand now?

Mr. NORRIS. This does not appropriate it out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not come out of that fund at all?

Mr. NORRIS. This is an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States into the reclamation fund; that is the effect of it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then, I should like to ask a further question: Why should we make available immediately $50,000,000? Because it is utterly impossible to spend that amount in a month or two; it could not be used.

Mr. NORRIS. Not in a month or two, but we could in a year very easily spend twice that amount on this work.

Mr. FLETCHER. Could you actually spend that much in a year?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. FLETCHER. You might, of course, let contracts or authorize contracts for the amount of $50,000,000, but I doubt very much if it is necessary to actually appropriate that money, because you can not do that work within a year.

Mr. NORRIS. The officials say they can. Take, for instance, an irrigation project that is 150 miles long, we will say; the question is whether you are going to build it in 1 year

or in 10 years. It is all surveyed; it is known just where the ditch is to be and what its size is and what it will cost, and everything of that kind, and it is a question of whether you work in one place or whether you work in a dozen places.

Mr. FLETCHER. It seems to me that if you had an authorization for such an expenditure and then a small appropriation, comparatively, say $10,000,000, that would be as much as you could possibly expend.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask for the information what the present law is with reference to the authorization of appropriations for this purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. The present law, as I understand, provides for appropriating the money that is in the reclamation fund by Congress. Formerly it was done by the department.

Mr. LENROOT. How does the law create the reclamation fund?

Mr. NORRIS. The money that goes into the reclamation fund comes from the sale of public lands.

Mr. LENROOT. And it is so provided by law?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. And there is no other source?

Mr. NORRIS. As I remember, there is no other source.

Mr. LENROOT. Then I make the additional point of order that this is general legislation, not authorized upon an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the statement of the Senator from Nebraska is true, that this comes out of the general fund and not out of the reclamation fund——

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Nebraska did not say that the reclamation fund comes out of the general fund; the money goes into the reclamation fund from the sale of public lands.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; that is just the point. If the reclamation fund, by law, is limited to the proceeds of the sale of the public lands, and if this proposes to take out of the Treasury $50,000,000 and put it into that fund, clearly it is general legislation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Washington on the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is a direct appropriation of $50,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly; just like any other item in the bill. It is not general legislation to appropriate money for a given purpose, and under the rules of the Senate, which the Chair has construed, it has been held that an item of that kind is in order when it has gone through a certain process in the Senate. We are not changing the reclamation law in any way, shape, or form; we are merely appropriating a certain sum and adding it to the reclamation fund. That is all there is to it, and we are doing it under the rule.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator what law authorizes any such appropriation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the rules of the Senate provide the way by which you can add a new item to an appropriation bill, and if the Senate acts favorably upon it it can be added to the bill. The rules of the Senate say that if you want to increase an appropriation bill by adding an item to a bill reported from the Appropriations Committee, it is in order under the rules of the Senate to put it on that bill; it does not make any difference what the money is to be used for.

Mr. LENROOT. Not if it is general legislation. I have a number of authorities here to that effect.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is no general legislation in this amendment at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I feel that I ought to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall not ask for a yea and nay vote.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is that a debatable proposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes it is debatable, although the Chair has not the rule directly at hand.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate or to seem to be actuated by any spirit of revenge, but this is an exceedingly important matter; it is important from many standpoints. I have sat here for the last week or 10 days watching the appropriation bills, and when the Army and the Navy and that class of appropriations were going through, $50,000,000, $100,000,000, $150,000,000, $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 are added without the bat of an eye.

Now the war is over; we have gotten back, I hope, to what we might call the "reconstruction" period when we have got to give some attention to the domestic concerns of this country. These vast acres of land are lying idle, and the people who occupy them come from every corner of the United States.

The lands are there subject to entry not by the people who reside within their immediate territory alone but subject to entry by anybody who comes from any part of the country to enter them, and they do come from all parts of the country; they come from the South, from New England, and from every other part of the United States.

As I said a moment ago, some of these lands were thrown open 8 or 10 years ago. The Government expressly or impliedly invited people to come there from different parts of the country to occupy them, and they went upon the lands. The lands, however, are absolutely uncultivable unless water is placed upon them; nothing can be raised upon them at all. But the people have gone there and in some instances remained there as long as five, six, seven, or eight years, and are now there. Many of them are there now on thousands of acres of land waiting for the Government to fulfill its pledge, to keep its contract to redeem their land and put water upon the land for them. I think that where people are home hungry, and where they are actually striving to connect themselves with the public land, to turn a desert into a garden, to build homes and communities, and to rear families, for Congress to hesitate to give a few million dollars, which will undoubtedly be returned, in the face of the kind of appropriations which we have been making is unwise, to say the least.

I am disposed, Mr. President, to carry this matter over Sunday so that we may reflect during the Sabbath Day and see whether or not that is a righteous thing to do. I do not propose to have this matter passed on and be put out of the way without more consideration than is being given to it here to-night. I feel that if I should do so I would be conniving at the misery and the suffering of the people who are upon these lands and have been there for years. Every western Senator and every gentleman who has any acquaintance with the West knows the situation to be as I represent it to the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to ask for a quorum.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. DIAL. What is the reason they can not form irrigation districts and sell bonds and develop their own lands?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, under the Carey Act they have done that in some instances; but this is public land, and the Government has set it apart for these irrigation projects, and they are now irrigation projects under the control of the Government; and the Government must either go forward, or they must stand there without anything whatever being done.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a suggestion?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. FALL. It is not only true as the Senator has stated it, but the further fact is that under the law the owners of these lands, having given a lien to the Government for the repayment of all money expended and to be expended by the Government, are precluded by the law itself from mortgaging the lands to anyone else for any sum whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho sug-

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Lenroot	Smoot
Borah	Gronna	McNary	Spencer
Calder	Harris	New	Stanley
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Swanson
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Poindexter	Trammell
Dial	Kenyon	Robinson	Warren
Elkins	King	Sheppard	Watson
Fall	Kirby	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Knox	Smith, Ga.	
Gay	La Follette	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators having answered to the roll call, there is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. FRANCE, Mr. KEYES, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. KING entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, at first view it may appear to some of the Senators who are not familiar with this subject that the proposed appropriation should not be made at this time nor in this way. It seems to me, sir, that sufficient answer to any objection of that character would be that if we can afford to expend $24,000,000,000 in the destruction of property we can afford to expend $50,000,000 in the construction of taxpaying property to return a revenue and upon which to support families in this country. If we have now reached an era of reconstruction in this country, let us devote some of our time and a few of our dollars to that purpose, rather than to continue military preparations, naval preparations, and armaments and purposes of that character.

The Secretary of the Interior has recently outlined a plan, or more than one plan, of providing homes for the soldiers who are being mustered out, or who have been mustered out; and, as I understand, the plan of the Secretary will call for the expenditure of $500,000,000 to be voted out of the Treasury of the United States. Included in that plan is the construction of these very projects referred to and provided for, or proposed to be provided for, in the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The homestead lands of the Great West are gone. Six hundred and forty acres of land granted to a man now of the remaining public lands of the United States, not under an irrigation project, constitute an additional liability, and not an asset. It is proposed to purchase, from private owners, cut-over lands in the State of Wisconsin and in other States of this Union, and to develop them for the purpose of making homes for the returning soldiers. It is proposed to go into the South, and drain the swamp lands of the South at the cost of the taxpayers of the United States, for the purpose of making homes for returning soldiers. It is proposed to go to the old, worn-out farms in the New England and other States, purchase the lands, divide them up, and improve them for the purpose of making homes for the returning soldiers.

It is true that the purpose for which this appropriation is proposed is not confined to making homes for the soldiers, but it is confined to making homes for citizens of the United States, whether soldiers or whether citizens who have not worn the uniform.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a fact which I think ought to be emphasized.

Mr. FALL. I think it should be emphasized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. These reclamation projects were established as the result of a great national policy, were they not?

Mr. FALL. They were.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And they are open equally to the citizens of every State of the country?

Mr. FALL. They are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And they can not be considered as projects for the benefit of any particular section?

Mr. FALL. They can not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am heartily in favor of the development of these reclamation projects in every possible way, and I am glad to have the fact emphasized that they are peculiarly of national significance.

Mr. FALL. I propose to lay further emphasis upon that fact.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. Could we not accomplish this purpose, then, by a general bill, and not by a measure relating to one particular section only?

Mr. FALL. There have been various general bills upon this subject, and this is carrying out legislation heretofore enacted by a general bill.

The reclamation funds referred to a few moments ago by one of the Senators, I believe, in voicing an objection or a point of order, are derived not only from the sale of public lands but they are derived also from the return payments being made now by the holders under every completed reclamation project in the United States. I think I may say that in very few of these projects already constructed or in operation are the people owning lands under them behind to the extent of one cent in their payments to the Government, although I may say, sir, that the necessary amounts or the supposed amounts which the projects would cost per acre have been, in almost every instance, doubled.

Mr. President, in my judgment, we can not expect to expend one-fifth of the amount of money which is proposed in the plan of the Secretary of the Interior in providing homes for the soldiers for the purpose of placing upon those lands soldiers alone. When his plan is proposed, and I have an opportunity to vote upon it or discuss it, I for one shall insist that while soldiers may be given preferential rights under the plan the other citizens of the United States shall have the right also to acquire homes from the Government of the United States and to repay to the Government of the United States the amounts expended for them, exactly as we people of the West are repaying every cent which you loan us for these irrigation projects.

This $50,000,000 is proposed to be returned and will be returned under the law, and it constitutes the first lien upon every acre of land under every project upon which one cent of the appropriation is expended, and no better security could be discovered in the United States. Lands that were absolutely worthless before the water is placed upon them, the day after the water runs through the ditches command a price of from $100 to $250 per acre or more. Then, by the expenditure of a few dollars of the money given as a loan you make valuable property which otherwise has no financial worth, no cash or credit value whatsoever; you create homes for the people of the United States, and they, in turn, create tax values for the support of the local governments and of the National Government of the United States; and then, upon the top of all this, they repay to you every cent of money which you loaned them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it not a fact that the terms on which these lands can be obtained are such as to bring them within the reach of men of limited means?

Mr. FALL. Why, of course, Mr. President. The men of limited means acquire the land at a nominal price, or simply as a homestead entry from the Government of the United States. It is for the benefit of the poor men that these irrigation projects have been constructed. It was for the purpose of making homes for the men who could not buy homes for themselves, exactly the same purpose that the Secretary of the Interior has in view in his magnificent projects for making homes on the cut-over lands of Wisconsin and the swamp lands of Florida.

Mr. President, to those of us who know and understand the conditions existing in the western part of this country, objections such as those made to-night appear preposterous. It is true that $50,000,000 a few years since would have been regarded as quite a large sum. It is true that when the Government loaned to these irrigation projects $20,000,000 in funds to be repaid it was regarded all over the rainfall area of the country as a great gift to the people of the West. It is true, as subsequent history shows, that it was no gift at all; that it was money expended upon the lands of the United States by the United States for the United States and for the people of the United States, to be sold to them. We ask nothing; we come here not as beggars. We have never retained in the State treasuries throughout the West hundreds of millions of dollars belonging to the public-school fund, as have the older States of the Union—money for which they have refused and still refuse to account. It is true that while you have loaned us $20,000,000 and we asked you to loan $100,000,000 more, the State of Massachusetts, the oldest State in the Union, has $28,000,000 which Andrew Jackson placed in their hands in 1836 and which now amounts at simple interest at 4 per cent to more than the entire amount, money belonging to public-land funds which under the law would go into this public-land fund and which you have refused to account for or for which you can not account. Now, we ask you, in justice to us, to loan us our own money.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, this debate is on an appeal from the ruling of the Chair on the point of order, as I understand it. While we have not been enlightened on the decision of the Chair, we have heard some facts that I wish, if I could, to impress more firmly on the minds of Senators.

The attitude, Senators, is simply this: The irrigation fund, by reason of the disjointed condition of our country for the last three or four years, has been almost entirely denuded of

money that would have flowed into it under normal conditions and met the very crisis that we are attempting to meet in the transfer of $50,000,000 under the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Be it known, as the Senator from New Mexico has well said, we who are advocating this are not mendicants begging for favors at the hands of the General Government or asking for one dollar of its money. Every dollar that has been paid by the people into the irrigation fund or every dollar donated by the Treasury to the irrigation fund is redeemable. It must be paid back. It stands as a first mortgage on every home benefited by the enterprise. It strikes me as being very far from that generosity of which we hear so much and see so little.

This is the greatest enterprise that has ever engaged the attention of the Senate, of domestic relations purely, the greatest that has or will face it in the next quarter of a century. It is the making of homes for the homeless, at no expense to the Government, by giving those who have nothing but brawn and muscle a chance to tie themselves to the land; and when we shall have done it your Bolshevism, your I. W. W.'ism, your socialism, and all this will pass away, when over every home in the country there is the flag of America maintained by an American citizen who loves his country and raises his family in the little home that belongs to him.

With that great purpose in view this $50,000,000 is a mere bagatelle, especially when it is an advance to be repaid by those who have been benefited by it. This applies only to those projects that have not been finished. It does not go into the general field of irrigation, but applies to those that have been stopped by reason of the war, by reason of which there was also a stopping of the fund on which they have always relied for the ultimate completion of these projects.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate a minute longer. I do hope that the point of order, that I myself do not believe to be well taken, will be overruled by the Senate.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I want to say only a word to supplement what has already been said. I realize that the question of the point of order is going to be decided largely upon the merits of the proposition. To my mind there is one very important point that has not been emphasized. I believe that this is a question of carrying out the good faith of the Government. When it became my official duty to look into the question of irrigation, the one thing which impressed me most was the lack of funds to carry out the implied promise and the good faith of the Government. Under existing law a small fund only is available. That fund must be appropriated by the Congress to the various projects.

In the early days of reclamation projects under the law, meeting with the approval of the various sections of the country, work started in nearly every one of the Western States. Under the law that was necessary to be done to carry out the spirit of the law. The projects were instituted; people were invited to come upon the projects and establish their homes. They were invited there to make their homestead entries. If private lands were involved, they were invited to mortgage those lands to the United States, usually through the method of conveying title or a mortgage to an irrigation district, and a contract of the irrigation district with the Government. These things were done years ago.

In 1913, when I first came in contact with these projects, the one great cry from every State in which there was a project was an appeal to the Government to complete the projects, so that they might reclaim the land and begin to get some return for the labor which had been put upon it and for the privations which thousands of them had endured. There was an appeal from every one of those projects for additional funds. Under the law it could not be done. All that Congress could do, all the Department of the Interior could do, was to allot the meager sum which was available to the fund as a part of the reclamation fund established by Congress. Those appeals were made. The land had been mortgaged, people are upon the land, and for all these years they have been appealing to Congress to finish the projects, to carry out the contract and the good faith of the Government, so that they might in some way avail themselves of the promise of the Government of the United States. I think the least reparation which we can make at this time is to provide funds now, so that these projects may be completed and the promise of the Government fulfilled.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, there is no doubt about the necessity of some accretion to the present reclamation fund. All appropriations are ostensibly grounded upon necessity, more or less acute. There is no doubt that the reclamation fund of the West will lag for some time to come in the absence of a fund obtainable elsewhere than from the sale of public lands. The reclamation act was made possible only by conditioning it upon the use of moneys derived from the sale of public lands in the several public-land States. It is the fund and the only fund which under the reclamation act can be so utilized.

If the question were merely one of necessity, I should be in perfect harmony with my associates from the public-land States regarding this subject; but, Mr. President, there are necessities for money from the Treasury in every direction. There are necessities for the money which the taxpayers need to pay their taxes into the Treasury, and, in my judgment, that to-day is the crying necessity of the hour. It certainly is with me, and I am not particularly worse off than are a great many of my friends.

All of these appropriations asked for, sooner or later, are grounded upon the theory that they are necessary to help the soldier. The need for helping the soldier is already the prolific source of raids upon the Treasury, and will continue to be. Do not misunderstand me. This is not a raid; this is a perfectly legitimate and meritorious effort to secure money for a needed purpose; but it is altogether wrong to say that we sent our soldiers across the bounding billows with the understanding that we would give them land when they returned. That is not the fact. We conscripted the soldier. We put a gun in his hand and told him to go, and he went. That is the fact about it. We have brought him home as soon as we could, and we are still engaged in that very laudable work.

Upon reflection, I think the ruling of the Chair is correct. It seems to me that the necessary result of this amendment is to change in very marked degree the existing reclamation statute. Of course, there is abundant ground for argument to the contrary, and there is much that is plausible in those arguments. Much as I want to see these reclamation projects continued, I can not be unmindful of the fact that other sections of the country are needing help, needing money; that other sections of the country have some portions of their communities in any other but a desirable situation. The precedent which we are about to set, considering the subject from a practical standpoint, will also be a subject of pause. Under these circumstances I shall vote to sustain the Chair.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not want to cavil about the rules of the Senate. I think we take up too much of the time in discussion—and I myself am guilty—about the rules; but I asserted a moment ago that the rules could be suspended by unanimous consent. A number of Senators—some sotto voce and some whose remarks went into the RECORD—said "It can not be done."

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator is right about it myself.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me read from Rule XL, a part of which reads:

> Any rule may be suspended * * * by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, Rule XII.

Clause 1 of Rule XII is as follows:

> 1. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

In other words, any rule of the Senate except clause 1 of Rule XII may be suspended by unanimous consent. I again renew my request for unanimous consent that the rules be suspended, so that the Senate may vote on this question, which, Mr. President, is supremely important.

Mr. DIAL. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. DIAL. Just a moment, please. I desire to state my position more in full.

I favor all legitimate enterprises in the United States; I have no ill will against the reclamation system at all; but my point is that the Government, as I understand, is now in no position to appropriate money for any such purpose as this. We all economized and did almost without the necessaries of life in order to buy Government bonds, and those bonds to-day are selling under par. I very much dislike to see the Government bonds selling under par, as I should to have my own note or that of anybody else sell under par.

The Government has no money except what it takes from the people by taxes or secures by the sale of bonds. It certainly seems to me that this enterprise could wait, when we could take up the matter generally and develop the whole territory at that time. I understand there will be a bill introduced in Congress to take care of the soldiers' settlements a little bit later on which will apply to the United States at large.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to say merely a word in reference to what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] has just said. It has not been very long since we passed

through the Senate and House of Representatives—and it is on this statute book and the money is being used—an appropriation of $10,000,000 to take care of the Mississippi River. That comes out of the General Treasury of the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he is not a little modest in his statement as to the amount appropriated for the Mississippi River? Is it not about $50,000,000 instead of $10,000,000? Forty-five million dollars, I think, is the amount, with $10,000,000 to be expended annually.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I believe that is it. That is not a loan; it comes out of the Treasury of the United States.

Now, let me call attention to what this proposition means. Every dam that is constructed across every stream in the Mississippi Valley, whose waters would otherwise get into the Mississippi River, holds back water that in the lower Mississippi would do damage, and we pay out of the Treasury of the United States, the funds of which are contributed by all of the people, the money to carry on that great undertaking. When a dam is built on a stream in Colorado or Wyoming or Montana the water is used for a useful purpose and is held back. Every gallon of the flood waters that such a dam holds back would do damage if it were permitted to flow on into the Mississippi River.

Not only is the damage on the Mississippi prevented, and the necessity of building levees and dams and other precautions to save the owners of real estate all through the lower Mississippi River Valley rendered unnecessary, but the water is used, where it is held back by the dam, to produce additional crops, to produce more food. In other words, the water is a benefit there, where it would be a damage if permitted to go on. So there is not very much difference in appropriating money out of the General Treasury to save the people who live along the lower Mississippi from damage and using the same money to hold back that water, which otherwise could do damage, where it originates and where it can be used for a useful purpose. There is only this difference: In this proposition the money is going to be paid back, while in the other proposition, where the money is used down along the lower Mississippi River, it never will be paid back; and there is no pretense of obligation to pay it back.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that when we come with this proposition, at a time particularly when everybody is crying for a lower cost of living, when we are trying to get people out of the city and on to the land, when all this waste land, which lacks only water, is producing nothing now, and the men and women of muscle and brawn are ready to put it to a useful purpose, it is not in very good grace for men who are using the money from the Federal Treasury, without any pretense of putting it back, to save themselves from damage, to object to holding this water back and having it do some good for mankind.

Mr. President, if there ever was a proposition contained in any scheme tending to reduce the cost of living, to put people on the farm, to release them from the overcrowded cities, and at the same time to employ for a useful purpose the very water which becomes the enemy of man a little later on, this is the proposition. No man denies that the security is ample; no one thinks for a moment that a penny of the money is going to be lost; and now, when there is a crying need for the means to put men on the farms, here is an opportunity to give it; here is an opportunity to make homes in the country, to increase production and decrease the cost of living for all the people.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the pending question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained upon the point of order that this amendment is general legislation? That it is general legislation, that the decision of the Chair is correct, is practically conceded by every Senator who has spoken upon this subject, with the exception of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. All of the debate has been upon the merits and not upon the question that is pending before the Senate, and I wish to say just a word with reference to the merits of the proposition.

There is no reason why the Senate should not consider this as an independent matter; there is no reason why the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands should not have reported it as a separate bill, in which case it would be found upon the calendar to-night, and if it had done so this bill could have been taken up next Monday and we would have had full opportunity to debate it and consider it upon its merits.

Now, what is the situation with reference to this appropriation on this bill? Even conceding the merits of it, which I do not propose to discuss, if this amendment should be adopted, if the rules of the Senate should be violated and the decision of the Chair overruled, it is certain that this $50,000,000 would go out of the bill in conference. There is not a Senator upon this floor who thinks for a moment that this $50,000,000 will remain in the sundry civil bill. The result is that the country next Monday morning, or to-morrow morning, if we shall complete the consideration of this bill to-night, will have the news conveyed to them that the Senate of the United States has no consideration for the Treasury, has no consideration for the taxpayer, and that the people of the United States must look alone to the House of Representatives for the protection of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senate had followed the method suggested by the Senator and brought in a separate bill appropriating $50,000,000 and it had passed, that would injure the Treasury exactly to the same extent, would it not, as though this method were pursued?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Then what becomes of the Senator's argument if he wants us to believe that if we had followed the other course we would get the $50,000,000?

Mr. LENROOT. Just this: The House of Representatives is entitled to consider an appropriation of $50,000,000 upon its merits, and because they will have no opportunity to consider it upon its merits, the conferees, of course, will not agree to this appropriation. Now——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. LENROOT. Just a moment. Conceding that the Senate would pass this in a separate bill, the House might or might not do so, but they would have an opportunity to consider the merits of the bill, as the Senator very well knows. He has been one of those who have objected as seriously as anybody to legislating by conferees to deprive either one House or the other from considering important questions upon their merits. Here he proposes a matter of $500,000,000 which the House will have no opportunity at this late date, as the Senator well knows, with the 1st of July beginning Monday night, to consider upon its merits.

Mr. NORRIS. Now will the Senator yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator know that this amendment to this bill, if it should be agreed to, would be just the same as every other amendment that the Senate has put on? If the Senator's theory is right, then the objection that he has made to this amendment applies to every other amendment that we have put on this bill. If I understand the rules of the House of Representatives—and I think the Senator himself, having recently come from that body, understands them and knows what I state to be the fact—when this bill goes to the House of Representatives, if the rules are followed, this particular item and every other item will, under those rules, be referred to a committee and will come up for debate in the House.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator knows just as well as I do, because he has been a Member of the House, as I have, that when this bill gets over to the House next Monday, with the fiscal year expiring at 12 o'clock Monday night, not one of these amendments will be referred to a committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Then at least this amendment is no worse than any other amendment that we have put on the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. I am not going to reply to that.

Mr. NORRIS. But will the Senator deny that under the rules of the House this amendment, together with all of the others, would, before it went to conference, be by the House referred to a committee?

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Wisconsin says, and the Senator from Nebraska will not deny, that in this particular case it will not, and he well knows the reason why it will not. The Senator asks, Will not every other amendment be in the same situation? Will the Senator point out any other amendment to the bill of this character?

There was one, the $10,000,000 appropriation for the Cape Cod Canal; but that went out on a point of order, very properly; and I think the Senator would have joined with me, if it had not gone out, in voting against it, because that amendment, like this, would not have been afforded any opportunity of being considered upon its merits. So much, Mr. President, for the merits of the proposition.

Now, I wish to say a word with reference to the rules of the Senate. I have been somewhat reluctant, being a new Member of this body, to say anything concerning a practice which seems to prevail in the Senate to a greater or less extent with respect

to complying with or following the rules which the Senate itself has made for its own guidance; but I am warranted, especially in a case of this kind, in saying a word upon that subject. It has been a great surprise to me as I have observed the proceedings of this body that while we do have rules for our guidance, rules that every Member from the moment he takes a seat in this body pledges himself as a Senator to be guided by and bound by, yet it is true that in matters of this kind the Senate has not always abided by the rules that it has made for itself; but it is seldom, indeed, if ever, that I have seen the Senate deliberately violate one of its own rules concerning which there can be no argument or debate; and that, Mr. President, the Senate must do if it reverses the decision of the Chair on the pending appeal.

The rules of the Senate provide that general legislation shall not be in order as an amendment to a general appropriation bill.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] a little while ago very frankly stated, and he was correct, that there was not the slightest question that this amendment was not in order under the rules of the Senate. I was sorry that the Senator from Arizona stated that in all probability, knowing that to be the fact, if called upon to vote, he would vote to reverse the Chair.

Mr. President, if we expect the people of this country to have respect for the laws of our land, it seems to me that Senators of the United States might well begin by having some respect for the rules that they have made for their guidance—rules that ought to be as binding upon the conscience of a Senator as the laws of the land are binding upon a citizen.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am rather surprised at the extreme position taken by the Senator. Is he not aware of the fact that the Senate, within the last day or two, has passed appropriation bills which contain legislation, in violation of the rules of the Senate? It was done by unanimous consent, was it not?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Was not that a violation of the rules of the Senate?

Mr. LENROOT. No, sir. The Senate can do anything by unanimous consent. It can suspend any rule that the Senate has by unanimous consent; but if anyone makes the point of order that the rules shall apply, the rules do apply.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator would more correctly say that the Senate can do nothing except by unanimous consent. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. That, also, is true; but, of course, the observation of the Senator from Nebraska has no bearing upon this subject, because when we permit legislation to go upon a bill by unanimous consent, that means that by unanimous consent the rule preventing it is suspended.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Exactly; but I wondered why the Senator was so solicitous for the sanctity of this rule of the Senate, when it has been notorious here that every Senator has been guilty of violating the rules in every appropriation bill that has been passed since we have been in session.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not admit that that is true.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Every time we do it by unanimous consent it means that we unanimously violate the rule that the Senator deems so sacred.

Mr. LENROOT. We do not violate the rule.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I will not yield any more. We do not violate the rule when, by unanimous consent, we say that a thing shall be done.

Mr. THOMAS. That is one of the rules.

Mr. LENROOT. That is one of the rules, that things may be done by unanimous consent, so we can not violate another rule; but whenever any Senator invokes the rule, it should apply.

Mr. President, just a word more. Being a comparatively new Member, I hesitate to say it, but I do say it—that the Senate is subject to criticism, and very severe criticism, for the practice that has gone on with reference to not following the rules of the Senate whenever a single Senator insists that they shall be followed. That is his right, recognized by the rules; and when a point of order is made, if the decision of the Chair is in accord with those rules, the Senate ought to stand by the decision of the Chair.

Why is it, Mr. President, that this body of precedents of parliamentary law has no standing anywhere as a series of rules for the guidance of any parliamentary body, while the rules in the other body stand as the very highest authority everywhere as parliamentary law? Because in that body a Member of the House would not think of reversing the decision of the Chair because he happened to think differently upon the merits of the question. I hope the time will come, and come speedily, when Senators will have some regard for the rules of the Senate; and when they do, business will be done in a more orderly way than it is at present. In this case, especially, I do hope that Senators who believe the Chair is correct in the ruling will not further violate the rule by voting to reverse it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] need not offer any apology for criticizing the Senate for what he deems its disregard for its rules because of his newness in the Chamber. If he does not do it while he is new, he never will do it at all. We have all been familiar with the experience through which the Senator from Wisconsin is passing. When I first came to the Senate, a number of years ago, I gave some consideration to the rules, and for a time I voted as I thought the rules indicated that I should; but when I found the old leaders voting according to the merits of the question rather than the rules, I finally weaned myself away from the proposition, as I have no doubt the Senator from Wisconsin will be able to do within the next year.

Mr. President, we have been putting on these different bills here in the Senate appropriations much larger than this for the last several days, all of which will go to the House and go through the same process that this amendment will have to go through if it is retained in the bill. In other words, the House will have just the same opportunity to pass upon these other appropriations as it will have to pass upon this appropriation; and so far as consideration upon the part of the House is concerned, undoubtedly as much consideration will be given to it as will be given to the appropriations which we added to the Army bill and to the naval bill, and they were very large.

Now, just a word in regard to the merits of this matter.

I do not think there has been any appropriation offered which has more merit than this particular amendment; for, as I said a moment ago, it is reaching a situation and dealing with a condition of affairs which has existed for a period of from five to eight years. The Senator says that this bill should have been brought here and placed upon the calendar and considered separately, and that we could have taken it up next Monday. Mr. President, we have been bringing bills of this nature here and putting them upon the calendar for the last four or five years. Mr. Lane, when he first became Secretary of the Interior, in the first report which he ever wrote as Secretary of the Interior—which, by the way, was one of the greatest reports ever made by the head of that department—recommended that this thing which we are now about to do should be done.

At that time the necessity existed. The people were upon the lands. They were asking for an opportunity to make their homes there and to build up the communities; and Mr. Lane several years ago, when he first became Secretary of the Interior, indorsed it.

Since that time a number of us have been advocating this proposition, and have had bills and amendments offered in different ways and in different methods that have not yet been successful. There are only six or seven or eight States at most that are interested in the reclamation of the arid lands, and it is a little bit difficult to get concerted action sufficient to get the bill before the Senate when such a small area of territory is concerned and so few Senators are interested in the proposition. I take it that in all probability the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] concluded that as this thing has been debated pro and con time and time again in this Chamber for the last six or seven years, and as it has been debated over and over again in the House upon its merits, every Senator and every Member of the House understands precisely all there is to the merits of the matter; and it can be passed upon in this manner, so far as the merits are concerned, just as well as if it were a separate bill and considered for a week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] By the sound the "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. BORAH. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on business of the Senate, but he has released me so that I can vote on this question. I vote "nay."

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). On this question I have agreed to pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KIRBY (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted in the absence of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MCCORMICK. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]. In the absence of my colleague [Mr. SHERMAN] I transfer my pair to that Senator and vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I wish also to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

The roll call resulted—yeas 24, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Capper	Kellogg	New	Stanley
Dial	Kenyon	Robinson	Sutherland
Gay	Keyes	Smith, Ga.	Thomas
Gerry	Kirby	Smith, S. C.	Underwood
Gronna	Lenroot	Smoot	Warren
Harris	McCumber	Spencer	Watson

NAYS—21.

Ashurst	Fall	Knox	Sheppard
Borah	France	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Harrison	McNary	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Norris	
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	
Elkins	Jones, Wash.	Poindexter	

NOT VOTING—51.

Ball	Hale	Myers	Sherman
Bankhead	Harding	Nelson	Shields
Beckham	Henderson	Newberry	Simmons
Brandegee	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Swanson
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Townsend
Curtis	King	Penrose	Trammell
Dillingham	La Follette	Phelan	Wadsworth
Edge	Lodge	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	McCormick	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	McLean	Pomerene	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Martin	Ransdell	Wolcott
Gore	Moses	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 24, the nays are 21. Three Senators are present and not voting. A quorum has not voted. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	Lenroot	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Gronna	McCormick	Smoot
Calder	Harris	McKellar	Spencer
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Stanley
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Thomas
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Elkins	Kenyon	Poindexter	Warren
Fletcher	Keyes	Robinson	
France	Kirby	Sheppard	
Gay	Knox	Smith, Ga.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. FALL entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. WATSON, Mr. GORE, and Mr. KING entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question recurs as to whether the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the Senate. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to my colleauge [Mr. NELSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the former vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. MCCORMICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]. I transfer my pair to my colleague [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair that I announced before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before in regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). In the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] I withhold my vote.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I wish also to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is necessarily absent.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 28, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Brandegee	Harris	Lenroot	Smoot
Capper	Kellogg	Lodge	Spencer
Dial	Kenyon	McCormick	Stanley
Gay	Keyes	New	Sutherland
Gerry	King	Robinson	Thomas
Gore	Kirby	Smith, Ga.	Trammell
Gronna	Knox	Smith, S. C.	Warren

NAYS—20.

Ashurst	Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent
Borah	Fall	Jones, Wash.	Poindexter
Calder	France	McKellar	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Sterling

NOT VOTING—48.

Ball	Cummins	Fernald	Harding
Bankhead	Curtis	Fletcher	Henderson
Beckham	Dillingham	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Cal.
Culberson	Edge	Hale	Johnson, S. Dak.

Kendrick	Newberry	Pomerene	Townsend
La Follette	Overman	Ransdell	Underwood
McCumber	Owen	Reed	Wadsworth
McLean	Page	Sherman	Walsh, Mass.
Martin	Penrose	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Moses	Phelan	Simmons	Watson
Myers	Phipps	Smith, Md.	Williams
Nelson	Pittman	Swanson	Wolcott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The following Senators are present and announced pairs:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]; and the Presiding Officer was present and declined to vote. The yeas have it; and the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber, about half past 7 o'clock, an amendment which I had prepared to offer to this bill was presented by the chairman of the committee and went out on a point of order made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I have since explained to the Senator from Utah what the situation is, and he has authorized me to say that he withdraws the point of order. I should like to have about one or two minutes in which to explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

Pittsburgh, Pa.: That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise a site for a new post-office building at Pittsburgh, Pa., at a cost not exceeding $950,000.

And that so much of section 18 of the public building act of March 4, 1913, as provided that the proceeds of the sale of the former unused post-office site in said city should be deposited in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt is hereby repealed; and the three paid installments of the purchase price of said former site, together with the interest on said purchase price heretofore paid, aggregating $761,-108.33, are hereby reappropriated and made available, together with the further sum of $188,891.67, which is hereby appropriated, for the acquisition of said new site under the above-stated limit of cost.

And that the remaining installment of the price of said former site, when paid, together with the interest thereon, shall be deposited in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, just as a matter of information and curiosity may I make a parliamentary inquiry to ascertain upon what point of order the amendment which has just been stated previously went out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant was not in the Chair when the point of order was made and does not recall the amendment. The point of order, the Chair is advised by the Secretary, was that the amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill, which point was sustained. Now the Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent, as the Chair understands, to offer the amendment, which, in the absence of objection, will be granted. The amendment is before the Senate and is open to a point of order if any Senator wishes to make it.

Mr. BORAH. I am not in the point-of-order business, but there are other Senators in the Senate who are.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I have not any doubt at all that if the point of order is made against this amendment it will go out. I am only asking for an opportunity to explain the amendment. It is not so dreadful as it sounds.

The same amendment was offered to the sundry civil bill last March, and after explanation the point of order which was then made against it was withdrawn and the amendment was allowed to go in.

The circumstances are simply these: In 1906 the Government bought a site for a new post office in the city of Pittsburgh, for which it paid $1,000,000, I think. The site was badly chosen, and the Government declined to construct the building upon the site. In 1913 an act was passed authorizing the sale of that site for a sum of not less than $750,000. The act provided that the proceeds of the sale of that site should be expended in the purchase of another site. The property sold for $950,000. The Government then took an option on a very well located site in the center of the city, which it managed to get at the same price—$950,000. By the act of 1913 the payments were authorized to be made for the new site, but unfortunately authorization is not appropriation. The Comptroller of the Currency ruled that the proceeds of the old site were paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous items; and there they have remained ever since. The option on the new site expires next November; and this amendment simply permits that to be done which by the act of 1913 was provided to be done, but which was not done because of the wording of the act. That is the whole situation.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. This means, then, no additional expense?

Mr. KNOX. Absolutely not a penny.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment which does not involve any appropriation; it does not involve the Government in any expense whatever; but it helps the State of Washington in a matter wherein it needs the assistance of the National Government.

The situation is this: Congress has donated to the State University of Washington certain lands; it has also donated to the State for school purposes certain other lands. In the enabling act, however, there is a provision that those lands shall not be disposed of for less than $10 an acre and at public auction. The State university desires to establish a forestry experiment station; and in order to do so and to get the proper site, an exchange of other school lands in the State for university lands is necessary to be made. That can not be done on account of the limitation of the enabling act. The amendment which I propose simply gives the consent of Congress to this exchange. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert in the proper place in the bill the following:

For the purpose of securing an area of lands suitable for a demonstration forest and forest experiment station for the University of the State of Washington the consent of Congress is hereby granted the board of regents of the University of the State of Washington, and the State of Washington, acting through its properly constituted authorities, to exchange lands heretofore granted to the State of Washington by act of Congress approved February 22, 1889, for the purpose of a university in said State, or lands by said act granted to the State of Washington "for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions," and thereafter by the State of Washington in part apportioned for the use and support of the University of Washington, for an area of equal value to be chosen and agreed upon out of lands heretofore granted to said State by said act of Congress for the support of common schools, whether heretofore or hereafter formally selected or patented under the laws of the United States. Lands so acquired by the State of Washington for the common schools and lands so acquired for the use of the State university shall be subject to the same restrictions and conditions as to sale and disposal as were imposed upon the lands originally granted by the act of Congress approved February 22, 1889, to the State of Washington for the use of the common schools and the State university, respectively.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Washington if it is necessary to enact this legislation? As I understand the language of the amendment he now offers, these are State lands not public lands.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They are not public lands; they are school lands. The necessity for the amendment, I will say to the Senator, is this: These lands were granted to the State for school purposes by Congress, and in the enabling act it is provided that they shall not be disposed of for less than $10 an acre, and at public auction.

Mr. GRONNA. As I understood the language of the Senator's amendment, it is for the exchange of lands.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what it is.

Mr. GRONNA. Why can not a valuation of $10 be placed on the lands which the university owns?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Because of the further provision that they must be disposed of at public auction at not less than $10 an acre. If that provision were not in the act, probably what the Senator suggests could be done.

Mr. GRONNA. This amendment is subject to a point of order, but I shall not make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, while the Senate is in a good-natured mood and has ceased to be technical and is not rejecting amendments on points of order where the object is known to be meritorious, I want to offer an amendment that comes under a similar category as the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]; one that is clearly subject to a point of order, as to which there can not be any doubt, but which possesses a great deal of merit and which has been previously adopted, as it ought to have been adopted. I am going to present an amendment that will contain, in my judgment, more merit than the amendment offered by the

Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. To begin with, as I have stated, I concede it is subject to a point of order, but it will appeal in its justice to every Senator's sense of fairness.

The Tariff Commission has a great many employees, just as the Agricultural Department and all the other departments have. I was dumbfounded to learn since we began the consideration of this bill—and I think all other Senators were—that the employees of the Tariff Commission were left out of the provision which was added to one of the appropriation bills for the coming fiscal year, by which an increase of salary was granted to nearly all of the employees of the United States; so that at the present time a stenographer working for the Tariff Commission will get only a certain salary, while a stenographer working in the Department of Agriculture or in the Navy Department or in some of the other departments, drawing the same salary, doing the same work, of the same ability, having passed the same examinations, in all respects equal, will get the increase in salary and the other will not. I have an idea that very few Senators knew—I do not believe that Members of the House know—that the particular provision that gave an increase of salary to all the other employees of the Government does not apply to the employees of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. I assume the Senator wants to be correct. There is a large percentage of workers in the employ of the United States to whom it does not apply.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; there are some temporary organizations where we thought it was best not to have it apply.

Mr. WARREN. There are organizations where the salaries paid are equal to the salaries paid those to whom the bonus of $240 does apply. That matter has been very carefully examined. In connection with a bill considered not long ago there were a half dozen amendments suggested from different classes of employees, all making the representation that it took that much to make them even with other employees of the Government; but they were mistaken, and of course the amendments went out, as the Senator says, on points of order.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will not say that applies to the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WARREN. So far as I know, it does.

Mr. NORRIS. So far as I know, it does not. I may be mistaken and, of course, the Senator may be mistaken; but I asked a member of the commission about it when I found that out and was told that that discrepancy existed. I learned on the floor while this bill was under consideration from one of the Senators in open debate that he went with one of the commissioners to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, called one of the members of the committee out, and wanted to explain to him that there was a difference and that the employees of the Tariff Commission were discriminated against, but he was told that not only were the employees of that commission discriminated against but that the whole commission was wiped off the face of the map.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Are not these employees paid out of lump-sum appropriations?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Can not the commissioners, then, fix the salaries to suit themselves?

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that the salaries of the employees of the commission are fixed in accordance with the salaries paid other employees of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Then the increase for which the Senator asks will practically be an increase of the appropriation for the Tariff Commission, which is now fixed at $300,000?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not understand that it will change the appropriation at all.

Mr. THOMAS. The money has got to come from some source other than the $300,000, if the increase is granted.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not understand that that is true.

Mr. WARREN. It is perfectly plain, because the Tariff Board has a lump-sum appropriation and fixes its own salaries for its own employees, exactly as several other commissions do. Now, as to one of the commissioners coming and calling a Senator out of the committee, I wish the Senator would name him. I have heretofore stated that I knew nothing of that.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know who the Senator was who was called out, but that was stated on the floor of the Senate this afternoon; that is all I know about it.

Mr. WARREN. As chairman of the committee I know nothing of that occurrence. Has the Senator a list of those employees and the amounts received by each?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have not had time to get any list or anything else; I only learned here since the debate began that that discrimination exists.

Mr. WARREN. If it does exist, it is the fault of the commission, because it was in their power to fix the salaries. The Senator must credit me with the knowledge that they are not on the list of statutory employees, with fixed compensation, but are paid by the commission.

Mr. NORRIS. There are a great many employees paid from lump sums who do get the increased compensation. The lump-sum proposition is not what determines whether they get the increase or not.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator mention some of them?

Mr. NORRIS. I will read the law if the Senator questions it. I have it here.

Mr. WARREN. Whenever they receive the $240 bonus it is to make their salaries equal to the salaries of those on the statutory rolls.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us see, since the Senator is questioning my word about it.

Mr. WARREN. I am not questioning the Senator's word.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator say that every employee paid under a lump-sum appropriation does not get the increase provided in the bonus provision?

Mr. WARREN. I did not say that. I said that where bureaus and commissions are run under lump-sum appropriations they are usually authorized to fix their own salaries. Some of the commissions or bureaus, such as the War Risk Insurance Bureau, came to the committee, and in taking up the law and trying to arrange matters for their employees they wanted to know whether they should have the $240 or not, so that they could arrange their salaries accordingly.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not help that; that has nothing to do with what I am saying.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator should not accuse me of questioning his word; I do not question his word but his information.

Mr. NORRIS. I say that from reading of the law. That is not hearsay; I have read it. My judgment may be bad; I know my education is poor, my advantages have not been very great, and I may be wrong in my construction, but I have the law here, and I say that, according to my judgment of what the law says, it does not depend upon a lump-sum appropriation in order to determine whether an employee gets the increase or whether he does not, and I will read the provision.

Mr. WARREN. If the law provides for it, will the Senator say why they do not receive it now? If the law provides for it, what is it and who is it that denies to those men this increase?

Mr. NORRIS. I will show the Senator. If it had been the Senator from Pennsylvania that was offering this just amendment, I have not any idea that there would have been so much criticism about it; but the Senator does not let me even get far enough either to read the law or to read my amendment before he jumps at the conclusion that there is something wrong about it.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator——

Mr. NORRIS. There the Senator goes again. All right; I will yield.

Mr. WARREN. So that the Senator shall not be disappointed if he expects a point of order, I will say to the Senator that I will make the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I did not say that I expected a point of order. The Senator is misquoting me. I hope he did not do it intentionally. I did not say that. I said that I admitted that it was subject to a point of order, and I did that because the Senator from Pennsylvania, to begin with, said that he admitted that his amendment was subject to a point of order, and that is undoubtedly true.

Mr. WARREN. I apologize to the Senator, and now I say that I will make the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. That demonstrates again the injustice of the chairman when he comes to apply anything to me. He announces in advance that he is going to make a point of order against an amendment that he has never heard.

Mr. WARREN. Well, what has the Senator been doing for the last half hour?

Mr. NORRIS. I have not read the amendment, principally because of the interruptions of the chairman of the committee. Now, if the chairman is through with his interruptions, I will read the law, and then I will have the Secretary read the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the Senator will proceed.

Mr. NORRIS. Under a provision attached to the legislative appropriation bill approved March 1, 1919, making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there was a provision for increasing the civilian employees of the United

States Government, and in section 7 it provides what that increase shall be. That is a long section, and I will not read that part of it. Then, in the second paragraph of the section, there is a provision making exceptions to the rule that is provided in the beginning, and here is the exception:

The provisions of this section shall not apply to the following—

Here they are:

Employees paid from the postal revenues and sums which may be advanced from the Treasury to meet deficiencies in the postal revenues; employees of the Panama Canal on the Canal Zone; employees of the Alaskan Engineering Commission in Alaska; employees paid from lump-sum appropriations in bureaus, divisions, commissions, or any other governmental agencies or employments created by law since January 1, 1916, except that employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance shall receive increased compensation at one-half the rate allowed by this section for other employees.

That is all of the section that it is necessary for me to read to give an understanding of what I want to explain. In other words, the employees of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, while they are paid from a lump sum, and while that bureau was organized and constituted since January, 1916, nevertheless are permitted to get one-half of the increase. If the lump-sum proposition decided it, then they could have said, "Why you are paying your employees from a lump sum." What difference does it make? There are dozens of appropriations in every appropriation bill in which employees are paid from lump sums. They are in this bill—old employees. They are in the Agricultural bill. It is not a very good way to legislate. We try to get away from it as much as possible, but we never have, and probably to some extent we never will.

The Tariff Commission was brought into existence by an act that was approved on the 8th day of September, 1916, and that is the reason why the employees of the Tariff Commission did not get the benefit of this increased salary. The lump sum is used in the statute that I have read, but they must be paid from lump sums and by a bureau or commission that has been organized by law since January 1, 1916; and that date, and not the lump sum, is what cuts off these employees.

Now, Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment, and submit it to the tender mercies of the chairman of the committee. Before the Secretary reads it, however, there is one other thing that I want to refer to that I know will be interesting to the committee—another thing that I did not know about until it had been approved.

On page 190 in the particular bill that we have before us now there is a committee amendment that has been agreed to; and, out of the tenderness of the hearts of the Senators, although the amendment submitted by the committee was subject to a point of order, it was not made, because Senators, I suppose, considered the amendment just, and they did not want to take a technical advantage. Now, here is what it says, and it comes from this committee:

That the chauffeurs who drive the cars of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President of the United States are hereby declared to be employees of the United States and entitled to the $240 per annum additional compensation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

I submit, Mr. President, that if the great city of Pittsburgh can get justice here by making a good case, and avoid a technicality, and if the chauffeurs of the Vice President and the Speaker are declared by the Senate to be employees of the Government, commencing perhaps yesterday, away after January 1, 1916, and paid out of a lump sum—if they are to get the $240 increase, then I submit that the hard-working, patriotic employees working for the Tariff Commission ought to have the same justice and the same privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The SECRETARY. On page 56, at the end of line 7, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the employees of the Tariff Commission shall be entitled to the increased compensation provided for civilian employees of the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in section 7 of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, approved March 1, 1919, notwithstanding said Tariff Commission was created since January 1, 1916.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the amendment is clearly legislation. It has not been estimated for. It has not been presented by any committee, and it is presumably changing the salaries that those men are receiving according to law, because no department would change the salaries of any of its employees provided by law, so, of course, it must be changing the law.

I make the point of order on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 121, after line 21, it is proposed to insert:

Kennewick extension, Yakima project, Wash.: For investigations, commencement of construction, and incidental operation, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase, maintenance, repair, hire, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn vehicles, and for all other expenses there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be reimbursed upon the terms and conditions specified in the reclamation act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat., 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, known as the reclamation law, the period of repayment, penalties, and conditions thereof being those specified in sections 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 12 of the act approved August 13, 1914 (36 Stat., 686), known as the reclamation extension act, $250,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, this amendment is an item that was estimated for by the department. In fact, the amendment is in the language of the estimate. It provides for beginning the extension of one of the oldest and one of the most successful reclamation projects which the Government has undertaken. The matter, in another form, was submitted to the committee; but I suggest to the chairman of the committee that this amendment contains certain provisions which were not submitted to the committee expressly making the amount reimbursable to the Government. I want to state further that it will be also for the relief of an emergency that exists, created by a shortage of water in the district which is already established, and in which the orchards have already been developed.

I have filed with the committee, and have here, and ask to have incorporated in my remarks in the RECORD, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior urging this appropriation.

I very much hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the letter referred to by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 24, 1919.

Hon. MILES POINDEXTER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of June 19: With our regular estimates last fall we submitted one for the appropriation of $250,000 for the Kennewick extension. This was submitted in general terms and did not specify the emergency repairs you mention or other particular work, but we had those in mind at the time.

On account of the small balance in the reclamation fund it was necessary to submit this estimate, if at all, as one for appropriation from the general fund. This we did, and similar items were submitted for a number of other projects. All of these the Appropriations Committee eliminated, so that the item for the Kennewick extension was not contained in the sundry civil bill, which was reported and failed of enactment at the last session; nor do I find it in the bill now pending, for which the same estimates were the basis.

I regret this, as I would be glad to see provision made for commencing work on the Kennewick extension on account of the valuable new land that would thus be brought under irrigation, and on account of the relief it would mean to the present farmers there who are dependent on an expensive and somewhat precarious system of supply.

Cordially, yours,

ALEXANDER T. VOGELSANG,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, is the Senator able to say that that is an estimate through the Treasury Department in the regular form?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am. In fact, the Secretary reads from a page of the Book of Estimates.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, if the Secretary of the Interior has a letter of estimate, that would not be an estimate in the sense that I mean. I am speaking of the estimate required by law and our rule, which of course is from the Secretary of the Treasury, as the Senator knows.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; this is from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator has that estimate, as the estimate of the department, in proper form, I am not going to object to the item going in, and will let it go to conference.

Mr. LENROOT and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, and then I will yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I wanted to ask if this is paid out of a special fund?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is paid out of the Treasury, to be reimbursed by the landowners under the reclamation law.

Mr. LENROOT. Then it is not in the same category as the appropriations for other projects in the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not familiar with the different items which the Senator has in mind, but the appropriation is out of the Treasury, to be reimbursed, however, under the reclamation law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to know if I understand the situation correctly. As I understand, this appropriation is asked to extend a project that has not already been taken over by the Government as a reclamation project, but at some time in the future it is understood that the Government will take over this part of the irrigation canal and make it a reclamation project.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is not exactly correct

Mr. SMOOT. Then, will the Senator state just what it is?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. The exact situation is this—that the project to which this is attached has not only already been adopted, but it has been very largely developed. This is an extension of that project, to which the Government is committed, and which under the law and under the policy of the law should be developed to its full extent. It is not a new project. It is an extension of an old project.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but the extension part of this project has not been taken over by the Government as yet. In other words, the money that has already been spent on this project has been spent by private parties.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken about that. There is, in the vicinity where this extension of the Government project is to be, a private project; but the Government is not taking that over, and this has nothing to do with that. It is to take the place of that. That will be absorbed by the existing Government project when it is extended into that community.

Mr. SMOOT. That is about what I thought it was, with the exception that this very part here was to make improvements so as to go into the project of the individual, and then become a reclamation project; but up to the present time that has not been taken over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator is somewhat confused on the situation. The amendment which I offer, as I stated before, is taken from a page of the Book of Estimates, which was submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, which was submitted to him by the Secretary of the Interior, providing for the extension of the Kennewick extension of the Yakima project. It has nothing whatever to do with any private project.

Mr. SMOOT. I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Yakima project in the State of Washington is provided for in this bill with an appropriation of $353,000. Every project that has been taken over by the Reclamation Service is provided with an appropriation in the bill. For this extension, so-called, of the Yakima project there is no appropriation, nor has there ever been in the past an appropriation for it. Is not that true?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There has never been an appropriation for this extension, but there have been many appropriations for the project of which it is an extension.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not a new project. It is an extension of an old project.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should like to ask the Senator whether the particular project for which he is asking this appropriation has ever been taken over as a part of the Government project to which the Senator from Utah alludes?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think what the Senator has in mind is an existing private project where the orchards exist now. That has never been taken over and this amendment does not provide for taking it over. This amendment, prepared by the Reclamation Service and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and sent here in the Book of Estimates, relates solely to the extension of a Government project. It has no relation whatever to any private project except that it extends into the community where the private project exists and will supplant the private project under the arrangements provided in the reclamation law in such cases.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is any of the land to be reached by the appropriation which the Senator now asks subject to a return of the money?

Mr. POINDEXTER. All of it will be subject to it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I know; but is it under the law at this time subject to return?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is when the project is extended to the land. It is not subject to it until the Government reclamation project reaches it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. For the information of the Senator—and it will only take a moment—I will state that I am in sympathy with every one of these projects if we can have them carried out. I have demands on me every day, and so have other western Senators, asking for money for particular projects. If the Government comes to the rescue even by the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, the question will arise before every one of us interested in these projects, and we will find great difficulty in the fact that we can not in matters that affect private lands expect Congress to put up the money every time it is asked for. The result will be disappointment of many, and to the very great dissatisfaction of many of us, who know that the demands of our constituents will be constantly met by that sort of thing.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate that; and I know the Senator——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection to the amendment, but I am afraid that ultimately we may hurt the proposition we are all working for if we do it at any time except when it is involved directly in an accepted project of the Government.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the case here, if the Senator please, and I agree with him entirely. I would not ask for a dollar of appropriation for a private project. This has no relation and makes no mention of a private project, and the money can not be used for any purpose except that which it is appropriated for, and that is expressed in the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator, with reference to this particular project, where it differs from the other projects that are appropriated for in the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It does not differ from them in any way that I know of.

Mr. NORRIS. If that is true, why should there be an appropriation out of the Treasury rather than out of the reclamation fund for this project and not for any of the others?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not sure but that there are appropriations out of the Treasury for others.

Mr. NORRIS. No; all these other appropriations come out of the reclamation fund. I submit this proposition to the Senator. I would be glad to favor any honest plan by which a worthy reclamation project could be advanced, and I favor the loan of $50,000,000 to the reclamation fund for that reason. But if the Senator has a reclamation proposition just like all the other reclamation propositions in the bill, it would be manifestly unfair for us to appropriate money out of the Treasury for that project and not pay any money out of the Treasury for any of the other projects. Does this project, I will ask the Senator, get any of the reclamation fund in the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. This extension of the project does not get it. There is an appropriation in the bill as follows:

> Yakima project, Washington: For operation and maintenance, continuation of construction, and incidental operations, $353,000.

That is for maintenance and continuation of construction of extensions upon which work has already begun.

Mr. NORRIS. I take it that under that language the money can be used for any extension of the project itself in so far as the money may be sufficient. I am impressed with what the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] says. I do not want to do any injustice here. At the same time I want to treat all the reclamation projects on the same basis. If the committee that has charge of it does not know about this, I should like to have some further explanation. It seems the committee is willing to accept it and not make any point of order against it, but if this proposition is not proper to be appropriated for out of the reclamation fund the same as the others, why is it not? Why have not the committee appropriated for it out of the reclamation fund the same as the others, if it is a Government proposition?

Mr. JONES of Washington. If my colleague will permit me, I think I can explain the situation, because I am thoroughly acquainted with this project. The Yakima project, used in the sense in which the Reclamation Service uses those terms, embraces a large territory traversed by the Yakima River with its tributaries. The reclamation of these various land projects is carried on by units, the project being divided into several different units and taken up one at a time. Under the reclamation act certain units of this project have been taken up already, and the $353,000 that is in the bill is to carry on work in connection with the units already actually taken up. The lands in what is called the Kennewick extension embraced in the amendment of my colleague are lands that are a part of the Yakima project constituting a separate unit that has not yet been taken up, and it is the purpose of this amendment to make the money available to take up that unit of the Yakima project.

Mr. NORRIS. To take money out of the Federal Treasury to do it and not out of the reclamation fund?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is the language of my colleague's amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say, if the Senator will permit me, that every reclamation project, I think, in the United States of any great consequence has different units.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I feel bound to make a point of order against this amendment. It has been considered

thoroughly by the committee. All the reclamation projects have been appropriated for out of the reclamation fund and this is an appropriation out of the Treasury and is new legislation. Therefore I make the point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Is there discussion on the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am very sorry the Senator from North Carolina proposes to make a point of order. I myself do not believe the point of order is well taken. I know the necessity of undertaking this project and I very much hoped we could get this appropriation. Of course, I realize that the Senate has just decided by a yea-and-nay vote a proposition that is on all fours with it, and under that decision the point of order may be well taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist that the statement of the point of order is not correct, so far as this amendment is concerned?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I insist that it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is just in line with the question decided on a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the facts here are in line with those involved in the other amendment, it is subject to a point of order. If the Senator will read it, I think the reading of the amendment shows that fact. Whatever the Senator has to say on the matter, the Chair will hear before the ruling is made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Without reading the entire amendment, but stating it in substance, it is for the maintenance, repair, and construction of Kennewick extension of the Yakima project, and appropriates money out of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To be reimbursed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. To be reimbursed. It is identical with every other item of the bill appropriating money for reclamation projects, with the exception that it appropriates money out of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have had a pretty thorough discussion of that particular point. If it appropriates money out of the Treasury instead of out of the reclamation fund——

Mr. POINDEXTER. It does not propose any general legislation. I understand that the rule prohibits general legislation being attached to an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds the point of order is well taken if the fact is that the money is proposed to be appropriated out of the Treasury instead of the reclamation fund, which I understand is the case.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I submit the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 10 insert the following:

Washington, D. C., Archives Building: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of section 21 of the public-buildings act approved March 4, 1913, directing him to purchase the site for an archives building, approved by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Interior, $486,000; for working drawings in accordance with the plans prepared by the Supervising Architect and approved as by law provided, $10,000; in all, $496,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will state my remembrance and what knowledge I have regarding this and submit it to the Senate. Some years ago by law we provided for what we called a storage of documents building, later called an archives building. We obtained the land at a low price and prices advanced. We were unable to get the money appropriated to build a building, and later on the Interior Department appropriated that block and built a large, elegant building that is now occupied by the Secretary of the Interior and his force. Later a law was passed—I do not have it with me and I am not entirely familiar with it—authorizing a building for the archives, and the Secretary of the Treasury in a regular way has estimated for this lot at the price named, and I think that the department have an option on it. The department also asks for several hundred thousand dollars to build a building. Of course I am sorry that we have to expend the money connected with that fund, but the matter the Senate is asked for is in the condition I have stated, as I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for a division, and in that connection I would like to make just a brief statement.

This is not asking for any new legislation. It is asking for an appropriation to carry out legislation that has already been enacted. In fact, legislation has been enacted providing not only for the purchase of land but for the construction of the building. This appropriation is simply to carry out the authorization for the purchase of land, postponing the erection of the archives building to some future time.

I do not know whether Senators who voted against this appropriation are familiar with the needs of the Government for a place to store archives or not, but every department of the Government is cluttered with the documents and papers which are accumulating from governmental business, and which have assumed such bulk that it is absolutely impossible to store them in a way in which they are available for use or in which they can be properly preserved. The most valuable documents of the Government, of inestimable value, are stored in attics and cellars, where they are being destroyed by heat and by dampness, where they are subject to fire, and in many instances have been lost by fire, and the offices of the Government are occupied by accumulated paper for which there is no other storage place, and which ought to be available for occupancy by the employees.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator yield for an interruption?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator may recall that about a year ago, after a resolution introduced by me in the Senate, an examination was made of the State, War, and Navy Building, and if he had carefully examined the report made to the Senate as a result of that inquiry, accompanied as it was by a report from the United States Board of Fire Underwriters, he would have observed that the board of fire underwriters stated that the vast quantity of valuable documents stored in the State, War, and Navy Building was exposed to great danger from fire. The board of fire underwriters urged that steps be taken at once to construct some such building as the Senator has proposed, to take care of these valuable papers. All the accumulations since the Government began, as the Senator states, are stored in these buildings. I know of my own personal knowledge, because it happens to be my own business, and I looked at these buildings, that we are running great risk every day, and some precaution ought to be taken in this respect. I am glad the Senator introduced his amendment and hope the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The United States is the only Government of any importance that I know of, even including our county governments, to say nothing of the State governments, and certainly not excluding foreign governments of any importance, which has not provided a building for the storage of its archives. The United States Government alone, with the great history which it has and the invaluable record of its wars, its business, its public lands, its Geological Survey, its War and Navy Departments, has no place for the orderly storage of its documents in a fireproof building arranged in such a way that they will be not only safe from destruction but available for use.

Congress has recognized the need of such a building, has authorized its construction, and in pursuance of the authority of law the officials of the Government have proceeded under the law to acquire the property and have acquired an option on it, and I may say they have made a very good bargain. They acquired an option on the property at its valuation for taxation purposes. The taxes are somewhat lower, I believe, than the estimated value, but adding the ordinary proportion to the taxable valuation to ascertain what the value is, it amounts to what they are able to buy the property for. I am very much in hopes that the Senate will not insist on its objection to the execution of the law under the authority which has already been granted.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk in lieu of the committee amendment which is found on pages 127 and 128. Objection was made to that amendment this afternoon by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] because it was too broad and comprehensive. The amendment has been redrafted to meet the objections of the Senator from Oregon, and I ask that the Secretary state it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a new amendment, the other amendment having been declared out of order?

Mr. KING. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 127, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

FOR THE DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL EXTENSION, BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

For the acquirement and conservation of motion-picture films and lantern slides in possession of the Government, particularly those made and procured during the war, and to enable the Division of Educational Extension to distribute the same to the States for educational purposes, $50,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask if that amendment is subject to a point of order?

Mr. KING. I am not so sure about that. It was reported by the committee, and the Senator from Oregon made objection to it. The Chair, as I recall, sustained the point of order.

Let me make one observation, with respect to the amendment. The Government has expended several million dollars in securing films, acquiring pictures, and so forth. Those are now dumped into the Interior Department. They have to be salvaged, and, by a proper handling of them, the Government may save a considerable sum besides materially advancing the cause of education. A committee is now at work upon this important task, and it has been felt that they ought to be permitted to conclude their labors.

I have no particular interest in the matter, but it seems to me, under all of the circumstances and from the investigation which I have made, that this is a very judicious and proper appropriation; and it cuts down the appropriation reported by the committee by $25,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am glad to see the Senator from Utah returning to the fold. The Senator this morning objected so quickly to this amendment as reported by the committee that he did not give me an opportunity to explain exactly what he has now explained. I am glad to see him appreciate the amendment, and I hope it may be adopted.

Mr. KING. It was the Senator from Oregon who made the objection to the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Well, the Senator from Utah will remember that he first made the point of order and then asked that the amendment might go over.

Mr. KING. That was a day or two ago, before I was informed concerning its merits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think this amendment is subject to a point of order, and I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota makes the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the Senator from South Dakota makes the point of order on the amendment, I wish to call attention to the fact that this appropriation has been regularly estimated for, and it has been reported by a standing committee of the Senate. On what ground does the Senator hold that a point of order will lie against it?

Mr. STERLING. I suppose it is general legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; it is not general legislation. There has been absolutely no legislation whatever in regard to this object for which we are appropriating; there has been no former legislation upon it. I simply suggest that for the consideration of the Chair.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just a word. This is an appropriation for money to be expended by the Bureau of Education, as I understand. Last March we appropriated $187,600 to be expended by the Bureau of Education for a number of activities. Not longer ago than March 1, I think, the bill was approved. I am interested in noting the activities of the Bureau of Education and how they have been extended over the activities allowed under the original act creating that bureau. Those activities have been multiplied, I think, nearly a hundredfold. Under the original act creating the Bureau of Education they were simply empowered to gather and to disseminate statistics and information with regard to education.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from South Dakota permit an interruption?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. KING. I agree exactly with all that the Senator from South Dakota has said, and I have been opposing the unwarranted activities of that organization. If the Senator will notice, however, the amendment which I have offered, he will see that it curbs that organization and limits this appropriation to a bureau which handles the appropriation and not the educational bureau, which, I think, has exceeded the limitations of the act of Congress. This amendment has been expressly drawn so as to keep the money out of the hands of some of those who, in my opinion, have been exceeding their authority.

Mr. STERLING. I understood the Senator to say, in answer to my question, that the matter came under the Bureau of Education.

Mr. KING. It does; but the money is to be expended by this divisional extension agency of the bureau, and it is to expend it purely for this purpose: For the salvage and distributing these two or three million dollars worth of films which are now in the Interior Department and which will be lost by deterioration unless they are speedily taken care of. I concur, however, in the criticism which the Senator from South Dakota is urging against the activities of some branches of that organization.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, under the statement made by the Senator from Utah with regard to the use of this fund and how it is to be employed, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to make an inquiry with regard to this amendment. Is this the same amendment that once before went out on a point of order?

Mr. KING. This is a different amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator from Utah himself made the point of order against this amendment several days ago when it was a committee amendment, and that the amendment went out. Is that correct?

Mr. KING. Several days ago when this bill was first under consideration a number of Senators who were not here suggested that reservation be made as to some particular items. I was making reservations with respect to a number of items without being familiar with them, and this was among the number.

Mr. NORRIS. Where was the amendment, then? How does it happen that the Senator was making a reservation against it if it were not in the bill in some form?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah objected to the amendment and it went over, but was taken up later, when, as the Senator stated, another Senator made a point of order against the amendment and it went out.

Mr. NORRIS. The amendment went out, and now it is here again?

Mr. KING. Oh, yes; but it is in a modified form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, by request of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], who writes me a letter hoping that I will take this action, I send to the desk an amendment, with a telegram from the Senator from Oklahoma, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 28, 1919.*

Senator A. B. FALL,
United States Senate, Washington:

Please present for me McMurray amendment sundry civil bill, and oblige.

R. L. OWEN.

Mr. FALL. I ask that the amendment now be read, and I desire to make a statement of about one minute in reference to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the proper place in the bill the following:

That chapter 8, Laws of 1918, page 583, third paragraph, in line 16 of said paragraph, after the words "United States," be amended by inserting the following:

"And with jurisdiction also to hear, consider, and adjudicate any and all other claims or demands by or against either party to said litigation, to the end that a complete and final adjustment may be had between said parties as to outstanding matters of controversy or account between them: *Provided*, That nothing in this amendment shall be construed to include Choctaw-Chickasaw coal contracts or contracts with reference to the leased district, nor contracts relating to proceeds arising from the sale of timberlands unallotted or other lands."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, from the office of the Senator from Oklahoma a memorandum was handed me to this effect: By the act referred to in the amendment I. F. McMurray was authorized to bring suit with restriction limited to professional services in certain cases against the Choctaw Nation. In court defendant brings in defenses and offsets involving other claims and demands, and this amendment is to put both parties on same basis. It is not a claim against the United States.

The amendment has been submitted to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and the proviso of the amendment itself was suggested by that Senator. I have been informed by the members of the committee that there is no objection to the amendment, while it is, of course, clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. WARREN. The amendment is with regard to Indian matters, and I generally look for advice in reference to those matters to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs [Mr. CURTIS]. I have no objection to the amendment if the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs has not.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, when the matter covered by the amendment was brought to my attention I asked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in reference to the right to interpose offsets and counterclaims in such cases, and he said he thought that all claims should be settled in this suit. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the amendment. I do not know anything about its merits, except as I have stated to the Senate.

Mr. FALL. I may say further that upon the memorandum handed me from the office of the Senator from Oklahoma it was suggested that I see the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I immediately adopted that suggestion and consulted him before offering the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to the proviso that it was added at the instance of Representative CARTER, who has until recently been chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, and is a member of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians. He advised me to the effect that he thinks the proviso in all probability sufficiently protects the rights of the Indians. He expressed regret that the matter could not go over until Monday, so that he might have further opportunity to investigate it, but he assured me that he would make further investigation and, if the rights of the Indians were not sufficiently protected, he would take the matter up with the conferees, and he had hope that the conference committee would make such provision as he might find necessary; but with the limited time he had to examine it he thought this was sufficient. I feel obliged to defer in large measure to his judgment, because he is familiar with these affairs, and but for that assurance on his part I should feel obliged to interpose a point of order against this amendment. It was on the strength of the proviso that I consented that it should go in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I desire to offer to the bill, and which I hope will not invoke any controversy, because it is a matter which passed the Senate unanimously at the last session as a separate bill and was unanimously adopted by the Senate as an amendment to one of the appropriation bills—I forget which one—which failed for the reason of the congested condition during the latter part of the last session.

In 1913 an appropriation was made for a public building, which in the act was designated for a post office and courthouse in the city of Santa Fe, under a bill approved March 4. There is in Santa Fe now a Federal courthouse, and the Treasury Department and those who are familiar with conditions in Santa Fe believe that the new building should not be constructed so as to include a courthouse, because at the present time all of the building will be required for other governmental purposes. So the amendment I propose is that the appropriation shall be available for a building for the accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices instead of for the post office and the United States court.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will be glad to answer any question that I can.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator give us any reasonable assurance that an appropriation will not soon be asked for a courthouse?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; there is a Federal building there now which is used as a courthouse and which the Federal judge desires to retain as the courthouse.

Mr. KING. Does that belong to the Federal Government?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Oh, yes, indeed; it is a building that the Government acquired many years ago.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think it is adequate for at least many, many years for the demands of the Government?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. So far as I can look into the future it is adequate for all time for a Federal courthouse.

Mr. KING. Then it is not a project to secure a further appropriation for another building?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly there is no present intention of that kind. I offer the amendment to be added as a new section to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That so much of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., 875), as authorized the erection of a building for the accommodation of the post office and United States courts at Santa Fe, N. Mex., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to require that said building shall be for the accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices, exclusive of the United States courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does this relate to an item already in the bill?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It does not. It may be subject to a point of order, but I trust that a point of order will not be raised.

Mr. WARREN. The amendment is so clearly a matter of legislation, entirely without reference to any appropriation, that I am compelled to make a point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALDER. I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 177, after line 24, it is proposed to insert:

Deportation of aliens under the laws regulating immigration: For the expenses of deporting to the countries whence they came, as specified in the immigration act of February 5, 1917, of alien public charges and others ordered deported under the laws regulating immigration since July 31, 1914, including conveyance to the frontier or seaboard for deportation, transportation charges when payable by the United States under the terms of existing law, salaries and expenses of officers and attendants in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act of August 1, 1914, and all incidental expenses, together with those involved in the assignment of officers and attendants as required, all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, $350,000.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this amendment was estimated for by the Treasury Department, and I do not believe it is subject to a point of order. I will state that there are about 3,600 of these accumulated cases in the United States. The amendment provides that aliens now public charges shall be sent to the countries whence they came. We have a law on the statute books which provides that that shall be done, but, because of war conditions for the past four and one-half years, none of these aliens have been sent to the other side. The Labor Department in their report indicate that there are, all told, in California 119 of these cases, in Connecticut 156, in Illinois 246, in Massachusetts 345, in Michigan 172, in New York 1,370, in Ohio 119, in Pennsylvania 215, in Washington 129. In fact, these insane aliens constituting public charges are in every State in the Union. It is estimated that it costs the States approximately $1,530,000 annually to provide for these people, and, if they are not very soon sent abroad, the time limit will expire and we can not deport them. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator has finished his remarks, and will not detain us longer, I was about to say that it is estimated for; and, as I understand from the department itself and from the Senator, that it is to dispose of the insane that could not well be gotten out of the country earlier on account of the submarines, and so forth, I shall make no point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if any of these are Belgians?

Mr. CALDER. There are a small number of Belgians; about 5 per cent of the total.

Mr. KENYON. Is it good business to send them home and then send food over there to sustain them?

Mr. CALDER. I do not assume that these aliens will be sent to countries that can not look after them; but there are a great many Italians, some from Poland, some from Greece, and some from the British Isles. I know that the great majority of them can be taken care of by the countries from which they came.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to call the chairman's attention to a matter on page 52 that I think ought to be corrected, so that it will be just exactly as we desire to have it.

On page 52 the House put in a provision to make the unexpended balances heretofore appropriated for certain purposes available for the ship-construction program, and in that they expected to get $213,000,000 included, in which was $25,000,000 that has heretofore been appropriated for plant construction. Now, I think that in the language of the bill they have omitted the language that would cover that appropriation, thereby making it doubtful whether or not that $25,000,000 will actually be used for this purpose; so I suggest that in line 11, after the word "appropriations," we insert these words:

For establishing plants and acquiring property.

So that it would read as follows:

And the unexpended balances of the appropriations for establishing plants and acquiring property for the housing of shipyard employees.

And so forth. I offer that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I do.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator called my attention to this amendment just a few moments ago, and I thought at the time it was all right; but let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the unexpended balance does not refer to plants at all, because in the existing law they are not mentioned; and, if the Senator will notice, on page 53 of the bill, line 3, we amended this act by putting in "or plant."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is, any material or plant, as defined, may be disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the disposal of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; but here, now, I want to call the Senator's attention to the act making appropriations to supply deficiencies, and so forth. Here is section 2:

For the acquisition or establishment of plants suitable for shipbuilding, or of materials essential therefor, etc., $34,000,000.

Now, the representative of the Shipping Board tells me that $25,000,000 of that is available, and that seems to be included in the list that the House used in making up the item.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is in the list. I will say that I think perhaps it had better be put in at this time, and then we can look up the question in detail.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think so. It can be considered in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, as there seems danger that what is known as the Lane bill, proposed by the Secretary of the Interior, making appropriation for the creation of homes for soldiers and sailors honorably discharged from service in the war just happily ended, may not be passed at this special session of Congress, I shall offer the amendment I send to the desk. Mr. MONDELL, of the House, and Senator SMOOT, of the Senate, have in their respective Houses introduced the Lane bill with some amendments, and the same has, in each body, been referred to the appropriate committee.

Pressed by the fear of the failure of that measure, I have here offered a temporary appropriation for the immediate beginning of the greater object ultimately to be obtained under some such measure as the "soldiers' home bill" attempts to accomplish. My amendment is frankly designed as a start toward the erection of these homes.

I know, and every Member of this body equally well knows, that this amendment is subject to a point of order, and if the point is made my amendment can not be voted on.

I would like and I appeal for an expression of the Senate on the merits of the amendment. May I not, in the light of this great and exigent necessity, hope that the point of order will not be raised? There is no proposed legislation before the Congress with which its Members in both Houses are more familiar than the bill to which I have referred. Hence there is no necessity for me at this juncture to consume the valuable time of the Senate in setting forth the merits of the measure.

May I again plead that no point of order be made against this amendment, so that the sense of the Senate may be taken on it?

I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert in the bill the following:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000,000, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior in creating homes on the public lands of the United States for honorably discharged soldiers and sailors in the military and naval service of the United States during the late war between the United States and the Empire of Germany. Said appropriation is to be expended in the most economical and expeditious manner for the accomplishment of the purpose aforesaid, under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary shall prescribe. That the said Secretary shall, on the meeting of each regular session of Congress, make report of such expenditures and the result accomplished. That in deciding who shall have possession of such homes preference shall be given the most worthy and needy, whom the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion may name, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, ordinarily I never refuse anything for the soldiers at any time; but I feel as if it is a little late this evening to spend $100,000,000, and I therefore make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 31 it is proposed to strike out lines 2 to 4, inclusive, and insert:

For collecting the revenue from customs, including not exceeding $200,000 for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, and an additional sum of $200,000 which shall be used in increasing the compensation of the inspectors of customs at the naval office ports to $6 per diem, as provided by the act approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat., 1065), $10,200,000.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this amendment is in the exact language of the bill that has already been passed upon by the Senate, excepting that it adds $200,000 to provide for the increase in compensation of the inspectors of customs at the larger ports of the country.

About 10 years ago Congress passed a bill fixing the compensation of the inspectors of customs at not to exceed $6 per diem. Very few of them, however, have received the maximum. Senators who have entered the ports of the United States from other countries know that the inspector of customs is the official in charge on the dock who passes on all customs questions.

These men are a very superior class of Government employees. The law provides that their pay may be $6 a day. In other departments of the Government the salaries of men are not ordinarily fixed by law. The salaries of clerks in the customs service and in the Treasury Department may go as high as double their entrance salaries. The inspectors, however, can not get more than $6 a day, and a great many of them are not receiving that amount. My amendment simply provides that all of them shall receive $6 a day.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I raise the point of order against the amendment, that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill, and has not been properly estimated for by the proper officials of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment only proposes an increase of an appropriation apparently agreed to by $200,000.

Mr. KELLOGG. But it has not been estimated for, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has it not been estimated for?

Mr. SMOOT. No; and I will say to the Senator that it also changes existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, this situation was called to my attention to-day, and it appealed to me from the statement made, and I promised to offer an amendment in regard to it. I am going to suggest it. I have talked it over with the Senator from Utah, and he has some facts that would indicate that it is not the proper amendment; and I should like to have him make a brief statement about it.

As I understand the situation, we have a law that prevents any Government employee from holding two Government positions where the combined salary exceeds $2,000; but in 1918 we suspended that law so far as it applied to teachers in the District of Columbia for a certain number of months, so as to enable their vacation time to be used in connection with Government work here; and this amendment was suggested to me to-day:

Section 6 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved May 10, 1916, as amended, shall not apply from July 15 to September 15, 1919, to teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia when employed by any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States Government.

It was stated to me to-day that if this amendment were adopted it would enable the Vocational Training Board that we have organized to use during those two months some of the teachers here in the District who are specially fitted to do this work. The work will have to be done, other people will have to be brought in, and so it occurred to me if these teachers could be given employment for a couple of months, with their experience, it would be beneficial.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think it would be the establishment of a precedent which would come home to plague the Government in the future dealings with employees?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was followed in 1918.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator feel that it was then an obnoxious precedent?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It did not so occur to me from the statement made, under the circumstances of the war and the war conditions. Ordinarily I think it would not be a good thing. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], as I stated, has certain facts, which I will be glad if he will state briefly to the Senate,

and if he thinks the amendment ought not to be adopted I will not press it.

Mr. SMOOT. A year ago this same question was before the Appropriations Committee, and the facts presented to the committee at that time showed that it was absolutely impossible to secure employees in different departments here in Washington, and legislation was requested. Senators must remember that this only affects employees who receive over $2,000. It does not affect anyone else receiving less than that.

The reports that I have received from some of the departments have been that it was a very unwise thing to do. I want to say that favoritism has been charged in some quarters. I do not want to go into details other than to say that I believe it was a mistake that was made a year ago. The Senator knows the subcommittee had it under consideration, and the subcommittee thought it was best not to adopt it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not remember that it had been taken up by the subcommittee.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, it was, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was probably taken up when I was not there.

Mr. SMOOT. It was decided at that time to be very unwise to change the law after the experience we had a year ago.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On the statement of the Senator from Utah I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to reserve for a separate vote the amendment that I gave notice of when the amendment was acted upon. It is the amendment in relation to the Federal Trade Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question, then, is upon concurring in all the amendments on which no reservation for a separate vote has been made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I promised the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to make a statement in pursuance of a telephone conversation I had with him with reference to certain excerpts that I read from the hearings before the House.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the amendment the Senator desires to make those remarks on is not before the Senate. We are voting on the other amendments first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to concurring in all the amendments with reference to which no reservation for a separate vote was made?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; but I desire to make my statement now, and then when the amendment comes up——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment will come up later, but the Senator may proceed now.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The chairman of the Federal Trade Commission called my attention to the fact that he had appeared before the House committee and had asked for $1,400,000, which was in January of this year, and that they had refused to allow him more than $1,000,000. He then proceeded to accommodate his force to that reduced amount. He stated that he had also made a request to come before the Senate committee, and he did so and sent his card in or perhaps a notice to the Senate Committee, but he said after they had denied $400,000 he had no idea in the world they would give the amount of $1,400,000 after the action of the House, and he stated that if I would examine carefully the report of the hearings before the House committee I would find his estimate was for $1,400,000.

Mr. SMOOT. His estimate was for $1,495,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I did not remember the odd figures, but in round numbers it was $1,400,000. I reexamined his statement and found it was very awkwardly drawn, because where he had put all the items together, the economic, the administrative, and so forth, he had them in a separate and distinct place as though it was an appendix, and in his recapitulation he had only $807,000 as the amount.

As I said when I was interrogated in the committee this morning, I am the last one who would cripple or attempt to cripple the action of the Federal Trade Commission. I think it is a body that is capable of doing great good. But I did not feel disposed to stand here on this floor and vote for an appropriation of $1,000,000 when the clear statement of the chairman of the commission was to the effect that $800,000 would be sufficient for them to get along with. Not only did he say that, but I did not read all of the excerpts because he said he was reducing his force to what $800,000 would be sufficient to take care of. The fact is that he thought he could get along with $600,000.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is convinced from his later information that it ought to be $1,000,000 instead of $900,000?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Relying entirely, as I presume the committee does, on the statement of Mr. Colver, I am willing to accept $1,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is a prominent member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and if he feels that way about it I have no objection to changing the amount to $1,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Very good. Mr. Colver made a positive statement that they could not get along with less than $1,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. With that understanding, I suppose it will be agreed that the committee amendments will be disagreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. The question is upon concurring in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole, with the exception of the amendment on page 42, line 5.

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment which has been reserved.

Mr. KING. I shall not, perhaps, dissent from the position taken by the chairman of the committee. Notwithstanding, however, the action of the chairman, I submit that no one can read the testimony that was submitted by the chairman of the commission before the House Committee on Appropriations without being convinced that $900,000 is a very liberal appropriation. I regret very much that the chairman of the committee has conceded the additional $100,000. I thought that the action of the Senate in Committee of the Whole ought to be affirmed by the Senate now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon concurring in the amendment of the Senate committee reducing the appropriation from $1,000,000 to $900,000.

The amendment was nonconcurred in.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in justice to the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, I want to have read into the RECORD a letter which he sent to me to-day in answer to my telephonic request. I think also the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has a letter or a copy of a letter that from my conversation he would like to have put in the RECORD. The letter written by the chairman of the commission, I think, will satisfy even the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that the action of the Senate just taken is absolutely right. It was charged here, or strongly intimated, that the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission was over in Europe making speeches, injuring the exports from this country, and that it was believed while he was there his expenses were being paid out of the Treasury. It was intimated that he is over there now. I knew that was not correct, because I had seen and spoken to him that day, but I called him up on the telephone. I did not know anything about these things, and I thought since these charges were made, or strongly intimated, upon the floor of the Senate, he ought to have an opportunity and we ought to know what the truth is. He has written me a letter, couched in such gentlemanly and courteous language, that I send it to the Secretary's desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the letter will be read:

The Secretary read the letter as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
Washington, 28 June, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your inquiry as to hearings on the Federal Trade Commission item on the sundry civil appropriation bill:

We of the Federal Trade Commission had no intimation that it was proposed by the Senate committee to reduce the item.

The paragraph had been written by the House committee in the Sixty-fifth Congress after a full hearing and had passed the House. It had again, in the present Congress, been accepted by the House committee and had passed the House.

No hearing was had before the House committee in the present session. We had communicated with Mr. GOOD'S office, asking if it was desired that further hearing be had and understood that the committee had no wish to reopen the paragraph unless we desired it.

We had no idea that the appropriation, twice acted upon by the House and its committee was to be opened in the Senate, but we did present ourselves at the Senate committee rooms with a request that the refunding item be reduced from $300,000 to $200,000.

Had we any intimation that the appropriation item was open, we should have specifically asked for a hearing thereon.

You have also called my attention to the debate at page 1985 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

"Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio a question: Does he know who the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission is now?

"Mr. POMERENE. I think Mr. Colver is the chairman now.

"Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know where he is at this time?

"Mr. POMERENE. I do not; I am not my brother's keeper in that respect.

"Mr. SHERMAN. I am not his keeper, either; but I believe I have some accurate information about where he is. Unless he has returned recently, he is in England. When the Senator speaks of the fostering

care of the Federal Trade Commission on our export trade, I will say that I believe I will have adequate proof to present here that, instead of promoting our export trade, he is destroying it in England by unfriendly comments, by violent speeches reported in English newspapers, denouncing certain of our export lines. I think he is paying his traveling expenses across the ocean out of such appropriations as this."

I apprehend that the proof to be presented to the Senate showing that during the five days, April 7 to 12, 1919, that I was in England, I made violent speeches denouncing certain American export lines, will not be forthcoming.

While I was in England I attended no public meeting nor dinner, nor did I on any occasion make any speech. I paid my traveling expense out of my personal funds, and not one penny of the Federal Trade Commission appropriation was used for my expense.

Yours, respectfully,

WILLIAM B. COLVER.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, after the discussion of the subject in the Senate yesterday I asked Mr. Colver to clear up the uncertainty as to the estimate submitted to the Committee on Appropriations. It is conclusively shown in the copy of the letter to the chairman which he furnished me and which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD, that the testimony quoted in the Senate related solely to the economic division whereas there are three divisions of the service, the legal, the administrative, and the economic division, and the total estimate submitted was $1,463,314.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 27, 1919.

SIR: From what I have heard of the debate in the Senate to-day with respect to the item in the sundry civil appropriation bill having to do with the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year 1920–21, there was a misunderstanding in the quotations made from the hearings before the Appropriations Committee of the House at the last session of Congress.

The commission made a revised estimate, in which its needs were subdivided as to the economic department, the legal department, and the administrative department.

The final estimate made by the commission and submitted to the House Appropriations Committee is found at the bottom of page 1216 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, part 2, and is as follows:

	Salaries.	Travel.	Miscellaneous.	Total.
Economic	$664,200	$137,500		$801,700
Legal	277,780	60,000		337,780
Administrative:				
Commissioners and secretary	55,000			55,000
Office force	150,584			150,584
Miscellaneous expenses[1]			$118,250	118,250
Total	1,147,564	197,500	118,250	1,463,314

[1] Includes original amount estimated for rent, $35,250, which will not be required if space can be secured in one of the temporary Government buildings.

The quotations that were made in debate to-day as to estimates made by myself before the subcommittee, were the estimates which I made for the Economic Division only.

I attempted to make it clear to the House committee that in addition to the needs for the Economic Division there were the usual needs for the Legal Division, including the administration of the Webb-Pomerene Act, the trading-with-the-enemy act, the Blue Sky investigation undertaken at the request of the Federal Reserve Board. Nor did the figures which were quoted in to-day's debate and which in my testimony related only to the Economic Division, include the necessary expenses for the Administrative Division.

As a matter of fact, the revised estimate of the commission was as shown in the tabulation above $1,463,314.

This amount the committee in its wisdom reduced to $1,055,000, the $55,000 being the statutory salaries for the commissioners and secretary and the $1,000,000 being to cover the necessary expenses in the Economic Division, the Legal Division, and the Administrative Division.

No hearing was had before the House Appropriations Committee in the present session for the reason that upon being asked whether or not the commission desired to be heard, we replied that unless the committee desired to reopen the paragraph we were content to stand on the record as made above as to our estimate and as to the determination arrived at by the Appropriations Committee of the House and by the House itself. That is to say, we accepted the reduction from our estimate of $1,463,314 to $1,055,000.

At the time of the hearing in the former session of Congress we proposed that we return out of the current appropriation the sum of $300,000 out of the money appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919. Later, after the bill had passed the House and when it was in the Senate, we found that by reason of unexpected work which we were called upon to do in winding up numerous and unexpected additional war-cost findings that with the most careful administration we were unable to turn back more than $200,000, although we have reduced the force of employees in the commission considerably more than one-third.

These cost findings were largely for supplies taken on a basis of price to be determined, with the understanding that the cost on which the price was to be determined was to be found by the Federal Trade Commission.

Unfortunately, when I visited your office prepared to lay these matters before you or to submit them to the committee, your committee was in session and was so pressed with business that you could not be excused from the meeting, and the pressure of work upon you in handling this bill has been such that I have not been able to reach you personally further than to place in the hands of your secretary my letter of explanation to Chairman GOOD, of the House Appropriations Committee, on June 25.

I think, however, the only point which needs to be emphasized is that in the debate to-day the quotations made were from the estimates of the Economic Division only, and that the figures given for the needs of that division of the work are not a statement of the needs of the commission for all of its work; that is to say, the Economic Division, the Legal Division, and the Administrative Division.

The commission most respectfully requests that the paragraph be allowed to stand as it has twice passed the House, carrying an aggregate appropriation of $1,055,000, and that we be directed to return to the Treasury out of the money appropriated for the current fiscal year the sum of $200,000 instead of the sum of $300,000.

By direction of the commission.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM B. COLVER,
Chairman.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments and that the Chair appoint the conferees upon the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. BUCHANAN managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes a. m., Sunday, June 29, 1919) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 30, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *June 28, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Infinite One, who hast made us a little lower than the angels, a little less than divine, and hast given us dominion over the works of Thy hands and thus crowned us with glory and honor, give us the courage, the strength, the fortitude, that we may live to the higher calling of God and prove ourselves worthy of the trust reposed in us; that our lives may be worthy in His sight and glorify ourselves and Him through His preferments; and all praise and honor be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting some observations on the cost of the war and incidents relating thereto.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, are they the gentleman's own remarks or do they cover remarks prepared by some one else?

Mr. HICKS. They are my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) entitled "Joint resolution to amend public resolution No. 33," approved June 29, 1918, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue permits for the diversion of water from the Niagara River.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 120) to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or

take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4226) entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 4.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 5,500 copies of the hearings and 10,000 copies of the report of the committee entitled "Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda and Bolshevik Propaganda," held before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, in the second and third sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress, pursuant to S. Res. 307 and 469, of which 3,500 copies of the report and 2,000 copies of the hearings shall be for the use of the Senate, 6,000 copies of the report and 3,000 copies of the hearings for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies of each for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution 4.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 5,500 copies of the hearings and 10,000 copies of the report of the committee entitled "Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda and Bolshevik Propaganda," held before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, in the second and third sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress, pursuant to S. Res. 307 and 469, of which 3,500 copies of the report and 2,000 copies of the hearings shall be for the use of the Senate, 6,000 copies of the report and 3,000 copies of the hearings for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies of each for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

To the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address to his fellow citizens by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address by the President of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It concerns the signing of the treaty of peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the President be read. Inasmuch as that address of the President conveys such good news, I ask that the Clerk be ordered to read it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the Clerk read the address of the President of the United States. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUNE 28, 1919.

Secretary Tumulty to-day made public the following message from the President:

"MY FELLOW COUNTRYMEN: The treaty of peace has been signed." [Applause.]

"If it is ratified and acted upon in full and sincere execution of its terms it will furnish the charter for a new order of affairs in the world." [Applause.]

"It is a severe treaty in the duties and penalties it imposes upon Germany, but it is severe only because great wrongs done by Germany are to be righted and repaired." [Applause.]

"It imposes nothing that Germany can not do; and she can regain her rightful standing in the world by the prompt and honorable fulfillment of its terms. And it is much more than a treaty of peace with Germany. It liberates great peoples who have never before been able to find the way to liberty. It ends, once for all, an old and intolerable order under which small groups of selfish men could use the peoples of great empires to serve their own ambition for power and dominion. It associates the free governments of the world in a permanent league in which they are pledged to use their united power to maintain peace by maintaining right and justice." [Applause.]

"It makes international law a reality supported by imperative sanctions. It does away with the right of conquest and rejects the policy of annexation and substitutes a new order under which backward nations—populations which have not yet come to political consciousness and peoples who are ready for independence but not yet quite prepared to dispense with protection and guidance—shall no more be subjected to the domination and exploitation of a stronger nation, but shall be put under the friendly direction and afforded the helpful assistance of governments which undertake to be responsible to the opinion of mankind in the execution of their task by accepting the direction of the league of nations." [Applause.]

"It recognizes the inalienable rights of nationality; the rights of minorities and the sanctity of religious belief and practice. It lays the basis for conventions which shall free the commercial intercourse of the world from unjust and vexatious restrictions and for every sort of international cooperation that will serve to cleanse the life of the world and facilitate its common action in beneficent service of every kind. It furnishes guaranties such as were never given or even contemplated before for the fair treatment of all who labor at the daily tasks of the world. It is for this reason that I have spoken of it as a great charter for a new order of affairs. There is ground here for deep satisfaction, universal reassurance, and confident hope.

"WOODROW WILSON."

[Prolonged applause.]

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 142.

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ such additional clerks as may be necessary during the five days next following the passage of this resolution, the payment of services not to exceed the sum of $100, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, how long does the employment of this clerk run?

Mr. IRELAND. Not to exceed five days.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is that all he is going to be employed?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am for it, then. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an address delivered at the Republican State convention in New Jersey on June 21, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an address delivered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is it about, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is an address delivered at the Republican State convention, and I am interested in it because——

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Senate resolution 94 be respectfully returned to the Senate, with the advice that, without passing upon the question as to whether the matter therein complained of constitutes, as is therein alleged, a breach of privilege, the House must courteously decline to predicate any action on the same for the reason that said Senate resolution itself involves a breach of privilege by declaring that language used by a Member of the House is untrue.

[Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Senate resolution No. 94, referred to the Committee on Rules, brought before the committee for serious consideration the delicate relation and obligations that the House and Senate sustain to each other, together with the duty of the Members of each and of the bodies

themselves to observe the strictest proprieties in parliamentary debate and procedure. The Members of the House of Representatives represent and speak for the body of the American people. Every function of the great office they hold is performed in a representative capacity. This representative character is so well settled in parliamentary law and procedure that the rules of this House forbid Members to address each other except in their representative capacity while transacting the business of the Nation on this floor. Each Member at all times is entitled to be referred to in a respectful manner as the gentleman or Representative from the State from which he comes.

Every Member of this body is protected from being assailed for what he says here by anyone outside of this body; his integrity, his veracity, and all other questions touching his honor and fitness to be a Representative are questions solely for the consideration of this House. No other body may impugn his motives or question his veracity for what he says or does here. These safeguards and securities to Members in their representative capacity stand upon sound principles. The House, in the interest of enduring and orderly government, must insist at all times upon those rights that come to it as a result of its creation and must remain with it while it continues to function as the representative body of a great people.

Without passing upon the question complained of in the Senate resoluton, the House must with all courtesy to the Senate decline to predicate any action upon such resolution with respect to one of its Members, for the reasons stated in the resolution I have submitted.

Members of the House are forbidden to discuss Members of the Senate or to impugn their motives or to assail their character on this floor, and if any Member at any time transgress that rule and violate the privileges of the House by so transgressing such Member is only amenable to the House of Representatives for such infraction on its rules. It is essential for the public welfare that the Members of the coordinate branches of Congress and the coordinate branches themselves so conduct the public business as to command the mutual respect and confidence of each other. Neither can accomplish its purpose for the public good except by joint action. While the two Houses are in a sense independent of each other they are interdependent when fulfilling the functions for which they were created. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I should like permission to yield a portion of that time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Tennessee has that permission.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I care to add to the remarks so well made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Committee on Rules approached the consideration of the Senate resolution, which was referred to them, with a full appreciation of the seriousness of the situation presented thereby. It was much more serious, and is, than some might conclude from a mere surface view.

We have reported the resolution which has been read at the desk unanimously, believing that in its tone of courtesy and yet in its explicit statement of facts it properly maintains the dignity and the rights and insists upon the courtesy due this House.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the first thing I desire to do is to congratulate the Committee on Rules on their wisdom and delicacy and good taste in reporting this resolution returning the Senate resolution to the Senate.

The wisest thing the fathers did in making this Government was to differentiate the powers of government and distribute them among three departments. The second wisest thing they did was to divide the legislative body into two branches. Those of us who have been here a considerable time know that occasionally the House gets stampeded, and I have no doubt, although I am not authorized to speak for the Senate, that it gets stampeded once in a while, too. Therefore the wisdom of having the two legislative bodies, that one may correct the other.

At a great dinner a lady asked Gen. Washington why they had two branches of the Congress; what they wanted with the Senate, anyway. His reply was that the Senate would serve the same purpose in legislation that a saucer did in drinking tea, that they would pour the hot tea of the House into the Senate saucer to cool off. Now, with due deference to the Senate, in these late days I think there is about as much hot tea over there that needs cooling off as there is in the House. [Applause and laughter.]

I fully agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that the proprieties and courtesies between the two Houses ought to be maintained, in order that we may get along and expedite legislation; but it was only here this week that a lot of gentlemen were inveighing against the Senate about their abuse of the use of riders, and so forth. There has always been a controversy, and it will exist until time ceases, about the power of the Senate to amend money bills.

There is an old saying that has much wisdom in it, that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. It seems to me that the Senate ought to have remembered, when they were passing this remarkable resolution, some of the things that have happened over there. Some time ago Senator SHERMAN, of Illinois, gave Representative MANN a great roasting. Mr. MANN never replied to it, and there was nothing that the House could do about it. Nobody in the Senate raised any objection to it, and it stands in the RECORD to this day. I will not quote Senator SHERMAN'S bitter words because I am very fond of Mr. MANN. What Senator SHERMAN said about Mr. MANN was fully as offensive as anything contained in the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] about another distinguished Senator. If we observed the rules strictly, there would hardly a week go by without some gentleman having words expunged from the RECORD, words said by one Member about another Member. Of course we have got to take into consideration the element of human nature. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] stated the fact, that the formula in addressing one another here is "the gentleman from Tennessee," or Ohio, or Kansas, or whatever State the Member comes from, and that the use of the direct personal pronoun "you" is forbidden by the rules of the House. Well, we do not pay too much attention to that. Some people have contended that it is the business of the Speaker to decide whether a thing said is parliamentary or not, but the precedents run the other way. The way to get at a case of that kind is to move to have the words taken down, which is a sort of ridiculous performance, but it brings the question before the House so that it can be passed upon.

People get hot under the collar in debate, to use a common phrase, both in the House and in the Senate. One of the most distinguished men in this House, who has served here a long time, said not long ago about conferences, that if you wanted to get what you wanted in a conference it was a very good thing to start a rough-house once in a while. He has been on all sorts of conferences and he has raised all sorts of rough-houses, and he has got a great many things that he wanted that the Senate conferees did not want him to have.

I hope this resolution will pass without a dissenting voice. It ought to. I give it as my opinion for what it is worth that that resolution which came over here from the Senate is as much a breach of the privileges of the House as what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] said was a breach of the privilege of the Senate. [Applause.] We are willing to treat them courteously, but we are not willing to be dictated to and lectured by the United States Senate, and that might as well be understood first as last. [Applause.] It seems to me that if this resolution passes, why, the whole thing ought to pass into oblivion. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. JUUL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the resolution be again reported. Without objection, the Clerk will again report it.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [After putting the question.] It is a unanimous vote, and the resolution is agreed to.

EXPUNGING OF CERTAIN REMARKS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 147.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives deems that portion of the remarks of the Hon. BEN JOHNSON, a Representative from the State of Kentucky, made in the House the 24th day of June, 1919, and published in the RECORD of that date, beginning with the words, "There is another matter which I wish to mention," being the third paragraph in column 1 on page 1785, and ending with the word "profiteers" at the conclusion of the sixth paragraph in column 1 on page 1786, to be in violation of the rules of the House. It is therefore ordered that the Public Printer be directed to exclude that portion of said remarks from the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a reading of the portion of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], referred to in the resolution, clearly indicates that those remarks violate the privileges of the House. This resolution has the unanimous report of the members of the Committee on Rules. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I can not allow this matter to be disposed of without saying this: Eighteen years ago I served on the Committee on the District of Columbia. I know something of the duties of the chairmanship of that committee. I think I have some idea of the difficulties and obstacles which confront him. For eight years the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman of that committee. In the discharge of his duty as he saw it he made a fight for certain reforms which no other man has ever had the courage to make. [Applause.] He is, in truth, one of those rare characters who would this minute go to the stake for his convictions. Of course he violated the rules of the House in the respect indicated by the resolution. All of us regret it. We could pursue no other course than to recommend that his remarks be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech of Hon. Daniel F. Cohalan, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, delivered at Liberty Hut in this city June 14, 1919, at a mass meeting held under the auspices of Patrick H. Pearce branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom and the Aloysius Club. As there are many matters here pending before Congress involving the Irish question, I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, being part Irish, I appreciate the fact that if we start the precedent of printing one Irishman's speech there will be many prominent Irishmen who will want their addresses printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That would be impracticable; therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas objects.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, the water-power bill.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment that I offered may be again reported.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit a request for unanimous consent. On yesterday we closed the general debate before the time on this side expired. I promised to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEARY] five minutes on a matter that is germane to the bill, but there were so few Members in the House at the time that I thought it would not do him justice; and I ask that he have five minutes at this time.

Mr. ESCH. Let the gentleman move to strike out the last word of the paragraph.

Mr. SIMS. But there is an amendment already pending.

Mr. WALSH. I imagine that will be disposed of in short order. I ask that my amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 1, line 5, after the word "of," strike out the words "the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture" and insert in lieu thereof "three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to be designated by the President."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the careful study that has been given to this question both by a special committee on water power and by the various committees of the House heretofore, I hesitate somewhat to urge any change in the measure which is now before the House for consideration. But I do want to direct the attention of this committee to the make-up of this commission which is provided in the bill and which will have jurisdiction of leases extending over long periods of years.

I think it is rather unusual in legislative procedure to appoint members of the official family of the Chief Executive, members of the Cabinet, to places on commissions, although sometimes it has been done by appointing one member from the Cabinet and providing for others from civil life.

But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in a matter of this sort we ought to have as members of the commission appointees who have more permanency in tenure of office than members of the Cabinet, who can be removed at the will of the Chief Executive. We all know, as I think has been pointed out by a Member in discussing the matter in general debate, that several members of the Cabinet have resigned since the present Executive has held that high office.

The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are appointed for a definite number of years. It may be said that this will greatly increase their duties. Possibly that is so, but if that is so I submit that it would be better to again increase the personnel of the Interstate Commerce Commission, so as to have three of them appointed on this special water-power commission. This is a matter that is going to affect interstate commerce; it is going to affect the rights of the different States, and the rights of the States as distinguished from the rights of the Federal Government.

Now, to say that three Cabinet members shall be a commission is simply to say that three subordinate officials in each of these departments will be vested with the power by these Cabinet officers and will practically be made the commission to pass upon and adjudicate the very important questions, the very involved problems, that are raised under this bill.

I submit that it will be much better if we place the jurisdiction under three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in whom we have reposed powers and responsibilities relating to transportation problems heretofore. This problem is closely allied to the transportation problem, and I submit that if we are doing that we are vesting this authority and power in the commission that has an engineering force, that creates the necessary machinery to administer the provisions of the act.

Now, the Department of Agriculture is not so closely related to the water-power problem, I submit, as to make it necessary that the Secretary of Agriculture should be a member of this commission. He is no more closely related to water power than the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman will agree that he is in error about that; that the Secretary of Agriculture has jurisdiction over 165,000,000 acres of forest reserve, and on that forest reserve are innumerable water-power sites. And he has a complete water-power department in his department now.

Mr. WALSH. I admit that the Secretary of Agriculture has connection with the water-power question, and so has the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. FERRIS. No.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, if the gentleman will read the organic act creating the Department of Commerce, he will see that the Secretary of Commerce has jurisdiction over problems of navigation of rivers the same as he does on the seacoast, and it is the duty of his department to foster and aid in the development of the merchant marine, and that is all closely allied to water power. The gentleman will contend that because the Secretary of the Interior has charge of public lands—which, unfortunately, we do not have very many in the section where I reside—that he therefore is a proper person to appoint on this commission; that the Secretary of War, because he has jurisdiction over navigable waters in relation to the erection of structures across them, is a proper person for this commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McARTHUR. If the gentleman's logic is correct in this matter, inasmuch as his amendment contemplates reposing the power in a commission of three men who are subordinate to the Interstate Commerce, or at least three members of that commission, why does not the gentleman propose to repose the whole power in the body itself rather than in a subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. WALSH. In reply, I would say it would be better to have three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission vested with this power as a special commission and have them execute the provisions of this act independently of their duties as members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and that it would be unnecessary and unwise to encumber the entire commission with the administration of this act.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What would the gentleman think of a commission having members who had no other duties that would conflict with their duties as members of the commission and who could give their whole time and attention to it?

Mr. WALSH. I can not agree with the assumption in the gentleman's inquiry that this would conflict with their duties as members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, because this special commission, in attempting to administer the provisions of the act, the gentlemen will find, will have to get information and have to confine themselves to regulations or laws which confer powers upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. I contend that it would be better to vest the power in one of the permanent commissions of this Government or make it part of that commission's duties and powers, rather than to say that the Secretary of War shall be a member of the commission, because the Secretary of War may resign to-morrow to be a candidate for some high office, and the same can be said of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and in so far as the Secretary of the Interior is concerned, he has his hands full now with a problem which he has been urging most carefully and most intelligently. It is undoubtedly contemplated, and properly so, that each one of the Cabinet officers will repose these powers in some subordinate official—an engineer or in the heads of present bureaus already established in their several departments. It would seem to me that because of the close alliance between the subject of water-power development and the promotion and improvement of water transportation upon navigable streams and in view of the fact that in the erection of these structures and dams upon navigable streams, whether on public lands or private lands, the jurisdiction is under another department, it would be much better if we reposed the authority and responsibility for administering the act in three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. If they say that is putting too much responsibility upon them, we might increase their personnel, as we did in the last Congress, but let us put the duties upon the responsible commission that has a definite tenure of office and not leave it to members of the Cabinet, who may be members to-day but who may resign to-morrow. Let us not place upon these three members of the Cabinet duties and powers which I submit will become so intermingled that it will require very careful hewing to the line in order that the act may be properly administered.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. If the amendment should prevail the whole bill would have to be rewritten, because the fundamental idea, so far as its administrative features are concerned, rests in the creation of a commission composed of three Cabinet officers. If this is stricken out and three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are substituted we will have to rewrite the bill. We had this matter up for consideration before the committee during the hearing. We questioned the witnesses, and after discussion in executive session we came to the conclusion that the only feasible way to properly administer a water-power bill covering navigable streams, the public domain, and forests was to place the power in the hands of the three officials of the Cabinet whose jurisdictions covered these subject matters. We did that in this bill. To place the power in the hands of three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission would impose upon those members of the commission duties with which they are not familiar and about which their previous experience upon the Interstate Commerce Commission has given them no knowledge. The least function of the commission would be with reference to the regulation of rates. They will have to do a vast amount of work before you come to the rate-making process. They will have to pass upon preliminary permits, have to pass upon the licenses, upon the terms and conditions of the licenses, and a vast number of other subjects. Under the circumstances, therefore, we felt convinced that the three secretaries would constitute a board that would have jurisdiction over the subject matter, and that by reason of the experience they have, by reason of the expert bodies they now have in their respective departments we would have a machinery created to carry out this law with scarcely any additional expense. For these reasons the committee has stood for the commission, and I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] has just stated. It would be equivalent to a vote to recommit the bill to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake to amend it in the manner now suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. There is much weight in what the gentleman from Massachusetts says. I have thought of this matter and discussed it in committee. These three Cabinet officers severally have all the jurisdiction covering these matters at the present time. The War Department has jurisdiction on navigable streams, the Secretary of the Interior on the public domain, and the Secretary of Agriculture on forest reserves. This bill permits them to act together as a commission, performing the functions as a commission they now perform severally, and the bill from one end to the other is constructed now upon that theory.

When we had the bill up for consideration before the House for nearly three weeks last year, in its constructive stages, why did not the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] bring up the question then and let us discuss it at that time, when there was abundant time? He wants to take three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and constitute them a water-power commission. As far as their general qualifications are concerned, no question can be made, but the complaint of the railroad executives at this hour is that the commission has not the time at present to discharge the functions that are already imposed upon it, and they have gone so far as to ask that a secretary of transportation be created and made a member of the Cabinet.

I do not agree with them. But those who are charged with the operation of the railroads of the country, those who represent their owners, claim that the Interstate Commerce Commission is so loaded down with present functions that it ought to become simply an appellate body and have regional commissions established over the country that will do the work the commission now does, and the commission become simply a reviewing body. Now, to transfer the duties provided herein to three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission is going to put it really into the hands of gentlemen already loaded down with duties exceeding those of the three Cabinet officers whose duties heretofore imposed upon them are practically the identical functions they will have to perform as a commission under this bill. I believe myself, and always have believed, that a water-power commission composed not of Government officials of any department, with long tenure of office, to be politically divided, was the most ideal commission that could be created. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not propose that kind of a commission. He proposes to put the burden on a commission that has already got all it can possibly do and do well.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Is it the gentleman's contention that this commission is to determine the policy with respect to water-power development?

Mr. SIMS. Why, no further than the bill authorizes them.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that you can get any consecutive policy determined where you have a partisan commission which may be one political complexion to-day and another the next day?

Mr. SIMS. There is weight in what the gentleman says, but it is utterly impossible and impracticable to undertake to amend this bill in any substantial basic manner if we expect to pass it at all this session.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the House, I have been listening with a great deal of attention to the discussions of many bills which have been presented to this body, and I find that if any attempt at amendment is made the excuse is always injected that these bills have come down from a previous Congress, and that if we attempt to amend them we run the risk of destroying their whole character. Now, Mr.

Chairman, I think that this is extremely unfortunate, especially as it relates to this water-power bill now under consideration. The water-power proposition is the great proposition of the future. It concerns not only our national development but the general welfare. Only a few years ago it was understood as coming from the Geological Bureau of the Government that within less than 100 years there would be a marked diminution of our coal supply. While later developments have shown a great increase in this supply, I think that it is not assuming too much when I say that coal is not inexhaustible. Therefore the time will come when our children's children will have to depend upon the light, heat, and power generated by the water power of our country. After years of wrangling between contentious forces over this matter, we are now at the threshold of legislation affecting it, and we should be extremely careful what are the first steps we take. This bill as it now stands puts the whole matter in the hands of the President of the United States, because it puts the administration thereof in the hands of three Cabinet officers, who are his appointees and who hold office at his will. It puts, therefore, in the power of the President to control one of the greatest natural forces of the future, and I most seriously think that the control under this bill should be put in the hands of some commission of long tenure—some commission that is as far away as possible from the ambitions and the politics of any President of the United States, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, in order to safeguard the interests of coming generations, and to avoid the danger of this great natural force from falling into such hands as have controlled the coal beds of the country, the coal, oil, the lumber; in fact about all of our national raw materials.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some misconception of the commission provided for by this bill by the proponent of the motion. The question of the resignation of any officer will apply equally as strong to the resignation of a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. So enough for that. Any man holding any office could resign. The last statement that we should take it away from actual consideration of the administration ought also to be answered by saying it is these new principles and ideas should be placed in hands where they can be advanced, where people are interested, where the American people have an opportunity to say through their representatives in elections that they want certain policies adopted and carried out. This commission will be in a shape to inaugurate and carry forward what is most desired and needful by the public. The three officers named are peculiarly situated so they as a body can do the work and fully carry out the provisions of the proposed legislation.

That seems to be the objection, that it is a live, working body. Now, the three members of the commission are constituted a governing body in this bill for this reason, namely, the Secretary of War now has jurisdiction and control of the navigable streams with an organization in his office for its operation. The Secretary of the Interior has the jurisdiction and power and an organized force in regard to public lands, in regard to the granting of permits, of licenses, and so forth.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAKER. I will yield in just a moment. With full organization and full power now to license anyone you please, with the present rules and regulations in regard to obtaining water-power permits. Third, the Secretary of Agriculture has power now to license those who apply for a permit on the national reserves, so that taking the three and getting their combined judgment—because they are all working on the same subject, the only difference is that the Secretary of War has control of navigable streams, the Secretary of the Interior has public lands, and the Secretary of Agriculture the forest reserves—but you get that combined judgment, that combined force of all their clerical assistants, engineers, and so forth, and when a man presents an application we have the joint judgment of the three to pass upon the policy and upon the question whether or not they should operate as it would under the law contemplated in this bill. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEGG. The question I would like to ask is, Why is it the Niagara Power Co. had to have a special act passed here yesterday—passed by the Senate and brought over to-day after the approval of the Senate—if the contentions advanced are correct?

Mr. RAKER. This was necessary because this bill has not become a law yet. The resolution you refer to will hold the matter in abeyance until this legislation is enacted and approved, then the Niagara Falls question can be properly handled.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. For a question.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Neither of the three departments have now in their possession all of the information that will be necessary for such a commission, have they?

Mr. RAKER. Practically, so far as they have gone, yes, and that is one of the reasons——

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Well, will there not of necessity be a bureau created independent of the bureaus now in existence, that will take charge of this water power?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Now, getting back to the fundamental question and to answer the arguments in favor of the amendment, and in order to show that the amendment should not be adopted, I want to call the committee's attention particularly to the words of the next section, beginning on line 5:

> The work of the commission shall, in so far as practicable, be performed by and through the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture and their clerical forces.

Now, you have a complete clerical force; you have a complete organization in all the three departments on this very subject, and the only question now is to get the combined judgment of the three heads after going into each project separately and distinctly and then establishing a policy to carry out the provisions of this legislation whereby practically the main feature——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Whereby there may be a known permit. Now, that is practically all there is in this legislation except what is on the statute books to-day, by way of rules and regulations enacted by these three departments, and a further provision whereby we can authorize the construction of dams on navigable streams and canals relative to the public lands, and on the forest reserve, so that a man will know when he invests his money that he has a tenure instead of a revocable permit and license from either of the departments.

This crystallizes what in effect is now being enacted by the three departments with their several jurisdictions, to the end that the public who are interested, as well as those who desire to develop, may have the opportunity, and, further and beyond all that, that the public interests may be protected in this bill, that a recapture may be had, that a proper rate may be fixed, and all the other conditions incident thereto may be carried out by a positive law that is now attempted under the various departments under rules and regulations, but if enacted into positive law the public and people will know that the water powers are being protected, are being preserved, will be properly utilized for their benefit, and will be safeguarded for the future, and it will develop these wonderful undeveloped resources to-day that are going to waste or unused.

And this legislation, providing for including it under the heads of the three departments, the three that now have charge, the committee have had long hearings on, and made investigation, as well as the former determination by the House and by the Senate, and agreed that this would bring about the result that would protect the Government, that this would protect the future generations in our water power, and at the same time give new developments, give those who desire to enter and spend their money under this bill to make a reasonable and proper return from the money they have had invested. The consumer will be protected. The public will be protected. The people investing their money will also be protected. The Government will likewise have ample and proper supervision in the provision of this bill, and the three departments named are the proper ones to handle the questions.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not a fact that the net investment provision of this bill is based upon a definition which is now used and employed by the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, well——

Mr. WALSH. Is it not a fact?

Mr. RAKER. Not altogether, but to a certain extent it is. I suppose practically that might be so; yes. But that is only one question. And, as I said before, the question of rates, whether it shall be by the Interstate Commerce Commission or not, can be fixed by them just like for a railroad, and because they fix a rate on a railroad from San Francisco to New York you would not say that the entire handling and management of that railroad from San Francisco to New York should be placed in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission any more

than to say that these projects involved here should be placed in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am a new Member of this House. I would like to know something about this proposition. I do not see any necessity for this inordinate haste. There are one-fourth of the Members of the House who are new Members, as I understand it. It is true, as has been said by the chairman of this committee, that this bill has been before this House for a considerable number of years, but we who are on the job for the first time should have an opportunity to find out what it is about. Even some of the gentlemen upon the committee—and I believe the gentleman last speaking was on the committee—do not seem to understand fully what water powers are comprised within the jurisdiction of this commission.

I am very much interested in the proposition of Niagara Falls, and I understand from the chairman of this committee that the Niagara Falls proposition is involved in this bill. I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is right in stating that this great power should be vested in somebody else besides the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that, because the great question as to the use of the water from the Niagara River is now involved. It is a matter of dispute in our territory as to who shall have the right to use the 20,000 cubic feet of water. There is a question of difference now as to who shall have 4,000 cubic feet that are not now being used except by temporary grant. The Secretary of War is committed to the granting of that 4,000 cubic feet of water to the present—as I believe—monopoly that now exists in the use of the Niagara Falls water.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. It is conceded now that as the law stands the Secretary of War has jurisdiction relative to the granting or the denying of licenses or leases to Niagara Falls.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This bill adds just two more men to the commission to use their judgment and discretion. Is that right?

Mr. MACGREGOR. No. You concede to the Government the power of issuing an irrevocable permit.

Mr. RAKER. No. I said that is not the law now. We want to amend it so that it is an irrevocable permit, so that it will run only for a certain and fixed number of years.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the bill gives the power to this commission to issue permits for 50 years. Now, as I stated, the Secretary of War has stated publicly that he is committed to the giving of this surplus power to the present combination.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. BEE. As I understand it, this is a permanent law that will live beyond the official life of any of these Secretaries, and it will be a continuous office.

Mr. MACGREGOR. But the present administration will have the power to give those 50-year permits, and that is what I am opposed to. I do not think it should be within the power or privilege of any political administration to play favorites. I insist that if we intrust to a commission the giving away of power rights in this country, we should give it to a body which is not purely political, and therefore I should agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

I have a very wholesome respect for the author of the amendment and his views on matters pending before Congress, but I can not concur with him in his conclusions in regard to this matter. I believe that the special committee on water power, having given this question exhaustive consideration, ought to be sustained by the House. For the benefit of new Members here I want to say that the hearings on this bill are available to them for their perusal and consideration.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCARTHUR. Yes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I beg to say that I made inquiry to ascertain where those hearings are, and I have not been able to get a copy.

Mr. MCARTHUR. If the gentleman will inquire of the clerk of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the chairman of that committee, he will undoubtedly obtain copies of the hearings on this question.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I did; and I was not able to find them.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Did the gentleman inquire at the document room?

Mr. MACGREGOR. No; I did not.

Mr. MCARTHUR. I think I can give the gentleman copies of the hearings.

The questions involved in this bill were thrashed out by the special water-power committee, and the bill was framed by that committee and agreed upon and passed by the House, and reported to the Senate and passed by that body, and a conference committee was appointed, and the conference report was adopted by the House by a vote of 264 against 65, and the only reason why this bill did not become a law in the closing days of the last Congress was the failure of the Senate to consider the conference report.

Now, this committee on water power did not hold any exhaustive hearings on this bill at this session, because they had gone over the ground thoroughly at the last session. I believe that the House understands the necessity of vesting this power in the hands of the three Cabinet officers named, who are familiar with the different phases of the water-power question.

I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts will be voted down, and that the committee will be sustained not only on this matter but also on other matters at issue.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCARTHUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you understand, then, that this committee or commission of three members of the Cabinet have the sole power to grant franchises for a 50-year period?

Mr. MCARTHUR. Yes; according to the terms of the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you think that is a proper lodgment of authority for that period of time?

Mr. MCARTHUR. Yes; I think that is an eminently proper lodgment of authority.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not believe that it would be better to have men representing two different political parties?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CLEARY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. THOMAS. For the purpose of making a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not make a motion while the gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not know that the gentleman from New York had the floor. He had only a part of it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the commission named in the bill, because I believe that in that commission, in those Secretaries, rests sufficient knowledge to enable them to handle that business. In those three departments they have all the knowledge requisite for an intelligent handling of that business. They have a good deal now to do with the carrying out of a proposition of that character, and I think it is a perfectly good selection.

But the thing I was invited to speak on was this: Yesterday there was some discussion here between some gentlemen on the question of inland transportation connected with ocean transportation, and, as I had a little knowledge perhaps on that subject, at that time I was going to add a little to what was said, but not having had the opportunity at that time I will do so now.

I might say that a good many years ago, when we first began to talk about the enlargement and improvement of the Erie Canal—and it was necessary to enlarge that canal, because the cars had been enlarged and the rails were heavier, and if the canal was to continue its functions as a regulator it had to be enlarged—the State of New York invited to the discussion of the question of enlargement the best thought on the subject of transportation that could be secured in this country, both in the engineering line and business men, and so forth, and we did discover, just as the gentleman from New York said yesterday, in the language in which he put it, that the overhead charges on ships were so great that they could not be utilized on the inland waterways, neither on the Mississippi River nor on the Hudson River or any of those rivers.

Now, in explaining the little difference of opinion that there was between two New York gentlemen yesterday relative to the Hudson River, I might say this: One of the gentlemen from New York did say that there are about 125 miles of the Hudson River where the water is deep enough for ships to go. That is true. That is up to Hudson. Above that the channel is crooked and narrow and shallow. It is also true, as stated by the gentleman from New York, that big ships do not realize the expectations of those who think that ocean-going ships will in

future successfully engage in inland navigation. They stop at New York, where they connect with all the railways and all the inland transportation lines, and there they transfer their cargoes to vessels that can handle them more economically. Where a cargo is destined to a point like Poughkeepsie or Yonkers, they do send some through to those places, for instance, to Yonkers with sugar and to other points on the lower Hudson, but that is when the transportation is direct to those points. For the immense amount of the transportation destined for beyond, it nearly all ends in New York.

Now, people who have not looked into the subject much have thought that it is perfectly natural to load cargoes in Chicago or somewhere on the Lakes and send them through to Europe. Well, in the first place, a great ship, like those which run into New York, can not go through our inland waterways. There is not water enough. There is a sufficient reason for that. There is a whole series of rapids in the St. Lawrence River. Small steamers manage to get up through canals around those rapids, but even the larger Lake steamers have to be cut in two in order to bring them through the Welland Canal. There are some other Canadian canals paralleling the St. Lawrence River, but great ships can not pass through them.

Then there is this to be considered, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] said yesterday: There is the question of the overhead charges. A great vessel coming from Europe crosses the ocean in a week. She has a large crew, she consumes enormous amounts of coal, and she travels several hundred miles a day.

If you should put that vessel into shallow and narrow waterways, even if there were water enough to float her, she would have to slow down and make very little speed, and she could not afford to run through narrow and shallow waters, because she could not go fast enough to pay her overhead charges. Even the river steamers that go up the Hudson, when they get within 30 miles of Albany, have to slow down and make very little time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEARY. The Great Lakes have channels through their shallowest portions between Buffalo, Cleveland, and Chicago of about 20 feet. The great ocean steamers draw nearly that much water without any cargo in them at all. They are very sharp at the bottom, and built enormously heavy to stand the seas of the Atlantic Ocean, and they would be useless for Lake navigation, let alone going through the canals.

Now, I will say a word about the Erie Barge Canal, which you have all heard of, but perhaps many of you are not entirely familiar with. It leaves the Niagara River at a place called Tonawanda, 12 miles east of Buffalo, just below Lake Erie, and goes through the country to the Hudson River. That canal provides a depth of 12 feet. In consequence of that shallow depth no large vessel could go through the barge canal. Then the prism of that canal is only 75 feet. Of course, two large vessels could not pass in a canal of that width, for some of them are fully that wide. So the present canal that they have been building for the past 15 years is simply a barge canal. Business men and engineers know that a barge canal is the cheapest highway of transportation in the world. You can build a barge very cheaply. She is built blunt and flat and square. She carries a large tonnage on a small draft, but she is built only for canal and river transportation. She transfers freight from the Great Lakes to any point to which the canal leads for less expense than any other class of vessel. For instance, to give you some idea of it, I have transported hundreds of thousands of tons from New York to Chicago for 7½ cents a hundred pounds. You would not think you could carry it to Buffalo for that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. Can the gentleman inform us to what extent the Erie Canal is now being used?

Mr. CLEARY. There are two canals which run from Troy, the head of navigation on the Hudson. The Champlain Canal runs north and the Erie Canal runs west. The Champlain Canal has lost comparatively little of its tonnage, because transportation in that canal has not been interfered with, but after the enlargement of the Erie Canal began in 1895 for a long time it was uncertain as to what kind of a canal they would have after it was finished, and so many of the canal-boat builders went out of business. The Erie Canal business was done by individual boat owners, and the tonnage fell off to a considerable extent, because there were so many impediments in the way while they were improving it. The boats went into other business, lighterage in New York Harbor, and so on. But now the canal is practically finished. There are a few spots yet where it is not complete. Of course, the same reasons that made the Erie Canal worth while in the beginning will operate again. It will be made use of as soon as it is finished. Companies will come into existence to run barges on it. A good many have come on this year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then the gentleman expects that business on the Erie Canal will improve?

Mr. CLEARY. Certainly, because of the cheapness of that kind of transportation. My firm controls a hundred barges, and I know we can carry stuff much more cheaply than any railroad can carry it.

Mr. HUSTED. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying about the barges. He says, as I understand it, that the barges are practical only for the canal.

Mr. CLEARY. For the canal and river.

Mr. HUSTED. They are also practical for river navigation?

Mr. CLEARY. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Would it be an economical proposition to bring produce by barge from Tonawanda to New York City?

Mr. CLEARY. Sure; that is what they are built for. When I speak of the canal I include the Hudson River. It is the tail end of it.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEARY. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman state whether the general barges towed around Cape Cod can go through the Erie Canal?

Mr. CLEARY. Yes; a number of barges are being towed around, and they will go through the Erie Canal.

Mr. PLATT. What is the size of these barges?

Mr. CLEARY. They are 15 feet high, draw 13 to 14 feet of water, about 35 feet wide, and will carry from 1,000 to 1,300 or 1,400 tons.

Mr. PLATT. Then they would not go through the Erie Canal loaded.

Mr. CLEARY. Yes; but you would not load them so deep. A boat 15 feet high going through a canal drawing 12 feet of water would not be loaded over 10 feet. It is very desirable to have extra room. If a boat carries a load of oats or other light merchandise, she could not put it under deck unless she had extra room. All kinds of boats would be built to accomplish the various kinds of transportation.

Mr. PLATT. Is it possible to tow boats through the canal and out into the ocean, say, around to Boston?

Mr. CLEARY. They would not be insurable if they went out into the ocean. They could be towed through the Cape Cod Canal.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEARY. Certainly.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Did I not understand Gen. Taylor to say that there had been some distinct improvements in the making of barges the past year through different experiments?

Mr. CLEARY. That is a matter in your mind. One man may think it is a distinct improvement, while another man may think it is not. They look at it from different points of view. It is like an automobile or a horse or a sleigh—one man likes it and another does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we can not conclude debate on this section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I would like 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that all debate on the section and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's question was in relation to different kinds of barges. When the Erie Canal was enlarged it was understood that it was an extension of the Hudson River to the Lakes, enabling the same kind of barges that run on the Hudson River to go up into the St. Lawrence River, as they do, to Lake Champlain, and it was attempted to

have the Hudson River traffic extended up into the Lakes by barges. They could build the barges cheaply. The citizens of the State without regard to corporations could own a barge. A farmer could buy a barge and navigate the canal. It compelled lower rates, and, as everybody knows, it took New York from the third place in commercial activity and gave her the first place.

Gentlemen, I can not say too much if I talk an hour about the value of water transportation. It is to be divided into three kinds—ship, lake, and canal, all different kinds of vessels—in order to carry freight economically. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have all enjoyed the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEARY], because he knows precisely what he is talking about. But I want to get back to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. As the bill now stands it provides for a commission of three members, made up of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Agriculture. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment that strikes out this commission, made up of those members of the Cabinet, and inserts in lieu thereof a commission made up of three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission has nine members, and he wants to select three from the nine to make up this board. I think the reasons for not doing it are very apparent, and I want to offer two or three that now occur to me as to why it would not be a wise thing to do.

He says that his commission would be more permanent than the three Cabinet officers. That is fanciful. A Cabinet officer is appointed for four years and a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission is appointed for six years. So the difference of tenure is trivial. It has been urged here that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of War or the Secretary of Agriculture might resign, quit, and run for some office or any other political activity. It is true that he may. But the office of Secretary of the Interior, the office of Secretary of War, the office of Secretary of Agriculture goes on forever. I have an abiding faith that if all of them resign we will again get faithful, honest officials who will appreciate the trust, who will guard the trust, who will be safe. I have confidence in the Government. I have confidence in the men who may in the future hold the office or offices.

I may add further that I know of no prohibition against the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission resigning and running for office or engaging in politics. In addition to that let me urge, if I may, that this provision is absolutely in form identical with the former bill, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i," that was passed through the House last session, went through the Senate, through the conference, and was adopted in this House by a vote of 263 for it with only 64 against it. So it is fair to presume that it is acceptable to the House.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma seriously contend that all of the wisdom of the Nation is bound up in the Sixty-fifth Congress?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not, but I do contend that this same commission proposition passed the House almost by unanimous consent, not once but twice, and I do contend that this same amendment or amendments like it were offered and voted down overwhelmingly; and I do contend that the fabric of this bill, the policy of it, the theory of it, has run the gantlet of technical criticism and amendment, and I very much doubt the wisdom of now in the first paragraph of the bill striking out the very backbone of the bill and launching upon a new theory.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. I would like the gentleman or some other gentleman, before we conclude the consideration of the bill, to explain to the new Members of the House what provision has been made to guarantee for the benefit of the American people the control of the water power in the country.

Mr. FERRIS. I will not have time in five minutes to go into that. I spoke of that yesterday. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman that the commission has very far-reaching powers in that regard. We reserve the title to sites in the Government, and we reserve for the benefit of the future and the present, power in the Government, undoubted, to control these activities and see to it that heavy-handed methods are not laid on the people.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to creating any more commissions. I am very much afraid that during the war we have almost gone to seed on the question of commissions. If you adopt the gentleman's amendment, you will create another commission and another bureau. Testimony before the Water Power Committee is, and it has been right along, that of the three bureaus in these three departments—War, Agriculture, and Interior—all now in operation, they intend to cull out and select from them the men who will compose the new bureau; and it will be done without additional expense, and in that way they will probably dispense with the services of a good many who are now employed. If the amendment should prevail, it seems to me it would call for the creation of another bureau and a great horde of agents and employees, and I doubt if the gentleman himself will want to do that.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not intend to do that, and I submit my amendment would not. It would simply impose these additional duties upon three members of an existing commission.

Mr. FERRIS. That is the very thing I want to answer. These three members of the commission have no constituted bureau now to work on. They are not engaged in water-power development.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, whether amended or not, the bill does just exactly what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] says he is opposed to having done. It creates another commission to do exactly what we created a commission a year or two ago to do, the commission having authority to go into these various departments, pick out these experts and scientific men from the various bureaus, and have them assemble here in this commission. My opinion is that it makes no difference whether the amendment is agreed to or not. The section ought to be stricken out, as it is or as amended. I can not say much in five minutes, but I will try to get through in that time, and in that time to call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1917 we created a Water Power Commission with power to do everything under the sun except possibly to interfere with the precession of the equinoxes.

That commission consists of seven members, to be appointed by the President of the United States, at least one of whom shall be chosen from the active or retired list of the Engineer Corps of the Army, one of whom shall be an expert hydraulic engineer from civil life, and the remaining five of whom may be selected either from civil life or public service. That language was inserted to enable the President to appoint these various Cabinet members mentioned here. That was perfectly well known. That commission is already created, and the money has been appropriated for them to go on.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. The personnel of that commission has never been appointed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No; it never has. We were told by the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee that if we did not put this provision in the bill, the bill, somewhere between the House and the statute books, would be interrupted and would not become a law. So we authorized the appointment of that commission and appropriated $100,000 and gave them power of almost infinite variety, among other things to deal with the question of "irrigation and drainage, flood control, regulation and clarification of streams, utilization of water power," and a good many other things. The commission is authorized to employ or "retain and fix the compensation for the services of such engineers, transportation experts, experts in water development, constructors of eminence, as it may deem proper to make such investigations and carry out the purpose of the act," and, in order to defray the expenses, $100,000 was appropriated.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know why that commission has not been named?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not know why; I assume because of the war. I just take that to be the fact. The war came on. But here is authority to name them, to pay them their salaries, and the money has been appropriated. The commission is given authority to do many of the things that this bill contemplates, and now, in the face of that, we come and create another commission, to be composed of these Cabinet officers, with power to go into the various departments and get other experts and scientific men, and so forth, and assemble them together and give them another $100,000 to start on. I think we ought to strike out sections 1 and 2 altogether and require that the things to be done under this bill be performed by this commission that has already this extraordinary power. They have the right to obligate the Government, to employ whomsoever they please, and to fix their salaries, and it is not subject to a point of order, because we give specific authorization here to appropriate for whatever they do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were—ayes 18, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk began reading section 2——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. For the purpose of offering amendments I would like to inquire whether the bill will be read by sections or by paragraphs?

The CHAIRMAN. It should be read by sections.

Mr. ESCH. Let the usual method be followed; let it be read by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read by sections.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Just where has the Clerk reached?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reading the first section, beginning page 2, line 2——

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last section. Mr. Chairman, without detaining the House—and I do not intend to detain the House, because I discussed this proposition—a parliamentary inquiry. Under the order for unanimous consent just now, is that debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move to strike out section 1?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is that debatable? We had a unanimous-consent order—I do not know just what it was—to close debate on that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Mississippi it is too late to make that motion. The Clerk had begun to read the second section.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. As soon as he began to read I rose and asked where he was reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the first section was quite full, the Chair will say to the gentleman. The Chair permitted a great deal of latitude and there was no dispositon to shut off debate.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I hardly think, if the Chair will permit me, that it is for the Chair to say whether debate has ended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the moton of the gentleman to strike out the section?

Mr. WALSH. Of course an objection can not stop that motion, but it would not be debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled the gentleman's motion comes too late. The Clerk had commenced the reading of the second section.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the Chair will permit, the gentleman from Mississippi was on his feet for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry as to where the Clerk was reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and the parliamentary inquiry was answered, and when the gentleman made his motion to strike out the first section had been passed and the Chair ruled that motion came too late.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The Clerk had read that far, "page 2, line 2."

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Mississippi practically gave notice he would move to strike out the first section when he was debating the motion under consent as to limitation upon debate.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is the fact, the Chair did not notice the fact, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi to make his motion and leave it to the committee. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out section 1. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREYS: Strike out all of section 1 after the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the commission shall appoint an executive secretary, who shall receive a salary of $5,000 a year, and prescribe his duties. The work of the commission shall, in so far as practicable, be performed by and through the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture and their clerical forces.

All of the expenses of the commission, including rent in the District of Columbia, all necessary expenses for transportation and subsistence, including, in the discretion of the commission, a per diem of not exceeding $4 per day in lieu of subsistence incurred by the commissioners or by their employees under their orders in making any investigation, or conducting field work, or upon official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated points of duty, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by a member or officer of the commission duly authorized for that purpose; and in order to defray the expenses made necessary by the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress may hereafter determine, and the sum of $100,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, to be paid out upon warrants drawn on the Secretary of the Treasury upon order of the commission.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I move to strike out the section.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a preferential amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee, offers an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "clerical forces" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "engineering, technical, clerical, and other personnel."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is clearly in the interest of the best use of the different classes of employees of the departments which exercise authority over water powers, and I think is acceptable to the chairman of the committee, so I do not wish further to argue it.

Mr. ESCH. There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move to strike out the last word?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir; not yet. I believe I have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must speak to a motion, and the Chair understood the gentleman to move to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, nearly every day some bill comes into this House to create a commission, with a big salary to the commissioners, and it has come to the pass that we have almost gotten to be a government by commissions instead of a government by Congress, the representatives of the people. I do not know how many million dollars are paid out yearly to useless commissions for alleged services that ought to be performed by committees of this Congress. I have read this bill pretty carefully, and without imputing the motives of any man—I never do that, for no two men can see alike upon all questions, we view different things from different standpoints; and the men who are advocating this bill, of course, are absolutely honest and sincere in their convictions—I believe this bill is simply a bill to turn over the water power of the United States to corporations under a license system. That is all I think the bill contains. I think that is the milk in the coconut, the sugar in the gourd, and the negro in the woodpile, gentlemen, in this bill. [Laughter and applause.] I may be mistaken, gentlemen, but I want to say to you if there is water power in this Union that is capable of being developed that it will be developed. In any State of the Union, in Kentucky, in Massachusetts, or elsewhere, I say, gentlemen, that private enterprise will develop that water power. It seems to me that we are running to socialism in everything. It seems to me that the last Congress, which they say was Democratic, that this Congress, which some people urge is Republican, have been spending money like a lot of drunken sailors [laughter] and have been giving away the franchises of the people of the United States to the corporations of the country. I am opposed to it. I believe in democracy, old-fashioned democracy, in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—the same Government that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln believed in and which does not seem to meet the approbation of these latter-day saints of government. [Laughter and applause.]

That is all this bill means now, gentlemen.

I see that the chairman has the hammer in his hands and can stop me. I am going to see where we stand, and I move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I made a motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 1, noes 41.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two gentlemen are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLATT: Page 2, line 4, after the word "of," strike out the figures "5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "25,000."

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in what will perhaps be considered an extreme form, because I wish to emphasize the fact that here is an executive officer of this new commission who ought to be a man of $25,000 caliber. He will be up against some of the biggest corporations in the country, some of whom pay their executives more than $25,000.

According to the report which accompanies this bill they expect to hook up some very great water powers, and it contemplates doing some big work. There should be a big man at the head. If you have a man as executive secretary of $25,000 caliber, the Cabinet officers who are named as commissioners will not have to do much more than to meet once in a while in order to determine on policies and ratify his work. Everybody knows that is all they can possibly find time to do. All through the Government work in the departments and bureaus here in Washington we see the effect of niggardly salaries for men in responsible positions. The Government of the United States pays its routine clerks very often more than necessary, but pays people who direct them so little that it frequently does not obtain men competent to give intelligent direction. You can go to almost any bureau here and find clerks sitting around because the man at the head of them does not know how to direct them and how to keep them busy. On the other hand, there are men working in Washington for $1,800, $2,000, $2,500, $3,000, $5,000 who are worth a great deal more than they receive and could obtain more if they had the courage to get out and take the risks of private employment. The low salaries obtain some good men who like the certainties or the vacation privileges of the civil service, but the policy is nevertheless a bad one, and as a rule results in inefficiency and high cost instead of economy. I put this at extreme figures so that if the kind of man is obtained that ought to do the work——

Mr. VARE. You would not pay a secretary of a commission more than you would a Cabinet officer?

Mr. PLATT. Why not? The gentleman knows that in New York State we pay $15,000 to our public-service commissioners, which is more than the governor gets, and we pay our supreme court judges $17,500, which is more than the governor gets. The Cabinet officers work for honor, and nobody can afford to take a position as a Cabinet officer who is not a rich man. Now, with a miserly salary like this, of $5,000, you might get a man like Gifford Pinchot, a distinguished and somewhat cranky millionaire, to fill the job. If you do not obtain such a rich man you are almost sure to get some one who will not be worth even $5,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] to the extent that we should have an efficient and competent man to carry on the activities of this new bureau, and I think "bureau" is the correct word for the department that carries on the activities under this act. I believe that the bill institutes practically a licensing bureau. I believe that through the policies laid down by this bill a great work can be done for the people of this country. I believe that it will develop water-power schemes before unheard of and that private capital has been unable to find. I can not think of any proposition before the public to-day from which more lasting benefit can come to all the people than the development of the great water powers that have been discovered and have not been developed, but which this bill will bring out. And therefore I believe that we should have a very efficient and able man as the general secretary of this bureau, and I believe that while $5,000 might secure a man who is competent, $10,000 would come nearer to getting the right type of a man. It would be a salary below that which the principals would receive, and yet I think it would be accepted by the public as well as by this House as being a reasonable and fair salary for a man until he had demonstrated that he was worth more.

And therefore I move to amend the amendment by striking out "$25,000" and inserting "$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Strike out the figures "$25,000" and insert "$10,000" in lieu thereof.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, for a number of years the people in all sections of the United States where there are any water powers susceptible to development have been hoping that the Congress would agree upon some legislation of a comprehensive nature under the provisions of which those who are interested in the development of the latent water powers of this country, wherever located, might make their arrangements, financially and otherwise, for the actual construction of power plants. Now, this bill that is pending before the committee at the present time occupies a rather unique position in the history of legislation. I do not believe generally in adhering necessarily to the wisdom of committee recommendations.

I, as often as any gentleman here, possibly, vote to override the reports of committees upon amendments. But here is a great proposition representing in its completed form a great compromise upon disputed questions, not only of policy but of governmental principle. For a number of years there was a heated controversy all over the country about the respective rights of the States over these water powers and sites as contradistinguished from those of the Federal Government upon navigable streams. A few who have been interested in this proposition are familiar with those two respective schools of thought. And now, after years of anxious waiting on the part of those who want to see the great latent, potential water powers of this country put into practical business operation for the benefit of the people and of the industries of the country, here we have before us the combined wisdom and the combined compromises, if you please, of all the conflicting and various schools of thought on this great governmental question. It was thrashed out upon the floor of Congress in the last session. It went through the Senate. After a long conference the conferees agreed upon the bill.

I think that it is a wise policy that the identical bill agreed upon in conference should have been introduced both in the House and in the Senate, and I trust, gentlemen, that in order to expedite the passage of this bill—which, as I said, includes the combined wisdom of those who have been put in charge of the proposition by both parties in the House and in the Senate—in the interest of the immediate and expeditious passage of this measure all substantive amendments that may be proposed may be voted down, so that the bill may become a law. And for that reason, gentlemen of the committee, I am opposed to any amendment of a substantive character that might delay to any appreciable extent the early passage and approval of this great proposition. I trust that all amendments of that character may be voted down.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that gentlemen will not offer amendments to increase salaries in this bill. Some gentlemen want to provide a salary for the executive secretary in an amount that indicates that Congress thinks he is going to do all the work of the commission and assume all the responsibility. I want these three members of the Cabinet constituting the commission to feel their responsibility and to act personally upon everything that is material and important. To give $25,000 or $10,000 to a mere executive secretary is to indicate that we ourselves are relying upon that gentleman as to responsibility and everything else.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. In a moment. The engineers of the War Department will do a great deal of this work. The engineers of the Interior Department and of the Agricultural Department Forestry Bureau will also do it in part, and there is absolutely no excuse for a huge salary for a clerk or an executive secretary in excess of $5,000. The secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission receives only $5,000. The gentleman from Massachusetts made a pretty good argument awhile ago to turn this work over to the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to three members of it. To come in now and pile up a large salary in order to provide a good job for somebody is, in my judgment, a mistake, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman knows, of course, that neither one of the three names mentioned in the bill, the Secretaries or heads of the various departments, will have any time particularly to spend upon this proposition. It must be turned over to some executive to organize and carry on the activities. Now, if this bill is going to create the business throughout the country that it is anticipated it will, it will certainly require at its head

a man of sufficient capacity to organize it. The gentleman knows that Secretary Lane has probably five times as much to do now as he ought to do. He has almost enough to do with my committee to keep one man busy, to say nothing about the other various things that he has to handle, and the gentleman knows and I know that he can do very little of that himself. He has to delegate it to somebody, and therefore that man should be a careful and able man, big enough to match wits with the bright business men of this country, and you can not get that man for $5,000, in my judgment.

Mr. SIMS. Then the Interstate Commerce Commission has not got and can not get that type of a man, according to the gentleman's argument, for its secretary, as he only receives $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 33.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

The question was taken.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire before that vote is taken to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, we were dividing on the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the committee is dividing on the vote, and it is not in order to offer an amendment or propound an inquiry in debate while the vote is being taken.

Mr. HULINGS. Before anything else is done I wanted to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on the amendment had closed, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania thereby lost his day in court. He could obtain information from the Chairman in the regular way. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, on page 2, lines 12 and 13, to strike out the words "per day."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "per day."

Mr. ESCH. We have already used the words "per diem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the section.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the chairman of the committee to give his attention to the thought that I have in mind, and that is that we ought not to create this new commission when we already have one, with the money appropriated for it, with all the powers necessary except such as are contained in this bill.

If you strike out sections 1 and 2 and on page 6 just say, "The Waterways Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'the commission') is hereby authorized and empowered," and so forth, that would impose upon the Waterways Commission the duty of carrying into effect the provisions of this act.

Now, when we have a commission authorized, with the money appropriated and the power given to that commission to do various and sundry things and to create obligations on the Government that must be met, there ought to be some reason stated why that commission is not given the power to do the things contemplated by this bill. It is a water-power commission, and I submit to the gentleman—I do not intend to take up any more time—that we ought not to create this new commission and give them power to employ the same agencies and agents that the Waterways Commission has power to employ when we have already got the Waterways Commission created and authorized and the money appropriated.

I do not know when that commission is going to be appointed. I suppose everybody thinks it is going to be appointed. If this commission is to be permitted to go around and do a lot of work that the commission herein to be created is to do, it will be nothing but a waste of public funds. So it occurs to me. If this House is not willing to impose on that commission the duties contemplated in this bill, you ought to abolish that commission and not leave the law open so that it can be appointed and the money spent and the work duplicated. That is all I have to say.

Mr. ESCH. I think the Waterways Commission to which the gentleman refers was authorized in one of the river and harbor bills, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; in the river and harbor act approved August 8, 1917.

Mr. ESCH. That provision authorized the appointment of commissioners and fixed the salaries of the civilian members of the commission.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. The statement was made by members of the committee at the time that the act was so worded that members of the Cabinet could be appointed on the commission, and it was the intention that these particular members of the Cabinet should be three of the commissioners.

Mr. ESCH. But it required the appointment of several commissioners from civil life, with the proper salaries attached.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; $7,500.

Mr. ESCH. That act was approved in August, 1917. About the same time there was created in the Departments of Agriculture, the Interior, and War an interdepartmental committee, I think, at the instance of the President, to devise a water-power bill that would cover water powers on the public domain, in the national forests, and on navigable waters. That interdepartmental committee devised the general water-power bill which the President handed to members of several committees at a meeting at the White House in December, 1917. It is our view that the President never perfected the personnel of the Waterways Commission authorized by the act of August 8, 1917, because of the hope of enacting this water-power bill, as recommended by the interdepartmental committee and as favored by the three Secretaries of Agriculture, War, and the Interior, for the reason that this newer bill would largely cover the scope of activities of the commission created in the act to which the gentleman has referred.

In view of the fact that the President has never exercised the power granted in the act of August, 1917, and in view of the fact that he is sponsor for this bill, which covers largely the field that was to be occupied by this other commission, we felt that we were justified in going on with this measure and carrying out the plan.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. But it still leaves this law on the statute books with authority to appoint this commission.

Mr. ESCH. I know it is very broad in its scope.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Oh, very.

Mr. ESCH. But it does not deal so particularly with water powers as it does with other subjects, such as flood control, irrigation, the purification of streams, and many other diverse and sundry subjects.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; everything else.

Mr. ESCH. This bill covers only water power.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That act provides that—

The commission is authorized to employ or retain and fix the compensation for the service of such engineers, transportation experts, experts in water development and utilization, and constructors of eminence, as they may deem necessary to make such investigation and carry out the purposes of this section.

Now, we gave them $100,000 in cash to start with, and specifically authorized Congress to appropriate any other sums without any limit whatever which this commission might report to Congress and Congress might think ought to be appropriated.

Mr. ESCH. But no portion of the $100,000 has been expended?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Oh, no; the commission has never been appointed.

Mr. ESCH. That provision for this waterways commission was the result of agitation started by the late Senator Newlands, of Nevada.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. And it was due to his persistent and able prosecution of this idea that it was finally incorporated in the measure.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; but if I am correctly informed it was considered by this interdepartmental committee which the gentleman has referred to, and they thrashed out this bill, and it was indorsed by them, and we were told here that we would have to write it into the law or else we would not get anywhere.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment in order to ask the committee if this bill gives unlimited power to the three Secretaries here mentioned, form-

ing a commission, to dispose of the water rights of the United States? Can they license those water rights to whomsoever they see fit for a period of 50 years?

Mr. ESCH. They can license suitable applicants who comply with the conditions of the bill to operate on streams that are navigable or streams in the public domain or the forest reserves, and for a period not exceeding 50 years.

Mr. HULINGS. Is there any appeal from their discretion? I remember very well that in years gone by there was a great deal of complaint as to the handling of the public lands in the West by the Secretary of the Interior. It was claimed that it was arrogant, that it was injudicious, that it was unwise, that it was partisan. These three men who occupy these places undoubtedly have enough business of other sorts in their various departments to occupy their time. Are they to have unlimited control of the licensing and disposing of these water rights, without any right of appeal to any other authority?

Mr. ESCH. Subject to the provisions and limitations of the act. Of course, if officials of the Government violate an act, there is a remedy.

Mr. HULINGS. What is the remedy?

Mr. ESCH. If they act contrary to the law, there is always a remedy in the courts.

Mr. HULINGS. Oh, well——

Mr. ESCH. But there is no appeal from the decision of the commission on any matter that is within the jurisdiction of the commission under this act.

Mr. HULINGS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SNYDER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendments Nos. 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WATER POWER COMMISSION.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the words defined in this section shall have the following meanings when found in this act, to wit:

"Public lands" means such lands and interest in lands owned by the United States as are subject to private appropriation and disposal under public-land laws. It shall not include "reservations," as hereinafter defined.

"Reservations" means lands and interest in lands owned by the United States and withdrawn, reserved, or withheld from private appropriation and disposal under the public-land laws, and lands and interest in lands acquired and held for any public purpose.

"Corporation" means a corporation organized under the laws of any State or of the United States empowered to develop, transmit, distribute, sell, lease, or utilize power in addition to such other powers as it may possess, and authorized to transact in the State or States in which its project is located all business necessary to effect the purposes of a license under this act. It shall not include "municipalities" as hereinafter defined.

"State" means a State admitted to the Union, the District of Columbia, and any organized Territory of the United States.

"Municipality" means a city, county, irrigation district, drainage district, or other political subdivison or agency of a State competent under the laws thereof to carry on the business of developing, transmitting, utilizing, or distributing power.

That the term "navigable waters" as used in this act and as applied to streams shall be construed to include only such streams or parts of streams as are in their ordinary natural condition used for the transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce, or which through improvement heretofore or hereafter made have been or shall become usable in such commerce.

"Municipal purposes" means and includes all purposes within municipal powers as defined by the constitution or laws of the State, or by the charter of the municipality.

"Government dam" means a dam or other work, constructed or owned by the United States for Government purposes, with or without contribution from others, from which flows surplus water not needed for Government purposes that may be disposed of under the provisions of this act.

"Project" means complete unit of improvement or development, consisting of a power house, all water conduits, all dams and appurtenant works and structures (including navigation structures) which are a part of said unit, and all storage, diverting, or forebay reservoirs directly connected therewith, the primary line or lines transmitting power therefrom to the point of junction with the distribution system or with the interconnected primary transmission system, all miscellaneous structures used and useful in connection with said unit or any part thereof, and all water rights, rights of way, ditches, dams, reservoirs, lands, or interest in lands, the use and occupancy of which are necessary or appropriate in the maintenance and operation of such unit.

"Project works" means the physical structures of a project.

"Net investment" in a project means the actual legitimate original cost thereof as defined and interpreted in the "classification of investment in road and equipment of steam roads, issue of 1914, Interstate Commerce Commission," plus similar costs of additions thereto and betterments thereof, minus the sum of the following items properly allocated thereto, if and to the extent that such items have been accumulated during the period of the license from earnings in excess of a fair return on such investment: (a) Unappropriated surplus, (b) aggregate credit balances of current depreciation accounts, and (c) aggregate appropriations of surplus or income held in amortization, sinking fund, or similar reserves, or expended for additions or betterments. The term "cost" shall include, in so far as applicable, the elements thereof prescribed in said classification, but shall not include expenditures from funds obtained through donations by States, municipalities, individuals, or others.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical error on page 6, line 8, to complete the word "necessary."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking two questions. On page 3, lines 9 and 13, the word "reservations" is defined. I would like to ask if the definition includes national parks. The chairman a moment ago, in response to an inquiry, stated that it included public lands and some other real estate owned by the Government.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman is inquiring as to whether reservations would cover national parks. That was our understanding.

Mr. BARBOUR. That was my interpretation of it, but I wanted to be certain. Now, on page 4, lines 6 to 12, the term "navigable waters" is defined as follows:

That the term "navigable waters" as used in this act and as applied to streams shall be construed to include only such streams or parts of streams as are in their ordinary natural condition used for the transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce, or which through improvement heretofore or hereafter made have been or shall become usable in such commerce.

I wish to inquire of the gentleman if that includes navigable streams within the boundaries of a State.

Mr. ESCH. They never have been under the jurisdiction of the War Department so far as granting consent is concerned, but parties desiring to build a dam over a navigable stream wholly intrastate had to come to the Secretary of War for the approval of the plans and specifications. I assume that the same procedure would follow under this act. There may be an effort made to amend the definition of "navigable waters," a very difficult one, and one which gave the committee a good deal of trouble.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 12, at the end of the line insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any boundary waters which are the subject of a treaty between the United States and a foreign country."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee at the outset to the fact that my amendment does not present any question of jurisdiction between the Committee on Water Power and any other committee. Under the special rule of the House adopted on the 22d of May of this year the special committee on water power is given jurisdiction over all water-power matters. So that if this amendment were adopted it would not take away from the Committee on Water Power the jurisdiction over treaty streams.

The amendment is simply predicated on the thought that boundary streams of the United States which are the subject of a treaty with some foreign power are not properly to be comprehended within the terms of a general water-power bill.

At the time this same measure, or its predecessor, was being considered by the House last September an attempt was made to exclude boundary streams. At that time the question of committee jurisdiction was involved, because the rule under which the special committee on water power was then operating expressly excluded the Niagara River and Niagara Falls and all other boundary streams. But the rule adopted by the House on the 22d of May omits that exception, and the special committee on water power, even if my amendment is adopted, will continue its jurisdiction over boundary streams.

I may say frankly that I think boundary streams which are the subject of treaty should be handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Whatever the members of the committee may think on that point, however, it is not involved in this amendment.

At the time of the debate last September it was repeatedly said and repeatedly admitted by members of the committee that the Committee on Water Power, in preparing its bill, had not considered treaty streams separately from its general consideration of all streams throughout the country. I suppose that was inevitably so. I suppose this committee, which was made up of the busiest men in this House, had not been able, had not physically and humanly been able to give the attention, which we feel they deserve and demand, to streams which are the subject of treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the consideration of the committee that the streams which are made the subject of treaty negotiation with other powers must be handled differently from streams wholly within the boundaries of the United States and for which a general water-power policy is to be prescribed. I am not going to weary the committee with citations of treaties under which questions might easily arise of an extremely delicate character, perhaps involving us in a controversy with other powers. But I should like to read one section from the treaty of May 13, 1910, which is a convention concerning boundary waters between the United States and Canada.

Article 3 of that treaty provides:

It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission to be known as the international joint commission.

Our treaties with Mexico are very numerous. Two or three of them relate to the waters of the Rio Grande, and I should like to read just one section from the boundary convention of 1889. Article 1 provides:

All differences or questions that may arise on that portion of the frontier between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico where the Rio Grande and the Colorado Rivers form the boundary line, whether such differences or questions grow out of alterations or changes in the bed of the aforesaid Rio Grande and that of the aforesaid Colorado River, or of works that may be constructed in said rivers, or of any other cause affecting the boundary line, shall be submitted for examination and decision to an international boundary commission, which shall have exclusive jurisdiction in the case of said differences or questions.

There is a similar provision in the treaty of 1906, which is a convention providing for the equitable distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande for irrigation purposes.

Mr. Chairman, we are likely as a Nation to be plunged into very great international complications if a general water-power bill is passed including without consideration our boundary streams which have been made the subject of treaties. This bill creates a commission, a commission upon which there is no representative of the State Department and no person who will be charged with the safeguarding of our international affairs. I submit that it is unsafe for us as a Nation to adopt a policy which shall include these streams within a general water-power bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. The suggestion has been made that this is the only way of procuring legislation for the Niagara River and for Niagara Falls. The suggestion has been made, and probably will be made in the debate to-day, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has had the question before it for some years and that no legislation has resulted. As I said at the outset, the pending amendment does not involve the question of jurisdiction between the committees, but nevertheless I want to answer the suggestion in case it is presented. It is true that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been considering Niagara Falls legislation for some years; but it is also true that it has repeatedly reported out a Niagara Falls bill, and it is also true that on at least two occasions that bill has passed the House. The only reason why there has not been Niagara Falls legislation from the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the past is precisely the same reason that there has not been general water-power legislation, namely, because of fundamental differences in policy between the Senate and the House.

If it should come to pass in the future that this bill shall be enacted, and if it should come to pass that the Committee on Foreign Affairs should have restored to it jurisdiction over Niagara Falls and over the other boundary streams, I am confident that within a period of a very few weeks—I should be prepared as an individual member of the committee to promise that within a month—there would be reported out from the Committee on Foreign Affairs legislation which would adequately deal with the Niagara Falls situation and at the same time amply safeguard our treaty rights. It is of the greatest importance that the United States in this time of international stress should safeguard by every means within its power the obligations under the treaties which it has made with its neighboring countries. We can not afford to be in the position of violating either in fact or potentially our treaty agreements; yet if this pending bill is adopted without the exclusion of boundary streams, we can have no assurance that this special commission, created with very broad powers, will give the slightest consideration to the treaty questions which may be involved, as I have shown from reading the citations from the treaties.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Under the existing treaty the Secretary of War practically carries out the conditions as far as the United States is concerned.

Mr. ROGERS. The Secretary of War has no power, as I understand it, under the treaty which I have read. The general powers are under the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission. Of course, emergency legislation, which Congress has passed on four occasions, does give the Secretary of War the right to grant revocable permits.

Mr. ESCH. Does the gentleman contend that if this bill is enacted into law it would amount to a denunciation of the treaty?

Mr. ROGERS. I think it would not amount to a denunciation of the treaty, I am happy to say; but my contention is it gives this commission power, without any reservation in the bill or elsewhere, to act in a way which would run counter to our treaty obligations.

Mr. ESCH. The only point is, then, that the present treaty is being carried out, so far as the United States is concerned, by the joint commission?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. And the Secretary of War, as far as war emergency legislation is concerned?

Mr. ROGERS. The Secretary of War, under these continuing resolutions that we have passed, has the power to grant revocable permits for a period of one year only.

Mr. ESCH. If this bill becomes a law, would it not be the fact that this commission created by this bill would cooperate with the joint commission in carrying out the treaty?

Mr. ROGERS. It might or might not; it would have abundant freedom of action to do one thing or the other as it saw fit. There is not a word of restriction in this bill upon which action it might take.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the Constitution of the United States the Constitution itself and all treaties made thereunder constitute the supreme law of the land. And, therefore, is it not true that if this bill becomes a law and the commission created under the bill is given jurisdiction over Niagara River the terms of this law must be in harmony with the provisions of the treaty, and that in so far as the law would violate the treaty, unless it could be considered an abrogation of the treaty, the treaty would prevail and the law would not?

Mr. ROGERS. No; as I understand constitutional law the latest expression of Congress, whether it is in the form of a treaty or an act of Congress, prevails in the event of a conflict. Consequently if this law should later on be construed to be violative in any respect of the treaty of 1910 it would prevail and it would, in so far as it was in conflict, abrogate the earlier treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman urge the view that this law in any respect abrogates or is in conflict of the treaty between the United States and Canada?

Mr. ROGERS. I am inclined to think that in so far as it gives untrammeled power to the special commission which is created by section 1 of this bill, without the slightest notice being taken of the treaty of 1910 which gives the international joint commission jurisdiction, that it is a violation of the treaty of 1910.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the powers of this new commission hereby created would have to be construed as being in harmony with and cooperative with this joint commission heretofore created?

Mr. ROGERS. The powers would not have to be construed to be in harmony. I suppose as on all other similar occasions an effort would be made to construe them in harmony, and that would be a very proper effort; but no one can foresee what the result of the effort would be when questions under this bill are brought before the courts.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. HUSTED. So far as the Niagara River is concerned, is it not true that the provisions of this act would apply solely to the development of water power which had been specifically set aside in the treaty itself for the exclusive use of the United States? If that is true, and I think it is true under article 5 of the treaty which specifically sets aside 20,000 cubic feet for the exclusive use of the United States, how could there be any conflict between the United States and Canada under the provisions of this act?

Mr. ROGERS. I have read the section of the treaty which seems to me to form the basis of a conflict. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have, of course, no hostility to Niagara Falls development. It is true that Niagara Falls wants legislation. I think it is probably true that it ought to have it. But at the same time let me call attention to the fact that Niagara Falls has been prospering in the past. The Representative of Niagara Falls on this floor will doubtless call attention to the patriotic services that Niagara Falls has rendered to the Government in the cause of preparedness in this war. And that very fact, I submit, indicates that the penalizing of Niagara Falls through lack of legislation up to this time has not been a very serious one. We can promptly get legislation from Congress that will adequately care for treaty streams and also for our obligations under treaties. Therefore I submit, in order that this country may be scrupulous in regarding its treaty obligations, that this amendment or something closely akin to it should be adopted.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] opened his remarks by saying that this was not a question of jurisdiction and did not involve jurisdiction, and yet his amendment would take from this committee, which by the resolution appointing the committee is given jurisdiction, not alone jurisdiction, but would exclude all boundary streams from the bill and deprive them from any participation in its great benefits. Now, let us look at the history of this situation. I hold in my hand some hearings way back in the dark ages, long before I came to Congress, hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee upon this question. They have labored for years, and the gentleman from Massachusetts says that they have once or twice in that long period of years actually reported a bill——

Mr. ROGERS. And passed through this House.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And passed it through one House; passed it through one House! Why, is that legislation? You might as well say to a famished child, "Although you are lacking bread, although you are dying of hunger, have not I on two occasions during the time you were starving come to the bars and held some bread before you and then withdrawn it?" The relief would be as great, the result would be the same, and that is what the gentleman from Massachusetts claims has been accomplished. And then, after saying that jurisdiction is not involved, the gentleman says that if it turns out that jurisdiction does come back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, then so and so. Then why speak of it? If jurisdiction is not involved, why debate what may be done if the Committee on Foreign Affairs obtains jurisdiction?

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. The reason is because some committee ought to deal specifically with boundary streams with which we have made treaties to make sure we do not violate those treaties.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman has made that statement; he has simply made that statement; but he does not support it by turning to one clause of the treaty and show how it will in any degree to the slightest extent be infringed by this legislation. He holds up a book and he says to the children who are before him now, "Be properly scared. I do not tell you why you should be scared, I do not show you the reason for being scared, but, gentlemen, you should be scared because I say so." Why, if there is anything in this treaty which is to be violated by this bill, the bill is before the House and the gentleman had ample opportunity to study it, he is familiar with its provisions, the treaty is here, we have had it for years, and he can compare the bill and the treaty, and why, if there is any conflict, does not he point to something instead of begging us to be children and be scared by the mere holding up of a bogey, back of which there is no substance? Then the gentleman says that the gentleman from New York will point to the patriotic services rendered by the Niagara frontier throughout the late war.

Of course, I will point to it. And the gentleman from Massachusetts himself ought to point to it as well, because more of the munitions of war were produced on the frontier than in all of the rest of this great Union combined. And they were produced in spite of the fact that there was an inefficient development of the water power and we tried to make it efficient without legislation and spent millions of dollars during the war without any legislation to protect us in that expenditure, from patriotic and unselfish and high-minded and lofty purposes, to make this great Union of ours succeed; to supply it with that which was needed, in order to make it succeed. And now here is the situation to-day: We have 20,000 cubic feet on this side of the Niagara River. It ought to produce 420,000 horsepower, if there were an adequate and efficient development, and we can not produce more than 250,000, because we have not the legislation to protect the investments of the millions of dollars which are needed. And then, down in the gorge, in addition to that 420,000 horsepower, we can develop 600,000 to 700,000 horsepower, so that instead of having 250,000 horsepower to-day we will have a million horsepower as soon as we have legislation. And the gentleman says "wait"; says to the industries of the country, says to the people who are cold in winter, says to the transportation systems which break down in carrying coal, "Wait until the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has on two occasions passed a bill through the lower House, can again exert itself in this heroic and splendid way."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understood the bills which the Foreign Affairs Committee presented and passed provided for only temporary relief.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There are two distinct things—a resolution and a bill. The resolution is temporary in its nature; the bill is permanent. And the gentleman can not point to-day to any way in which the bills which he says his committee passed through this House differ as to their treaty provisions from this bill now under consideration.

Now, in conclusion, gentlemen, let me say to you that here is a general water-power bill. I am not going to address myself to the constitutional question here, because that is going to be dealt with by somebody else who will deal with it better than I can; but here we have spent a long period of years to develop water power. We have finally reached the nearest point to passing a water-power bill at which we have ever arrived, and at that point in comes the Foreign Affairs Committee and says, "Instead of having a general water-power bill, let us have one which excludes the greatest water power upon the broad surface of the world; let us have a water power which will exclude Niagara; let us have a water-power bill which will exclude the St. Lawrence; let us have a water-power bill which will belie its name; and instead of being general, be a small water-power bill dealing only with the other powers which are not in boundary streams."

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the only excuse heretofore given for dealing with Niagara was the fact that there was no legislation on the subject, and does not this bill provide the general legislation under which Niagara can be developed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is exactly the situation. And so I say to you, gentlemen, in conclusion, I defy any member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to point to the treaty provision which will be violated by this bill. I defy any member of that committee to point the distinction between a bill which they say passed the lower House twice and this bill in that respect. I defy them to point to that which safeguards in their bill and which fails to safeguard here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And I say to you, in conclusion, gentlemen, that the instant this water-power bill becomes a

law we will make the development at Niagara efficient; we will produce 420,000 horsepower in place of 250,000. We will begin the development in the lower gorge, and it will produce a half million additional horsepower, or perhaps seven to eight hundred thousand. We will have at least a million horsepower instead of a quarter of a million, and the frontier will prove in peace, as it proved in war, of incalculable service to this country. It will increase the wealth of the country; it will lighten the transportation of the country; it will lessen the need for fuel; it will send out this liquid stream to carry on and turn the wheels of commerce and of the manufactures of this country instead of having to bring the coal from Pennsylvania and distant fields to do it. And in that way we will solve not alone the water-power problem but we will solve the transportation problem; we will solve the fuel problem; and we will be ready at any time if an emergency like that under which we have just passed through comes again upon us to aid, as we aided then, in patriotic and devoted service to maintain the cause of this great Nation of ours. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is recognized.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] would remove from the operation of this bill boundary waters. He contends that his amendment is necessary in order to preserve and protect the treaty obligations of the United States entered into with the nations lying contiguous to us. If his proposition was well founded, his argument, of course, would be entitled to very serious consideration. But is it well founded? The question asked by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and favorably commented on by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], expressed an answer to the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The commission created by this bill, the duties and the limitations imposed upon that commission, set forth precisely that they are governed by law, not only the law contained in this bill but by the general law. And this commission must take notice and be governed by any obligations which the United States has entered into by treaty. So that any treaty obligations with Canada or with Mexico, being the supreme law of the land, are binding upon the commission under this bill. If that be true, then the contention of the gentleman would not seem to be well taken. There are other reasons why boundary waters should not be excluded from this bill.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] gave certainly a very strong reason when he referred to the great delay in the enactment of any legislation whatever for the development of water power. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] himself gave an instance when he stated that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had reported a bill regarding boundary waters which had passed the House but which has not yet become a law. We now have an opportunity for the development of all the water power on streams within our own borders and at the same time develop the water power in boundary waters in conjunction with treaty rights and obligations.

I might further call the attention of the gentleman to subsection b of section 4, on page 6 of the bill, which specifically authorizes the commission "to cooperate with the executive departments and other agencies of the Government in such investigations; and for such purpose the several departments and agencies are authorized and directed, upon the request of the commission, to furnish such records" and papers and any assistance which may be available; so that it would be the duty of this commission, in the exercise of its duties, when an application is made for a license for the development of water power on boundary waters, to confer with the State Department, with the international joint commissions, or, in the language of the bill, any "other agencies of the Government," in order that they may inform themselves and take pains that they shall not infringe upon any existing law or violate any obligation of the United States in any existing treaty.

So that I think upon careful consideration the committee will determine that here we have an opportunity to develop water power upon our boundary waters, and that no good reason has been submitted why we should not embrace the opportunity and place within the jurisdiction of the commission all the boundary waters. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can arrange to close debate on this matter.

Mr. FERRIS. I want five minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may want five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. I may not use all that time.

Mr. ESCH. Several gentlemen over here desire time.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I want to speak in favor of the amendment. It seems all the rest of the gentlemen want to speak against it. I would like to have some time in favor of the amendment.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It would make no provision for the division of that time between the proponents and opponents.

Mr. ROGERS. I suggest to the chairman that we close debate in 20 minutes and divide it equally.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Massachusetts had 20 minutes himself.

Mr. ESCH. The time has been practically equally divided thus far between the proponents and opponents of the amendment. I move that the debate close in 25 minutes, the time to be at the disposal of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that to include the time of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Unless I can have a little time for an amendment I will not agree to it. I can tell the gentleman that right now.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between those in favor of the amendment and those opposed. There has been more time used in opposition up to now than in favor of the amendment. I think that is fair to the opponents.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The memory of the gentleman from Massachusetts is not very good.

Mr. ROGERS. I have had 15 minutes and gentlemen on the other side have had 17.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought the gentleman from Massachusetts had 20 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. No. I had 15.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the section and amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that debate on the section and amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it a request for unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it was a request for unanimous consent. The Chair heard no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent that the 30 minutes be divided equally between the opponents and proponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he suggested that the gentleman from Wisconsin take that matter into consideration before putting the request. The request was restated and put, and there was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. I understand, Mr. Chairman; but can I not now ask the Chair to put that request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts now makes a unanimous-consent request that the time so allotted—that is, 30 minutes—as was stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, be equally divided between those for and those against the amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I want to offer another amendment to this particular paragraph. I want two or three minutes on it, and as the proposition suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts precludes me from even an opportunity to do that, I feel obliged to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota objects. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had more than five minutes, in order that I might discuss some broader phases of the question than this particular amendment, but as the situation stands I suppose I shall have to confine myself to the technical consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The gentleman from Massachusetts fears that the commission created by this bill may in some way violate the provisions of the treaty. Now, the gentleman confesses and admits at the

start that the bill itself does not contravene any provisions of the treaty. What follows from that? I will concede that if the bill in question anywhere in its provisions contravenes the provisions of the treaty, then that enactment would be superior in its force and effect and more binding in its effect than the treaty itself. But nothing of that kind having been found within the contents of the bill, it follows that the treaty is the supreme law of the land, which the commission that is appointed by this bill are bound to obey. They would be expected to obey it as much as any other commission, as much as the Secretary of War, as much as the Secretary of State. And I go further at this time and assert that if they violated any provisions of the treaty their acts would be utterly invalid, void, and of no effect, because the treaty represents, nothing contravening it in this bill, the supreme law of the land.

Now, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has really taken this view itself in all its bills and all its measures, so far as I have been able to get them before me in the brief time that I have had opportunity. In the bill and the resolutions which it reported they have inserted no provision to the effect that the Secretary of War, who is to grant temporary permits, or any commission that was created by the force and effect of their bill to carry out its provisions, should be bound by the terms of the treaty. Why? Because such a provision was entirely unnecessary, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs knew it.

The bills which the Foreign Affairs Committee has heretofore introduced are subject to the very same objections now made to the bill before the House. The same argument that the gentleman from Massachusetts has made, if it was good at all, would be good against the bills which have been introduced heretofore by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. But I insist that this argument has no validity; that we have no more reason to expect that the commission which will be created by this bill will violate the provisions of the treaty than any other body which could possibly be created by this Congress.

Now, what sort of a situation have we? The greatest possession that any nation can have is energy. At Niagara Falls there flows a stream of energy, unharnessed and unused, thousands of horsepower—I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] said hundreds of thousands of horsepower—literally going to waste all the time. Here is something that can make or unmake this Nation. In this power that is going to waste there is the potential strength by which it may overcome all opposition in trade, in commerce, in war, if it is used, or for the want of it we may fail in war, in trade, in our duties to our own citizens. We seek to make life better and easier for each individual. In so doing we must lift in some way the burden of his toil. Here is all this countless horsepower, an inexhaustible source of energy wasted at Niagara, and wasted elsewhere, because Congress has failed to take action. Untold wealth might be produced by it. As gentlemen of the committee are well aware, wealth consists not simply in gold, not simply in credits, but in production of the necessities and the comforts and even the luxuries of life. Here are the materials for it pouring over Niagara, pouring over numbers of other waterfalls scattered over the vast extent of this country, going to waste because we have failed to take action. I submit that now is the time to pass this bill just as it is. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer another amendment, and if there is no more debate on this particular amendment I am willing that a vote should be taken on it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is an amendment to the original paragraph, and I ask to have it read for information.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the offering of this amendment preclude any further debate on the original amendment? After the gentleman from Minnesota has moved his amendment, will it be in order to debate the original proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when debate was limited the gentlemen who rose and apparently were to participate in the time were the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN]. If those are the gentlemen who are to have the time, then the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is not provided for.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] was one of those whom the chairman of the committee considered in the making of his request for 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen standing at the time the limitation was made were apparently those whom the Chair has named. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] reserved five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I was in favor of the amendment, but I am perfectly willing to yield my five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BARKLEY. I was simply endeavoring to preserve the rights of those of us who desire to speak on the main motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the matter has been satisfactorily adjusted and that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] for five minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota having offered an amendment, he can speak for five minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] been cared for?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] will be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have my amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON: On page 4, in lieu of the definition of navigable waters, insert the following:

"'Navigable waters,' as used in this act, means all streams or parts of streams over which Congress has jurisdiction under its authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, which, notwithstanding interruption by falls, shallows, rapids, or other obstructions, are susceptible of navigation either with or without improvement. The commission shall, upon the application of any person qualified to take and hold a license under this act, determine whether any stream for which an application for license or permit is made is navigable within the meaning of this definition."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the definition of navigable waters in the bill is a very restricted definition. Navigable waters under the bill include only—and I emphasize the word "only" because it is in the bill—such streams or parts of streams as are in their ordinary natural condition used—not susceptible, but used—for the transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce, or which through improvement heretofore or hereafter made have been or shall become usable for such commerce.

It is clear from that definition that this commission will not take any jurisdiction at all unless a stream is navigable in its natural condition or has been improved in such a way as to make it navigable. The definition which I have offered is intended to broaden that definition so as to make navigable waters include all the streams or parts of streams which, notwithstanding natural obstruction to the flow, are susceptible of navigation either with or without improvement.

Mr. ESCH. How could such a stream, where there is interruption by falls, shallows, rapids, or other obstructions, be susceptible of navigation without improvement?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course it includes both, those which are susceptible in the natural condition and those which are susceptible after improvement.

In addition my amendment would make it possible for any person contemplating an improvement on a navigable stream to have the question of navigability determined in advance.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. What construction does the gentleman place on the last two lines of the paragraph as now written, "have been or shall become usable in such commerce"?

Mr. ANDERSON. I put the construction on it which is clearly indicated by the language itself. The jurisdiction does not attach to a navigable stream until it has become actually usable for navigation. I think that is a clear indication of the language itself.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman stated that the commission only had jurisdiction over such streams as are now used by navigation and by improvements heretofore made. Did the gentleman take into consideration the future development?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think the language I used was subject to the interpretation which the gentleman puts on it. I intended to say the jurisdiction did not attach to the stream under this definition until it was actually navigable either in its natural condition or because of improvement placed in the river.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does it include any river not actually navigable and not used for commercial purposes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think not. It excludes streams not navigable in their natural condition and those not used for interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I am asking for information on the gentleman's amendment. The first part of his amendment is that navigable waters as used in this act means all streams or parts of streams over which Congress has jurisdiction under its authority to regulate commerce.

Taking that part of the definition that would give jurisdiction over nonnavigable parts and nonnavigable feeders of navigable streams—is that the intention of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. The intention of my amendment is to include exactly what the language says, "all streams and parts of streams over which Congress would have jurisdiction under the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce." The gentleman from Oregon knows as well as I do what that means. He knows how indefinite the decisions of the Supreme Court and the authorities are on that question.

Mr. SINNOTT. The reason I ask the question is to direct the attention of the gentleman to the language of the first part, and to ascertain whether or not it is qualified by the last sentence—"are susceptible of navigation either with or without improvement." Some of the upper reaches of the nonnavigable feeders of navigable streams are not susceptible of navigation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think they would not be included in the definiton of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak against the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and as the last speech was on that side I prefer to wait until there has been a speech for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether he offers his amendment as an amendment to the Rogers amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is in order in that form.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from New York in glowing terms and flowery language depicted the patriotism of the power company at Niagara Falls when he said that they poured out a liquid stream of power day and night to make munitions for this Government.

I am sorry that he did not say that their patriotism was paid for by so much a kilowatt and the price per kilowatt was twice as much as it is at Niagara Falls, Canada.

I do not wish to say anything against the power company, because some of those fellows are my personal friends. But I believe it is stretching a point, I believe it is far-fetched, when the legislators of this country will come up and seriously protest that the power company that has made millions did an act of patriotism by keeping their plant running. [Applause.] I would like to put that kind of patriotism, if you please, up against the patriotism of the boys that occupy beds at the Walter Reed Hospital.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I do not care to at this time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield before he closes?

Mr. BEGG. I will, but not at this time. I do not believe, gentlemen, that we want to pass this bill on any emotional appeal or anything so far-fetched. I claim that this Congress is dealing with the most monumental proposition it ever dealt with in its history, as far as a public commodity is concerned. All the scientists say that we are just going into the edge of electricity, and electricity must come from water power. If the gentleman from California was right in his statement this morning when he said that we only had coal enough to last another 100 years, we are compelled to look to water for power.

Do you know or do I know that in 25 or 50 years conditions will be such that we will want this proposition tied up in the hands of any company without any opportunity or privilege of reducing it?

Now, to come back to this particular question, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee were very much harangued and complained of for inactivity.

I hold no brief for the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I offer no apology for them, but whatever might have been the shortcomings of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the past, that is no just reason for haranguing the Foreign Affairs Committee to-day, whose membership is about 50 per cent new men. They were challenged to show where there was a single provision in the treaty with Canada that was violated by this proposition. I challenge the advocates of this proposition to show where they are offering a plan for water development. Instead of offering a plan for water development, you are offering easy access to the great power interests of this country by the moneyed interests. You have not got a plan; you have put in a few provisions, and there is no plan outlined in your proposition for development.

Article 4 of the treaty with Canada says:

The high contracting parties agree that, except in cases provided for by special agreement between them, they will not permit the construction or maintenance on their respective sides of the boundary of any remedial or protective works or any dams or other obstructions in waters flowing from boundary waters, or in waters at a lower level than the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the effect of which is to raise the natural level of waters on the other side of the boundary, unless the construction or maintenance thereof is approved by the aforesaid international joint commission.

If that means anything, it means that the aforesaid international joint commission does have jurisdiction. If I am able to interpret this bill, it creates a special commission, with absolutely unlimited powers, to license individuals, corporations, companies, and States, and what not, to handle and do the very thing that is being safeguarded in article 4 of this treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] and so vigorously advocated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] will not prevail. I think it is perfectly clear to our minds that under the Constitution provision is made that the Constitution itself and treaties made thereunder shall be the supreme law of this land. Congress can not abrogate a treaty merely by providing a law that has some relation to the matters covered in the terms of the treaty. In the first place, the occasion for entering into this treaty was the fact that there was certain water power at Niagara Falls, and there was a difficulty in apportioning between the United States and Canada the water power that was capable of being created at that place. In the treaty that was entered into between this country and Canada an effort was made to divide the water power between Canada and the United States in a certain proportion.

My recollection is that Canada gets 36,000 cubic feet per second and that the United States gets something like 20,000 cubic feet per second, making a total of 56,000 cubic feet of water per second, provided for in this treaty. Under that treaty the only part of that water power at Niagara Falls that this commission could deal with would be the 20,000 cubic feet provided for in the treaty, and this bill does not in any way undertake to create any authority in this commission of three members of the Cabinet to infringe upon the rights of that portion of water going to Canada, or to infringe upon the jurisdiction or authority of this joint high commission in administering the terms of the treaty; and that is the only object the treaty had in providing for a joint commission. It was to see to it that the terms of the treaty are lived up to by both parties.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this situation at Niagara is perhaps one-tenth part of the boundary power situations that the international joint commission has to deal with.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that be true, it is all the greater argument why it all ought to be combined in one bill, because if Niagara can be excluded and separate legislation enacted for Niagara Falls, then all of these other sites where there is water power upon the boundary between the United States and the other countries will have to be covered in a separate bill and be provided for, whereas this bill will care for all those situations in one general omnibus bill, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] calls it.

Mr. ROGERS. The treaty says that certain things can be done with the approval of the International Joint Commission. The bill now before us says those same things can be done without the approval of the joint commission, upon the recommendation of the special commission. Is there not a conflict there?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so. I think the jurisdiction with respect to these international boundary sites that will be exercised by the commission which we create in this law will be subject to the provisions of the treaty already in force between the United States and Canada or any other country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And the resolution passed by the Foreign Affairs Committee gave the Secretary of War power to do just the thing that this bill does, and they never found that that was in violation of the treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The Secretary of War has always had general jurisdiction over water power, just as he had jurisdiction over navigable streams, and the bill, as the gentleman suggests, brought in by the Foreign Affairs Committee gives to the Secretary of War alone power to do what these three members of the Cabinet have the power to do under this legislation. I am not making any attack on the Foreign Affairs

Committee, because it is an excellent committee and is diligent in the performance of its duties, and I do not think criticism properly may be laid to it, but about all that it has done lately is to come in periodically and ask for an extension of time within which this work might be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the time was fixed by unanimous consent.

Mr. MACGREGOR. So that I have no opportunity to say anything?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman had been here at the time the agreement was made, he would have understood at that time that the time was limited for debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Then we have a monopoly, so to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has nothing to do with that; it was done in open committee by unanimous consent.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I protest against monopoly on time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is obliged to say the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to say, while I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I do not care anything about jurisdiction in this case. You may leave the jurisdiction of all these boundary streams with the Committee on Water Power as far as I am concerned. But my service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs has convinced me that boundary streams, and particularly the boundary streams between the United States and Canada, ought to be exempt from the provisions of the present bill. I want to call the attention of the committee to the following provisions in the treaty with Great Britain respecting boundary waters. Article 7 of that treaty, establishing the International Joint Commission, provides:

ARTICLE 7.

The high contracting parties agree to establish and maintain an International Joint Commission of the United States and Canada composed of six commissioners, three on the part of the United States, appointed by the President thereof, and three on the part of the United Kingdom, appointed by His Majesty on the recommendation of the governor in council of the Dominion of Canada.

In article 3 it is provided:

It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

The foregoing provisions are not intended to limit or interfere with the existing rights of the Government of the United States on the one side and the Government of the Dominion of Canada on the other, to undertake and carry on governmental works in boundary waters for the deepening of channels, the construction of breakwaters, the improvement of harbors, and other governmental works for the benefit of commerce and navigation, provided that such works are wholly on its own side of the line and do not materially affect the level or flow of the boundary waters on the other, nor are such provisions intended to interfere with the ordinary use of such waters for domestic and sanitary purposes.

Article 4 provides:

The high contracting parties agree that, except in cases provided for by special agreement between them, they will not permit the construction or maintenance on their respective sides of the boundary of any remedial or protective works or any dams or other obstructions in waters flowing from boundary waters or in waters at a lower level than the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the effect of which is to raise the natural level of waters on the other side of the boundary unless the construction or maintenance thereof is approved by the aforesaid International Joint Commission.

It is further agreed that the waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I take the position that under the terms of this bill, even if it be true that the commission which this bill creates will only have the privilege of exercising the rights that are granted to the United States by the treaty—I do still assert that this commission would still have to go to the International Joint Commission to secure its approval of the various projects involved in boundary streams.

Mr. FERRIS. And the Secretary of War has to go to the same place now?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but the Secretary of War, Mr. Chairman, only deals with one proposition, and that is at Niagara Falls.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Secretary of War under our resolution is only authorized to deal with a matter that is already secured to us by the treaty. That is not under the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Surely. The International Joint Commission does not exercise the same powers the Secretary of War exercises. The treaty not only provides for the division of water, as suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky, but the treaty provides that the United States shall receive 20,000 cubic feet per second and Canada 36,000 cubic feet per second; but, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, the International Joint Commission has nothing to do with the water that is already appropriated by the United States, but that is a matter which the Secretary of War, under the resolution of this House, has control of. We do not delegate to the Secretary of War the right or authority to deal with other streams and other projects involved in boundary streams, but we only authorize him to distribute the 20,000 cubic feet of water which was permitted to be taken under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, and when you come here and seek to pass an act involving not only Niagara Falls, but other boundary streams you go out into that part of this matter over which the International Joint Commission has jurisidiction. When you do that you ought to harmonize your act here with the obligations contained in that treaty.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, to my way of thinking, and I feel sure I am right about this, this bill neither takes from or adds to any power that this International High Commission has. The real truth about it is it is not really a question involving the international commission at all. The bill makes no reference to it. The bill does not in any way involve them, and it does not in any way curtail their powers or reduce them. What are the facts? Heretofore the Public Lands Committee has always dealt with the water power on the public lands. Heretofore the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has always dealt with water power on navigable streams. Heretofore the Foreign Affairs Committee has dealt, one year at a time, with the Niagara Falls situation, which is the crux of this debate. Now, the answer to it all is Congress, in its wisdom, has created a Water Power Committee, has given the Water Power Committee jurisdiction to do what? To propose a comprehensive water-power policy in its entirety. This committee set to work last year; they reported a bill which passed this House almost unanimously. They reported this bill. They are here with a complete and adequate water-power policy as distinguished from any piecemeal plan. We passed it last year. It went to the Senate; the Senate accepted it. It went to conference; the conferees accepted it. The question was debated then and it was voted on then. This amendment has always been voted down. The House has never agreed with the proponents of this amendment. It was adopted in conference. It was passed on in conference and has always resulted the same. This matter ought to be put at rest. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman, I believe, from Minnesota, the gentleman from Ohio, and one or two others have objected, or rather not objected so much to what is in here, because there is nothing in here, but they are advocating an amendment which will specifically exclude all boundary waters. Well, I can not for the life of me conceive what has been accomplished if the Congress has spent years and years trying to pass a comprehensive water-power policy, and then we are to undertake to leave out what is in fact the greatest water power in the country.

And if we leave it out, where does it leave us? We are driven back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who will come in here at this session and the next session probably, and ask to do what? To pass a resolution for one year. And what have they told us each time? They have said, "We want you to vote for this resolution until such time as we can get a great, comprehensive water-power policy through." And year after year the Congress has been encumbered with this resolution. We have lost time with it; it ought to be disposed of. This bill does dispose of it.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. No.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman made a misstatement that I would like to correct.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no; I have not. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Year after year Congress has been encumbered with a resolution just dealing with this proposition superficially, just one year at a time, and until such time as a general, comprehensive policy could be passed. The policy has been agreed upon, this

same water-power bill has been passed before, the bill has again been reported, this proposition has been adjudicated, and the gentleman has raised a bogy man again that we are interfering with the International Joint Commission. Not a word of it interferes with the International Joint Commission in any way. What they ask to do is to write in here a specific prohibition against dealing with that. Absolutely this whole thing is a tempest in a teapot, to my way of thinking, and it is a jealousy between two committees that ought not to exist.

I am sorry that some members of the Foreign Affairs Committee were not included on this committee. If they had been it would have been all right. At times members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee have insisted on being on this committee. I am sorry they were not. Then it would have been all right. But to raise a great question here of jurisdiction and raise other bogy men about imaginary obstacles and obstructions and schemes in order to eliminate a very great water-power development in this country, is not the thing for this House to do; and I assume that the House will do as it has heretofore done, pass this in its entirety, and not make a piecemeal proposition of it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ROGERS. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 12, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment reported.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. SMALL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDERSON: At the end of line 12, page 4, insert: "The commission shall, upon application of any person qualified to take and hold a license under this act, determine whether any stream for which an application for license or permit is made is navigable within the meaning of this definition."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON: On page 5, in lieu of the definition of "net investment," insert the following:

"'Net investment' in a project means the actual, legitimate, original cost thereof plus similar cost of additions thereto and betterments thereof minus the sum of the following items properly allocated thereto, if and to the extent that such items have been accumulated during the period of the license from earnings in excess of a fair return upon such investment: (a) Unappropriated surplus; (b) aggregate credit balances of current depreciation account; and (c) aggregate appropriations of surplus or income held in amortization, sinking fund, or similar reserves, or used for the purpose for which such reserves were created or expended for additions or betterments. The term 'cost' shall be defined by rules and regulations of the commission, which shall conform as nearly as possible to the definition and interpretation thereof in the 'classification of investment in road and equipment of steam roads, issue of 1914, Interstate Commerce Commission,' and shall include, so far as applicable, the elements prescribed in said classification, but shall not include expenditures from funds obtained through donations by States, municipalities, individuals, or others."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Practically the only purpose of your amendment is to change the language with reference to location of the classification of investment as prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, putting it at the end of the proposed paragraph rather than at the beginning?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has more effect than simply changing it from one place to the other. Under the bill as reported "original cost" is cost as defined and interpreted under the "classification of investment in road and equipment of steam roads, issue of 1914," by the Interstate Commerce Commission. In other words, this bill writes into the law itself that classification and definition of cost, while the amendment as I have written it defines cost under the rules and regulations of the commission created by the bill, which rules and regulations must follow, so far as they are applicable, the classification which is referred to in the bill. The only difference is that this writes into the bill itself an absolutely inflexible definition, while the amendment as I have drawn it leaves the matter in such shape that the cost is defined by rules and regulations issued by the commission in accordance with the definition which the Interstate Commerce Commission has laid down.

I do not think it is a wise policy to write into the law itself this definition of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a separate body, which definition is subject to change by that body, and in that way make this definition an absolutely inflexible one, whereas applied to the railroads it is a flexible one.

Now, there is another thing that I want to call attention to: Under the bill as written and as reported, among the reductions of the net cost which occur in the definition are the following items: "(a) Unappropriated surplus; (b) aggregate credit balances of current depreciation account; and (c) aggregate appropriations of surplus or income held in amortization, sinking fund, or similar reserves." Now under the last item the reduction would only cover the actual reserves in the hands of the licensee as reserves. It would not cover the amount of such reserves which had been used for the purpose for which they were created. To illustrate, let us suppose that a licensee under this bill is authorized to earn a fair return of 10 per cent. He is required to keep certain reserves, or maintain certain reserves, out of the excess earnings in excess of that 10 per cent. Now, suppose he has made his 10 per cent and in excess of that an amount equal to 5 per cent, or 15 per cent in the aggregate, and he has accumulated that 5 per cent over fair return in a surplus account for the purpose of reduction of the bonded indebtedness of the corporation, and thereafter has paid out of that surplus a part of his bonded indebtedness.

Now, it is clear that in that case the Government in taking over the property should be entitled to reduce the original investment by the amount by which the original investment had been reduced by payments out of the accumulated surplus. That is all that the amendment does. I do not know whether I have made myself entirely clear on it or not. If the reserve or surplus is actually in the treasury of the licensee at the time of recapture, the amount which the Government or any other licensee taking over the property would have to pay would be reduced by that amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. But if the reserves had actually been used for the purpose of reducing the indebtedness, in that case the amount of that reduction would not be taken from the amount which the Government or any other licensee would have to pay in order to take over the property.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. If I understand the gentleman's position, his amendment looks in the direction of a larger governmental benefit in the case of recapture?

Mr. ANDERSON. Unquestionably so.

Mr. SIMS. Is that the purpose and object of the amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Is that all?

Mr. ANDERSON. It does only the two things that I mentioned.

Mr. SIMS. What is the other?

Mr. ANDERSON. The other part of the proposition is simply this: Instead of providing, as the bill does now, that the original cost shall be as defined in the classification of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it provides that the cost shall be determined by the regulations issued by the commission in accordance with such classification.

Mr. SIMS. By the water-power commission?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the commission is hereby authorized and empowered—

(a) To make investigations and to collect and record data concerning the power industry and its relation to other industries and to interstate or foreign commerce, and concerning the location, capacity, development costs, and relation to markets of power sites, and whether the power from navigation dams can be advantageously used by the United States for its public purposes, and what is a fair value of such power, to the extent it may deem necessary or useful for the purposes of this act.

(b) To cooperate with the executive departments and other agencies of the Government in such investigations; and for such purpose the several departments and agencies are authorized and directed upon the request of the commission, to furnish such records, papers, and information in their possession as may be requested by the commission, and temporarily to detail to the commission such officers or experts as may be necessary in such investigations.

(c) To make public from time to time the information secured hereunder, and to provide for the publication of its reports and investigations in such form and manner as may be best adapted for public information and use. The commission, on or before the first Monday in December of each year, shall submit to Congress for the fiscal year preceding a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued under this act, and in each case the parties thereto, the terms prescribed, and the moneys received, if any, on account thereof.

(d) To issue licenses to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such citizens, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, or to any State, or municipality for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining dams, water conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, or other project works necessary or convenient for the development and improvement of navigation, and for the development, transmission, and utilization of power across, along, or in any of the navigable waters of the United States, or upon any part of the public lands and reservations of the United States (including the Territories), or for the purpose of utilizing the surplus water or water power from any Government dam, except as herein provided: *Provided*, That licenses shall be issued within any reservation only after a finding by the commission that the license will not interfere or be inconsistent with the purpose for which such reservation was created or acquired, and shall be subject to and contain such conditions as the Secretary of the department under whose supervision such reservation falls shall deem necessary for the adequate protection and utilization of such reservation: *Provided further*, That no license affecting the navigable capacity of any navigable waters of the United States shall be issued until the plans of the dam and other navigation structures have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. Whenever the contemplated improvement is, in the judgment of the commission, desirable and justified in the public interest for the purpose of improving or developing a waterway or waterways for the use or benefit of interstate or foreign commerce, a finding to that effect shall be made by the commission and shall become a part of the records of the commission: *Provided further*, That in case the commission shall find that any Government dam may be advantageously used by the United States for public purposes in addition to navigation, no license therefor shall be issued until two years after it shall have reported to Congress the facts and conditions relating thereto, except that this provision shall not apply to any Government dam constructed prior to the passage of this act.

(e) To issue preliminary permits for the purpose of enabling applicants for a license hereunder to secure the data and to perform the acts required by section 9 hereof: *Provided, however*, That upon the filing of any application for a preliminary permit by any person or corporation the commission, before granting such application, shall at once give notice of such application in writing to any State or municipality likely to be interested in or affected by such application; and shall also publish notice of such application for eight weeks in a daily or weekly newspaper published in the county or counties in which the project or any part thereof or the lands affected thereby are situated.

(f) To prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of a system of accounts and for the maintenance thereof by licensees hereunder; to examine all books and accounts of such licensees at any time; to require them to submit at such time or times as the commission may require statements and reports, including full information as to assets and liabilities, capitalization, cost of project, cost of operation, and the production, transmission, use, and sale of power, and to make adequate provision for currently determining said costs. All such statements and reports shall be made upon oath, unless otherwise specified, and in such form and on such blanks as the commission may require. Any person who, for the purpose of deceiving, makes or causes to be made any false entry in the books or the accounts of such licensee, and any person who, for the purpose of deceiving, makes or causes to be made any false statement or report in response to a request or order or direction from the commission for the statements and report herein referred to shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(g) To hold hearings and to order testimony to be taken by deposition at any designated place in connection with the issuance of any permit or license, or the regulation of rates, service, or securities, or the making of any investigation, as provided in this act; and to require by subpœna, signed by any member of the commission, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence from any place in the United States, and in case of disobedience to a subpœna the commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any member, expert, or examiner of the commission may, when duly designated by the commission for such purposes, administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Depositions may be taken before any person designated by the commission and empowered to administer oaths, shall be reduced to writing by such person or under his direction, and subscribed by the deponent. Witnesses summoned before the commission shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(h) To perform any and all acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to issue such orders not inconsistent with this act as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. LAYTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Delaware rise?

Mr. LAYTON. I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment: On page 6, line 17, after the word "of," strike out the words "the Government" and insert the words "State or National Governments," so that it will read: "To cooperate with the executive departments and other agencies of State or National Governments."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 6, line 17, after the word "of," strike out the words "the Government" and insert the words "State or National Governments."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment. After the word "agencies," in line 18, page 6, insert the words "of the National Government."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 6, line 18, after the word "agencies," insert the words "of the National Government."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I do so, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. Subsection (d), or paragraph (d), authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of dams. What I want to know is whether there is any limitation on the authority of the commission to issue these licenses for the construction of dams? The particular question I have in mind is whether they would have authority to authorize the construction of a dam which would throw out some existing and going structure up the stream?

Mr. ESCH. That could only be done by paying whatever damages the construction of such a dam would entail.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. But they can then proceed and issue a license which would mean the obliteration of an existing plant upon the payment of damages?

Mr. ESCH. There are many provisions in this bill giving the commission power to grant licenses to such applicants as will best develop the water powers of the region, and with such power granted to the commission it might be that they would grant a license to a lower builder of a dam, even though it might entail loss to the upper owner of a dam. Of course it would be subject to the payment of damages. I doubt, however, whether the commission would exercise such power to any considerable extent.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. But the fact is that they would have that power under this bill?

Mr. ESCH. I know of nothing in the bill that would take that power away.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. That is somewhat of a departure from the usual practice in respect to development, I take it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Would prescriptive right have any effect in that connection?

Mr. ESCH. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment which I think the chairman of the committee will accept. On page 9, line 5, after the word "person," insert the word "association."

In defining the powers of the commission in subsection (d) they are empowered to issue licenses to citizens of the United States, associations, or corporations. On page 9, in line 5, only the words "person or corporation" are used, and as the word

"person" is not sufficiently defined in the section containing the definitions, it strikes me that the word "association" should be inserted.

Mr. ESCH. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARKLEY: Page 9, line 5, after the word "person," insert the word "association."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDERSON: Page 9, line 18, strike out all after the word "to" and all of lines 19, 20, 21, down to and including the word "cost," in line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "assets and liabilities, capitalization, net investment and reduction thereof, gross receipts, interest due and paid, depreciation and other reserves, cost of project, cost of maintenance and operation of the project, cost of renewals and replacements of the project works, and as to depreciation of the project works, and as to production, transmission, use, and sale of power; also to require any licensee to make adequate provision for currently determining said costs and other facts."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the subsection to which this is an amendment authorizes the commission to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of a uniform system of accounts, and also authorizes the commission to require licensees to make certain reports. The amendment which I have offered does not limit the subject matter as to which the commission may require reports, but extends it in the following particulars:

Under my amendment the commission might require a report as to the net investment and also as to the reductions which have been made on the net investment. It might also require a report as to gross receipts, as to interest due and paid, as to depreciation and other reserves, as to cost of renewals and replacements.

Now, these reports could not be required under the bill as it stands, unless, for instance, depreciation could be included under the term "cost of operation." There is some question as to whether depreciation is an element in the cost of operation. I am inclined to think that it is not in the sense in which it is used here.

There is also some question as to whether a report could be required as to maintenance and the other items which I have added to the subject matter of this subsection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Does the gentleman also take into consideration in this question of cost the matter of distribution? For instance, the Niagara Falls Power Co. would be the licensee. That company has another company which consists of practically the same men, which is known as the distributing company. The distributing company sends its power to the General Electric Co., which distributes power in the city of Buffalo. Now, if you have this effective only as to the licensee, you do not reach the cost to the consumer in the city of Buffalo.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is taken care of in another section. This has reference only to the cost of operation, maintenance, and other elements relating to the project of the licensee itself. As I said before, the elements which I have inserted do not limit the language, but extend it and make it certain that it covers some elements of cost which, it seems to me, clearly the commission ought to have the power to require.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I know of no objection to this amendment. It allows the commission to secure more elaborate accounting and get more elaborate details of the financial operations of these various licensees. I have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were—ayes 25, noes none.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, the committee rose; and Mr. WALSH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the general water-power bill (H. R. 3184) had come to no resolution thereon

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman calls up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1920, and for other purposes, having met, have been unable to agree.

C. R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
Managers on the part of the House.
CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I understand that the Senate have acted upon this report and asked for a further conference. I now move that we disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the further conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, the water-power bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 22, after the word "thereto," strike out the comma and insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the chairman and the gentlemen of the committee I think they will agree to this amendment. This is a subparagraph which authorizes the commission to issue licenses, and at the end of the paragraph, at the bottom of page 8, is this proviso:

Provided further, That in case the commission shall find that any Government dam may be advantageously used by the United States for public purposes in addition to navigation, no license therefor shall be issued until two years after it shall have reported to Congress the facts and conditions relating thereto—

This amendment proposes to strike out the remainder of the paragraph, which reads as follows:

except that this provision shall not apply to any Government dam constructed prior to the passage of this act.

If this proviso should have application to any Government dam hereafter constructed it should also have application to any existing Government dam. There are a number of Government dams which have heretofore been constructed and which are not now being utilized for water power for lack of general legislation. For instance, I can cite one dam at Minneapolis, at the head of the Mississippi, which is a very important dam. It seems to me that this proviso, if it is applicable to a Government dam hereafter constructed, ought to be applicable to a dam already constructed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say that in the case of the Minnesota dam everybody knows what can be done and has all the information in respect to that dam. Does the gentleman think that the whole proposition ought to be held up for two years after the bill passes in order to get another report, in order to give Congress an opportunity with respect to that dam?

Mr. SMALL. I have no information whatever of any agreement, and, as a matter of fact, no agreement has been made. The dam has been constructed and is being used for the purposes of navigation, but nothing has been done looking to its utilization for the development of power. Now, whether this proviso should have application to any Government dam may be another question, but I say if it has application to any Government dam—and there are many Government dams on streams throughout the country that have already been constructed and should come within the proviso as much as dams hereafter constructed—I think it is proper and in the interest of good legislation. These dams have been constructed, but they are not utilized. No investigation has been made to ascertain whether they can be advantageously utilized for public purposes in addition to the navigation, and therefore if they can be used some investigation should be made of those already constructed as well as those hereafter to be constructed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. There is a difference with respect to the application of this paragraph and also a difference as to the facts with respect to dams already constructed and ones to be constructed in the future.

In the case of the dams to be constructed in the future, the question which this particular section raises comes up at the inception of the application for the improvement. Consequently there is no particular harm done to anybody by providing that in that case there should be a period of two years elapse in order that Congress may have an opportunity to determine what it will do with respect to that dam. But in the case of a dam already constructed, the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina simply means that there must be a delay of two years before anything can be done under the bill with respect to the power created by the Government dam, although the dam is entirely completed and ready for the installation of the power machinery. I can see no reason on earth why, under the circumstances created under this bill, where the commission has full authority over the rate charges and everything else connected with the dam, that there should be a delay of two years before you can utilize the power created by the dams already constructed.

Mr. SMALL. If I may interrupt the gentleman, the gentleman refers to a delay of two years; there need not necessarily be any such delay.

The matter is reported to Congress, and Congress shall be in session and Congress can determine what legislation, if any at all, should be enacted within a few months or within much less time than that. The delay of two years is only for the purpose of enabling Congress to act. This is in the discretion of the commission to the extent that if they find that the dam can be advantageously used by the United States for any public purpose in addition to navigation, they can so report, and if they do not so find as a fact, they would not report to Congress as to any existing dams. If they do find it may be used, they report to Congress, and if Congress shall be in session, as Congress most always is, at most there can be but a brief delay in the Congress exercising its wishes in whatever legislation it desires.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, the gentleman knows as well as I do, and he has been here longer than I have, that expedition is a word which is not in the dictionary of legislative procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. As I recollect it, there are four such dams in the State of New York, three in Arkansas, and three in Minnesota that are already built, but no company has applied for licenses on these projects waiting for legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that, as far as dams have been built for a long time, the Government, through the War Department, knows all about conditions surrounding those dams.

Mr. ANDERSON. Reports have been made on every one of them.

Mr. SIMS. And it has the right in other portions of the bill, if the commission deems it in the public interest, to report to Congress. Therefore there can be no precipitate issuance of license on these dams by reason of the Government not knowing the surroundings of the situation, but a new improvement may not be generally known, because it may be built by a private company or a licensee, and therefore there ought to be some time in which the people may understand the situation as well as the States and municipalities and the National Government, so that they may determine whether or not there are uses for it that justify the Government or State or municipality in asking for a license. I understand that to be the position of the gentleman from Minnesota in substance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he would give the reasons that prompted the committee to make this exception—

that the provisions of this act shall not apply to any Government dam constructed prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is more familiar with the situation that prompted the committee in inserting that language than I am. There are very few Government dams on which it is possible to develop power. As I recollect there are not more than five or six in the United States. Two or three of those are in Ohio and there is possibly one in New York State and I think one at Minneapolis on the Mississippi.

Mr. ALMON. Are there not some on the Warrior River in Alabama also?

Mr. ESCH. I am not aware of that. I know there was a bill passed for the construction of a dam on the Black Warrior and it was vetoed by President Taft, so that there are very few existing water-power developments so far as the Government is concerned. The only practical one is the one at Minneapolis. That has already been completed, and the information with reference to it is all at hand. I do not believe it would be wise to adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That each preliminary permit issued under this act shall be for the sole purpose of maintaining priority of application for a license under the terms of this act for such period or periods, not exceeding a total of three years, as in the discretion of the commission may be necessary for making examinations and surveys, for preparing maps, plans, specifications, and estimates, and for making final arrangements. Each such permit shall set forth the conditions under which priority shall be maintained and a license issued. Such permits shall not be transferable, and may be canceled by order of the commission upon failure of permittees to comply with the conditions thereof.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on line 18, page 11, by striking out the word "final" and inserting the word "financial."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 18, strike out the word "final" and insert the word "financial."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That licenses under this act shall be issued for a period not exceeding 50 years. Each such license shall be conditioned upon acceptance by the licensee of all the terms and conditions of this act and such further conditions, if any, as the commission shall prescribe in conformity with this act, which said terms and conditions and the acceptance thereof shall be expressed in said license. Licenses may be revoked only for the reasons and in the manner prescribed under the provisions of this act, and may be altered only upon mutual agreement between the licensee and the commission after 90 days' public notice.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 25, strike out the words "fifty years" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty years."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I wish only to say in behalf of my amendment that according to this bill any licensee may renew his license, as he has a preference in the renewal of the same if he is living up to the conditions and regulations laid down by this commission, and all he has to do is to come before that commission and ask for a renewal and he can get it. I offer this amendment on the ground that I believe it is contrary to the best interests of public policy to license any corporation without any opportunity to come back at them and get an adjustment oftener than every 50 years. I offer it for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BEGG) there were—ayes 19, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That in issuing preliminary permits hereunder or licenses where no preliminary permit has been issued the commission shall give preference to applications therefor by States and municipalities, provided the plans for the same are deemed by the commission equally well adapted to conserve and utilize in the public interest the navigation and water resources of the region; and as between other applicants, the commission may give preference to the applicant the plans of which it finds and determines are best adapted to develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the navigation and water resources of the region.

That whenever, in the judgment of the commission, the development of any project should be undertaken by the United States itself, the commission shall not approve any application for such project by any citizen, association, corporation, State, or municipality, but shall cause to be made such examinations, surveys, reports, plans, and estimates of the cost of the project as it may deem necessary, and shall submit its findings to Congress with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate concerning the construction of such project or completion of any project upon any Government dam by the United States.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 14, after the word "adapted," insert a comma, and after the comma insert the words "or shall be made equally well adapted."

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, by section 7 it is provided that a preference right shall be given to States and municipali-

ties, provided the plans for the same are deemed by the commission equally well adapted to conserve and utilize in the public interest the navigation and water resources of the region. The object of my amendment is to enable the municipality to modify or amend its application provided the application first filed is not equally well adapted to developing the water resources as the application filed by some other individual or corporation. I do not want to see a municipality foreclosed and concluded in case its plan is not as good as some other plan. I think, if the municipality or the State is willing to amend or modify the plan first filed by it and make that plan as good as the other plan filed, that it should have that opportunity, and my amendment seeks to give the municipality that opportunity to modify and amend its plan and make it as good and as efficient as any other plan filed.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman repeat the words he wishes to add?

Mr. SINNOTT. I want to add, in line 14, after the word "adapted," the following: "or shall be made equally well adapted."

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman does not strike out anything?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; I do not strike out anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 21, strike out lines 21 to 25 on page 12 and lines 1 to 6, inclusive, on page 13.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the attention of the chairman of the committee to ascertain whether I interpret this paragraph correctly—that is, the second paragraph of section 7. As I interpret that paragraph it reposes with the commission the right to express their judgment as to whether the development of water power upon a certain stream should be undertaken by the United States rather than issuing license to a person, corporation, and so forth?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. If it is their judgment that the development of water power should be undertaken by the United States, that they shall not issue a license but report to Congress?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the part of this section, the second paragraph, which this amendment seeks to strike out. Mr. Chairman, this bill is predicated upon the thought that the development of water power shall be made by private capital at the hands of individuals, corporations, municipalities, or other State agencies.

There is nothing else in the bill, so far as I know, which looks to the development of the water power by the Government of the United States. It seems to me that Congress ought to take a definite position upon that subject. Now, we have no assurance of the attitude of future gentlemen who may occupy the distinguished positions of Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of the Interior, or Secretary of War. For all I know, one or more of these gentlemen to-day may favor the development of water power by the Government of the United States rather than by private agency. If Congress is ready to adopt a policy for the development of water power by the Government of the United States, then permit this paragraph to stay in, but I understand that the attitude of Congress is to the contrary; that it is not proposed by any substantial element in this House that the water power upon the streams of the country shall be developed by the United States.

And if that is true, why should we permit a paragraph to go in here allowing three men, if in their opinion a particular water power ought to be developed by the Government of the United States, or if, perchance, they are men when they assume that high office that believe in the development of water power by the Government of the United States, to have the privilege or the right to make the recommendation to Congress to delay the development of water power?

Mr. WELTY. Would not they have to submit that to a future Congress?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly. That is what the paragraph provides, that they shall deny the permit and report the matter to Congress. Now, if this body is in favor of the development of water power by the United States, or even if it is a debatable question in the opinion of the committee, let the paragraph stay in; but I understand the contrary is true, and that this bill was predicated upon the theory that it would invite private capital, through the agencies of individuals and corporations and municipalities and other State agencies, to develop water power, and that it is expected that capital will respond to this invitation, and that water power will be developed. If that be true, why should Congress repose in three men the right to hold up the license for water power, all other conditions being favorable for the issuing of a license, because, forsooth, in their opinion the United States ought itself to develop the water power?

The chairman of the committee is of the opinion that the interpretation which I gave to the paragraph is correct, and, if it is, I submit that the paragraph ought to go out.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I think I am reasonably prepared to discuss the amendment from the fact that the paragraph was put in upon my recommendation after discussing the matter with Government officials.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] seems to forget that a water power is a mere incident to improving a stream for navigation, and the only excuse that any private corporation or individual has for asking Congress to permit it to build a navigation dam and get a license to use the resulting water power for a certain length of time is upon the theory that it will do that which the Government would otherwise have to do at its own cost and get nothing in return for it.

The gentleman from North Carolina not only wants to permit private capital to be thus profitably invested, but he wants to remove all chance for the Government to reimburse itself for any expenditure it may make in order to improve navigation and thereby remove the burden from the common taxpayer to the extent and value of the return which it gets from leasing out the water power. But the commission is not authorized to expend money in development. The commission may, however, when an application is made to it for a license to build a navigation project or to build a water power upon Government-owned land, if it deems it in the public interest that the Government should make this improvement and get the benefit of the resulting water power, and lease it out at a sum to reimburse the Government as far as it will for the cost increase, withhold the license and recommend to Congress that the Government make the improvement. The gentleman from North Carolina would deprive it of this right, but would be very willing for the common taxpayer to furnish the money to improve navigation where no private capital can make money by making the improvement, where no resulting water power would follow; the gentleman from North Carolina has no objection to the common taxpayer carrying the burden of building a dam for navigation purposes where no resulting water-power benefits may follow.

But where the resulting water power may aid the Government in defraying the expense it has incurred in a navigation dam he would deny it the opportunity to do so. If that is not carrying Government-ownership opposition to an extreme I do not know what it would take to make an extreme case. This is one of the best provisions in this bill. It is substantial and fundamental. And I say that the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina ought to be voted down most emphatically, as he desires to deny the Government any opportunity to reimburse itself in building a navigation dam by leasing out the water power resulting from it.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will admit, I assume, that there is nothing in this bill that prevents Congress hereafter, in the improvement of navigable streams, from authorizing the construction of dams.

Mr. SIMS. That is all this commission is authorized to do, in such a case as indicated, simply to report to Congress its judgment. Here is a valuable water power that the Government may get a benefit out of, which will reimburse the Government for the expense and outlay it has to go to to improve navigation. What objection has the gentleman got to the Government's getting a rental to reimburse it for the one particular project or letting it go into the Treasury to help pay for dredging the Mississippi River or improving any other navigable stream that is to be improved for navigation out of the taxpayers' pockets, with no possible chance for reimbursement?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman who last spoke, that the matter of government control, so far as this project is concerned, is very important. We have passing through the Niagara River nine-tenths of all the freshwater flow of the globe, and the Niagara Falls proposition is the most important one that I know of in this country. On the other

side of the river there is the Province of Ontario, which handles the distribution of power as a governmental proposition, and it is stated by Sir Adam Beck, in the hearing before the Water Power Committee, that at Toronto they are selling power at one-half of the rate that it is sold for at Buffalo, 20 miles from the Falls, and Toronto is 84 miles from the Falls.

In connection with the power at Niagara Falls, the great object ought to be to conserve to the people that great energy, so that they shall have the benefit of the enlargement of that power, and that it shall not go for the benefit of absentee landlords. That power is controlled absolutely, as I gather from the hearings that have been had before various committees of this House—absolutely controlled by the great financiers and capitalists and monopolists of this country, and probably the very power given by this bill will result in having the great rush of water over Niagara Falls coined into gold for the benefit of those who have it, and that it will not inure to the benefit of the people in the reduction of the cost of power.

I am solely interested here in seeing to it that the people of Buffalo receive power and enjoy light and heat and the use of electricity for manufacturing purposes at a minimum cost. It is our water. It is our stream. I believe that the people at large should have the benefit of it, and not a few individuals. I hope and trust that this bill will result in accomplishing that purpose, but I fear it will not.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question, for information?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. CURRY of California. I would like to know who fixes the price for the power and light in New York, whether it is the owners of the waterpower, or whether it is fixed by some official body?

Mr. MACGREGOR. It is governed more or less by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. CURRY of California. It fixes the price?

Mr. MACGREGOR. It simply has the power of investigation to determine as to the reasonableness of the rate. But you know what that amounts to.

Mr. CURRY of California. No; I think the public service corporations of the United States and the public officials are just as honest and just as square here as they are in Canada or in England. [Applause.]

Mr. MACGREGOR. We are not getting the results, so far as the cost of electricity to the people is concerned.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is pending. The gentleman can move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. SMALL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I failed to make myself clear to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and certainly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR], who, I understand, was not discussing the amendment which I had the honor to offer.

There is nothing in this pending bill which prevents the improvement of streams for navigation, just as we have been doing it for years. There is nothing to prevent the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from reporting in favor of a project which has been recommended by the engineers involving the canalization of a stream by the construction of locks and dams, and this bill provides that such dams, when constructed, may be used in the development of water power.

The purpose of the amendment which I offered was simply this, to take from the commission—the heads of these three departments—the power to deny an application for an improvement, an application which ought to be granted because all of the conditions exist which would ordinarily authorize it, and yet, because in their opinion the United States should put up its money and develop the water power, therefore they will deny the permit and report it back to Congress.

What I was trying to make plain was that that power should not be given to the commission, because this bill was predicated upon the theory of the development of water power by private capital through these several agencies. The paragraph is inconsistent with the entire bill. It does not create any monopoly. It leaves to Congress the same powers which it has now, without any additional legislation. Navigable rivers may be improved, and the amendment seeks only to deprive this commission of the privilege of denying an application simply because, in their opinion, the United States should develop it instead of the agencies provided for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee, offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Page 12, line 13, after the word "municipalities," insert the following: "To the extent such power is to be used by such States or municipalities for State or municipal purposes."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if the bill is to be made consistent one part with another this amendment ought to be adopted.

On page 16, on lines 20 and 21, there is a limit placed on the manner and extent to which States and municipalities can develop water power, and on the manner and extent to which the power can be used, which is only for municipal and State purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. When we reach that section in line 16 it is my purpose to offer an amendment——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have seen the gentleman's amendment, and I am not in favor of it. I believe that States and municipalities should have the authority and should be given the preference to develop water power for their own use, but I do not believe that they should be permitted to develop water power for the purpose of going into the business of selling power, to engage in commercial propositions. I do not believe in Government ownership as a general proposition. I do not believe in permitting States and municipalites to develop these powers except for ther own use. I do not believe they ought to be permitted to go into the business of developing water power for sale, and in order to prevent that, in order to hold them down so that they will develop only for their own uses, it is necessary to adopt my amendment. Then later, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offers an amendment to strike out the words in lines 20 and 21——

Mr. MADDEN. I do not intend to move to strike out.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Or to modify them; he ought not to be permitted to do so.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will wait, perhaps he will agree with me. I do not intend to move to strike out anything; but after the word "purposes," in line 21, page 16, I propose to offer this:

Except that as to projects constructed or to be constructed by States or municipalities primarily designed to provide or improve navigation licenses therefor shall be issued without cost.

I do not think the gentleman will be opposed to that, because I do not think that what he contends for is included in this amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. My idea is clear enough. The committee can grasp what I am getting at. If they approve it they will vote for the amendment, and that is to limit States and municipalities, in the development of water power, to do so for their own uses, and that they shall not develop water power primarily for the purpose of engaging in the business of making and distributing power.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion most seriously and in the public interest.

The gentleman's amendment would prevent a city or town from applying for a license and developing water power unless the city at the time it applied for it had need, for purely municipal purposes, for the whole amount of power to be developed. All cities are growing. Suppose here is a city that has a population of 100,000, but like all other cities it wants to have a population of 1,000,000. There is a water-power site within reach of the city of 100,000 population, and it will produce power fully developed for a city of 200,000. Now, the gentleman's amendment would prevent that city from receiving a permit or making application—would prevent it from having an opportunity to develop the site—unless it can use the whole output for immediate municipal purposes. All of these amendments, whether so intended or not, are playing into the hands of the water power trust, if there is one, for the reason that the city that needs only 50,000 horsepower and the development will provide for 100,000 horsepower can not get a permit or license because it only needs it for 50,000 horsepower. If this

amendment is adopted you would stifle the development to the extent of 50,000 horsepower.

Now, in another place in the bill where the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is interested it is a question of charge. The bill provides that if a city needs 50,000 horsepower and develops 100,000 horsepower that it shall not have the horsepower free of charge only to the extent that it uses it for municipal purposes. Therefore it can charge the municipality or State for all the power produced and disposed of in excess of that used for municipal purposes.

Whether that is right or wrong is a different question from the gentleman's amendment, because it provides that a permit shall not be issued to a State or a municipality unless it is for exclusively municipal purposes. A corporation could apply and develop 100,000 horsepower and be charged by the Federal Government for all of it, and in turn sell 50,000 horsepower to the city, and the city would have to reimburse the charge made by the National Government to the corporation.

These things were well studied in the committee, as the gentleman knows, and our intention was in every case to give the State or municipality preference for a permit and license and without charge to the extent of the power used for State or municipal purposes. To deny a license unless the city or municipality or State shall couple with it that it will develop only to the extent it may be needed for municipal purposes is vicious and wrong in principle.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the principle is offensive to those favoring Government ownership. Something has been said about the water-power trust. I do not know anything about that, but I do know that there is a demand by some here for Government ownership and operation of these water powers. Their demand has been so insistent and their attitude against legislation permitting private development has been so strong that they have prevented legislation for any kind of development. That has been their attitude, and they talk about a water-power trust. Whenever one wishes to confine a municipality and Government to its proper function they can talk in favor of Government ownership. When they go too far and we try to limit it they talk about the water-power trust.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That all licenses issued under this act shall be on the following conditions:

(a) That the project adopted, including the maps, plans, and specifications, shall be such as in the judgment of the commission will be best adapted to a comprehensive scheme of improvement and utilization for the purposes of navigation, of water-power development, and of other beneficial public uses; and if necessary in order to secure such scheme the commission shall have authority to require the modification of any project and of the plans and specifications of the project works before approval.

(b) That except when emergency shall require for the protection of navigation, life, health, or property, no substantial alteration or addition not in conformity with the approved plans shall be made to any dam or other project works constructed hereunder of a capacity in excess of 100 horsepower without prior approval of the commission; and any emergency alteration or addition so made shall thereafter be subject to such modification and change as the commission may direct.

(c) That the licensee shall maintain the project works in a condition of repair adequate for the purposes of navigation and for the efficient operation of said works in the development and transmission of power, shall make all necessary renewals and replacements, shall maintain adequate depreciation reserves for such purposes, shall so maintain and operate said works as not to impair navigation, and shall conform to such rules and regulations as the commission may from time to time prescribe for the protection of life, health, and property. Each licensee hereunder shall be liable for all damages occasioned to the property of others by the construction, maintenance, or operation of the dam, reservoir, or of the works appurtenant or accessory thereto, constructed under the license, and in no event shall the United States be liable therefor.

(d) That after the first 20 years of operation, out of surplus earned thereafter, if any, accumulated in excess of a specified rate of return upon the net investment of a licensee in any project or projects under license the licensee shall establish and maintain amortization reserves, which reserves shall, in the discretion of the commission, be held until the termination of the license or be applied from time to time in reduction of the net investment. Such specified rate of return and the proportion of such surplus earnings to be paid into and held in such reserves shall be set forth in the license.

(e) That the licensee shall pay to the United States reasonable annual charges in an amount to be fixed by the commission. When licenses are issued that contemplate the use of Government dams or other structures owned by the United States, in the discretion of the commission the charges to be paid by the licensee may be readjusted at the end of 20 years after the beginning of operations and at periods of not less than 10 years thereafter, in a manner to be described in each license: *Provided*, That licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge to the extent such power is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes; and that licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power for domestic, mining, or other beneficial use in projects of not more than 50-horsepower capacity may be issued without charge; but in no case shall a license be issued free of charge for the development and utilization of power created by any Government dam and that the amount charged therefor in any license shall be such as determined by the commission.

(f) That whenever any licensee hereunder is directly benefited by the construction work of another licensee or of the United States of a storage reservoir or other headwater improvement, the commission may, in its discretion, require as a condition of the license that the licensee so benefited shall reimburse the owner of such reservoir or other improvements for such part of the annual charges for interest, maintenance, and depreciation thereon as the commission may deem equitable. The proportion of such charges to be paid by any licensee shall be determined by the commission.

Whenever such reservoir or other improvement is constructed by the United States the commission shall assess similar charges against any licensee directly benefited thereby, and any amount so assessed shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, to be reserved and appropriated as a part of the special fund for headwater improvements as provided in section 17 hereof.

(g) Such further conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this act as the commission may require.

(h) That combinations, agreements, arrangements, or understandings, express or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade, or to fix, maintain, or increase prices for electrical energy or service are hereby prohibited. In issuing licenses for a part only of a complete project, where the land of the United States required is to be used only for transmission lines, water conduits, or for storage reservoirs, or for a complete project of not more than 50-horsepower capacity, the commission may, in its discretion, waive such conditions, provisions, and requirements of this act as it may deem equitable in the circumstances.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, subject to the right to amend section 10 just read, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is his intention to go on with this bill on Monday?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

The motion of Mr. ESCH was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3184, the water-power bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock a. m. on Monday. I make that request for the reason that it is hoped that when the appropriation bills before the two bodies have passed and been signed it will be possible to have an adjournment for a week or until a week from next Monday.

Mr. SMALL. Can the gentleman approximate when that recess will begin?

Mr. MONDELL. After the signing of the appropriation bills now before the Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Signed by whom?

Mr. MONDELL. By the Speaker and the President of the Senate. They can not be signed by the President until some day thereafter.

In order to expedite the business of the House on Monday to pass on conference reports as they come in, it seems advisable to meet at 10 o'clock, if possible. Hence the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock a. m. on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORTS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that he may have permission until 12 o'clock to-night to present for printing in the RECORD under the rules the conference report on the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs may have permission to file a conference report on the naval appropriation bill, for printing in the RECORD, at any time up to midnight. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], that he may have permission to do the same thing with respect to the conference report on the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of two persons, whose names shall be placed on the rolls of employees of the House of Representatives.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, filed the following conference report on the naval appropriation bill for printing under the rules:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 27, 37, 38, 39, 44, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 69, 71, 72, 76, 81, 83, 85, 86, 89, 97, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, and 107.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 9, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 54, 56, 63, 65, 66, 68, 73, 74, 75, 80, 82, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 99, 108, and 109, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of said amendment strike out "$60,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$25,000,000 to be expended as follows: For necessary aircraft and equipment for fleet use, $3,027,250; for the purchase abroad of five special type planes, $100,000; for the erection on Government-owned land of two hangars for two large dirigibles, $3,700,000; for the construction of one rigid dirigible, $1,500,000; for the purchase abroad of one dirigible of the latest type, $2,500,000; for the conversion of the U. S. S. *Jupiter* into an aeroplane carrier, $500,000; for the conversion of two merchant vessels into aircraft tenders, $700,000; for the maintenance and operation of aircaft factory, helium plant, and aircraft stations, $3,008,007; for continuing experiments and development work for all types of aircraft, $6,700,000; for flying equipment for Marine Corps advanced base units, $618,000; for general and miscellaneous contingencies, $2,646,743; and the money herein specifically appropriated for 'Aviation' shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with the existing law as 'Aviation,' and for that purpose shall constitute one fund"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Line 2 of said amendment strike out the word "from"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment strike out the period and add the following: "for the purpose of paying all obligations or claims incurred at the instance of the Navy Department in carrying out the provisions of said acts and for the purpose of paying all expenses incident to the closing of the schools maintained and operated in pursuance of said acts"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out the comma and "$250,000" after the word "barracks," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "for a period not exceeding six months, $100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "170,000 men and the President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 191,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment, strike out the comma after the word "reserves" and insert a comma after the word "duty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "February 3,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "February 3"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"The act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129), granting under certain conditions, to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only during the period of the war and in no event beyond October 1, 1919."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That officers of the permanent Navy who have served satisfactorily during the war with the German Government in a temporary grade or rank shall be eligible under the provision of existing law for selection for promotion and for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank until July 1, 1920, without regard to statutory requirements other than professional and physical examinations: *Provided*, That the age and grade requirements prescribed by the act approved August 29, 1916, in the rank of commander, is hereby extended from June 30, 1920, to June 30, 1921."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment insert a colon (:) and add the following: "*Provided*, That such membership in the Naval Militia shall not interfere with the discharge of duties by such members thereof who are in the Naval Reserve Force."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$105,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the colon following the word "Virginia" and insert the following: "Incinerator plant, $67,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$12,632,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$2,875,656"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$164,203,494" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, regarding the promotion of captains in the line of the permanent Navy shall not restrict the promotion of such captains as may have been wounded in line of duty and who are now on the active list, and such captains shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of section 1494, Revised Statutes of the United States, and also to the benefits of the act of March 4, 1911."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$15,500,000"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "this" in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words "the foregoing"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment insert a period (.) in lieu of the colon (:) after the word "grades" and strike out the remainder of said amendment; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 7 of said amendment strike out all after the word "buildings" and in lieu thereof insert the following: upon the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such temporary buildings as may be erected in pursuance hereof at a total cost not to exceed $10,000 during the year; $660,898; and the House agree to the same.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
WM. J. BROWNING,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

C. S. PAGE,
MILES POINDEXTER,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
FREDERICK HALE,
J. WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and submitted by the accompanying report on the amendments of the Senate, namely:

Of the Senate amendments agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, the following are merely changes of totals, to wit, 64, 66, 70, 77, 79, 87, and 91.

Of the amendments of the Senate agreed to by the managers on the part of the House the following involve changes of language, grammar, etc., and do not involve any material change of the substance of the bill, to wit, 7, 14, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 46, 74, and 95.

On amendment No. 1: Restores the clause covering traveling expenses of civilian employees, which was inadvertently omitted by the House when amending the clause covering traveling expenses of midshipmen, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 2: Increases the limitation in the appropriation for clerical, inspection, and messenger service at navy yards and stations under "Pay, miscellaneous," from $400,000 to $450,000, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 3: Provides for an investigation of fuel oil and gasoline adapted to naval requirements, and the House recedes with an amendment reducing the appropriation from $60,000 to $30,000.

On amendment No. 4: Applies to the annual appropriation "Aviation," and the House recedes, reducing the Senate amendment from $35,000,000 to $25,000,000, and itemizes the expenditure of the entire amount.

On amendment No. 5: Requires the Secretary of the Navy to report to Congress as to all adjustments made by him of claims for damages to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 6: Appropriates $40,000, to be expended in the discretion of the governor of Guam, to aid the island in becoming self-sustaining and to protect it against loss of surplus crops and seeds in time of storms, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 8: Increases the appropriation for "Recreation for enlisted men" from $400,000 to $600,000, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 9: Grants uniform gratuity to officers of the Naval Reserve Force transferred from the National Naval Volunteers in the same manner as granted to members of the Naval Reserve Force who enrolled therein directly, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 10: Provides for a reappropriation of $500,000 of unobligated moneys for training and instructing recruits; and the House recedes with an amendment whereby the expenses incurred at special schools and colleges may be settled and such special places of instruction closed.

On amendments Nos. 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16: These amendments are on account of maintenance of the naval training stations at California, Great Lakes, and Hampton Roads, and the Senate recedes, in view of the provision elsewhere in the bill providing that the appropriations "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," and "Repairs and preservation" shall be available for the maintenance of naval training stations where the regular appropriations for the maintenance thereof are found to be insufficient.

On amendment No. 17: Provides for expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve Forces, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 18: Provides for maintenance of naval detention training camp at naval barracks, Wissahickon, N. J., and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 19: Provides for the maintenance of receiving barracks, and the House recedes with an amendment limiting expenditures on this account to a period of six months and reducing the appropriation from $250,000 to $100,000.

On amendments Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26: Provide for increased activities at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Provide an enlisted force of 191,000 during the period from October 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, instead of 191,000 men for the period from October 1, 1919, to December 31, 1919, and 170,000 men for the period from January 1, 1920, to June 30, 1920. On the former the Senate recedes, and on amendment numbered 28 the House recedes with an amendment granting to the President authority, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy during the period from December 31, 1919, to June 30, 1920, to 191,000 men.

On amendments Nos. 29 and 36: Provide for the continuation of nurses of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty, and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 37 and 38: Provide 90 instead of 30 days for transferring female members of the Naval Reserve Force to inactive duty, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 39: Reduces amount for compensating members of the Naval Reserve Force transferred to inactive duty and retained as civilian employees, because of their proposed retention as reserves for a longer period than the House had provided, and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Make it permissible to employ members of the Naval Reserve Force transferred to inactive duty and civilians who may qualify as expert technicists, not exceeding 24 in number, at rates of pay ranging from $2,000 to $4,000 per annum, and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 42 and 43: Extends the period during which enlisted men may be construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war from April 7, 1917, to February 1, 1917, and the House recedes with an amendment making the commencing date February 3, 1917.

On amendment No. 44: Extends provisions of bill relating to the discharge of enlisted men to enlisted men of the Army, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 45: Strikes out House provision denying to officers on field duty the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, and the House recedes with an amendment limiting such allowances to the period of the war and in no event beyond October 1, 1919.

On amendment No. 47: Makes officers eligible for selection for promotion and for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank in which they served temporarily during the war with the German Government. This amendment ultimately would result in a number of permanent commanders being placed upon the retired list, and the House recedes with an amendment which will not make the retirement of said officers practicable before July 1, 1921.

On amendment No. 48: This amendment gives to bureau chiefs with the permanent rank of rear admiral who have heretofore served a full term and are now serving as chief of bureau constructive service of six years to compensate for six years' credit given to line officers who were in the service before 1913 for service at the Naval Academy.

On amendment No. 49: Extends provision of existing law permitting of the annual appointment of 100 enlisted men to the Naval Academy to members of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 50: Permits members of the Naval Reserve Force and such members thereof who formerly were members of the National Naval Volunteers to be or become members of the naval militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and the House recedes with an amendment requiring that such membership in the Naval Militia shall not be permitted to interfere with the discharge of Naval Reserve Force duties.

On amendment No. 51: Authorizes Secretary of the Navy to investigate and settle losses sustained by occupants of certain premises within the naval station at Pensacola, Fla., who were recently required by the Secretary of the Navy to vacate said premises, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 52: Provides for transfer and promotion of William R. Rush from the rank of captain on the retired list of the Navy to the rank of rear admiral on the active list of the Navy, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 53: Provides for the restoration to the Naval Reserve Force, inactive service list, of Frank Pulaski, late a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve Force, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 54: Provides for the appointment of First Sergt. Edgar Hayes, United States Marine Corps, as a first lieutenant in the permanent establishment of the United States Marine Corps, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 55: Provides for promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Renwick John Hartung from the rank of lieutenant commander to the rank of captain.

On amendment No. 56: Provides for the Government sharing equally with the States of Maine and New Hampshire the cost of constructing a bridge connecting the city of Portsmouth, N. H., with navy yard at Kittery, Me., and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62: Provides or are incident to the provision of additional facilities at certain navy yards, and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 63, 65, and 66: Provide or are incident to the provision of additional facilities at the Philadelphia Navy Yard and the Naval Academy, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 67: Provides for a machine and electrical shop building, to cost $400,000, at the navy yard, Norfolk, Va., and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 68: Provides for a pattern shop and storage building at the navy yard, Norfolk, Va., required in connection with ship construction at that yard, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 69: Provides for the completion of steel and lumber storage facilities at the navy yard, Norfolk, Va., at a cost of $300,000, and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 71 and 72: Are on account of an item of $30,000 to replace two temporary marine barracks at the navy yard, Mare Island, Calif., and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 73: Provides for the construction of a railroad connection between causeway now crossing Mare Island Straits and the South Vallejo railroad yards, at a cost of $165,000, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 75: This provides for new piers, costing $75,000, at the torpedo station, Newport, R. I., and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 78: This provides for an officers' mess building, $50,000, and an incinerator plant, $67,790, at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va.; and the House recedes, with an amendment striking out the officers' mess building.

On amendment No. 80: This provides for a site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park in San Diego, Calif., to be accepted by the Federal Government without cost or incumbrance, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 81: This provides for the returning of the sites for the training station and naval hospital at San Diego, Calif., in case the Federal Government does not develop these sites for these purposes, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 82: This provides for an exchange of a small strip of land between the Marine Corps base property and private ownership in another piece of land contiguous to the Marine Corps base without cost to the Government, and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 83, 85, 86, and 87 are changes in appropriations resulting in the adoption of the House figures in personnel, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 84: This is a reduction in the appropriation for commutation of quarters by reason of the House provision providing for commutation of officers at sea for a period not longer than October 1, 1919, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 88: This provision grants to captains in the line of the permanent Navy who have been wounded in the line of duty and who are on the active list promotion to the next higher grade on the retired list upon their retirement by reason of their inability to perform duty at sea on the active list.

On amendment No. 89: This is an increase due to the Senate provision for personnel, and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 90 and 91: These provide for increased appropriation for maintenance in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts and the increase in limitation of the clerical force provided in said appropriation, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 92: This provides that the naval hospital in the District of Columbia shall be supplied with fuel from the Government fuel yard in the District of Columbia, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 93: This provides an increase of $500,000 in the clerical limitation on the appropriation "Engineering," and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 94: This provides an increase of limitation from $30,000 to $32,000 for the purchase of land for a site for a radio shore station at Otter Cliffs, Me., and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 96: This provides that certain practical instructors in the trades at the Naval Academy shall be considered practical instructors of midshipmen in order that they may not be reduced in rating or pay should the force of mechanics which they supervise be reduced, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 97: This provides that the strength of the Marine Corps be not to exceed 27,400 as an average for the year and inserts that this average shall be maintained "so far as practicable," and the Senate recedes from the amendment striking out the words "so far as practicable."

On amendment No. 98: This provides for an equitable reduction in the number of officers in the various grades by providing reduction symmetrically, and also provides for 50 additional warrant officers, and the House recedes with an amendment striking out the additional warrant officers.

On amendment No. 99: This amendment removes any doubt as to the legality of certain promotions in the Marine Corps from the ranks to warrant officers and provides that such promotions shall be construed as legal where such promotion takes place from retired enlisted grades to warrant officers.

On amendment No. 100: This discontinues the services of two civilian clerks in the office of the Paymaster of the Marine Corps, and provides for the detail of two military pay clerks who, while serving as chief clerks in the office of the paymaster, shall receive the pay and allowances of the next higher grade, and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 101 and 102: These are changes in total, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 103: This provides for the repairs to barracks of the Marine Corps, and the House recedes with an amendment providing that the leasing of any buildings in the District of Columbia shall be with the consent of the Public Buildings Commission, and the erection of any temporary buildings outside the District of Columbia are restricted to a total cost not to exceed $10,000 during the next fiscal year.

On amendment No. 105: This provides for reimbursement to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who lose their baggage while traveling under orders of the United States Government, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 106: This is a change of total, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 107: Provides for an investigation and report at the next regular session upon the facts and circumstances relating to losses or delay caused to contractors with the Government by reason of any governmental agencies, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 108: This provides that except for emergency requirements no materials that can be manufactured at reasonable prices in the United States shall be purchased or acquired in any foreign country unless the efficient operation of the Navy necessitates purchase or acquirement abroad.

On amendment No. 109: This provides that when time and facilities permit any article that can be manufactured or pro-

duced in a Government navy yard shall be obtained from navy yards, provided the price is less than it can be purchased or acquired otherwise, and the House recedes.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
WM. J. BROWNING,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KAHN, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, filed the conference report on the Army appropriation bill for printing under the rule.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has reported out a concurrent resolution for the appointment of a special committee to consist of two Senators and four Members of the House, whose duty it shall be to confer with the officials of the State of Massachusetts and officers of any organization, with reference to participation by the Federal Government in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, Mass., which observance will be held in that State next year, the idea being that the United States should have some part in commemorating that historic event—not to permit it to be debased by having a world's fair, with side shows or anything of that sort, or to have any such celebration as will necessitate calling upon the United States for an enormous or extravagant appropriation; and in view of the fact that it may be possible for this joint committee, if appointed, to have such conference during the recess which may follow the conclusion of the appropriation bills, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 14, appointing a joint special committee to confer with the officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and others relative to the participation by the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a joint special committee consisting of two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, is hereby created, whose duty it shall be to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any political subdivision thereof, and with officers of any organization or societies or with individuals relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims. Said committee shall report on or before September 1 next, with its recommendations as to appropriate legislation for participation by the Government of the United States in the observance of this historic anniversary. The expenses of said committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent funds of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. WALSH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, House joint resolution No. 31 was ordered to lie on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ASHBROOK, indefinitely, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Monday, June 30, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STINESS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1378) to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the navigable waters of Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 80), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. BABKA, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 687) for the relief of Frank Pinkley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 81), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of Frank S. Ingalls, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 82), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ROMJUE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of W. T. Dingler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 83), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACGREGOR, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5238) for the relief of the Cleveland Trinidad Paving Co., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 84), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6413) granting the sum of $549.12 to Clara Kane, dependent parent, by reason of death of William A. Yenser, late civil employee, killed as a result of an accident at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 85), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1765) granting a pension to Dora Snyder, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6851) to provide for the erection of a public building at Morganton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6852) to provide for the construction and improvement of waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 6853) authorizing appropriation for the purchase of a site and erection of a post-office building at East Point, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6854) authorizing appropriation for purchasing site and erecting post-office building at Decatur, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 6855) for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a post-office building at Louisburg, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6856) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Smithfield, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6857) to authorize the change of the name of the steamer *Charlotte Gravcraet Breitung* to *T. K. Maher;* to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FERRIS (by request): A bill (H. R. 6858) for the relief of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 6859) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Madison, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 6860) to provide for the disposition of certain public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 847), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., 497), and which are no longer needed; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 6861) to amend section 1 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act, so as to provide for the payment of the expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Board and employees by the Federal land banks and joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 6862) for the repair, preservation, care, and future maintenance of the restored historical naval brig *Niagara*, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6864) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Big Rapids, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6865) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gladwin, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6866) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mount Pleasant, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6867) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Midland, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6868) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bay City, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6869) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grayling, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6870) to provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6871) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clare, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6872) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Roscommon, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6873) authorizing the Secretary of war to donate to the county of Iosco, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece, with its accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6874) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the Mount Lebanon Cemetery Association at Tarrs, Pa., two cannon or fieldpieces with carriage captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6875) providing for the investigation of the feasibility of reclaiming by irrigation certain lands in the State of Idaho for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. FESS: Resolution (H. Res. 146) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Education to appoint a clerk for said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOCH: Resolution (H. Res. 148) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to report certain facts relative to the issuance of Government permits or licenses for the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 142) authorizing the establishment of a free port at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, requesting Congress to grant additional compensation to soldiers, sailors, and marines who have served in the military or naval service of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing Congress to favorably consider legislation looking toward increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6876) for the relief of Thomas W. Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6877) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Moorhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6878) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Spurgeon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6879) for the relief of Edgar H. Hale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6880) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Moulton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6881) for the relief of Joseph A. McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6882) granting a pension to Lida G. Frantz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6883) for the relief of Timothy L. P. Miles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 6884) granting a pension to John T. Griggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 6885) granting an increase of pension to Osiah Attison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6886) granting an increase of pension to Acel Lyons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6887) granting an increase of pension to Squire C. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6888) granting a pension to Peter R. Crum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6889) granting a pension to Maria Howe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6890) granting an increase of pension to John D. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 6891) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Parkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 6892) for the relief of Hubert Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6893) granting a pension to Moses C. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6894) granting a pension to Allen Y. Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6895) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Hunnewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6896) granting a pension to George N. Thurlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6897) granting a pension to Thomas F. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6898) granting a pension to Meda E. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6899) granting a pension to Minnie K. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6900) granting a pension to Simeon D. Morrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Alumni Association of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass., relating to the Irish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Local Union No. 177, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Springfield, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of citizens of Wichita, members West Wichita Church of Christ, and citizens of Derby, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Sedgwick County, Young People's Branch of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Wichita; members of Methodist Episcopal Church of Mayfield; members of the Milton Methodist Church, and members of Church of Christ of Newton. Telegram from 10,000 members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union; resolutions from Disciples of Christ of Haverhill, and letter from South Lawrence Church of Christ, Wichita, all in the State of Kansas, against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of Earl Davis and others, of San Antonio, Tex., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from Trades Council of San Antonio, Tex., on Customs and Immigration Service, and eight-hour day; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of International Association of Machinists of Washington, D. C., relating to labor policy; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Petition for the repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream from the citizens of Murfreesboro, Tenn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts protesting against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charlestown Metal Trades Council, of Boston Navy Yard, for necessary legislation for the establishment of the 44-hour week for the employees of the United States Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition from sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Verona, Ill., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition act and favoring enforcement legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of sundry churches of Oregon, by the pastors and clerks, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition and urging Congress to immediately pass an adequate permanent code to carry into effect the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Letter from Frank H. Butterfield, manager of the Palace Theater at Flint, Mich., protesting against war tax on theater tickets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Mr. B. B. Bassette, a citizen of New Britain, Conn., protesting against the holding of a so-called prize fight at Toledo, Ohio, July Fourth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Resolution adopted by Painters' Union No. 176 of Gloucester, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; also resolution adopted by Local No. 924, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Manchester, Mass., in favor of league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR. Petition of F. A. Ericson, of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring a national budget system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of a number of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Louis B. Parsons, of New York, urging modification of House bill 5549; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif., praying relief through the Congress and executive departments of the Government from conditions arisen from the surplus of labor drawn from agricultural regions to cities and manufacturing centers by the exigencies of the late war, looking to the early restoration of normal food production, as well as to relief from unemployment; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Venice, Calif., to establish in that city a free port district on the same plan as demonstrated in the cities of Hamburg, Copenhagen, and elsewhere in Europe as of great value in promoting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Calif., recommending that a high protective tariff be placed upon the importation of foreign-grown beans and indorsing the efforts of the bean growers of California to obtain such tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Southern California Industries Association, of Los Angeles, and California Corrugated Culvert Co., of West Berkeley, both in the State of California, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Southern California Industries Association, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the Poindexter bill to amend the fourth section of the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Federal Employees' Union No. 1, San Francisco, Calif., requesting support of the item of $150,000 in the sundry civil bill for the women in industry service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of San Francisco Lodge No. 854, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, San Francisco, Calif., asking for five years further Government control of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Calif., urging Congress to provide for a national budget system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition by the Chamber of Commerce of Venice, Calif., asking that steps be taken to make Venice a free port district on the same plan as Hamburg; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution adopted by the Christian Men's League of Red Bluff, Calif., protesting against any repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from the California Redwood Association, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the long and short haul bill to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter from the California Walnut Growers' Association, Los Angeles, Calif., urging support of bill of Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, making it clearly lawful for farm organizations to operate; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter from the California Yearly Meeting of the Friends Church, of Whittier, Calif., protesting against any repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from Alex. J. Rosborough, of San Francisco, Calif., asking for support of House bill 4381; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By. Mr. ROWAN: Petition of L. M. Williams, of Richmond, Va., relating to the railroad labor unions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Louis B. Parsons, of New York, asking some modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Metal Trades Association of New York, protesting against any appropriation for the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Rev. George Alexander and others, of New York, relating to national life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Van Duzer Extract Co., of New York, for modification of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of San Francisco Parlor, N. S. G. S., relating to the treaty of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of residents of Dolgeville and Herkimer, N. Y., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Welsh Presbyterian Synod of New York and Vermont, for an enactment under the constitutional amendment and against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of citizens of Northampton County, Pa., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Affidavits of witness to accompany House bill 6627; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Carnation Milk Products Co., of Chicago, Ill., relating to the Poindexter bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Milton Goldmann, of Cleveland, Ohio, urging the repeal of article 19, section 900, of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, for the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 30, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou dost from Thy throne behold all dwellers upon the earth. Thou fashionest their hearts alike. Thou hast fixed the bounds of their habitation, and hast said thus far shalt thou go and no farther. To-day we stand at the parting of the ways, facing the tremendous issues that are pressed upon us. We seek divine wisdom and guidance that in the leadership of this country in its relations to the nations of the earth we may fulfill the will of God for the world. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919, when, on request of Mr. NELSON and Mr. SHEPPARD and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM B. WILSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refers to the Committee on Printing an address delivered by the Secretary of Labor before the American Federation of Labor convention, to determine whether it should or should not be printed in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint special committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any political subdivision thereof, etc., relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had been recommitted to the committee of conference.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GOOD, Mr. VARE, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 120. An act to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes;

S. 409. An act to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York;

H. R. 3157. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of two persons, whose names shall be placed on the rolls of employees of the House of Representatives.

LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the concurrent resolution just received from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a joint committee consisting of two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, is hereby created, whose duty it shall be to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any political subdivision thereof, and with officers of any organization or societies or with individuals relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims. Said committee shall report on or before September 1, next, with its recommendations as to appropriate legislation for participation by the Government of the United States in the observance of this historic anniversary.

The expenses of said committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House.

The resolution was concurred in.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I present a resolution signed by the Franklin Club, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., in favor of the principle of the league of nations, and requesting the Senators from North Dakota to support it by whatever means may be in their power. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the North Dakota civil-service employees' committee in the Panama Canal Zone, remonstrating against the proposed decrease in the salaries of Government employees, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rockville County, N. Dak., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 11, 1919.

Whereas there are resident in the United States certain aliens who are enjoying all the privileges and opportunities of the democracy established by the Constitution of the United States, but who fail to appreciate the asylum offered to them in this country; and

Whereas among our alien population there are many who are the enemies of democracy, whose aim is the overthrow of our Government and the promotion of anarchy, whose weapons are violence, arson, and murder, and whose proceedings are conducted in darkness and secrecy; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States certain legislation which provides for the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants: Therefore be it

Ordered, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts heartily approves the said legislation and urges its passage; and be it further

Ordered, That attested copies of this order be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. FERNALD presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Aroostook County, Me., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior for reclamation of lands for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Metal Trades Council of Portsmouth, Me., praying for the establishment of a 44-hour work week, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. NELSON presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Local Branch No. 28, National Association of Letter Carriers, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed "doubling up" of routes of letter carriers in that city, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of E. M. Brown, of Beaverton, Oreg., praying for the passage of the civil service retirement bill, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Mystic, Plymouth, Wallingford, Hartford, and Danbury, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 39, Cigarmakers' International Union, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the repeal of war-time prohibition so far as wines and beer are concerned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry Italian citizens of Bristol, Conn., praying for the control of Fiume by Italy, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a petition of the Teachers' Club of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry labor organizations in the city of Detroit, Mich., praying for the repeal of war-time prohibition so far as beer and wines are concerned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Crystal Falls, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Michigan Bankers' Association, praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Letter Carriers of Detroit, Mich., and a petition of Local Union No. 295, Postal Clerks' Association, of Detroit, Mich., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal clerks, which were referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Chambers of Commerce of Jackson, St. Joseph, Bay City, Detroit, Manistee, Saginaw, Pontiac, and Traverse City; of the Rotary Clubs of Marquette and Ypsilanti, and of the Civic and Commercial Association of Sault Ste. Marie, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the deepening of the St. Lawrence River and the Welland Canal, and the construction of larger locks, so that ocean-going vessels may come into the Great Lakes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Commerce of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NEWBERRY (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE,
EXTRA SESSION OF 1919.

Senate concurrent resolution 3.

Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to grant additional compensation to soldiers, sailors, and marines who have served in the military or naval service of the United States during the present war.

Whereas the regular pay granted to such soldiers, sailors, and marines has been, and is, extremely low, especially as compared with wages and salary paid to all classes of labor in the United States during the period of the war;

Whereas enormous profits have been received in practically all classes of manufacturing industry, in which the said soldiers, sailors, and marines have been prevented from sharing because of their service; and

Whereas it is the belief of the people of the State of Michigan and of this legislative body that some measure of appreciation should be shown for the sacrifice and courage of our soldiers, sailors, and marines: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Michigan (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to grant and pay to each soldier, sailor, and marine who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during any part of the period of the World War, or to the proper relatives or dependents of any soldier, sailor, or marine who has lost his life in said war, an additional compensation of at least $50 per month for the period of service; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives be, and they hereby are, instructed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Michigan.

Adopted by the senate June 11.

DENNIS E. ALWARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives June 12.

CHARLES S. PIERCE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE,
EXTRA SESSION OF 1919.

Senate concurrent resolution 6.

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to favorably consider pending legislation looking toward increased compensation for postal employees.

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation looking toward increased pay for all postal employees; and

Whereas under present conditions it is plainly evident that such employees are underpaid, as evidenced by the large number of resignations from the service to enable such employees to take up more remunerative occupations, thus resulting in impaired postal service: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That it is the sense of this legislature that such compensation should be increased and to this end Congress is hereby memorialized to favorably consider the pending legislation now before it granting increased compensation to such postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Senators and Members of Congress from Michigan.

Adopted by the senate June 16.

DENNIS E. ALWARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives June 17.

CHARLES S. PIERCE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Benton Harbor, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of St. Joseph, Mich., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of Friends of Irish Freedom, of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented resolutions adopted by the National Association of Master Plumbers in convention at Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the recognition by the peace conference at Versailles of the Irish delegates, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Michigan Bankers' Association, praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Rotary Club of Ypsilanti, Mich., praying for the deepening of the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mecosta County, State of Michigan, praying for the repeal of the "stamp" tax on medicines, toilet articles, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Horton, Almena, Topeka, Protection, Coffeyville, Sylvan Grove, Rose, Miltonvale, Norton, Derby, Auburn, and Calvert, and of Morton and Stevens Counties, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of sundry Jugo-Slav organizations of the State of Kansas, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Atchison and Topeka and of the community labor boards of the counties of Brown, Douglas, Geary, Jackson, Jefferson, Lyon, Marshall, Morris, Nemah, Osage, Pottawatomie, Riley, Shawnee, Wabausee, and Washington, all in the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership and control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of John A. Logan Post No. 75, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Salina, Kans., praying for an increase in pensions for veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Summerfield, Kans., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Industrial Council of Topeka, Kans., praying for the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation restricting immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Atchison, Oskaloosa, Summerfield, Topeka, Stockton, Sawyer, Elmer, Rock, Chase, Iola, Cawker City, Portis, Valley Falls, Salina, Stanley, Lebo, Winchester, Little River, Detroit, Baldwin, Abilene, Emporia, Bonner Springs, Winfield, Osborn, Atwood, Floral, Havi-

land, Leoti, and Garden City, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POMERENE presented a petition of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the repeal of prohibition so as to permit the manufacture of beer and wines, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a petition of the City Council of Pueblo, Colo., and a petition of the City Council of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for an investigation into the high price of gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. HALE. I present resolutions adopted by the State Conference, League of Nations, of Portland, Me., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MAINE BRANCH, LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE,
BY A LEAGUE OF FREE NATIONS,
June 28, 1919.

Senator FREDERICK HALE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am inclosing signed copy of resolutions, in accordance with your request.

Very truly, yours,

RALPH O. BREWSTER,
Secretary.

Resolutions.

Whereas the great World War, which with the assistance of America has been fought to a victorious conclusion by the Entente Allies, has demonstrated to the people of all nations that it is necessary for civilization to prevent war or perish; and

Whereas to this end it is essential that there should be created some common force by a general association of nations which shall safeguard the right as the first and most fundamental interest of all people and governments, and which shall afford mutual guaranties of political independence, territorial integrity, and permanent peace: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting of the citizens of Maine, in State conference assembled this 23d day of May, 1919, in the city hall at Portland, Me., that the covenant for the league of nations in the amended form adopted by the Paris Peace Conference does not require the American people to surrender their independence or their dominant position in the New World, in any manner or to any extent which, under present world conditions, they should not be willing to do, and, limited as it is for a period of two years, with the right to withdraw thereafter, involves no obligation which we should not be ready to assume in order to restore the world to an immediate peace basis and lessen the danger of future wars.

Resolved, That it is our belief that, so far as humanly possible, such a league will provide appropriate machinery for a just and peaceable settlement of international controversies and will tend to unite the potential force of all against any nation that attempts to substitute might for right, or to settle its disputes by resort to arms, and will work for the promotion of liberty and the orderly development of civilization.

Resolved, therefore, That it is our conviction that the league of nations covenant be ratified forthwith without amendment by the Senate of the United States as an integral part of the peace treaty of Paris.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

(Signed) FRANKLIN C. PAYSON,
Chairman.
ARTHUR G. STAPLES,
KENNETH C. M. SILLS,
W. J. THOMPSON,
H. B. BRAWN,
Committee on Resolutions.

State Conference, League of Nations, City Hall, Portland, Me., May 23, 1919.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 282) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 56) thereon.

Mr. FRANCE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred Senate resolution 52, requesting the United States Housing Corporation to transmit certain information regarding governmental dormitories in Washington, D. C., submitted by Mr. NEW on the 29th ultimo, reported it without amendment.

Mr. NEW, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 57) thereon.

Mr. SHIELDS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 662) to amend section 107 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as heretofore amended, reported it without amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 1358) providing for an additional judge for the northern district of California, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 58) thereon.

PROPOSED SALE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that Senate resolution 92, expressing the judgment of the Senate that it is inadvisable at this time for the Shipping Board to sell the merchant ships of the Government to foreign interests, submitted by me on the 24th instant, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2295) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 2296) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate four field guns to the city of Great Falls, Mont.; and

A bill (2297) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the City Council of Eureka, Mont., a German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2298) for the relief of the Flathead Nation of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 2299) for the relief of Benjamin F. Spates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2300) for the relief of the estate of Henry A. V. Post; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 2301) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Lewisburg, Marshall County, Tenn., three brass cannon, with carriage; and

A bill (S. 2302) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Crockett County, State of Tennessee, one German cannon, with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2303) to amend an act approved March 4, 1915, abolishing the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in certain cases involving claims against the United States for property destroyed or appropriated by the Federal Army during the Civil War; and

A bill (S. 2304) to amend section 162 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2305) for the relief of the trustees of Hobson Methodist Church, of Davidson County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 2306) for the relief of Alice Evelyn Mabry Hazen, Lawrence C. Mabry, Herbert S. Mabry, Churchwell Mabry, and William Deaderick;

A bill (S. 2307) for the relief of Nathaniel F. Cheairs;

A bill (S. 2308) for the relief of the Tennessee Deaf and Dumb School, of Knoxville, Tenn.; and

A bill (S. 2309) for the relief of the city of Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2310) to provide for the erection of a public building at Kingsport, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 2311) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lenoir City, Loudon County, Tenn.; and

A bill (S. 2312) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at South Pittsburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2313) to appropriate $500,000 to aid the Andrew Jackson Memorial Association in the erection of a monument at Nashville, Tenn., to commemorate the life, character, and services of Andrew Jackson; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 2314) granting a pension to Alvin W. Smith (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2315) granting a pension to John Collins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2316) for the relief of Edwin F. Mathews; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2317) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Cooley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 2318) to appropriate $2,000 from any unexpended moneys in the Public Treasury for the removal of a Confederate monument at Indianapolis, Ind., and directing the Secretary of War to remove said monument (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2319) granting an increase of pension to John Fullam (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2320) granting a pension to Maria J. Jennings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2321) to punish shipment of bombs and infernal machines in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWBERRY (for Mr. TOWNSEND):

A bill (S. 2322) granting a pension to Matilda Love (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS (by request):

A bill (S. 2323) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2324) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2325) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Berlin, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2326) to permit joining the United States of America as a party defendant in an act in Federal and State courts in certain actions affecting title to real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2327) granting an increase of pension to James Manning; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2328) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Marsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2329) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Florence M. Metz, widow of Edmund Metz, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2330) granting an increase of pension to William F. Pike (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2331) granting a pension to Lizzie Ann Morrison (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2332) granting an increase of pension to William D. Irwin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2333) granting an increase of pension to Evan James (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2334) granting an increase of pension to Phebe S. Riley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2335) granting an increase of pension to Clement F. S. Aimes (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2336) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Sheesly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2337) to create an additional judge in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 2338) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Scully (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 2339) for the relief of Frank S. Ingalls; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2340) to amend the military record of Richard Parke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) suspending temporarily the operation of certain provisions of the immigration act relating to alien contract laborers and illiterate aliens; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) granting American citizenship to Leopold Godowsky (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

AFFAIRS IN KOREA.

Mr. SPENCER. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested, if not inconsistent with the public service, to inform the Senate as to whether the situation in Korea at the present time is such, in connection with its relation to other nations, as to indicate the necessity and wisdom of the United States exerting its offices in behalf of Korea under the provision of the treaty between the United States and Korea of date May 22, 1882, providing, inter alia, "If other powers deal unjustly or oppressively with either Government, the other will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement."

ISSUANCE OF RAILROAD PASSES.

Mr. NEWBERRY. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Director General of Railroads report to the Senate as soon as practicable the number of annual passes issued for the year 1919, good over all lines, under the United States Railroad Administration, including passes good for sleeping-car and parlor-car accommodations or free dining-car service, the report to include the name and residence of the recipient, date of mailing, by whose order, and for what reason each pass was issued.

CITY OF FIUME.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 100), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the council of the city of Fiume has appealed to the Senate of the United States as the true representative of the American people to secure encouragement and help in its desire to be annexed to its mother country, Italy: and

Whereas the population of the city of Fiume has by referendum vote asserted its principle of self-determination as expounded by the President of the United States of America; and

Whereas this great American Nation is founded upon the principle that the Government derives its just power from the consent of the governed; and

Whereas the council of the city of Fiume has appealed to the Senate of the United States of America as the representative body of a liberty-loving, humanity-serving people; and

Whereas there is not as yet before the Senate of the United States of America any treaty upon which its members could intelligently express any sentiment of approval or disapproval, either for or against the aspirations of any European nation; and

Whereas the failure to act on the part of the Senate of the United States might be construed as its refusal to heed the voice of the oppressed people of the world who long for liberty and self-determination and the pursuit of happiness or its indifference to the same: Be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States send to the recently delivered population of Fiume its sincere expression of heartfelt sympathy, together with the assurance that the representatives of the American people will do their full duty, according to the best traditions of this great Republic, in defense of liberty, humanity, and the principle of self-determination, so that the blood of its generous children, shed on the devastated battle fields of Europe to save that unfortunate country from militarism and oppression, shall not have been in vain.

SALT CREEK OIL FIELD, WYOMING.

Mr. PHIPPS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 103), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit to the Senate all information in the possession of the Department of the Interior concerning the withdrawal from public entry of certain lands in Natrona County, Wyo., known as the Salt Creek Oil Field, and the claims filed by individuals and corporations in connection with same, either prior or subsequent to such withdrawal from entry; to report to the Senate the names of the individuals and corporations who claim such lands adversely to the United States; to report the action which has been taken or is being taken by the Department of the Interior to protect the interests of the United States in said lands; and to report all negotiations which are pending between the United States and said claimants for a compromise or adjustment of any or all claims and contests in regard to said lands.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. HARRISON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 104), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Rule XX of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and is hereby, amended, so as to read as follows:

That all questions of order shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate, without debate; and no question of order shall be entertained after debate on the merits of the proposition has begun. When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once and without debate; and any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer.

The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate.

AUSTRALIAN EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have a brief article on the subject of shipping, from the Christian Science Monitor of June 26, 1919, which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. It is a statement with reference to the Australian situation, and it is not long.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE ISSUED TO SHIPPING RING—AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TAKES STAND AGAINST COMBINE WHICH HAS CONTROLLED MOST OF TONNAGE TO BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES.

The Commonwealth Government has thrown down the gauntlet to the shipping ring which has controlled practically the whole of the tonnage employed in the carriage of goods from Great Britain, the United States, and Canada to Australia. As the London Shipping Conference has allowed it to be clearly understood that no rebates will be granted

to those who ship goods in vessels not controlled by members of the conference, the keenest competition seems certain.

What possibility is there that the Commonwealth Government, burdened with huge war costs and immense repatriation expenditure, can successfully face a combination of ship owners controlling more than 7,000,000 tons (estimated) of shipping, with fast steamers specially built for the Australian trade, and subsidiary organizations interested in the coastal shipping? The actual prospects of failure or success, however, are not likely to influence the Federal Government, which is convinced that it can not leave Australia at the mercy of a shipping combine. Moreover, Australia has made a most successful experiment in ship owning, having paid from profits the whole purchase price of the 15 steamships bought in 1916 by Mr. W. M. Hughes, the prime minister.

Not only has it made a net profit of £2,070,000, the purchase price of the steamers, but by the end of December, 1918, it had a credit balance in hand (after payment) of £15,000. One of the 15 vessels has been sold for £20 a ton, the original purchase price, and two of the steamers were sunk by the enemy soon after purchase. This means that Australia has a fleet of 12 slow cargo boats, whose ages probably average 10 years. There are also some captured German vessels and a number of wooden steamers and motor ships which have been built in the United States to the order of the Commonwealth. If this fleet were to represent Australia's only reply to such marine giants as the Pacific & Oriental and Orient Lines, the end would be soon in sight, but the Commonwealth is steadily at work on its own shipbuilding program. It has just launched two fine cargo steamers—the *Delungra* and the *Dromana*—with a displacement of 7,680 tons, a dead-weight of 5,540 tons, a gross tonnage of about 3,400 tons, and a speed of 10½ knots. The *Delungra* was launched at Walsh Island, in Newcastle Harbor, at the end of March, and the *Dromana* at Williamstown, Victoria, in the middle of April. These pioneers of the all-Australian fleet each carry 11 steam winches and 11 cargo derricks, and their propelling machinery has been built in Australian workshops; a great portion of the material has been supplied by the Broken Hill Proprietary's new steelworks at Newcastle.

LABOR TROUBLES ADJUSTED.

Two thousand men have been engaged on shipbuilding and magnificent work has been achieved, all labor troubles, including the dispute over piecework, having been satisfactorily adjusted. All Australia is proud of its successful entry into the realm of ship construction and credit is due to the following: Mr. Watt, the acting prime minister; Mr. Poynton, acting minister for the navy; Mr. Curchin, chief executive office of shipbuilding; Mr. Bomphrey, manager of the Walsh Island dockyard; Mr. Cutler, director of engineering at Walsh Island; Mr. Kenneth Watson, in charge of the engineering section; Mr. Hewison, chief draftsman for Messrs. Thompson & Co., at Castlemaine, Victoria, who built the machinery for the *Dromana*, and the Walsh Island Government dockyard, who built the engines for the *Delungra*.

The significance of this double launching is added to by the fact that other vessels will follow, at short intervals, from Cockatoo, Walsh Island, and Williamstown. It is also an open secret that four 10,000-ton steamships will presently be begun, probably at Walsh Island.

As a further illustration of Australia's shipbuilding possibilities, there may be mentioned the launching of the fine naval collier, the *Biloela*, which is really a greater achievement than the construction of the merchantmen. She was built at Cockatoo Island and took the water on April 10.

The appearance of a fleet of modern cargo steamers, thoroughly equipped, and ranging from 5,000 to 10,000 tons, will give the Commonwealth a far sharper weapon than is afforded by the slow Austral Line and the American-built wooden vessels. There are, however, other weapons than the ships concerned which will be used by both sides. The shipping ring, with its rebate system and its control of a proportion at least of Australia's coastal shipping, will be able to cut prices and bring pressure to bear on Australian merchants. On the other hand, the Commonwealth will be able to give a cash discount equal to any rebate likely to be offered by the shipping ring, and this cash discount will not carry with it the obligation to send future shipments by the Commonwealth Line. The federal vessels will have certain advantages which the shipping ring will not possess. They will escape the excess-profits taxation, will probably have favored harbor dues, large shipments of cargoes on Government account, such as wheat and meat, mail contracts, and a certain Australian sentiment, which will influence many merchants.

IMPOSITION OF ARBITRARY RATES.

It is probable, also, that the Commonwealth Line will benefit by the feeling which has been aroused in the past by the tactics of the shipping ring. The imposition of arbitrary rates of freight and the inclusion of clauses in bills of lading, which operate against the interests of the shippers, have shown Australian merchants what they may expect in the future if the Australian Government retires from the ocean contest. It must be admitted at this stage that among the advantages which the shipping conference has afforded Australian traders have been uniform rates of freight, the provision of specialized tonnage, and regular sailings. As against this the conference has held the export trade of Australia and New Zealand in its grip, and steamers outside the ring have had to come to Australia in ballast. The rebate system is not allowed, under the Australian industries act, in the carriage of goods in the Australian coastal trade. The shipping ring adopts the system on oversea cargo of making a deferred rebate on all freights paid by a merchant for the first six months of a year, provided that he has not consigned goods to Australia in the full 12 months by any outside shipping service. As this rebate often amounts to 10 per cent of the freightage paid, it gives a very strong control to the combination exercising it.

Australia's attitude has been made clear by Mr. Poynton, minister in charge of shipping, who stated that Australia had known for some time that an attempt was being made by the big shipping ring to squeeze out the Commonwealth Line, but the Federal Government did not intend to sit down quietly and allow the ring to carry out its intention.

"In my opinion no place in the world is likely to suffer more than Australia through the action of a shipping ring," declared the minister. "The great bulk of our primary products must find markets oversea, and it would be madness on the part of any Government to allow themselves to be either bluffed or squeezed out. The whole of our primary producers would be placed at a great disadvantage if that were allowed to happen. The Federal Government will go on with its shipbuilding program and will not withdraw from competition in the shipping trade."

While the Federal Government is awaiting with interest the next move by Lord Inchcape, the guiding influence of the shipping conference, they have been gratified by the whole-hearted support of such men as Mr. W. M. McPherson, the iron merchant of Melbourne, who has declared that if proper steps are taken by the Commonwealth shipping authorities he has no doubt that his business colleagues will send their goods by the Commonwealth Line.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, had been recommitted to the committee of conference.

EFFECTS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed and the calendar, under Rule VIII, will be proceeded with.

The bill (S. 1373) to amend the Articles of War was announced as first in order on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Hale	McLean	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Harding	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harris	Nelson	Smoot
Calder	Harrison	New	Spencer
Capper	Henderson	Newberry	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Nugent	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Phipps	Underwood
Dial	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Keyes	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	King	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Kirby	Ransdell	Warren
Fernald	Knox	Robinson	Watson
Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Lenroot	Sherman	
Gay	Lodge	Shields	
Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the pending bill on the calendar.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 1373) to amend the Articles of War, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs without amendment, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 112 of section 342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, approved July 9, 1918," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"ART. 112. Effects of deceased persons—Disposition of.—In case of the death of any person subject to military law the commanding officer of the place of command will permit the legal representative or widow of the deceased, if present, to take possession of all his effects then in camp or quarters, and if no legal representative or widow be present the commanding officer shall direct a summary court to secure all such effects; and said summary court shall have authority to collect and receive any debts due decedent's estate by local debtors; and as soon as practicable after the collection of such effects said summary court shall transmit such effects, and any money collected, through the Quartermaster Department at Government expense to the widow or legal representative of the deceased, if such be found by said court, or to the son, daughter, father, provided the father has not abandoned the support of his family, mother, brother, sister, or the next of kin in the order named, if such be found by said court, or the beneficiary named in the will of the deceased, if such be found by said court, and said court shall thereupon make to the War Department a full report of its transactions; but if there be none of the persons hereinabove named, or such persons or their addresses are not known to or readily ascertainable by said court, and the said court shall so find, said summary court shall have authority to convert into cash, by public or private sale, not earlier than 30 days after the death of the deceased, all effects of deceased except sabers, insignia, decorations, medals, watches, trinkets, manuscripts, and other articles valuable chiefly as keepsakes; and as soon as practicable after converting such effects into cash said summary court shall deposit with the proper officer, to be designated in regulations, any cash belonging to decedent's estate, and shall transmit a receipt for such deposits, any will or other papers of value belonging to the deceased, any sabers, insignia, decorations, medals, watches, trinkets, manuscripts, and other articles valuable chiefly as keepsakes, together with an inventory of the effects secured by said summary court, and a full account of its transactions to the War Department for transmission to the Auditor for the War Department for action as authorized by law in the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army.

"The provisions of this article shall be applicable to inmates of the United States Soldiers' Home who die in any United States military hospital outside of the District of Columbia where sent from the home for treatment."

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) directing the appointment of a special committee to devise a plan for a national budget system, and to report not later than September 1, 1919, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NELSON. Let that go over, Mr. President. Provision has been made for that in the appropriation bill.

Mr. KING. I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR MONTANA.

The bill (S. 202) providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Montana if this is the same bill which passed at the last session of Congress?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It has twice passed the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there a unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary in its favor?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is a unanimous report in its favor, but I will say in this connection that there is no written report accompanying the bill as now reported, but a report on it has twice been submitted, showing, upon the statement made by the present judge of the district court, that the passage of this bill would result in an annual saving to the Government of the United States of $50,000 in the administration of the Federal jurisdiction in the State of Montana. The distances to be traveled in our State being so great, the expense of running the district court is greater than in any other State of the Union.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Montana if there is more than one judicial district in his State?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is only one judicial district in the State.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional judge for the district of Montana, who shall reside in said district and shall possess the same qualifications and have the same powers and jurisdiction and receive the same salary now prescribed by law in respect of the present district judge therein.

SEC. 2. That in case of disagreement in relation thereto between the judges of said district court the senior circuit judge of the ninth circuit shall make all rules for the transaction of the business of said court and all necessary orders for the division of the work and the assignment of cases for trial.

SEC. 3. That the clerk of the district court for the district of Montana and the marshal and district attorney for said district shall perform the duties appertaining to their offices, respectively, for said court.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INJURIES IN PLACES UNDER FEDERAL JURISDICTION.

The bill (S. 206) concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

Mr. KING. I ask my colleague to permit the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to make a brief explanation of that bill, when, I think, there will be no objection to its consideration. The bill has the unanimous report of the Judiciary Committee in its favor and it has received full consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the Senator from Montana making an explanation of the measure.

Mr. KING. I feel sure that neither my colleague nor any other Senator will object to the bill when the matter is fully explained.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I can not believe that the senior Senator from Utah is advised concerning the purpose of the bill or he would not have the least objection to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply desire to examine the report in connection with this bill. In fact, I have been so busy and so closely occupied with appropriation bills that I have been unable to give the calendar any attention whatever. I have examined the digest furnished by the bureau appointed by Congress for that purpose and there is no information contained in it in reference to the bill. I shall be very glad to hear what the Senator from Montana may have to say. I thought the bill was of sufficient importance that it should not be considered under the five-minute rule.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not believe the bill will give rise to any discussion or arouse opposition. The acts creating the various national parks give to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over those territories, so that a question has frequently arisen as to whether, in case one suffers death by the default or willful act of another within those jurisdictions, there is any law whatever under which the dependents of the deceased may recover against the person answerable for his death. For instance, in the Yellowstone National Park quite a number of deaths have occurred in connection with the transportation of passengers through the park, and a very serious question arises as to whether, in a case of that character, there is any law whatever under which the widow of a man who was killed by the neglect, for instance, of the transportation company handling the passengers in the park could recover.

The purpose of this proposed statute is to give a right of action in all such cases exactly the same as is given by the law of the State within which the reservation or other place within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States may be located.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to ask the Senator right there if that same power would apply in the Panama Canal strip?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; it could not apply to the Panama Canal strip, because it applies only in cases within States or Territories which have laws applicable to the particular jurisdiction.

Mr. SMOOT. What was in my mind was this: Why should the right of action be granted as to a person killed on a forest reserve located in a State and owned by the Government any more than it would apply to the Panama Canal Zone?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it may be that our laws in relation to the Panama Canal Zone ought to be amended; I think they cover the case; but however that may be, we are not going to undertake to legislate for the case of a recovery in each one of these jurisdictions. The bill contemplates that the law of the State within which the territory is located shall control and govern.

In the case of the Panama Canal we legislate directly, and there is no other legislative body that can deal with the subject. So the two questions, I will say to the Senator from Utah, ought to be dealt with in altogether different bills. This is merely to give the same right of action in a case within a district which is within the exclusve jurisdiction of the United States as is given by the law of the State within which it is located should the occurrence happen outside of the region within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand from the Senator's statement what is desired to be accomplished, but I was wondering whether it was a wise thing to do that at this time. An act of Congress authorizes the payment of a certain amount of money to the widow or the heirs of an employee killed or injured in the public service. It is true that those amounts are usually paid by special bills by way of claims against the Government when there is no objection to them. I do not know just how this bill, if enacted into law, will affect the existing law.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me say to the Senator that we are required to take care of the cases to which he has referred, because they touch the rights of persons in the employ of the United States, and their cause of action is against the United States. This bill does not touch cases of that kind at all. It merely touches cases of injury inflicted by some one other than the Government. Under this bill the Government will be in no wise liable at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I have no objection to the bill if it is limited in that way.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is limited to private action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration to the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 206) concerning actions on account of death or personal injury within places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 2, to strike out "wherein" and insert "within," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the case of the death of any person by the neglect or wrongful act of another within a national park or other place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, such right of action shall exist as though the place were under the jurisdiction of the State within whose exterior boundaries such place may be; and in any action brought to recover on account of injuries sustained in any such place the rights of the parties shall be governed by the laws of the State within the exterior boundaries of which it may be.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The amendment is merely a formal correction.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question in regard to this measure. I note in line 3 that this relief is proposed to be granted "in case of the death of any person." Why should it not also apply to the case of an injury which might not result in death?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The reason is that in the case of an injury there is a common-law right of action against the person inflicting the injury, no matter where it happened.

Mr. POMERENE. I understand.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL PEACE POLICY.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall assure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war, and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world, was announced as next in order.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. ROBINSON. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over.

DISTRICT JUDGE, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 661) to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter there shall be a district judge of the United States for the middle district of the State of Tennessee, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall possess the same qualifications and shall have the same powers and jurisdiction and receive the same compensation prescribed by law in respect to district judges of the United States: *Provided*, That the judge now acting for the eastern and middle districts of Tennessee shall continue to act in both said districts until a judge is appointed and qualified for the middle district as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That the district judge now holding office and acting for both said districts and his successors shall be assigned to and hereafter be the district judge for the eastern district in said State.

SEC. 3. That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the district judge for the southern district in said State, who shall, as to all business and proceedings arising in said middle judicial district, possess and exercise all the powers conferred by existing law upon judges of the district courts of the United States, and who shall succeed to and possess the same powers and perform the same duties within the said middle district as are now possessed and performed by the district judge acting for both said districts in said State.

SEC. 4. That terms of court may be held at the places and in the manner now prescribed by law in the eastern judicial district by the judge of the middle district or in the middle judicial district by the judge of the eastern district, provided it is mutually agreed by and between the judges of each of said districts that the public interest demands it.

SEC. 5. That all laws and parts of laws so far as inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPERTY LOSSES DURING LABOR STRIKES IN COLORADO.

The bill (S. 253) for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914 was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "June 30," to strike out "1919" and to insert "1920," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $7,800, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1920, for payment of claims on account of loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops from civilians in the State of Colorado during the labor strike troubles which occurred in the calendar year 1914: *Provided*, That settlement of such claims shall be made by the Auditor for the War Department upon the approval and recommendation of the Secretary of War, where the amount of the loss has been ascertained by the War Department, and payment thereof will be accepted by the owners of the property in full satisfaction of such claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY P. GRANT.

The bill (S. 248) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,574.24 to Henry P. Grant, formerly postmaster of Helena, Ark., said sum being the amount he voluntarily paid into the Treasury to make good the shortage of the assistant postmaster, William B. Lindsey, who was duly tried and convicted of said crime and punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary for a term of four years.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there must be something wrong with this bill. The bill says "tried and convicted of said crime." What crime? No crime is mentioned before that in the provisions of the bill. I think there must be something left out.

Mr. ROBINSON. The crime of shortage in his accounts.

Mr. SMOOT. That may not be a crime.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the language is all right—

To make good the shortage of the assistant postmaster * * * who was duly tried and convicted of said crime.

Shortage in accounts is an offense known to the postal laws.

Mr. SMOOT. There may be a shortage without its being a crime; it may be due to a mistake.

Mr. ROBINSON. But I think there is such an offense known to the postal laws as shortage in accounts, and that was the offense for which the assistant postmaster was tried.

Mr. SMOOT. Was the assistant postmaster tried and convicted?

Mr. ROBINSON. He was tried and convicted. The language of this bill was prepared by the former Senator from Arkansas, Senator James P. Clarke, and the bill passed the Senate during his service here, and also passed the Senate at the last session. I simply reintroduced the bill that former Senator Clarke, of Arkansas, introduced. I am satisfied with the language of the bill. I do not know whether or not the technical term "shortage of accounts" is correct, but the language is sufficient to describe the act. I do not think it material, even though the language used it not a technical description of the crime, because I do not think it is material that for the purposes of this bill the crime of which the assistant postmaster was convicted be legally described. It is merely a matter of narration or of historical allusion.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to my colleague, if I have the right to do so.

Mr. KIRBY. I would suggest that as the crime was embezzlement, if the Senator will insert "the crime of embezzlement," that will meet the objection urged.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have already said that I think he was indicted under a statute which defines a crime of shortage. I think the description is sufficient, but I have no objection to the amendment suggested by my colleague.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask the Senator a question. Was not the assistant postmaster insured?

Mr. ROBINSON. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the law requires that.

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I do not think the law required it at that time. This shortage occurred a very long time ago. This case has been pending before Congress for a quarter of a century or more. A bill on the subject has been reported by one House or the other several times, and it has passed the Senate twice. At that time the postmaster was not responsible for the defalcation of his assistant, and the assistant was not under bond.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not had the time to look it up; but, as I remember, there was a greater shortage than $7,000, but the insurance which was compelled to be carried was not sufficient to pay the full amount, and this was the balance. There are other cases like this which have been before the Claims Committee for many, many years, and I did not know whether this was one of such claims or not; and I thought, perhaps, there ought to be at least action taken against the assistant postmaster to show that the postmaster was not responsible, and also to show that the assistant postmaster was guilty of the crime.

Mr. ROBINSON. The assistant postmaster was tried and convicted, and served a period in the penitentiary. As to whether the crime for which he was convicted should be designated "embezzlement" or "shortage," I am unable to say. I merely reintroduced the bill as former Senator Clarke introduced it, and as the Senate has already passed it two or three times. I do not think it is a material question.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. To meet the objection raised by the Senator from Utah it seems to me we might amend lines 8 and 9 so as to read as follows:

To make good the amount of public money appropriated by the assistant postmaster, William B. Lindsey, to his own use.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to the amendment; and if the Senator from Minnesota will offer it, I will accept it.

Mr. NELSON. I think that will meet the objection of the Senator from Utah; and I offer that amendment, if the Senator from Arkansas has no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the word "shortage" and insert "the amount of public money appropriated by," and, after the name "Lindsey," insert "to his own use," so that it will read:

To make good the amount of public money appropriated by the assistant postmaster, William B. Lindsey, to his own use.

Mr. ROBINSON. I accept that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed to address the Senate without the application of the five-minute rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island will proceed.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, when the question of the United States entering into the league of nations arose, naturally everyone turned to the writings of Washington for counsel and advice. His Farewell Address is known to every school child throughout our land, and is recognized as one of the greatest of our State papers.

The opponents of the league of nations assert that what he said then is a barrier to our ever entering into any such agreement; but, Mr. President, I believe a thorough analysis of that address shows that the reasons on which Washington based his doctrine are not applicable to-day on account of the undreamt-of change in conditions. The particular sentences that are taken from his address to support their contention are these:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her policies or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

But no one to-day, after the catastrophy of the last four years, will say that European interests have a "very remote relation" to us, and no one can say that the controversies that exist there are "essentially foreign to our concerns." Washington continued:

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected.

No one can now honestly believe that "our situation is detached and distant" from that of Europe. It can not be said that "we may defy material injury from external annoyance." The submarine campaign of the German Government is a denial in fact of that allegation, and certainly our "neutrality was not scrupulously respected." How close our shores are to those of Europe was brought forcibly to the notice of the people of my State when a German submarine appeared in the harbor of Newport while we were still neutral and after departing sank, within a few miles of our shore, several commercial vessels of the Allies. And it should be noted that after we entered the war other submarines operated in our own waters. "Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation?" said Washington.

Mr. President, "the peculiar situation" no longer exists. It is one of the positive facts that has been taught us by this war. Not only is it possible for us to be attacked by vessels from the sea, but the development of airplanes has made it equally possible for us to be attacked from the air.

During my visit to Europe, from which I have just returned, I was fortunate enough to travel from London to Paris with some members of the Navy who made the flight across the ocean and proved that the development of the heavier-than-air machines had reached such a stage that they may be used as a means of attack against us in the near future, should occasion arise for such use. If it had not been for misfortune with our Navy lighter-than-air craft, that would have given further proof of how much nearer we are to Europe than we are inclined to think. Since then an airplane has flown from Newfoundland to England, covering the distance in a matter of a little over 16 hours. These are only the forerunners of agencies of war that are eliminating the difficulties of distance. The heavier-than-air and lighter-than-air machines are only in their infancy. The discovery and use of helium gas for the lighter-than-air machines may be considered only as on trial, and yet wonderful results have already been obtained. When we consider further, in connection with the foregoing facts, the advance of chemistry and the belief of many experts that the next war will be principally carried on by destructive gases, whereby entire peaceful communities may be destroyed, it must be admitted that the horrors of another conflict would undoubtedly be brought very quickly to our own shores.

There is still another thought that by the linking together of the peoples of the world by cable and by wireless public turmoil and anarchy in Europe is bound to have its effects quickly in this country. That which endangers the civilization abroad will be felt in our own land, and must be considered seriously by our American statesmen.

These are facts which it was impossible for Washington to have in mind when he made his Farewell Address. These inventions were not dreamt of in his day, and there is no justification to warrant the assertion that he would entertain the same views to-day as he did then. When this war commenced we were relying on Washington's theory of our isolation to guard and protect us and keep us from becoming entangled in the European conflict, but our efforts were absolutely futile. We were forced into it against our wishes in defense of our honor, our own preservation, as well as our duty to civilization. What followed? America sent 2,000,000 men across the seas in a period of a very few months with insufficient transportation facilities, again clearly indicating that we were but a short distance from European shores, a much shorter distance for troop transportation purposes than had been realized by military experts. Reflect for a moment upon what the transportation equipment and facilities were in Washington's day as compared with the great ocean liners of to-day, and you are forced to the conclusion that New York and Brest are closer than were Boston and Baltimore in his time.

Mr. President, although we were not actively engaged in large numbers in the war until the last few months, and at no time did we have more than 500,000 men or thereabouts in the battle line, our losses were over 45,000 killed and about five times that wounded and missing. No one, unless he has seen these battle fronts of Europe, can realize the privations, hardships, and difficulties that our men had to overcome. The horrors positively can not be described; they must be seen, and, of course, to be thoroughly appreciated, must have been seen during the battle periods. That our men, with marvelous courage, overcame all obstacles and destroyed the German power can be no argument against our wishing to prevent future generations from having to undergo similar conditions, and I feel sure that there is no sentiment stronger in any of the soldiers returned from the front than the desire to prevent their children from having to suffer what they have had to bear. The question now is, What are we going to do to change conditions so that we may effectively place barriers against the inception of future wars of this nature? The old diplomatic methods and weak Hague tribunals have not availed, neither has the doctrine of the balance of power proved effective. We must turn to something new if we are to have any hope that the future is to hold a brighter page than the past.

The great statesmen of the world have realized this fact. They have studied and counseled upon it, and their leading representatives have submitted a plan, and this plan is the league of nations. It shall be my endeavor, briefly and in a short space of time, to analyze the covenant of this league as I see it, and the reasons for my support of it shall be stated. By way of premise, let me say that I think any support of this league of nations from a partisan basis is entirely unwarranted. It is too big a question for that. A fortiori do I believe that any opposition based upon the same ground is unjustified. This is the view of our people, and many prominent Republicans in my State have expressed the hope that I might be able to lend my support to the adoption of this covenant.

The covenant of the league of nations consists of a preamble and 26 articles. The preamble simply sets forth the reasons why the high contracting parties agree to the covenant. No one questions the high motives or the splendid purposes for which the league is intended.

Article 1 declares who are to be the original members of the league and who may become members and how. It also provides that any of the members of the league may withdraw after two years' notice of intention so to do, provided that all its international obligations and all obligations under this covenant have been fulfilled. No objection to any part of this article has arisen except to the provision regarding withdrawal, where it has been contended, notably by Mr. Root, that the section is not satisfactory because other members of the league might raise a question that such obligations under this covenant had

not been fulfilled by the party desiring to withdraw. It seems to me clear, however, that to prevent withdrawal there would have to be a unanimous vote under article 5. It is inconceivable that all the members present would vote against the withdrawal if, in fact, all the obligations had been fulfilled, and thus attempt by dishonorable means to hold us in the league, if from no other reason than the danger of establishing such a precedent for themselves. It is also inconceivable that the United States would think of withdrawing unless it had fulfilled its obligations. On the other hand, it would be unfair to have a provision allowing withdrawal without having some such restriction placed upon each nation entering the league. It would not be just to allow a nation with obligations unfulfilled to withdraw.

Article 2 simply shows the instruments through which the league will operate and effect its purposes; that is, through a council and an assembly.

Article 3 states how the assembly shall be composed, when it shall meet and where, what it may deal with at its meetings, and the vote and representation each member of the league shall have, namely, one vote to each member and not more than three representatives. This gives the smallest nations the same vote in the assembly as the great nations of the world. It is notice to them that they shall be recognized and receive fair play. In considering this proposition one must bear in mind the subsequent provisions of the covenant, which indicate what powers the assembly has as distinguished from the powers of the council. It must be admitted that the powers of the assembly are very limited, indeed, but it does afford an ample opportunity for every country to present its views upon every international question.

Article 4 sets forth, namely, who shall be members of the council and how they shall be selected; also how additional members may be created; also when and where the council shall meet and what it may deal with, of course in accordance with other provisions of the covenant. I have heard no complaint to this particular section. This article besides contains a further proviso setting forth that any member of the league not represented in the council shall be invited to sit as one of its members during the consideration of matters especially affecting its interests. This is an especially wise provision, as it is only fair that a nation whose particular interest is involved should be a party to all that transpires. It also provides that at meetings of the council each member of the league represented in the council shall have one vote and not more than one representative.

Article 5 is an important provision and provides that except in certain specified cases the vote required for any action on the part of the assembly or council is a unanimous vote. It then sets forth that the form of procedure in each of these bodies shall be determined by the body itself, and that a majority vote on these questions suffices. There is likewise included a provision indicating how the first meeting shall be called.

By article 6 it is provided how the permanent secretariat shall be formed.

Article 7 simply states where shall be the seat of the league and how this question is to be determined. It also sets forth that all positions under and in connection with the league shall be open to both sexes, which is a recognition of women's equality throughout the world. There is given to representatives of the members of the league and all officials and buildings and property diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Article 8 deals with the plan for curtailing armament and preventing competitive naval and military programs among the nations, which have proved such a great burden to the taxpayers in the past. It sets forth that the council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for the reduction of armament and leaves it to the consideration and action of the several Governments to act upon these suggestions if they see fit.

If the several Governments agree to a plan of limits of armament, these limitations shall not be exceeded within a period of 10 years without the concurrence of the council. It also has another very important proviso in regard to the manufacture by private corporations of munitions and implements of war, and empowers the council to advise how the evil effects of such manufacture can be prevented. The council is required, in making these suggestions, to consider the necessity of the members of the league who are not able to manufacture munitions and implements of war themselves. It further requires that members of the league shall give full and frank information of their armaments, including their military and naval programs, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes.

Article 9 creates a permanent commission to advise the council on the execution of the provisions with reference to military and naval questions in general, and more particularly those under article 8, just dealt with, and article 1. (Article 1, you will recall, specifies that the admission of future members to the league requires that they shall give effective guaranties of their intention to observe international obligations and to accept the regulations prescribed by the league in regard to their naval and military forces and armaments.)

There has been a good deal of objection to article 8 on the ground that we are surrendering our sovereignty by permitting the league of nations to determine for us what our Army and Navy should be, matters which are reserved by the Constitution to the Congress. But, Mr. President, it is apparent from what I have already stated that this provision for the limitation of armament only gives the council power to recommend and leaves to the individual nation the question of whether or not it will adopt the recommendation. There is no moral obligation on any nation as far as the wording of the covenant is concerned to require it to accept. It is therefore self-evident that our sovereignty is not in any way surrendered and that the matter is left to Congress to determine. If, however, Congress desires to adopt the recommendations of the council, then we are pledged not to increase our armament without the concurrence of the council beyond the plan agreed to for 10 years, and every other country is in exactly the same condition. If disarmament is ever to take place, I doubt if a fairer plan can be evolved, and it is worthy of note that the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June, 1917, carried a provision which gave the President discretionary power to decrease our armament if a proper international understanding could be reached. That it is not beyond the treaty-making power is well shown by the fact that this power was exercised in the treaty which we have with Great Britain with reference to limitation of armaments on the Canadian border, including naval vessels on the Great Lakes.

Article 10 states that the members of the league shall undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all its members. In case of any breach of this the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

This is the most controversial article in the league, and it is the one on which Senator Root has concentrated his major opposition. In his letter to Mr. Hays, chairman of the Republican national committee, dated March 29, 1919, he suggested as an amendment to add to article 10 the following:

> After the expiration of five years from the signing of this convention any party may terminate its obligation under this article by giving one year's notice, in writing, to the secretary general of the league.

In his letter to Senator LODGE of June 19, 1919, he amends his own suggestion as follows:

> The Senate consents to the ratification of the said treaty, reserving article 10 aforesaid with the understanding that whenever two years' notice of withdrawal from the league of nations shall have been given, as provided in article 1, no claim, charge, or finding that international obligations or obligations under the covenant have not been fulfilled will be deemed to render the two years' notice ineffectual or to keep the power giving the notice in the league after the expiration of the time specified in the notice.

In other words, in March he was willing to support article 10 for a limited period, but in June he is not willing to support it at all. Everybody has the highest regard for Senator Root's great learning and legal abilities, and no one has a higher standing as a constitutional lawyer; but I can not forego the thought that for many years he has been one of the ablest advisers of the Republican Party, and when he speaks in favor of such a resolution as that offered by Senator KNOX, the partisan purpose of which is so apparent, his loyalty to his own party may have unconsciously biased his judgment. Such a reservation by the Senate as he suggests in regard to article 10 would, I think, mean that we rejected the treaty, and, in any event, would cause unpardonable delay in requiring renewed consideration by the other nations. It is very unlikely that the other nations would consent to this article being omitted.

There seems to be some misunderstanding in regard to the contents of the whole of this article. It does not guarantee the territorial integrity or the existing political independence of any member of the league except from external aggression. In other words, it would be inoperative against any internal action, uprising, or rebellion. Danger of war under this article is also further safeguarded by articles 11 to 17, to which I presently shall come, and which provide, generally speaking, for arbitration. The importance of this article is easy to understand when one realizes that if this league of nations had existed in 1914 it would have been notice to Germany when she invaded Belgium and France of the opposition that she would have to expect. There is little doubt that it would have prevented her from initiating the conflagration. The constitutional objection that we have no right to say that our country will

wage war in the event that the territorial integrity or existing political independence of another nation was interfered with was very well answered by the eminent Senator from Montana a few days ago, when he stated on the floor of the Senate that the United States had obligated itself to do that very thing in the case of Panama. One can not forget that we have never been forced into a war under the Monroe doctrine, which is practically an assertion of a similar condition limited to the Americas.

The object of this section is to prevent the occasion for wars, which, arising even in small and remote countries, may involve the peace of the world. The framers of the covenant had naturally a very lively recollection that this great conflict was started directly by the attempt of a great nation to impose unreasonable and destructive measures upon a very small nation. From this small beginning arose a world-wide conflagration.

The article possesses teeth, but to my mind we are not likely to have serious trouble with it, and as many new nations have been created it is extremely important that all countries should know that these weaker nations shall not be left to their own defense against outside oppression.

Article 11 provides that any war or threat of war affecting any members of the league is a matter of concern to the whole league. It does not indicate what action shall be taken, but allows the calling of it to the attention of the league for its consideration in accordance with the provisions of the covenant.

Article 12 simply requires the members to submit matters of dispute either to arbitration or to inquiry by the council, and makes them agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the council. It further maintains that the award of the arbitrators shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the council within six months after the submission of the dispute. It is a very salutary provision, and is intended to check by cooler thought a hasty entry into a war. It affords an opportunity for discussion which nearly always would prevent countries from engaging in war. It is really and substantially an agreement for arbitration such as we have already established with a great many European nations.

Article 13 states that the members of the league agree that whenever any dispute arises between them which they recognize to be suitable for arbitration, and which can not satisfactorily be settled by diplomacy, it will be submitted to arbitration; and then sets forth examples of questions that are suitable and proper for arbitration. It allows the parties to choose the court of arbitration. The members of the league agree that they will carry out in good faith any award that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against any member of the league which complies with it. In the even of any failure to carry out such an award, the council has a right to propose what steps may be taken to give effect thereto.

This is a very important provision, because our Government has been contending for years that such questions ought to be decided by arbitration. Many of our international difficulties have been overcome by that method. The provision that members of the league will not go to war after a final decision is had is also a wise one as giving effect to the validity of the decision.

Article 14 empowers the council to formulate and submit to the members of the league plans for the establishment of a permanent court of international justice. The plans suggested can be accepted or rejected. But even should such court be established under the foregoing article, it is not necessary for the members of the league to submit any matters of arbitration to it if they do not care to do so.

By article 15 it is provided that where a dispute is likely to lead to rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration under article 14, the members of the league shall submit it to the council, and that any party to the dispute shall effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the secretary general. It further sets forth the procedure for carrying out the arbitration and then relates that the council shall endeavor to effect a settlement, and, if successful, a statement giving the terms of settlement, and so forth, shall be published. On failure of settlement, the council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall publish a report containing the statement of the dispute and make recommendations. And that any member of the league represented on the council may make a public statement of the facts of the dispute and of its recommendations. If a report by the council is unanimously agreed to by the members other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the league agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations. If the council fails to obtain a unanimous report of all members present other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, then the members reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within domestic jurisdiction, the council shall make no recommendations as to its settlement. The council may in any case under this article refer a dispute to the assembly, and it shall be so referred at the request of either party to it if such a request is made within 14 days after the submission of the dispute to the council.

In any case referred to the assembly, the provisions of this article and article 12—you will recall article 12, the important provision of which is that no war will be declared for a period of three months after notice of the award—relating to the action and powers of the council shall apply to the assembly, provided that a report made by the assembly, if concurred in by the council members of the league and the majority of the other members of the league, exclusive of the representatives of the party to this dispute, shall have the same force as a unanimous report by the council.

The purpose of this article is to provide several convenient methods of arbitration, giving the disputants the choice of having it determined by the council or by the assembly in the manner specified in the various sections. The discussion and findings that are made by either the assembly or the council can not have any result except to bring the parties closer together, and in all probability result in an adjustment of the dispute without resort to any further proceedings. It is well to note here the distinction drawn between domestic questions and international questions. There has been an endeavor by the opponents of the league, through false construction, to make it appear that our domestic questions could be interfered with and made the subject of arbitration by the league. This provision especially requires that if a dispute arises which is found by the council to be a matter which by international law is solely within domestic jurisdiction, that then no recommendation shall be made. It is impossible to believe for one moment, when we consider that it requires a unanimous vote of the council, outside of the members to the dispute, or, if the matter is referred to the assembly, a unanimous vote of those members of the council and a majority of the other members of the league outside of the disputants, that a decision could be had declaring a domestic an international question. The members of the league must naturally be as interested in their domestic questions as we are in our own, and they would not create any precedent that would react against themselves. Take the case of England in regard to immigration. Is it not perfectly apparent that Australia, New Zealand, and Canada have the same interest as ourselves in that question?

The action to be taken by the members of the league, should any member resort to war in disregard of articles 12, 13, and 15, is set forth in article 16. It requires the severance of our trade and financial relations with the offending member, the prohibition of all intercourse with it, and the prevention of any financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the members and the covenant-breaking State. It has a further provision that it shall be the duty of the council in such a case to recommend to the several Governments what effective military or naval forces the members of the league shall contribute to protect the covenants of the league. It further requires that the members of the league will support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this article in order to minimize the loss resulting from such measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number and that they will afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the members of the league which are cooperating to protect its covenants. Any member of the league which has violated any covenant may be declared to be no longer a member by a vote of the council if concurred in by the representatives of all other council members of the league. The particular point to which I would call attention is that even though it is the duty of the council to make recommendations upon what military or naval forces each one shall contribute, it is only a recommendation, and not at all binding unless it is agreeable to the members. The only steps that are binding are those relating to financial and economic questions.

Article 17 states how the machinery of the league shall be used in the settling of a dispute by arbitration when it is between a State that is a member of the league and one that is not a member or between two States non-members. I do not understand that any particular objection has been offered to this

section. The rules of procedure would be practically the same as if the dispute had arisen between the members of the league and the covenant would apply with the same effect.

Article 18 provides for the publication of treaties, and is therefore in harmony with American opinion in the idea that there should be no secret treaties.

The reconsideration of treaties that, because of time or conditions, have become inapplicable and might endanger the peace of the world is provided for by article 19.

Article 20 requires that members shall not enter into compacts that are inconsistent with the agreement to which they have entered under the covenant of the league of nations, and that they shall make no treaty in the future inconsistent therewith.

Article 21 specifies that certain engagements or regional understandings for securing and maintaining peace, and particularly the Monroe doctrine, shall be deemed not to be affected by this section. This is official recognition that the Monroe doctrine is outside the jurisdiction of the covenant of the league of nations. It is recognized as a purely American policy, and while it may not have been aptly described the mentioning of it by name, regardless of what it is called, makes it certain that it is beyond the jurisdiction of the league to deal with. I believe that this does away with the objection that was raised to the former draft. It seems to me that any other viewpoint is far-fetched and against the rules of ordinary construction.

Article 22 provides for mandatories to protect and safeguard the interests of the colonies and territories created, and of nations that have been recently set up, and that are in an unstable state, and require protection and help in their government by the stronger and more civilized nations of the world. The particular point to be borne in mind is that no nation is obliged against its will to become the mandatory to any nation or territory. Proper restrictions are placed upon the mandatories, and in every instance a report has to be furnished the council at the expiration of every year. The degree of authority that shall be exercised by a mandatory is determined by the council, having consideration for the situation and the condition of the State or nation over which the mandate is exercised. A permanent commission is also constituted to advise the council in all matters relating to the mandates.

Article 23 declares that the members of the league will endeavor to secure international organizations for obtaining fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children, as well as just treatment of native inhabitants of the territories under their control. It likewise stipulates that the league will exercise general supervision with regard to the traffic in women and children, in opium and other dangerous drugs, as well as the trade in arms and ammunition under certain circumstances. It is further agreed that they shall endeavor to secure equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league, and finally will undertake the very worthy object of attempting to prevent the spread of disease.

The placing of all international bureaus already in existence or those that shall be established hereafter under the direction of the league is established by article 23, and provision is made for taking care of the expenses.

Article 25 provides for the encouragement of various Red Cross organizations of the different nations that are members of the league.

Article 26 provides for amendments to the covenant, which take effect when ratified by members of the league, whose representatives compose the council and by a majority of the other members of the assembly. No such amendment shall bind any member which signifies its dissent therefrom, and in that case it ceases to be a member of the league.

It is apparent from the foregoing analysis that this proposed covenant of the league of nations has presented a workable plan for a collective action of nations to try and prevent wars, as far as possible, by introducing the principles of arbitration and by agreeing to marshal the civilized nations of the world against such acts of aggression as Germany and Austria perpetrated in this war. The instrument does not take from us our sovereignty, neither does it ask any greater sacrifice from America than is absolutely necessary to give proper and adequate force and vitality to the league.

In considering the covenant it is well to remember that while we enter into certain obligations, if adopted, so do all the other countries; and, secondly, that upon some important and paramount questions unanimous vote is required and no action can be taken without our assent. In certain other cases where we might happen to be one of the disputants to a controversy, unanimous consent of all representatives, excluding the representatives of members to the dispute, is necessary. It is not believable that these nations would unite against us if our cause is just. If the members of the council, as representatives of nations, should be thus willing to conspire unanimously against the United States, it is equally easy to argue that, without the league, they would be willing to combine against our country.

The real question is whether we believe that it is not better for the United States to have a say in European matters and thus try to prevent another horrible war or to keep our hands off and wait until the world is aflame and then endeavor to assert our might to protect our rights. In one case we have a hand in shaping the destinies of mankind. In the other, in refusing to accept responsibility, we suffer the consequences that are likely to come from an uncontrollable situation in Europe.

If we fail to agree upon a league of nations, the world will have to go back to the old conditions of armed camps and balance of power, and upon a larger scale, great nations forming alliances and relying on force to maintain themselves, and each small nation apprehensive and joining the alliance considered best for its safety and protection. Might and not right will then continue to rule, and the nations that we have recognized and helped to form will be left in a helpless condition. It will be but a short time before they will be practically swallowed up or controlled by one combination or another. Can we allow such a condition to occur, and if we do, can Europe survive it? If anarchy and Bolshevism pervade Europe, will it not bring serious problems and difficulties to our own land?

It is very wise to scrutinize very carefully all the different provisions of the league and to consider the effects they might have upon ourselves, but in our analysis we should not lose all sense of proportion. I have just returned from Europe, where I have endeavored to obtain as much information as possible on a short visit concerning the general European situation. I covered the battle areas of France and some of the devastated regions and talked with many people from all walks of life and in all sections. In Belgium, while my visit was brief, I had the pleasure of interviews with the three men that stand out as the great figures in the present-day history of Belgium—the King, Cardinal Mercier, and Burgomaster Max. The King and the burgomaster must long be held up as examples of true patriotism and ability, and Cardinal Mercier will long be respected by all denominations not only for what he accomplished for his own people but for the example he gave in fighting for the highest ideals of Christianity. I spent considerable time in Paris and naturally came in contact with many prominent statesmen of all nationalities.

It is this personal contact with the situation over there that makes me realize that the greatest danger is not from what may come in the distant future, but what is now threatening and impending at our very doors. When the devastated areas are seen one realizes how impossible it is to describe them. It is a fact that the country generally has been so shell torn that much of the land for some time to come will be absolutely unproductive, and it will be necessary to plant forests in order to rehabilitate it. As the Senators well know, in places it is even worse than that. In Rheims there are only 14 houses that have not been damaged, and elsewhere many towns have been entirely obliterated. Looking at the map, the area invaded was not large, but when one considers that it was the great industrial district of France one realizes the tremendous and vital losses to the country.

For four years Europe has passed through an era of horrors, deprivations, and bloodshed that has shaken the very foundations of our civilization. Men and women have been taken from their usual pursuits of life and become but the cogs of a great war machine. Their attitude on life has received rude awakenings. They have borne, with heavy hearts but not unthinking minds, the hardest of tribulations. They did it knowing, of course, that it was necessary if they were to keep the sword from their throats; but now that hostilities have ceased, they are in a questioning mood. They have been shaken in their belief in our civilization. They are seeking to prevent a recurrence of the horrors that they have lived through. They are looking for a new era, with better conditions, and they are in a state of mind easily led to wrongdoing in an endeavor to secure a panacea for their ills. These war-weary people expected as soon as fighting ceased that good conditions would be immediately restored. They did not look for the necessary period of reconstruction and adjustment that must come after every war. It is this situation through which we are now passing that makes it one of the most critical periods in history. Economic conditions are abnormal. We must prevent Bolshevism and anarchy, and they join hands with unemployment, want, and privation. It is necessary to turn war industries into those of peace, with the natural readjustment and renewing and replenishing of markets; to obtain raw materials and to secure necessary tonnage for transportation; to demobilize armies and find

employment for the soldiers. All nations have enormous war debts and heavy taxes to pay, and many of the necessities of life are procured with difficulty. The people of England, France, and Belgium are just beginning to realize that a sufficient indemnity from Germany can not be obtained to meet all of these obligations.

The coal situation is very serious, if not alarming. In England the output has decreased, and it is doubtful if she will have much, if any, to export to her neighbors, and the price per ton will be very high, meaning not only hardship for the poor, but a hampering of shipping and industries. France has been suffering from the loss of mines destroyed by the Germans. Many will be inoperative for some time to come by reason of the blowing up of the shaft entrances, creating great craters. Possibly the same thing may have been done two or three hundred feet under the ground. The enemy, in relinquishing the territory, committed these outrages to paralyze French industries. Of course, in reparation for this, France will receive coal from the Saar Valley, but there seems to be a great fear that she will not have enough to meet her primary and essential needs. Understanding, as we do, the part that fuel plays in the civilized life of to-day, and what it means to our industrial and social life, we can realize the serious thought that this problem is receiving.

If the peace of the world is to be restored and put in normal condition, industries of these countries must be recreated and started. To do this America is looked to as the main hope. It will be necessary for us to help establish credits and to furnish them raw materials. To do this is not only following the path of civilization, but it is also following the path of material expediency and wisdom. If we expect to reap the benefits that the greatness of our country entitles us to, we must trade with the nations of the world, and they can only repay us by the return of the products of their own industries.

The Central Powers used all means to destroy the commerce of Belgium. They not only deported her people, but they ruined nearly all the blast furnaces and carried away the machinery of the factories. The Belgians are desirous of returning to work, but it is impossible for them to do so without a vast amount of help. Even then it will be some time before things are anything like normal in the industrial and economic line. It is important to bear in mind that this aid should be given as soon as possible, especially when it is considered that during the German occupation it was a virtue for the Belgians not to work, as thereby no aid would be given to the enemy.

Mr. President, the people of western Europe went through all this terrible period and kept their heads, because they believed that there was a better time coming to them. They are fighting with a courage that is as great as any they have exhibited in the war to try and put themselves, as well as their country, once more on their feet, but they are doing this, as I said, because they believe in the future, and their one great desire is to prevent such a calamity again coming upon the world. They feel that the days of despotism must be terminated forever, and that the days of right and justice to the average man must come, and that new recognition of principles must be created among the nations that will make them act in accord to prevent renewed catastrophies.

It is this spirit that is the foundation, in my judgment, of the support that President Wilson has received for his league of nations. The plain people of Europe feel that he has been their spokesman and more nearly represents their feeling than any statesman of the day. He has placed America on a pinnacle that no other nation has occupied in the history of the world. They know that we came into the war without any selfish motives; that we are asking nothing in the way of an indemnity, nothing in the way of territory or aggrandizements; that our sole object was to destroy the German horror and then to see that the world was put on a basis of permanent peace. The old European jealousies and intrigues were foreign to our views and purposes. The rights of the individual and the aspirations of the mass of humanity were the things that were foremost in our minds. President Wilson came to Europe with a program and a purpose that has placed him in a unique position. He was stronger than any statesman in Europe, and had he sought solely his own personal gratification and demanded a "pitiless publicity" in the proceedings before conclusions were reached and an inflexible insistence on his views, there is not a people in Europe that would not have supported him; but if he had done this, it would not have been possible to prevent continual changing in European cabinets, and in the incendiary condition of Europe it was essential that the confidence of the people in their leaders should be retained. There were many questions that the European peoples did not understand; many promises had been made by Governments in the excitement of war and many hopes raised which were not capable of fulfillment.

The statesmen of Europe knew that, but the people did not, and therefore during all the peace conference we find an effort made to obtain concessions that could not be granted. Then, again, as soon as peace had been declared, the old jealousies that were dormant during the war reasserted themselves, and our American representatives undoubtedly exercised a beneficial influence in quieting and controlling them, and this well illustrates the rôle we may play in the league of nations. I feel that if the matter had rested with the United States solely an even more satisfactory result would have been obtained, but the fact remains that an extraordinary amount was accomplished, and accomplished in spite of the conflicting opinions and jealousies which quite naturally arose among the representatives of the different nationalities having widely varying views, and in spite of the adverse attitude of many different elements in Europe—politicians and others—who had special objects to attain, to make it appear that President Wilson did not represent American views and that the policy of our members of the peace commission was not the policy that America wished to pursue. In this they were helped considerably by remarks on the floor of the Senate, to which you have all listened, and by the attitude of the expatriated American, who is more foreign than the foreigner, and whose criticisms had become so distinctly in opposition to America as to call forth an admonition from one foreign statesman that they could not give vent to the same unbridled criticisms of her officials in a foreign land as they could if they were in America without danger of their being misunderstood.

Mr. President, out of the experiences of the last four years and the conditions of to-day the plan of a league of nations has forced itself upon the world. The thoughtful man is not only thinking about what it will accomplish, but he does not forget what will happen if it is not created. We are at a crisis. Not only is there danger from the social conditions of western Europe, but the condition of eastern Europe is chaotic. Russia is striving to overcome Bolshevism and anarchy and return to an orderly government. If there be no league of nations, what is to prevent Germany from dominating the country? Germany herself must eventually be admitted to the league if we are to do away finally with the danger of her attempting to form other alliances.

Several small nations have been created. They are weak and inexperienced in self-government and beset by contending ambitions on all sides. It will be necessary in order to help them maintain their stability that there should be behind them the force of stronger nations, more developed in the art of government. This whole situation is one that will require attention, advice, and the best efforts of the league, but if it is not given serious trouble will result in the future, as it did in the past, with always the danger of the spreading of the conflagration. The old theory of the balance of power has proved utterly ineffectual. We have had enough of its consequences.

In this league of nations we may not have been able to carry out all the high ideals and we may not have righted all the wrongs that we desired, and it undoubtedly does not contain everything that each Senator may wish, but the fact remains that it is the greatest practical advance in establishing a method for the prevention of wars that has as yet been devised or proposed.

From the knowledge that I have gained of the conditions in Europe and the analysis I have made of the covenant, I believe that the league contains provisions absolutely essential to the safety of our country and the sustaining of civilization. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). Under the rules of the Senate, no applause is permitted in the galleries.

AN APPRECIATION OF PRESIDENT WILSON.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, definite information has been received that the President of the United States is now on his way home. He sailed yesterday. During his absence, and while he was engaged in the intricate and tremendous problems affecting the nations of the world, he has been unjustly assailed abroad, not only by some of those for whom he has earnestly labored but by some of his countrymen, to whose sympathy and support as our Chief Magistrate he was entitled. Inspired by the definite and lofty purpose of effectuating the greatest good for the greatest number, he has serenely pursued his steadfast course, undaunted by his enemies and undismayed by the magnitude of his task.

Through it all the President has measured up to the high standard so feelingly and graphically outlined in this beautiful poem of Rudyard Kipling:

"If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting, too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or being lied about, don't deal in lies,
Or being hated, don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good nor talk too wise;

"If you can dream, and not make dreams your master;
If you can think, and not make thoughts your aim,
If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster
And treat those two imposters just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build 'em up with worn-out tools;

"If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings
And never breathe a word about your loss;
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the will which says to them: 'Hold on!'

"If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings, nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With 60 seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And, which is more, you'll be a man, my son!"

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCUMBER in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gay	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gerry	McKellar	Smoot
Borah	Gore	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Hale	Nelson	Stanley
Capper	Harding	New	Sterling
Chamberlain	Harrison	Norris	Sutherland
Colt	Henderson	Nugent	Swanson
Cummins	Hitchcock	Overman	Thomas
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Phelan	Trammell
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Underwood
Dillingham	Kellogg	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kendrick	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Kenyon	Pomerene	Warren
Fall	Keyes	Ransdell	Watson
Fernald	King	Reed	Williams
Fletcher	Knox	Robinson	Wolcott.
France	La Follette	Sheppard	

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] are necessarily detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I desire to take advantage of the quiet and peace now reigning over the world and this assembly to offer a few observations upon a subject which has been occupying the attention of other Senators more than myself, possibly, for some time.

The proposed conditions of peace formulated by principal allied and associated powers and the allied and associated powers for the acceptance of Germany is not a treaty of peace, but a treaty of alliance, and not a treaty known to any international lawyer or statesman of modern or ancient times.

Broadly speaking, it consists, first, of 26 articles, with an annex formulating a proposed constitution of the league of nations, 32 in number—signatories, and 13 others invited to accede to the covenant.

Aside from the league articles it consists of parts, chapters, sections, articles, and paragraphs covering 50 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and establishing rules and regulations upon every possible subject which could be brought up for consideration by the most astute minds of European statesmen, aided by a vast cohort of so-called experts upon such subjects, from the delimitation of geographical, international, and intranational boundaries; the creation of new nationalities and the readjustment of old; to the creation of another league of nations, a league within a league, and the turning over of Chinese territory and 40,000,000 Chinese citizens to Japan. It does not deal with the open seas, but it declares portions of the Danube, the Elbe, the Oder, and the Niemen to be international streams, and adopts special clauses for the regulation of navigation and use of each, creating or recognizing commissions, outside even the proposed league of nations, who are to enforce such rules and clauses; and it contains special clauses relating to the Rhine and the Moselle.

It deals with cession and working of mining properties, with the government of certain districts, and with plebicites, the results of which may be enforced or set aside even over the expressed will of the voters. It names and establishes free ports and harbors and partly free ports and harbors and cities. It deals with and regulates supplies of electrical power—article 69—with private property rights in practically every country on the Continent of Europe; it deals with judgments, prosecutions, executions, with debts and credits, national, international, and private. It embraces the subject of breeds or types of horses, Ardennais, Boulonnais, and Belgian, large and small; with the delivery of coal to Italy, even providing that a certain proportion of such coal shall be transported by land. It compels the turning over of trophies, works of art, and so forth, even political papers belonging in 1870 to one Mr. Rouher, to say nothing of the delivery within six months to the King of the Hedjaz of the original Koran of the Caliph Othman—article 246—and the handing over to His Britannic Majesty's Government the skull of Mkwawa; customs regulations, unfair competition, the abrogation of existing treaties are among the subjects appearing upon one page; stock exchange, negotiable instruments, security, fire and life insurance occupy another.

Why continue? All these and scores of similar and as many diverse subjects are regulated; and we, by signing the treaty without the league covenant, become morally or legally obligated to see each of its provisions enforced forever.

By the proposed league covenants we not only obligate ourselves to certain procedure and participation, laid down and commanded for us, in event of dispute concerning each of such provisions, chapters, clauses, schedules, articles, and sections, but by the terms of the league constitution to become involved in every dispute or question of any other character arising between nations, or disturbances within nations, and to pursue the course provided for us, and not our own course of action in reference thereto.

I will first confine my discussion to the proposed covenant of the league of nations.

FIRST: POWERS OF GOVERNMENT.

Has the treaty-making power of the United States the power or authority to bind the United States to membership in a government of nations, or to agree in its behalf that governmental powers may be exercised for us by any other than the constitutionally designated departments of our Government, or that orders of such supraconstitutional government through its council, or assembly, or both, shall be obeyed by us?

SECOND: POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN ITS FOREIGN RELATIONS.

If the President and the Senate have the power or authority in the name and in behalf of the United States to enter such government as a member, shall the United States become a member and thus admittedly abandon the policy adopted and pursued by it at least since the formation of our present Government to the present time? And (a) would such change of policy result in best service to the world? (b) Would such change be for the best interest and benefit of the present and future generations of those living in that portion of the world now known as the United States of America?

Under this question of policy, the argument would relate also to the moral or legal obligations imposed upon us by our ratification of the treaty itself aside from the league covenant.

Our Government is that of a self-governing Republic. Under a written Constitution providing for a Union of States and for a Government both Federal and National in its nature, with all powers not expressly delegated and clearly defined in the Constitution itself or necessarily implied reserved to the States or the people thereof.

By section 2, Article II, of our Constitution the President "shall have power, by and with the consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Article VI says:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

The Constitution, we are told by its preamble, was formed by "We, the people of the United States," and "in order to form a more perfect Union, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

When the Constitution was submitted for ratification to conventions in the different States a number of such States at the time of ratification expressed a desire that further restrictive and declaratory clauses should be added to prevent misconstruction and abuse. Congress at the session begun on March 4, 1789, therefore submitted 12 amendments, 10 of which were adopted, the last of which, known as the "Tenth Amendment," provides:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Among those powers directly prohibited to the States by section 10 of Article I of the Constitution—and I ask you to mark the words—is that "No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation."

At the time we formed the Constitution "in order to form a more perfect Union," and so forth, we had a form of government for the United States established in 1778 under Articles of Confederation, by Article IX of which, among other things, the Congress, in which powers of government were vested, had the sole and exclusive right of "entering into treaties and alliances," and I desire to emphasize to you the word "alliances."

The framers of our Constitution were not tyros at government. They knew the history and the course of the governments of the colonies and States which they brought together into this Union, from the first settlement at Jamestown or the landing at Plymouth Rock to the surrender at Saratoga, bringing, as the latter event did, the tardy assistance of France to the struggling colonies. They had entered into the two French treaties of alliance made under the authority of Article IX of the compact of confederation. They had first-hand knowledge of the occurrences in Europe brought about by the revolution of the people in France which embroiled every country of the Old World in war and shook the throne of its every prince. They were makers of history, makers of a nation, makers of government.

These men knew treaties, knew alliances, knew covenants, and when they wrote, their written words are to be construed as written, plainly and simply. They had written "alliances" into the Articles of Confederation for the purpose of making the alliance of 1778 with France; and when they prohibited the States making "treaties, alliances, or compacts," they understood the different classes of treaties, whether of alliance or not, and intended that their meaning should not be misunderstood. They knew in 1787 just what difficulties and dangers had been engendered by the alliance, and in writing the Constitution they were on the eve of adopting that policy voiced by Washington in his Farewell Address, and again by Jefferson, Monroe, Adams, and their successors. They delegated the power to the President and the Senate to make treaties. Not yet strong enough to break away from the French entanglement, they wrote in Article VI, "Treaties made or to be made under the authority of the United States," and so forth; and this article, if construed otherwise than as to save the French treaties as supreme law of the land, is the only foundation for the claim that the proposed covenant of the league of nations is not in conflict with our Constitution. The treaties with France were concluded on the same day in 1778. One, entitled "A treaty of amity and commerce," contained mutual agreements as to ships of war of each country defending vessels of the other against attack while they were in company, the right to use ports for warships, prizes, and so forth.

The other was called "A treaty of alliance," and was a mutual guaranty of territorial possessions "forever against all powers."

The makers of the Constitution had read and were able to discuss intelligently the three phases of the government of the Roman Empire; they understood the form of government of the Swiss and German confederations; they knew the history and form of government of Great Britain. They could and did compare and discuss the Achæan League, and, while they neither assumed nor cared to assume the guardianship of the Temple of Delphi nor pose as the sole interpreter for its oracle, they were familiar with the laws and customs of the Amphictyonic Council. They knew the rights of man; they established them; they did not dream the Declaration of Independence; Jefferson wrote it. They were contemporaries of Rousseau, and they knew without indorsing in whole his theories of the "social contract." By their acts and with their swords they made a nation. With their words they voiced their own thoughts, and with their pens inscribed them not in polished phrases but in simple, plain language, in an instrument such as had never been adopted, the magna charta of our liberties, the guidepost always pointing to freedom, that imperishable document, the Constitution of the United States. Gathered at their council chamber, they needed no vast horde of theoretical ethnological, geographical, or financial experts; they were experts. While not having the advantage of the counsel of the great diplomat from the salt flats of southern Texas, they had read the doctrine of the "freedom of the seas" from the pen of Grotius, the great Dutchman, as written in his brief in the Heemskirk case in 1609 and elaborated in his "De Jure Belli."

They were contemporaries of Vattel and familiar with his "Law of Nations," and knew the writings of Puffendorf, De Wolf, Grotius, and other international lawyers, makers of international law, all profound students of government, national and international. They were aware of the distinction between the necessary and the voluntary laws, the natural laws of nations, and they understood what was and is embraced under the term "arbitrary and conventional law" of nations, that embodied by the will or consent of nations in treaties, express agreements, and compacts.

These fathers of our country—statesmen, lawyers, patriots—could have explained clearly, without the aid of experts, that the proposed covenant of the league of nations is what all international lawyers would define, as Vattel explained in 1758:

An unequal alliance with national sovereignty impaired.

Unequal technically, if for no other reasons, because it is proposed for the "principal allied and associated powers, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States," to control the council of nine.

With "sovereignty impaired," because by its terms sovereign power is not only limited in each member and for each nonmember State, but is delegated to a body, whether a "super" or a partly "supine" government, not contemplated by the makers of our Nation and the framers of our Constitution. They would have known that the powers delegated to the Federal Union, to its Congress, to raise revenue, to declare war, to provide naval and military force, to wage war, to make peace, could not be delegated, even granting, for the sake of argument, that such or similar powers and authority might by some arbitral or similar agreement concerning the natural, necessary, or voluntary laws of nations be impaired.

If this proposed constitution of the league had been presented to them for their consideration they would doubtless have pointed to the use of language in the Constitution, the limitations upon the power of the States and article 9 of the Articles of Confederation and answered that the power vested in the President and Senate to "make treaties" was not intended and did not authorize the creation of another "super" or even "supine" government to wield strongly or even weakly any of the powers delegated in the Constitution.

They might well have answered that the United States could constitutionally exercise such power to create a supra constitutional Government in one way, and one way only, and that by calling upon the people to exercise the reserve power to alter their form of government, as expressed in the provisions of the tenth amendment to the Constitution. We might by treaty constitutionally agree to the formation of and become one of a league and constitutionally agree to all the provisions of article 23 of the proposed constitution, although by so doing yielding something of the sovereignty of this Nation. We might agree to articles 3 and 4 if properly defined as to how the council or assembly were to "deal with" the questions "affecting the peace of the world," and we would unhesitatingly, I presume, agree to limitation of armaments if all other members of the league agreed to proportionate disarmament and carried out such agreements; and this, while a limitation of sovereignty, would not be unconstitutional. The same is true of the articles 12 and 14, and conditionally of article 13; that is to say, that the "proposal by the council as to necessary steps to enforce an award" is to be made to the nations themselves and that such award as to treaty interpretations or finding of fact as to international law or breach of obligation should not be of binding force against any municipal or State law or regulation. Article 15 might be constitutionally agreed to if it is clearly understood that the recommendations accompanying an unsettled dispute are to be made to the State involved, to be adopted or rejected

by them. Of course, we can not agree to article 21. The wording of this so-called reservation of the Monroe doctrine is of itself an insult to those who announced the principles and to the intelligence of the Americans who believe in it.

Other articles might be agreed to without changing our form of government or violating our Constitution, although possibly limiting in some degree our sovereignty; but in my judgment we can never constitutionally adopt sections 10, 11, 16, and 17, as each contains not only a limitation of but delegation of sovereignty and delegation of powers. The President and Senate in making treaties are acting under constitutional delegated powers and can not by treaty delegate war powers or other powers delegated to them, either of them, to the House jointly with the Senate as the Congress or to the other departments of Government.

The articles merely limiting sovereignty are those treating of natural or necesssary or voluntary obligations or duties of international relations and intercourse and are well understood by international lawyers and statesmen.

Whether we could even by constitutional amendment, as provided in the Constitution, change our form of government, or whether in the exercise of their reserve power under the tenth amendment the people must themselves, in State conventions or otherwise, initiate and adopt such change I leave to later discussion.

But "may I be permitted to say" that Vattel, referring to a subject similar to that which I have been discussing, 161 years ago wrote:

> For my having entered into a society does not oblige me to follow its fate when it dissolves itself in order to submit to foreign domination. I submitted to the society as it then was, to live in that society as the member of a sovereign State and not in another; I am bound to obey it while it remains a political society, but when it divests itself of that quality in order to receive its laws from another State it breaks the bond of union between its members and releases them from their obligations.

Of course, the events of 1860–1865 may be referred to as establishing the fact that this Federal Union could not be destroyed by the swords of some of the States; but what force has failed to effect in the destruction of some countries has been accomplished by insidious and more peaceful methods of some of its members or rulers.

Again, what force itself has failed to accomplish when a nation's sovereignty remains and it is able to adopt and pursue its own course lesser force may immediately accomplish under other conditions.

The French Republic and Napoleon first were at war with Spain from 1793 to 1814; free to act, with the assistance of Great Britain, although harassed, broken, and continuously at war, she finally regained her freedom, and under her Cortez or Congress compelled Ferdinand VII to accept the constitution of 1812, limiting royal power, dismissed her royalists from office, elected her revolutionary Riego as President of the Cortez, and became a constitutionally governed nation; but she had joined the Holy Alliance of 1815. France, under a mandate from the council of that body, authorized under a constitution proclaiming the rule of Christ on earth, in 1823 sent 100,000 soldiers under her Duke of Angouleme into Spain, crushed the constitutional government, restored Ferdinand to power, and the liberty-loving French soldiers were compelled, although Angouleme protested, to witness the massacre of the majority of the Cortez and leading republicans. As one historian says, "even the fear of revolt, the last check upon despotism, was removed by the presence of the French Army, which remained in Spain until 1827."

POLICY AND TREATY.

I have necessarily referred at least incidentally to the policy of the makers of our Nation in discussing the Constitution which they adopted.

As already stated, the treaty with Germany, aside from the league articles, is in very many of its provisions a restriction of our sovereignty, but not necessarily unconstitutionally so.

That our signature to the treaty creates an obligation upon us with reference to the great majority of its provisions is beyond question. With us a treaty is not a scrap of paper and no Jesuitical or hair-splitting attempted distinction between a legal and moral international obligation is known to international law, except as some writers have attempted to distinguish the obligation under natural or necessary or voluntary law from the same when within a compact.

Without our signature we could, under international law, protest diplomatically, or, even if we cared to go so far, by other methods protest, the delivery of the Shantung Province of China and its millions of Chinese citizens without their consent and over the protest of their government to the Empire of Japan.

Having signed the document of delivery we have at least estopped ourselves from such diplomatic or other procedure. By the terms of the covenant we guarantee not only the delivery but the possession even to the use of our treasure and the shedding of our blood to secure and maintain it. In the name of peace!

By our signature to the articles creating Jugo-Slavia and the Greater Serbia we have incurred an obligation to maintain and support these countries when they are countries and their governments when they have governments. Without the league covenants the methods by which we would discharge these obligations would be for the consideration and determination of the Congress of the United States with the President acting as a part of the legislative department.

Under the covenants the methods would be determined for us and our action compelled by others.

I am aware that the answer will be made that by refusing unanimous consent we may avoid this obligation and not be thus coerced or compelled. I answer that the very refusal of such consent may be under the ambiguous terms of various articles of the covenant, through some real or fictitious cause, presented as a question of dispute between ourselves and some other nation or nations within or without the league, and we precluded from voting upon the subject. Our obligations under the treaty itself, or failure to perform them at once or in some particular manner, may cause disputes which, considered by the council or assembly, may preclude our voting upon the question of war upon another nation.

By ratifying the treaty and covenants we make a scrap of paper of the Declaration of Independence and brand its signers as falsifiers.

That the adoption of the treaty with or without the covenants marks an entire reversal of the policy of this country in foreign affairs, to say nothing of its limitations upon our municipal laws, I assume will be admitted by all, as it is so acclaimed by its proud sponsors.

We still owed France more than $2,000,000 when, in 1793, France declared war against England and Genet sought our assistance as allies. Washington insisted that we should take no part upon either side, but should declare neutrality. The Cabinet was divided, Jefferson, among other objections, contending that a proclamation of neutrality by the President was not within the power of the Executive, as it would be equivalent to a declaration that we would not take part in the war, and that it was the province of Congress to declare war. The proclamation was issued, but the word "neutrality" was not used, and Jefferson was thus appeased.

Washington referred to the French treaties yet existing, when in his Farewell Address in 1796 he said it is our true policy "to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. * * * I repeat, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them."

He stood with sword in hand and a commission as general in command of our forces to oppose France with arms while these treaties were denounced and abrogated by us in 1798.

The Clayton-Bulwer agreement, 1850, for the mutual protection of an Isthmian canal, is the only other approach to an alliance for the possible use of force which we have entered into. This was simply for mutual action and in no sense a delegation of power to Great Britain, but was a certain limitation upon our sovereign rights. But we are all familiar with the troubles which it has cost us, even to the repeal of an act of Congress to enable the President to carry our some mysterious foreign policy.

You will recall that in the same address this great man, Washington, said: "The great rule for conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements; let them be kept in good faith. Here let us stop."

In 1802–3 Jefferson wrote various letters to Livingston and Monroe, referring to foreign entanglements by virtue of claim of sovereignty over portions of this hemisphere by European nations, and practically announced the Monroe doctrine, although France, one of the powers interested, was yet a republic, Napoleon not becoming Emperor until after our purchase of Louisiana. In 1808, writing to the governor of Louisiana of sympathy with the uprising in Spain, he said that if successful we would be satisfied to see Cuba and Mexico remain dependencies, but unwilling to see them controlled by France or Great Britain, either politically or commercially; that we consider "their (Spanish people's) interests and ours the same; and that the object of both must be to exclude all European influence from

this hemisphere." Again, in 1820, he said: "The day is not distant when we may formally require a meridian of partition through the ocean which separates the two hemispheres."

When Monroe asked Jefferson's opinion of the Canning note in 1823, Jefferson replied immediately, "Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second never to suffer Europe to meddle in cis-Atlantic affairs"; and speaking particularly of the Latin-American countries, "We will oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any other power or auxiliary, stipendiary or under any other form or protest, and most especially their transfer to any other power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Adams, our Secretary, wrote to Rush our determination upon the Canning note:

As a member of the European community, Great Britain has relations with all the other powers of Europe, which the United States have not, and with which it is their unaltered determination not to interfere. But American affairs, whether of the northern or southern continent, can not henceforth be excluded from the interference of the United States. All questions of policy affecting them have a bearing so direct upon the rights and interests of the United States themselves that they can not be left at the disposal of European powers animated and directed exclusively by European principles and interests.

Monroe in his message announced:

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage, * * * nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the governments de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

But in regard to these continents, circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allies should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness.

And so forth.

As I am not now engaged in discussing the Monroe doctine as relating particularly to its second portion, applicable strictly to affairs on this hemisphere, I will only call your attention to the fact that it was communicated to Great Britain in two letters of Mr. Monroe, Secretary of State, to the British minister in 1811, and despite the claim in some quarters that Congress had never declared or approved it, announced by a resolution of Congress passed on January 15, 1811.

The Monroe doctrine consists, as Jefferson puts it, of not one but two maxims, the first and fundamental of which is "never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe." This is announced again as first by Monroe, as well as by Adams, in the official letters and the presidential message.

This first fundamental maxim is now calmly ignored as a part of the doctrine unless sneeringly referred to in the classification of it as a "regional understanding."

The Monroe doctrine message was simply a declaration of the American policy of Washington, Jefferson, and the other makers of this Nation, called for and announced upon a particular state of facts having arisen. It was the doctrine of American policy and American action and American self-defense, that all countries might be warned aforetime and conduct themselves accordingly in the future.

No President until Wilson has assumed to reverse the policy announced as the first maxim. Excuse is attempted by him and for him upon the theory that having sent our soldiers to Europe, loaned our Allies money, and conducted a war there, we have thus reversed the policy and that necessarily it must, from April 6, 1917, have been and remains obsolete. This theory or excuse is based upon a false premise laid down by President Wilson himself. Read his own message of December 8, 1914, when he says "more than this * * * would merely mean that we had been thrown off our balance by war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes can not touch us * * *."

The causes which brought us into the war are set forth in his message of April 2, 1917, and these causes were certain acts of the German Government. It is true that he elaborated upon what he hoped would be the results of the war in the peace to be established. It is true that he had theretofore expressed himself in similar vein in his address delivered on January 22, 1917.

Congress declared war for the reasons expressed in the resolution itself. We, with President Wilson and the people of the United States, went to war with Germany because of specific acts of war of Germany against us. We indulged, with him, in the hope that peace might bring conditions which would make for the betterment of mankind and render wars less likely to occur.

I will, to attain these objects, go as far as my sense of my obligations to the people of the United States and to their and my Government justify.

I would have voted to place the fifth article of the Knox resolution, as amended before being stricken out in the committee, upon every copy of the peace treaty and subscribe to that article. I would have voted to authorize the President of the United States to sign for us that pledge, and, in my judgment, that action would have done more to secure peace in Europe than any other which this country could have taken. I would have voted, and will vote, to bind this country to abide the decisions upon international questions not affecting our national honor or the Monroe doctrine or municipal regulations, such as naturalization. I would agree to an additional limitation of sovereignty in enforcing such decree by blockade or other means to be decided by us; but I could not vote to allow even that court to declare war for us nor to exercise the powers which its decisions by our agreement might limit or restrain.

The President of the United States must qualify by taking an oath as follows: "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." This is a constitutional provision.

The Senators are required by Article VI of the same instrument to make oath "to support this Constitution."

The President holds no commission from the people entitling him to form or join in creating or forming any other government. Attempt to ratify any such act by the Senate would, in my judgment, be a violation of the senatorial sworn duty.

The President can constitutionally, through the medium of an address to Congress or otherwise, present any project of a super or other government to the people of the United States. If they desire to change the present form of government, they and they alone can do so. He can not do it with or without the assent, advice, or ratification of the Senate. He is the judge of his own acts while President, subject to the provisions of the Constitution and the verdict of the people. I am the judge of my acts and obligations as Senator and responsible for a betrayal of my country or a violation of my oath. I can not with my "limited horizon" and possibly "pygmy" mind see my way to ratify the President's proposals as contained in the treaty and covenant for the league and at the same time keep inviolate my oath of office and not betray the United States and its people.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like, with the permission of the Senator from Idaho, to call attention to the RECORD, as it is printed, of the colloquy between him and myself when he addressed the Senate on the 25th instant. The Senator's speech referring to an address I had theretofore made appears printed in the RECORD of June 26, and I read from page 1745 as follows:

Mr. BORAH. Then the Senator from Montana said, "The Senator from Washington is right."

The Senator adds:

I am not quoting the exact language now.

The quotation continues:

But, whether it is binding as a constitutional proposition or not, it is binding as a matter of honor, and we can not escape the advice of these men except through repudiation and dishonor.

This language the Senator from Idaho attributes to me in the course of the address which I made to the Senate. It is true he said that he did not quote my words, but the language appears in the printed report in quotations as though it were my language.

In the course of the colloquy I said to the Senator from Idaho that he had really misinterpreted my language, and that I had expressly stated in my address that we were under no obligation whatever to follow the advice contemplated to be given in the second sentence of article 10. I was not then able to refer to it, but I now call the attention of the Senator to the following from the address on which he was commenting:

Article 10 is unassailable on constitutional grounds. In its substantive part it is to all intents and purposes a treaty of alliance. It concludes, "In case of any threat or danger of such aggression the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Then I continue:

The purpose of this clause is obviously to secure concert of action, but it is left to each nation to determine for itself, the recommendation of the council notwithstanding, whether the occasion calls for action in fulfillment of its obligation and how that obligation ought to be discharged.

I think, in view of that, the Senator from Idaho ought to correct the quotation, at least, as it appears in the RECORD.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of course I shall be glad to correct any quotation which is incorrectly quoted. I undertook to protect the Senator from Montana at the time by saying that I did not quote his language exactly, but if I quoted the substance incorrectly, of course I shall be glad to correct it. I will say to the Senator, however, that I looked over the Senator's speech and also over my notes before I printed my speech and I did not believe that I had misquoted the Senator; but the Senator is the only interpreter of his own language and interprets it as he understood it. Therefore I am perfectly willing to make the correction in accordance with the Senator's statement. In other words, I accept the record as he now makes it. The debate between the Senator and myself was largely over the inference or the conclusion to be drawn from his argument, and it was not my intention to rely literally upon the quotation either one way or the other. But, as I said the other day, I am perfectly content to have the construction placed which the Senator places upon it and to accept the language as he now states he intends it should be understood.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is no difference at all over the interpretation of my speech between the Senator and myself. It is simply a question of what I said, and it is perfectly obvious that what I said is quite the contrary of what was attributed to me by the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no; it is not perfectly obvious that it was quite the contrary at all. I simply say now, Mr. President, that I do not believe that I was in any sense substantially in error as to the correct construction and statement of what the Senator said; but I repeat that I now accept the statement as he makes it. It ought to go into the RECORD precisely as he contends it to be, and I shall in the future deal with his speech as he now contends it to be.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, a few days ago a rather formidable petition was sent to the Senate asking certain Senators named, and, inferentially, all Senators, to proceed at once to the ratification of the peace treaty. The clear inference of the language used in that petition was to the effect that we should proceed to the ratification practically without debate; that there should be no time taken in the consideration or discussion of this important matter. That petition was written or formulated at 40 Wall Street, New York City. This was, it seems, not wholly incidental.

The authors of the petition and many of those who signed it were either bankers in that immediate vicinity or their attorneys. The only place whence has proceeded an inordinate desire to speed this treaty to its final ratification without any proper consideration or debate has been that immediate vicinity, where the powerful financial interests of the country have seemingly organized for the purpose of putting across this treaty, regardless of its merits or demerits, so far as the rest of the country is concerned.

It is also a significant fact, Mr. President, that the first treaty which was discovered to be in this country was found in the possession of big business or banking interests of Wall Street. It was secured properly, I assume—for he was an adviser to the peace conference—by one of the representatives of the international bankers, turned over to his partner in the banking business, and brought by him to the city of New York, for the purpose of discussion and consideration, I shall show in a moment, for discussion and consideration from the standpoint of the interests of the gentlemen engaged in this particular kind of business.

A representative of a responsible journal in England has stated that the international bankers dominated the conference so far as the things in which they were particularly interested were concerned; that is to say, that they were influential, as this journal contends, in securing that which was of most concern to them. These things, Mr. President, are incidents which have led to some considerable investigation concerning the activities of these men with reference to the league, their wide-ranging efforts and influence, and as to the motives which lie back of this action.

Perhaps the most powerfully organized body in the country in aid of this propaganda is what is known as the League to Enforce Peace. It was organized several years ago, and ex-President Taft was made its president. He still holds that honorable position. It has spent hundreds and thousands of dollars in its work of advocating a league, and, since the announcement of this league, in advocating the ratification of this particular league. According to an Associated Press dispatch they have 20,000 speakers now in the field, to say nothing of those who are speaking in their own behalf without being listed as among their campaigners. In some instances, I observe, their speakers are advertised as traveling in special cars. A short time ago I observed in the New York papers—whether it was in all of them or not I do not know; but in a number of them—an entire page devoted to advertising material placed there by the League to Enforce Peace, advocating the ratification of this league and treaty. I observed that that same article appeared in a number of the great newspapers of the country, to what extent I am unable to say, but in Chicago, in San Francisco, and in other places. That single advertisement was an expensive affair. This League to Enforce Peace, in other words, has expended in this way and in different ways vast sums of money in urging the ratification of this treaty, and in urging its ratification without any change or modification whatever.

I hold in my hand the bulletin of the League to Enforce Peace under date of May 31, 1919. On page 419 of the bulletin and on page 3 of this particular publication I read this statement:

> Big business men favor league. Opposition confined largely to those of restricted outlook. What opposition to league of nations exists in business circles is confined largely to small business men whose horizon is restricted by their own front doors. The big men, the real leaders of world commerce, believe in a league, understand its principles, and are working for its success. Three-fourths of the money that supports the work of the League to Enforce Peace comes from business men, such national figures as Edward A. Filene, of Boston; Charles Schwab; Dwight W. Morrow, of J. P. Morgan & Co.; Samuel Fels, the Philadelphia manufacturer; W. L. Douglas, the shoe man; F. A. Seiberling, president of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Charles E. Hires, the root-beer man; and the late H. J. Heinz, of "57 varieties" fame.

I observe, Mr. President, that the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. is not included here, but I have a written statement, upon which I rely, to state that it should be included. Whether the firm itself has contributed or not, a member or members have done so to very large amounts. This statement says:

> What opposition to the league of nations exists in business circles is confined largely to small business men whose horizon is restricted by their own front doors.

It may be, Mr. President, that the occasion for the opposition upon the part of "small business men" is not a limitation of vision; it may possibly be that their investments are not the same and their interests are not the same. It may be that they are confining themselves to the interests of their own country and still believe in the traditions and policies of their country; and it may possibly be that those who take a wider view of the matter are those who have large investments in other countries and who propose to have more investments there, which investments will be worth very little, as they contemplate it, unless they are underwritten by the United States and guaranteed by American soldiers. Bonds and securities of all kinds in Europe, both those already being held and those of the future, will be of uncertain value unless the United States can be induced to in effect guarantee them, and that is what they believe the league does.

> In a recent article in the New York World S. S. Fontaine—
>
> Says this bulletin—
>
> has this to say:
>
> The foundation upon which the great financial businesses are building their great expectations for future commercial supremacy is the covenant of the league of nations as sponsored by President Wilson.
>
> Another sentence says:
>
> The league of nations provides this guaranty—referring to guaranteeing credit—and that is why the partisan vaporings of certain of our elder statesmen at Washington are not echoed in Wall Street, where the policies of their party on all questions having a financial bearing are ultimately shaped.

There is no doubt the opinion prevails that ultimately the question of ratification or nonratification will be determined not in the Senate but, as this paper states, in the vicinity of the financial interests, where it is alleged the policies of both parties are ultimately determined. I do not myself think that that prophecy is going to prove true in this instance. The terms and conditions of the league have gotten abroad, and the masses of the people are now doing their own investigating and their own thinking. The haste, the desire to ratify without proper consideration, was seemingly due to the fact that they would have us enter upon and accept this plan before the people could know its real import. Indecent haste always accompanies questionable legislation or doubtful governmental action.

Mr. President, in this connection I desire to call attention to the last general instructions from the League to Enforce Peace, three-fourths of the finances of which are furnished by these gentlemen. I read from these instructions:

> Plan of campaign in behalf of ratification of the Paris covenant for the league of nations formulated and reported by a committee representing State branches of the League to Enforce Peace, William Howard Taft, president.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Your committee appointed to formulate a program of activity to be recommended to all State branches of the League to Enforce Peace reports as follows:
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> First, immediately bringing public sentiment to the attention of the United States Senate. By this we mean getting influential men to go to Washington to advise with their Senators. This we consider of vital importance.

Second. Educational work on the whole body of the people.

Therefore we recommend and urge upon every State organization as its duty in the present crisis:

1. To open up a State campaign headquarters in charge of an active man giving his full time to the work until the covenant is ratified.

2. To get as many citizens as possible in every locality of the State to send telegrams or write personal letters to Senators.

But these same gentlemen are just as determined that there shall be no popular vote upon this question. While they organize for the purpose of having certain selected influential gentlemen come here to confer with their Senators, and while they organize for the purpose of having certain letters written by their selected agents in order to create the false impression that the masses of the people are in favor of this proposal, there is not one of them who will not resist to the last any proposal which will have for its object and purpose the taking of a real consensus of public opinion by the vote of the people upon this question. They are all opposed to a plebicite, to a popular vote. They prefer organized public opinion well selected and carefully coddled.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. Before the Senator passes to another topic of his discussion I wish to ask him in respect to an observation he made a moment ago, that it had been proposed that the United States should underwrite securities of the international bankers. I ask the Senator if he knows in what form that proposition came or what was the modus operandi to be employed?

Mr. BORAH. I am going to discuss that in just a few moments as nearly as I can bring it to the measure of the facts.

Mr. KNOX. While I am on my feet I wish to say that I had been told several weeks ago that the project was to form a great international corporation under an act of Congress; that this international corporation was to take the securities of the various countries of Europe, which securities were to be expressed in terms of merchandise; that they were to be the agents through which the merchandise was to be sold; and that a bill had been prepared and brought to the attention of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to that effect. I confirmed that story to-day by inquiring of a Senator to whom this bill had been presented, and who, much to his credit, had intimated that perhaps they had better leave out the proposition of a guaranty by the United States of securities when it was presented to the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I had heard that statement myself, but I had not confirmed it by consulting with any particular Senator. But the Senator has stated the whole scheme. Private interests are to secure the profits, but the Government is to underwrite the whole scheme.

3. To get as many organized bodies as possible to adopt resolutions and forward them direct to Senators.

4. To bring every possible legitimate pressure to bear on political leaders and State and national committees to convince them of the danger to their particular party if it makes the league of nations covenant a partisan issue.

Those who have been of the opinion that this ought not to be a partisan issue have strong support among that class of men where there is no partisanship when their interests are involved; they do not know any partisanship and never have. There is no partisanship in Wall Street whenever Wall Street's interests are involved; and while they know perfectly well that the powerful organization whose head is sponsor for this league is back of the pact, if they can neutralize and destroy the opposition they have gone a long way toward the success of the pact, in which they are deeply interested. Their cry of nonpartisanship is a part of their plan to adopt the league. If they can induce this Government to go behind their investments in Europe, they are not concerned as to the shame and utter dishonor which would attach to a political party which stood neutral while the most vital principles of national sovereignty were being transferred to a tribunal the majority of whom are aliens.

In this connection let me call attention to an interview given a few days ago by the leader of the minority in this Chamber. I refer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. This is relevant to the subject of its being kept out of politics and that no partisanship be permitted to creep in. The Senator said, quoting from the Washington Post:

No compromise whatever is possible on the league of nations. The Democrats will not consent to any proposition of that kind.

Not supporters of the league generally, not Republicans and Democrats and Prohibitionists and Socialists who are supporters of the league of nations, not the people generally, supporters of it, but the Democratic Party, in whose keeping and custody the sacred covenant is, will not consent to any change in it. Not a partisan issue! If not, why should the able Senator, who is far from being unfamiliar with the situation, say that the Democrats will not consent? What have the Democrats as Democrats, or the Democratic Party as the Democratic Party, got to do with consenting, if it is not already a party question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not only one who has been in public life a good while but I am a newspaper man, and I make it a point never to repudiate an interview that embodies anything near a correct expression, because I know how difficult it is for a reporter to quote a public man exactly; but if the Senator will substitute for "Democrats" the words "supporters of the treaty" he will have exactly what I said and exactly what I meant. I mean that the sincere supporters of this treaty, whatever party they belong to, are going to make a fight to have it ratified as it was adopted, and we are.

I think the Senator will recall that in the speeches I have made upon the floor of the Senate I have declared that the treaty has sincere support upon the Republican side of the Chamber, and I have already stated that it has tremendous Republican support throughout the country. I have here material to show that the Republican support is far more widespread, far more complete, than I showed in the brief colloquy with the Senator a few days ago. I will say to the Senator now that the Republican support of this treaty, from President Taft down to the rank and file of the Republicans all over the country, is as sincere and as earnest as it is among the Democrats throughout the country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I noticed the interview to which the Senator refers, which seemed upon its face to be authoritative. I paid but little attention to it, however, and would say nothing about it now but for the fact that it is now emphasized by the Senator from Idaho.

I am a party man, Mr. President; I believe in party; and I honor and respect the opponent who is as vigorous, positive, and sincere in his views as I am in mine; but I am not a party man so far as this treaty is concerned. I, as an humble Member of this body, affiliating with the Democratic Party, would under no circumstances be guided or governed by any majority expression of my party in the Senate, however great, upon this subject, unless it squared absolutely with my own views and convictions. I believe this proposed treaty to be one of the great problems, one of the serious crises, which at intervals confront the American people. It is so far above and beyond all partisan interests and prejudices that we should consider it from the standpoint of our American citizenship and as Senators of the United States, charged with a tremendous responsibility, which we must recognize. It imposes a duty the performance of which must tax our intelligence, our conscience, our convictions, not as members of the Democratic Party or of the Republican Party, not for the transient advantage of political organizations, but for that of the United States of America, of the Western Hemisphere, and of the civilized world.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Colorado is in perfect accord with the Senator's character and public service. He has very many times refused to abide by the decision of his party; but that did not keep it from being party action. He simply got outside of the corral for the time. He has done it many times, and is known to be a man of great courage in that respect. That does not change the situation at all.

With these two confessions, Mr. President, I will proceed with the discussion of this interview:

It is certain—

Says the Senator from Nebraska—

that there will be more than two Republicans who will aid us in accomplishing this result.

And who are "us"? The Democratic Party, to which he has just referred. Now, the Senator knows, and we all know, that that is the situation. I think there are a great many Republicans who are going to support this proposition. Whether they are in the Senate or not, I do not know. I hope they are not. I think, too, that there are some Democrats who are going to oppose it; but that does not keep the situation from being as it is, and the Senator spoke precisely the facts. Whether he was correctly quoted or not, the correspondent got the facts as they are, to wit, that it is a party issue upon that side of the

Chamber, and, if I can have my way about it, it will be a party issue upon this side of the Chamber.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator is discussing the subject in a very interesting way, and I thought, perhaps, he might add a little further light. I understand that a very amiable gentleman has been here in the city during the last two or three days. He is now at the head of the Republican national organization, and I have been told that he has been laboring to harmonize the views on the Republican side of the Chamber. Can the Senator inform us as to whether his labors were in the interest of America or in the interest of the Republican Party?

Mr. BORAH. I am bound to confess that I think the labors were rather feebly put forth. The fault that I have to find is that the labors were not persistent and insistent enough. If he should succeed in bringing the Republican Party to a pronounced stand in favor of the position I advocate, he would succeed in bringing a great force to the defense of American institutions. I want my party to take its position—because there are two sides to it, and only one side, from my viewpoint, is the American side. Others see it in a different light. However, I have no fears any longer as to how the voters in the Republican Party feel, and I have no doubt what the position of the party is and will continue to be. I have heard enough from the country to satisfy me.

We are for the league solidly—

Still continuing the interview—

and there is no division of counsel on our side.

That sounds to me very strong. If there is no division of counsel upon that side, and no division of sentiment, it really seems, whether you intend it or not, that by the inevitable strength of the cause the party has come to be united upon this particular question; and if that does not make it a party issue so far as that side is concerned, I do not know what would.

Now, Mr. President, this tremendous propaganda which has gone out through the country, and the hundreds of letters which we have all received, and the resolutions which have been passed, and the editorials which have been written denouncing some of us for wanting to make it a party issue, emanated from this particular organization; and this particular organization, according to its own statement, gets three-fourths of its support from big business, or from Wall Street.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What statement does the Senator refer to there?

Mr. BORAH. The bulletin of the League to Enforce Peace, in which they say——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Do they say they get three-fourths of their support from Wall Street?

Mr. LODGE. They do.

Mr. BORAH. From big business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that must be an error, because I have on my desk the itemized statement, which I am going to read. I know where they get their support.

Mr. BORAH. Well, I quote it for what it is worth.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I know it.

Mr. BORAH. I will do so, particularly because it is from the League to Enforce Peace:

What opposition to the league of nations exists in business circles is confined largely to small business men, whose horizon is restricted by their own front doors. The big men, the real leaders of world commerce, believe in a league, understand its principles, and are working for its success. Three-quarters of the money that supports the work of the League to Enforce Peace comes from business men—such national figures as Edward A. Filene, of Boston; * * * Dwight W. Morrow, of J. P. Morgan & Co.—

And so forth, naming them. That was what I had reference to; and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., or members of the company, also should be included in that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say to the Senator that in opposition to that I shall put in the facts. I happen to have them here.

Mr. BORAH. I do not suppose the Senator will put in any evidence here to the effect that these men did not contribute.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator to state that three-fourths of the support that they received came from Wall Street. The only man whose name is mentioned is not a Wall Street man, but a Boston merchant.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no; J. P. Morgan & Co., of Wall Street——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, that was the first name mentioned.

Mr. BORAH. And Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of Wall Street; and Mr. Schwab drops in occasionally. [Laughter.] I am taking their statement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not think their statement bears out the Senator's statement that three-fourths of their support comes from Wall Street.

Mr. BORAH. I said from big business or Wall Street; and the Senator will not undertake to contend that the business interests which cooperate with Wall Street are all located upon Wall Street. Mr. Davison, as the representative of Wall Street, has been in Chicago for the last week or 10 days, going into action with the business men of Chicago to see that they come into line also.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can say to the Senator that the average subscription to the League to Enforce Peace is $83, and the number of subscribers is almost 7,000.

Mr. BORAH. How does the Senator account for this statement, then?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not account for it, but I think it does not bear out the assertion, even as the Senator states it. I do not deny—no one denies—that large business men, important business men, bankers and others, are supporting the League to Enforce Peace; but what I do say is that its support comes from a nation-wide appeal throughout the country; and if the Senator is informed he will know that at every meeting they hold cards are passed around among the audience and subscriptions are taken.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And they have kept a careful account of all the subscriptions made during the last four years, and they are ready to make those public, and I have the items here—not every one of the 6,500 who subscribed, but I have the total number and the total amount and the largest subscription and the second largest subscription.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator give me, from the floor, the six largest subscribers?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will read this statement to the Senator, if he would like to hear it.

Mr. BORAH. I do not care about it, except the six largest subscribers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not the six. I have the first and the second. [Reading:]

During the four years over which its activities have extended the League to Enforce Peace has raised $547,408.82 in general subscriptions and membership fees. The largest single subscription made to it by any individual has been $25,000, and the next largest $5,000.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator state who that individual is?

Mr. HITCHCOCK (reading):

The approximate number of its subscriptions is 6,575, of which only 132 are $1,000 or over, and the average subscription is $82. Not a dollar of the income of the league has been derived from the Carnegie or Rockefeller Foundations. Its money, on the contrary, has been derived from people of moderate means who have believed that the establishment of the league of nations, by preventing future wars, would operate to the untold advantage of future generations and to the upbuilding of civilization. These funds have been contributed for the most part at the conventions of the league, in the organization meeting in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in June, 1915; in the Washington convention of the league in May, 1916——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Just a line further.

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. If the names of the subscribers and the amounts are not there, it does not throw any light upon this question at all. I know that they have taken up subscriptions. I know that they do that wherever they go. They say themselves that notwithstanding the fact of their general subscription three-fourths of it comes from this source.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is obviously not true.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it can not obviously be untrue unless the Senator has the amounts which have been subscribed by these men, and who they are.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There are only two subscriptions of $5,000 or over, and that demonstrates that three-fourths of the money can not come from Wall Street. There are 6,500 subscribers.

Mr. BORAH. If that statement says that there are only two subscriptions of $5,000 or over, I venture to say that the error is in that paper. I am just as certain that that is not correct as I am that I am standing here.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I will read it just as it is. There is only one subscription of $25,000.

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator reads it let me ask him where he got it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I got it from the League to Enforce Peace.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They supposed that somebody would rise here and try to show that the source of their support was corrupted, and they want to show that their support is nation-

wide; that it comes from thousands of people; that the average subscription is only $83; and that it is a popular movement, the like of which can not be found in any popular movement in this country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I at least would not have risen here, notwithstanding my individual knowledge with regard to this thing, if I had not had, over the name of the League to Enforce Peace, a bulletin put out under the indorsement of the ex-President of the United States, stating these facts. I have not yet stated a single fact that has not come from that source. Now, if this was a false statement, what possible reason could they have for making a false statement to the effect that three-fourths of their money came from big business? It is not the kind of statement about which they would have dropped into error through accident. It may be that these men have put out a statement which subsequent conditions have required them to explain, but the explanation and the statement must go together, and we will leave it to the country to say whether or not three-fourths of this money has come, as they say, from big business.

Let me say, before I pass on, that big business has just the same right to take a part in this fight that anybody else has, but we have also a right to examine into the motives and the reasons why they are doing it. I would deprive no class, no business or body of men of a voice, but I want the facts known fully and completely.

There is not a Senator who has been opposed to this league of nations who has not been characterized by this same "big business" interest as disloyal, and narrow-minded, and of circumscribed vision, and of pygmy mind; and they have even gone so far as to resurrect the old bogey, and try to trot it out again, that we are in touch with the Huns, or the Germans.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. I said a few weeks ago that if they desired that kind of a campaign we would be compelled to give them something of like nature. If I am not mistaken, I will show before this debate closes that these men are in a conclave or a combination to exploit the natural resources of Europe, to gather their untold and uncounted millions, as they did from 1914 to 1916 from the distressed and exigent conditions of Europe, and to have this Nation underwrite their investment and American boys guarantee the mortgage they will have upon the energies of the people of Europe. When they charge Senators here, who are doing what they think is right and defending the traditions and the policies which have existed in this country for 100 years, with evil motives they will find they can not mask under the cloak of patriotism, and that even the honored name of an ex-President can not protect these men who propose to sell their country.

I call attention to another evidence of their activities.

Just about the time this fight for a league of nations began Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, one of the active members of J. P. Morgan & Co., bought the New York Evening Post and threw it at once into the fight for the league of nations. It is a very ably, exceptionally ably edited paper; and this great international banker, who practically sat at the council table in Versailles, who was in such confidential relations with the situation that he could gather up a treaty and send it to his partners whenever he wanted to, is sending out through the means of the Post this propaganda to all parts of this country.

What does the Post advocate? The Post advocates, in the first place, the absolute surrender of the traditional foreign policy of this Government, announced by Washington and maintained here for nearly 150 years. It puts aside as immaterial and as unworthy of preservation at this time a policy under which we have lived and strengthened and without which we never would have been able to control or command the situation as we did in this great war. The Post advocates, futhermore, that we should surrender and forfeit the policy which for nearly 100 years has kept Europe out of America, which has devoted this Western Continent to peace, which has protected us from the turmoil and disorder and discontent which has been the part of the old Continent. The Post advocates that we enter into a combine conducted by those who will stand for the European system and to submit the policies of this Government, so far as international affairs are concerned, to a tribunal controlled by those who owe no responsibility whatever to our people.

And for what purpose does the Post advocate it? Why, when Mr. Lamont handed this treaty over to Mr. Davison he did not say to him, "Look it over and see whether or not it is to the benefit of the American people. Judge it and measure it, and see whether or not it accords with the traditions and policies of the American Republic. Look into it, and see if we as a country can afford to take this responsibility." No; he said to Mr. Davison, "Look into this treaty, and see if it helps this plan which we are trying to formulate"—a plan, as Mr. Davison said, practically to finance Europe. That was the object and the purpose of Mr. Lamont in transmitting the treaty to Mr. Davison, according to Mr. Davison's statement, to ascertain whether or not it would help their financial scheme.

Mr. Davison says himself, in his testimony:

> Therefore I say as an international banker, which I am now, that the importance of knowledge in connection with this treaty is very great to all the financial interests, not any one single interest, because it must be done by bankers throughout the country. When I arrived here I submitted my views to the representatives of the Treasury of the United States. I found them in accord as to the general principles, and they asked me to go on and develop them. We called together the bankers of New York and submitted it on general lines. They expressed themselves in accord. I have an appointment with bankers of Chicago and with the industrial interests of Chicago on Friday night, to submit the same plan, the idea being that if we are going to meet this situation it can not be done by any one house or any one interest, or any group, but it has got to be done by the coordination of all the financial interests and of the industries within the country.
>
> There is another reason—

Stating his reasons for wishing to see a copy—

> There is another reason, and that is this: I, as a member of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., had to do with the financial situation of some of the allies at the outset of the war and during the war, up to the time that we went into the war. Through our firm more than $3,000,000,000 was spent of foreign money in America for supplies which the countries with whom we later became associated in war were to be furnished.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> I myself made the statement to representatives of the American peace mission, as well as to members of other peace missions, in Paris that in my opinion the situation could not be handled unless it was handled not by one house, not by one aggregation, but by the financial interests of America from the North, the East, the South, and the West, and that in order to give the relief to Europe, and in order to promote the trade of America and keep our position which we then held, first the demands of Europe must be coordinated, and, second, the supplies on this side must be coordinated, that there should be coordinated not only the financial interests of America and throughout the whole country but the industries of America should also be coordinated. That matter was discussed in Paris with various members of the peace mission.

In the dispatch from the Boston Herald, under date of the 16th of June, it is said:

> The proposal to form a gigantic financial corporation, with Federal cooperation and with resources only second to those of the Federal Government itself, for the purpose of supplying all Europe with the means of productive activity and wealth creation, is under consideration by the unofficial committee of bankers of this city, who are seeking to reduce to practical form the recommendations of Henry P. Davison and Frank A. Vanderlip.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The plan most favored for building such a machine, it was said, was that of linking the Federal Government and private banking and industry in such a way as to bring together the power and unifying effect to be derived from Federal participation, with the energy and efficiency of private initiative. The problem has been tackled during the past 10 days in a series of informal conferences by a few men.
>
> The personnel of the informal committee has not been announced. Henry P. Davison, of J. P. Morgan & Co., and Charles H. Sabin, of the Guaranty Trust Co., are among those who have attended the conferences, while representatives of Kuhn, Loeb and the National City Bank and other big firms have been present. A similar committee in Chicago has been studying the problem.

The interest of these people, according to their own words, is that of financiers. How all this works is disclosed by a statement which was published a few days ago to the effect that the Russian bonds to the amount of about $50,000,000 had defaulted. Those who were affected by this default are some of the same contributors to the League to Enforce Peace. What a difference it will make with Russian bonds, with French bonds, with all European bonds if the United States guarantees the territorial integrity and political independence of all these nations. What a difference it will make, how many millions will it mean to international bankers, if the league goes through and the United States pledges her material resources to succor Europe. When that happens the bill now in hiding in the Capitol will come forth and the gigantic financial enterprise will start.

So, Mr. President, what I desire to have thoroughly understood is that if the bulletin which has been published by the League to Enforce Peace be a correct one, a large portion of this propaganda and the force behind it is being supplied and backed up by those who have these particular and peculiar financial interests in Europe.

As I said a moment ago, if it is thoroughly understood why they are interested and why they are putting forth this effort, I am perfectly willing that they shall put forth whatever effort they may. But let it be understood that the prime reason for their activity is, as they state it to be, to enable them to go forward with their financial scheme in exploiting or, as they call it, in rehabilitating Europe.

There is a provision in the treaty which states that when three of the high contracting parties have ratified it, the treaty

will be in force between the ratifying parties from that time. Mr. Taft, in construing this proposition, said at Albany:

Mr. Taft warned business men especially "to examine with closest scrutiny and care" the arguments against the covenant of the league of nations and its inclusion in the peace treaty. Because, he declared, if any substantial amendments were made by the United States Senate to the treaty and they were not subsequently ratified by the other signatories the United States would be in a state of war with Germany while Germany would be at peace with the other nations and in a position to trade with them.

In other words, the plea seems to be made to the business men of the country that if they support any movement which amends or delays the ratification they will lose something in the way of trade or in the way of business activities in their trade with the German people. That is entirely too low an estimate to place upon the patriotism of the average business man of this country. That will not move that class called by the league "small business" men. The question will not be whether we will be permitted to trade with Germany a little earlier by reason of the ratification than otherwise we would, but the question is, Is the ratification to the interest of the people of the United States as a people, business men, workingmen, and all other classes of men? That is the reason which, in the last analysis, will appeal to the people of the country. Those who suppose the ratification of the treaty is going to turn upon the question of business interests, either financial or mercantile or otherwise, our trade with Germany or with European powers or our failure to trade with them, are greatly in error. The question will be decided ultimately and finally upon what is to the best interests of the people as a whole and the American Republic.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Idaho to send me the bulletin from which he just read.

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. While the Senator from Idaho was speaking, I questioned the phraseology which he read, because it seemed to me that it does not state that three-quarters of the funds derived for the support of the league of nations is derived from Wall Street and big business men. I think the Senator and I will agree as to what is meant by big business. It is meant that dominant business represented by the powerful men of Wall Street who control the gigantic concerns of the country. What this loosely drawn statement does, in fact, say, is this:

Three-quarters of the money that supports the League to Enforce Peace comes from business men.

I have not any doubt that is true—"business men."

Mr. BORAH. It then names them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Business men all over the country, as the list shows. But it says:

Such national figures as Edward A. Filene, of Boston.

He is not a Wall Street man. He is an enterprising merchant who has built himself up from the ground.

Charles M. Schwab.

As the Senator from Idaho says, he might rank in the list of big business men. Possibly he could come within that category.

Dwight W. Morrow, of J. P. Morgan & Co.

He would rank as a big business man of Wall Street.

George Eastman, head of the Eastman Kodak Co.

He certainly does not.

Samuel Fels, of Philadelphia.

A manufacturer of soap, as I recall, but anyhow one of the great manufacturers of the country.

W. L. Douglas.

The shoe man. He certainly is not a Wall Street man.

F. A. Seiberling, president of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

So far as I know he is a manufacturer and not a big business man in the offensive sense which the Senator from Idaho quotes.

Charles E. Hires.

I presume he is a manufacturer, but not a Wall Street big business man in the sense meant by the Senator from Idaho.

H. J. Heinz of the 57 varieties.

The Senator can easily see that these men were taken as samples of the business men of the country, because they are known nation-wide, and the real fact that they intend to state there, and what they do state in the circular, is that the business men of the country, having a vital interest in the prosperity of the country, are among the 6,500 subscribers to this League to Enforce Peace.

They are for business reasons for it because they believe it will add to the prosperity of the country, make secure our foreign exports, and make safe our international relations.

Now, Mr. President, I want to carry out this idea a little further. I stand here to affirm that there has never been any question at all controversial that has received such widespread nonpartisan support as now is being given to the league of nations, being given in a nonpartisan way by Democrats and Republicans alike all over the country, and any Senator here who will look into the organization of the League to Enforce Peace in his own State will appreciate what I say when I declare that it is in the main nonpartisan and bipartisan, composed of men representing both parties.

Mr. President, be it said that the League to Enforce Peace is not the only organization that is standing behind this great movement. There are many other evidences which indicate the overwhelming character of popular support being given to the league of nations.

Let me recite again the test of public opinion that I referred to a week ago in this Chamber, and I challenge the Senator from Idaho to refer me to any test made anywhere to show the state of public opinion on this league that is not favorable to it.

For instance, take the voting contest held by 16 newspapers in different parts of the country. The men who voted at that test cut their votes out of the paper and mailed them or sent them to the office of the papers. The yes votes of those 16 papers were 107,644. The no votes were 33,407.

Take the polling which was undertaken by the Literary Digest and published in April. A poll was made of 1,377 newspapers of the country. Seven hundred and eighteen, with a circulation of 10,000,000, voted yes; 181, with a circulation of 4,000,000, voted no; and 478, with a circulation of 7,000,000, voted yes conditionally.

Take, then, the voting contest held more recently at Yale University, after notice duly given in the Yale News. The yes votes were 814, the no votes were 284.

Now, let us leave big business and little business and all kinds of business for a few moments. Let us listen to the voice of labor. Does the Senator deny that the voice of labor in the United States is for the league of nations?

Mr. BORAH. I do deny it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will undertake to prove that wherever the test has been made labor has voted overwhelmingly for the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. I deny it, and I call upon the Senator from Nebraska to make good his challenge. The way, and the only way in the world, you can test popular opinion is by popular vote. I have not a particle of doubt as to where labor stands upon this question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is a very difficult matter to go over a country so large as the United States and take a poll of labor, but I am going to take a certain State. First, let me say that when the American Federation of Labor met at Atlantic City it voted by something over 26,000 to 460 in favor of the league of nations, after a discussion.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; after a discussion. Mr. President, they absolutely refused Miss Bonfield an opportunity to come before the organization and present the other side of the question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Miss Bonfield is not an American citizen.

Mr. BORAH. She, nevertheless, was invited there by the American Federation of Labor, came as a representative of labor of England, and asked permission to present the other side of the question, and she was refused an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is sufficient to say that any member of the American Federation of Labor in that great, free convention had the opportunity to take the floor and did take the floor. They may have refused permission to some alien who came here for a purpose, but so far as American voices were concerned, they were heard freely in the American Federation of Labor, and when the votes were counted it was found that over 26,000 were cast for it and less than 500 against it.

I have taken a sample State. I believe Massachusetts, the State from which the Republican leader of the Senate hails, may be taken as a sample State. I have here the result of 147 labor unions of all sorts, from all parts of Massachusetts, who have voted in support of the League to Enforce Peace, adopted resolutions to that effect, and I challenge the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and I challenge the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to produce the vote of a single union in Massachusetts on the opposite side.

Now, leaving labor—we have done with business men, we have done with labor—let me come to another classification of our population. Take the religious organizations of the country. Has any Senator ever heard of any religious organization anywhere in the United States that has taken a position opposed to the league of nations?

Mr. BORAH. I do not suppose any organization has——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. BORAH. But I have a great number of letters from prominent ministers of the gospel who have, and some of them are worth reading. They would be instructive to some of the people who are supporting it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am going to read what some of the organized religious bodies of the United States say on this subject.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I merely want to inquire if the Senator from Pennsylvania is included in the invitation as to whether he knows of any religious organization——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. KNOX. I can tell of this instance: I received a letter within a week or 10 days from a Methodist minister in New Jersey who said he had preached a sermon opposing the league of nations to a congregation of about 600 or 700 people, and he had taken a vote on how they stood, and they were about 90 per cent against the league of nations. But then he thought perhaps after all his own personal influence with the congregation might have accounted for the overwhelming character of the vote. So he invited a brother minister, who he knew was in favor of the league of nations, to come and preach the following Sunday, and they took another vote, and it stood as it had originally.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is a very unusual case, I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, because the fact is that Gentile, and Jew, Catholic and Protestant, denominations of all sorts everywhere, so far as I know, overwhelmingly support the doctrine of the league of nations.

Mr. KNOX. If the Senator will allow me another moment, I think it is only fair to the many, many men who come within the description just now stated by the Senator from Nebraska to say that I have received within the past month letters from bishops, from heads of theological seminaries, dozens of letters from ministers of the gospel, men who, according to the teachings of the propaganda to which the Senator from Idaho has referred, I had been led to believe were almsot unanimously in favor of the league of nations, and they expressed themselves quite as strongly as anyone I have heard against it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think probably those are the exceptions which prove the rule, because the rule is that all national organizations, when they have expressed themselves, overwhelmingly adopted resolutions in support of the league of nations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It occurs to me that it is scarcely even an exception. I do not understand the Senator now to assert that every clergyman is in favor of the league of nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. He is making the assertion that every church organization having expressed itself upon this subject has expressed itself in favor of it. It does not follow by any means that some individual congregation or some individual clergyman may not be against it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Exactly. It is rather the exception that a clergyman does not support the league of nations, but there is no exception to the rule I have laid down that every national religious organization that has met has declared itself in support of the league of nations.

Mr. KNOX. May I inquire especially of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] if it is his intention to be understood that the great distinctive religious bodies as such, speaking through some official organization, have declared in favor of the league of nations?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No. I have not so stated. The Senator——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am making that assertion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator is asserting that every religious organization that has spoken on the subject has spoken in favor of it. The Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Idaho answer by saying that certain individual clergymen take a different view.

Mr. KNOX. Has that great, noble, useful organization known as Roman Catholic Church as an organization expressed itself in favor of it?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have just sent to my office for a copy of a resolution sent me this morning by the Federation of Catholic Societies of Maryland declaring in favor of it. I have no doubt the Senator from Nebraska has a copy of it.

Mr. KNOX. The Federation of Catholic Societies of Maryland personally do not speak for the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, because I can say to the Senator that I have received many, many letters from priests of the Roman Catholic Church who are violently opposed to this as an un-American proposition.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are not denying that there are here and there priests, here and there clergymen, who are opposed to it. My position is that every religious organization that has spoken has declared overwhelmingly for the league of nations, and a good many of them have spoken.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. NEW. I simply desire to add to what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] has said, that within the last few days I have received a letter from the president of one of the greatest Catholic educational institutions in the United States in which he takes the strongest possible ground against the league of nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There, again, it is the exception. I am talking about the people of the United States. I first said the business men are for it, I then said the laboring men are for it, and now I am undertaking to prove that the religious sentiment of the country numbering millions is overwhelmingly for it.

I hold in my hand resolutions passed by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America at its special session in Cleveland in May of this year:

When it is borne in mind that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ represent practically all the Protestant bodies in America, the two sets of resolutions which follow, passed at the regular session of the council at Cleveland, have great significance. Furthermore, the Cleveland representation was very general and made up of men of very diverse schools in the same denomination. Also many laymen were present. Consequently these resolutions may be considered as very generally the voice of the churches.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That we express our gratitude for the establishment of the league of nations as agreed upon by the Paris peace conference and pledge our support in securing its ratification by the Senate of the United States and our devotion to make it a success.

Resolved, That we urge the incorporation at an early date into the covenant of the league of nations a clause guaranteeing freedom of religious belief.

Resolved, That legislation by Congress should be passed providing for the adequate protection of the lives and property of aliens by the Federal authorities.

Resolved, That we urge the incorporation at an early date into the covenant of the league of nations a clause guaranteeing equality of race treatment, understanding by this equal treatment in respect of the law and its administration in the case of aliens lawfully within the territory of the Government concerned.

This council represents 40 denominations and 18,000,000 members.

Here are resolutions passed by the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches May 15, 1919:

Resolutions passed by the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, May 15, 1919.

Resolved, That the American Branch of the World Alliance for International Friendship believes that the effective establishment of a league of nations guaranteeing to every nation, great and small alike, equal justice, opportunity and safety by the united power of all is a step of the greatest importance in the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God on earth; and that it records its gratitude to God that so much progress has thus far been made toward this great end, and pledges its support in securing the ratification by the Senate of the United States of the revised covenant of the league of nations as an integral part of the peace treaty and its devotion in making the league a success.

I have here also a statement issued by the trustees of the Church Peace Union, reading as follows:

Statement issued by the trustees of the Church Peace Union, May 15, 1919.

When the United States entered into the Great War it did so with a solemn declaration that it took up arms to end war and establish a new world order based upon justice, righteousness, and good will. As the war progressed, the religious and moral leaders of all the allied and many neutral nations proclaimed the league of nations as the one political expression of this new idealism and as the end for which the youth of the Allied Nations were laying down their lives. The heads of government in both America and Great Britain have constantly held the league before their soldiers as the great consummation of their sacrifices. It is the first attempt to establish the principles of the Kingdom of God among nations. Its covenant demands the same high and honorable standards of conduct among nations in their mutual relationships as those which pertain among high-minded, honorable men. It has been unanimously accepted by the peace conference as the one hope of conserving the fruits of victory and creating a world order where the events of 1914 can never happen again. It has been unanimously indorsed by both the Anglican and Free Churches of Great Britain. It has received the indorsement of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at its recent meeting, and by many denominational bodies during the last two weeks.

We, the undersigned, trustees of the Church Peace Union, and members of various religious bodies, earnestly hope the ministers and churches of the Nation will exert every influence upon the Senate of the United States, urging them to ratify the Paris covenant when it shall be laid before that body.

I shall not read the names of the trustees, Mr. President, but I ask to have them inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

The following are the names:

Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D., LL. D.; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, D. D.; Rev. Arthur Judson Brown, D. D., LL. D.; Rev. Francis E. Clark, D. D., LL. D.; President W. H. P. Faunce, D. D., LL. D.; Robert H. Gardiner, Esq.; Rev. Frank O. Hall, D. D.; Hamilton Holt, LL. D; Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D. D., LL. D.; Rev. Frederick Lynch, D. D.; Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, D. D.; his eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons; Marcus M. Marks, Esq.; Dean Shailer Mathews, D. D., LL. D.; Edwin A. Mead, M. A.; Rev. William Pierson Merrill, D. D.; John R. Mott, LL. D.; George A. Plimpton, LL. D.; Rev. Junius B. Remensnyder, D. D., LL. D; Judge Henry Wade Rogers, LL. D.; Robert E. Speer, D. D.; Hon. William Howard Taft, LL. D.; and Bishop Luther B. Wilson, D. D., LL. D.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will, however, state that the foregoing statement has also been signed by 136 of the leading clergymen in the United States, whose names appear below it. I will state that it is not necessary to print those names in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have also here a resolution passed by the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States in May. The general assembly represents the Presbyterian churches of the United States:

Resolution passed by the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, May, 1919.

Whereas the defeat of German militarism by the united powers of the free nations has brought to an end the greatest war of history and has opened the way for a covenant of peace and a league of nations to conserve the future peace of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:

(1) That we render thanksgiving to Almighty God for this glorious achievement and express our profound gratitude to and pride in the men who, on land and sea, through service and sacrifice, secured the great triumph.

(2) That we call upon our people to rally to the support of the treaty of peace and the league of nations as vigorously and unitedly as they supported the armies on the battle fields, in order that we shall secure the full fruit of our victory and an end of all war.

(3) That we appeal to the Members of the United States Senate to ratify the covenant of peace, including the league of nations.

(4) That we commend and indorse President Wilson in his efforts both at home and abroad to establish the principles of a just and enduring peace.

(5) That a copy of these resolutions be given to the press, and that attested copies be sent to the president of the peace conference in France, to the President and Vice President of the United States, and the Hon. William H. Taft, president of the League to Enforce Peace.

Attest:

WM. H. ROBERTS,
Stated Clerk, General Assembly.

I hold in my hand also resolutions passed by the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in session at Buffalo in May of the present year:

Resolution passed by the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in session at Buffalo during May, 1919.

The bishops of the Methodist Church would express their intense interest in the proposed league of nations. The time seems a logical one for the adoption of such a covenant while the remembrance of the world's terrible sorrow is still poignant. Moreover, the war was waged by the Army of the United States on documents that strongly advocated the adoption of such an international agreement, and we feel that good faith with our soldiers, those who have lived through the fearful struggle and those who paid the utmost price of their convictions and died for our country and for the world, demands that we join with the other nations in bringing in the era of arbitration and peace.

We rejoice that the discussion of the proposed constitution of the league of nations is being lifted above a partisan level, since we believe that an issue so momentous for the whole world should be treated in the broadest spirit. We are glad also that the tentative form of the agreement has been before our people and has had such a wide and eager consideration, resulting in various amendments. Without doubt a document dealing with so many nations and such complex interests could scarcely be put in perfect order at first, and the actual working of the league will probably discover the need of later amendments, even as in case of the Constitution of the United States. But it is our earnest conviction that the time is at hand for introducing this wonderful experiment, calling for high idealism, and demanding that the nations of the world shall place upon themselves such wise restraints as shall prevent haste and give warning against all aggression of greed.

We feel that the league of nations is an advance toward the period prophesied by the Hebrew prophet when men should not "learn war any more," and that it is likewise an attempt at an international application of the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. As His ministers and as citizens of our Republic, we respectfully urge the President and Senate to adopt the covenant, that we may cooperate with our sister nations in preventing future wars, with their inevitable devastations and their frightful waste of young and promising life.

To this good end the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church pledge their constant prayer and their full endeavor to cultivate both a national and international spirit that shall make the covenant more effective and shall, under the guidance of God, appoint "salvation" "for walls and bulwarks" over all the earth.

So speaks the Methodist Church. Now, the Baptist Church. Resolutions passed by the annual convention of the Baptist Churches of the North, in May, 1919:

Resolutions passed by the annual convention of the Baptist Churches of the North, May, 1919.

Resolved, That we express our gratitude to God for the return of peace; that we recognize in the Paris covenant for the league of nations a great step in the advance of a Christian civilization; and that we urge our people to use their utmost influence to secure its ratification. We urge that at the earliest practicable date an amendment be made to this covenant providing for religious freedom. We also urge the early incorporation into the covenant of an amendment providing for equality of race treatment, understanding by this equal treatment in respect to law in dealing with aliens lawfully residing within the territory of the Government concerned.

I come now to the Unitarian Church.

Resolutions passed by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting, Boston, May 21, 1919.

The American Unitarian Association gathered in its annual meeting rejoices that the great war for freedom and democracy has been won, not only by the superior material and military resources of the allied nations, but also by their moral and spiritual forces. The self-reliance, the disinterested good will, the spiritual idealism, the fearlessness in the face of danger and death which have been taught and illustrated in the churches of this country, are the principles which have primarily sustained the courage and cheer of our soldiers and sailors and fortified the patience and persistence of the American people. The association records its conviction that the full results of the war can not be obtained except through an effective league of nations such as that proposed by the Paris conference.

Mr. President, I realize that this is not complete, and I shall ask the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to hand me the resolution which was recently adopted by the International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ at its convention held in St. Louis on May 29 to June 3, which adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ deploring the horrors and sufferings of war, and believing that a league of nations will guarantee universal peace, secure proportionate disarmaments of all nations, and promote concord and amity among the peoples of the earth: Be it

Resolved, That this International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ, in convention in St. Louis, Mo., representing educational institutions of more than 40 States and the Dominion of Canada, indorses a league of nations that will give freedom and justice to all; and be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each Senator of the United States, and to the Hon. William H. Taft, president of the League to Enforce Peace.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt that that kind of a resolution would be passed by any body; it would be passed by the opponents of this league. There can be no possible criticism of that resolution. Neither does it indicate in the slightest that it is in favor of this proposition.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the fact that recently the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] claimed that the Pope was in favor of the league, and he made some invidious remarks upon that occasion. Now, as the Pope is the head of the Catholic Church, and as the Senator from Illinois assumes that the Pope controls the political opinions of the Catholic laity, it would be a complete answer if the Senator from Nebraska should, in the language of the Senator from Illinois, state that the Pope, representing the Catholic laity, is in favor of the league of nations. I do not for a moment admit, however, that the Pope controls the Catholic laity, for I believe he does not, except in matters spiritual.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course not.

Mr. PHELAN. The Christian church of all denominations favors peace and justice and naturally favors a league whose purpose is to promote peace.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to answer, first, what the Senator from Idaho states. He splits hairs on the resolution which I have just read, but he knows there is only one league of nations before the world; that there is only one league of nations before the people of the United States; and this resolution, adopted of course in the language of men who are not accustomed to framing legal documents, has been directed to be sent to the Senate of the United States, where the league is pending, and to be sent to William H. Taft, the foremost supporter of the league of nations in the United States. I can not see how the Senator with a straight face, in view of those facts, can split hairs and say that this resolution is not significant.

Mr. BORAH. That is due to the Senator's wonderful capacity over his facial expression.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, if the Senator deems that a legitimate argument, I am satisfied with it. I am willing to leave it with the country.

The fact is that wherever people have gathered and considered the league of nations, and have indorsed "the league," they mean this league; they do not mean a league that was favored 20 years ago; they do not mean a league that Mr. Taft favored before this league was adopted. They mean the only league

that is before the country. They know that it is this league or no league, and when they adopt these resolutions and the Senate is considering this league, they adopt them for the purpose of showing that they want the Senate to support this league. When they direct them to be sent to William H. Taft, they direct them to the foremost advocate in the country of this particular league, and anybody can tell what they mean by it.

Mr. President, a few moments ago I referred to a large number of labor organizations in the State of Massachusetts that had indorsed the league of nations.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before I am interrupted I desire to say that some effort has been made to ascertain how many religious bodies indorsed the league in the State of Massachusetts, from which the Senator [Mr. LODGE] who leads the opposition to this league comes, and I have in my hand a list of 50 religious bodies in the State of Massachusetts who have taken the trouble to pass resolutions in support of the league of nations. I ask to have these lists incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The lists referred to are as follows:

LIST OF MASSACHUSETTS LABOR UNIONS WHO HAVE INDORSED A LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Massachusetts Branch of the A. F. of L.: Boston Central Labor Union; Chicopee Central Labor Union; Framingham Central Labor Union; Pittsfield Central Labor Union; Springfield Central Labor Union; Worcester Central Labon Union.

Pittsfield local unions: Bottlers and Drivers No. 324; Carpenters and Joiners No. 444; Draftsmen No. 18; I. B. E. W. Local Union No. 170; I. B. E. W. Local Union No. 242; Sheet Metal Workers; Electrical Workers No. 242; Federal Union No. 15271; Labor League, Branch No. 21; Metal Trades Council; Molders No. 245.

Springfield local unions: Asbestos Workers; Bakers No. 34; Barbers; Boiler Makers; Bottlers and Drivers; Brass Molders; Brewery Workers No. 99; Bricklayers; Building Laborers; Building Trade Council; Button Workers; Carpenters No. 96; Carpenters No. 177; Carpenters No. 1107; Carpenters, Mill; Cigar Makers No. 49; Cooks, Waiters, and Waitresses; Drop Forgers; Electrical Workers; Elevator Constructors; Engineers; Garment Workers; Grain Handlers; Horseshoers; Iron Molders; Machinists No. 214; Machinists No. 619; Machinists, Railroad; Maintenance of Way Employees; Metal Polishers; Painters; Plumbers; Photo Engravers; Sheet Metal Workers; Railway Mail Clerks; School House Custodians; Steam Engineers; Steam Fitters; Stereotypers; Tailors; Teamsters, Coal; Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen No. 215; Tobacco Strippers; Trolley Men; Typographical Union; Wine Clerks.

Boston local unions: Boot and Shoe Workers No. 229; Carpenters No. 33; Carpenters No. 386; Cigar Factory Tobacco Strippers; Cigar Makers No. 97; Clothing Workers No. 149 and No. 173; Electrical Workers No. 103; Electrical Workers No. 104; Pattern Makers Association; Plumbers No. 12; Web Pressmen; Sheet Metal Workers No. 17; Electrical Workers No. 142; Garment Workers No. 7; Gas Fitters No. 175; Housesmiths and Bridgemen No. 7; Insulators and Asbestos Workers No. 6; Machinists No. 264; Molders and Coremakers No. 468; Molders No. 106; Steam Fitters No. 537; Theatrical Stage Employees No. 11; Waist Makers; Neckwear Cutters.

LIST OF RESOLUTIONS SECURED FROM LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

June 18. Local 261, of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, Lawrence, Mass.
June 13. Carpenters' Union, Local 551, Lawrence, Mass.
June 13. Allied Shoe Workers, Lowell, Mass.
June 20. Hawthorne Division 8, Brotherhood of Railroad Station Employees and Clerks, Salem, Mass.
June 16. Sheet Metal Workers Union No. 226, Fall River, Mass.
June 15. Framingham Lodge, No. 236, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Framingham, Mass.
June 16. Carpenters' Local No. 910, Gloucester, Mass.
June 3. Cigar Makers' Local No. 206, of the International Union of America, North Adams, Mass.
June 18. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union No. 396, Boston, Mass.
June 7. Bartenders' International League of America, Milford, Mass.
June 18. Carpenters and Joiners of America Local No. 780, Boston, Mass.
June 18. Plumbers and Helpers, Steam Fitters' Local No. 238, Quincy, Mass.
June 21. Iron Molders' Union of North America, Local No. 97, Fitchburg, Mass.
June 17. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local No. 75, Fall River, Mass.
June 20. International Molders' Union of North America, Local No. 39, Taunton, Mass.
June 19. Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local No. 96, Springfield, Mass.
June 19. Pattern Makers' Association of Springfield and Vicinity, Springfield, Mass.
June 18. Carpenters and Joiners' Brotherhood, Local No. 441, Cambridge, Mass.
June 22. Bottlers and Drivers' Union, Local No. 143, Springfield, Mass.
June 23. Glaziers' Local Union 1044, of Boston, Boston, Mass.
June 18. Quincy Branch of Granite Cutters, Quincy, Mass.
June 17. Boot and Shoe Workers' Union Cutters, Local No. 191, Haverhill, Mass.
June 13. National Amalgamation of Textile Operatives No. 33, Salem, Mass.
June 17. Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees No. 238, Lynn, Mass.
June 16. Painters and Paperhangers' Local No. 797, Manchester, Mass.
June 1. Bottlers and Drivers' Union No. 324, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 3. Local Union International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers No. 170, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 5. Local Union No. 18, Draftsmen, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 6. Local No. 242, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 8. Molders' Union; Local 452, Stage Employees, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 9. International Molders' Union No. 245, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 12. Central Labor Union, North Adams, Mass.
June 12. Local 94, Painters, Paperhangers, and Decorators, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 13. Local 206, of C. M. I. U. of A., North Adams, Mass.
June 14. Railroad Carmen of America, Pittsfield, Mass.
June 16. Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers No. 18, North Adams, Mass.
June 17. Local Union No. 1042 and Local Union No. 627, Brotherhood of Painters, Paperhangers, and Decorators of America, Great Barrington, Mass.
June 18. Local No. 1197, Textile Union, Housatonic, Mass.
June 2. Lathers; phone operators; grocery clerks, Worcester.
June 3. Retail grocery clerks; sheet-metal workers, Worcester.
June 4. International Association of Machinists No. 898; Central Labor Union; Local 898, Machinists' Helpers, Greenfield.
June 5. Machinists No. 481, Greenfield.
June 6. Machinists No. 882; Railway Workers No. 109, Greenfield.
June 8. Carpenters' District Council; Wholesale Wine Clerks; City Employees No. 1412; Coal Teamsters No. 308, Worcester.
June 9. Painters; Molders; Web Pressmen; Local 5, of the International Musicians' Union of North America, Worcester.
June 10. Patternmakers' Association; Leather Workers, Worcester.
June 11. Carpenters No. 720; City Employment No. 15798; Printing Pressmen No. 72, Worcester.
June 12. Hoisting Engineers; Railway Car Workers; Plumbers, Worcester.
June 13. Bakers No. 133; Building Laborers No. 210; Metal Polishers, Worcester.
June 16. Local 48, Painters and Decorators; Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers International Union; Stone Masons; Iron Molders (Special), Worcester.
June 17. Amalgmated Sheet Metal Workers International Alliance, Local No. 194; Carpenters' Union No. 408; Bricklayers No. 210, Worcester.
June 18. Worcester Central Labor Union.
June 20. Framingham Central Labor Union.

GENERAL LIST OF RESOLUTIONS OF 50 RELIGIOUS BODIES IN MASSACHUSETTS.

June 16. Baraca Class of First Congregational Church, Uxbridge, Mass.
June 15. Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Taunton, Mass.
June 22. The Linden Methodist Episcopal Church, Malden, Mass.
June 22. Grace Union Church Congregation, North Wilbraham, Mass.
June 19. Ashby Grange, No. 172, Ashby, Mass.
June 10. Meeting in Parish House, Cambridge, Cambridge, Mass.
June 16. St. Stephens Baptist Church, Cambridge, Mass.
June 15. West Fitchburg Methodist Episcopal Church, Fitchburg, Mass.
June 14. Quarterly Conference of South Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Lynn, Mass.
June 15. Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Oak Bluffs, Mass.
June 20. Village Congregationalist Church, Dorchester, Mass.
June 22. Greek Evangelical Church, Boston, Mass.
June 22. North Grafton Methodist Episcopal Church, North Grafton, Mass.
June 22. Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, North Grafton, Mass.
June 22. Second Congregational Church, Hadley, Mass.
June 22. First Methodist Episcopal Church, Framingham, Mass.
June 3. Congregational Church, Enfield, Mass.
May 13. Abigail Batcheller Chapter D. A. R., Whitinsville, Mass.
May 13. Hyannis Woman's Club and Wide Awake Club, Hyannis, Mass.
June 18. League of Jewish Women's Organizations, Boston, Mass.
June 15. Evangelical Congregational Church, Lancaster, Mass.
June 15. Second Trinity Congregational Church, Marshfield, Mass.
June 15. Methodist Church, Millville, Mass.
June 15. Congregational Church Men's Bible Class, Williamsburg, Mass.
June 15. Second Congregational Church, Plymouth, Mass.
February 8. Massachusetts Meeting New England Congress for a League of Nations, Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.
January 14. City of Cambridge City Council, Cambridge, Mass.
January 15. Men's Club of Unitarian Church, Watertown, Mass.
January 21. Ward 7 Good Government Association, Boston, Mass.
February 2. Brookline Civic Forum, Brookline, Mass.
February 7. Labor Session of New England Congress, Boston, Mass.
February 11. Brookline Equal Suffrage Association, Brookline, Mass.
February 28. Wollaston Woman's Club, Wollaston, Mass.
March 3. Business Girls' Club of Blue Triangle Y. W. C. A. War Work Council, Boston, Mass.
March 9. First Congregational Church, Reading, Mass.
March 12. Board of Trustees of the United Society of Christian Endeavor, Boston, Mass.
March 25. Two hundred citizens of Northborough, Northborough, Mass.
March 19. Hingham Forum, Hingham, Mass.
March 24. Body of railroad men assembled at the Boston & Maine Railroad Department, Boston Young Men's Christian Association, Open Forum, Boston, Mass.
March 30. Congregational Christian Endeavor Society, Pembroke, N. H.
April 3. North End Working Girls Club, Providence, R. I.
April 3. Tufts College faculty, Medford, Mass.
April 3. St. Hilda's Guild, Trinity Church, Boston, Mass.
April 7. Boston Bar Association Collegiate Alumnæ, Boston, Mass.
April 20. Boston Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Boston, Mass.
April 28. Ladies' Physiological Institute, Boston, Mass.
April 29. Andover Association of Congregational Churches, Andover, Mass.
May 26. Presbyterian Ministers Association, Boston, Mass.
May 8. Revere Men's Club, Revere, Mass.
May 10. Twelve thousand members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Boston, Mass.
May 10. Concord High School Forum, Concord, Mass.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I desire to ask the Senator if he had anything to show the sentiment of the returning soldiers as to this league? I should like to hear how they feel about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not known of any effort that has been systematically made to secure a poll of the returning soldiers, but I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that one of the most brilliant and convincing speeches that I have heard was by young Capt. Chamberlain, who has written a book entitled "Why We Fought." The young man is only 26 years of age. He was in the thick of the fight on the other side. He has just returned here, and I wish the Senator from Iowa might hear that young captain—that young warrior who has been through the thick of the fighting on the other side—before an audience declaring in solemn tones that he has seen men go into the fight, that he has seen wounded men lying upon the battle field, that he has seen wounded men lying in hospitals, that he had talked with them, that he knows that they want something that will prevent war in the future, and that they believe this is the thing that will do it.

The returning soldier has a dread of militarism and a horror of war. Those soldiers have no regret that they fought, but they never want the occasion again to arise when they may be called upon to go. That young Capt. Chamberlain, if he could speak in every community in the United States, would not only voice the sentiment of the returning soldiers, but he would impress the people who stayed at home with the fact that the men who went over there and fought want something done by the responsible nations of the world to make such an occasion impossible for the future.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I was not asking the question in an antagonistic spirit.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I realize that. One can find sentiment on both sides, but I am introducing evidence here to show the overwhelming trend of public opinion, and I am waiting for some opponent of the league, some one who is opposed to the principle, like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], to present evidence here as to the state of public opinion. I have the evidence.

I hold in my hand a list of national organizations that have indorsed the league of nations in their meetings. There is the National American Woman Suffrage Association, who indorsed the league on March 28, 1919. Do Senators realize how the women of the world feel on this question? I voted against submitting the woman suffrage amendment to the States not because I was opposed to woman suffrage, for in my State I expect to favor it, but I am glad for one thing, that the women of the country, if this ever does become a political issue—a popular issue—will settle the result. Everywhere overwhelmingly, rich women and poor women, old and young women are for the league of nations. They have some justice in their claim that men in their schemes of government heretofore have made a failure, for to my mind one of the indictments of government is that in the midst of a world of tremendous change during the last century we are in the matter of international relations almost where relations were in savage times. There is some excuse for the Bolshevism that is spreading over the world, some excuse for the resentment toward government which in the past has used more than half of the resources of the people for destructive purposes, some resentment toward government, civilized and half civilized, which through all the centuries have driven millions to the slaughter, and which will continue to drive them to the slaughter unless the world is organized for peace instead of for war.

Then there is the Council of Jewish Women, which met in January of this year, which also adopted a resolution supporting the league of nations. I have already read the Church Peace Union resolution. There was the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which adopted a resolution in favor of the league of nations; the American Agricultural Association, March 3, 1919, in its national convention adopted a resolution in support of the league of nations; the National Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, on April 15, 1919, adopted a resolution in support of the league of nations; also the Farmers' National Reconstruction Conference, January 7, 1919; so also the National Board of the Farm Organizations, February 12, 1919; so also the Farmers' Equity Union, February 13, 1919; so also the Department of Superintendents of the National Education Association of the United States, on February 24, 1919; so also the great convention of the National Society of Christian Endeavor, on December 10, 1918; so also the Religious Education Association, March 19, 1919; so also the General Federation of Women's Clubs, on May 29 of this year; so also the Victory Committee of Women, composed of the heads of all organizations who did war work, such as councils of national defense, the National League for Woman's Service, and so forth; so also the Mid-Year Conference of Home Missions, Secretaries of Disciples of Christ, February 28, 1919; so also the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, which I have already read; so also the Northern Baptists' Convention, June 2, 1919; so also the National Economic League, January 15, 1919; so also the U. S. Grant Lodge of the Independent Order of the Brith Sholom, June 23, 1919; and so also the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. President, I do not pretend that I have here the reports of all of the national associations, but every national association whatever that has expressed itself at all has come out in favor of the league of nations.

Now, let me go to another method of showing the state of public opinion in the United States. I hold in my hand the result of a poll of the agricultural press in the United States. Of these agricultural newspapers, having an enormous circulation in the aggregate, 66 unqualifiedly favor the ratification of the pending treaty; 2 favor ratification conditionally upon a clear understanding of the covenant's meaning; 1 is noncommittal; and one is absolutely opposed. The aforesaid papers represent a constituency of farmers covering 43 States. The papers in this list report a combined circulation of 2,100,000. Those papers, Mr. President, not only are exponents and supporters of the league of nations but they unquestionably represent the overwhelming opinion of their readers as well. Agricultural papers do not fly in the face of their readers in matters of public opinion. The very fact that they are supporting the league of nations so ardently is an indication of the sentiment of the farmers to whom they constantly go, and with whom they become a family companion.

Let me read some of the statements of the editors. Elmer E. Reynolds, editor of Rural Life, Rochester, N. Y., says:

> I am emphatically and unreservedly in favor of the ratification of the league of nations covenant, believing that in taking this position I am voicing the sentiment of a vast majority of Rural Life's more than 300,000 readers on the farms and in the villages of the Eastern and Middle States.

The editor of Pierce's Farm Weeklies, in Iowa—perhaps the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] knows of these publications—writes:

> Our three farm publications (the Iowa Homestead, Des Moines, Iowa; the Wisconsin Farmer, Madison, Wis.; and the Farmer and Stockman, Kansas City, Mo.), reaching nearly 400,000 grain-belt farm homes weekly, have from the first taken a strong position in favor of the league of nations covenant.

I could take the time of the Senate to read pages of opinions from other editors. They are all of the same tenor, and all are enthusiastic supporters of the league. I repeat that they not only express their own opinions but they voice to a large and overwhelming extent the opinions of the farmers who take these papers.

Now I am going to leave the agricultural press and come again to the Republican newspapers of the country, mention of which I made a week ago here. I have so far found only one case where I mentioned a Republican newspaper erroneously; but, on the other hand, I have found a large number of Republican papers which should be added to the list, and I have no doubt if I could make further investigation I would find many more newspapers, either Republican or independent, who are giving strong support to the league of nations. I ask unanimous consent to insert this list in the RECORD without taking the time of Senators to read it. I may say that there are 50 Republican papers in the list, 56 independent newspapers, and 16 which are independent Republican. I have taken the classification from the Newspaper Guide where I have not been able to ascertain it from the paper itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The list referred to is as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLICAN AND INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPERS FAVORING THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

ARKANSAS.

Fort Smith: Times Record (Independent).

CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco: The Bulletin (Independent Republican).
Los Angeles: The Times (Republican).
Fresno: The Republican (Republican).
Whittier: The News (Republican).
San Diego: The Sun (Independent).
Stockton: The Record (Independent).
Oakland: The Enquirer (Independent Republican).
Sacramento: The Union (Republican).

COLORADO.

Denver: The News (Independent Republican); the Post (Independent).

CONNECTICUT.

Waterbury: The American (Republican).
New Haven: Journal-Courier (Independent).
Ansonia: The Sentinel (Independent).

ILLINOIS.

Chicago: The Post (Republican); the News (Independent).
Bloomington: Daily Pantagraph (Republican).
Springfield: News-Record (Republican); the Register (Independent).
Danville: Morning Press (Independent).
Peoria: The Journal (Independent).
Decatur: The Herald (Republican).

INDIANA.

Indianapolis: The Star (Independent Republican).
Terre Haute: The Star (Independent); the Tribune (Independent).
Muncie: The Star (Independent Republican).
Evansville: Journal-News (Independent).

IOWA.

Des Moines: The Register (Republican); the Capital (Republican); the News (Independent).
Burlington: The Hawk Eye (Republican).
Davenport: The Times (Republican).
Sioux City: The Tribune (Independent); the Journal (Republican).

KANSAS.

Topeka: The Capital (Republican) (Capper); the Journal (Republican).
Wichita: The Eagle (Independent Republican).
Emporia: The Gazette (Independent Republican).
Iola: The Register (Republican).

KENTUCKY.

Louisville: The Herald (Republican).

MAINE.

Lewiston: Evening Journal (Republican).
Portland: Daily Eastern Argus (Independent).

MARYLAND.

Cumberland: Daily News (Republican).
Baltimore: The American (Republican).

MASSACHUSETTS.

Boston: The Herald (Independent Republican); the Record (Republican); the Globe (Independent).
Springfield: The Republican (Independent); the Union (Republican).

MICHIGAN.

Grand Rapids: The News (Independent).
Detroit: The News (Independent).
Adrian: Daily Telegram (Independent).
Muskegon: The Chronicle (Independent).

MINNESOTA.

St. Paul: The News (Independent); Pioneer Press (Independent Republican); Dispatch (Independent Republican).
Duluth: The Herald (Independent).

MISSOURI.

St. Louis: The Star (Independent); Globe Democrat (Republican); Post-Dispatch (Independent)

NEBRASKA.

Omaha: The Bee (Republican); the News (Republican).
Lincoln: The Journal (Republican); the News (Republican); the Star (Independent).

NEW JERSEY.

Newark: The News (Independent); the Call (Independent).
Paterson: Press Guardian (Independent).
Hoboken: Hudson Observer (Independent).
Jersey City: The Journal (Independent Republican).

NEW YORK.

New York City: The Journal of Commerce (Independent); The Post (Independent); The Globe (Independent Republican); The Mail (Republican); The Commercial (Independent).
Buffalo: The News (Republican); The Express (Independent Republican).
Syracuse: The Standard (Republican); The Herald (Independent).
Albany: Times Union (Independent).
Brooklyn: Daily Eagle (Independent).
Rochester: Herald (Independent); Post Express (Republican).
Binghamton: Press (Independent).
Troy: Record (Independent).
Lockport: The Journal (Independent).

OHIO.

Columbus: State Journal (Republican); The Dispatch (Republican).
Cincinnati: The Times Star (Republican); The Enquirer (Independent).
Youngstown: The Times (Independent Republican).
Toledo: The Times (Independent).
Akron: The Press (Independent).
Toledo: News-Bee (Independent).
Newark: Ledger (Independent).
Springfield: Sun (Independent Republican).

OKLAHOMA.

Guthrie: Daily Leader (Independent).
Muskogee: Daily Phoenix (Independent).

OREGON.

Portland: Oregonian (Republican).
Salem: The Journal (Independent).

PENNSYLVANIA.

Philadelphia: Public Ledger (Republican); Saturday Evening Post (Independent); Inquirer (Republican); Jewish World (Republican).
McKeesport: The Daily News (Republican).
Pittsburgh: The Press (Republican).
Wilkes-Barre: The Record (Republican); The Times Leader (Independent).
Allentown: Morning Call (Independent).
Altoona: The Mirror (Independent).
Erie: The Times (Republican).

RHODE ISLAND.

Providence: The Tribune (Independent Republican).
Pawtucket: The Times (Republican).
Newport: The News (Republican).

TENNESSEE.

Nashville: The Banner (Independent).

UTAH.

Salt Lake City: Telegram (Independent); Tribune (Republican).

WASHINGTON.

Spokane: Spokesman Review (Republican).

WEST VIRGINIA.

Wheeling: Evening Telegraph (Republican); Intelligencer (Republican).

WISCONSIN.

Milwaukee: The Journal (Independent).
La Crosse: Tribune-Leader-Press (Republican).
Oshkosh: Daily Northwestern (Republican).

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask the Senator why he leaves out the Democratic newspapers?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am only interested in showing to my Republican friends the fact that Republican sentiment in this country is in favor of the league of nations. I presume that 95 per cent of the Democratic newspapers are supporting the league of nations. A Democratic newspaper not supporting the league may occasionally be found, but it is like the clergymen to whom the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] referred; you can find exceptions to prove the rule. In the main the great number of Democratic papers throughout the country are supporting the league of nations. I am now seeking to show my benighted friend from Idaho that Republican sentiment is overwhelmingly for the league and that he is flying in the face of Republican sentiment.

Mr. BORAH. I would just as soon fly in its face as in the face of Democratic sentiment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not doubt it.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator know of any Democratic paper that is not supporting it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have run across a few; yes.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to find one. If the Senator can find one I should like him to give its name.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I trust the Senator will not succeed, although I have found a few. They are for the most part inconsequential, and for the most part are inspired by some personal grudge against the President of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I supposed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that some people speak of the Hearst papers as Democratic papers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Hearst papers in the list that I present are classified as independent, and I think they may properly be so classified. While Mr. Hearst, as a general proposition, supports the Democratic ticket, I think his papers are called independent and support candidates without regard to party. Mr. Hearst is unquestionably opposed to the league of nations, and I suppose it is not an injustice to Mr. Hearst to say that he possibly is inspired by some of the same reasons that move the Senator from Idaho to oppose the league of nations. I shall not specify what they are, but I think perhaps we understand them.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be through in just a moment.

Mr. WARREN. I merely wish to present a conference report.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will wait, I shall be through in a very few moments.

Mr. President, I ran across to-day a very interesting reference which I should like to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

A bomb has been thrown into the Republican ranks in Ohio by the official Republican organ of Fairfield County, the Lancaster Gazette, which demands the ratification of the league of nations, because it was pledged by the Republican Party in Ohio in its 1918 platform. The newspaper declares that Senator WARREN G. HARDING, of Marion, and National Chairman Will Hays agreed upon the league plank and approved it. The platform which called for the treaty is as follows:

"We would have the world kept safe for the cooperation of mankind and the maintained fraternity of nations, great and small. To that end we favor the participation of the United States in a league of nations to maintain the peace of the world.

"Pending such established security we favor military training in the spirit of a Republic which condemns military domination."

This, the editor asserts, was the work of Republican National Chairman Will H. Hays, of Indiana, and concerning its production and insertion into the declaration of principles it is said:

"In the old Mark Hanna rooms of the Neil House, Columbus, between the hours of 8 and 10 p. m. a subcommittee of three men of the committee on resolutions, duly authorized, met Messrs. Hays and HARDING, who drew up and O. K'd that part of the State platform which had to do with national affairs and which later was adopted in its entirety by the State convention.

"The league plank in the Ohio Republican State platform is the work of Hon. Will Hays and Senator WARREN G. HARDING, two of the most outstanding men in the Republican Party. So let him who would sneer at the league of peace plank in the Ohio platform remember that it was adopted not only by Republicans of Ohio but written and O. K'd by two of the leading Republicans of the United States—one often mentioned for the Presidency, the other the head of the party."

Standing for the plank, as written and adopted unanimously by the Republican convention, the editor says of it as a party manifesto:

"It can mean only one thing, namely, that Republicans believe that the peace of the world can be secured and maintained through the operation of a league of nations.

"The last sentence of the plank adds emphasis to this, for its import is that without a league militarism in the United States must be adopted as a means of defense."

Now, Mr. President, that is very true. Unless this league is adopted we will have to take up universal military training; we will have to enter upon a career of militarism and giant appropriations; we will, as a Nation, having so much to defend, be compelled to turn ourselves into a military camp, because we have offended the greatest power in the world and we must be ready to meet it when the time comes for revenge, unless there is some international organization to preserve the peace of the world and prevent wars of revenge in the future.

I have placed in the RECORD a list of papers that will be found supporting the league of nations, Republican, independent Republican, and independent papers of large circulation, all being dailies, none of them having less than 5,000 and very few of them less than 10,000 circulation, and some of them going up into the hundreds of thousands in circulation.

I realize that there are a few Republican newspapers in this country that are opposing the league of nations; and I wish to say at this time, Mr. President, that a great organization has been formed, and is now in successful operation, for the purpose of editing a large number of Republican newspapers by machinery. Those editorials are written in Washington. The organization was formed in the Senate of the United States. This organization is known as the Republican Publicity Association. I said it was formed in the Senate of the United States, largely by Senators, and it is presided over by one of the able men of the country, Mr. Jonathan Bourne, jr., formerly a Senator, and who was just leaving the Senate at the time he formed this association. He is the president, and has been running it for a number of years. The other officers who appear upon the letterhead of this association are John W. Weeks, who is vice president; MARTIN B. MADDEN, who is treasurer; Anson W. Prescott, secretary. The executive committee are ex-Senator Jonathan Bourne, jr., Oregon, chairman; Senator A. J. GRONNA, of North Dakota; Senator MILES POINDEXTER, of Washington; Senator WARREN G. HARDING, of Ohio; Senator FREDERICK HALE, of Maine; Representative MARTIN B. MADDEN, of Illinois; ex-Senator John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts; ex-Senator John D. Works, of California; ex-Senator James A. Hemenway, of Indiana; ex-Representative George W. Fairchild, of New York; Hon. Benjamin S. Hanchett, of Michigan; and Hon. Walter S. Dickey, of Missouri.

This association has elaborate and beautiful offices in Washington; it employs editors, managing editors, copy readers, and stenographers, and expends many thousands of dollars a year. The sole purpose of this association is to edit here in Washington hundreds of newspapers by machinery. Those newspapers are all trying to destroy the league of nations; they are doing everything in their power to destroy it; but my information is that those newspapers do not represent the sentiment of their local communities, and the publishers of those papers can not be considered as speaking for their local communities; they are speaking for the machine organized here by the political leaders in the Senate of the United States for the purpose of controlling the Republican press of the country.

Now I want to show the lengths to which this organization has gone to achieve its purpose. It has published this "second declaration of independence," with the engraved portraits of the 37 Senators who signed the "round robin." It has sent this beautiful "declaration of independence," signed by the autograph signatures of these Senators, to all the Republican newspapers which are upon this list, and in addition to that has offered, and I have no doubt has sold, a number of copies of this "second declaration of independence" to those who sympathize with its aims. But, Mr. President, the thing to which I desire to call the particular attention of the Senate at this time is the organized effort that has been made to control the Republican sentiment of the country by machine, an effort which I should think would be resented by some of the Members of the Senate who signed the so-called "round robin."

I shall read what my friend, Jonathan Bourne, jr., president of the association, says in his letter. I am not going to read all of this document, although it is an interesting thing, but I want to read the opening paragraph of the article which appears upon the back:

The Republican Publicity Association, through its president, Hon. Jonathan Bourne, jr., gave out the following statement from its Washington headquarters on March 4, 1919, the day on which the second declaration of independence, printed on the opposite side of this sheet, was presented to the Senate.

And here is the first paragraph:

The British-Wilsonian league of nations is dead, killed by the courageous action of the Republicans of the Senate in rising up at the critical moment and signing their names to a document that amounts to a promise not to vote for the league if it is presented to that body for ratification.

Mr. President, I think some of the signers of the "round robin" will rather resent the idea of being placed in the attitude of pledging themselves not to vote for the ratification of a treaty presented here by the President of the United States. I only mention it and only exhibit this document to show that notwithstanding the fact that independent Republican papers all over the country, in great numbers and with great circulations, reflecting and expressing the sentiments of their own communities, have taken a strong position in favor of the league, there is with its headquarters here in Washington, and right in the Senate of the United States, an attempt to manufacture, by machinery, editorial opinions for newspapers willing to take them in a hand-me-down fashion from the offices of the Republican Publicity Association here in Washington.

To my mind, with the organized effort that has been made to distort the opinion of the Republican newspapers of the country it is a remarkable fact that it is, to the large extent that it has shown itself to be, supporting the league of nations in every State in the Union; and I ask Senators to examine this list of papers which I shall place in the RECORD to see how it shows, in almost every State in the Union, Republican newspapers of representative capacity, large and small, giving their support voluntarily to the league of nations, because their editors believe in the league and because the sentiment of their community favors the league.

Mr. President, I have detained the Senate too long. I yield the floor.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, there are some fundamental things that ought to be clearly understood as we draw near to the time when the Senate must, in pursuance of its constitutional right and duty, consider the treaty of peace with Germany, including the league of nations, and this understanding is necessary alike for the sake of the Senate, that its position may not be misconstrued, and for the information of the country.

Neither the league of nations nor the treaty of peace of which the league of nations is a part is as yet before the Senate. The only information we have regarding either is mainly newspaper report, and changes in each almost up to the hour of their final submission have been of daily occurrence, so that it is difficult either to discuss with confidence the provisions which are presumed to be therein or to definitely determine our own attitude with regard to them. Certain fundamental preliminary statements can be made and ought to be made, and if these fundamental principles are generally agreed upon the way to final action upon the treaty and the league itself will be the easier.

Certainly the President was entirely within his constitutional right to negotiate a treaty as to him seemed wise, without asking in the negotiation either for the advice or the consent of the Senate.

The fact that it would have been wiser and more conducive to cordial cooperation and constructive conference if he had voluntarily pursued a less autocratic course and had, in some degree at least, arrived at his conclusions openly and without such excessive secrecy and exclusiveness does not in the least lessen his abstract right or diminish his unquestioned power.

When we do come to the consideration of the matters contained in that treaty—matters which concern the welfare if not the actual existence of more than a thousand million of people—and that are of such transcendent importance to our own country, there is no place for any motive or word or action except of sympathetic desire to constructively cooperate in the ratification of a treaty that shall bring peace to the world, and that even more important than bringing temporary peace to the world, shall not surrender any of the great traditions that have been the glory of this Nation, or the fundamental rights of the American people.

We would be indeed foolish if, as a victorious Nation, we either ignorantly or designedly surrender our national liberty

of action for the preservation of which, if challenged by any other nation in the world, we would have fought to the death.

The Senate will neither delay action nor in any sense embarrass the President or complicate the consideration of the great questions which finally the Executive must submit to the Senate for its approval. As a preliminary to that more important discussion, consideration, and determination, it is desirable, partly because of the general uncertainty that exists with regard to the attitude of the Senate upon the question and partly because of the beneficial effect which it will have upon the American people, to let it be clearly known that it is our purpose to sympathetically receive and consider and act upon the treaty of peace, and at the same time to see to it that every essential American right is fully safeguarded against either destruction or impairment by any of the treaty terms, and that when these fundamental rights are thus protected to cooperate with the other signatory powers as freely and generously as we may in any plan to prevent future war and to promote the general welfare of the world. We ought to make it known—that there may be no doubt about it—that the Senate is not antagonistic to a league of nations. That there is every desire to make effective the work of the President in the negotiation of this treaty, but that above every line of the treaty, and more important than the league of nations itself, it is essential that our own sovereignty as a Government and liberty as a people should in no sense be jeopardized.

We are the great stabilizing factor in the world. No other nation is so free from suspicion or distrust on the part of other nations.

It is recognized in all parts of the earth that with the American people there is neither lust of power or dream of conquest.

We must maintain this position of national independence. It is vital not alone from the standpoint of national honor and of national usefulness to the world, but as well from the standpoint of our own commercial, agricultural, and industrial prosperity, and it is for this reason that the American people ought to be assured in advance that in the ratification of the treaty there shall be such reservations as will in no sense require the treaty to be sent back to the other nations of the world and thus delay the final consummation of peace, but that shall nevertheless be so clearly announced that both in this country and in every nation of the world the attitude of the United States will be clearly understood upon the following essential provisions:

First. That this country regards the Monroe doctrine as an American policy, founded alike upon the necessity of self-preservation and established by nearly a century of acquiescence, and that when the Monroe doctrine should apply and the extent of the application, are matters to be determined as the occasion for interpretation arises by the United States alone and without interference direct or indirect upon the part of any other nation.

Second. That the consideration of questions which are domestic in character such as immigration and tariff, are matters which, notwithstanding certain international results that may naturally from time to time arise therefrom, are to be determined solely by the country in which they arise and are under no circumstances to be in any degree regarded as matters for the determination of the league of nations.

Third. That when in the future, if ever, the United States gives the prescribed notice of its intention to withdraw from its identification with the covenant of the league of nations, its withdrawal at the termination of the prescribed time is and must be a matter entirely within its own power to determine and not limited by the right of any other nation to say that there are or may be existing conditions of unfulfilled obligations which prevent the withdrawal of the United States.

Fourth. That the written constitution of this country is supreme over every provision of the treaty and over every requirement of the league of nations, so that the United States can not and ought not to bind itself in advance either to make war in the future or to send its Army and Navy into other lands for purposes of control, which is in itself an act of war, without the express authorization of Congress at the time, because under the Constitution the sole power to declare war vests not in the treaty-making power of the United States, but in the legislative department of the United States, and Congress alone can declare war, and therefore whether the United States as the necessity may in the future arise, shall by any military or naval force cooperate in maintaining any of the provisions of the league of nations, is a matter which Congress under the provisions of the Constitution is and must be entirely free to determine by what in its judgment is at the time consistent with the honor and interest and duty of the American people.

If, Mr. President, these fundamental questions are clearly understood by the American people, it will not alone make the consideration of the treaty the easier, but what is of far more importance, it will make the final action in regard to the treaty wiser and safer as a fact and more readily approved by the conscience and judgment of the American people.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the Senator concludes, will he permit a question? I do not ask it in a controversial way, but for information. Is the last reservation to which the Senator has referred intended to exclude article 10 of the covenant of the league?

Mr. SPENCER. Not by any means.

Mr. KING. Or to modify it?

Mr. SPENCER. Article 10 remains. Article 10 is subject to as many interpretations as there are Senators upon this floor. That reservation puts upon article 10 the interpretation which the Senate puts upon it, and by which the people of the United States would hereafter abide.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand the Senator, the fourth fundamental—as the Senator denominates it—is meant for the purpose of restricting the application of article 10 of the covenant?

Mr. SPENCER. I should rather say of interpreting what we regard article 10 as meaning. Is that clear to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KING. I think I understand the Senator.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to submit a conference report on the third deficiency bill, simply reporting a disagreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to the bill (H. R. 3478) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JAMES W. GOOD,
J. G. CANNON,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement to the Senate.

The conferees on the Army bill reached a full and complete agreement Saturday midnight, or, to be more exact, in the early hours of Sunday morning. The conferees on the part of the House submitted their report to the House to-day. After an extended debate a motion was made to recommit the bill to the conference committee, and that motion was adopted by the House of Representatives. Apparently, the motion was regarded as a message from the House to the Senate, and the papers have been sent over here by an official messenger of the House, and the Senate has been officially notified that the House has adopted a motion to recommit.

I believe, Mr. President—and I shall be glad to be corrected if I am wrong—that this is not a message which can be properly sent to the Senate. The situation is this: The Senate conferees have not as yet submitted their report to the Senate. Therefore, we have not been discharged from the consideration of the matters upon which the two Houses are in difference. The Senate conferees are still authorized, as it were, to meet with the House conferees upon their request; and it occurs to me that these papers should be returned to the House. Their motion to recommit the bill to the conference committee affects the House Journal alone, not the Senate Journal; and upon the invitation or request of the House members of the conference committee the Senate members of the conference committee will gladly meet with them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The papers should go back.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, during the winter of 1911–12 President Taft submitted to the Senate for consideration a treaty that had been worked out, subject to the ratification of the Senate, between Great Britain and the United States. That proposed treaty provided very broadly for arbitration, and if a difference existed between the United States and Great Britain as to what the treaty required to be arbitrated, that difference was to be submitted to a "high commission," and this commission was to determine whether, under the terms of the treaty, the particular subject should be arbitrated.

When this matter came before the Senate the Senate rejected the provision of the treaty which allowed a "high commission" to arbitrate the question as to whether, under the terms of the treaty, the United States would be bound to arbitrate, and it ratified the treaty with a resolution, which, I think, is interesting at this time, and I will read it:

The Senate amended the proposed treaty by striking out the third paragraph of article 3 and ratified the treaty as amended with the following resolution:

"*Provided*, That the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the said treaty with the understanding, to be made part of such ratification, that the treaty does not authorize the submission to arbitration of any question which affects the admission of aliens into the United States, or the admission of aliens to the educational institutions of the several States, or the territorial integrity of the several States or of the United States, or concerning the question of the alleged indebtedness or monied obligations of any State of the United States, or any question which depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude of the United States concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe doctrine, or other purely governmental policy."

I desire to bring this bit of history to the attention of the Senate, as this resolution of qualified ratification received the unanimous support of every Democrat in the Senate and was opposed by many of the leading Republicans.

Senator Bacon, of Georgia, was at the time the leading Democrat upon the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was a member of the Senate.

Senator Bacon led the fight in favor of ratifying the treaty with terms of modification and, although the Democrats were in the minority, the modifying terms were adopted by a handsome majority.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] handed to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] a resolution passed by the International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ, at its convention held in St. Louis, Mo., May 29 to June 3, 1919, which was read, supposedly in support of the proposed treaty with the covenant included. I will read it:

Resolved, That this International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ, in convention in St. Louis, Mo., representing educational institutions of more than 40 States and the Dominion of Canada, indorses a league of nations that will give freedom and justice to all.

Mr. President, that kind of a resolution, perhaps, would not be objectionable to any body of men or to any class of people—"a league of nations that will give freedom and justice to all."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator endeavored some days ago to quote from a speech that I made, as well as his recollection served him, but I thought very inaccurately. Now, I may quote the Senator very inaccurately, too, but I think he made a speech in which he said—and I shall be glad if he will correct me if I am in error about it—that he was not particularly concerned in the details of this particular covenant for a league of nations, because he was opposed to any league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not modify that position so far as I am individually concerned. Do not misunderstand me. I am opposed to any league of nations, any shell of a league of nations, any pretense of a league. I said that this kind of a resolution would undoubtedly receive the support of almost any body of men.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But would not pass muster with the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. No; not individually, because I do not think a league of nations which will insure peace or freedom is a possibility. I think it is founded upon a wrong idea. It is based upon the wrong theory. With me it is not a question of amendment of any kind. If my country is to be sold I am not interested in the details of the bill of sale.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Do I understand the Senator now takes the position that the Catholic Church is not friendly to the league?

Mr. BORAH. I have no authority to speak for the Catholic Church. I simply state that this resolution does not express any view at all with reference to this particular league. What I rose to say is that I have a telegram from the Catholic bishop of Montana, joined in by the bishop of Washington, the bishop of Idaho, and the bishop of Oregon, all protesting against this particular league. So it is not fair to presume that when they say they are in favor of a league of nations which does certain things they are in favor of this particular league. I do not know whether they are members of this alumnæ body or not, but they live in that region of the country which the Senator from Montana and I have the honor to come from, and are protesting against this particular league.

Mr. THOMAS. I asked the question, Mr. President, because last week we were informed that the cloven foot of the Catholic hierarchy was not only in, but upon, this league, and that it proposed through its instrumentalities and by the use of its machinery to effect some sort of a religious domination of Christendom. I am very much relieved to learn that a few of the numerous adherents to that faith are upon the other side. I think it is a good thing for the country to know that the danger is not so absolute as I was led to think that it might be.

Mr. BORAH. If I have contributed in any way to the relief of mind of the Senator from Colorado, he knows I am happy to have done so.

Mr. THOMAS. I know that, Mr. President; but every day here I listen to intimations, to statements, and to assertions with regard to certain elements and interests that are for and certain other elements and interests that are against the league, so that I am reaching a position where I am almost inclined to say—

A plague o' both your houses.

Mr. BORAH. I trust the Senator will hold that attitude. The Senator from Idaho is only able to take care of his own consistency, and while he makes no claim to consistency he believes he has been rather consistent in his opposition to this league.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; the Senator has.

Mr. BORAH. I was opposed to the league from intuition; I was opposed to it the moment I saw the proposition; and all my subsequent investigation and all my study of it have supported what was originally an intuition, which I think is sometimes more entitled to consideration than investigation.

Mr. THOMAS. At the time the Senator first announced his opposition I did not know the basis of it, but I have been very fully informed since.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator should not complain of information.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield for a question; but if the Senator wants to make some observations, I will conclude in just a moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; it is in connection with what the Senator has already alluded to; and I wish to ask him if he does not find that it is in common with much other evidence of the same kind? This is from a constituent in Chicago. He says:

To-day, Sunday, I have just witnessed the passing of a resolution by the Irving Park Christian Church indorsing a league of nations. This was done at the suggestion of the minister, a Y. M. C. A. worker with the Army in France, who stated that all the Chicago churches were to take such action. The resolution was unanimously indorsed, and will be sent to you and Senator MCCORMICK and Senator LODGE. When the resolution was first made it was to indorse "the" league of nations. One of the brethren, however, stated the contents of the proposed league had not been given out, and, not knowing what it would be, how could it then be indorsed? And then the resolution was changed to indorse "a" league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. That was the object I had in mind in calling attention to this particular form of resolution. It has been cited by Senators as indorsing this league, which I do not think it fairly does.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] was interested in knowing the views of the soldiers, and I think it is important that their views be known. I do not, of course, presume to speak the sentiment of all the soldiers in regard to this matter. No man will assume to do that. I suppose in all probability there is a division of view among the soldiers in regard to it, the same as there would be among any other class of citizens. But the supposition has been entertained and statements have been made that the soldiers were almost universally for the league of nations. I have not found that to be true. I have found very wide and extended opposition among them. To what percentage it would go or how many of them it would include I can not say.

I have a letter here dated June 7, 1919, from Luxemburg, written by a soldier. I call particular attention to it because it has reference to the letter published by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, to which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has referred. After calling attention to this statement of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and his assuming to represent the soldiers of the country, this writer says:

Ask almost any soldier what his opinion of the league is and I think you will find him indifferent to it in the majority of instances, opposed to it in many others, and seldom for it. To them it conjures up visions of "entangling alliances," with all the joys and sorrows of campaigns in foreign lands in which we have no interest. A soldier does not emerge from an ordeal such as we have been through over here with many false or hazy ideals. He considers the ideal only in so far as it will be applicable to the concrete issues of our everyday national life. The Constitution of the United States defines our national ideals and prescribes in clear-cut words methods by which we may realize them. It facilitates in every way not only the establishment but the maintenance as well of an organization which should effectively safeguard every national consideration, and in times past we have been able to assist weaker nations as well. Then, why at this time should it be necessary for us to give bond that we will not disturb the peace of the world and that we will throw our forces onto the side of right? Surely no one can accuse us of desiring that which is not ours. We would never start a war of aggression, and no league of nations would properly safeguard us from nations that were aggressive and avaricious.

The boys over here are pretty well informed about what has been going on politically at home. Taken as a whole, we represent fairly well, I think, the average American citizen. Being soldiers, we may lack complete knowledge of some questions, but we can at least form and hold an opinion. This much, however, we do know, that the principles for which the American soldiers have been fighting and dying are the same principles stanchly upheld by our greatest Americans—Washington, Henry, Monroe, Lincoln, and Roosevelt. Our boys have again safeguarded them with that most precious of earthly things. Let's not barter away any of our traditions and rights for some apparent concessions which in reality do not exist. We have always extended the helping hand and welcomed those who cared to come to the United States and share our liberties and responsibilities. It has been that policy that has so strengthened us, not one whereby a man would be a citizen of the world. If we are to be Americans, let us be Americans first, last, and all the time. Let's not yield to temptation and adopt some international scheme at least a thousand years in advance of our time.

That letter was inspired by the Chamberlain letter, so industriously exploited. This is a private letter, and perhaps I ought not to use the writer's name, as the writer is yet in the service. But any Senator who wishes to see the name of the writer is welcome to see it.

I have another letter here, written from Embry, Miss., dated June 25, 1919, from a soldier. There are some personal matters in this letter, but I can not very easily dissect it:

EMBRY, MISS., *June 25, 1919.*

DEAR SENATOR: I notice you are taking a positive stand against the league of nations in its present form. I want you to know that millions of the masses of Americans are with you. Do not let a subsidized and prejudiced press deceive or intimidate you. This is a time that tries the hearts of men. I have always been a Democrat, but my party has gone away from all that has made me proud of America. I have been a soldier in France, and we know we do not want any more European entanglements.

His name is also subject to the call of anyone who wishes to see it.

This is from another soldier, dated June 26, 1919, who says:

DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to express my sincere appreciation of the splendid American stand you are taking upon the league of nations question. I am a lawyer in business, recently discharged from the Army Air Service, and to me, as an American, it is indeed refreshing to know that there are a few real men in our Senate, like yourself, who are willing to stand up and proclaim to all the world that they are nothing less than Americans.

The work that you are doing is deserving of lasting praise, and personally I know that it is bringing forth the desired results.

Very truly, yours.

———— ————.

It is signed, and his name is here.

Here is a letter from France, written by a soldier from Camp J. W. Garrett:

MONTIERCHAUME, FRANCE,
Camp J. W. Garrett, A. P. O. 138, March 22, 1919.

DEAR SENATOR: Having read a few excerpts from speeches made by you and others before the Senate, allow me to congratulate all on the stand you have taken in regard to the so-called league of nations in its present form. Keep the good fight up, brother, and when the American Expeditionary Forces return to the United States they will fight with you and what you stand for. Let's not lose our Americanism either individually or nationally now or at any future time. These European countries have a very wholesome respect for old Uncle Sam. Let's keep it and to keep it is to not tie up with them on any visionary proposition. The American Expeditionary Forces are not interested in the league of nations. They are interested in getting peace signed up so that they can return home, for they are getting very tired of being police dogs of Europe. Ask the officers and men returning how they stand on the league of nations proposition and I think you will be highly gratified of the stand you have taken in regard to the matter.

You may rest assured that these countries are anxious to get the United States tied up in an alliance, as we are policing Europe for them now, and if we sign up to many scraps of paper we will be policing the world.

If this league of nations goes through, it will mean an immense Army and Navy for the United States, and some one has to pay the freight. That means everything one eats, wears, or has in the way of amusements will be taxed. In addition it will mean being taxed on one's salary above a few dollars a week. Look at Europe to-day. Do we want it to line up and drift into the same conditions that exist here? I say no, keep away from it.

I do not want you to understand that any of the American Expeditionary Forces are regretting coming over, but are glad of it and would go anywhere on earth if occasion could ever arise. But the American Expeditionary Forces came across for a purpose which they have fulfilled. They did the job well. It is finished. If they had not come, Germany would have been dictating peace in a short time. Our work is done, so let's get these peace terms signed and get out of here.

Well, this is a rambling letter I know, but I can assure you that the officers and enlisted men of this camp are enthusiastic admirers of you and others for standing up for Americanism, for we are all red-blooded Americans.

Yours, truly,

Capt. ———— ————.

I ask leave to insert without reading another letter from a member of the American Expeditionary Force, under date of May 1, 1919.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letter referred to is as follows:

ON ACTIVE SERVICE WITH THE
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE,
May 1, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for the interest you have taken in the boys "over here."

Your stand for a "Monroe doctrine" and "No entangling alliances" is true Americanism.

We who fought the fights "over here" do not care to help fight the future wars of these jealous European nations.

Thanking you for past and future favors for the boys "over here."

Mr. BORAH. I have a letter here, written by a member of the National War Work Council of the Young Men's Christian Association of the United States, Transportation Bureau, as follows:

[National War Work Council of the Young Men's Christian Association of the United States. Transportation Bureau.]

HUDSON HUT,
Hoboken, N. J., March 26, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. ————: Replying to your inquiry regarding the attitude of returning soldiers to the present draft of the constitution of the league of nations, I presume within the past four months I have talked with at least 500 officers and enlisted men regarding this subject and can most emphatically state that the consensus of opinion—I could almost say the unanimous opinion—is one of opposition to the present draft. As one officer put it, "If an election were to be held immediately and all the soldiers given an opportunity to vote, not more than ten in a thousand would vote for it."

There are two main reasons given for this sentiment, the first being the fear that American soldiers will be called upon to fight again on foreign shores, without what is, in their opinion, a fair representation of American sentiment in the league of nations as now proposed, and, second, the absorption of the sovereignty of the United States by the league.

Trusting this will cover the ground presented in your inquiry, I am,

Very truly, yours,

I present these among a multitude of other letters which I have covering the subject, and answering to some extent the question of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. I state at the same time that I do not assume to say that the soldiers are universally against it, but they are certainly not all for it.

The resolutions which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has called to the attention of the Senate are all resolutions which conform with the directions which I have read from the instructions sent out by the League to Enforce Peace. They are in such complete conformity with these instructions that they all even comply with the last suggestion there, and that is that you send copies to the Senators and also to the address of the League to Enforce Peace, Forty-second Street. I have received a number of those resolutions from farmers' organizations in my State, and observing that the closing clause always covered that general proposition, "Send copies of the resolutions to your Senators and also to William Howard Taft, No. so-and-so, New York." I was led to write back and ask them whence came those resolutions. In two replies which I have they stated the form of the resolution sent to them, I presume from the league.

One idea which I had in mind in calling to the attention of the country the fact that the league was sending out these instructions, and the fact that the money which supports the league, or three-quarters of it, came from big business of the country, was that it might lead those who are passing the resolutions to study the situation a little more for themselves and to investigate the matter upon their own accord and perhaps formulate a different style of resolution from that which has gone out generally from the League to Enforce Peace.

Mr. PHELAN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. Does the Senator contend that big business is more in favor of war than of peace?

Mr. BORAH. I did not say anything of that kind. But I do not know, in view of the millions which have been made out

of the war, why, following its ordinary instinct, it should not be in favor of war.

Mr. PHELAN. That was my understanding, because during the preparedness campaign big business was accused of fomenting discord and war. It is assumed for the league that it is to promote peace. If big business is now for peace, and prior to the war, during the preparatory stage, its attitude was for conflict in order to sell munitions and materials, I can not reconcile the Senator's position.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is seemingly suffering from the ordinary delusion of those who advocate the league of nations, and that is that it means peace. It does not mean anything of the kind. It means war, and it is an organization for the purpose of war. Articles 10, 11, and 16 are war articles. They require stupendous armament every moment of our existence, and it means war for the world if there is a disturbance in any part of the world.

Mr. PHELAN. Well, Mr. President, of course it means ultimately war if there is no way of reconciling the differences between nations, but machinery is set up for the purpose of reconciling those differences, and to that extent it is a covenant for peace.

Mr. BORAH. The machinery is not set up for the purpose of reconciling differences. The machinery is set up for the purpose of crushing insurrection or for the crushing of disturbance and settling all matters by means of force. That is the effect of the whole scheme.

Mr. PHELAN. Does the Senator say advisedly that it is to crush insurrection?

Mr. BORAH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. PHELAN. Well, there is a wide difference of opinion between those who interpret article 10 as to its significance. It certainly does not, in my opinion, affect the right of revolution, which is insurrection.

Mr. BORAH. Yes. I listened to the Senator's statement the other day with reference to the easy way by which Ireland would get her freedom in case the league of nations was formed. It was a delightful presentation of a fanciful story for the contemplation of countrymen how Ireland would get her independence under this league of nations. The Senator said that Ireland would get her independence in two or three ways; one was by consent of England. The Senator belongs to a humorous race, and therefore I might leave that matter where it stands with his statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from Idaho undertook, Mr. President, to state that I gave two or three avenues to Irish independence under the league. One was by the voluntary act of England, another was by revolution, and a third was by the aid of outside force, but that the latter method was barred, and that was the only method that was barred, by the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. Now, let us analyze that proposition. First, if Ireland gets her independence she gets it by the consent of England. For seven hundred years Ireland has been endeavoring in every conceivable way, persistently and consistently, to get the consent of England. That consent has not yet arrived. Not only has England refused to consent to the independence or freedom of Ireland, but she has even refused to consent to give the Irish people a hearing. Even the President of the United States, representing 100,000,000 people, 20,000,000 of whom, perhaps, are either Irish or of Irish descent, could not secure from England a hearing for the Irish people—such a hearing as is seldom denied by any civilized tribunal to a people whose destiny it is proposed the tribunal shall determine.

A conference which was dominated almost exclusively by three nations refused a hearing, and the Senator from California holds out to the anxious Irishmen that one of the ways by which they will get their freedom is by the consent of England! So much for that.

The other method is by revolution. Well, Ireland has also tried revolution off and on for 700 years. She has lately formed, by a very large majority vote of her people, a government, and to-day Ireland has a government which is just as much a government as were the American colonies when they first asked for their independence; and so far as governmental form is concerned and the expression of a people is concerned, the Republic of Ireland to-day represents the people of Ireland as completely as the Confederation represented the American people when we demanded our independence of England. If they had a simple recognition of that proposition, it would constitute the first step in their independence. But can Ireland, reduced now through her 700 years of persecution—persecution which was never more extreme and drastic than in this hour, for the Irish people are held in subjection every hour by English bayonets—can Ireland hope to get her freedom through revolution against England? So we dispose of that proposition.

Then it comes to the proposition of revolution by aid of some other power; and that is the only way that Ireland will ever get her freedom. She can not secure it without assistance, direct or indirect.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, does the Senator look forward to Irish independence through that channel?

Mr. BORAH. Through revolution by the aid of other people?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Well, I do not know just what the Senator means. If he wants to know what I hope, I will say that I sincerely hope that, if Ireland is not recognized and her independence given to her, she will get her independence through revolutionary action and through the aid of those who believe in human liberty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So far as I am concerned, I sincerely hope that she will get her independence anyway. It does not make any difference to me how she gets it, but I most ardently hope she will get it. The Senator from Idaho, however, has just excluded the two avenues suggested by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN]—first, by consent of England; that is dismissed; second, by revolution; that is dismissed. I should like to know what the Senator thinks about the third?

Mr. BORAH. I am just now starting to discuss it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understand the Senator hopes that Ireland will obtain her independence, and so do I.

Mr. BORAH. I am just now starting on the third proposition.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, very well. Ireland has been hoping in that way to get her freedom for 700 years, just the same as she has by other ways.

Mr. BORAH. But she was never so strong in the sympathy of the other nations as she is to-day.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Idaho if it would not be very well for the Irish people to determine among themselves just what they want?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have heard that question raised before. If the American colonies had had to determine among themselves with any greater unanimity than the Irish have done as to whether or not they should have independence, the Tories would have easily held them in subjection to the English Government. Do you know, my friend, that the vote in favor of Irish freedom is very much larger than the percentage of support of the American colonies at the time that they demanded their independence from the English Government? There never has been a nation of which history gives me any information where there was such complete unanimity as there is among the Irish people for independence. It is not universal; it is not complete; but the vast percentage of the Irish people are in favor of the independence of Ireland. If we say to them, "You wait until you shall have the support of every man within the confines of Ireland," it will be to rivet the chains of slavery upon them for all time to come.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana asks, "What about the third proposition?" We have dismissed the first and second propositions. The third proposition involves revolution aided by some foreign Government or through the sympathetic support of some foreign Government. Then comes in the league of nations. If Ireland should start a revolution which England should undertake to subdue, and the United States or any other Government should extend any aid or assistance in any way, shape, or form, it would be immediately construed by the council as in violation both of article 10 and article 11 and possibly article 16. The result would be that, while all the other nations of the world were excluded from giving any aid or comfort whatever to the struggling Irish people, England would be left free to subdue the insurrection or the revolution of her own motion or her own act. In such a conflict the cause of Ireland would be hopeless.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I inquire very anxiously if the Senator from Idaho is contemplating aid by this Government to the Irish people?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of course I do not contemplate that if the Senator means military aid. If I could have my way, and we should come home and attend to our own business in this country, I could not contemplate it for a moment, but under the league we would be restrained from extending our sympathy and moral support. But there is one thing I want to say to the Senator from Montana that I do not contemplate. If the Irish people ever start a revolution, and some future President undertakes to call American boys into the service to insist upon maintaining the integrity of the British Empire, I do not contemplate that one of them will go.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator claim there is anything in the league of nations which makes that possible?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I quite agree with the Senator that they could not get an American boy to go to do anything of the kind. Now, I ask the Senator to point to any provision of the league of nations that obligates this Government or the boys of America to do anything of the kind? I canvassed article 10 in the discussion I made the other day on that subject, and I undertook to show that there is no obligation of that character at all. I have not heard anybody urge anything to the contrary. The provisions of article 10 are perfectly plain, and I scarcely believe the Senator, with the candor that he usually exhibits in the discussion of these propositions, will undertake to assert here that there is anything in the provisions of article 10, at least, that would obligate the Government in that way at all. The language excludes by its very terms any such thing; it clearly declares that the league guarantees the territorial integrity and political independence of each member of the league against external aggression.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If that does mean that this Government binds itself, as the Holy Alliance contemplated should be done, to suppress insurrection within the domains of any government, I am against this covenant

Mr. BORAH. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And I undertake to say that there is not a man upon this side of the Chamber who would vote for it if he felt convinced, if he felt satisfied, that that contention could reasonably be made as to the effect of article 10.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Montana admits that if the United States ratifies this treaty it will be obligated to use its power to protect the territory of any other member of the league from external aggression. Now, suppose Ireland, for instance—and I only mention Ireland by way of illustration; it might apply to any other people that are under the government of either one of the members of the league—should receive the assistance which the American Colonies received in their struggle for independence in 1776, the assistance of France, we will say, for illustration, or some other power which should intervene in behalf of Ireland in the exercise of the judgment and discretion of the Nation. The United States would then be compelled, if it kept its agreement under this league of nations, to intervene and assist Great Britain against the aggression of the foreign power.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will permit, I shall be very glad to reply to the idea advanced by the Senator from Washington in connection with the illustration he mentions of Ireland. There is no man on this floor who has any better reason for anxious concern about the future of Ireland than myself. But, Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Washington or any other Senator what country he anticipates is going to the aid of Ireland when Ireland shall rise in insurrection against Great Britain?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should be glad to pursue this if the Senator will allow me a little time.

Mr. BORAH. I prefer to pursue my remarks, and then let the Senator take the question up in his own time——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

Mr. BORAH. Because it rather interferes with the course of my argument to have all my time taken.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to show that the Irish people have been expecting aid for 700 years; that repeatedly other nations have come to their aid; and there is not any greater prospect now of getting their independence in that way than there has been at any time in 700 years.

Mr. BORAH. That does not answer at all the argument which I present.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not trying to answer the argument of the Senator from Idaho now; I am trying to reply to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me to say just a word, the Senator from Montana bases his answer upon what he considers the probability that some nation will not do it. The Senator from Montana does not know anything about it; nobody knows what the contingencies of the future may bring about as to the conflict of nations.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is one thing sure, and that is this, that what we did do with reference to Cuba is precisely what we could do, without the league of nations, with reference to Ireland. The Senator from Montana will agree that if we should undertake to do with reference to Ireland what we did do with reference to Cuba, it would be inhibited by the league of nations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not like to pursue this unless I am permitted to express my views about the matter.

Mr. BORAH. I am outlining an opportunity to the Senator to speak to-morrow. Now, the Senator does not, in my opinion, discuss the question I put. He simply says there is no hope or expectation that any nation will come to the help of Ireland. What I am trying to do now is to discuss the three propositions which the Senator from California presented as to how Ireland could get her freedom—first, by the consent of England; second, by revolution without any aid; and, third, by a revolution with aid. We have determined that the first two are not at all probable.

Then when we come to the third proposition, even if it were probable, the league of nations prohibits it, because certainly it will not be contended that under article 10 and article 11, if the United States should come to the aid of the people of Ireland, or if the people of Egypt should secure their independence and in turn should undertake to assist the independence of Ireland, or if any other government should come to her aid, the league of nations would inhibit it, because it would be immediately construed as external aggression, and the tenth article would immediately apply. But let me read the eleventh article:

> Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league.

How long would it take a council sitting at Geneva to determine, as the Holy Alliance determined, that any war, whether it threatened the members of the league or not, was a matter of concern to the league; and therefore if war should break out in Ireland, if a revolution should start and Ireland should declare war upon England, what possible provision could be called into play to prohibit action of the council under article 11?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to inquire of the Senator what he thinks the council could or would do in a case of that character?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, they have jurisdiction——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Of all matters concerning peace, and they could immediately advise action upon our part, and, if we remained true to our obligation, we would accept their advice.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. To what obligation?

Mr. BORAH. The obligation to which we agreed in article 10 and article 11.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But article 10 applies only to external aggression.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. Now, what else?

Mr. BORAH. To article 11, which reads:

> Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared to be a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall—

Not reserving the right to do so, as it did in the original draft; but—

> The league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Now, to put a concrete case——

Mr. BORAH. Wait a moment. The league may take any action that it deems wise; and we, as a member of the league, have agreed in advance that it shall take that action, and if it takes the action we, as a member of the league, must abide by its action.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Take what action?

Mr. BORAH. Any action that it sees fit. It might order that troops be sent there.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Where is the covenant that we agree to do anything they tell us to do?

Mr. BORAH. This covenant agrees in itself——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We agree in article 10 to do so-and-so. We do not agree in article 11 to do anything.

Mr. BORAH. We do agree to it. We, as a member of the league, agree that the league shall take action, and whatever action it takes binds us as a member. If we do not agree to this, will the Senators on the other side of the question tell me whether we are pursuing a fantasy or whether we are dealing with a legal contractual obligation?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am asking the Senator what they can do. Let me ask the Senator whether the league might not just exactly as well say to England, "Let Ireland go"?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; certainly. But it could with equal authority say the opposite.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That would stop the war.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and it might just as well say, with England's 6 votes and with her alliance with every other power, "Hold and suppress Ireland, as we have done for 700 years."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the Senator well knows that they have not any 6 votes in the council.

Mr. BORAH. They have 6 votes in the assembly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well; but they have to have a unanimous vote in order to make it binding.

Mr. BORAH. In the assembly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Why, certainly; in the assembly.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose that they do have to have a unanimous vote. Let us suppose that they have.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Which would include the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Let me suppose that they have to have a unanimous vote. They had to have a unanimous vote to place the chains of serfdom on 40,000,000 of Chinese, and they got the unanimous vote, with the President of the United States representing this country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is not in the league of nations.

Mr. LODGE. It is in the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. I know it is not in the league of nations, but the Senator is talking about a unanimous vote. If the President of the United States, sitting as the representative of this Government, would consent to crush the national life out of 40,000,000 of Chinamen by turning them over to an alien power, what do you think an ordinary member of this council would do?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, that is an entirely different matter. The Senator is talking about the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. Yes, I am; but I was drawing an illustration of what it means to get a unanimous vote. You do have to have a unanimous vote, but it will be no trouble to get a unanimous vote when you are sitting behind closed doors in Geneva. And do you think that, sitting there with England, with her vast power with regard to her own dominions, the representatives of America would not agree to her policy in a matter of this nature?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is it not a fact that any representative of America will be under the legislative control of the Congress of the United States, which has the power to prescribe his duties and limit his powers? Is not that a fact?

Mr. BORAH. No; that is not a fact. There is nothing either in the league constitution or our Constitution providing who or how his duties shall be prescribed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator very well knows that Congress has the power at this session to pass an act prescribing and limiting the power of the representative of the United States in the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. So far as this league of nations is concerned, and so far as this covenant is concerned, Col. House could sit there without consulting the Senate of the United States, just as he is sitting at Versailles to-day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator certainly does not mean that.

Mr. BORAH. I mean precisely that. There is not a word in the covenant of the league of nations which states the Congress shall take any steps whatever concerning the subject, and there is nothing in our Constitution on the subject.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is not necessary. If the Senator will permit me, does he question the fact that a bill introduced in Congress and passed by Congress, stating the powers of the representative of the American Government in the league of nations, would control him and limit him?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not concede that at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator question it?

Mr. BORAH. I do question it for the reason that he is an officer unknown to the Congress of the United States, unknown to the Constitution of the United States, the representative of a different government, a supergovernment. He might not be a representative in the sense that we have provided for in the Constitution at all, because no such man is provided for in the Constitution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But does the Senator claim that anyone representing the United States, having the power to bind the United States, is not subject to the legislative restrictions of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BORAH. I am claiming the whole thing is impossible, unworkable, and abhorrent to our constitutional Government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, seriously, I should like the Senator to answer that question.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator need not enjoin seriousness upon my part.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it is a serious question.

Mr. BORAH. I think it is a serious question, too, and I am just as conscious of the seriousness of it as the Senator from Nebraska, and I think I understand just as well what I am saying. The man who represents us at Versailles is unknown to the Constitution of the United States. He is not provided for in our Constitution or our form of government. Congress has no authority now to create such an office.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken about those representing us at Versailles. He knows very well that the Constitution of the United States empowers the President of the United States to negotiate treaties. He knows that.

Mr. BORAH. I am not talking about that at all. If I said "Versailles," I meant "Geneva." What I say is that the man who represents us at Geneva under this league of nations is unknown to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The man who represents us anywhere is under the control of the Congress. He can not bind the United States Government unless he does it under the powers and limitations prescribed by the Congress.

Mr. BORAH. There is not a word in the league of nations, there is not a single phrase, which in any way provides for the Congress of the United States acting in regard to our representative.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course not.

Mr. BORAH. Now, wait just a moment. There is not a word in the Constitution or in the laws of the United States which provides for a representative to any supergovernment or to any council of this kind. That is the hiatus of the whole thing.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, will the Senator permit an interruption? Is it necessary to state in this league of nations what authority the English representative shall have or what authority the French representative shall have? Is it not left to each nation inevitably to prescribe how its man shall be selected and what his powers shall be?

Mr. BORAH. I can not speak as to the English Government or the French Government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Any Government.

Mr. BORAH. I can speak as to the American Government, however. The Constitution of the United States nowhere provides for any such representative; and I claim that the President, after this league was formed, could appoint Mr. House, and the Congress of the United States could not have anything to say about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Congress of the United States fails to act, that might be so. If the Senate ratifies the treaty, and it goes into effect, and Congress fails to prescribe the man's duties, that might possibly be so; but the Senator knows that if Congress acts, no one can go beyond the powers given him by the Congress of the United States. The British representative will have such powers as the British unwritten constitution and the acts of Parliament may prescribe. The French representative will have such powers as the French Parliament gives him, and he can not have any different powers. The league can not prescribe the man's powers. All the league can do is to say: "The United States shall have one representative or three representatives." Then it is for the United States to say what his powers shall be when he gets there.

Mr. FALL. Why, Mr. President, neither the British Parliament nor the French Parliament has anything in the world to do with naming the British representative or the French representative.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is because their constitutions——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to continue my remarks now to a speedy conclusion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the Senator goes on, will he pardon me until I make a statement as to my own position with regard to article 11?

Mr. BORAH. No; I prefer to go ahead, because that will simply lead to another debate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think that is quite unfair of the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Well, I will not do anything which the Senator thinks is unfair. I have stood here for some time permitting the other Senators to occupy my time; and if the Senator thinks I am unfair unless I give up all the time, I will yield it to him.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; I do not ask for all the time.

Mr. BORAH. Very well, I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to say, Mr. President, that I can not agree to the contention that under article 11 the United States is bound in any sense whatever to make war, nor has the league any power to direct it or advise it to make war under article 11. We obligated ourselves to make

war under the provisions of article 10, and we limited ourselves then to make war only in the case of external aggression; and I maintain that it is utterly impossible to say that we incurred a greater liability to make war under article 11.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator's statement, but, of course, I knew what it was before he made it, because I read his speech the other day, and that is the same position which he still occupies upon this particular article.

But now to get back to a starting point:

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise, the secretary general shall, on the request of any member of the league, forthwith summon a meeting of the council.

The Senator said a moment ago that the council might very well decide that what England should do was to give Ireland her freedom. I agree to that. It might just as well decide that as to decide the other, but it might just as well decide that it was the business of the league, in order to conserve the peace of the world, to suppress an insurrection in Ireland, and that it was the duty of the league, combined, to do that work; and to my mind that is a perfectly fair and legitimate construction of this article.

Mr. President, article 11 is very much stronger and much more latitudinous than the terms of the treaty made by the Governments which constituted what is known as the Holy Alliance; it is very much stronger than that provision under which they did proceed, and they claimed justly, to suppress insurrections in all the different countries; and why? Because they said that the insurrections, spreading, would undoubtedly disturb the established Governments in which they were interested, and therefore the only safety they could have would be to suppress the insurrection in its beginning, to crush it where it was.

Why, Mr. President, are the Allies in Russia to-day? Why are the Allies interfering with the internal affairs of Russia? Because they say something is being engendered there which we call Bolshevism, which will spread over national lines and disturb the established institutions of the world. Why was it that England declared war upon France or France upon England in 1792 or 1793? Because they said that the armed system which was prevailing in France, represented by the Jacobin mob, was a system which would spread over the national lines of the world and destroy the established institutions of the world. Why was it that the Holy Alliance wanted to go into the internal affairs of the South American Republics? Because a theory of government, democracy, was being built up in those Governments which would disturb the established institutions of the world. So when you give a league jurisdiction over everything which concerns the peace of the world, and say to them that they shall take action in regard to it, you give them just as much right to crush an insurrection as you give them a right to recognize the independence of the people asking for it.

Just a word in conclusion, Mr. President.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has read here a great deal of evidence of public opinion, and we are also informed that the President shortly is to go out to build up public opinion. I repeat what I said the other day: I am very glad to see that kind of debate go on. I want to carry it to the public forum. I want to take it to the country. I want it to go out of the atmosphere of the Senate Chamber. I want to get just as far away as I can from the "three-fourths of big business" which is sending its propaganda all over the United States. I want to go to the people in their homes, and I welcome the gauge; but I ask you people to join with us in measuring and gauging that public opinion when it shall have been aroused. Will you, after you have aroused public opinion, submit it to the test of a popular vote and find out whether this is an organized propaganda or whether it is the legitimate representation of public sentiment in this country?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit the conference report on the Naval appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 27, 37, 38, 39, 44, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 69, 71, 72, 76, 81, 83, 85, 86, 89, 97, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, and 107.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 9, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 54, 56, 63, 65, 66, 68, 73, 74, 75, 80, 82, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 99, 108, and 109, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of said amendment strike out "$60,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$25,000,000 to be expended as follows: For necessary aircraft and equipment for fleet use, $3,027,250; for the purchase abroad of five special type planes, $100,000; for the erection on Government-owned land of two hangars for two large dirigibles, $3,700,000; for the construction of one rigid dirigible, $1,500,000 for the purchase abroad of one dirigible of the latest type, $2,500,000; for the conversion of the U. S. S. *Jupiter* into an aeroplane carrier, $500,000; for the conversion of two merchant vessels into aircraft tenders, $700,000; for the maintenance and operation of aircraft factory, helium plant, and aircraft stations, $3,008,007; for continuing experiments and development work for all types of aircraft, $6,700,000; for flying equipment for Marine Corps advanced base units, $618,000; for general and miscellaneous contingencies, $2,646,743; and the money herein specifically appropriated for 'Aviation' shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with the existing law as 'Aviation,' and for that purpose shall constitute one fund"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Line 2 of said amendment strike out the word "from"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment strike out the period and add the following: "for the purpose of paying all obligations or claims incurred at the instance of the Navy Department in carrying out the provisions of said acts and for the purpose of paying all expenses incident to the closing of the schools maintained and operated in pursuance of said acts"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out the comma and "$250,000" after the word "barracks," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "for a period not exceeding six months, $100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "170,000 men and the President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 191,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out the comma after the word "reserves" and insert a comma after the word "duty" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "February 3,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "February 3"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"The act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129), granting, under certain conditions, to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only during the period of the war and in no event beyond October 1, 1919."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That officers of the permanent Navy who have served satisfactorily during the war with the German Government in a temporary grade or rank shall be eligible under the provision of existing law for selection for promotion and for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank until July 1, 1920, without regard to statutory requirements other than professional and physical examinations: *Provided*, That the age and grade requirements prescribed by the act approved August 29, 1916, in the rank of commander, is hereby extended from June 30, 1920, to June 30, 1921."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment insert a colon (:) and add the following: "*Provided*, That such membership in the Naval Militia shall not interfere with the discharge of duties by such members thereof who are in the Naval Reserve Force."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$105,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the colon following the word "Virginia" and insert the following: "Incinerator plant, $67,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$12,632,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$2,875,656"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$164,203,494"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, regarding the promotion of captains in the line of the permanent Navy shall not restrict the promotion of such captains as may have been wounded in line of duty and who are now on the active list, and such captains shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of section 1494, Revised Statutes of the United States, and also to the benefits of the act of March 4, 1911."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$15,500,000"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "this" in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words "the foregoing"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of said amendment insert a period (.) in lieu of the colon (:) after the word "grades" and strike out the remainder of said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of said amendment strike out all after the word "buildings" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "upon the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such temporary buildings as may be erected in pursuance hereof at a total cost not to exceed $10,000 during the year; $660,898"; and the Senate agree to the same.

C. S. PAGE,
MILES POINDEXTER,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
FREDERICK HALE,
J. WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
WM. J. BROWNING,
PATRICK KELLEY,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the bill what appropriation is carried for naval aviation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Twenty-five million dollars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AN IRISHMAN'S CREED.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I received some time ago a very interesting paper entitled "An Irishman's Creed," written by a scholar and a patriot, and I think it is entitled to very grave consideration. It is especially appropriate in view of what has been said this afternoon on the Irish question, and I commend it to the careful study of Irish-Americans. I think it ought to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask that it be so printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AN IRISHMAN'S CREED.

"My desire in this statement is to set down as clearly as I can my own fundamental beliefs as to the political and national future of my country as a basis for discussion with other Irishmen. I wish, therefore, to assume as little as possible, to argue my positions as dispassionately as possible, and, above all, to make no disingenuous reservations, to use no dialectic for the purpose of gaining an illusory political advantage.

"I make in the beginning one large assumption: I must be allowed to claim that Ireland is a nation; that is, that in the sense of President Wilson's utterances she has a right to self-determination.

"In making this claim I do not wish to beg the question; I admit the necessity of defining the word "nation," and the further necessity of showing how great a measure of self-determination my nation may justly require, for it does not seem to me that the mere establishment of nationality brings with it of necessity a right to absolute independence.

"The distinguishing features of nationhood are, I believe, any or all of the following: Racial, geographic, economic, psychological (within the sphere of psychology I include both tradition and religion). The measure of independence to which any group is entitled will depend upon the extent to which it satisfies the test under each of these heads.

"1. Racially, I consider that the claim of the Celt has been greatly exaggerated. Leaving on one side the highly controversial question as to whether there is actually a Celtic race existent to-day in the United Kingdom, it must be conceded that there is a considerable part of Ireland inhabited by persons who are racially absolutely distinct from and unmixed with the conquering Anglo-Saxon race and who were originally distinguished by language and habit. The existence of this population is sufficient to affect powerfully the fourth or psychological factor, but is not sufficient to entitle Ireland to complete independence on racial grounds, for the following reasons:

"(a) The original race has intermingled almost completely with the invader and has adopted his language and customs.

"(b) A large and important part of Ireland is occupied by a second racial group, having more affinity with the Anglo-Saxon.

"(c) The original race in Ireland is almost equally powerful in Scotland, Wales, Cornwall, and France.

"2. Geographically, Ireland is manifestly a self-contained unit with a claim to separate existence as such. There is no logical line of partition within the island, while there is a perfectly obvious line of cleavage between it and other countries. At the same time the geographical position of the country dictates a closer connection with England than with any other nation. I assume that strategic considerations are included under the heading of geography.

"3. Economically, Ireland, with an industrial and manufacturing population in the northeast corner, balanced by an agricultural population throughout the rest of the island, has claims to be a balanced unit superior to those of Denmark, or even of England. On the other hand, she can not in the near future hope to be self-supporting. Her industrial centers can not provide a complete market for her agricultural produce, nor can she provide within her borders the necessary raw materials for her industry. She must for many years both import and export raw materials, and the greater part of this trade must pass through English channels. Furthermore, she does not and can not hope to produce within her own borders the wealth necessary to exploit her own resources. She can, on the other hand, offer to England and America a method of shortening their lines of communication with one another.

"4. Psychologically Ireland is a unit distinct from any other country. She has within her own borders two traditions, distinct in religion and in sentiment. Yet even Ulster, in its most limited sense, has a consciousness absolutely distinct from that of England. The most distinctive of Ulster customs, the celebration of July 12, while nominally a defiance of Ireland, is very clearly un-English. The Orangeman of Ontario is not merged with the English Canadian. The history of the eighteenth century shows that the two Irish traditions may easily be welded against England. The traveler entering Ireland via Belfast will be just as conscious of crossing a line of demarcation when he goes from England to Ulster as when he passes out of Ulster into the south.

"It appears, then, that reliance on the racial argument points to a complicated partition which must either produce a reductio ad absurdum or lead to the establishment of more than one bitterly contested terra irredenta; reliance on geography postulates either the subjection of a minority or the abandonment of racial differentiation; reliance on economic arguments demands the creation of a concordat within Ireland and the acknowledgment of the necessity of an understanding with England; reliance on phychology means either that we must revert to the racial argument already discussed or that we must base our claim not upon the tradition of Catholic Ireland as against Ulster but upon the tradition of Ireland as against England.

"Summing up the argument, we find that we can abandon geography and economics and make out a claim upon grounds of race and tradition for self-determination of the Ireland of the Catholic and the Gael, a self-determination which can not have practical and permanent results, becuse it holds out no prospect of independent nationhood. A group stripped of geographic and economic completeness can hope for nothing but to be a picturesque "reservation" under the protection of England. In the alternative we can abandon racial and traditional justification and hand over the geographic and economic unit to majority rule—create, in fact, a new Hungary in which the minority will be forever invoking the protection of England. This way also independence of any kind is impossible.

"The only remaining course is to concentrate upon that degree of self-determination which can be achieved by satisfying the tests under all four heads. For this reason the two peoples in Ireland must sink their racial history in a new Irish nationalism, must merge their antagonistic traditions in a new Irish tradition, and must take full advantage of their geographical and economic unity. The Gael must then admit the title of the Ulsterman to be Irish, the Ulsterman admit the Gael as a kinsman. The Gael must give up his claim to complete independence of England, the Ulsterman his claim to complete dependence. England must admit that their united voice entitles them to a full measure of self-determination.

"The conclusions which follow are that the separatist, the Gaelic Leaguer, the apostle of hatred and physical force, are alike with the Orangeman playing into the hands of the English advocate of partition or of repression, encouraging those who hold the maxim "divide et impera" or those who argue "these people ask with a divided voice, therefore we will give them nothing." The separatist will be punished by riveting his own shackles, the Orangeman by cutting himself off from the ultimate source of his economic progress. If the argument is sound, it points to the absolute necessity of a middle course, to which the extremists on both sides will make some considerable sacrifices. Many Irishmen have reached this point; they have all broken down when they came to consider the obstacles which confront them. Would it not be well to avoid enumerating those obstacles, and instead simply to state what must be done on both sides, if they would sincerely work for peace?

"The extreme nationalist must realize—

"(a) That by demanding more than he will take he is committing himself to a game of bluff and encouraging his opponents to do likewise. This is serious, because it inevitably produces a disunion, which affords an opportunity to dishonest Englishmen and frightens away honest ones.

"(b) That the teaching of a Gaelic language and a Gaelic tradition strengthens the racial tradition at the expense of the geographic argument and makes plain the very case for partition which he wishes to avoid. The same applies to the fostering of religious bigotry.

"(c) That a gospel of hatred against England does not encourage England to give him liberty to make that hatred effective, and does not encourage the Ulsterman—who has close ties with England—to exchange them for subordination to England's enemy. That England must always be Ireland's ally, and that the great majority of Englishmen, especially of English workingmen, have for 50 years sincerely tried to help the Irish people. These Englishmen must be helped by Ireland's friendship to struggle against their own ruling classes in Ireland's interest. To bring them all under a common contempt defeats this end.

"(d) That this war has been Ireland's war; that the cause of the Allies has been a just cause. Germany was the greatest oppressor of small nations in the world, and her aims were imperialistic, autocratic, and in every way repugnant to the spirit of an Irishman. It was against these things that the ordinary Englishman fought, and from them he has protected Ireland. By the blunders of his Government—which refused to take Irishmen as allies and tried to take them as vassals—he has lost a large measure of Ireland's aid; but on his home-coming he must at least get Ireland's just verdict on his achievement. It must be remembered that the Englishman did not fight for the secret treaties; and in the result he has won what he did fight for—the protection of Belgium, the liberation of Bohemia, Poland, and Croatia.

"(e) That Ulster is a part of Ireland, a worthy and essential part; that she has reasons for wanting safeguards, and should be given them.

"(f) That honest constructive service is necessary to self-government and should be recognized above vociferous correctness of doctrine.

"(g) That Ireland can only achieve the full measure of her own importance by not considering herself the most important thing in the world.

"The Ulsterman must realize—

"(a) That in demanding nothing but the maintenance of the status quo he is merely postponing and aggravating the reckoning. He suffers materially by the existence of unrest and the most superficial observation of the facts, or reading of history must convince him that the unrest will not improve with suppression.

"(b) That in demanding as an alternative partition he is destroying the geographical and economic unity on which his material progress, as well as his social comfort, must ultimately depend.

"(c) That he is a citizen of Ireland, as well as of the British Empire, and must assume the responsibilities as well as claiming the privileges of this dual position. If he does not accept this citizenship, he must acknowledge himself a colonist, bound to submit to the Government under which he may find himself. He might also realize that the colonists in South Africa who took a different point of view succeeded in bringing about a measure of union and self-government through bloodshed.

"(d) That he can not prove his claim to superior industrial and administrative capacity by the adoption of a nonpossumus attitude. If he desires safeguards, he must state the nature of these safeguards.

"(e) That no sane man desires coercion of Ulster by force, but that if Ulster proves the one stumbling block to a resettlement of Europe, the overwhelming sentiment of the world will be against her.

"If both parties were to adopt these positions, England would be met with a sane demand for self-determination. Her objec-

tions then to the granting of a full measure of dominion home rule would be narrowed to the strategic and economic. Her present objections—fear of the extremists on the Nationalist side and protection for the extremists on the Ulster side would ipso facto disappear.

"The strategic objection is based on prewar conditions, strengthened by her experiences as a belligerent. Any settlement of the world now must of necessity include some league of nations, which will have, among other functions, that of guaranteeing the international security of certain strategic points, such as Constantinople and Trieste. This league must be based primarily on a federation of the English-speaking world, and if the whole of such federation guarantees the integrity of each member, the Irish difficulty disappears. An attack on England, through Ireland, would necessarily bring the whole league to the assistance of England, no matter how great a measure of independence Ireland enjoyed.

"The economic question can be fully met by a free-trade treaty between England and Ireland, together with internal safeguards for Ulster, and the provision of an Anglo-American line of communications through Ireland on the same basis as the Hungarian access to Fiume through Crotia, or the Bulgarian and Serbian access to the Aegean through Greek territory.

"A scheme of self-determination, which I shall proceed to outline, could, therefore, be at once agreed upon.

"It is necessary, however, to consider England's position if either or both of the parties refuse to be moved by the arguments set forth.

"(1) If Ulster accepts these arguments and Sinn Fein does not, England will be justified in imposing the settlement and announcing it to the peace conference, with an appeal to that body to accept it and give it moral sanction. A rebellion against such a settlement would have no moral support and little practical force. In my opinion, it would not be attempted.

"(2) If Sinn Fein accepts them and Ulster does not, the peace conference should be asked to give Ulster six months to propose a workable arrangement and to prepare herself at the end of that period to accommodate herself to any Irish settlement which has the sanction of the league of nations or the Anglo-American federation.

"(3) If both sides persist in their present attitude, the peace conference should be asked to receive representatives from Ireland appointed jointly by the convention and the Mansion House conference, and after hearing them to impose a settlement of the Irish question.

"It will be noted that I assume that England must settle this question either at or before the peace conference. I do not admit the claim that the settlement of Ireland is a domestic question. It seems to me to postulate (1) That matters of this kind are domestic to victorious nations and international to defeated nations; (2) that a man may beat his wife and remain a member of the committee of a garden city, neither of which conclusions can be accepted by any honest man. I believe that the vast body of the English people agrees with my view and has a genuine desire to put it into force.

"I admit that the attitude of Ireland to the war has been unfortunate, but I claim that the larger share of the responsibility rests with England. I believe that resistance to conscription was as well justified in Ireland as in Australia, and that, on the other hand, Ireland had as much interest as Australia in helping the cause of the Allies. In pursuance of these beliefs I have pledged myself both to join the British Army if called upon and to resist conscription if it were imposed. I do not know how many Irishmen have done this, but I believe many would be in agreement with the course.

"It remains only to state the main heads of the settlement which I hold would meet the just requirements of all parties. These are briefly:

"(1) A Parliament for the whole of Ireland, with the same legislative and executive powers as are enjoyed by the Dominion Government of Canada.

"(2) A perpetual or renewable free-trade treaty with England.

"(3) Ireland to have no armaments, military or naval, with the exception of a territorial defense force. The integrity of her waters and territory to be guaranteed by international agreement.

"(4) England and America to have joint treaties with Ireland in respect of an Anglo-American rail and steamship service.

"(5) Provincial councils to be set up with powers as set forth in the bill drafted by "Two Irishmen."

"(6) Religious equality (and linguistic equality) to be expressly safeguarded.

"(7) The upper house to draw half its membership from persons nominated by the Ulster Provincial Council."

EXECUTIVE SESSION—RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there are three conference reports on appropriation bills still out that must be completed to-morrow. Two can be disposed of this evening. The other one can not be disposed of until to-morrow morning. I shall therefore move for a brief executive session, which I have been asked to do, and then move a recess until 8 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator tell us which bill will go over until to-morrow?

Mr. LODGE. The Army bill is the only one to go over.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator means that the conference report on the sundry civil bill will be disposed of to-night?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

POSTAL RATES ON NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, out of order, I submit resolutions adopted by the Publishers' Association of New York City, representing the daily newspapers in the city of New York and Brooklyn, and ask that they may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Publishers' Association of New York City, representing the daily newspapers of New York and Brooklyn, Wednesday, May 21, 1919.

Resolved, That Congress be urged to repeal the act of October 3, 1917, fixing postage rates on newspapers and other publications. It was advanced as a war measure. The urgency of any revenue-producing measure at the time the bill was considered prevented its careful consideration. Haste was requisite, and in consequence the law is faulty, burdensome, discriminating, and against public welfare.

The act is not intelligently framed and does not serve the purpose of the Government or of the people. Many long-standing rules, trade customs, traditions, and precedents of the newspaper business are overridden and opposed by the law. The provision taxing advertising has resulted in what has long been regarded as editorial matter being labeled advertising and taxed. The enforcement of the law has embarrassed the relations between publishers and readers, and constant annoyance has been caused by the decisions of the Post Office Department in this and other respects.

The zoning provision of the law as framed has hampered and embarrassed newspapers in the dissemination of news, the distribution of which should be facilitated in every particular as a matter of public education and welfare. Newspapers published in the larger cities, with their facilities for gathering and printing the news, can adequately meet the demand of the public for important information of the events of the day. The provisions of the law restrict the distribution of daily newspapers of large circulation and shut off from millions of people the news of important events of the world.

The American Expeditionary Forces abroad, under the ruling of the Post Office Department, are placed in the eighth postal zone. As a result newspapers sent to our soldiers in foreign service carry the heaviest postage that can be imposed under the law. Newspapers thus distributed are sent out without profit and the rate of postage on such newspapers should be at the minimum figure. Publishers make special arrangements for wrapping and dispatching newspapers to soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces and are glad to do so as an act of patriotism, but the law has imposed a penalty upon publishers, forcing them to pay extra postage on news of home events sent to United States soldiers and sailors.

Resolved, That Congress be asked to appoint a committee to investigate rates, the transportation and distribution of second-class mail matter, the actual cost of the second-class mail service, and the proportion which should be charged to newspaper distribution and to transportation, the inefficient space system now in vogue in the Railway Mail Service, the irregularity and late running of newspaper mail trains.

The present system of transportation and distribution is inadequate for the requirements of the newspaper business. It imposes burdens upon publishers and subscribers and involves unnecessary delay in the distribution of newspapers throughout the country. The physical conditions of the Post Office Department prevent prompt and efficient distribution and delivery, the systems prevailing for many years still being in operation, with few and in many cases no improvements.

The late running of mail trains results in dealers not receiving their bundles of newspapers in time for delivery. This is an injustice to subscribers. Newspapers have become indispensable to the community, and the present inefficiency of the Railway Mail Service in the delivery of newspapers should and can be improved. The use of mail bags for outside mail delivery to news dealers is suggested.

Resolved, That Congress be requested to make a particular investigation of the conditions in the New York territory, where, more than elsewhere in the United States, conditions are greatly congested because of the circulation of New York newspapers and the inadequate machinery provided at railway terminals. The distribution from New York is around but little more than half a circle, owing to the situation of New York on the Atlantic Ocean, being confined to the northeast, north, northwest, west, and southwest.

Resolved, That Congress be asked, after the investigation requested in these resolutions, to enact legislation providing for the postal requirements of newspapers, which have far outgrown the transportation and distributing facilities now provided under the law.

DAUPHIN ISLAND BRIDGES, ALABAMA.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back unanimously and without amendment the bill (S. 1361) further extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge or bridges authorized by an act entitled "An act to amend an act to authorize the Dauphin Island Railway & Harbor Co., its successors or assigns, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges or viaducts across the water between the mainland, at or near Cedar Point, and Dauphin Island, both Little and Big; also to dredge a channel from the deep waters of Mobile Bay into Dauphin Bay; also to construct and maintain docks and wharves along both Little and Big Dauphin Islands," approved June 18, 1912, as extended by an act approved June 30, 1916, and I submit a report (No. 59) thereon.

The junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is anxious to have the bill acted upon this evening. For that reason I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge or bridges authorized by the act entitled "An act to amend an act to authorize the Dauphin Island Railway & Harbor Co., its successors or assigns, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges, or viaducts, across the water between the mainland, at or near Cedar Point, and Dauphin Island, both Little and Big; also to dredge a channel from the deep waters of Mobile Bay into Dauphin Bay; also to construct and maintain docks and wharves along both Little and Big Dauphin Islands," approved June 18, 1912, as extended by an act approved June 30, 1916, is hereby further extended to seven and nine years, respectively, from and after the 18th day of September, 1916.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS.

Mr. SMOOT. I am informed that the House has already adjourned without taking action upon the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill or the report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The Senate took a recess for the purpose of considering those reports to-night. As there is nothing else for the Senate to do to-night, I move that it take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, July 1, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June 30, 1919.*

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee that a peace treaty has been signed by a majority of the leading nations; and while it may not be adequate to the needs of the world we most fervently pray that it may be a stepping-stone to a higher civilization, from which shall spring spontaneously from the hearts of all men and of all nations a peace pact which shall spare the world from a holocaust through which it has just passed, leaving it inexpressibly sad and mournful in the loss of men and means.

Hear us, we beseech Thee, in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

POINT OF NO QUORUM.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Buchanan	Cooper	Davey
Ashbrook	Burke	Copley	Davis, Minn.
Bacharach	Caldwell	Costello	Dewalt
Baer	Campbell, Pa.	Crago	Dickinson, Iowa
Blackmon	Caraway	Crowther	Dominick
Booher	Carew	Cullen	Donovan
Bowers	Carss	Curry, Calif.	Dooling
Brooks, Pa.	Casey	Dale	Doremus
Browne	Coady	Dallinger	Doughton
Dunn	Ireland	Moore, Ohio	Sabath
Eagan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Va.	Sanders, Ind.
Eagle	Johnston, N. Y.	Morin	Sanders, N. Y.
Echols	Jones, Pa.	Mudd	Sanford
Edmonds	Kendall	Murphy	Saunders, Va.
Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Neely	Scully
Emerson	Kiess	Nelson, Mo.	Sherwood
Evans, Mont.	King	Nichols, Mich.	Shreve
Fairfield	Kleczka	O'Connell	Sinclair
Fess	Knutson	Oliver	Small
Fields	Kreider	Osborne	Smithwick
Fitzgerald	Lampert	Padgett	Snell
Focht	Langley	Paige	Steagall
Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Parker	Steele
French	Lesher	Pell	Stephens, Miss.
Fuller, Mass.	Lever	Peters	Stevenson
Gallivan	Linthicum	Phelan	Sullivan
Garland	Longworth	Porter	Taylor, Ark.
Godwin, N. C.	Lufkin	Pou	Taylor, Tenn.
Goldfogle	Luhring	Purnell	Temple
Goodall	McAndrews	Quin	Thomas
Gould	McClintic	Radcliffe	Tilson
Graham, Pa.	McCulloch	Ragsdale	Timberlake
Greene, Mass.	McDuffie	Rainey, Henry T.	Treadway
Griest	McFadden	Rainey, John W.	Upshaw
Griffin	McGlennon	Ramsey	Venable
Hamill	McKinley	Randall, Wis.	Ward
Hardy, Tex.	McPherson	Reber	Watkins
Harrison	Magee	Reed, N. Y.	Watson, Pa.
Haskell	Maher	Reed, W. Va.	Weaver
Hayden	Mann	Riddick	Webster
Heflin	Mansfield	Riordan	Williams
Hill	Mead	Robinson, N. C.	Wilson, Pa.
Houghton	Merritt	Rodenberg	Wise
Hull, Tenn.	Miller	Rogers	Woods, Va.
Husted	Montague	Rowan	Woodyard
Hutchinson	Mooney	Rucker	Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-six gentlemen have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a unanimous-consent request to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Hon. Joseph H. Choate to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Joseph H. Choate to Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is it about and what is the necessity for putting it in the RECORD?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. For this reason, that when the sundry civil bill was pending certain references were made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to the Chemical Foundation Co. and to Mr. Choate, which is explained in the letter addressed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GARNER. And another necessity for including the letter is that it is in explanation of testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to at the time he was on the floor of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I desire to say that the letter which the gentleman has in his hand was delivered to me on Saturday when I was very actively engaged in congressional duties, after it appeared in New York and in some of the Philadelphia newspapers. I have no objection to its publication, because in due course I expect to make some further remarks upon the question raised by the writer. On reaching my office this morning I wrote Mr. Choate that I had his letter and would comment upon it later. If publicity is the purpose of the letter, I shall be very glad to give additional publicity to it and the matter to which it relates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, *June 27, 1919.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of the keen sense of fairness which you have so often manifested in your earnest efforts for the public welfare, I feel sure that you will not wish to leave uncorrected certain inaccuracies in the statements of fact and suggestions of motive made by you in debate on the floor of the House on June 20 with reference to the Chemical Foundation. I therefore take this method of calling to your attention, with as nearly as may be an equal degree of publicity, the real facts.

(1) You state (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 21, 1919, p. 1511) that the Chemical Foundation is "capitalized at $500,000 for the purpose of engaging in the manufacture of dyestuffs in the United States." This is the precise opposite of the truth. The foundation has no power, under its charter, to do anything of the kind. It can only license others to manu-

facture under its patents. It must license by a nonexclusive license any competent and truly American manufacturer who may apply up to the capacity of the market. So far, therefore, from having been organized to use the patents itself, its main purpose and effect is to prevent the monopolization of the inventions covered by the patents and to make them available to all, whether members of the foundation or not.

(2) You state (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 21, p. 1516) that as a result of carrying out the plan of organizing a trustee corporation to purchase the patents "somebody would make use of the German patents, and make money—yes; make money." The plain intimation is that the trustees, officers, or stockholders of the foundation are going to make money out of it. When you made this statement you can not have read with care the pamphlet giving the history of the foundation, which you held in your hand as you spoke. The truth is that the foundation was carefully organized in such a way that nobody can possibly make money out of it. No one of the trustees own, or ever will own, a share of stock. The trustees, whom you present to the public view as dangerous financial bugaboos, serve permanently without compensation of any kind. So does the president. So, at this time, do even the minor executives, who will doubtless have to be paid salaries when the foundation develops so as to take their entire time. No officer or director owns stock except the necessary qualifying shares. The stock is being distributed so widely and in such small allotments that ultimately the corporation will be owned in equal shares by 500 different concerns, none of which will own more than $1,000 worth. The stockholders can never receive more than 6 per cent on the cash at par paid by them for their stock. All surplus above this figure—6 per cent on $500,000, or $30,000 a year, divided among the whole industry—has to be used for research and the advancement of science. Does that look like a money-making institution? Some return, equivalent to a fair rate of interest, obviously had to be provided for, if the money for the purchase and defense of the patents was to be raised. The smaller concerns in the industry were in no position to give money outright in aid of the project, nor was any philanthropist discoverable who was so inclined. Either the people who put up the money had to be given a chance to avoid its loss or the small manufacturer had to be left out, leaving the enterprise tied up to the large concerns. The charter requires that if the foundation succeeds the preferred stock must be promptly retired by the return to the stockholders of their investment. That will leave the company with 1,000 shares of common stock, not more than two shares held by any one concern and limited to 6 per cent dividends, if declared. Here, surely, is an alarming display of avarice. Do you really believe that if the gentlemen concerned had set about to create a money-making organization they could have done no better?

(3) You criticize the selection of the trustees of the foundation on the ground that they are not dye makers. In this, I think, you forget their function. They are not directors of the corporation, but primarily voting trustees of the stock. If the foundation was to be kept out of all danger of falling into the control of any group which might use it for selfish interests, the voting stock obviously had to be trusteed, as otherwise control might readily have been bought up by anyone—even by a single dye maker or by German agents. To insure impartiality in the issue of licenses the trustees had to be men wholly dissociated from either the dye-making or dye-using industry. It was evidently desirable that they be men familiar with German commercial crookedness. From these three points of view the board could hardly be improved.

(4) You refer to the trustees as the men "who formed this corporation." This is wholly inaccurate. They were not selected until after the organization was completed.

(5) You criticize the connection of Mr. F. P. Garvan with the foundation, on the ground that it must detract from his service as Alien Property Custodian and hereafter as Assistant Attorney General when he assumes that office. Mr. Garvan, however, became president of the foundation on its organization in February, 1919, long before he became custodian. He did so most unwillingly, on persuasion amounting almost to duress from Mr. Ramsey Hoguet (patent counsel for the custodian, who was one of the leading spirits in the creation of the foundation, and who, like you and like myself, is an ardent Republican). We insisted on his taking the place because we felt that his knowledge of German methods and men and his organizing ability were indispensable. His selection was the enthusiastic choice of the organizers of the foundation—the dye makers, great and small, of the country—and responsibility for his acceptance rests upon two good Republicans.

His connection with the foundation will not interfere with his other duties. It is well understood that till his official functions cease he can do nothing for the foundation except in the way of occasional advice. The suggestion that he and Mr. Palmer will spend their time prosecuting infringements is wide of the mark. Mr. Palmer has nothing to do with the foundation, and the whole job of attacking infringers is, of course, left to the patent counsel for the foundation.

(6) You suggest that the foundation intends to "fix the price of dyestuffs" and may contravene the Sherman law. There is certainly no intention to fix prices, and no real power to do so. Even if the foundation could persuade makers to accept licenses revocable at will (which is doubtful, to say the least), it could do no more than to revoke licenses when excessive prices were charged. This is as far from a price-fixing power as was the Interstate Commerce Commission's power over railroad rates before the Hepburn Act. Moreover, it applies to only a fraction of the industry, the patents covering only about a quarter of the dyes used before the war and none of those made in the United States to-day. The foundation, therefore, has at most capacity to influence rather than control prices; and since the real government of the corporation is in the hands of the trustees, who have no selfish interest to serve, this constitutes no danger. There can be no contravention of the Sherman law, because the only monopoly involved is that granted by the patent laws, and the benefits of even this authorized monopoly are available to all.

In general, your criticisms fail to take into account the situation which called the Chemical Foundation into being. The custodian found himself in possession, along with other German property, of a mass of chemical patents which stood as an impossible obstacle in the path of American industry. That obstacle had to be removed. Unless Congress (if it had the power) followed the English precedent and annulled the patents, which would have left the Germans free to import or make the patented dyes here, the obstruction could be done away with only by a sale to good Americans. The patents could not be sold piecemeal or they would not be worth defending. They had to be sold to strong concerns, because no weak firm could stand the expense of defending. Yet, if sold to any existing concern, the inventions would be lost to all others and a monopoly would be created. The only way in which the patents could be made available to all and at the same time used to fight the German trust was the creation of a trustee corporation. That method was adopted, and I can confidently submit to the judgment of the country that the resulting institution, the Chemical Foundation, will prove one of the most beneficial forces in our industrial world.

JOSEPH H. CHOATE, Jr.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6176, to disagree to all Senate amendments, and to agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the sundry civil bill, to disagree to all Senate amendments, and to agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6176) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question. There is in the bill as passed by the Senate, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, an amendment in reference to a suit that has been sent to the Court of Claims on some items disagreed to between Mr. MacMurray and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians. I want to ask the gentleman if he has looked into that amendment and knows anything about the scope of it?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I have not investigated that matter. I understood the gentleman wanted to get into touch with me about it yesterday, and I am very anxious to talk with the gentleman in regard to it and learn the facts, because the amendment, as the gentleman knows, does not on its face give one any idea of what the real controversy is or which is the right side of the controversy. And I understand there is a controversy.

Mr. CARTER. And has no place whatever in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. I think myself it properly belongs in the Indian appropriation bill, if any place.

Mr. CARTER. Well, I shall not object, Mr. Chairman; but I want to have a conference with the conferees and see if we can not straighten that matter out in a way that will be equitable to both sides.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the House Members who will likely be appointed conferees have conferred in regard to the matter and want to talk to the gentleman from Oklahoma, because we recognize the fact that he is an authority on the subject.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to call the chairman's attention to the fact that last Saturday night at a late hour the Senate placed upon this bill an amendment granting $400,000 in a blanket appropriation to the United States Employment Service. Prior to that action there was an effort made in the Senate to place an amendment on this bill granting $45,000 to this service, and upon being argued on a point of order this $45,000 amendment was finally withdrawn. And this later amendment, which placed $400,000 in the bill, was made shortly afterwards, but before the session closed, which I think was at 10 minutes past midnight.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I send to the desk an amendment which I am offering on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall have to make a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let the amendment be stated.

Mr. WARREN. Pardon me a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Let us hear the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following at the proper place in the bill:

"To enable the Secretary of Labor to continue inquiry into methods of betterment of working conditions of wage earners, to collect and disseminate information and advice for the elimination of causes of strikes and industrial unrest. For the above purposes—for salaries of officers and employees in the District of Columbia and in the field; per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding $4; traveling expenses; fuel, light, and heat; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; supplies and equipment; typewriters; telephone and telegraph service; contingent expenses and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $45,000."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order against that amendment. So far as the labor question is concerned, there is no disposition on the part of the chairman of the committee, so far as I know, to do anything but the liberal, fair thing; but I presume on account of the pressure of war duties and these various strikes, and so forth, that have taken the Secretary of Labor to many parts of the country, there seems to be a confusion which is unaccountable to me. For instance, there are no estimates for the particular thing that the Senator has offered.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am sure the Senator is in error about that, because I find on page 821 of the Book of Estimates that it has been estimated for, and in a much larger sum than I am now asking for.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me to go on, it is not estimated as a separate matter, nor for that purpose; but there are, I may say, nine measures, commencing with fourteen million dollars and something and going along down—$1,335,000, $1,659,917, $212,820, $300,000——

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is the item.

Mr. WARREN. Three hundred thousand dollars again, $1,814,454, $50,000, and $447,512.19.

Now, to take one of the items here, $1,335,000, for instance, it is for a particular subject, and yet we find that this $50,000 is for the same subject. These matters seem to have come up from employees and those attached to the Department of Labor. I can not account for it in any way except that in the multitudinous duties there, and because of the very great anxiety on the part of employees to remain in the employ of the department, and the propaganda that they have gotten up as to Senators, and the letters and other communications that they have poured in on us, they are somewhat confused.

If we can confine this to a reasonable amount, I am perfectly willing to have it go in; but, for instance, we are talking about economy. In these amendments that have been offered there are two or three where there are salaries of $6,000, salaries of $5,000, 15 or 20 salaries of $4,000, $3,500, and $3,000. I do not think I can allow without a protest, and certainly not without a vote of the Senate at this time, matters of that kind to go in.

Take the House of Representatives. They finally managed to get $200,000 into the bill, and that went out and there is nothing in the bill. I do not think we should load this bill up with amendments of that character, and of great amounts, just to go to conference and lose them there, and then the conferees take the usual "cussing" which they are apt to get. I should like to have these matters confined to some one proposition of two or three or pssibly four hundred thousand dollars, and try to take care of it.

And upon objection the said $45,000 amendment was withdrawn, and later the $400,000 amendment was offered from the floor and adopted with the following limited consideration:

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On Page 187, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 1 of the act approved March 4, 1913, entitled 'An act to create a department of labor' to continue to foster, promote, to develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by maintaining a national system of employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof and to coordinate the public employment offices throughout the country by furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and by maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official station together with their per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and printing and binding, $400,000."

Mr. WARREN. The chairman of the committee has no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

I insert the full proceedings in order that it may be seen how very easy it is to attach a $400,000 rider in the Senate to an appropriation bill, when in the House it would not be proper to thus appropriate a single dollar against a point of order. How many Senators do you suppose were present last Saturday night when this $400,000 rider was offered and adopted without objection or debate? It was only the other day that the Senate attached another rider to an appropriation bill, giving this same Employment Service $272,000, which makes, all told, $672,000 awarded it since this Congress convened last month.

I realize, notwithstanding the above, that by the fight I have made against appropriations for this United States Employment Service I have nevertheless saved the people to this date the enormous sum of $11,833,808.10, for in the last deficiency bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress was appropriated $1,800,000, and the Gallivan amendment sought to give this service $10,033,808.10 additional, which was knocked out on my point of order against it, the two making a total of $11,833,808.10 of proposed appropriations failing to pass, and against which, through the fight I have made in an effort to have audited and cleaned up this service before appropriating more money for it, it has thus far gotten only the $272,000 and this last proposed $400,000. You will see that I have thus far saved $11,833,808.10 for the people, even if we allow this $400,000.

The chairman of the committee will remember that in the hearings on the last deficiency bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress, just before adjournment, Mr. Densmore, the director general, stated that he had on hand unexpended out of previous appropriations on February 1, 1919, the sum of $1,543,400. This sum, together with the $272,000 allowed by the Senate the other day, makes $1,815,400 granted the service for which we have had no report whatever.

Now, the question arises whether, in view of the fact that many witnesses from that department, some of whom are still employed there, are willing to testify before any committee that the funds of that department are wastefully and extravagantly expended, that there are numerous employees who theretofore had been drawing salaries of from $1,100 to $1,200 a year under civil service, were placed on the roll in this department under blanket appropriations at salaries ranging from $2,500 to $5,500 a year, I think it would be strange indeed for this Congress, without any further investigation or any further auditing of that department, to allow this $400,000 more, when it was stated here the other day, when the $272,000 was allowed, that it was allowed merely to help this department wind up its business.

I call the chairman's attention further to the fact that there has been no service by the United States Employment Bureau throughout our districts since Congress adjourned. The employment service has been handled by our local chambers of commerce without a dollar of cost of this Government in most of the districts of this Nation.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands the regular order. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I reserved the right to object for the purpose of asking the chairman some questions. Of course the regular order will deprive me of that privilege.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman mean that he objects? The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, to object would prevent this sundry civil appropriation bill from passing before the new fiscal year begins to-morrow, and because of that I do not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands the regular order. Of course the gentleman can not reserve the right to object.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Texas can bring this up under the head of instructions after I get unanimous consent, if he wants to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. MONDELL. I wish that would be withdrawn for a moment. I would like to have some information in regard to the action of the Senate.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] how much the Senate——

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood the gentleman from California demanded the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman arose in his place and said that he withdrew it.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I presume I still have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Nobody had the floor.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the regular order. The question is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. GOOD. They have not been appointed yet.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas will state his motion.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to move for certain instructions to these conferees, and as a basis for that motion I desire to call the attention of the House to a few little instances connected with this $400,000 item.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the conferees to be appointed on the part of the House be instructed to insist on the elimination of the Senate amendment providing for $400,000 for the Labor Department to expend on the Employment Service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas submits a motion, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BLANTON. On that I would like to be heard a moment.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman give the number of the amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. This bill has not yet been printed, and I have not had access to it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has the papers. He can tell the number of that amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. It is toward the last of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The bill has not been printed, anyway, has it?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it has been printed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to instruct the conferees on the part of the House to insist on the elimination of Senate amendment No. 91 to the bill, appropriating $400,000 for the Department of Labor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order on the motion that it is not in the proper form.

Mr. BLANTON. My motion was that the conferees be instructed to disagree to that amendment, No. 91, as I understand. I desire to be heard on my motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. To instruct the conferees to disagree?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to see if we can agree with the gentleman as to time. I am perfectly willing that there shall be some discussion of the matter, but the gentleman knows that we have five conference reports that we want to act on to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. I desire only 15 minutes. This is an important matter.

Mr. GOOD. Let us have 15 minutes, and I will take 5 minutes and the gentleman can have 10. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto——

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I desire to inquire of the Speaker whether or not it would be in order to make a motion to instruct the conferees before the conferees have been appointed?

The SPEAKER. That is the time when it should be made.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NOLAN. Has the conference report been laid before the House?

The SPEAKER. Not the conference report. The bill is before the House. There is no conference report.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all debate on amendment No. 91 and the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] be limited to 20 minutes, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas and the remaining one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the debate on amendment No. 91 and the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas and 10 minutes by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Texas in order after debate?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not want any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on account of my time being limited I ask not to be interrupted.

I realize that I shall not be able to prevent the appropriation of this $400,000. I know that on this item I will vote in a hopeless minority. I feel it my duty, however, to call your attention to some chronological facts.

In hearings had before the last Congress adjourned Mr. John B. Densmore admitted that on February 1, 1919, he still had on hand unexpended the sum of $1,543,400. Since Congress adjourned the employment service in the States has been handled by local chambers of commerce and State agencies without receiving any money from Mr. Densmore. In what way has Mr. Densmore expended this $1,543,400? He has made no report of same whatever. Yet the other day the Senate gave Mr. Densmore $272,000 more. This was another rider on an appropriation bill. Now the Senate asks us to give Mr. Densmore an additional $400,000. Again it is by the rider route on an appropriation bill.

How many of my colleagues are familiar with the statement made by Auditor Burroughs on page 936 of the RECORD? Let me call your attention to it again:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 9, 1919.*

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
United States Representative, City.

DEAR SIR: Answering, as requested, in detail your specific inquiries, will state:

My name is Charles H. Burroughs; live at 221 B Street NE.; am now one of the auditors in the United States Shipping Board, employed in room 1046, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

First, I would like to state that in answering your inquiries I am not volunteering information; that I am dependent upon my position for a livelihood, and hope that you will not cause me to lose my position with the Government.

You are correct in stating that formerly I was Chief of Transportation and Revolving Fund Section of the United States Employment Service. I voluntarily left such position.

Relative to your inquiry concerning record of travel vouchers of Special Representative Luther C. Steward for the months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1918, wherein Mr. Steward claimed and there was allowed to him for travel expense: For July, $134.45; for August, $127.25; for September, $87.50; for October, $113.25; for November, $120.50; and for December, 1918, $127.50, per vouchers numbered, respectively, 197, 2450, 6248, 9656, 14331, and 18495. I am familiar with such departmental matters. Numerous parties connected with the service were furnished with transportation books containing printed requests and stubs in same, and such parties would present such requests, filled out by them, to the railroads and get transportation, and their books, with the stubs, were supposed to be returned to the department. The claim of Mr. Steward was in addition to such transportation furnished by the railroads. Thousands of dollars were absolutely wasted in this way. I doubt whether one-third of these books were ever returned and filed with the department. It can not be shown that it was necessary for Mr. Steward to make these trips. He was receiving in the neighborhood of $3,500 or more from the Government and at the same time drew about $2,750 from the Employees' Union, and for a time, at least, his wife worked in the Munition Building at about $1,100. If this service is properly audited it will be found that thousands of vouchers were issued in irregular and unnecessary transportation, and it will also be found that there were numerous details made from stations merely to enable parties to draw their $4 per diem in addition to their salaries and travel transportation. It was wholly unnecessary for Mr. Hibbard and Mr. Harry H. Stone to take that expensive trip to France. Mr. Harry S. Parks took many unnecessary trips at great expense. Relative to the transportation voucher and three Pullman tickets issued to Miss Jeannette Densmore, sister of the director general, from New York to Atlantic City on July 4, 1918, and the return by Miss Densmore from Atlantic City to New York on July 7, 1918, will state that is only one of hundreds of such trips such agents took on the expense of the Government. In my opinion, the business management of the whole department was rotten. Answering your inquiry, will state that, in my judgment, had Congress allowed the proposed $10,000,000 appropriation requested in February that at least two-thirds of same would have been wasted. It would be a waste of public money for Congress to allow this United States Employment Service any more appropriations until the whole service has been properly audited and investigated and reorganized on proper business lines. It has been continually stated that much has been done and is being done for the returning soldier. Reports of this work are padded and is mostly propaganda, as I do not believe that returning soldiers have received any benefit from the great bulk of the enormous expenditures wasted by this service. I was absolutely disgusted with the system and practice.

Answering your inquiry, I believe that you can depend upon Mr. J. Stuart Brand, of 1477 Newton Street NW., and Mr. J. E. Leemon, now employed by the Federal income tax, to tell what they know about this service.

If the department is properly investigated, Congress will be astounded at the revelation awaiting accounting.

Very sincerely, yours,

CHARLES H. BURROUGHS.

P. S.—If you can get him to do so, Mr. Lynn could give you some very valuable information.

And since she has testified before the committee, let me also call your attention to the statement of Miss Lilestone:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 9, 1919.*

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: While I am willing to tell a congressional committee what I know concerning the waste of public money in the United States Employment Service, I would prefer for you not to make my name public, as I am dependent upon employment for a living.

With regard to your inquiry, will state that it is my firm belief that it would be almost impossible for any person not a member of some union to obtain desirable employment through this service, as that is almost one of the first questions asked, "Are you a member of the union, and, if not, are you willing to join the Employees' Union?" I do hope that Congress will not give this service another dollar until it has been properly investigated. I will go before any committee, if my evidence is necessary, to assist the administration in cleaning up this department.

Very truly,

J. RAYNES LILESTONE.

You will remember that following the above I charged on the floor of the House that on July 4, 1918, Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, the sister of Director John B. Densmore, went from New York to Atlantic City, and procured Pullman reservations for three people, taking two other persons with her, and that on July 7, 1918, she returned from Atlantic City to New York, with one Pullman reservation.

On June 24, 1919, Mr. Densmore had the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to print in the RECORD, pages 1712–

1713, a statement from Secretary Wilson, of the Department of Labor, and also a statement from Director Densmore himself.

After stating "I make no hesitancy in stating that I am a trades-unionist myself; I believe in trades-unionism," Secretary Wilson admitted: "When the demand for ship workers and shipbuilders came from Seattle our employees in the interior of the country said to those who were applicants for employment that 'it is not advisable to go to Seattle unless you are either a union man or willing to join the union.'" He admitted that the Employment Service made that statement, that it is making it now, and that it will continue to make it, under like conditions, and he further said: "If there was an industrial dispute in existence we would not be the agency through which labor could be furnished to that industrial dispute."

In his statement Mr. Densmore admitted that on July 4, 1918, on Government transportation, his sister, Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, went from New York to Atlantic City, and that two ladies not connected with the Government went with her, but stated that Miss Densmore paid her Pullman transportation herself, that the other two young ladies paid both their railroad and Pullman transportation, and that no part of same was paid by the Government. Concerning his alleged investigation of the Thomas J. Mooney case Mr. Densmore said:

In the meantime when I returned to Washington, in November, 1917, I was, as before mentioned, asked to take charge of the establishment and direction of the United States Employment Service, and I resigned as solicitor to do so. This new work engaged all my time, and it was not until the middle of October, 1918, that I found myself able to leave this work even for a few weeks to go to San Francisco and assist the district attorney in the prosecution of the cases. I was then Director General of the United States Employment Service, but I went to San Francisco at that time solely for the purpose of assisting in the Government's prosecution of the people indicted as a result of my investigation as solicitor, and not at all for the purposes, as universally charged, "to investigate the Mooney case." Such investigation as was made was carried on by the two inspectors of the department who remained in San Francisco, and no person connected with the United States Employment Service had anything to do with it.

The investigation was practically finished when I arrived in San Francisco last October to assist the United States attorney in the trials, and the report of the investigators was transmitted by me to the Secretary of Labor. Unfortunately some of this report fell into the hands of the publisher of a local paper, who published it without any authority whatever.

On this same date, June 24, the Joint Committee on Labor authorized me to bring witnesses before its hearings the next day, and I immediately caused the following notice to be sent to the named employee of the United States Employment Service:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 24, 1919.*

Mr. STANLEY R. LYNN,
United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The joint session of the Senate and House Committees on Labor have authorized me to present before such session to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 201, Senate Office Building, certain evidence.

I respectfully request that you kindly appear there at that time, as I desire to interrogate you concerning certain business of your department.

Kindly bring with you the following documents:

(1) The record card of travel for Luther C. Steward for months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1918.

(2) Request for transportation No. L51736, signed by Jeanette V. Densmore July 4, 1918, from New York to Atlantic City, N. J., and the three Pullman coupons attached thereto, numbered, respectively, as follows:

Office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5071; office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5072; and office No. 2357, Form 2, No. 5073, all of same being from New York to Atlantic City, issued July 4, 1918.

(3) Request for transportation No. L51737, signed by Jeanette V. Densmore July 7, 1918, from Atlantic City, N. J., to New York, and the Pullman coupon thereto attached—office No. 2304, Form 43, No. 6206—from Atlantic City, N. J., to New York, July 7, 1918.

(4) Voucher No. 30682, travel expense, Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, for $747.33; trip begun about September 3, 1918. I might add that I have personally inspected the above, and they should be easily found in your department.

I will ask you also to be prepared to tell what you know concerning about $300 collected by Mr. Harry Parks, personnel section, official station, Washington, for trips he took away.

Also please investigate voucher No. 20479 for $13.75 to Lillian Haberkost, Akron, Ohio, December 12, 1918, and voucher No. 27137 for $12.70 to Lillian Haberkost, Akron, Ohio, March 6, 1919.

Kindly investigate voucher for $15.10, giving reason of S. Tyson Kinsell to go to his home in Philadelphia.

Hoping that you will kindly comply with the foregoing requests, I am,

Very truly, yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Promptly on Wednesday morning, June 25, 1919, I appeared at the committee rooms and had present there ready to testify the following witnesses: Miss Mary Cunningham, Miss J. Raynes Lilestone, Stanley R. Lynn, Charles H. Burroughs, Mr. E. P. Le Phron, and Mr. Patrick L. Collins. I had barely met two of these witnesses, and before the hearing began called two of them aside, and while talking to them one called my attention to a man who had come within a short distance of us standing with his back to us and undoubtedly purposely eavesdropping, the witness whispering to me that such party was an agent of Densmore's and was named O'Leary. I promptly moved the fellow. Two of the witnesses further called my attention to the fact that Director General Densmore, with some of his domineering chiefs, was present, and that it would be awfully embarrassing to testify against him, as he might cause them to engage in a physical encounter and would cause them to lose their Government positions. Several had never given testimony anywhere before.

After stating that she taught school in Texas, had never belonged to a union until after she was employed in the War Risk Insurance Bureau, Miss Cunningham stated that she now belonged to a union, and when I sought to have her state why she joined a union the following objection was made by a member of the committee:

Mr. MACCRATE. I object to that, Mr. Chairman, on these grounds: If we are going to take up personal reasons and other reasons why girls join different associations, we will never finish here in this world. They may bring in girls from any one of the other departments and take up the time of this committee.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the only question that I desire to ask this witness, and I will say this, that she was induced to join one of them upon representations that that was the only way by which she could hold her position.

And Mr. MACCRATE's objection was sustained, and the committee would not let her answer. She would have testified that she was compelled to join the employees' union, parties stating to her that only by such action could she hold her position.

I then put on the stand Miss J. Raynes Lilestone, of Indianapolis, Ind., but formerly of Richmond, Va., and I requested permission to put in the record a number of indorsements certifying to Miss Lilestone's standing and credibility, one from a United States Senator, and two from appellate judges, but both the chairman and Mr. MACCRATE of the committee objected, even though I then asserted that I felt satisfied Mr. Densmore would in some way try to break down the testimony of all witnesses appearing against him, and stated:

Mr. BLANTON. But I can not come back and refute the testimony that they will bring out. I have but a short time to appear before this committee, only two hours this morning. I do not expect to come before the committee any more, as I am very, very busy, and I can not be here to hear their testimony and introduce testimony to refute it. May I not leave these letters with the committee, with the understanding that if her standing is attacked that the committee will look after that and allow them to go in?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, if her standing is attacked, we will allow you to put them in.

I insert the following excerpts from Miss Lilestone's testimony to show that at least one employee in the Department of Labor lost her position by refusing to join a union:

Mr. BLANTON. Were you employed by the Labor Department, Miss Lilestone?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. When?

Miss LILESTONE. In the month of—I began my services during the month of September.

Mr. BLANTON. When?

Miss LILESTONE. September 16, to be exact. No; it was September 12.

Mr. BLANTON. The 12th?

Miss LILESTONE. The 12th.

Mr. BLANTON. And after entering your employment, state whether or not you were asked by anyone—state whether or not you were requested to join a union.

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And what answer did you make to them?

Miss LILESTONE. I told them that I did not think it was necessary for me to join a union. The question was asked if I was a member of organized labor, and I told them no.

Mr. CASEY. What is that?

Miss LILESTONE. I told them no, that I did not think it was necessary in order to keep my Government position.

Mr. BLANTON. And what other statement, if any, was made to you?

Miss LILESTONE. The statement was made that in order to have a safe position that I would be compelled to join the union.

Mr. BLANTON. It was in the Labor Department?

Miss LILESTONE. It was in the Labor Department; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And you refused to join the union?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And when did you leave——

Mr. CASEY (interrupting). Who asked you that?

Miss LILESTONE. Really, I could not recall.

Mr. BLANTON. Was it a man or a woman employee?

Miss LILESTONE. Several of them asked me, but I gave it very little attention.

Mr. CASEY. Was it anybody in the Labor Department? Was it the Secretary of Labor or the General Director—the Director General?

Miss LILESTONE. No; it was not.

Mr. CASEY. Was it anybody of authority?

Miss LILESTONE. It was nobody in authority that I know of.

Mr. NOLAN. Were you working for the Employment Service System of the branch of the Department of Labor?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. NOLAN. And who was your superior officer?

Miss LILESTONE. The superior was Roger Babson, but he was not there during the time that I was employed.

Mr. NOLAN. What branch of the service was it?

Miss LILESTONE. It was the educational—the Bureau of Education.

Mr. NOLAN. And is it connected with the United States Employment Service?

Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. How long did you work there after that?

Miss LILESTONE. I worked, not quite, I would say, just about a month. I received my dismissal, the letter was dated on the 9th and I received my dismissal; it was dated on the 9th and I received it on the 11th.

Mr. BLANTON. Of what month?
Miss LILESTONE. October.
Mr. NOLAN. You were there just one month?
Miss LILESTONE. You have the letter there, Mr. BLANTON. I think that I gave it to you.
Mr. BLANTON. You have a document here from the Civil Service Commission which shows that you made a rating of 81?
Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.
Mr. HERSEY. Let us see the letter of dismissal. What does it state?
Mr. BLANTON. Here is your dismissal, signed by Mr. S. J. Gompers, chief clerk, and there is your dismissal [handing letters to Miss Lilestone].
Mr. BLANTON. Please read the dismissal.
Miss LILESTONE. "October 10, 1918. Miss J. Raynes Lilestone. By direction of the acting chief of the service, your services as clerk at $1,100 per annum in the industrial plants position have been discontinued, effective at the close of October 9, 1918. Robert C. Starr, chief clerk, Information and Education Service."
This gentleman, as I understand it, is a member of the union.
Mr. BLANTON. Did you go to see that gentleman after you received that letter?
Miss LILESTONE. I did; and he said that he had orders from the department head to dismiss me.
Mr. BLANTON. And then did you ask him the reason for your dismissal, Miss Lilestone?
Miss LILESTONE. I asked him the reason for my dismissal, and if you gentlemen will just let me explain, they never gave me a chance.
Senator KENYON. Do you mean that when you first went there they never gave you a chance?
Miss LILESTONE. I beg your pardon.
Senator KENYON. Do you mean that they never gave you a chance from the time that you went there?
Miss LILESTONE. They never gave me an opportunity. Of course, I knew I made good.
Senator KENYON. Then, what do you mean by saying that they never gave you a chance?
Miss LILESTONE. They never gave me any reasons why such a dismissal was sent; they never gave me a hearing or anything of that kind.
Mr. BLANTON. And right after that you were employed by the commission on training camp activities in the War Department?
Miss LILESTONE. Just shortly after, in fact the very following week; I saw that my means were very limited on account of the conditions existing here and I made an application to the administration, the Railroad Administration, and I received a position, beginning at a salary of $1,500 per year, but on account of my physical condition, due to the experience that I had undergone—that is, the humiliation part of it; it was not the question of work, but it was the humiliation part of it—I broke down and taken ill, and I was compelled to go into the hospital. When I came out I made application to the War Camp Activities——
Mr. BLANTON. Let me read that: "January 14, 1919. To whom it may concern: This is to certify that Miss J. Raynes Lilestone has worked in the accounting office of the Commission on Training Camp Activities, from December 11 to January 11, 1919, upon a special piece of work which is now completed, and we are therefore giving Miss Lilestone a release. Her work for the Commission on Training Camp Activities has been very satisfactory. Chester C. Waters, chief accountant."
Now, Miss Lilestone, after that you had an appointment from the War Department, the Purchase, Storage and Traffic Division, General Staff, dated March 21, giving you employment at $1,100?
Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.
Mr. BLANTON. When did you cease to be employed by the War Department? You were employed by the War Department up to when?
Miss LILESTONE. Up to the 23d.
Mr. BLANTON. The 23d of June?
Miss LILESTONE. Yes, sir.
Mr. BLANTON. Now, Miss Lilestone, I will ask you, while you were working for this War Department, if any person who purported to be interested in organized labor and who had previously known you in the Labor Department when you worked there had occasion to see you working in the War Department and have a conversation with you; and if so, state who it was and when it occurred?
Miss LILESTONE. I was sitting at my desk, and I was approached by a lady who I did not recognize immediately, and she says, "What are you doing here?" I said, "Why, I have a perfect right to be here. I am under civil service." She said, "Are you a member of the employees' league?" I said, "I am not." Then I said to her, "What is your name?" I thought perhaps she was one of the members of the department there. She said, "I was with the Federal Employment Service." I did not remember her. I said, "I do not know your name." I said, "What is your name?" She said, "I can not tell you." Then she disappeared from the room. A gentleman in charge there——
Mr. BLANTON. Now, just a minute, in that connection. During that conversation did she give you any information of whether or not you would be permitted to remain in the War Department?
Miss LILESTONE. Well, she intimated, she——
Mr. MACCRATE. Not what she intimated; tell us what she said. What did she say?
Miss LILESTONE. Well, she said it would be safer to be a member of the employees' union, but I paid very little attention to it, because those things—I thought that the Government would take care of its employees without having to join an organization in this country.
Mr. BLANTON. You are out of a position right now, are you?
Miss LILESTONE. Yes.
Mr. BLANTON. And you are dependent on working for a living?
Miss LILESTONE. I am.
Mr. NOLAN. Before the lady leaves the witness stand, I think that the—she has intimated that she thought the United States Employment Service had agents around these departments. Now, Mr. Chairman, is it fair to permit questions affecting the service? If it is, I think it also fair to permit the service, or those representing the service, to defend themselves and cross-examine the witness.
Mr. BLANTON. I have no objections.
Mr. NOLAN. No; you shouldn't have any objections; it is not for you to have objections. It is a matter for this committee to decide, and I ask that the other side be entitled to cross-examine the witness if they care to. I believe Mr. Densmore is here.
Mr. MACCRATE. I do not think that any cross-examination is necessary, so far as this witness is concerned.
Mr. NOLAN. Well, one of her last statements was that the United States Employment Service had agents throughout the departments——
Mr. MACCRATE. But they can meet that statement when they go on the stand.
Mr. NOLAN. I ask that the representative of the Employment Service, if he so desires, be permitted to cross-examine this witness.
Senator KENYON. If the witness wants to say something, she may do so.
Miss LILESTONE. I was asked by Grace Porter Hopkins, who is superintendent of the Woman's Division of the Employment Bureau, and her story is a lengthy one, if you want to listen to it now. She asked me if I was a member of the employees' league, and I told her no, and she said that "it would be safer for you to become a member of it."

Mr. E. P. Le Phron testified that he had been employed by the Phœnix Construction Co. and the Atlantic Loading Co., and as their labor employment agent he did not charge laborers for placing them, but was stopped by the United States Employment Service from soliciting them, except at his plant, although he had been getting 150 men per day. But finally by agreeing to give the Employment Service credit for it, he procured himself 1,500 men per month out of Philadelphia and sent his cards to the Employment Service, giving them the credit for it, and stated that if you would appoint him Federal Director of the United States Employment Service he could elect the next President of the United States, there was such great power attached to the office.

I then offered Mr. Stanley R. Lynn as a witness, but before going into his testimony proper objection was made after the following occurred:

STATEMENT OF STANLEY R. LYNN.

Mr. BLANTON. May I show the committee the extent of the propaganda that has been sent out under the signature of the Federal director's office? I would like to put an excerpt into the record.
The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to put that in here? I do not think you want to.
Mr. BLANTON. It won't take me more than two minutes.
The CHAIRMAN. You are surely opening the door there to a great mass of testimony. I suggest that that is not a part of the case, and we can get along without it——
Mr. BLANTON. It is in behalf of this particular bill.
The CHAIRMAN. Why, there is so much of that. I have received lots of letters that are really stereotype.
Mr. BLANTON. I mean over the signature of the Federal director.
The CHAIRMAN. If you want to ask the witness any questions, you may do it.
Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Lynn, what position do you hold here in Washington? What position are you in in Washington?
Mr. LYNN. I am working in the transportation section.
Mr. BLANTON. Of what service?
Mr. LYNN. Employment Service. I used to be in the correspondence section, assistant chief and acting.
Mr. BLANTON. Mr. John B. Densmore is your employer, is he not, the Director General?
Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.
Mr. BLANTON. Yesterday I sent you this notice—

Submitting to the witness a copy of my letter of June 24, heretofore in the RECORD—

Mr. BLANTON. First, as to the traveling record of Mr. Luther C. Steward, for the months of July, August, September, October, November, and December, 1918.
Mr. MACCRATE. Was not the first question, if you received this communication?
Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.
Mr. BLANTON. Did you comply with the request that I made?
Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.
Mr. BLANTON. Have you the travel cards of Luther C. Steward?
Mr. MACCRATE. I think that we are going beyond anything that this committee will have to consider. I do not think that we should go into that.
The CHAIRMAN. I have been contending for that right along.
Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Chairman, here are people accused of improper use of money inside of an organization. This has nothing to do with the organization itself. The machine may be all right, but the mechanic using it may be all wrong, and if we are going to take evidence in detail here as to how money was spent in going to Philadelphia and all that sort of thing I do not think that we will ever finish.
Mr. BLANTON. May I call the attention of the committee to the fact that on yesterday in the House of Representatives, Mr. John B. Densmore, Federal Director for the United States Employment Service, caused to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by himself, where he denies flatly that Miss Jeanette V. Densmore got three Pullman transportations at Atlantic City, or rather at New York, on July 4 to Atlantic City, and when I can show the number of those three Pullman transportation coupons, so that they can be identified by the railroad company, by a question asked this witness only a few days ago, that they were attached to the statement of a traveling voucher, signed by Miss Densmore, and that they were inspected by me and this witness, does it not bear upon this inquiry where the record of a department is put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at no later date than yesterday, and where those three coupons have been taken out of that department within the last few days, and they were attached to the traveling statement and can not be found at this time, do you mean to say that this committee is not interested in that testimony?
The CHAIRMAN. You have a resolution looking toward an investigation of that very question.
Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about whether or not we ought to pass this bill now.
Mr. HERSEY. What jurisdiction has the committee of this?
The CHAIRMAN. I do not see any.
Mr. BLANTON. I think that it is very close, because under this bill the employment service will stay in existence.
The CHAIRMAN. Maybe we will put such restrictions on it——
Mr. BLANTON. But there are no such restrictions in the bill now.
The CHAIRMAN. But the committee has not reported out the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. That is my purpose right now, to get this committee to put in the proper restrictions. Otherwise I have wasted my time——

The CHAIRMAN. What is the wish of the committee?

Mr. MACCRATE. I move you, Mr. Chairman, that the testimony be not allowed at this time, because it does not seem to be worth our while to go into the matter of payments for clerks, and so on. The question before us is whether we ought to have a bureau——

Mr. BLANTON (interrupting). And I want to call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that my testimony has disappeared, some of it, from this department, and I have had this witness bring before us testimony showing the sum of $737.33 collected by Miss Densmore through travel, for travel, when I am sure that there was no occasion for it. As I stated, three of these Pullman vouchers have disappeared. How are we to know that the balance of this testimony will not disappear in the future. I ask the committee, in order to establish a permanent record, and they are important records, to make a permanent record at this time. This young man has to take these papers back and file them in this department. This committee has no right to keep them here, and the very minute that they are taken back in those files and the very minute they are taken back to those files we have lost jurisdiction over them. They can be destroyed and wiped out.

Mr. Speaker, I have put the foregoing details in the RECORD to show whether it is an easy matter or not to get evidence before our Committee on Labor, for the committee would let me go no further, and I sent all my witnesses home.

Later that afternoon a member of the committee told me that I would be permitted to put my witnesses on the next day at 10 a. m. Being very busy in the House until it adjourned, and some of the witnesses living 5 miles away and scattered, it took me half the night to find them and notify them to be at the hearing.

On the next morning, June 26, Mr. Lynn resumed the stand, stating that he had been in the Department of Labor nine years, and, among other things, testified:

Mr. BLANTON. Did you bring those documents, Mr. Lynn?

Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir; I have them here.

Mr. BLANTON. This is a claim of $747, gentlemen; this is a voucher showing a claim of $747.33, made by Jeanette V. Densmore, for reimbursement of that amount which she claims she expended in travel, and so on, and I want to get that into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be allowed to be put into the record.

And witness produced voucher No. 30682, showing that on check No. 74182 the United States Employment Service paid to Miss Jeanette V. Densmore $742.48 for travel, which covered Montana, California, Colorado, Texas, Florida, and various other States, covering railroad and Pullman fare, taxicabs, tips to porters of all kinds; and while she asked for $747.33 she was paid only $742.48, because under regulation she was limited to 25 cents for a tip to porters, although she was allowed $5 covering autostage from Missoula to Polsom, Mont., at which place she formerly lived, which $5 is shown by the following:

MARCH 14, 1919.

From: Director General.
To: Jeanette V. Densmore, Assistant Chief Women's Work, United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Special authority.

1. In conformity with expense account submitted by you for the period September 3, 1918, to February 23, 1919, amount $747.33, authority is hereby granted covering the expenditure by you of $5 for auto stage from Missoula to Folsom, Mont., it being noted that no other means of transportation was available at the time and that the hiring of this automobile saved one day's time.

2. In view of the fact that you failed to secure a receipt covering this service in support of your claim for reimbursement, as provided for in section 4 of the travel regulations, this requirement in this instance is waived.

3. These expenses are properly chargeable to the appropriation "War Emergency Employment Service, 1919," and in order to expedite payment of the account a copy of this authority has been attached to the voucher.

_____,
Acting Director General.

Approved.

_____,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the witness a few questions now. Are these documents you have brought here official documents?

Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CASEY. Official documents of the Department of Labor?

Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CASEY. And by whose authority did you take them out?

Mr. LYNN. I took them out by letter of authority.

Mr. CASEY. A letter of authority from whom?

Mr. LYNN. From Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. CASEY. And is that the only authority you had to take official documents from the files of the Department of Labor?

Mr. LYNN. Yes; but I considered that sufficient.

Mr. BLANTON. Have you that letter that I wrote to you?

Mr. LYNN. Yes; I have it here.

No. L–51736—did you bring that?

Mr. LYNN. I have.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Lynn, do you remember the time that I called your attention to the fact that I would like to have you make copies of these numbers of these Pullman tickets pinned to this business?

Mr. LYNN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, look at these numbers—are they the numbers of the Pullman tickets that were attached to that?

Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. State whether or not there were three such Pullman tickets.

Mr. LYNN. I had them going through my hands. I remember them going through my hands.

Mr. BLANTON. Up to what time—about what time did you know that they were in the office attached to this transportation; about how long ago?

Mr. LYNN. Two and a half weeks ago; somewhere around there.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Lynn, when I requested you the other day to bring this transportation voucher, together with those three Pullman tickets that were pinned to it, what did you find?

Mr. LYNN. I found them just as they are, without any check on them.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us see that; do you see where the tickets were pinned to it?

Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. The pin pricks are still in it where the tickets had been attached?

Mr. LYNN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you know what became of them?

Mr. LYNN. No; but I was advised on good authority that they were around there looking for this transportation request.

Mr. BLANTON. You were advised by good authority that they were around there looking for this transportation request?

Mr. LYNN. Yes; and so they must have taken the tickets off, I presume.

Mr. CASEY. You say you were advised by good authority. What do you mean by good authority?

Mr. LYNN. By the authority of the persons in the office there.

Mr. CASEY. Who were they?

Mr. LYNN. Mr. Page, of the transportation section.

And, gentlemen of the House, not to prolong the matter, Stanley R. Lynn testified that the travel voucher No. L–51736, from New York to Atlantic City, signed by Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, up to about two and a half weeks ago had attached to it three Pullman coupons numbered, respectively, Office No. 2357, Form 2, Nos. 5071, 5072, and 5073, all issued July 4, 1918, from New York to Atlantic City; and that travel voucher No. L–51737, from Atlantic City back to New York, had attached to it Pullman coupon office No. 2304, Form 43, No. 6206, issued July 7, 1918, from Atlantic City to New York, said voucher signed by Miss Jeanette V. Densmore, and that since two and a half weeks ago said four Pullman coupons disappeared.

It so happened that when I first inspected said vouchers I put an identification mark on them, and here are the two vouchers now that were produced by Mr. Lynn, and they have my identification mark on them yet.

Now, how does Mr. Densmore get around the matter? The next day, with no one prosecuting him present, he produced before the committee duplicate copies of these vouchers Nos. L–51736 and L–51737, and also produced the four Pullman coupons, showing that some one for him had theretofore, just as Lynn stated, disattached them from the other copies of these vouchers, and that he did not produce them until I forced him to by giving such minute description that the railroad company could identify the transaction by its stubs.

And the only explanation for said four Pullman coupons being attached, three from New York to Atlantic City attached to one, and the fourth attached to the voucher from Atlantic City back to New York, which John B. Densmore could give was that his sister had not traveled much and he supposed that when the three girls handed their Pullman tickets to the conductor he must have handed them all back to his sister and she just attached them to her voucher. He admitted, however, that his sister collected $13.46 for the trip when the railroad fare one way was $1.25 and the Pullman fare one way was 98 cents, hence my colleagues can figure the matter up for themselves.

Mr. Lynn further testified that Harry Parks, with official station in Washington, collected about $300 for trips away from here; also that on voucher No. 20489 Miss Lillian Haberkost collected $13.75 for trip to her home in Akron, Ohio, December 12, 1918, and again, on voucher No. 27137, collected $12.70 March 6, 1919, for a second trip home. Also that S. Tyson Kinsell collected $15.10 to go to his home in Philadelphia. On the preceding day Mr. Lynn brought the travel voucher of Luther C. Steward showing that for months of July, August, September, October, November, and December last he collected over $700 for travel in addition to his salary. The following from last Saturday's Washington Times (June 28, 1919) shows what kind of trips Mr. Luther C. Steward takes, and whether they are on Government business:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' HEAD RETURNS FROM MEETING.

Luther C. Steward, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, returned to-day from New Orleans, where he attended the annual meeting and festival of local No. 22 of the federation. Mr. Steward was the guest of honor at a banquet tendered him, and he was presented with a handsome gavel.

As president of a union, of course, he has to travel over the United States. And after bemeaning Stanley R. Lynn, one of his employees, for testifying against him, Mr. John B. Densmore stated before the committee that in all its history the Employment Service never had more than seven men getting around $4,000, and that Mr. Lynn had lied in stating that there were more. Now, let us see who is right. The following is the

list of employees Mr. Densmore gave in the hearing on the deficiency bill as existing February 1, 1919:

United States Employment Service—Salaries, administrative office, Feb. 5, 1919.

Title.	Number.	Rate.	Total.
Director general	1	$6,000	$6,000
Assistant director general	1	5,500	5,500
Assistant to director general	1	5,000	5,000
Do	2	3,500	7,000
Special assistant to director general	1	3,500	3,500
Assistant to director general	2	4,000	8,000
Do	1	3,500	3,500
Special representative	5	3,500	17,500
Do	2	3,000	6,000
Do	3	2,500	7,500
Special agent	1	4,000	4,000
Do	1	3,650	3,650
Do	4	3,500	14,000
Do	10	3,000	30,000
Do	10	2,500	25,000
Do	4	2,400	9,600
Do	5	2,250	11,250
Do	2	2,000	4,000
Director of division	4	4,000	16,000
Assistant director of division	1	3,500	3,500
Do	1	3,000	3,000
Assistant to director of division	1	3,600	3,600
Do	2	2,500	5,000
Do	1	2,250	2,250
Do	1	2,100	2,100
Do	1	2,000	2,000
Chief of section	1	4,500	4,500
Do	1	4,000	4,000
Do	1	3,500	3,500
Do	5	3,000	15,000
Do	2	2,700	5,400
Do	2	2,750	5,500
Do	3	2,500	7,500
Do	1	2,400	2,400
Assistant chief of section	2	3,000	6,000
Do	1	2,750	2,750
Do	1	2,500	2,500
Do	1	2,400	2,400
Do	1	1,800	1,800
Disbursing agent	1	2,750	2,750
Secretary (War Labor Policy Board)	1	4,500	4,500
Secretary	1	3,500	3,500
Do	2	3,000	6,000
Do	2	2,000	4,000
Do	1	1,800	1,800
Do	1	1,740	1,740
Do	1	1,500	1,500
Do	1	1,440	1,440
Clerk (senior)	1	2,750	2,750
Do	1	2,620	2,620
Do	8	2,500	20,000
Do	1	2,400	2,400
Do	4	2,250	9,000
Do	1	2,220	2,220
Do	5	2,100	10,500
Do	5	2,000	10,000
Do	2	1,980	3,960
Do	10	1,860	18,600
Do	16	1,800	28,807
Clerk	1	1,740	1,740
Do	1	1,728	1,728
Do	1	1,720	1,720
Do	2	1,680	3,360
Do	14	1,620	22,680
Do	1	1,600	1,600
Do	2	1,560	3,120
Do	36	1,500	54,000
Do	1	1,440	1,440
Do	10	1,400	14,000
Do	23	1,380	31,740
Clerk (junior)	61	1,320	80,520
Do	4	1,260	5,040
Do	65	1,200	78,000
Clerk (under)	15	1,100	16,500
Do	12	1,080	12,960
Do	5	1,020	5,100
Do	1	1,000	1,000
Do	1	990	990
Do	1	960	960
Do	4	900	3,600
Do	1	780	780
Do	1	720	720
Do	1	600	600
Do	2	600	1,200
Telegrapher	2	1,600	3,200
Engineer	1	1,440	1,440
Electrician	1	1,320	1,320
Fireman	3	960	2,880
Messenger	2	1,320	2,640
Do	2	1,200	2,400
Do	1	1,080	1,080
Do	1	960	960
Do	6	900	5,400
Do	2	840	1,680
Do	1	780	780
Messenger (junior)	10	720	7,200
Do	7	600	4,200
Do	7	480	3,360
Watchman	1	1,200	1,200
Do	5	900	4,500
Elevator operator	2	900	1,800
Do	1	720	720

United States Employment Service—Salaries, administrative office, Feb. 5, 1919—Continued.

Title.	Number.	Rate.	Total.
Skilled laborer	1	$1,320	$1,320
Do	1	1,140	1,140
Do	9	900	8,100
Do	1	780	780
Janitress	1	840	840
Charwoman	8	312	2,496
SPECIALS.			
Adviser on industrial relations	1	5,000	5,000
Special examiner	1	4,000	4,000
Special camp organizer	1	4,000	4,000
National field organizer	2	3,000	6,000
Do	1	2,400	2,400
Assistant to chairman (War Labor Policy Board)	1	2,750	2,750
Associate director, Boys' Working Reserve	1	2,750	2,750
National director, Boys' Working Reserve	1	2,500	2,500
Assistant to Federal director (in charge of farm labor)	1	2,100	2,100
National director, Women's Land Army	1	2,000	2,000
Assistant Federal State director (Public Service Reserve)	1	1,800	1,800
Director, Negro economics	1	4,380	4,380
Assistant director, Negro economics	1	1,740	1,740
Supervisor of Negro economics	2	1,740	3,480
Total	513		861,214

From July 1, 1918, to December 31, 1918, six months, said Employment Service paid out in—

Salaries	$1,967,962.81
Rent of offices	229,239.11
Per diem expenses	164,380.00
Travel expenses	74,803.19
Furniture, etc	361,495.21
Printing and stationery	172,862.47
Telephone	168,036.79
Miscellaneous	146,498.46

After notice that he even paid a Negro, designated as director Negro economics, $4,380 per year, and was it to curry favor with the Republicans that Mr. Densmore stated that many of his appointees were Republicans?

Again, Mr. Densmore said that Mr. Charles H. Burroughs was in effect fired. The following is an admitted copy of Mr. Burroughs's resignation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 5, 1919.*

Mr. J. B. DENSMORE,
Director General, United States Employment Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I herewith tender my resignation, effective May 15. I regret very much to leave the service with the transportation in the condition that it is, but it is absolutely useless for anyone to attempt to straighten out the entanglement under the antagonistic supervision that has existed since the early part of December.

I am fully aware of all the misrepresentations that have been made to you by those ignorant of the enormous detail attached to this work. The entanglement has been caused by not acquainting the employees of this service as to how transportation should be issued. I will give you a brief outline of the difficulties that I have experienced since entering this service, that no one can discredit unless they make false statements, which appears they have been accustomed to doing.

Prior to my entering this service I was in the general office of a railroad company for the past 20 years, as division chief in charge of accounts, also handling Government transportation issued by all branches of the service, at a salary of $2,700 per year.

I was sought by one of the officials of this service to accept the position as assistant transportation clerk, which I did, at a very much less salary than that mentioned above. I entered upon such duties on August 1.

After carefully going over the situation, I found that there had been no instructions issued, and that transportation was being irregularly issued. I immediately proceeded to draft a general letter of instruction, which received the approval of those that were interested. This proposed letter was held up by one of the officials who had previously approved it, and my repeated efforts for action were fruitless. In the meantime transportation requests were being issued, and a great majority of them covering no charge and many of the charges incorrect.

In the middle of December I was taken sick with influenza, during which time Mr. Steward entered my office, making inquiries concerning expense vouchers that were referred to this office so that transportation could be deducted and proper charges noted on the memorandum copies. There was some accumulation of vouchers at that time, due to not having the memorandum copies of the transportation requests. Ignorance of the duties of this office caused him to make a remark very unbecoming of an official. When I confronted him with it, he made an effort to lie out of it, which he thought he had successfully done. However, I continued to appeal to him for assistance, informing him each time of the importance of clearing up the transportation, and if it were not, that this service would be responsible for a great amount of it. I then received the assistance of Mr. Mellon for a short time, but he was only able to do a certain amount of work, not having other assistance to enable us to go on with it in a satisfactory manner.

He, with the balance of those in the office, was dismissed without a day's notice. Later on there were three clerks of this service, without any knowledge of the work, assigned to me. With them and the return of Mr. Mellon and other necessary help, there could have been considerable accomplished. Mr. Mellon was not permitted to return at that time.

Mr. Mason, upon assuming the duties of the Director of the Control Division, sent for me to come to his office for the purpose of talking over conditions. He informed me that he was aware that I had not

gotten along well with the Control Division. He assured me that he would heartily cooperate in every respect so that this work could be advanced as rapidly as possible. I accepted his remarks, which I considered to have been in good faith, but I have now discovered that he possesses the same small qualifications as his predecessor.

I am frank in saying that this is my first experience in being associated with men of so little ability and principle. They are simply bluffing their game through.

For your information, this transportation is in very bad condition, and it is very different from any other class of transportation that has been issued, and it will require some one that is very familiar with it to finally clear it up. If not, this service will be paying a very large amount that it should not pay.

I am loathe to complain or criticize, but being aware of the misrepresentations to you, I feel that, in justice to myself, I should explain the situation.

CHARLES H. BURROUGHS,
Chief, Transportation Section.

And the following is the letter of acceptance written by John B. Densmore to Mr. Burroughs:

MAY 7, 1919.

Mr. C. H. BURROUGHS,
United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to your resignation dated May 5 recommendation is being made to the department for its acceptance, effective at the close of business on May 15, 1919.

As some one else must assume the responsibility for the continuance of the work you are now doing it is thought advisable to relieve you from duty at once, and annual leave to cover the period up to and including May 15 will also be recommended to the department.

Very truly, yours,

J. B. DENSMORE, *Director General.*

Now, Mr. Densmore testified that Mr. Burroughs was not chief of the transportation section. Please note that in signing his resignation on May 5, 1919, long before any controversy arose, Mr. Burroughs signed as "Chief, Transportation Section," and to his Director General.

And remember again, that in his statement June 24 Mr. Densmore stated that neither he nor anyone connected with the United States Employment Service had ever made any investigation of the Thomas J. Mooney case in California. Please note the following, which he can not deny.

I copy from the San Francisco Call of Saturday, November 23, 1918, on page 1, the following excerpts:

HERE IS TEXT OF DENSMORE REPORT.

Following is the report, in full, of John B. Densmore, Federal Director of Employment, to Secretary of Labor Wilson:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *November 1, 1918.*

HON. W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to instructions received from time to time during the past six months I have the honor to report that I have conducted a secret and altogether informal inquiry into the Mooney case and beg leave to submit herewith the results of my investigation. * * *

The case of the people of the State of California against Thomas J. Mooney et al., charged with perpetrating a bomb outrage in the city of San Francisco during the Preparedness Day parade, on July 22, 1916, thereby causing the deaths of 9 or 10 persons and the injury of numerous others; * * * Mooney and Warren K. Billings were found guilty, Mooney now being under sentence of death. * * *

I had at this time two trusted assistants in San Francisco, and to these I confided my plan of operations. * * * It was absolutely necessary to the success of the operation to install a dictaphone in the office of the district attorney, Mr. Charles M. Fickert. This task was a seemingly impossible one, owing to the fact that Fickert keeps himself barricaded behind double locked doors on the fourth floor of the Hall of Justice, in a private office, to which only one other man has the keys. The full details as to how this dictaphone was finally installed will probably never be divulged. * * * Some idea of the difficulties involved will be gained when it is stated that more than two months of careful and clever work were required before the installation was complete and the machine in actual operation.

Fickert's office in the Hall of Justice is a very large room in the southwest corner of the building, on the topmost floor. (See diagram, Exhibit "A.") It is lighted by two arched windows, one overlooking Portsmouth Square to the west and the other fronting Merchant Street on the south. The district attorney's desk is in the extreme southwest corner of the room, between the two windows. Besides the desk, the room contains a large, oblong table; otherwise there is little furniture. On the floor and table, in picturesque disarray, are countless exhibits alleged to relate to the activities of the I. W. W.'s, the Mooney defendants, and other reputed agitators and dynamiters. For dictaphone purposes the location was by no means an ideal one. * * *

And then, in a report covering several pages of the Call, this renowned Director General of the United States Employment Service, who on said November 1, 1918, was drawing a salary of $6,000 per year, fixed not by Congress but by the Labor Department out of blanket appropriations, and who was presumed to be preparing to find jobs for soldiers, went on to relate the strenuous efforts he made, not to help a district attorney and his Government ferret out and punish crime, but to eavesdrop a district attorney who had convicted an anarchistic dynamiter, for the purpose of trying to assist such dynamiter to escape the law and just punishment.

And, remember, at Atlantic City a few days ago Secretary Wilson stated that he himself was still giving much time to this Mooney case, which the newspapers reported was for the purpose of obtaining a new trial.

Also read the following, copied from the San Francisco Bulletin, issue of December 13, 1918:

This is the "immunity" letter.

Below is what appears to be proof that J. B. Densmore promised immunity to his subordinate, Robert Fergusson, a defendant in the Angel Island graft cases. It is a photographic copy of a letter written on a Government letterhead, signed by Densmore as a Government official, and sent to Fergusson's father:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
IMMIGRATION SERVICE,
November 11, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. FERGUSSON: I hope you will pardon me for not answering your letter of the 3d instant before this time, but the unusual press of official business has prevented me doing so.

I am very happy to confirm your belief that I will look out for the interest of your son Robert. I shall ask that he be given complete immunity as a Government witness. This means, of course, that he will not be required to suffer any punishment imposed by the court. He has, however, been granted no immunity and must rely on my promise to obtain that clemency to which he will be entitled at the proper time. I want to assure you that I have the utmost confidence in him, and I also agree with you that he is honest at heart. If and when this matter is over he will take hold of himself and put this misstep behind him he will go ahead in a straightforward manner with no fear that he will ever again fall by the wayside.

Sincerely,

J. B. DENSMORE,
National Director of Labor Distribution, Washington, D. C.

Mr. M. J. FERGUSSON,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Also read the following:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *June 25, 1919.*

To the honorable REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS:

I hope you will pardon me for addressing you when I do not even know the initials of your name. I am led to do this because of the inclosed newspaper clipping from the Oakland Tribune of this date.

For over 10 years I was an inspector in the United States Immigration Service, Department of Labor, respected by my superiors as a very efficient officer. From 1912 until 1917 I was stationed at Angel Island, San Francisco Harbor, and was there when Densmore was unable to find out who was responsible for about 70 Chinese being smuggled on the steamship *Mongolia*. At that time William Boyce was in charge of the division directly concerned. His assistant went insane. Boyce is to-day a high official in the employment department on this coast.

On July 3, 1917, Densmore called me into his office here and, with Boyce, wanted me to play the tool for him—to confess to meeting an attorney with whom I never came in contact in any way except officially, and that but little. Densmore threatened to have me sent to prison, but I informed him that the right would prevail. The attorney later made an affidavit, prior to his death, that I was responsible for more aliens (for whom he was the attorney) being denied by the office than any other officer, which fact can be verified by the records.

The Fergusson mentioned in the clipping I've kicked out of my office time and time again as untrustworthy. The Akers was caught because he dropped stolen records on my desk, which when found by me were so quickly reported that the guilt was easily placed.

While Densmore was in power he acted like a European autocrat, which he, of course, might do as long as the war was on; but, believe me, I am thankful to be an American; thankful that we have our own representatives, who see to it that such as Densmore are exposed.

Respectfully,

WM. W. THIESS.

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have called your attention to the foregoing, merely in a further effort to convince you that there should be a sweeping investigation made of this United States Employment Service by some committee not aligned and identified with organized labor and upon which there will not be strong labor partisans. I think that such an investigation should be made before we give Mr. Densmore another cent; and if these charges against him are true, he should be dismissed as Director General. He says Lynn has lied. Mr. Stanley R. Lynn is a Royal Arch Mason, in good standing in his lodges. Until he testified against Director Densmore he was a respected employee of Mr. Densmore's department.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN].

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have only five minutes, and in that time I am going to try to cover as well as I can the situation in relation to this man Lynn and the trip of Miss Jeanette Densmore to Atlantic City on the 4th, 5th, and 6th of July last year. I should like to have more time, because I think I could convince the House that there are some things in connection with this that we all ought to know and that ought to be brought out here and will be dealt with fully when the Labor Committee make their report on the bill to make the Employment Service permanent.

Miss Jeanette Densmore, according to the testimony adduced before your Committee on Labor, that has been holding hearings in conjunction with the Senate committee on the Employment Service, went to Atlantic City in July, 1918. It has been testified that Mrs. Neill, the lady in charge of the Employment Service in New York, deputized Miss Jeanette Densmore to go to Atlantic City last July. She left for Atlantic City on the afternoon of the 4th of July at the request of the employment director of the State of New Jersey to go down there to confer with him in regard to the employment of women in the Atlantic City

hotels, the women to be recruited by the New York office of the United States Employment Service. She stayed there on the 5th and 6th and returned to New York on the morning of the 7th. Her whole expense voucher was $13.64. Eight dollars of that was for her subsistence, at $4 a day for two days. There was 96 cents each way for a Pullman parlor-car ticket and 25 cents for the porter each way, 25 cents for baggage from the depot to the hotel and back again. There is an itemized expense voucher that was placed in the record at the joint hearings which covers every cent of that. The gentleman from Texas stated nothing about that. Now, that voucher was for the month of July, 1918. There is not any charge for any extra Pullman service to Atlantic City. The only Pullman item on this expense account is for her Pullman seat to Atlantic City and return for herself. Miss Densmore took two young ladies with her. The two young ladies were daughters of a lady in Washington, who is a clerk in the Employment Service at $1,200 per year. This lady appeared before the committee and testified that she went to the depot in New York and bought the railroad and Pullman tickets for her daughter and another young lady and sent them to Atlantic City with Miss Densmore as chaperone.

She had three going and must have had three coming back. That would be six. There were only three, according to the gentleman, attached to it. Here is what this man Lynn did. He went down there and extracted the transportation vouchers and left the Pullman stubs, and left the entire expense voucher for the month of July that covered every item of expense of this woman. One thing about Miss Densmore is that she happens to be unfortunate or fortunate enough, as the case may be, to be the sister of the Director General of the United States Employment Service, and the attack is made upon her and upon her character on that account. I leave it to this House, and I leave it to you, when I tell you about the witness they brought forth, Mr. Lynn. He took the records from the Department of Labor upon the request of a Member of Congress and brought them to him, and he had these records extracted weeks before the hearings took place and weeks before this thing came up in this House. The man testified that he had tried to get advancement in the Department of Labor; that he had used the influence of Members of this House who are to-day Members of the House in asking them to go to the Department of Labor in his behalf; that he had used the influence of ex-Members of the House and had used a Member of the United States Senate, and he could not get political preferment. He said before the committee that it was impossible to get advancement down there through political influence. That was the man's own statement. The thing I want to tell you about to-day is this: The man was asked this question by myself and by my colleague from New York [Mr. MACCRATE]:

When did you first see Mr. BLANTON?

He said he never saw him until these hearings were held. Five or six times that man was asked that question, and the man denied that he had ever seen Mr. BLANTON, but he finally had to admit, under the questions of the gentleman from New York, that he had conferred with Mr. BLANTON on a number of occasions before these hearings were held before the joint committee, and all the time that this man sat there and lied about these questions the gentleman from west Texas [Mr. BLANTON] sat and heard him.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the gentleman's statement, and the record will not bear him out.

Mr. NOLAN. The record will bear me out. The chairman of the Committee on Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACCRATE], and every other man that sat there will bear me out. Is that right, Judge SMITH?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. Is that right, Mr. MACCRATE?

Mr. MACCRATE. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. That is the truth. This man sat there and lied. The only trouble about him is that he could not get these jobs down there. He was looking for them, and so was Mr. Burroughs, and so were the rest of them. They were not able to take care of them, and they go and extract records and lie, and that is the situation regarding these men and this witness. [Applause.]

The investigation of these charges before the joint committee of the House and Senate during the hearings on the Employment Service bills develops the fact that some of these men, Mr. Lynn in particular, were sore because they did not get some of the high-salaried positions to which men were appointed from the outside. On this account they said the whole service was rotten, but it is apparent that if they could have used their political influence and secured one of the plums everything would have been all right.

In the opinion of every man that sat at the hearings in the Senate Office Building there is absolutely no foundation to the charges against Miss Jeanette Densmore.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is neither the time nor the place to try the Employment Service. I have no manner of doubt that that service has been recklessly extravagant. I have no doubt but that it has indulged in questionable practices. Notwithstanding all that, there is a work in connection with the furnishing of employment to our returning soldiers and others seeking employment that under present conditions the Federal Government must perform, if it is to be performed properly.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. MONDELL. The House committee recommended an appropriation of $200,000. It went out on a point of order. The Senate amendment broadens the provision and increases the appropriation to $400,000. In my opinion, the Senate amendment ought to be agreed to, but in any event we can trust the conferees to settle this matter, and there should be no instructions to disagree with the Senate amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not. I hold no brief for Mr. Densmore or for the Employment Service. I think a great deal of the money out of the $5,272,000 made available for that purpose last year has been recklessly expended; but I want to say to the Members of this House that we have 1,000,000 men to-day in the military service of the United States, and on every ship that comes from abroad carrying American soldiers there is an officer taking the names of the soldiers, finding out the former employment of each one, what he was employed at before entering the service, what he desires to do, and so forth. In order to find a place for these boys we must have a clearing house in Washington. By that organization the job and the man will be brought nearer together. I think the amount here is too much. I think the provision of the Senate bill should place a limitation upon the salaries that are provided for. I do think, however, there should be a clearing house in Washington in order that we may find a place for the discharged soldiers and sailors, and I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Texas will be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute motion, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute motion offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: That the conferees be instructed not to accept the Senate amendment appropriating $400,000 for the United States Employment Service unless the following proviso is inserted in the bill:

"*Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated for this purpose shall be used to pay the salary of any employee who is not an honorably discharged soldier of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, having served during the late war."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, if we indulge in this, we will have to continue that sort of practice. We have five appropriation conference reports to be passed on to-day, and I am compelled to object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The question was taken, and the substitute motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 1, noes 188.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-two Members are present.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a further motion to instruct the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BANKHEAD moves to instruct the House conferees to agree to Senate amendments on page 41 of H. R. 6176, so far as they affect the appropriation provided for in the bill amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. That is not the proper way to instruct conferees in reference to a Senate amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the gentleman that possibly it is not in technical form.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a Member can not interrupt a point of order with a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. STEENERSON. The House has already disagreed by unanimous consent to the amendment——

The SPEAKER. This is another amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have been unable——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Is the gentleman discussing the point of order?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I am discussing my motion.

Mr. GOOD. Time has been limited on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is this the same amendment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This is not the same amendment.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair is in error, and the gentleman from Iowa withdraws his point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, as I stated, I have been unable to secure the number of this particular Senate amendment.

Mr. WALSH. What became of the point of order?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. That the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama is not in proper form.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not made a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. On the gentleman's motion to instruct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the point of order? What is the matter with the motion?

Mr. WALSH. It does not refer to the Senate amendment. He takes the bill as it comes back from the Senate and finds there is something referring to the act of June——

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will kindly give the number of that Senate amendment I will be glad to have it, for I have been unable to get it.

Mr. GOOD. What is it in reference to?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is page 41 of H. R. 6176. The amendment is not numbered in the print and therefore I was unable to give the number of the Senate amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Is it in reference to the vocational item?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. It is amendment numbered 22.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will kindly indicate the number of the Senate amendment, I will endeavor to put it in proper form.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there are three amendments, numbered 21, 22, and 23, for the provision of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. I do not know just exactly which part of the Senate amendment the gentleman's amendment would apply to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In order to get the matter up I move to disagree to all three of those amendments—amendments Nos. 21, 22, and 23.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman modifies his motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BANKHEAD moves to instruct the conferees not to agree to amendments of the Senate Nos. 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, we have already disagreed to all Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman can modify his motion to instruct.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman how much time he desires? I would like to see if we can not agree on a limitation of time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I regard this as a very important matter. We fought this question out here a few days ago on its merits, and after a rather exhaustive debate the House by a majority of nearly a hundred, approximately 90 to 100, fixed this appropriation at $6,000,000 for the purposes named in the bill amending section 2 of the original act. Now, the conferees come in with a proposition to strike out the $4,000,000 providing for the general expenses which we understood would go to the Vocational Board and fix the entire amount at $6,000,000, which would be absolutely insufficient. I think 20 minutes on a side would be proper.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman understands that possibly there are several other amendments which some Members think are quite important.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I regard this as a very important proposition.

Mr. GOOD. Suppose the gentleman discusses it for 10 minutes on that side, and we will take 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am unwilling to do that. I think 20 minutes on a side is the smallest amount of time in which this matter can be properly considered by the House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Is a motion in order now to fix time to close debate?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can move the previous question, and then there will be 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. GOOD. Then, I do not want to do it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Chair recognized me for the purpose of making a motion, and I understand the rule is that I can have an hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman in charge of the bill has to be recognized for any motion to expedite the passage of the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand from that that by that motion I can be taken off my feet?

The SPEAKER. Always the practice is, as the Chair remembers it, that the gentleman in charge of a bill is to be recognized to move the previous question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] will agree that this is an important proposition.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and there are a whole lot of important matters in this bill, and Members want to bring them up, and I am perfectly willing they shall be discussed. If the gentleman will take 15 minutes on that side, we will take 10 minutes on this side.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We will agree to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that there be 25 minutes on this amendment, 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Before we begin the discussion I ask unanimous consent to amend my motion and put it in the proper form to instruct.

The SPEAKER. This is in the House, and the gentleman can amend his motion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this amendment involves the merits of the proposition that we thrashed out here a few days ago very thoroughly affecting an appropriation requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the director of the Vocational Board which involved the taking over for training of about 4,000 wounded and disabled soldiers that under existing status could not be taken under control at the present time. All you gentlemen are familiar with the arguments for and against the merits of that proposition. After a full discussion here before the Committee of the Whole, before which the proposition was pending, and after it got back into the House, upon the roll call this House registered its decision that it accepted the view that this $6,000,000 was for a special and specific appropriation to take care of all the requirements made by amending section 2 of the original act, and that it did not include the total amount requested and needed by the Vocational Board for that purpose and for the general administrative purposes of the board, amounting to $4,000,000, which had already been granted in the sundry civil bill.

Now, gentlemen, here is the proposition: This House has heretofore by a vote, I think, of 80 or 90 majority decided that this bill amending section 2 of the original act should carry an extra and additional appropriation of $6,000,000 to pay the expenses at the rate of $80 a month of these seven thousand and odd wounded soldiers who are to be taken over for training. And it was passed for that purpose, with full understanding of the facts, after an elaborate discussion of the bill here upon the floor.

Now, the conferees, gentlemen, disregarding absolutely the registered will of this House upon that proposition, have gone out and brought in and agreed to a Senate amendment appropriating the sum of $6,000,000 for the entire expenses of the Federal board, including all of its administrative expenses, its officers, its agents, its instructors, and the whole operation of the board, reducing it to $6,000,000. Gentlemen, it is inadequate; it will not carry out the purposes that you intended to be provided for in this amendment to section 2 of the original act; and if you want to have these additional 4,000 wounded soldiers assisted to get immediate training and to

provide money for their subsistence and their care, I appeal to you to vote for my motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to this Senate amendment, because that is the proposition involved in this matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would be glad to, but I can not.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not adopt the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I take it that every Member of the House is anxious to see this bill become a law at the earliest possible moment. The new fiscal year begins to-morrow. This bill ought to be passed immediately, so that it will be ready for the President's signature when he comes back.

Every gentleman in this House who has had any experience with conference committees knows that when you go into conference instruction upon any proposition which comes up in conference frequently serves to delay matters and puts you in a situation where you can not always freely confer with the conferees of the other body.

Now, I want to say this: There is not any gentleman who is more anxious to do what he can for the returning soldiers, and especially those that have been wounded, than I am, or who would go any further than I in their behalf. I do not believe there is a man on the floor of this House who would refuse to vote every dollar that is necessary to give these boys who have served their country the proper training. [Applause.] I do not think you need have any fear, whether this bill carries $6,000,000 or whether it takes the place of the appropriation carried in the other bill, that if the Vocational Board needs an additional appropriation and comes here with its estimates it will get every dollar it actually needs for the soldiers, and there will not be a man on the floor of this House who will raise any opposition to it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa use some more of his time now?

Mr. GOOD. I will reserve my time until the time on that side has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope you will use some time now.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, of course this motion would have been entirely unnecessary except for the peculiar conditions that exist in this case. We know what the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations is. The members of the Committee on Appropriations in the House on both sides opposed the passage of this bill and declared that it was amply taken care of in the appropriation bill. Now, in the sundry civil bill the appropriation is increased $2,000,000, and the appropriations already in the bill that make it appropriate under the circumstances have been stricken out, and we have now a broad and flat appropriation of $6,000,000, which, it is provided, "shall be in lieu of appropriations contained in the act approved July 19, 1919, amending section 2 of the act approved June 27, 1918."

I suppose that it is practically impossible for anybody to show to the House the exact conditions with regard to the uses to which this appropriation may be put. We are only, in so far as the Committee on Education is concerned, asking that the money that is demanded for the pay of the soldiers, together with the legislation that we put in the other bill, shall be made available. We are only asking that these men shall certainly be paid, and everybody seems to admit that this should be done. There can not be one single dollar paid more than is provided for in the appropriation bills, and, of course, when gentlemen talk about an excessive amount of appropriation, when the bill provides that the money shall be paid under the provisions of the existing law, it occurs to me that gentlemen who profess fears that the money will be improperly used are dealing in imagination and not in facts.

All that is asked, gentlemen, in this motion is that you shall stand by the action already taken when you passed the bill the other day which in the first place transferred from the War Risk Insurance Bureau to the Vocational Board the duty of paying these soldiers and provided a fund with which to do it. That is all there is in this motion and that is all there is in the appropriations attached to the other bill; so that it seems to me it is clearly the duty of the House under these circumstances to act in consonance with their action already taken the other day when we carefully considered the whole proposition.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. For a brief question.

Mr. MAPES. When this matter was up last week I did not hear, and I have not heard to-day, anyone say that the Vocational Board estimated that it would need more than $6,000,000 for this purpose. Can the gentleman enlighten us about that?

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true. The estimate was made both by the board and by the bureau that $6,300,000 would be required for the purpose of making these transfers and for paying the soldiers the increase from $65 to $75. That has been the estimate, and there is no other estimate before us.

Now, in the discussion that took place in the Senate——

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TOWNER. Just for a brief question.

Mr. MAPES. When that estimate was made, did the Vocational Board take into consideration the $4,000,000 that was provided for in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. TOWNER. I presume they did, but I am not authorized to speak for them.

Mr. MAPES. That, it seems to me, is the weakness of the position of the proponents of this additional appropriation. None of them, so far as I have been able to find, has been able to say definitely that the board needs it.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me say that the Secretary of the Treasury himself said that the bill passed the other day was necessary. The Secretary knew what the appropriation was in the sundry civil bill. Certainly he would not have asked Congress to appropriate twice for the same purpose.

Mr. BRYNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the $6,300,000, was dated June 2, which was prior to the passage of the sundry civil bill in this House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in two minutes I can only say that, as I understand it, these boys receive their vocational training and tuition from Federal funds paid through the various States, where bed and board and medical attendance are furnished.

Now, then, I called the attention of the House the other day to the fact that the hearings of the bill a short time ago on this matter showed that they had 300 employees, of whom 150—I speak in round numbers—were getting $5,000 and some of them $4,000 and some less, but on the average getting $3,000 each. I do not want any dollar paid unnecessarily to the people who profess to be caring for the boys when, in fact, they are caring for themselves. [Applause.]

One further suggestion: The House will be in continuous session. We are all for the $70,000,000 or $80,000,000. If there is any shortage for the boys we will get the report, and it will be passed by unanimous consent. That is all I have to say. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we are all of us in favor of appropriations sufficient to give vocational training to all of the soldiers who need it and desire it, but none of us ought to be in favor of making appropriations of millions of dollars that are entirely unnecessary.

The sundry civil appropriation bill reported in February carried $1,500,000 for this purpose. It was increased on the floor of the House to $2,000,000. The appropriation bill recently reported carried $4,000,000 as the maximum needed for this service. The Committee on Education, apparently without knowledge of this great appropriation, brought in another appropriation in connection with legislation reported from the committee for $6,000,000. Assuming that $6,000,000 is needed, which is doubtful, there is no earthly reason for appropriating $10,000,000. The Senate provision makes available $6,000,000 for this purpose. It is an abundant sum to meet all the needs of his highly important service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has four minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in his statement said the amount in the bill as it passed the House of $4,000,000 was for administrative expenses. If that is true, then the men who are at the head of this institution do not know what they are talking about, because they came before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for an appropriation of $6,000,000, and out of that they propose to pay $75 a month for subsistence for the men who are taking vocational training. That was their explanation. We certainly would have refused to give them $4,000,000 for administrative expenses. One of these gentlemen agrees that there is duplication. Another man in this institution seems unable to explain whether there is duplication or not, and I want to say to you that when we are giving $6,000,000 for this service I think we are giving all they will be able to expend under the law. If we have not given all they will be able to expend, Congress is going to be in session, and Congress is going to see to it that every man who is entitled to this training shall have his allowance and shall be given training. Congress will appropriate every dollar that is necessary, but it intends to eliminate waste. I beg of you at this hour, when we must pass five appropriation bills to-day, that on a matter of this kind that has been well fought out on the floor of this House you ought not to tie the hands of the conferees and say they can not confer with regard to this amendment. The nigger in the woodpile in this proposition is this: The House provision absolutely limited the amount that these men could receive. The Senate provision should be amended so that there would be a limit, a reasonable limit, as to salaries. We put in a provision that would protect the boys, and should see to it that every dollar that we appropriated to take care of the rehabilitation of these boys be used for that purpose, and that it should not be used to pay high salaries. The gentlemen on the other side want this bill amended as the Senate has amended it in this regard so that there can be no limitation on the high-salaried positions that these gentlemen may hold.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GOOD. Now, gentlemen, when this matter was fought out the other day on the floor of the House, of the men who heard the discussion only 50 voted against it, and more than 70 voted for the proposition of only $6,000,000. The trouble has arisen from the fact that the Committee on Education has all at once assumed that it is an appropriating committee and has brought in a bill here appropriating $6,000,000 without hearings and without a word in print before Congress with regard to that appropriation. We want to give these men all they want, but for God's sake let us not appropriate here blindly millions and millions of dollars simply because the soldiers are involved. Let us be reasonable. [Applause.]

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Does the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] cover the matter between lines 10 and 16 with reference to the limitation of salaries?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman indicated that he desired to change his amendment. Does he wish to do so?

Mr. BANKHEAD. My motion is that the House conferees be instructed not to agree to Senate amendments 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman, if I may be permitted, I will say that this bill——

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. SEARS. I am not discussing it. The gentleman asked for information as to what this amendment covered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama has stated his motion, which is to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendments 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. We are entirely without information as to what those amendments are.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman can ask that the amendments be reported.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I ask that the amendments be reported, so that we may know what they are.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report Senate amendments 21, 22, and 23.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 21: Page 39, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "by the act approved February 26, 1919."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the print of the bill in my hand the amendments seem to be numbered differently.

The SPEAKER. There are two prints of the bill. The Clerk will read from the latest copy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 42, lines 18 and 19, strike out the words "by the act approved February 26, 1919."

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 42, lines 22 and 23, strike out the figures "$4,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 42, lines 23, 24, and 25, and page 43, lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, strike out the language "in addition to the sum of $2,000,000 appropriated in the said act: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, not more than 20 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation in excess of $3,000 each per annum, and not more than 30 persons shall be employed at rates of compensation from $2,500 to $3,000, inclusive, per annum" and insert in lieu thereof the language "in lieu of the appropriation contained in the act approved July 19, 1919, amending section 2 of the act of June 27, 1918."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Could we have this motion of the gentleman from Alabama separated and voted separately upon these three different Senate amendments? If so, I ask that the motion be separated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the right to have them separated. The question is, first, on the motion to instruct the conferees to disagree to amendment No. 21.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were—ayes 21, noes 110.

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to instruct the conferees to disagree to Senate amendment No. 22.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were—ayes 28, noes 98.

So the motion to instruct the conferees was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to instruct the conferees to disagree to Senate amendment No. 23.

The question was taken.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the last amendment be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 19, noes 106.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the point of order is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and six Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to instruct the conferees to disagree to Senate amendment No. 23.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 97, nays 207, answered "present" 5, not voting 121, as follows:

YEAS—97.

Almon	Ferris	McKinley	Sanders, La.
Aswell	Fisher	Major	Sears
Bankhead	Gallagher	Martin	Sims
Barkley	Ganly	Minahan, N. J.	Smithwick
Bee	Gard	Moon	Steagall
Bland, Mo.	Goodwin, Ark.	Nelson, Mo.	Stedman
Bland, Va.	Hardy, Tex.	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Blanton	Hayden	Nolan	Taylor, Colo.
Brand	Howard	Ogden	Thomas
Brinson	Huddleston	Oldfield	Thompson, Okla.
Campbell, Pa.	Hudspeth	Oliver	Tillman
Candler	Hull, Tenn.	Overstreet	Towner
Clark, Fla.	Igoe	Park	Upshaw
Clark, Mo.	Jacoway	Parrish	Vinson
Cleary	Jones, Tex.	Platt	Watkins
Crisp	Kincheloe	Pou	Whaley
Cullen	Lanham	Quin	Wheeler
Darrow	Lankford	Rainey, H. T.	Wilson, La.
Dickinson, Mo.	Larsen	Rainey, J. W.	Wingo
Dominick	Lazaro	Raker	Woods, Va.
Dowell	Lee, Ga.	Riordan	Wright
Drane	Linthicum	Rodenberg	Young, Tex.
Dunbar	Lonergan	Romjue	
Dupré	McDuffie	Rouse	
Evans, Nev.	McKeown	Rubey	

NAYS—207.

Ackerman	Bland, Ind.	Byrnes, S. C.	Costello
Alexander	Boies	Byrns, Tenn.	Cramton
Anderson	Box	Campbell, Kans.	Crowther
Andrews, Md.	Briggs	Cannon	Currie, Mich.
Andrews, Nebr.	Britten	Carter	Curry, Calif.
Anthony	Brooks, Ill.	Chindblom	Dale
Ayres	Brooks, Pa.	Christopherson	Davey
Babka	Browning	Classon	Davis, Minn.
Barbour	Buchanan	Coady	Davis, Tenn.
Begg	Burdick	Cole	Dempsey
Benson	Burroughs	Collier	Denison
Black	Butler	Connally	Dent

Doughton	Hulings	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Dyer	Hull, Iowa	Mason	Snyder
Echols	Humphreys	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Elliott	Ireland	Michener	Stephens, Ohio
Elston	James	Miller	Stiness
Esch	Jefferis	Monahan, Wis.	Strong, Kans.
Evans, Mont.	Johnson, Ky.	Mondell	Strong, Pa.
Evans, Nebr.	Johnson, Miss.	Montague	Summers, Wash.
Flood	Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Pa.	Sumners, Tex.
Foster	Jones, Pa.	Moore, Va.	Sweet
Freeman	Juul	Moores, Ind.	Taylor, Tenn.
French	Kahn	Morgan	Thompson, Ohio
Fuller, Ill.	Kearns	Mott	Timberlake
Gandy	Kelley, Mich.	Nelson, Wis.	Tincher
Garner	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Garrett	Kendall	Newton, Mo.	Vaile
Glynn	Kennedy, Iowa	Olney	Vare
Good	Kettner	Ramsey	Venable
Goodykoontz	Kinkaid	Ramseyer	Vestal
Gould	Kitchin	Rayburn	Voigt
Graham, Ill.	Kraus	Reavis	Volstead
Green, Iowa	LaGuardia	Reed, W. Va.	Walsh
Greene, Mass.	Lampert	Rhodes	Walters
Greene, Vt.	Layton	Ricketts	Wason
Griest	Lea, Calif.	Riddick	Watson, Pa.
Hadley	Lehlbach	Robsion, Ky.	Watson, Va.
Hamilton	Little	Rogers	Weaver
Hardy, Colo.	Luce	Rose	Webb
Haskell	Luhring	Rowe	Webster
Hastings	McAndrews	Sanders, Ind.	Welling
Haugen	McArthur	Schall	Welty
Hawley	McFadden	Scott	White, Me.
Hays	McKenzie	Sells	Williams
Hernandez	McLaughlin, Mich.	Siegel	Wilson, Ill.
Hersey	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinnott	Winslow
Hersman	McPherson	Sisson	Wood, Ind.
Hickey	MacCrate	Slemp	Yates
Hicks	MacGregor	Small	Young, N. Dak.
Hoch	Madden	Smith, Idaho	Zihlman
Holland	Magee	Smith, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Bell	Booher	Steenerson
Blackmon		

White, Kans.

NOT VOTING—121.

Ashbrook	Fields	Longworth	Ragsdale
Bacharach	Fitzgerald	Lufkin	Randall, Calif.
Baer	Focht	McClintic	Randall, Wis.
Benham	Fordney	McCulloch	Reber
Bowers	Frear	McGlennon	Reed, N. Y.
Browne	Fuller, Mass.	McKinley	Robinson, N. C.
Brumbaugh	Gallivan	McLane	Rowan
Burke	Garland	Maher	Rucker
Caldwell	Godwin, N. C.	Mann	Sabath
Cantrill	Goldfogle	Mansfield	Sanders, N. Y.
Caraway	Goodall	Mead	Sanford
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Merritt	Saunders, Va.
Carss	Griffin	Mooney	Scully
Casey	Hamill	Moore, Ohio	Sherwood
Cooper	Harrison	Morin	Shreve
Copley	Heflin	Mudd	Sinclair
Crago	Hill	Murphy	Smith, N. Y.
Dallinger	Houghton	Neely	Snell
Dewalt	Husted	Nichols, Mich.	Steele
Dickinson, Iowa	Hutchinson	O'Connell	Stevenson
Donovan	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor	Sullivan
Dooling	Johnston, N. Y.	Osborne	Temple
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Padgett	Tilson
Dunn	Kiess	Paige	Treadway
Eagan	King	Parker	Ward
Eagle	Kleczka	Pell	Wilson, Pa.
Edmonds	Knutson	Peters	Wise
Ellsworth	Kreider	Phelan	Woodyard
Emerson	Langley	Porter	
Fairfield	Lesher	Purnell	
Fess	Lever	Radcliffe	

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. TILSON with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. WARD with Mr. CALDWELL.
Mr. SNELL with Mr. CAREW.
Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. CASEY.
Mr. SHREVE with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. REBER with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin with Mr. DOREMUS.
Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. PETERS with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. PARKER with Mr. FITZGERALD.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. FIELDS.
Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. BARKLEY.
Mr. MURPHY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. MUDD with Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. HEFLIN.
Mr. MERRITT with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. LEVER.
Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. LESHER.
Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. MCGLENNON.
Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. KREIDER with Mr. MCLANE.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. MANSFIELD.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. MEAD.
Mr. HUSTED with Mr. PELL.
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. GARLAND with Mr. RAGSDALE.
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. RUCKER.
Mr. FREAR with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. FOCHT with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. FESS with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. EMERSON with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. CRAGO with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. BROWNE with Mr. O'CONNELL.
Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. O'CONNOR.
Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.
Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.
Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.
Mr. COOPER with Mr. CARSS.
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.
Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. WHITE of Kansas.
Mr. DALLINGER with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. BOWERS with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CANTRILL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the conferees be instructed not to agree to Senate amendment No. 52, page 106.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be reported.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of this amendment be dispensed with. There are 10 pages of that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALSH, of Massachusetts, moves that the conferees be instructed not to agree to Senate amendment No. 52.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this amendment seeks to make permanent law the act which was passed October 17 creating a bureau down in the Bureau of Mines to control the production of explosives and the disposition, storage, and use of the same. It is clearly legislation. It is a reenactment with some very important changes of an act which comprises 10 or 11 pages of this printed bill. This is no time nor is this the manner in which to legislate upon this subject. Why, we have a Committee on Mines and Mining in this House that ought to have jurisdiction of this subject, and if we are going to write a permanent law something that was enacted to cover the war emergency we ought to have a committee consider it and hold hearings and go into the matter. But this is no way to send a bill over here from somewhere else containing 12 pages of legislation and expect the House to swallow it whole. Why, it creates an inspector of explosives, at $5,000 a year; 14 assistant inspectors, at $3,600 a year; and numerous other clerks and experts, whose salaries are not stated, and gives them authority to wander at large throughout the country and enter upon property, protects the people who have secret formulas now for manufacturing explosives, and yet whoever may develop a secret formula after the passage of this act has got to come in and make it public or disclose it to the Bureau of Mines through this inspector. It also gives the Secretary of the Interior the right to dispose of these matters, whereas in the war-emergency law they had to go to the Council of National Defense, and that council is still in existence. There are several other important changes in this from the war-emergency act. I have not had the time carefully to analyze them any more than just hastily to glance over them; but, Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that this bill should be passed before the 1st of July is the real reason for this amendment. It ought to go out of the bill. Talk about riders on appropriation bills. Why, if the international allied order of world highbinders were to hold a convention and recommend legislation be enacted into law the Public Treasury would not be subject to any greater strain than it will be if we adopt all the amendments that confront this House as we are about to send these bills to conference or approve these conference reports. I trust that the House in this instance will say to the conferees, "We will not permit you to agree to this amendment

and to write into permanent law something that was enacted clearly for the war emergency and to make perpetual a bureau down here of high-salaried experts and give them extraordinary power and authority and make that the permanent law of the land."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to see if we can have some agreement as to the time for discussion of this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I want five minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I would like five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes. Is there any objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this amendment raises one of the most important questions that this House has to deal with, that of permitting the people to legislate through their representatives. Here is one of the most flagrant cases of willful neglect of the House of Representatives that we have had come to our notice since this session began. [Applause.] The Bureau of Mines, recently created, but coming forward constantly for increasing appropriations, desires to increase its power. Does it come before the House of Representatives? Does it send its estimate and its proposed revision of law for reference to the Committee on Mines and Mining of the House of Representatives? If so, we have not heard of it. No; in contempt of the House—and I am using these words advisedly, because it has come to be the practice of the departments in Washington to have contempt for the House in the last stage of our sittings here—in contempt of the House the Bureau of Mines at the eleventh hour, when we are about to adjourn, when the appropriation bills must be passed, proceeds to another body and there manages to have inserted, when we must either vote up or vote down one of the great appropriation bills of the Nation, this proviso, 12 pages long, creating new offices, devising new regulations, and presenting new forms, all contrary to good practice and dangerous in the extreme. There is not the slightest opportunity for the House of Representatives to be heard, except as we may, by the courtesy of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, have a few moments here to discuss this important matter. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has well said that this amendment proposes to change the existing law. But it provides also that there shall be created a new inspector, who shall have a salary of $5,000, and 14 other explosives inspectors, who shall have a salary of $3,600 each. To do what? To establish a license system and stop bomb throwing in the United States. Why, do you not remember that only a few days ago we discussed the checking of bomb throwers and gave an added appropriation to the Department of Justice for that purpose, although apparently no bomb thrower had been caught. How many departments are going to search for these bomb throwers, and how many bureaus, in the name of patriotism, are going to sneak in through another body and enact statutory law without giving a chance to the House of Representatives to know what is going on?

And how many men are going to stop bomb throwers in this new bureaucratic deal? One assistant inspector and 14 assistants. They are going to catch the bomb throwers going from State to State. Yes; they are going to cooperate with the State officers at the same time. Big job for these 15 new officers, who are created by this rider on an appropriation bill without the people knowing anything about it.

Would we have passed this law had it come up in the regular way through the Committee on Mines and Mining of the House after careful consideration and the hearing of the parties; after an understanding whether or not it was going to conflict with the State laws, whether it was duplicating other work, or whether it was going to hamstring manufacturers or dealers in explosives or miners and workmen throughout the country? We know nothing about these things, gentlemen. We are expected to pass this obnoxious amendment just as it has been injected here in this almost surreptitious manner. It is new law, to be made permanent for a bureau down here, that seems to have been afraid to come before the people's Representatives and ask for what it wanted. It ought not to go in this bill, and I trust the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts will carry. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, under leave to print, I wish to say that the governor of Pennsylvania has wired his concern about the purpose and effect of this amendment. It is believed the amendment in its present form is unwarranted and unnecessary interference with State regulations controlling the industries in Pennsylvania. Dr. Francis D. Patterson, of the department of labor and industry of that State, in a memorandum just handed to me, submits some pertinent comments on the State side of this question which I think will be interesting as showing why this 12 pages of new law injected for the benefit of the Bureau of Mines should be rejected now, so that parties interested in our peace-time industries may be heard if they wish to. This memorandum, in part, is as follows:

Memorandum.

Subject: Amendment by the Senate to the sundry civil bill, H. R. 6176, Calendar No. 43, page 106; insertion after line 9 "control of the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of explosives."

I have the honor to most respectfully submit to you for your consideration that the governments of the various States have ample jurisdiction in times of peace and their laws adequately control the manufacture, distribution, storage, interstate transportation, use, and possession of explosives.

I would emphasize the comprehensive laws which have been enacted by the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, New York, California, Oklahoma, Massachusetts, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Montana, etc.

The laws of these various States have been ably and sufficiently administered. These laws have conserved the lives and health of those employed in the industry and have proved a safeguard to the property adjacent to explosive plants and storage facilities and of those who reside or travel in the vicinity. Federal operation and Federal supervision has not always been equally effective. One need but emphasize the recent disaster at the Morgan plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co., where many lives were needlessly sacrificed, a property damage of countless thousands of dollars created, and the prosperous community of South Amboy rendered practically homeless. Such a disaster would have been prevented had the Federal Government complied with the laws of the State of New Jersey, but instead there was gross violation of these laws, and the inspector of the department of labor of New Jersey was ordered from the plant and the War Department notified the commissioner of labor of New Jersey that the State laws did not apply to this Government plant.

It is little short, often, of a calamity to set aside these State laws to stop the inspection by properly authorized and qualified State inspectors, and it would not make for efficiency to substitute in their place 1 Federal chief inspector and 14 other Federal inspectors, as provided in the amendment under consideration.

These 15 inspectors could not adequately and properly supervise the manufacture, storage, transportation, and distribution of the approximately 600,000,000 pounds of commercial explosives manufactured and used within these United States.

As a "war measure" the Sixty-fifth Congress passed House bill 3932, which law this amendment now under consideration would perpetuate indefinitely, so it is pertinent at this time to inquire how the Federal Bureau of Mines administered this law and whether or not under its administration there was greater safety to the community at large.

* * * * * * *

There is no evidence to show that act 3932 as enforced by the Bureau of Mines has prevented the unlawful possession of explosives.

The Bureau of Mines did not prevent the recent bomb outrages, not one single perpetrator of any of these outrages has been apprehended, and it can be stated on the authority of a representative of a responsible authority who examined the explosives that were used that these explosives were of a type only manufactured for use in the war for the Government; these explosives were not stolen from any one of the three plants wherein they were manufactured, and so may it not be presumed that the Federal Government itself was lax in its protection of these explosives and this laxity resulted in their theft?

This amendment would give extraordinary power and jurisdiction to the Bureau of Mines; it would give them jurisdiction over every drug store, hardware store, every plant wherein acid was manufactured, all explosive manufacturing plants and nearly all chemical plants.

It would make the lawful possession of explosives so valuable to the farmer, the miner, the contractor extremely difficult to obtain and would therefore seriously interfere with the conduct of legitimate business.

* * * * * * *

In conclusion this amendment is offered under the excuse that it is intended to prevent bomb outrages. There is not one bit of evidence to show that if adopted it would prevent a single outrage, but there is every evidence to show that it adopted it would take away the great safeguard of inspection by properly qualified representaives of the State governments, it would make difficult the lawful possession of explosives, it would place an unwarranted and unjustified interference and burden on legitimate business and would be a usurpation of State rights upon the part of the Federal Government which your committee should not agree to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, while I do not agree with the strictures of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] on the Bureau of Mines, which in my judgment is one of the most efficient bureaus of the Government, I think as a practical proposition we ought to go very slowly in making any of these war-time acts permanent. [Applause.] Those of you who were Members of the last Congress will recall the hesitation with which those of us who were responsible for this character of legislation stood for it even in war time. If it is necessary to have Federal control of the manufacture and distribution of explosives in time of peace, the proper way to go about it is for the Committee on Mines and Mining to take it up and have hearings and consider it very carefully. [Applause.]

We have an act now which covers the matter in times of war, and I, for one, as the ranking Democratic member on the Mines and Mining Committee—and I think I speak the senti-

ments of the committee, because it has always shown itself willing to hear the departments and give consideration to every important matter—would be glad, if they can show us necessity for peace control—Federal control of the manufacture and distribution of explosives in time of peace—to hear them and to frame an act that we can explain to you gentlemen, and justify it.

Under this proposed act no farmer could buy a stick of dynamite to blow the stumps out of his new ground without getting a Federal permit. What is the necessity for that in times of peace? There is none, gentlemen. The only reason why we passed the war-time act was that some of the States had neglected to pass explosive-control acts. The war was on and we had to meet the emergency. But the legislatures of the different States have been in session since then, and they will be in session in the future, and can pass the necessary acts. And if we think there should be a general Federal supervision over the manufacture of explosives, it will be time for us to frame carefully and consider carefully before our committee an act that will do it. I do not see how any lawyer can conclude that we have authority to enact such a statute in time of peace. I am surprised that great lawyers who sit at the other end of the Capitol permitted this to come up here as a peace-time proposition. It is ridiculous from a legal standpoint to ask that the Federal Government have authority to do the thing that is sought to be done by this 12 pages of legislation put in here at the closing hours of the fiscal year as a rider on an appropriation bill. I protest against that kind of legislation, and I insist that we go very carefully and considerately in extending any of these war acts beyond the date stipulated when they were enacted to meet the war emergency. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a general appropriation bill. Under the rules of the House and also of the Senate legislation is not in order as a rider on such a bill. Yet the Senate amends the bill by placing upon the bill 11 pages of an amendment.

I will read:

That the act approved October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of same, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"In the interest of public safety, that it shall be unlawful to manufacture, distribute, store, use, or possess powder, explosives, blasting supplies, or ingredients thereof, except as in this act provided.

"SEC. 2. That the words 'explosive' and 'explosives' when used herein shall mean gunpowders, powders used for blasting, all forms of high explosives, blasting materials, fuses, detonators, and other detonating agents, smokeless powders, and any chemical compound or mechanical mixture that contains any oxidizing and combustible units, or other ingredients, in such proportions, quantities, or packing that ignition by fire, by friction, by concussion, by percussion, or by detonation of, or any part of the compound or mixture may cause such a sudden generation of highly heated gases that the resultant gaseous pressures are capable of producing destructive effects on contiguous objects, or of destroying life or limb, but shall not include small arms or shotgun cartridges: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the manufacture, under the authority of the Government, of explosives for, their sale to, or their possession by, the military or naval service of the United States of America.

"SEC. 3. That the word 'ingredients' when used herein shall mean the materials and substances capable by combination of producing one or more of the explosives mentioned in section 1 hereof."

It will be noticed that section 2 is broader than section 1. Now, what are the ingredients of powder? Sulphur is one of them. You can not produce sulphur without having, I was going to say, a corps of Government employees in order to see what is done with it. Another ingredient is saltpeter.

Now, this is for peace legislation, and it renders war-time legislation respectable.

Mr. Speaker, I indorse what the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] has said and the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. There are 11 pages of this amendment which would involve, if enacted, the employment of thousands of people to enforce it. No man could make or sell any of these explosives or any ingredient thereof without paying for licenses to produce or sell the same.

Now, that is about all that I have time to say and it is about all that I want to say. It may be that legislation is needed. If so, let the Committee on Mines and Mining, as constituted in this House, being a legislative committee, have a little time to perform its functions rather than allow somebody without any considerable investigation to write, hop, skip, and jump a lot of provisions like these, and put them into an appropriation bill which must pass in a limited time if the Government goes on.

I will violate the rules of this House by referring disrespectfully to the Senate of the United States. [Laughter.] I will venture, however, to say that when the Senate agreed to these provisions there were not a dozen Senators in their seats. They generally escape to their committee rooms—I say it respectfully—and go and get something to eat when such legislation as this is proposed. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. You do not blame them, do you?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I blame them for not considering legislation such as this and not allowing their regular committees, which I assume to be competent in proposing and considering proper legislation, to do so; and for unloading on us, just when it is absolutely necessary for this bill to pass, that which ought to receive serious attention from the Bureau of Mines and Mining, and which would require of the appropriate committees consideration for at least three weeks' or a month's time to mature it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who voted against the explosives act when it was originally passed. I thought then that it was harsh to an extreme, unnecessary, and that it would be ineffectual. If I thought that of it as a war measure, what must I think of it as a peace measure?

I venture to say to Members of the House that scarcely one of you can examine this measure in the form in which it is presented here and be able to approve it as a whole or in many of its details. I want to advise gentlemen who have small boys among their constituents to beware of this measure, because no boy under this law will be allowed, without a license from the Bureau of Mines, to have the smallest firecracker in his possession. And I advise gentlemen who have constituents who still use old-fashioned squirrel rifles or muzzle-loading shotguns to beware of this measure, because under this law no country boy can take down the old musket and powder horn from over the door and powder and shot that he buys from the country store and go out to kill a squirrel without a license from the Bureau of Mines without being guilty of a crime which may send him to the penitentiary. And to Members who may represent coal miners I say that if one of them should take home from his day's work in the mine a piece of fuse only a foot long that he bought from the company magazine and paid for himself and had left from his day's task that miner under this measure will have to go to jail.

This act excepts, so far as firearm ammunition is concerned, cartridges merely. It does not except loose powder or even the old G. D. caps that we used when we were boys. These illustrations, gentlemen, show the extreme and unnecessary provisions of this act. The fact that the measure is undigested and has been little considered shows to what length those responsible for it are willing to go in order to get what they want. Also, the measure takes away from the States all control over the regulation of explosives; it invades the proper police powers of the States—a usurpation by the Federal Government of functions which have been exercised by the States from the very beginning of our system.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, we have certain interests in this country that are trying to fix permanently upon the people thereof for times of peace certain oppressive, harsh, and extreme measures that were passed as war measures. We must be on our guard against such proposals.

Here they come forward with this so-called explosives measure. What is the excuse for it? It is on account of the scare that some people have gotten because anarchists sent a few bombs through the mails or tried to blow up something. Why, that is not new. We have had that kind of thing in this country before the war. It has been done recently notwithstanding the fact that we had this harsh law. This law has not served to prevent it. It has served merely to increase the number of crimes for which men may be haled before the criminal courts; it has merely served to restrict the liberties of the people and to bind them tighter and tighter in a mesh of Federal statutes. It is time to call a halt. Let me say that I would rather take my chance of being blown up by some anarchist's bomb than to make permanent in times of peace espionage acts, explosives acts, and other laws which I regard as un-American. For myself, I shall refuse to further place unreasonable restrictions upon the old-fashioned liberties of the people of this country. Liberty is sometimes worth more than life itself. If after we have won the war in defense of democracy and Americanism we are to continue these oppressive and harsh war measures, then I will say that the time has come when liberty is no longer at its par value in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I shall use that two minutes to call the attention of the House to the fact that the sundry civil bill, as it passed the House in February and as it now stands, contains a section providing for the covering into the Treasury of the unexpended balance in the Bureau of Mines for the purpose of enforcing this act. It was the opinion of the committee in the last Congress, an opinion confirmed by the committee in this Congress, that all of the available funds that the Bureau of Mines now has for the purpose of enforcing this act should be covered into the Treasury. And now, instead of bringing the activities of the bureau under this act to an end, the Senate by this legislation seeks to reenact it.

It means, so far as the farmers of this country are concerned, that every one of them who seeks to purchase explosives for the purpose of blasting out a stump would have to go to the clerk of the court or some other officer in his county and pay for a license to purchase the explosive, and the merchant who attempts to sell explosives in time of peace would also have to pay for a license.

To grant the powers contained in this bill during peace time is an unheard-of proposition, and it can have no purpose other than to continue in office some people now drawing salaries. The House should know that in the last Congress, when this legislation was passed, the Senate of the United States inserted a provision for the appointment of a State agent in each State at a salary of $2,400 a year, and such a man was appointed for each State by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The director did not ask the House for State inspectors and did not need them, but these agents were provided for and appointed. Their term of office ought to come to an end some time, and if this act is passed without this legislation the bill now provides for the termination of the activities of that bureau.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under what authority can you enact this legislation except under the war power or the interstate-commerce power of the Constitution? And does the amendment fall under either of these powers?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think there is no power in the Constitution warranting the enactment of this legislation. I think it never will be enacted if it is sent to committee and given proper consideration, and I hope it never will be enacted. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was on the Committee on Mines and Mining in the Sixty-fifth Congress when this measure was enacted as war legislation. It is now proposed to continue it as a peace measure, and to that I am opposed. I want to call the particular attention of the House to sections 18 and 19, so the House may know just to what extent this proposed amendment goes. These sections are on page 115 of the bill, and are as follows:

SEC. 18. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying into effect this act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 19. That any person violating any of the provisions of this act, or any rules or regulations made thereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

This would authorize the Director of the Bureau of Mines himself to make a regulation, with which this Congress would have nothing to do, and then authorize the courts to punish a man who violated such a regulation and to sentence him to imprisonment for 10 years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, by this subterfuge, the enacting this rider in this manner, we would give the bureau the right to put a man in jail for violating its regulations?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. We authorize the bureau in effect to make a law and to punish a man by imprisonment for 10 years for its violation; and I want to call the attention of those Members who live in mining districts to this provision on page 110:

SEC. 10. That the Director of the Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to issue licenses as follows:

* * * * * * *

(c) Purchaser's license, authorizing the purchase and possession of explosives and ingredients.

By paragraph (c) there is a provision for a purchaser's license, which authorizes the purchase and possession of explosives and ingredients. Every coal miner is required to purchase explosives, and there are many men who are not citizens of the United States who are engaged in coal mining, and many of them are citizens of countries with which we shall be technically at war until the confirmation of the peace treaty. Yet the following section provides that a license shall not be issued to any person who is a citizen of such a country.

Therefore if any such foreigner engaged in the mining business in this country should purchase or have possession of explosives, he might be punished by imprisonment for a period of 10 years under a regulation made by the Bureau of Mines, for under the law he could not have such a license. In addition to the fact that such legislation is not wise, of course it is not constitutional as peace legislation. It was constitutional as a war measure, because under our war powers we had the right to legislate with reference to explosives, but under the peace powers of this Congress we have no right at all to legislate upon this subject. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this amendment is essentially vicious. Therefore I am in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts not to agree to it. Another object is that the amendment is really an entire bill within itself, in no way germane to the Army bill on which the Senate seeks to fasten it. In other words, it is a legislative rider on an appropriation bill, and should be rejected for that reason.

But I do not intend to talk about the amendment. Several gentlemen have delivered more or less elaborate lectures to the new Members of this House. I will deliver a very short one. If you want to do good here, you line up for the proposition that the Senate must quit loading up appropriation bills with riders and amendments that have nothing whatsoever to do with the subject matter of the bill. [Applause.] The correct way to legislate is to introduce a bill into the House or Senate; refer it to the proper committee; consider it adequately; report it back; and consider it in the regular manner. Everybody will then know what we are doing. Cut out riders and legislate with that deliberation necessary to good legislation.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] said he wanted to speak respectfully of the Senate, and, of course, I do and everybody else does; but the habit grows on the Senate to catch the House of Representatives right close to the end of the session, and now at the end of the fiscal year, when time is the essence of things, and load up these bills with the most unjustifiable amendments in the world; and if we want to have any standing in the country as a branch of the law-making body we must break the Senate of that bad habit. I will give you a sample of what happened here once while I was Speaker. We sent the Agricultural bill over to the Senate in the last days of the short session. At the time this thing was done there were seven Senators in the Senate Chamber, one of them in the chair, three of them asleep, and the rest of them added the McCumber bill for land banks to the Agricultural appropriation bill. I think there were 26 pages in it.

Nobody objected over there. One Senator started to object because they were adding MCCUMBER'S bill instead of adding his own bill. [Laughter.] And the chairman of the committee went over to him and told him to keep still, that when they got into conference they would substitute his bill for the McCumber bill. [Laughter.] Well, they sent it over here. On several occasions I have seen a dozen men up on the floor at one time trying to secure recognition, but when that bill came back here it looked to me as though half the Members in the House rose up and addressed the Chair to move to concur in that McCumber bill, and not a man in the House had read it, a bill of 26 pages starting a new, important, and far-reaching plan, and nobody could tell what the end of it would be. I looked that crowd over for a moment, and finally I picked out a man who, I thought, had sense enough to move to refer it to the committee instead of moving to concur in it, and I recognized him, and he made the motion. Now, they are getting worse and worse over there, and if we submit to all of these things we might as well get indefinite leave of absence and go home and stay there. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has one minute.

Mr. JUUL. I would like one minute——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has only one minute.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I should object to a motion of this kind. Ordinarily, when conferees are sent to confer with the conferees of another body on an appropriation bill, I do not believe their hands should be tied; but in this

amendment there are 12 pages of important legislation, and I have no hesitancy in saying that I think Members ought to express their opinion on the merits of this legislation; and when the vote is taken I shall ask for a division so that I may be able to inform the conferees of the Senate what the sentiment of the House is. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to instruct the House conferees to disagree to Senate amendment No. 52.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 243, noes none.

Accordingly the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was received with applause.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. GOOD, Mr. VARE, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment No. 21 of the Senate to the bill H. R. 3478, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida and the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the water-power bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT—NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and send to the Clerk's desk to be read a request for unanimous consent to correct the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUTLER asks unanimous consent to correct the RECORD as to Senate amendments Nos. 4, 88, 91, 95, 98, 103 by making the report show that the House recedes with an amendment and not the Senate, and that the Senate agrees to the same.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening last we finished the conference report about 7 o'clock. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], at my request, had obtained permission that we might print the conference report after the House had adjourned and before midnight. The Clerk and our experts had about five hours in which to make up the report and to draw up the statement. In making out the report they used the wrong blank inadvertently, and it appeared that where the Senate receded it was the House that receded in three or four places. This in no way affects the bill or the amount of money appropriated, or the terms of the bill, but it is awkward, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the House give us permission to correct the RECORD so that when the Clerk reads the report it will show the correction.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the House has no authority over the conference report with reference to changing it before it is presented. It seems to me a rather delicate matter for the House to go tinkering with a conference report, by unanimous consent, particularly when it is signed by the managers of the other branch of the Legislature. The conference report states that the Senate recedes when it should show that the House recedes. Of course, I appreciate that this is a clerical error, but if it is done in this way I direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that when it goes to the Senate a similar request will have to be made in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the House has no control over the conference report, and the only correction the House could authorize, in the opinion of the Chair, would be the correction of a clerical error.

Mr. WALSH. I understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is an understanding between the managers on the part of the two Houses that a similar correction will be made in the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman has overstated that a bit. There is no understanding, but we intend to ask them over there to have this matter corrected in accordance with the correction made here.

The SPEAKER. It would certainly be necessary.

Mr. BUTLER. The report has not been reported in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, is not the proper way to get at this to recommit the conference report?

The SPEAKER. That is the parliamentary way.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It will take a little time, but it is the right way to do it.

Mr. BUTLER. Then we will have to consider this to-morrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not making such a motion.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentlemen could come back in 10 minutes with a new report.

Mr. BUTLER. This in no way changes the legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If the report is withdrawn by being recommitted or otherwise sent back, then it does not exist. The House and Senate conferees can meet and make the proper amendments as they ought to be made, and could then report the conference report back, and if that can be done any time before adjournment to-day the gentleman could get unanimous consent to waive the rule and pass the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The whole thing can be done in 30 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The errors in this report do not affect the legislation at all. They are simply typographical errors, a misstatement referring to House amendments as Senate amendments.

Mr. PADGETT. Referring to Senate amendments as House amendments.

Mr. MONDELL. It is a clerical error. It is not necessary to change the conference report, because the conference report itself is not in error. The report makes an error in referring to Senate amendments as House amendments. If attention is called to that fact as the report is read, the RECORD will show very clearly what the intent was, and there is no necessity of sending the bill back to conference.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, you can not read language which says one thing and then say, "I guess it meant something else, that the intent was there." The report is wrong. It says that the Senate recedes when, as a matter of fact, the House recedes, and it does affect the legislation, and if we adopt this conference report it is going to seriously affect the law which is passed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the conference report recommitted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman if the conference report itself is correct?

Mr. BUTLER. Absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. That is what the House acts on.

Mr. BUTLER. Every item, every bit of legislation is exactly as we agreed to it, but in making the report the words "Senate" and "House" have been improperly used.

Mr. WALSH. Then the report is not correct——

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the only mistake is in the printing.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Bureau of Mines and Mining, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid any sort of dispute as to the effect of these clerical errors, I ask permission to withdraw the conference report and ask that it be recommitted to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 2216) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain department publications and to provide for crediting the department's printing allotment with the proceeds, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 14.

Resolved, etc., That a joint special committee consisting of two Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, is hereby created, whose duty it shall be to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or any political subdivision thereof, and with officers of any organization or societies or with individuals relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims. Said committee shall report on or before September 1 next with its recommendations as to appropriate legislation for participation by the Government of the United States in the observance of this historic anniversary. The expenses of said committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2216. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain department publications and to provide for crediting the department's printing allotment with the proceeds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3157. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 409. An act to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York; and

S. 120. An act to repeal the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made on the telegraph and telephone measure passed some days since by printing in the RECORD a resolution of the United States Independent Telephone Association, a resolution of the National Association of Postmasters in the United States, and an article from the New York Herald of Sunday, June 29.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the resolutions referred to and an article from the New York Herald. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Be it resolved by the United States Independent Telephone Association, representing more than 10,000 independent telephone systems, with representatives present from all sections of the United States, in convention assembled at Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1919, That it hereby expresses to A. S. Burleson, Postmaster General of the United States, and his assistants, its appreciation for his fair, just, and impartial administration of the wire systems of the country; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary of this association be instructed to transmit by wire a copy of these resolutions to A. S. Burleson, Postmaster General of the United States, and that they be instructed to mail a copy of these resolutions to Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States.

—

Resolution adopted by executive and advisory committees, National Association of Postmasters of the United States.

Whereas our attention has been directed to a statement in the New York World of April 21, 1919, in connection with an article criticizing Postmaster General Albert S. Burleson, in which printed statement the following paragraph occurs, to wit:

"* * * The Burleson system requires that its lieutenants throughout the country reflect the Burleson mind in their attitude to the employees under them. Thus it is almost a capital offense for a postmaster to be on good terms with the employees of the office."

And

Whereas if this statement were true, then the postmasters of the United States should not hesitate for one moment to express their opinion in emphatic terms of such action upon the part of the Postmaster General; but

Whereas we know that the above-mentioned statement is absolutely untrue in every particular; that, on the contrary, we know that the Postmaster General assumes every attitude of friendliness to the employees of the Postal Service, which makes it impossible for us to reflect any but the best of attitudes and motives, and it is absolutely untrue that the postmasters of the United States are on any but good terms with the employees under their direction in the many post offices under their supervision; and

Whereas, contrary to the allegations contained in the statement of the New York World, the best of feeling prevails by and between the postmasters, the supervisory officers, and the employees of the post offices under their direction, and no discord or disturbance has occurred, except when some disgruntled or discharged employee has agitated such a disturbance for sordid or selfish reasons.

We therefore assert, beyond all fear of successful or truthful contradiction, that the attitude of the employees of the Postal Service is one of respectful response to well-meant instructions for the good of the service, and that they are on good terms in every way with the postmasters of the country, and that no intimation, either direct or indirect, has been conveyed to us by either the Postmaster General, his assistants, or any bureau head of any condition to the contrary; and

We therefore desire to indicate by this statement that a grave injustice has been done to the Postmaster General and also the postmasters of the United States by placing them in such a position; that the statement hereinbefore quoted is not only untrue and unfair but unwarranted by all the facts.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COLIN M. SELPH, *President.*

Attest:

E. S. SHANNON, *Secretary.*

Adopted by referendum vote of these committees this 17th day of May, 1919.

—

(By Albert S. Burleson.)

The labor policy of the Postmaster General and an answer to the charges made against him in the resolutions of the American Federation of Labor may be found in a brief citation of facts. The principles which have influenced his action apply not to labor alone but to all other questions relating to the administration of public affairs.

His attitude, which has at all times been consistent, has aroused the antagonism of all those who seek special consideration for special interests or special organizations, since its guiding principle demands impartial justice and condemns favoritism for privilege to one class above another. No man who is honestly performing a service of any sort and trying to earn a living or to conduct a legitimate business or enterprise should under our institutions be discriminated against on account of his belonging or not belonging to any particular church, society, fraternity, or other organization which is lawful. His qualifications, character, and conduct should determine his status.

The initial charge of the American Federation of Labor quotes from the message of President Wilson of May 20, 1919, the declaration that "the object of all reform in this essential matter must be the genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organized way in every decision which directly affects their welfare or the part they play in industry," and then declares that Postmaster General Burleson has pursued a labor policy directly in conflict with this declaration of the President. Is this charge true? If so, the Postmaster General would find no place in the Cabinet of President Wilson.

"NO WARRANT FOR THIS ASSERTION."

No warrant is given for this assertion as to the policy of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General has declared and frequently reiterated his policy, and the facts will show that it is not in conflict with this declaration of the President. Now, to cite the facts: A statement of the views of the Postmaster General bearing directly on the issue raised was made through the columns of the New York Herald last May, as follows:

"The intelligent employer in our country no longer regards his employees as mere machines. He realizes that the employee is entitled to a hearing before working conditions, hours of labor, and wages are to be finally fixed. He understands that better results can be had by giving the employee an opportunity to present his grievance face to face with his employer, and that no satisfactory relationship can be maintained unless both sides have confidence that the other is not only willing to be just but is able to see the whole case from the other's viewpoint. These are the conditions existing in America. So long as they obtain no great oppression or wrong can be done to the worker and hence the causes which produce Bolshevism will not exist. The avoidance of social wrongs and the doing of social justice is a sure preventive of Bolshevism."

No one can point to an act of the Postmaster General during his term of office inconsistent with these views, long entertained by him and often announced. At the time the Government assumed control of the wire systems a long-standing and bitter controversy existed between one of the telegraph companies and a certain labor union, and strikes were threatened. The union represented but a small percentage of the employees of this company, and affiliation with the union was prohibited by the company under penalty of dismissal, a number of employees having been dismissed for that reason. On October 2, 1918, an order was issued by the Postmaster General which directed that—

"In its operation of the telegraph and telephone systems the Post Office Department will not distinguish between nonunion and union employees. Persons will be employed solely because of their fitness for the position to which they seek employment and must not be employed, discharged, favored, or discriminated against because they do or do not belong to any particular organization. Officers and employees of the telegraph and telephone systems will comply strictly with the provisions of this order."

POLICY TOWARD EMPLOYEES.

The policy with reference to employees in the wire service was again clearly set forth by the Postmaster General in a letter to the Secretary of Labor on March 15, 1919. In this letter he said:

"These (employees) heretofore denied (by a company) the privilege of joining labor unions are now permitted, if they choose, to do so. * * * We do not deal with persons not connected with the service, who often are authorized and seek to speak for and represent but a small percentage of those employed therein. Neither have we permitted such outside persons to control or influence the operation of the wire systems, notwithstanding their open threats of what will result if the demands they make are not met, for such actions are deeply resented by the great majority of older and more efficient employees.

"The dismissal of employees because of their affiliation with labor unions was one of the first matters to receive our attention, and it was promptly decided that they should not be dismissed for that reason. Not only was this done, but orders were issued to reemploy all those dismissed because of such affiliation. * * * In accordance with these instructions, employees dismissed solely because of their affiliation with a labor organization have, when they so requested, been reemployed, and no dismissals have been made on this account since August 21."

A total of 261 of these dismissed employees applied for reemployment and 226 were employed in accordance with these instructions. Of the 35 applicants who were not reemployed, 21 were offered reemployment but did not accept. Employment was refused to 14 because of their undesirability, a majority of these on account of malicious interference with the wires and service or on account of bad habits.

DISCRIMINATION NOT PERMITTED.

In this same letter of March 15 to the Secretary of Labor the Postmaster General said:

"We have not permitted union employees to be discriminated against because of their affiliation with labor organizations; neither have we permitted employees not members of labor unions to be discriminated against, coerced, or intimidated in any matter."

Investigations by representatives of the Postmaster General not connected with the wire systems have disclosed that many protests have been filed by members of labor unions which had no basis in fact and were made in accordance with instructions received from their international officers, as shown by the following excerpt from a letter to members of the union dated January 30:

"Keep on filing protests at Washington. Even though nothing is done immediately, keep on sending the protests against injustice to the wire board, the War Labor Board, Congressmen, and Senators. Let them know that you are keeping a record of every wrongful act. Perseverance wins, and we are going to win."

Notwithstanding the agitation and annoyance resulting from this pernicious propaganda, the Wire Control Board never permitted itself to be provoked to any action which could be distorted into a departure from its fixed policy disclosed by the foregoing statements.

RIGHT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

The assertion is made in the Federation of Labor resolution that the Postmaster General "characterized as 'silly' the right of collective bargaining." This statement does not accord with the facts. In the beginning of Government control of the wire systems it was made known that the policies of the War Labor Board, which had been approved by the President, would be enforced. This entitled employees to the right of collective bargaining. Again, in the letter to the Secretary of Labor, March 15 last, which was widely published, it was said:

"Employees have been dealt with individually and collectively, and we have at all times permitted individual as well as collective bargaining, without regard to affiliations or membership in any organization of such employees."

And again:

"The operating officials have been instructed to receive committees of their own employees, either individually or collectively, when they desire to present requests for better compensation, conditions of labor, or hours of employment."

And again, on April 17 last, instructions given to a local manager of a telephone company which was at that time involved in a strike, it was stated, and the statement was given wide publicity:

"* * * Every opportunity will be accorded, either to the individual employees or to them collectively, so that they may be given the full benefit of all methods of bargaining * * *."

And, again, before the adoption of the resolutions at Atlantic City the Postmaster General in a signed statement said:

"The order relating to discrimination against employees because of union affiliations has existed from the beginning of Government control and will continue to be enforced to the end of Government control. It has been repeatedly stated that employees, union or nonunion, were at liberty to bargain individually or collectively with the managerial officers of the companies with reference to wages, working conditions, etc. There has been no change in this policy."

The foregoing discloses the policy of the Postmaster General and the Wire Control Board with reference to collective bargaining. Can it be misunderstood by any person with an open mind?

"WHAT ARE THE FACTS?"

Furthermore, the change in the resolution, whether intended so or not, is a perversion of the language of the Postmaster General. What are the facts? In the statement of April 27, in reply to Mr. Gompers, the Postmaster General drew a clear distinction between employees of the Government whose salaries and hours of labor are determined by the law of Congress and those employees or groups of employees who may be temporarily in the Government service but whose wages and hours of employment are not fixed by law. Speaking of civil-service employees, he said:

"As the Postmaster General sees it, it is little short of silly to talk about collective bargaining with an executive officer by civil-service employees under his administration. The salary and wages to be paid such employees, the hours of labor, and working conditions are fixed by the legislative branch, and it is for the executive head of a department to strictly follow the law in respect thereto. * * *

"Now, in the matter of telegraph and telephone employees, they are at present working for the Government, and the Postmaster General insists that a strike on their part is not permissible, and he will not concede that it is. While they are working for the Government the wage paid them is not fixed as that of other Government employees, and hence a different treatment or method must be used in ascertaining what is a just wage."

Can this meaning be misunderstood by one who wants to be fair?

The resolution charges that the Postmaster General "has ruthlessly invaded the rights of employees," etc., and "has also sought to have repealed the employees' constitutional right of direct appeal to Congress." In 1895 organizations of postal employees had become so active in attempts to influence legislative and administrative action that Postmaster General William L. Wilson found it necessary to issue an order directing that no postal employees, under penalty of dismissal, should visit Washington for the purpose of influencing legislation before Congress. This order having afforded but temporary relief, President Roosevelt on January 2, 1902, issued an Executive order forbidding all officers and employees of the United States, either directly or indirectly, individually or through associations, to solicit an increase in pay or to influence, or attempt to influence, in their own interest any other legislation whatever, either before Congress or its committees. The penalty for the violation of this order was dismissal.

This afforded relief; but as a result of terrific pressure the Congress on August 24, 1912, by a rider on an appropriation bill permitting Government employees to form organizations, in effect nullified this Executive order by President Roosevelt.

"DISTORTING AND MISREPRESENTING."

As a result of this legislation many organizations now maintain representatives in Washington for the purpose of influencing legislation and presenting grievances. By distorting and misrepresenting facts they have encouraged disrespect for administrative officers, disloyalty to the service, and rendered the maintenance of discipline extremely difficult. An attitude of hostility has been assumed by them for years, irrespective of how or by whom the service has been administered.

The advisability of permitting Government employees to affiliate with an outside organization which utilizes the strike and boycott as a last resort to enforce its demands is questioned by many serious-minded, thoughtful people interested in public welfare. In calling the attention of Congress to this matter in his report of 1917 the Postmaster General cited the fact that civil-service employees are selected through competitive examination, without regard to politics or religious faith, their appointment and promotion being determined by the merit system, and he expressed the belief that these employes should have imposed upon them certain limitations as to their activities.

"They should," he said, "be permitted to form organizations for their social and mutual welfare, appear before committees in Congress when requested and give any information concerning the Postal Service of which they may have knowledge, but the formation of organizations for other purposes, such as interfering with the discipline and administration of the service, the control of the election of persons nominated for public office, or enactment of legislation for their selfish interests and not for the welfare of the public should cease."

"MENACE TO PUBLIC WELFARE."

In concluding his recommendations, the Postmaster General said: "The conduct of these organizations at this time is incompatible with the principles of civil service and with good administration of the Postal Service. They are fast becoming a menace to public welfare, and should no longer be tolerated or condoned. It is earnestly recommended that the provision in the act of August 24, 1912, referred to be repealed." Now, was this a ruthless invasion of the rights of the employees? That it was so regarded is admitted, and, notwithstanding the Postmaster General has been repeatedly denounced by the American Federation of Labor, his views on this subject have undergone no change.

The Postmaster General has at no time denied to employees of the Postal Service the privilege of presenting to him for themselves any complaints or grievances which they might believe demanded consideration. On the contrary, he has invited them to make known their views or any suggestion for the betterment of their condition and the improvement of the service and has repeatedly given assurances of fair and just treatment.

In his first annual report, June 30, 1913, he said:

"The prime consideration in perfecting the personnel of the Postal Service shall be to recognize efficiency and to eliminate partisanship. It is the earnest hope that ultimately all positions will be covered under the classified civil service, and that merit and faithfulness will be the sole consideration in making appointments as well as promotions."

STANDARD RATE OF PAY.

He stated in his 1916 report that it was the earnest effort of the department to fix the standard rate of pay in the service at from 15 to 50 per cent above the average rates or similar service paid by the leading commercial institutions of the country, and said:

"Wherever an employee or group of employees is found to be receiving salaries below the standard, the department will make an effort to secure appropriate increases. It is the department's desire to maintain not only a living wage for all of its employees but, by the adoption of every safety appliance possible, to establish sanitary and comfortable working conditions for both the departmental and Postal Service employees, and in no case to require of any postal employee more than eight hours' work in any one day."

Since Government control of the wire systems, the Postmaster General has pursued these same policies toward the telegraph and telephone employees. He has at all times while acting as trustee for the wire systems endeavored to be absolutely just and fair to them, but at the same time he tried also to be just to the stockholders of these companies and fair to the general public. Often during this period the question has arisen, Shall those in temporary control of these wire properties permit themselves to be driven beyond the just principles embodied in these policies? Shall established governmental policies be abandoned or governmental powers surrendered to employees because of threatened strikes? To allow this would be to concede the assumed rights of employees serving the Government to use the strike as a means of enforcing whatever demands they may see fit to make. No such concession has been or will be made.

"ORDERLY PROCESSES OF GOVERNMENT."

The question is, as the Postmaster General sees it, whether the orderly processes of government shall be ignored, whether labor organizations can defy its authority and put into effect their will regardless of the right of others and the public interest. The Government undertakes to see that even-handed justice is meted out to all. To yield to outside agencies the exercise of Government authority to decide what action shall be taken is to confess that the Government has failed and can not be relied upon to do what is right. In the opinion of the Postmaster General, such confession would be indefensible.

The declaration that the labor policy of the Postmaster General "is in utter defiance of the wishes of the people and in complete opposition to the expressed words of President Wilson" is a generalization, the truth of which is refuted by the foregoing citations and by every action, recommendation, or utterance of the Postmaster General.

The resolution speaks of the Postmaster General's attitude as being archaic and autocratic and resulting in a demoralized service, etc., and as choking "industrial progress, etc."

The Postmaster General does not believe it is archaic, autocratic, or obstructive to industrial progress to stand for even-handed justice, fair, and impartial administration of government, to ignore class distinction and recognize the right of labor to absolutely fair treatment, whether organized or unorganized. But why multiply words? Let us come directly to the cause of complaint against the Postmaster General. All of us know that the right to organize, the right of collective bargaining, etc., etc., are but means to an end. What was desired was the increase of the wage scale.

HANDICAPS FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Time and again the Postmaster General gave assurance of his willingness to investigate requests for wage increases in order to determine whether the same were just. Many increases were made as the result of these investigations. Some requests were found unjust and, of course, were not granted. The Postmaster General was much handicapped in this matter because of the legal difficulties under which he labored as trustee for the properties and because of the obstructionist policy of the State utility commissions.

It was necessary under the law to operate the properties so that they should be returned to their owners in as good condition as when received, with their value unimpaired. Congress made no appropriation with which to raise wages or to maintain the properties. It was necessary, therefore to pay operating expenses, including wages, and also just compensation required by the law and the Constitution out of the revenues received from operation. When an attempt was made to raise rates sufficiently to procure revenues to accomplish these things the State commission in 18 States enjoined the proposed rates. They were able to do this because of the peculiar situation presented by the division of the rate-making power in peace times between the States and the Federal Government.

As a consequence, any wage increases could have only one of two effects. Either the value of the properties would have been destroyed because of the extinction of their earnings or else they would have been operated at a huge deficit, to be covered by an appropriation to be raised by taxes. As trustee of these properties it was his duty to prevent the destruction of their value. To pile up a huge deficit to be covered by congressional appropriation would have been without authority and, in effect, to use the taxing power for the benefit of a particular class of wage earners. This the Postmaster General refused to do.

"MANY INCREASES OF WAGES."

Often the policy has been declared that wage increases asked, if proven to be just and reasonable, would be granted in any event, even though, in order to continue efficient service, the charges to the public must be increased. As stated, many increases of wages were made, but this did not satisfy those who more than once made demands which, if met, would have increased the operating expenditures of the wire systems so enormously that they could not be returned to their owners, because they would have been practically without value.

Such unreasonable demands for wage increases have been resisted and as a result the Postmaster General is not a popular idol, but he has the satisfying knowledge that when the period of Government control ends that to each wire system its properties will be returned with its value unimpaired. In the discharge of his duty in connection with the control of the wire service the Postmaster General has tried to be absolutely just and fair to all parties at interest. He has made no distinction between the plutocrat and the proletariat. He has protected the rights where they existed of the one just as he did of the other; he has resisted the unreasonable and selfish demands of the one just as he has of the other.

The foregoing clearly discloses what the labor policy of the Postmaster General is and has been from the beginning. He has no desire to change it, but a fixed purpose to adhere to it.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, may I just take one moment to say that in introducing these matters into the RECORD, so far as the article printed by the Postmaster General in the Herald is concerned, that the Postmaster General expresses a view on the subject of the civil service which I do not approve?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object in this case——

Mr. MOON. Permission has already been granted.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman has the floor, and I intended to reserve the right to object——

Mr. MOON. Permission has already been given.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numberd 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 18, 44, 51, 53, 58, 81, 83, 90, 91, 93, 105, 106, 107, and 110.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 95, 99, 100, 102, 103, and 108, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"*Provided*, That the restrictions herein above recited concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of $12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department: *Provided further*, That in addition to the delivery of the property heretofore authorized to be delivered to the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture and the Post Office Department of the Government, the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell any surplus supplies including motor trucks and automobiles now owned by and in the possession of the Government for the use of the War Department to any State or municipal subdivision thereof, or to any corporation or individual upon such terms as may be deemed best."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Appropriations, Air Service: Creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools, courses of instruction for aviation students and enlisted men, including cost of equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; improvement, equipment, maintenance, lease, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, plants for testing and experimental work, including the acquisition of land, or any interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation, where necessary to procure helium gas; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft, accessories thereto, including helium gas rights, and aviation engines, including patents and other rights thereto, and plans, drawings, and specifications thereof; purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith, and also for the purchase or manufacture and the issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expense connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, including the hire of civilian employees, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of such consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Service as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, including necessary

traveling expenses: *Provided*, That the entire expenditures for the services of consulting engineers for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $100,000; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs, and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Service; for the establishment of aviation stations in the Philippine Islands, including the lease of land or any interest in land for landing fields only and the preparation of land now owned by the Government necessary to make the same suitable for the purpose intended, buildings, heating, lighting, plumbing, water, sewer, roads, and walks, at a total cost not to exceed $350,000, in all, $40,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding $250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post, and approved by the Director of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $150,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter actual and necessary expenses only, not to exceed $8 per day, shall be paid to officers of the Army and contract surgeons when traveling by air on duty without troops, under competent orders: *And provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain at one or more established flying schools courses of instruction for aviation students.

"Aviation students shall be enlisted in or appointed to the grade of flying cadet, Air Service, which grade is hereby established: *Provided*, That the total number of flying cadets shall not at any time exceed 1,300. The base pay of a flying cadet shall be $75 per month, including extra pay for flying risk as provided by law. The ration allowance of a flying cadet shall not exceed $1 per day, and his other allowances shall be those of a private, first class, Air Service.

"Upon completion of a course prescribed for flying cadets, each flying cadet, if he so desires, may be discharged and commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to discharge at any time any flying cadet whose discharge shall have been recommended by a board of not less than three officers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For pay of officers of the line, $13,991,672.

"For pay of officers of Staff Corps and departments, $10,653,784.

"For pay of officers, National Guard, $100.

"For pay of the Officers' Reserve Corps, $3,000,000.

"For pay of warrant officers, Mine Planter Service, $107,880.

"For pay of three officers, Bureau of Insular Affairs, $15,000.

"Aviation increase, to officers of the Army, $650,000.

"For pay of the officers, Philippine Scouts, $624,004.

"Additional pay to officers for length of service, $2,929,506.

"PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

"For pay of enlisted men of the line, $93,386,650: *Provided*, That the pay due enlisted men of the Army shall not be withheld from them by reason of the fact that their service records or other official papers showing the status of their accounts with respect to pay have been lost or not returned from overseas, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, these men may be paid upon their personal affidavit as to date of last payment and condition of their accounts: *Provided further*, That payments made in accordance with such regulations (or which have already been made upon the affidavit of the soldier) shall be passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury to the credit of the disbursing officers making them.

"For pay of enlisted men, National Guard, $100.

"For pay of enlisted men of the Staff Corps and departments, $14,997,374.

"For pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, $290,000.

"For pay of enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, $100,000.

"Aviation increase to enlisted men of the Army, $6,500.

"For pay of the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, $1,326,648.

"Additional pay for length of service to enlisted men, $3,285,832.

"*Provided*, That the provisions of section 10 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishments of the United States,' approved May 18, 1917, in so far as it increases the pay of the enlisted men of the Army, be, and the same hereby are, continued in force and effect from and after the date of the approval of this act.

"PAY OF PERSONS WITH RETIRED STATUS.

"For pay of the officers on the retired list, $2,788,650.

"For increase pay to retired officers on active duty, $229,760.

"For pay of retired enlisted men, $3,404,844.

"For pay and allowances of retired enlisted men on active duty, $25,000.

"For pay and allowances of Regular Army Reservists on active duty, $50,000.

"For pay of retired Philippine Scout officers, $54,000.

"For pay of retired pay clerks, $18,562.50.

"For pay of retired veterinarians, $3,570.

"For pay of persons wounded, as found due, and reported and set forth on page 20 of House Document No. 1168, Sixty-second Congress, second session, $29,000.

"CLERKS, MESSENGERS, AND LABORERS, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

"One chief clerk, at $2,500 per annum, $2,500.

"Three clerks, at $2,000 each per annum, $6,000.

"Six clerks, at $1,800 each per annum, $10,800.

"Ten clerks, at $1,600 each per annum, $16,000.

"Twelve clerks, at $1,400 each per annum, $16,800.

"Seventeen clerks, at $1,200 each per annum, $20,400.

"Eight clerks, at $1,000 each per annum, $8,000.

"One captain of the watch, at $900 per annum, $900.

"Six watchmen, at $720 each per annum, $4,320.

"One gardener, at $720 per annum, $720.

"One packer, at $840 per annum, $840.

"One chief messenger, at $1,000 per annum, $1,000.

"Three messengers, at $840 each per annum, $2,520.

"Fifteen messengers, at $720 each per annum, $10,800.

"Two laborers, at $720 each per annum, $1,440.

"One laborer, at $600 per annum, $600.

"Five charwomen, at $240 each per annum, $1,200.

"PAY OF ARMY FIELD CLERKS AND CIVIL-SERVICE MESSENGERS AT HEADQUARTERS OF THE SEVERAL TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENTS, ARMY AND CORPS HEADQUARTERS, TERRITORIAL DISTRICTS, TACTICAL DIVISIONS AND BRAGADES, SERVICE SCHOOLS, CAMPS, PORTS OF EMBARKATION AND DEBARKATION, AND AT SUCH OTHER STATIONS AT WHICH, IN THE DISCRETION OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR, THESE CLERKS OR MESSENGERS MAY BE ASSIGNED TO DUTY.

"Thirty-three clerks, at $2,000 each, $66,000.

"Eighty-two clerks, at $1,800 each, $147,600.

"One hundred and fifty-seven clerks, at $1,600 each, $251,200.

"Two hundred and twenty-three clerks, at $1,400 each, $312,200.

"Four hundred and ninety-five clerks, at $1,200 each, $594,000.

"One hundred and three messengers, at $720 each, $74,160.

"Additional pay while on foreign service, $8,000.

"For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, $23,040: *Provided*, That hereafter Army field clerks shall have the same allowances and benefits as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, not including retirement: *Provided, however*, That the minimum or entrance pay, exclusive of said allowances, of said Army field clerks shall be $1,200 per annum: *Provided further*, That Army field clerks shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed by law to commissioned officers of the Army: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to employ, during the present emergency and for a period not exceeding four months thereafter, such additional Army field clerks as may be necessary, not exceeding 4,272. For commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, $76,800: *Provided*, That said clerks, messengers, and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War, to the offices and positions in which they are to serve: *Provided further*, That [illegible]erk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divi[illegible] military departments, brigades, service schools, and office [illegible]e Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

"MISCELLANEOUS.

"For pay of contract surgeons, $58,500.

"For pay of nurses, $1,113,177.

"For pay of hospital matrons, $3,600.

"For pay of reserve veterinarians, $512,720.

"For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, retiring boards, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending same, and expenses of taking depositions and securing other evidence for use before the same, $325,000.

"For additional pay to officer in charge of public buildings and grounds at Washington, D. C., $500.

"For commutation of quarters and of heat and light to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men on duty at places where no public quarters are available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, $7,323,247.

"For interest on soldiers' deposits, $145,000.

"For pay of expert accountant for the Inspector General's Department, $2,500.

"For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty for periods of not less than 10 days in the offices of Coast Defense Artillery Engineers and Coast Defense Ordnance officers, and as switchboard operators at seacoast fortifications, $25,000.

"For extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty as switchboard operators at each interior post of the Army, $19,215.

"For extra pay to enlisted men of the line of the Army and to enlisted men of the Quartermaster Corps, Medical Department, and of the Signal Corps employed in the Territory of Alaska on the Washington-Alaska cable and telegraph system for periods of not less than 10 days at the rate of 35 cents per day, $38,430.

"For mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, $2,047,500.

"For additional 10 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service, $1,209,310: *Provided*, That hereafter warrant officers shall receive the same increase of pay for service beyond the continental limits of the United States as is allowed to commissioned officers of the Army.

"For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, $5,552,000.

"For pay of one computer for Artillery Board, $2,500.

"For pay of one computer for Field Artillery Board, $2,500.

"For pay of one computer for Infantry School of Arms, $2,500.

"For payment of exchange by acting quartermasters serving in foreign countries and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the Quartermaster Corps when serving in Alaska, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Quartermaster Corps at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,000.

"For additional pay to officers below the grade of major required to be mounted and who furnished their own mounts, $195,000.

"For amount required to make monthly payments to Jennie Carroll, widow of James Carroll, late major, United States Army, $1,500.

"For amount required to make monthly payments to Mabel H. Lazear, widow of Jesse W. Lazear, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, $1,500.

"For amount required to make monthly payments of $100 to John R. Kissinger, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry, also late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, $1,200. All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous, except the appropriation for mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active service, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That any part of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919, not exceeding $100,000,000, that is not required for the service of that fiscal year, may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "$62,526,466.50: *Provided*, That not to exceed $22,500 of this sum be made available for the care of the peach orchard on Poole Island, Aberdeen Proving Ground, and the grain now growing at this and other reservations and the harvest and disposal of the crops; and such disposal by sale or otherwise shall be made pursuant to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as 'Miscellaneous receipts'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$10," and on page 25, line 19, of the engrossed bill, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Land for hospital and other purposes: For the purchase of land contiguous to the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia, 26.9 acres, more or less, for the final location of the Army Medical Museum, the Surgeon General's Library, and the Army Medical School, and for the improvements now on the land to be purchased, $350,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert "$300,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for 'Engineer equipment of troops,' 'Engineer operations in the field,' and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed $225,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "$5,000,000: *Provided*, That all the moneys hereinbefore appropriated for the arming, equipping, and training of the National Guard shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert "cantonments except in such cases as National Army or National Guard camps or cantonments which were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been or may be found more economical to the Government for the purpose of salvaging such camps or cantonments to buy real estate than to continue to pay rentals or claims for damages thereon, and except where industrial plants have been constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes and the purchase of land is necessary in order to protect the interest of the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"That the several organizations of the Army, to wit: The Chemical Warfare Service, the Air Service, the Construction Division, the Tank Corps, and the Motor Transport Corps, with their powers and duties as defined in orders and regulations in force and effect on November 11, 1918, shall be continued to and until June 30, 1920.

"That officers of the emergency Army appointed to the Officers' Reserve Corps may be appointed therein to the grade held by them in the emergency Army or next higher grade, as the Secretary of War may direct."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Sec. 2." in line 1 of the second paragraph of the amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Exchange of Army cold-storage plant, Chicago, Ill.: That the President is hereby authorized, through the Secretary of War, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by the Secretary of War, to dispose of the United States Army cold-storage plant in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, with machinery and equipment therein contained, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, and to accept in part payment therefor a warehouse adjacent to the Army general supply depot in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, contaning approximately 650,000 square feet of storage space, together with the land comprising the site of same: *Provided*, That such exchange shall be effected without expenditure for this purpose by the United States, except necessary costs of conveyancing not exceeding $500, hereby appropriated for this purpose. The President, through the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized to execute and deliver in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effect such sale or exchange.

"That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of such sale or exchange shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of 'Miscellaneous receipts,' and a full report of the same shall be submitted to Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Insert at the beginning of the amendment a side title as follows: "Boughton Memorial Association"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Maj. H. W. Daley: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Maj. H. W. Daley, National Army, to the position and rank of second lieutenant on the retired list."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Relief of Mrs. Blanche Winters: That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to be paid to Mrs. Blanche Winters, widow of Charles F. Winters, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, as compensation and relief for the loss, by death, on January 11, 1918, at Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas, of her husband, Charles F. Winters, who, while engaged in the discharge of his duty, in conducting the camp bank at Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas, and in protecting the money and funds of the Government of the United States of America and of the soldiers of the United States Army, was feloniously killed by Louis R. Whistler, a commissioned officer and captain of Company E, Three hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment, Infantry, Eighty-ninth Division, of the Army of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Medical supplies for the American Red Cross: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross such medical and surgical supplies and supplementary and dietary foodstuffs used in the treatment of the sick and injured, now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces, or needed for use in military hospitals in the United States, or as military or hospital stores for the Army of the United States, to be used by said American Red Cross as it shall determine, to relieve and supply the pressing needs of the peoples of countries involved in the late war. The Secretary of War shall prescribe regulations and conditions for the selection and delivery of said supplies and foodstuffs to the American Red Cross for the purposes aforesaid."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"Prosecution of claims by former Government employees: That it shall be unlawful for any person who, as a commissioned officer of the Army, or officer or employee of the United States, has at any time since April 6, 1917, been employed in any bureau of the Government and in such employment been engaged on behalf of the United States, in producing or assisting to procure supplies for the Military Establishment, or who has been engaged in the settlement or adjustment of contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for the Military Establishment, within two years next after his discharge or other separation from the service of the Government, to solicit employment in the presentation or to aid or assist for compensation in the prosecution of claims against the United States arising out of any contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for said bureau, which were pending or entered into while the said officer or employee was associated therewith. A violation of this provision of this chapter shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year,

or both: *Provided*, That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any of the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JULIUS KAHN,
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on:

On amendment No. 1: The House receded from this amendment with an amendment which authorizes in the first proviso to employ men who are capable to dispose of the Government property. The second proviso prohibits the payment of any salary in this act in excess of $12,000 per annum. In the third proviso the conferees inserted a provision authorizing the Secretary of War to sell any surplus supplies, including automobiles in the possession of the Government to any State or municipal subdivision or to any corporation or individual upon such terms as may be deemed best.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment relates to the Military Intelligence Division for which the House appropriated $250,000, but the Senate increased this amount to $430,000. Your conferees compromised this sum by allowing $400,000.

On amendment No. 3: On this amendment the Senate recedes, which restores the House text naming Fort Sill, Okla., for the Infantry School of Arms.

On amendment No. 4: The Senate recedes from this amendment, which restores the words "Fort Sill, Oklahoma."

On amendment No. 5: This amendment appropriated $10,000 for textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and for other expenses required for Field Artillery brigade firing at Camp Bragg, Camp Knox, and Camp Taylor, from which the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 6: The Senate recedes from this provision relating to special prices on typewriting machines and thus restores the House text.

On amendment No. 7: This amendment appropriates for the Signal Service of the Army which the House passed at $3,000,000 and the Senate increased to $3,500,000. Your conferees agreed to this amendment by allowing $3,250,000.

On amendment No. 8: Your conferees accepted the Senate appropriation of $140,000, which is for the maintenance of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system.

On amendment No. 9: Provides the procurement of hilium gas, limits the establishment of aviation stations in the Philippine Islands, limits the leasing of land in the Philippine Islands for landing fields only, and limits the expense for aviation in the Philippines to $358,000. Provisions for the purchase of land at Buffalo; Dayton, Ohio; Burlington County, N. J.; and San Diego, Calif., are eliminated. It provides for courses of instruction for aviation students and the creation of the grade of flying cadet of the Air Service. The amount of money appropriated is $40,000,000.

On amendment No. 10: The House conferees agreed to the Senate provision which allowed $3,500,000 of the unexpended balances of the appropriation on June 30, 1919, for all necessary expenses for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft act, and authorizes the employment of clerical help to furnish the adjutant generals of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with the Central Powers.

On amendment No. 11: This amendment relates to the pay of the Army. The amount appropriated is based on an army of 325,000 men.

On amendment No. 12: The House conferees recede from this amendment which will allow members of the Officers' Reserve Training Corps at camp subsistence in the Army.

On amendment No. 13: This amendment relates to appropriations for subsistence of the Army. Your conferees allowed $62,526,466.20, which is estimated as all that is necessary. The House passed this provision at $67,500,000 and the Senate at $85,000,000. This decrease is the result of maintaining an Army of 325,000 men. It also provides $22,500 for the harvesting and disposal of crops on Poole Island, Aberdeen Proving Ground.

On amendment No. 14: The Senate recedes from this amendment, which restores the appropriation allowed by the House for the regular supplies of the Army.

On amendment No. 15: Your conferees accepted the Senate amendment, which allows a donation of $10 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement under court-martial sentence. The conferees compromised on the total for incidental expenses by allowing

On amendment No. 16: This amendment struck out the provision for the transportation overseas to the United States of the bodies of officers and enlisted men who died in Europe during the present war which the House conferees accepted for the reason that this appropriation is carried in the sundry civil act.

On amendment No. 17: This amendment relates to transportation of the Army.

On amendment No. 18: This amendment relates to water and sewers at military posts, which proposed to strike out the House text, from which the Senate recedes, thus restoring the House language.

On amendment No. 19: The House appropriated $5,000,000 for water and sewers at military posts and the Senate increased this amount to $10,000,000. Your conferees allowed $7,000,000.

On amendment No. 20: The House conferees receded from this amendment, which allowed each soldier a suit of citizens' outer clothing at a cost not exceeding $15, which is an increase of $5 as passed by the House.

On amendment No. 21: The House allowed $18,750,000 for clothing and camp and garrison equipage, which the Senate increased to $25,000,000. By reason of the reduction of the Army to 325,000 men, it was estimated that $20,000,000 would be sufficient, which your conferees allowed.

On amendment No. 22: This amendment is for horses for the Army, which passed the House at $1,000,000 and was increased in the Senate to $5,000,000. Your conferees compromised by allowing $2,500,000.

On amendment No. 23: This amendment relates to barracks and quarters for the Army, which was passed by the House at $2,000,000 and increased in the Senate to $15,000,000. The House conferees allowed $7,500,000.

On amendment No. 24: The House appropriated $150,000 for equipment of amusement rooms and gymnasiums at military post exchanges, which the Senate increased to $1,350,000. Your conferees receded from this amendment by allowing $675,000.

On amendment No. 25: This amendment relates to barracks and quarters in the Philippine Islands, for which the House appropriated $150,000. The Senate increased this amount to $350,000, and your conferees compromised by allowing $250,000.

On amendment No. 26: The House appropriated $3,000,000 for the construction and repair of roads, walks, and wharves, and for the disposal of drainage, which the Senate increased to $5,000,000. Your conferees receded by allowing $4,000,000.

On amendment No. 27: The House conferees accepted this amendment, as it was a decrease of $100,000 in the appropriation for shooting galleries and ranges.

On amendments Nos. 28 and 29: These amendments authorized the increase of $100 in the salaries of the assistant engineer and a carpenter at the Army War College, which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 30: This amendment is merely a change in total, hence the House recedes.

On amendment No. 31: Your conferees recede from this amendment, as it reduces the appropriation $15,000 for rental of buildings for military purposes in the District of Columbia and does not allow any appropriation if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

On amendment No. 32: This amendment relates to vocational training under the national defense act, for which the House appropriated $10,500. The Senate increased the amount to $5,000,000. Your conferees receded from this amendment by allowing $2,000,000.

On amendment No. 33: This amendment is merely a change in title. Your conferees recede.

On amendment No. 34: This amendment relates to rifle ranges for civilian instruction. The Senate increased the House amount of $10,000 to $100,000 and provided that the governors of States and Territories and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate which team shall represent their respective States, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 35: This amendment relates to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The Senate increased the amount from $1,000,000 to $4,000,000, and the House receded.

On amendment No. 36: Your conferees accept the Senate amendment for the reason that it strikes out the authority to purchase land for storage and shipping facilities.

On amendment No. 37: The House allowed $22,750,000 for storage and shipping facilities which the Senate increased to $45,000,000. The House conferees yielded to this amendment by allowing $30,000,000, which is a decrease of $15,000,000 as passed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 38: Your conferees allowed $4,500,000 for the Medical Department of the Army, which is a decrease of $500,000 of the amount allowed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 39: Your conferees accept the Senate amendment, as it is a decrease of $10,000 for hospital care at the Canal Zone garrisons, and allows $50,000 for this purpose.

On amendment No. 40: This amendment relates to the purchase of land for the Army Medical Museum contiguous to Walter Reed General Hospital. The amount involved is $350,000, and the House accepted the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 41: This amendment relates to the engineer equipment of troops for which the House allowed $200,000 and the Senate increased to $400,000. Your conferees allowed this item at $300,000 and allowed the Secretary of War to employ the services of skilled draftsmen and civil engineers in the office of Chief of Engineers.

On amendment No. 42: This amendment provided for $25,000 for civilian assistants to engineer officers, which the Senate increased to $50,000. Your conferees accepted this amendment by allowing $40,000.

On amendment No. 43: This amendment relates to engineer operations in the field, which the House allowed $2,000,000 and the Senate increased to $5,000,000. The House conferees yielded to this amendment by allowing $3,000,000.

On amendment No. 44: The House appropriated $100,000 for the construction and maintenance of military roads in Alaska, which the Senate increased to $300,000. The Senate receded from this amendment, which restores the House text.

On amendment No. 45: The House accepted the Senate amendment as it prohibits any purchase of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles by the Ordnance Department.

On amendment No. 46: Under this amendment the House allowed $5,000,000 for the Ordnance Department, which the Senate increased to $14,000,000. Your conferees compromised on this item by allowing $7,000,000, which is a decrease of $7,000,000 in the Senate item.

On amendment No. 47: Your conferees yielded on this amendment and accepted the Senate provision, which allows $1,600,000 for the Frankford Arsenal.

On amendment No. 48: The House accepted this amendment, as it was a reduction of $50,000 in the appropriation allowed for small-arms target practice as passed by the House, and did not allow the Senate provision for the appointment of a director of marksmanship in the Army.

On amendment No. 49: The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment, which struck out the provision for "purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops."

On amendment No. 50: The House conferees accepted this amendment, as it is a reduction of $1,000,000 in the appropriation passed by the House, which provides for ordnance stores and supplies. Your conferees accepted the amount allowed by the Senate, which was $2,000,000.

On amendment No. 51: The Senate recedes from this amendment, which was a change in phraseology, thus restoring the House text.

On amendment No. 52. This amendment relates to the purchase of automatic machine rifles, for which the Senate allowed $1,000,000. This is a reduction of $500,000 in the amount passed by the House. Your conferees accepted this decrease.

On amendment No. 53: This amendment of the Senate related to incidental expenses for the Tank Corps School, from which the Senate receded.

On amendments Nos. 54 and 55: These amendments change the word "horses" to "animals," which also permits the purchase of mules for the arming, equipping, and training of the National Guard.

On amendment No. 56: This appropriation was $250,000 less than the amount passed by the House, and the House conferees accepted this amendment.

On amendment No. 57: Your conferees accepted the amount allowed by the Senate for the pay of property and disbursing officers for the United States, which was passed by the Senate at $43,750, an increase of $8,750 over the amount allowed by the House.

On amendment No. 58: The Senate receded from this amendment, which restored the House amount for travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers making inspections.

On amendment No. 59: Your conferees accepted this amendment as it is a reduction of $4,000 in the travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers changing stations.

On amendment No. 60: The House allowed $40,000 for travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers on visits of instruction, which the Senate reduced to $30,000, making a decrease of $10,000, which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 61: The House conferees accepted the Senate provision allowing $200,000 for the transportation of supplies.

On amendment No. 62: The House conferees receded from the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the pay of the National Guard and accepted the amendment of the Senate which provides that this amount shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund.

On amendments Nos. 63 to 78, inclusive: The House conferees receded from all of these amendments, as they are merely changes in phraseology of the paragraphs relating to the equipment for the National Guard.

On amendment No. 79: Provides for the cancellation of previous enlistments in the National Guard.

On amendment No. 80: The House conferees receded from this amendment, as it simply provides staff officers appointed in the National Guard of the District of Columbia shall have the same status as officers appointed from the States.

On amendment No. 81: Provides for the appointment of National Guard officers without physical examinations, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 82: The House conferees accepted this amendment, as it is only a change in the title to the paragraph.

On amendment No. 83: This amendment, as passed by the Senate, increases the appropriation of $100,000 for ordnance equipment for rifle ranges, but the Senate receded, and thus restored the original appropriation as passed by the House of $100,000.

On amendments No. 84 to 86, inclusive: Your conferees accepted these amendments, as they only add to the language of the titles of the national-defense act.

On amendments 87 and 88: Your conferees accepted these amendments, as they only provided for the changing of certain provisos in the bill to paragraphs.

On amendment No. 89: This amendment proposes to strike out a provision authorizing the Secretary of War to have printing done elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office, and in view of the fact that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs received a communication from the Secretary of War requesting that this amendment be agreed to, your conferees accepted the same.

On amendment No. 90: The Senate receded from the amendment providing for the purchase of land for an aviation field at Eberts Field.

On amendment 91: The Senate receded from the text of this amendment so as to transfer the language contained therein to amendment 92.

On amendment 92: This amendment accepted the House language regarding the purchase of real estate and made an exception as to camps and cantonments that were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been found more economical to the Government to purchase such camps or cantonments than to pay rentals or damages therein, and made further exceptions as to industrial plants which were constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes.

On amendment No. 93: The Senate recedes from the striking out of bonus provision and the stop-watch system and left the language as passed by the House.

On amendment No. 94: This amendment provided that all of the several organizations of the Army should be continued until otherwise provided for by law, but the House conferees receded with a provision which authorizes the continuation of the War Chemical Service, the Tank Corps, the Motor Transport Corps, and the Air Service.

On amendment No. 95: This amendment provides for the dispossession of certain balances from a previous appropriation relative to a memorial archway at Vicksburg, Miss., which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 96: This amendment provides for the disposal of real property by sale or lease which, in the judgment of the President, or the head of such department, is no longer needed by the Government, and the moneys derived therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and a report made annually to Congress, which your conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 97: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of War to exchange the Army cold-storage plant at Chicago, Ill., for a warehouse adjacent to the Army general depot in the city of Chicago, which is recommended by the Secretary of War. Your conferees accepted this amendment.

On amendment No. 98: This amendment authorizes the Boughton Memorial Association to erect and maintain a building at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to be first approved and constructed in such location as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, upon condition that the ground floor of said building shall be used by the Post Office Department free of charge, which your conferees accept.

On amendment No. 99: This amendment permits the Secretary of War to transfer certain ammunition, explosives, and other ammunition components to other executive departments of the Government. The House accepted this amendment.

On amendment No. 100: The Senate amendment authorizes the appointment of Col. William A. Simpson, United States Army, retired, as a brigadier general on the retired list, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 101: The Senate amendment provided for the appointment of H. W. Daley to a major on the retired list. The House conferees accepted this amendment with an amendment providing for his retirement as a second lieutenant.

On amendment No. 102: This amendment restores Capt. Daniel W. Hand to a certain position on the lineal list of the Army. The House conferees accepted the amendment.

On amendment 103: This amendment provides that Lieut. Frank Barber, first lieutenant of the Dorset Regiment of Infantry of the British Army, who lost the sight of both eyes and became totally blind by reason of a premature explosion while acting as instructor of United States troops at Camp Wheeler, Ga., shall receive a compensation as provided under the war-risk insurance act, and the House conferees accepted the amendment.

On amendment 104: This amendment provided for the payment of $25,000 to Blanche Winters as compensation and relief for the loss by death of her husband, Charles F. Winters, who was feloniously killed at Camp Funston while protecting the funds of the Government of the United States. Your conferees accepted this amendment, but reduced the sum appropriated to $10,000.

On amendment 105: This amendment authorized appointment of Leonard F. Matlack to the position of captain on the retired list, but the Senate receded.

On amendment 106: This amendment proposed to credit the accounts of Maj. Gen. Jesse I. McCarter, United States Army, the sum of $352.23, but the Senate receded.

On amendment 107: This amendment authorized the appointment of Capt. J. C. Garrett to take rank as if he had remained continuously in service, which conferees did not accept; Senate receded.

On amendment 108: This amendment authorized the appointment of Col. Samuel R. Jones, United States Army, retired, as a brigadier general on the retired list, which the House conferees accepted.

On amendment No. 109: This amendment authorized the Secretary of War to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross certain medical and surgical supplies, etc., which are not needed for the American Expeditionary Forces or for use in military hospitals in the United States. Your conferees accepted this amendment with a further condition that said supplies shall not be needed as military or hospital stores for the Army of the United States.

On amendment No. 110: This amendment provides that the Secretary of War is authorized to make use of certain facilities of civil educational institutions for student officers stationed in the vicinity thereof, and the Senate receded from this amendment.

On amendment No. 111: The Senate amendment against the employment of any officer of the Army in the prosecution of claims for supplies for the military establishment was amended so as to provide that no former commissioned officer of the Army or employee of the United States who had been employed in any bureau of the Government in procuring supplies for the military establishment may solicit or accept employment in the presentation of claims against the Government arising out of any contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies for such bureaus. Also that all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are repeated. The House conferees accepted the same.

JULIUS KAHN,
DANIEL R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the conferees were in session until early Sunday morning and therefore it was not possible to make as full a statement as the conferees would have liked to make because we had to print the report that very morning in the RECORD in order to take it up to-day under the rules. The conferees finally agreed upon a pay appropriation for an army of 325,000 men. That is a little more than the House conferees thought was necessary, but it is 75,000 less than the Senate committee provided for. In my judgment it is an ample force for the next fiscal year without any fear of complications that may possibly arise. The matter was fully gone into and I believe the House will be justified in standing for an average army of that size. As the House knows, there is a situation on the border just now which probably requires a fair force in that part of the country, but I believe that the number provided for in the conference report will take care of every situation that is likely to arise during the coming fiscal year. Generally the conferees were able to retain those provisions which the House felt were principles upon which the House desired to stand.

Mr. FERRIS rose.

Mr. KAHN. Not just at this moment, if the gentleman pleases. That is so with regard to the purchase of land, including four tracts for aviation. That was so with regard to the purchase of land at Camp Benning and other places. The fact of the matter is that nobody in either House of Congress knows just what areas of land we now have, nor where they are situated, nor how much the various tracts cost. During the war large purchases of land were made by the War Department out of lump-sum appropriations. I do not know whether they were all necessary, but at any rate before we appropriate more money for the purchase of land let us take stock. Let us find out where we are, and then after having made that survey the Committee on Military Affairs can make recommendations to the House as to the other land projects. The conferees succeeded in striking about $120,000,000 from the Senate appropriations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the aggregate how much more did this conference report carry in money than the bill which passed the House?

Mr. KAHN. About $57,000,000, but of course 25,000 more men had to be provided for under the conference agreement than the House provided for.

Dr. DENT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Does that $57,000,000 include the $100,000,000 unexpended appropriation that the Senate put in the bill which is not specifically stated?

Mr. KAHN. I do not think so.

Mr. DENT. Then it is $157,000,000 more rather than $57,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. The Senate bill as it passed provided for $885,000,000 plus $100,000,000 reappropriated and we provide for $776,000,000——

Mr. DENT. Plus $100,000,000, and that $100,000,000 was put in by the Senate as a lump-sum provision, and increases the appropriation for pay of Army out of unexpended balance to the extent of $100,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. DENT. That would have had to have been added to the specific appropriation had the conferees agreed to the Senate provision.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to my colleague on the committee and to the House generally that, of course, in taking up the size of the Army and other items the Committee on Military Affairs had in mind an average Army of 400,000 men. We brought in an appropriation of $809,000,000. The House cut down the number of men to 300,000. The figuring that we indulged in was not as accurate as it would have been had we had the opportunity to go into it thoroughly. The amendments were offered from the floor. The committee had no opportunity at the time to discover whether the amounts were accurate or not.

Sixty-one and one-half million dollars have to be provided for the Army in bonuses alone during the fiscal year 1920. Every soldier in the Army is entitled to $60 as a bonus. And so in figuring the amounts originally we probably were inaccurate in the House, because we made rough estimates as to what would be required. But the fact remains that there is $100,000,000 reappropriated from last year's appropriation. That amount was appropriated last year and was not expended. It is a reappropriation.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sure that my colleague wants to have this matter stated exactly as it was.

Mr. KAHN. I do; certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask my colleague if it is not a fact when the officers of the Army appeared before our committee with their estimates for pay of the Army that they included in that estimate the amount that would be required to take care of the $60 bonus?

Mr. KAHN. There is no doubt of that; but I say frankly that in figuring the amount of decrease on the floor of the House after the House decided to take only 300,000 men, we had to figure very roughly. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], if you remember, moved to cut down the appropriation and none of us had an opportunity to examine the accuracy of his figures. It was not done by the committee at all.

Mr. GARNER. What is the total amount appropriated in this bill, including the $100,000,000 unexpended balance?

Mr. KAHN. Eight hundred and seventy-six millions.

Mr. GARNER. That is the total, including the $100,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; the reappropriation.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. As the bill passed the House, as I recollect, it carried $718,000,000 in round numbers?

Mr. KAHN. Quite right.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that it now carries $776,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. It carries $776,000,000, plus a reappropriation of $100,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. So that it now carries $876,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; with the reappropriation.

Mr. MONDELL. As it passed the Senate——

Mr. KAHN. It carried $986,000,000, with that reappropriation of $100,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. So, as a matter of fact, the conferees agreed to an increase from $718,000,000 to $876,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Practically.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood that the increase which the House granted was only an increase of $58,000,000 instead of $158,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Leaving out that $100,000,000 reappropriated.

Mr. MONDELL. One hundred million dollars is something of an item. It is not a matter to be laughed at as though it did not amount to anything. The day was when we did not pay much attention to $100,000,000, but that day, thank Heaven, is past. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. The House conferees, I want to say to the gentleman, have tried in every way to inform the Senate that that day is past, and they fought all the way down the line to make them realize that that day is past.

Mr. MONDELL. But, nevertheless, as I understand it, the House agreed to an increase of about $165,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. The amount in the Senate was $885,562,548, exclusive of $100,000,000 reappropriated.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I want to make this statement clear, if you please:

The conferees sent word to the War Department officials that had been figuring on the pay of the Army and found that inaccuracies had been made in the House figures on the pay of the Army, and they cut out of the various items, notably for pay of the enlisted men, pay of the Staff Corps, and several other departments of the Army, $100,000,000. They cut down the figures they had estimated for to that extent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Then they gave in a lump sum $100,000,000 that was reappropriated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In my amendment, which reduced the Army down to 300,000 men, I deducted the percentage of the appropriation that amount. In this appropriation has it not been increased just one-quarter, inasmuch as you only added 25,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. It seems that in making the figures for the House proposition we forgot about the bonus, which was about $61,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This is what is worrying me: Is there any danger that this $100,000,000 has been reappropriated for the purpose of allowing the General Staff to keep their 509,000 men, regardless of what we say?

Mr. KAHN. I do not think so, because in the total it provides only, including that $100,000,000, for 325,000 men.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then the gentleman is satisfied that the amount appropriated is only for an average Army of 325,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. I am satisfied. I want to say to the gentleman that in fixing the figures for the pay of the Army they have gone below in some instances what even the House allowed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I call the gentleman's attention to amendment No. 24? The gentleman will recall that is an appropriation for providing amusement rooms and gymnasiums. The gentleman will recall that the chief of that bureau appeared before the committee and asked for $1,500,000.

Mr. KAHN. More.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. He wanted money to buy the Red Cross huts and the Y. M. C. A. huts which are on military property. The appropriation carries $675,000. Is the gentleman satisfied they can not spend this money to buy property which belongs to the Army now?

Mr. KAHN. I am satisfied they can not possibly buy the property. In fact, the House conferees were very reluctant to increase the amount; but we were told that the principal use for this additional money was for the purpose of buying baseball bats and balls, boxing gloves, punching bags, and athletic paraphernalia generally.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, does the gentleman know what the Young Men's Christian Association and the Red Cross are going to do with the funds that the American people gave them for the specific purpose of buying this kind of material?

Mr. KAHN. I do not know what they are going to do with the balances they have on hand, but I am told that this money provided in this bill is to be utilized by the Army for this purpose, and that the entertainment of the soldiers will be under the Army and not the welfare organization in the expenditure of this money.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the Army will not buy the huts which the American people presented to the Army?

Mr. KAHN. I understand there is no intention of buying those huts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has much more confidence in the General Staff than I have.

Mr. KAHN. I am quite certain that these huts will not be purchased. In the first place, most of the cantonments and camps will not be utilized. I think it is the purpose of the department to utilize only 4, all told, so that of the 18 that they were talking about 14 will be closed altogether.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I ask the gentleman also in reference to amendment No. 35, which increases the appropriation for the reserve officers' training corps from $1,000,000 to $4,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What was changed in that situation?

Mr. KAHN. It developed that all the universities and colleges of the country are preparing to have training camps this summer, and as the national-defense act provides for that corps of course they need the money to carry them on.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I ask the gentleman with reference to amendment No. 92? I will ask the gentleman's careful consideration of that. Will that open the door for the purchase of Dayton Field, in Ohio, and the Curtiss plant, in Buffalo, which was taken out of the other provision in the bill?

Mr. KAHN. I am quite sure that it will not provide for the purchase of any of those pieces of land for the Air Service. I want to say to the gentleman that the House conferees were very insistent and finally succeeded in expunging those purchases of land from the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. One more question, please. Amendment No. 9 shows an increase from $15,000,000 to $40,000,000 for the Air Service—a $25,000,000 increase. Now, the gentleman will recollect when the Air Service people came before our committee they had no fixed or definite plan or program. They were so eager to buy certain land that they forgot everything about the flying machines, and they could not tell us anything of what they wanted to do. They asked for $85,000,000, and we reduced it to $15,000,000. Has anything appeared before the committee of the Senate that justifies this appropriation of a lump sum?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the very splendid manner in which the Committee on Naval Affairs come in here with their appropriation, where they specify every amount so that we are sure that the naval money will be spent for the development of aviation. Here we come in with a lump sum again and give them $40,000,000, which I think is very dangerous and wasteful.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the increase to $40,000,000 was allowed after a long fight lasting, I think, something like three

hours. The Senate committee had the same evidence that we had, that they needed $83,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. We could not see the reason for the use of so much money, but they finally told us that they were developing some gas wells in Texas and Oklahoma for the production of helium gas for the Balloon Service. Helium gas is a noncombustible gas. It is just in the process of development, and we have no such gas plants at this time. It also developed that we have no so-called airships. We have airplanes, as to which I think the less we say of them the better. We have no pursuit planes at all, as I understand it, and those are essential to any army. Up to this time there never has been a branch of our Air Service in the Philippine Islands. They propose to establish such a branch down there. Finally the conferees, upon the showing made, submitted to an increase. The Senate, I want to say, appropriated $55,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. We saved $15,000,000 on the appropriation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I just want to call the gentleman's attention and the attention of the House to the fact that the Naval appropriation bill appropriates $3,800,000 for this helium development. It appropriates $2,500,000 for lighter-than-air ships, and we go here and do the same thing. We have already wasted $640,000,000 on airships, and I hope this will be the last $50,000,000 that we waste on aviation.

Mr. KAHN. I hope so myself. I have always said that in this bill, at least, the House ought to take stock, ought to see where we are, before embarking on new projects. But, after all, when you go into conference you have to make compromises. This was not an entirely new proposition. It was an expansion of some of the old propositions.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And this is the last day of the year?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, what is exactly before the House?

Mr. KAHN. The Airplane Service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has control of the time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want the gentleman to recur to the question of economy.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Secretary of War asked originally for an Army of 509,000 men. This bill carries provision for how many men?

Mr. KAHN. Three hundred and twenty-five thousand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So there is a saving in the pay and expense for upward of 175,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is, upward of 175,000 men will be dispensed with and the appropriation lessened to that extent?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. I want to say to the gentleman that the House passed the Army appropriation bill in the last Congress carrying $1,117,000,000. It provided for an average Army of 509,000 enlisted men and 28,000 officers for the fiscal year 1920. At the hearings this year most of the bureau chiefs came to the committee and asked for large increases over this amount, which increases the House committee resisted, and finally the House itself cut the figures down to $718,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman continue to yield to me for a minute?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman state what the amount saved by this reduction of the Army force would be?

Mr. KAHN. I can not give the gentleman the exact amount, but I think $300,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Three hundred million dollars would be saved considering the requests made by the Secretary of War?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, the requests of the Secretary of War were for a much larger amount, but I think we will save approximately somewhere in the neighborhood of $300,000,000 from what we appropriated in the bill that passed last February.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There seems to be some confusion about what has been saved or not saved as the result of the conference. I want the gentleman to bear with me to see if we can get this straight, because upon it may depend the support that the conference report will receive.

The Senate bill, according to the gentleman's statement, carried, as I recall, $986,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Including the $100,000,000 reappropriated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This bill as it comes from conference carries $876,000,000, each amount including that mysterious $100,000,000 which seems to confuse the situation. If my figures are correct that would make a saving of $110,000,000 from the original Senate bill.

Mr. KAHN. Exactly so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So as the result of the work of the conferees there is a saving from the Senate bill of $110,000,000. Am I right about that?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is right about that. Of course, these additions were made rather hurriedly. The statement slip that I have here shows that we saved $120,000,000 from the Senate amount; but in making a rough calculation myself I am inclined to think that $110,000,000 is more nearly accurate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then we may say that as a result of the work of the conferees the bill comes to us calling for $110,000,000 less than the Senate bill called for?

Mr. KAHN. Exactly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not been able to hear all the controversy that has been going on.

Mr. KAHN. I beg the gentleman's pardon——

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman need make no apologies at all. My inability to hear what has been said has been due entirely to the confusion on the floor of the House. There seems to be a good deal of controversy as to the result obtained. May I ask the gentleman how much, if any, has the Republican House saved over the Republican Senate?

Mr. KAHN. Between $110,000,000 and $120,000,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman from California permit me to make clear just the amount of the saving in this bill, as compared with the demands of the War Department as originally given to us?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. They originally asked for 509,000 men. By fixing the number in this bill at 325,000 men, it makes a saving of 184,000 men in the size of the Army. We figure that it costs $2,000 a year to support a man in the Army. That makes a saving in this bill below what was asked for by the War Department of $368,000,000, to state it exactly. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The bill as it passed the House carried in round numbers $718,000,000. As it passed the Senate it carried, including the $100,000,000 reappropriated, $985,000,000. The difference between these two sums is $267,000,000. As the bill comes to the House the conferees have secured a reduction in the Senate bill of $110,000,000, but in doing that they agreed to increase the House bill by $157,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I have said repeatedly that in figuring the amount for the pay of the Army, when the House reduced the number from 400,000 to 300,000 men, we had to figure the pay right here on the floor without checking up the matter accurately. We assumed that the figures that were offered by the gentlemen who wanted the decreases were correct. We had no chance to figure them out; but it develops that they were mistaken about them, and that we cut too much on the items for pay of the Army.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, then the gentleman stands for the statement he just made to me?

Mr. KAHN. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That in the matter of men we have saved upward of $300,000,000, and that as between the House and the Senate the conferees bring back a bill that positively saves $110,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, yes.

Mr. DENT. I want to ask the gentleman from California if, as a matter of fact, it would make any difference whether the appropriation for the pay of the Army fixed the amount at $500,000,000 or $300,000,000 if, as a matter of fact, we did not have the number of men who would require that amount?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman knows that they can only pay the number of men that they have.

Mr. DENT. That is exactly what I wanted the gentleman to admit.

Mr. KAHN. Any appropriation for an amount more than that would go back into the Treasury.

Mr. DENT. So that if we had appropriated too much it would not make any difference. The amount which was not necessary to be paid out would go back into the Treasury.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I should like to ask the gentleman about the lump sum for airship development.

Mr. KAHN. They have had lump-sum appropriations for all kinds of developments. The Committee on Appropriations, the Military Committee, and almost every committee of the House during the war wrote some kind of legislation to help the War Department. What I want to do is to get back to earth and find out where we are.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Can the gentleman state how much has been spent for helium gas?

Mr. KAHN. I can not say.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand that a very large sum has already been spent. The gentleman says we have no airships.

Mr. KAHN. An airship is of a different type.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand what the gentleman means; he refers to a ship that will travel in the air——

Mr. KAHN. Heavier than air.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Different from an aeroplane—I understand that. We have not got an airship to put the helium gas into.

Mr. KAHN. An airship costs $1,000,000, and there is not an aeroplane that costs more than $75,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Some at the front cost $2,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The only advantage of helium gas is that it is noninflammable, which makes it advantageous to use in time of war.

Mr. KAHN. Not only in time of war but in making experiments. A man who is operating a balloon in the air ought to be protected by the Government as well as it can protect him. The balloons are apt to catch fire even in peace times, and helium gas is used to protect the man in the balloon.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I desire to submit an inquiry with respect to Senate amendment No. 94, which I understand appropriates for several organizations in the War Department to be continued until reorganization of the Army. I understand the conferees agreed to that amendment with an amendment specifically naming certain organizations in the department. I find omitted from the enumeration the names of the Finance Division and the Transportation Division. Will the gentleman tell me how it affects the Finance Division and its work?

Mr. KAHN. They will be continued under the Overman Act for six months longer, and in the meantime it is hoped that we will be able to pass an Army reorganization bill which will take care of the matter.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. In that same connection, unless the reorganization bill is agreed upon, will the Finance Division and Transportation Division go out of existence?

Mr. GREEN of Vermont. I think the gentleman will find that amendment 94 is a continuation of the military tactical unit, and what the gentleman refers to is some civilian military board in the War Department itself.

Mr. KAHN. Which will continue under the Overman Act for six months, anyhow. The Military Committee will be able to take care of that proposition when we take up the Army reorganization bill.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Then these divisions are not affected directly by this legislation?

Mr. KAHN. Not at present.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This relates to such tactical units which we know generally as troops.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to the gentleman from Maine that there was a disposition by the War Department to cut out the Chemical Warfare Service, the Air Service, the Motor Transportation Service, the Tank Service, and some other services of the Army. The House conferees agreed to this amendment of the Senate and will permit those organizations to continue until we get a reorganization of the Army.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. BEE. Did I understand the chairman to state to the gentleman from Wyoming that the bill that comes back here increases the appropriation one hundred and fifty-seven millions over the appropriations as the bill passed the House?

Mr. KAHN. Including the one hundred million reappropriated.

Mr. BEE. I understand there is an increase of one hundred and fifty-seven millions over the amount as the bill passed the House.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There has been a great deal of discussion as to what has been saved. What has been saved is cutting down what the War Department asked for.

Mr. KAHN. If we take what the War Department estimated and take the figures submitted in the bill, we would have saved probably $600,000,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The War Department asked for 509,000 men, and the House provided for 300,000 men; the Senate provided for 400,000 men, and the conferees have agreed on 325,000 men. What I want to know is upon what theory did the conferees agree upon 325,000 as against 509,000 asked for by the War Department?

Mr. KAHN. The committee felt that if we cut the Army down to approximately 325,000 men, they would meet all the requirements of the country.

The national-defense act was passed in 1916, and the House during the discussion of the military appropriation bill last February adopted a provision that only the force permitted in the national-defense act should be recruited by the enlistment of volunteers, and that force would be approximately 225,000.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think there is a discrepancy between the conference report and the statement.

Mr. KAHN. The report would be correct.

Mr. FERRIS. But I think the statement is right and the report is wrong.

If the gentleman will take the report, I will call his attention to page 10, to the purchase of land amendments. I want the gentleman then to turn over to page 18 and look at the statement with reference to it. The statement says precisely what the report ought to say. The land amendments are 91 and 92 in the bill. The statement recites that as to 91 the Senate recedes from the text of the amendment in so far as to transfer the language contained therein to amendment No. 92. The conference report omits to say that; so that if you follow the conference report, which I assume you would do, you would have in the amendment No. 91 with reference to land, and you would not accomplish what the conferees intended to accomplish.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is correct. The statement prepared by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] states the facts precisely—that is, that the Senate receded from the text of amendment No. 91—but the report itself fails to make that statement, so that as a matter of fact the text of amendment No. 91 remains in, when we agreed it should go out. If the gentleman will return to page 18, which is the statement that the gentleman made, he will find amendment No. 91 in his statement reads as follows:

> The Senate receded from the text of this amendment so as to transfer the language contained therein to amendment No. 92.

That does not appear in the conference report. If it appeared in the conference report, then everything would be in perfect shape, and the amendment would be transferred to 92 and would be as we agreed to it.

Mr. KAHN. What the gentleman says is probably correct. Of course, this report was gotten up at 3 o'clock on Sunday morning.

Mr. FERRIS. It is not by way of criticism that I make the statement. I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to it, so that that part of the statement with reference to amendment No. 91 could be injected into the report, so that it would have the effect the gentleman desired.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, you can not change this report in the House without a motion to recommit.

Mr. FERRIS. Then the conference does not accomplish what the gentleman wants.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will examine page 1 of the report, I believe he will find that the matter is taken care of properly.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] observed that the Senate had a system of slipping something over on the House at the last minute, when we are about ready to adjourn. Right now we are arranging to take a recess for a week. The fiscal year is now ending. While waiting for that significant and embarrassing moment the Senate slips in with a conference report by which there is added $157,000,000 to the War Department appropriation. Why did they hold this bill till this fiscal year's end? This $718,000,000 is plenty of money to let the Army spend in these times of peace, and it ought to have been enough. The House committee considered it very carefully, and should have stopped there. Personally I am not

at all satisfied with any such report as this, and the committee has done so nicely so far that I am sure that if they will put it over to the next week and consider it in conference and report when we get back from the recess that they will accomplish a great deal more and save the taxpayers millions. As far as I am concerned, I shall not vote for this report, if I have a chance to vote against it. I do not believe I would vote for a bill spending so much money on an army in times of peace, when all the world is our friend and we have 4,000,000 trained soldiers. You are spending a lot of money for flying machines, for instance. The other day, when the former chairman of the committee was on the floor, I asked him if any West Pointer has been made an American ace, and he could not think of any. I do not think these people are qualified to spend this money. To be frank, I am astonished that alleged experts who wasted hundreds of millions and had no machines, and who left the field of fame in the air to men who never were in the Army before, should ask for any air fund.

Mr. KAHN. I suggest to the gentleman that I have only a very limited time.

Mr. LITTLE. And I have only three or four minutes, and the gentleman is interrupting me.

Mr. KAHN. There is evidently a mistake in the conference report.

Mr. LITTLE. Let us put it over for a week. We can save a hundred million dollars or two, I think.

Mr. KAHN. I doubt whether we can. It was the desire of the House and of the conferees to get this bill passed before the 1st of July. The fiscal year begins on the 1st of July. The conferees of the House fought the Senate increase for practically three days. They were in session until 3 o'clock Sunday morning. If we had thought the House would be willing to let the matter go over beyond July 1, we would still be fighting for further reductions and would not have filed this report for Saturday's RECORD.

Mr. LITTLE. Let me make a statement there.

Mr. KAHN. Very well.

Mr. LITTLE. If anybody is at fault and the bill does not pass by that time, then it is the people who refuse to take the money that we offer them—the department. My colleague from Kansas [Mr. STRONG] heard a number of gentlemen, from the department evidently, downstairs discussing this bill the other day. One of them said: "We have got the House licked. The Senate will stay with us and vote this, and the House can go to hell." Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned, I do not want to go, and if they want to wait for 10 days, let them do it. I think this can very well lie over for a week.

Mr. YATES. For $100,000,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that unless the bill is passed to-day the chances are that the demobilization of the soldiers will be held up until the President returns.

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, yes; "held up!" That is what the House is up against all of the time, and I am tired of being held up. Let them do as they please. If the Senate and the War Department wish to speed demobilization, they should desist from this attempt to increase the taxpayers' burden by $157,000,000 and go to work with the unparalleled peace appropriation the House has so generously provided.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to the gentleman that the conferees on the part of the House were tired of hearing about that, too, but they succumbed in many instances to a condition that confronted them. There are 15,000 soldiers being demobilized every day, who have to get their final pay and their transportation and bonuses, and if the bill does not go through to-day——

Mr. WALSH. How can they get it at all until the President signs the bill?

Mr. LITTLE. This will not interfere with that. The President will not be here to sign the bill until we can consider after recess, anyway.

Mr. KAHN. If the President does not sign, then the responsibility is his and not the House of Representatives. Let us do our work, if the President is not here to do his. That matter was fully considered by the House conferees. If we had not been pressed for time we would still be fighting for reductions. That is the way the conferees felt about it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to have a little time in which to discuss this matter. I understand that the bill is going back to conference. There are a number of matters that I would like to discuss.

Mr. KAHN. How much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition in my own time for 20 minutes.

Mr. KAHN. One moment. There are one or two gentlemen whom I agreed to recognize——

Mr. LITTLE. That is in his own time.

Mr. KAHN. I understand I have 13 minutes left, and I agreed to give the gentleman——

Mr. MONDELL. I do not ask for the gentleman's time.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Texas five minutes and the gentleman from Georgia five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the discussion of the gentleman from California I desire to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report in order that I may make some corrections.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to be heard on the conference report.

Mr. KAHN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recognized on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with very, very great regret I rise to criticize this conference report. I realize how earnestly the conferees on the part of the House have striven to carry out the will and purpose of the House in the passage of the bill. I have no thought of criticism of them. I know they have tried to do the very best they could under the circumstances. It is possible, however, that the other legislative branch does not realize the determination of the House of Representatives to cut down appropriations to the sums absolutely necessary for the proper transaction of the public business, including the maintenance of the Army. [Applause.] Now, what are the facts in regard to this conference report? The bill as it passed the House carried approximately $718,000,000. As it passed the Senate it carried approximately $985,000,000, including $100,000,000 reappropriated. We might just as well stop referring to that as a reappropriated sum, for it comes out of the pockets of the American people just as though it were an original appropriation. The difference between the two Houses in appropriations was the difference between $718,000,000 and $985,000,000, a difference of $267,000,000. Of that difference the Senate has yielded on approximately $110,000,000 and the House conferees have yielded on approximately $157,000,000. The House has yielded to the Senate much more than the Senate has agreed to recede from. There has been a good deal said at one time and another as to the size of the Army to be provided for, as to whether we should appropriate for an Army of 300,000 or 325,000 or 400,000 men. As a matter of fact, as the bill passed the House it would have provided for an Army of well-nigh 400,000 men, in my opinion, and as it passed the Senate it would make ample provision under existing circumstances for an Army of 450,000 men.

What are the facts in regard to the cost of an Army? For many, many years it cost about $1,000 for every man under arms; and if we had an Army of 100,000 men we had an appropriation bill for about $100,000,000. But during the Great War the cost of the maintenance of the Army was increased by the increases in pay, in the cost of rations, in the cost of clothing, and also in the item of transportation, until now it costs probably $2,000 per annum for every man under arms——

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment; let me finish the sentence. And therefore if we were providing for an Army of 400,000 men and we had no surplus supplies it would require an appropriation of about $800,000,000. The bill as it passed the Senate carried $985,000,000, enough to provide for an Army of 450,000 men at $2,000 each and $85,000,000 to spare. As passed by the House the bill carried $776,000,000, or a fraction less than the amount necessary for an Army of 400,000 men at the present rate of pay and cost of maintenance. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. While the statement of the gentleman is correct on the average cost of men in peace time and ought to be proportionately the same in war time, the fact remains that the great item of transportation—the cost of bringing the men back from Europe—is not included in that $2,000, and that increases the cost very materially. There are several other added costs in war time. If that were not the fact, the gentleman should have refused to vote for more than $600,000,000 when the House passed the bill originally.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, that is more or less a matter of opinion.

Mr. KAHN. The director of finance of the War Department made that positive statement.

Mr. MONDELL. A large majority of the troops have returned from Europe.

Mr. LITTLE. That is what produced the $2,000.

Mr. MONDELL. If it were true, which I can not believe, that it costs $2,000 per man in addition to the cost of transportation overseas—if it is—I can not understand what items could double the cost. Even if that were true, this bill, as presented to the House, provides not for an Army of 325,000 men but for an Army of 400,000 men at $2,000 per man and $85,000,000 over, which would transport over a million men overseas at the rate of $81.75, which has been agreed upon.

Another matter we seem to have lost sight of: We now have on hand hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of supplies, equipment, and provisions, tens of millions of dollars' worth of meats, and many other items which go to make up the ration. We have on hand to-day cloth and clothing enough for a great part of the Army up to 300,000 or 400,000 men. We have underwear enough not only for an Army of 400,000 but for an Army of a million or more.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman allow me? The gentleman does not want to make any misstatement?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I do not.

Mr. KAHN. There is no clothing on hand at all. This allowance for clothing that is carried in this bill is to make up the uniforms for the discharged men.

Mr. MONDELL. But my friend does not mean to say there is no clothing on hand?

Mr. KAHN. Exactly so.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the gentleman wants to increase the item in his bill.

Mr. KAHN. No; the gentleman cut the item down to the lowest figure; and if the gentleman will remember, Congress passed a provision giving every man in the Army his uniform, his equipment, on discharge. The War Department is giving every soldier two suits of clothes at his discharge. He is given a new uniform and the uniform that he is supposed to have worn in the service. That is part of his equipment. Now, there is no clothing on hand. There is a great deal of cloth, and they are manufacturing the cloth into clothing in order to comply with the law which Congress passed.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from California does not intend to say that there is no clothing on hand?

Mr. KAHN. I do intend to say that there is no surplus clothing on hand. They are manufacturing the clothing that is intended for the purpose of giving every man an equipment under the law we passed. The same is true of shoes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman qualifies. He says now there is no clothing on hand for the purpose of furnishing men an extra suit. Well, that may be true, and provision has been made abundantly in this bill for that purpose. Col. Hannay did say they were not estimating for the manufactured clothing; he did not say they had none.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, the gentleman——

Mr. MONDELL. So far as the item of cloth is concerned, and camp equipage, we have on hand not only enough for an army of 400,000 men, but for an army very much larger.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman tell the House where he gets his facts? [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Well, does the gentleman from California pretend to say we have not vast stores of supplies on hand of tentage and equipment?

Mr. KAHN. I pretend to say that we have cloth on hand for clothing, but we are making up clothing in order to give every man two suits of clothes when he goes out.

Mr. MONDELL. While I do not agree with the gentleman at all that we have not clothing on hand, for we have great quantities on hand, he does admit that we have cloth on hand, which is a large item of cost, and still, in providing for an army, we are asked to appropriate to a large extent as though we had nothing on hand.

Mr. KAHN. Why, the gentleman knows that the cloth in a suit of clothes costs very little. The labor of making up a suit of clothes costs a great deal, and we are making cloth into uniforms to supply to every soldier. That is what the clothing appropriation is intended for, largely—that and shoes.

Mr. MONDELL. The testimony is it costs 90 cents to build a pair of trousers, and the coat in proportion. How about the matter of underwear and socks? It was testified before the committee they had an overabundance of them.

Mr. KAHN. We are salvaging all those things, and the soldiers are getting salvaged clothing.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it proposed to sell all we have got at auction prices and buy new material for the Army?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is mistaken. Let me tell him about shoes: During the war the Army was furnished with hobnail shoes. Now, on the discharge of the soldier he is given one pair of hobnail shoes, and they are buying ordinary shoes, so that he gets one pair of hobnail shoes and one pair of walking shoes on his discharge. I believe the latter cost about $5 a pair. That is adding a great deal of money to his clothing allowance. They did not have a pair of shoes of the ordinary kind on hand when they began to demobilize the Army. They had to go into the market, and are still going into the market, to buy shoes in order to comply with the law which makes it incumbent upon us to give every soldier upon demobilization a complete equipment.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not claimed, and I do not claim, that we have every article of clothing and equipage necessary for the Army for the coming fiscal year. I do not claim, and I have not claimed, that we have all of the provisions necessary to ration an army for the coming year; but I do claim as to a large proportion of these articles—cloth, clothing, camp equipage, meats, many of those things that are important items of the ration—we have now millions of dollars' worth on hand.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Just a moment.

And in spite of all that, estimating the Army at $2,000 per man, we are proposing to appropriate as though the larder were empty, as though we did not have a dollar's worth of stock on hand, while it is true that the warehouses from one end of the country to the other are bursting with Army supplies. Now, if it be true that the Army has to buy anew from the stocks of the country and salvage at such prices as it can secure for the material now on hand, it is well that we know that fact, for I am sure the Congress of the United States will not appropriate the people's money to buy hams and bacon and socks and underwear when these articles are in the warehouses of the country, even to the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars' worth. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield one moment?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. KAHN. In the matter of subsistence, the gentleman called the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to the fact that he believed there were supplies of food on hand. I thereupon took the matter up with the War Department again. I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that we passed in the bill an appropriation for food for 300,000 men, amounting to $67,500,000. I want to call to the attention of the gentleman that we are proposing to take care of an army of 325,000 men, with a reduction of the House appropriation of approximately $5,000,000. And the conferees did that.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if it be true that the conference committee and the committees of the House and Senate have taken into consideration the fact that we have certain supplies on hand, and have reduced certain items in view of that fact, then it must follow inevitably as a mathematical certainty that other items are unnecessarily high, because take the items as a whole and they amount in the Senate bill to money enough to take care of practically all the Army the War Department asked for—500,000 men, at $2,000 per man per annum.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. KAHN. One of my colleagues has called my attention to the fact that the gentleman made a statement that we were salvaging stuff and then buying additional stuff to sell.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not make that statement. The gentleman from California made that statement.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no; "the gentleman from California" made this statement, that the Army is now salvaging a great deal of stuff and is reissuing it to the soldiers without the need of buying new material. In other words——

Mr. MONDELL. If that be true, then in heaven's name why are we appropriating practically at the rate of $2,000 a man for an army of 400,000 when we claim we are providing for an army of only 325,000 men?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman make his computation of $2,000 for a soldier on the idea that all the items in this bill are proportionately related to the per capita basis and may be figured in that way?

Mr. MONDELL. All the items in the Army bill at all times added together and divided by the number of men give a certain cost per man. Of course it is true that when you increase without justification, in my opinion, in time of peace an item for airplanes and air service from $15,000,000 to $40,000,000,

you are going a little outside of the items that ordinarily are calculated in making up the $2,000 per man.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If you are reckoning that the $2,000 which you are estimating as the cost of the Army to be per soldier——

Mr. MONDELL. No; I think I know what the gentleman's question is. At the beginning of my remarks I stated that formerly and before the beginning of the Great War it cost $1,000 per man, approximately, to cover the cost of the War Department, and every item under it, including the clerks here in Washington, so far as they are carried on the Army bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman——

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I am not mistaken; and every man who has been in this House for any considerable period at all knows that for many years the Army bill carried approximately $1,000 for every man provided for, and no more.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman——

Mr. MONDELL. And now it is claimed that the cost is double; that it is $2,000 per man. But even on that basis of $2,000 per man, the House has agreed to a bill that would provide at that extreme cost for an army of nearly 400,000 men, and that in the face of the fact that we have hundreds of millions of dollars worth of clothing, cloth, shoes, socks, underwear, meats, and provisions of all kinds ready to issue.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Now, will the gentleman permit a further suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is it not true that the basis of $1,000 per soldier was arrived at in peace times, when there was no——

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I have said that repeatedly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You have not said what I was going to say in addition to it.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, it is conceded to be $2,000 in time of war.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will not the gentleman give me a chance to ask a question? I do not want to infringe upon the gentleman's time unduly, but I want to ask him this question.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will ask a question and not make a speech, I will yield.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is what I wanted to do. I was just going to conclude the question by saying that that $1,000 per man per capita was the basis of calculation in time of peace, but it can not be used as a basis where you are establishing new arms of the service and adding new areas to the lands and property owned by the Government; and all who have followed me will know——

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, this bill does not contemplate the purchase of new areas of land. On the contrary, I think it prohibits the purchase of new areas of land.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Other items, not including the purchase of land, are included in it which are not included in the per capita cost. They are independent factors.

Mr. MONDELL. If it be true——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is true——

Mr. MONDELL. If it be true, then, that we have reached a time when the Army, which formerly cost us $1,000 per man, and which during the Great War cost $2,000 per man, with the return of peace is costing more than $2,000 per man, then let us have that fact clearly understood by the American people.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. I know that the gentleman wants to be fair in presenting his figures.

Mr. MONDELL. I do; and I also want to keep this appropriation bill down.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will not the gentleman admit that there is $230,000,000 here for transportation, over $200,000,000 of which is to bring our men back from France? That ought not to be figured in the per capita cost of the Army. And there is $6,000,000 for the bonus to be paid to the men, and that should not be figured in the per capita cost. The gentleman should be fair in stating his figures.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me go over it again. In time of peace it costs $1,000 per man. Now, by reason of increases in pay, by reason of increases in the cost of transportation, and by reason of these other increases that the gentleman has referred to it costs $2,000 per man. Where does the additional $1,000 per man come from if it does not come from the very items that the gentleman has referred to? Of course it comes from them. It is transportation, increased pay, bonuses, and all that sort of thing that make the increase of $1,000 in the cost per man per annum.

Mr. KAHN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. MONDELL. "The gentleman" is fair.

Mr. KAHN. The transportation item is not included in the $2,000 per man. And this bill carries $230,000,000 for transportation.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Speaker, in their own time gentlemen can give their opinion as to what items enter into the cost of the maintenance of a soldier, but I am stating my opinion and the opinion that up to this good hour has been held generally by everybody. An army that cost originally $1,000 per man now costs $2,000 per man. I am willing to concede, for the sake of argument, that that original cost of $1,000 per man did not include certain things. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman to ask for 20 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no; one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 25 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I am willing to admit for the sake of argument, as I say, that the item of increased appropriation for the air service should not be included in the per capita cost of $2,000, although up to this time, up to the time this discussion began, the air service was figured in as a legitimate part of the service, and is one of the items which increase the cost of the maintenance of a soldier from $1,000 to $2,000 per man.

Now, as to this matter of transportation, of the item of $230,000,000 for transportation, the gentleman from Kansas says $200,000,000 is for transportation overseas. I have called attention to the fact that the Senate bill would provide for an Army of 400,000 men at $2,000 per man, and leave $85,000,000 over for sea transportation, and that we settled with Great Britain for sea transport at $81.75 per man. Gen. Hines said the estimate for water transportation was $109,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. What condition is there to-day justifying an increase in the appropriation in this bill for air service from $15,000,000 to $40,000,000? The only justification I have heard is that it is $15,000,000 less than the enormous sum which the Senate approved. So far as I know, that is the only excuse for an increase to $40,000,000 of the cost of this branch of the Army service. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] be good enough to tell me what the naval air service costs or what it is proposed to appropriate for it?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I shall be glad to do that, and it is all itemized, too. It will be $25,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. It will be $25,000,000 for the Navy?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; and all itemized.

Mr. MONDELL. Forty million dollars for the Army in a lump sum.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MONDELL. I want to finish this, about the Air Service.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to say something about the Air Service.

Mr. MONDELL. Just let me finish this statement; $25,000,000 for the Navy and $40,000,000 for the Army, or $65,000,000 for the Air Service. The war is over, the peace treaty is signed. How long are we going to continue to spend $65,000,000 a year for military air service? And where can anyone justify himself before the American people in expenditures of that sort?

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman learned how many Liberty motors the Army possesses?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They are no good, if they have got them.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, if my young friend will be patient, I will state that they have 110,000 Liberty motors. The Navy has 4,000, and they want new motors. Does the gentleman know the space that will be required to store those machines? Why does not the gentleman investigate to know how much money they need for storehouses for these things? The gentleman is the leader on this side. I am not going into it now, for I have not got the time, but I will tell you what I know when we reach the conference report on the naval appropriation bill. Does the gentleman know how much the Liberty motors that the Army now has have cost us?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I know.

Mr. BUTLER. Over $600,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. They cost altogether nearly $700,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. And with thousands of them on hand——

Mr. BUTLER. The most awful extravagance I ever heard of.

Mr. MONDELL. And with thousands of them on hand we are asked for $65,000,000 more. What for? To develop a new motor. Why, right down here at Bolling Field there are hundreds of motors piled away, Liberty motors, Rolls-Royce, prac-

tically every motor that is made, warehouses bulging with them, and still we are asked to appropriate $40,000,000 of the people's money on the Army bill for more motors.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to say to my friend that the appropriation for the Navy is largely for machines that are lighter than air. The Navy does not possess those machines. We have cut down the others and put the hitching strap on them, and we ask the Army to do the same thing.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman has asked why we need $65,000,000 for aviation now that peace has come. I ask the gentleman why Great Britain is asking for $250,000,000 for her aviation service now that peace has come?

Mr. KAHN. Three hundred million dollars.

Mr. HICKS. It is because Great Britain proposes to be mistress of the air as she has been mistress of the seas, and America wants to do the same thing.

Mr. MONDELL. I was waiting for that. It took quite a while to bring it out, but I knew it would come eventually. It always comes every time anyone is proposing a scandalous expenditure of the public money for any war purpose that Japan or Siam or Kamchatka or Madagascar or somebody somewhere has a sinister purpose to get the better of us in the air, on the sea, or on the land. [Applause.] It is the argument that is made for every senseless and reckless expenditure of the public money and always has been. I wonder the gentleman did not give us a whisper about Japan. Is not Japan proposing to spend some money for aeroplanes? And how about Siam? How about Mexico? The other day a well-known correspondent, writing for a newspaper of this city, had so little regard for the judgment and good sense of his readers, that with thousands of Liberty motors on hand, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] tells us, he was fearful we would not have enough to chase Villa in Mexico. And I suppose it will be insisted that we must start now in a foolish, headlong race with Great Britain, a race which she has not even started upon, but which somebody has suggested she will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman from Wyoming will yield, I will say in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] that England has not wasted the hundreds of millions that we have wasted. She has something to show for her aviation, and she is now developing commercial aviation, and there is nothing in our program that will develop commercial aviation or do anything for it. It is a repetition of the old method of squandering appropriations.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think it will be a very good thing if we pause a bit—just a moment; let up on the pressure on the public pocketbook for just a bit—until we can take account of stock and find out where we stand in this matter of aviation and flying machines.

Is there some one somewhere who wants to cover up, minimize, and excuse the squandering of the past appropriations for the same purpose? If not, why not take the planes we have and make use of them?

Some one suggested that the Liberty motor was of no value. The Liberty motor is a very good motor, and for the great majority of uses it is as good as any motor now made anywhere. It may be that for some special purposes we may need some planes different from those we now have. But we do not need $40,000,000 worth of them in the Army and $25,000,000 worth of them in the Navy.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. It has been said that there are $230,000,000 included in this bill for transportation. It is conceded that we have less than a million men to transport, which makes it at the rate of $230 per man. Is that the admitted cost under this administration?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his figures. In the first place, we have approximately a million men to bring back from France, and it is necessary after bringing them across the Atlantic that we carry them on the railroad to every part of our country, and we have to pay railroad transportation in addition to the transportation by sea. There are many items that make up the total of the sum for transportation.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have not gone over the various transportation items and therefore can not verify the figures given by the gentleman from Nebraska. My impression is that the transportation items in this bill do not total $230,000,000; but if they do, then that total is, as it always has been, a part of that cost which being averaged indicates the cost of the maintenance of a soldier. In the old times when it was $1,000 per annum to a man the item of transportation was one of the very large items in the bill, and it is only increased now in proportion as the cost is increased from $1,000 to $2,000 per man per annum.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. In regard to the matter of transportation I wish to state to the gentleman from Wyoming that the testimony before our committee was to the effect that an agreement had been entered into between our Government and the Government of Great Britain for $81.75 for a man, which was looked upon as a very good and conservative figure.

Mr. MONDELL. And if there were a million men to be returned—and there are not under this bill—then the cost would be $81,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to a matter that has been temporarily overlooked—the Navy is taking care of the matter of transportation. All the expense except the expense of food is paid for by the Navy. We have only a few transports furnished by Great Britain. How they can possibly figure such a great amount for transportation in this bill is more than I can understand. Of the $230,000,000 they have at least $200,000,000 more than they ought to have. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I have been reliably informed that the Aircraft Board contemplates a salvage of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of material that they have no use for, including high-cost motor engines. If so, why do they need this large appropriation?

Mr. MONDELL. I would not be at all surprised if it was the purpose of the War Department to sell perfectly good Liberty motors, partly as an excuse for making motors of a different pattern.

While I am on that subject let me talk a moment about automobiles. At the time of the signing of the armistice we had thousands of automobiles, thousands of automobiles that had not been used and other thousands that were in use. They cluttered the streets of this city and every other city where there were any considerable number of troops. Congress expected after the signing of the armistice that there would be a considerable number of automobiles and trucks to be disposed of.

During the recess of Congress I noticed, as I came down the street from day to day, brand new five, six, seven passenger Cadillac automobiles coming into use every day. I never went down the street for weeks that I did not see new motors, new Cadillacs, with the Army insignia being put into use.

I made inquiry as to what the methods and purpose of the War Department was, and I was told that an order had been issued that old machines were to be scrapped and the new machines to be brought into use. It seemed to have been the deliberate purpose of the War Department not to have a single, solitary new automobile to sell, to lay aside every machine that had the paint scratched on it, for the order went out to lay aside old machines, with no suggestion that they should be worn and unfit for use when laid aside, but to lay aside used machines and draw on the new supply, and they are going into use every day.

Within the last week I have seen at least half a dozen new Cadillac motors brought into Army use in this city. Now, what has been done with automobiles, I have no doubt, is contemplated with regard to air machines. It is probably contemplated to do the same thing in regard to socks, shoes, and underwear, of which we have millions of pairs. Why should not it be when Congress appropriates the people's money for all these uses while the warehouses of the country bulge with them in the sums of uncounted millions?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Why does not the gentleman change this and see to it that the War Department and the General Staff do not continue this method of which he is complaining?

Mr. MONDELL. This is not my administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. It is the gentleman's administration, because now he is lecturing his side of the House for doing the very thing which he said just a moment ago Congress ought not to permit. He says that Congress is permitting this thing to be done. Why does not Congress change it?

Mr. MONDELL. The House changed it.

Mr. GARNER. Why not change this method?

Mr. MONDELL. The House did, and if the gentleman's side will give us even reasonable support, we will see that this bill is reduced. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. We will do it. Go ahead and try it. We will assure you that that will be done.

Mr. MONDELL. There is one thing more I wish to say. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] referred the other day to a statement that I made. I want to call attention to the fact that all of the reductions made thus far have been made practically by a unanimous House, and I am not taking from the Democratic side of the House the credit that is theirs for joining in keeping down the appropriations. [Applause.] There is a constant insistence on the part of all the departments of the Government, the War Department above all others, to increase, constantly increase, the appropriations. While I do not desire to have this committee instructed, while I would not under any circumstances think of taking the bill from the hands of the men who are now handling it on the part of the House, I do entertain the hope and the expectation that when this bill comes back to the House it will be reduced by many millions of dollars. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I just came into the Chamber, and I do not know what the motion is that is before the House.

Mr. MONDELL. There is no motion before the House. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] having discovered certain errors in the conference report on the Army bill has made a request for unanimous consent that the bill be rereferred to the conferees.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman anticipate any instructions to the committee in order to remedy the situation?

Mr. MONDELL. It is not my purpose to ask for any instructions. I think that all the gentlemen have needed is knowledge on the part of the coordinate branch of the Congress that the House means what it says and proposes to stand by what it did when it passed the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me see if I understand the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MONDELL. Just one moment. How much time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] proposes to make a request that this bill be rereferred to the conferees for the purpose of making corrections. If that is the only purpose, then when the bill is returned it will have the same amounts in it, and I object to the amounts. It is not to any sort of mistakes that have been made.

Mr. GARNER. The conference report has been already written. The mere matter of correcting the errors to which the gentleman from California refers can be done in the House.

Mr. MONDELL. It is simply a matter of voting down the conference report or allowing the withdrawal of the conference report, without qualifications as to the purpose of withdrawal. Personally I am willing to allow the gentlemen to withdraw their conference report with the understanding that it amounts to a vote to disagree.

Mr. BUTLER. To the same as a recommittal by the House?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the gentleman anticipates that when this report is again made these figures will be reduced?

Mr. MONDELL. I expect that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee is here, and he says that it is highly essential that this bill should be passed to-day so as to have money available for troops that are being demobilized. If the bill is passed to-day, how can it become a law until the President signs it, which will not be until the 6th or 7th of July?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is entirely right about that. For all practical purposes it would be just as well if the Army bill did not become a law until the President returns; but the bill can be passed to-day if the bill goes back to the conferees with the understanding that the House expects a scaling of the items—and they can be scaled—and the bill can come back this afternoon. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BUTLER. How will the conferees have that understanding unless we vote squarely here upon it?

Mr. MONDELL. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman shall vote down the conference report.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the way to do it. That will be noted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman contemplate offering any instructions if this bill is withdrawn or recommitted, or anything of that sort?

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection to instructions that gentlemen may want to make.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is not what I asked the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. Personally, I did not intend to move instructions, because I have believed that the temper of the House in the matter has been shown so clearly and definitely that there will be a reduction.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would not the gentleman's offering instructions be the logical conclusion of the very able speech which he has made here this afternoon? [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. The trouble about offering instructions, I will say to my friend, is there are many items in this bill that ought to be reduced, and if we were to instruct the conferees on all the items that ought to be reduced we would have to do quite a job in the way of instructing. I think it ought to be made very clear that the House insists in the main on the bill as it passed the House, and that it certainly does not approve the increase of $25,000,000 for aviation.

Mr. GARNER. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the very scaling down of the various appropriations does not remove the condition of which the gentleman has been speaking—of those new Cadillac machines and the other things which he has been criticizing here. We have got to put something in this bill somewhere if you are going to protect the Treasury against abuses of which the gentleman has been speaking.

Mr. MONDELL. One of the best ways of protecting the Treasury is not to give the money to buy new Cadillac machines.

Mr. GARNER. As I understand, they have enough machines now, it looks like, to run on for a year, and yet there is no provision in this bill saying that they shall not buy any new ones.

Mr. MONDELL. We ought to follow that up by further legislation. Now, for just one minute, because I desire to conclude. If this conference report is voted down or if it goes back to conference with the understanding that it is disapproved of by the House, it can still be passed upon this afternoon. One thing more. Certain gentlemen allow themselves to be stampeded with the suggestion that something might occur somewhere on the map of the earth in Mesopotamia or Mexico or Germany requiring more troops than we are appropriating for. We all know that the Commander in Chief has the right to use and retain as many troops as he needs, and if a condition should arise requiring the use of more troops than this bill provides for—it will not, but if it should—a deficiency could be made for that purpose. And more, the major items of this bill constitute practically a common fund and are available for any one of these purposes, so that even an extraordinary situation would not change the fact with regard to the sufficiency of the appropriations.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman's position to be that the conference report should be sent back as a whole or that a motion should be made instructing the conferees with respect to certain items?

Mr. MONDELL. If the conferees' report is disagreed to it expresses the judgment of the House and its disapproval of the report as presented. Or if the gentleman withdraws his report under present conditions, it amounts to the same thing. Then if any gentleman wants to make a motion to instruct, such a motion will be in order.

Mr. BUTLER. I know the gentleman is a good parliamentarian. I have darkness before me, and I desire to get some light. If we send this back without any instructions, I understand the conferees of the two bodies have agreed upon certain increases. How can they change or cut those increases? I do not understand it, unless an agreement between the two bodies is made or that this shall be tried here in the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Gentlemen can vote down the conference report, and when that is done a motion to instruct will be in order in due time.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MONDELL. Personally, I am willing to leave the matter with the present conferees.

Mr. HAUGEN. If this conference report is rejected, it leaves the conferees free. The whole matter can be taken up and either a reduction or an increase made?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the House under present conditions in the country can not afford to agree to the conference report as now presented and that the report should go back to conference, and when it comes from

conference, unless very considerably reduced in the amount carried, the House should again refuse to agree to it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. KAHN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. HAUGEN. I simply wish to ask the gentleman a question. Amendment No. 1 authorizes the Secretary of War to sell supplies——

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Wyoming has referred to the automobiles——

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Upon such terms as he may deem wise and best. Now, then, has the department submitted any plan, any definite plan, as to how these supplies are to be disposed of?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let us have that plan.

Mr. KAHN. I have only 13 minutes left.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will ask that the time be extended. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was before the House in committee that very question was gone into in a debate lasting probably two hours. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] and other gentlemen called attention to the Bureau of Sales. That bureau did submit a plan for disposing of all these surplus supplies. I could not begin to discuss it in the 5 or 10 minutes remaining of my time, but if the gentleman will just look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing the debate, he can get all the information to be had as to what the department proposes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Now, can the gentleman state what plan the department suggested? I will state to the gentleman that I have a communication here from the very gentleman, and it gives but little information. For a month I have been trying to get information in order that I might intelligently reply to my constituents and give the information desired.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 10 or thereabouts, he will probably get a great deal of information about it; but I can say to the gentleman——

Mr. HAUGEN. The RECORD of June 24 explains how aeroplanes were disposed of, and my opinion is that automobiles and supplies should not be disposed of that way.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman was talking about the aeroplane matter, that is a different proposition.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; and the question now is as to disposing of other supplies. Has the gentleman any definite information? Can the gentleman state the department plan; has it any definite plan for the disposal of them?

Mr. KAHN. They have. They have a Bureau of Sales, and that Bureau of Sales has worked out a definite plan as to how these surplus supplies are to be disposed of.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman state what that plan is?

Mr. KAHN. It is full of ramifications. I can tell the gentleman briefly, because my time has almost expired, that they have gone into the matter of selling food supplies to the different construction and lumber camps. They have gone to the eleemosynary institutions. They have gone to the penal institutions. They have gone to many organizations such as the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, and similar organizations, trying to induce them to buy some of the surplus food supplies. They have also tried to interest the large business houses. They have gone to other organizations to buy other material that is surplus. They have written thousands of letters to individuals to try to secure the sale of these things.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I want to be courteous to the gentleman from Iowa and to the other gentlemen. I have only about 5 or 10 minutes of my time left. There are some other things that I want to explain also after the speech of the gentleman from Wyoming, and I ask that my time may be extended one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his time be extended one hour.

Mr. BLACK. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman has agreed to yield to me.

Mr. KAHN. If I get the time, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. I shall object unless I know I will get it.

Mr. KAHN. I will yield to the gentleman and also to his colleague from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from California has had an hour——

Mr. KAHN. Answering questions.

Mr. MONDELL. And if additional time is given him, of course, it will be with the understanding that the hour will be divided among gentlemen who desire to speak, I assume, and not altogether to the gentlemen on one side of the question.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I have wanted to be absolutely fair in this discussion. I have tried to answer questions as they were propounded, and most of my time was taken up in that way. The gentleman from Wyoming took half an hour to make a speech. I want to say something to him in reply, and then I also want to yield some time to the other gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAUGEN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think there will be no objection to that if some time is allowed at the close of that hour for gentlemen who may not hold the views of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MONDELL. With the understanding that there will be 30 minutes allowed at the end of that time——

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question? Is it the purpose of Congress to pass these bills before midnight?

Mr. MONDELL. It is.

Mr. BUTLER. You are going to have another hour of this discussion. There is the naval bill to be disposed of, and here is the District of Columbia bill. I do not use much of the time of this House. I have not talked an hour or 10 minutes or 15 minutes. I do not want time. I have worked myself nearly to death, however, so as to conclude the naval bill to-night.

Mr. KAHN. So have I.

Mr. BUTLER. Let us stop talking and go to voting. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken practically no time for myself, except in the answering of questions, and if the gentlemen will insist on asking questions I must have the time in which to reply.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the gentleman from California that is the only way we have to get information; not by long speeches, but by asking questions and having them answered. I am not going to object, but I want to get this naval bill over to the Senate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, unless there is a motion made here on which the House can act and instruct these conferees, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the conference report be recommitted to the conferees with instructions to disagree to the language of the Senate—I do not have the number of the amendment, but I am reading from line 3 to line 16, inclusive, on page 35.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, Mr. Speaker, there is another motion before the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is that motion amendable?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move to amend the instructions——

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will suspend, the Clerk will report the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. The conference report is now before the House, and the question is on agreeing or disagreeing to the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. And no motion is in order until we have voted on the conference report. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a motion to recommit is in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recommit the conference report to the conferees. The Chair thinks that is in order. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair just stated that it was, unless the previous question was ordered.

Mr. McKENZIE. I move to amend it.

The SPEAKER. The motion has not yet been reported. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has asked that question. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. Can the gentleman give the number of the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. No. 11, the last paragraph of the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11, page 35: Mr. MADDEN moves to recommit the conference report to the conference committee with instructions to insist——

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, No. With instructions not to agree to the language of Senate amendment No. 11.

The Clerk read as follows:

To disagree to the language on page 35, beginning with line 3 and ending with line 16, inclusive.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like the Clerk to report that.

The Clerk read as follows:

All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous except the appropriation for mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active service, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks, of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, shall be disbursed and accounted for as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That any part of the appropritaion for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919, not exceeding $100,000,000, that is not required for the service of that fiscal year may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, that is the last part of amendment No. 11.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. I move, Mr. Speaker, to include in the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] amendment No. 40.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] moves to amend the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] by including——

Mr. McKENZIE. Senate amendment No. 40.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE moves to include in the motion offered by Mr. MADDEN Senate amendment No. 40, which is found on page 59, beginning with line 1: "For the purchase of land contiguous of the Walter Reed General Hospital, District of Columbia, 26.9 acres, more or less, for the final location of the Army Medical Museum, the Surgeon General's Library, and the Army Medical School, and of the improvements now on the land to be purchased, $350,000."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague on the committee will not insist on that. Let me explain briefly the situation. There were six purchases of land in the bill put in by the Senate when the conferees went into conference. We succeeded in striking out five of those purchases. This was the only one that we left in, although the House conferees almost to the end insisted on its going out.

Now, the medical department of the War Department has a medical museum, a medical library, and a medical school, all occupying rented quarters. It is proposed to consolidate the activities of the medical department at the Walter Reed Hospital. Therefore the House conferees in their extremity agreed to the purchase of this one piece of land; we rejected the other five; we felt that we were saving thousands in the long run in the matter of rentals, because the buildings that will be put up there will take care of those activities and will save the rentals that are now being paid for these rented buildings to the Government. I believe the rent we are now paying is about $22,000 per annum.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word. Of course, I always dislike very much to differ with my good friend, the chairman of the committee, and I would not offer this motion at this time if I did not believe that no real emergency exists for this legislation.

When the Surgeon General of the Army was before our committee I questioned him very closely in regard to this item, and he very frankly admitted that there is no emergency existing at this time that would require the appropriation of this money.

It is true that it is a small item; that it is only $350,000; but it involves later on—perhaps next year—$8,000,000 or $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 for the construction of the buildings out there. I think it will be well to put up the buildings in time, but at this time, if we are going to pursue any policy of economy at all, then this is a good way to begin. It is chiefly the principle involved, and not the amount of money that leads me to offer to include this in the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that it be stricken from the bill as an item which is wholly unwarranted at this time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] amending the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KAHN. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 67.

Mr. KAHN. Tellers, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Speaker appointed Mr. KAHN and Mr. McKENZIE to act as tellers.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, are we voting on the McKenzie amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes; on the McKenzie amendment. Those in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] will pass through the tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 77, noes 72.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK offers the following amendment: At the end of the Madden amendment as amended add the following language: "And not to agree to Senate amendment No. 9 and to insist on House provisions dealing with air service."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] made a very interesting and very able speech on this conference report, advocating reductions in the appropriations which it carries, and a considerable part of his remarks dealt with amendment No. 9. I agree with the gentleman from Wyoming that amendment No. 9 ought not to be agreed to. But I am willing to back up my disagreement by offering the conferees specific instructions on that amendment.

Now, in the consideration of the conference report on the sundry civil bill to-day we had considerable discussion on the danger and the unwisdom of attaching legislative riders to these appropriation bills. The gentleman from Missouri, ex-Speaker CLARK, made a very strong argument against enacting legislation in this manner, without giving the House opportunity to properly consider it. What does amendment No. 9 do? It increases the aircraft appropriation from $15,000,000, as passed by the House, to $40,000,000, as agreed to by the conferees. The Senate had originally increased it to $54,000,000, but the House conferees have succeeded in getting the amount reduced to $40,000,000. So far, so good. But, despite these changes which the House conferees succeeded in making, the amendment is, I think, still in unacceptable form to the House. The amendment, besides the appropriation, further contains some very important legislative provisions which the House has not considered for a moment, and, indeed, has not had time to consider. It establishes flying schools to which civilian students are to be admitted and provides that these students shall be paid $75 a month, shall be given the allowances and subsistence of a private of the first class, and at the end of their term as students in these aviation schools it provides that they may be released from the service and commissioned as second lieutenants in the Officers' Reserve Corps. Now, it may be, gentlemen of the House, that this is wise legislation. It may be that it would be the will of the House, when we take up permanent military legislation, that we do this, but I submit that on an appropriation bill that is brought in here at this hour, when we are asked to act without proper time for consideration of all these matters of legislation, that it ought not to be done. There is no such emergency now existing as would require it. We have already discharged hundreds of young men from the Aviation Corps who were well trained and disciplined fliers and their number would undoubtedly meet any need for the early future.

Therefore we ought to recommit this conference report to the conferees with instructions not to agree to that amendment.

Gentlemen will see by referring to amendment No. 9, on pages 12 to 18, that it contains a great deal of legislation, and provides that 1,300 aviation students may be enrolled in these aviation schools at a time, and, of course, as these are graduated others can and will come in. Now, I submit that it is not a wise thing; it is not a proper thing to do to take up this legislation until we take up a comprehensive plan as to our future military policy. It is the program to do this some time during

the present session, and we will then have time to deal with all these matters carefully and comprehensively.

I would not have offered this amendment if the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] had offered it, but after listening to his able speech——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the House will agree to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I am glad to have the gentleman's support, and in view of his able support and the influence which it will carry I will not take up any further time of the House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I move that the conferees be instructed not to agree to amendment No. 100.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER to the motion of Mr. MADDEN: Include in Mr. MADDEN's motion Senate amendment 100, found on page 80, beginning with line 18, which reads as follows:

"Col. William A. Simpson: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Col. William A. Simpson, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the merits of this amendment, but upon this appropriation bill it is attempted to legislate a promotion for an officer who is on the retired list. I am being petitioned, and I am sure that many Members of this House are being petitioned, by friends of officers on the retired list who have served with great distinction and great credit in this war, many of them abroad in the foreign service, to have them promoted on the retired list. I have no doubt that there are many deserving cases that ought to be considered, but I believe that these bills for the promotion of officers on the retired list ought to go to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that that committee ought to examine into the merits of each and every case, having the records of these officers before them. If they find that one or more of these officers should be promoted upon the retired list, then the Committee on Military Affairs should bring into the House a bill for that purpose and a report showing the records of these officers and the reasons why they should be promoted. We ought not to legislate for an individual case upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why does the gentleman pick out this individual and not all the others?

Mr. DYER. I shall be glad to include the others. How many are there?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They are included in amendments 100 to 108.

Mr. DYER. I ask permission to modify my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. DYER. I desire to modify my amendment to include Senate amendments 100 to 108, inclusive, omitting amendments 103 and 104. My motion is to include as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] the amendments beginning on page 80, line 18, amendments 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, and 107.

Mr. BLACK. They are all out anyway.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Why does the gentleman except amendment 104?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER to the motion of Mr. MADDEN: To include amendments 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, and 107.

Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio. Why not include all of them?

Mr. DYER. I will also include 103 and 104.

Mr. FIELDS. I hope the gentleman will not include 103.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he is now asking us to include Senate amendments which the House conferees rejected and which had no merit in them.

Mr. WALSH. The House has not yet adopted the conference report, and those amendments are not rejected by the House until the House adopts the report.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move the previous question on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER]?

The SPEAKER. It is in order if the gentleman obtains the floor.

Mr. KAHN. I make that motion.

Mr. DYER. I make the point of order that I have the floor, and the gentleman can not take me off the floor. I yielded to the gentleman from Kansas to ask a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not yielded the floor.

Mr. DYER. I desire to say one word with reference to these amendments, that they propose to legislate for individual cases upon an appropriation bill. The understanding in the beginning was that this bill was to be purely an appropriation bill, to continue the Army on a certain basis until the Congress could see what were the needs of the Army, and then bring in a bill in proper shape.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these amendments have come in on this appropriation bill. They have not been considered by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. There are hundreds of these cases that demand and deserve the attention of Congress, meritorious cases, where men who have served with great credit ought to receive the promotion, and where we ought to consider them with the report and the facts, but we can not go into these individual cases in a conference report like this and do justice to all concerned. For that reason I am in favor of striking out and I trust that the House will strike out all of these legislative provisions that have to do with individual matters and let the Committee on Military Affairs bring in a report in favor of these cases. If they do that, Mr. Speaker, this Congress will respond to the demands of justice and right for our Army officers and pass them with a big majority.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. I will say in regard to amendment 103 that it has been considered and favorably reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DYER. But not on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FIELDS. Yes; last winter it went out on a point of order. This man is blind; his sight was destroyed while instructing men in our Army; and I trust that the gentleman will withdraw that from his amendment and let that remain in the bill. It would be a humane and the right thing to do.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I wish to refer to amendment 103. It received full consideration, passed the Senate previously, and, as the gentleman from Kentucky has said, it has been considered and reported favorably by the House Committee on Military Affairs as a separate measure in the last Congress. It involves the case of a British officer who was instructing our troops and whom we blinded. It is the one case, and it is the only case of the kind, that has arisen during the entire war. I ask the gentleman to exclude that from his amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts mean to convey the idea that we blinded this officer intentionally?

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, of course not; we blinded him through an explosion of a machine gun while he was instructing our troops in Georgia a year ago last February.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts state a case where an American soldier was severely wounded while serving with the British troops, where the British Government has done anything of the kind for him?

Mr. ROGERS. If there has been any such case I never heard of it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman include amendment No. 104?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I say this, that if we leave amendment No. 103 stand we will establish the precedent of putting a British soldier on the American pension roll. There is no other construction to be put on it. If we accept 103 and strike out 104, we deprive an American widow whose husband was killed in the performance of his duty defending the funds of the United States and deny her support.

Mr. FIELDS. I hope that he will include that, also.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman is going to strike out all of these propositions, well and good, but if any exception is made my plea is for the wife of the American who lost his life. We should take care of her if we put a foreign soldier on the pension pay roll.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania prefers to see a payment of $10,000——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I prefer to take care of the American——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. WALSH. But the gentleman from Missouri has not yielded the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposed the gentleman had yielded the floor.

Mr. DYER. No, Mr. Speaker; I have not yielded the floor. I yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to put a question, and he made a speech, and a good one, as usual. I do not desire, for the time is short, to go into the merits of individual cases, because there is much merit in all of them, and in some more than in others. But the principle of legislating on an appropriation bill for promotions of individual Army officers, of picking out some individual man or woman who is entitled to consideration and giving it to them on an appropriation bill in this manner, is wrong. They ought to come in here on the merits of each one, in an omnibus bill, if there need be, from the Committee on Military Affairs. For that reason I am opposed to it.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I notice from the conference report that the Senate receded from amendments 105, 106, and 107.

Mr. WALSH. But we have not adopted the conference report yet.

Mr. DYER. The Senate has receded on most of them. My judgment is that the Committee on Military Affairs is opposed to this method of legislation. I would not attempt to oppose the committee, because I have the highest regard for them, but there is no merit in legislating in this way, and I want to oppose it.

Mr. KAHN. I can say to the gentleman that I am opposed to legislation in this way, too, but when you go into a conference yau can not always have things your own way.

Mr. DYER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take any further time. I wanted to bring it to the attention of the House, because it is just and right. We ought to send this conference report back with instructions to the House conferees to do what they have practically agreed to do, and that is to disagree to these Senate amendments. I yield the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my amendment and all amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FIELDS. Is the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri divisible? It affects different subjects. Some Members might want to vote for a part of it but not for all of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is not divisible. The motion to recommit with instructions is not divisible.

Mr. FIELDS. If I may be permitted, there are three or four different provisions.

The SPEAKER. Of course, they are very different, but this is a motion to recommit a conference report.

Mr. FIELDS. It is a motion to recommit with instructions to disagree to these amendments. Now, there are seven or eight amendments, and probably the membership of the House would accept some amendments and others they would not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's argument is addressed against the reason of the rule.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to know to what numbers the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri applies? I desire to make the point of order that the gentleman can not include Senate amendment No. 103 at this time.

The SPEAKER. It is too late to make the point of order, the previous question having been ordered.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the Chair hear me for a moment? The motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] was presented and read from the Clerk's desk, and then afterwards he talked about excepting some other amendments that were not presented, and he was not given leave to modify his amendment.

The SPEAKER. He did not require unanimous consent to modify it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the Chair hold that a Member can change his amendment at any time?

The SPEAKER. He can in the House, but not in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DYER. I modified the amendment while I had the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can modify his amendment in the House without unanimous consent, but not in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CARTER. But the matter has never been reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken. It has.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HULINGS. Is it in order now to move an amendment to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Madden amendment be again reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the Madden amendment may again be reported. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. I object until this amendment is voted on.

Mr. CARTER. Then I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri be again reported.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARTER) there were—ayes 83, nays 28.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the Madden amendment may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Madden amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the Madden amendment.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to offer, as a preferential motion, that the House adopt the conference report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The motion to recommit has preference.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Madden amendment, in effect, strikes out $100,000,000 as a lump sum of the unexpended balance. Would that bind the conferees to add that amount specifically?

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on agreeing to the Madden amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have a motion to further instruct the conferees.

The SPEAKER. It is too late. The matter has been recommitted and it is beyond the House now.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference, and I ask that the conferees be named at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the parliamentary situation is this: The House has recommitted the conference report to the conference committee with certain instructions, so that it is now before the conference committee.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Under the instruction of the House, could the conferees disagree to any other of the Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. They can do as they please.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, the report having been heretofore recommitted to the conferees this morning, and I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered at this time, the rule respecting printing to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania submits a conference report, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on H. R. 5608, an act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the further consideration of the conference report, although it has not been printed in accordance with the rules. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Is that a new conference report?

Mr. BUTLER. It is the conference report that was under consideration this morning and which was recommitted.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania state if the only changes in the conference report from that which was submitted this morning are the clerical errors to which he referred this morning?

Mr. BUTLER. The clerical errors indicated in the statement I made this morning. We met with the Senate conferees and simply changed the words to correct those errors.

Mr. WALSH. I think if that is the case the conference report itself ought to be read.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; we will ask to have it read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 27, 37, 38, 39, 44, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 69, 71, 72, 76, 81, 83, 85, 86, 89, 97, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, and 107.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 9, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 54, 56, 63, 65, 66, 68, 73, 74, 75, 80, 82, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 99, 108, and 109, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of said amendment strike out "$60,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$25,000,000 to be expended as follows: For necessary aircraft and equipment for fleet use, $3,027,250; for the purchase abroad of five special type planes, $100,000; for the erection on Government-owned land of two hangars for two large dirigibles, $3,700,000; for the construction of one rigid dirigible, $1,500,000; for the purchase abroad of one dirigible of the latest type, $2,500,000; for the conversion of the U. S. S. *Jupiter* into an aeroplane carrier, $500,000; for the conversion of two merchant vessels into aircraft tenders, $700,000; for the maintenance and operation of aircraft factory, helium plant, and aircraft stations, $3,008,007; for continuing experiments and development work for all types of aircraft, $6,700,000; for flying equipment for Marine Corps advanced base units, $618,000; for general and miscellaneous contingencies, $2,646,743; and the money herein specifically appropriated for 'Aviation' shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as 'Aviation' and for that purpose shall constitute one fund"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Line 2 of said amendment strike out the word "from"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment strike out the period and add the following: "for the purpose of paying all obligations or claims incurred at the instance of the Navy Department in carrying out the provisions of said acts and for the purpose of paying all expenses incident to the closing of the schools maintained and operated in pursuance of said acts"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out the comma and "$250,000" after the word "barracks," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "for a period not exceeding six months, $100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "170,000 men, and the President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 191,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In said amendment strike out the comma after the word "reserves" and insert a comma after the word "duty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "February 3"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "February 3"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"The act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129), granting under certain conditions to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only during the period of the war and in no event beyond October 1, 1919."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That officers of the permanent Navy who have served satisfactorily during the war with the German Government in a temporary grade or rank shall be eligible under the provision of existing law for selection for promotion and for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank until July 1, 1920, without regard to statutory requirements other than professional and physical examinations: *Provided*, That the age and grade requirement prescribed by the act approved August 29, 1916, in the rank of commander, is hereby extended from June 30, 1920, to June 30, 1921."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That such membership in the Naval Militia shall not interfere with the discharge of duties by such members thereof who are in the Naval Reserve Force"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$105,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the colon following the word "Virginia" and insert the following: "Incinerator plant, $67,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$12,632,140"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$2,875,656"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$164,203,494"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, regarding the promotion of captains in the line of the permanent Navy shall not restrict the promotion of such captains as may have been wounded in line of duty and who are now on the active list, and such captains shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of section 1494, Revised Statutes of the United States, and also to the benefits of the act of March 4, 1911."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$15,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "this" in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words "the foregoing"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of said amendment insert a period in lieu of the colon after the word "grades" and strike out the remainder of said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of said amendment strike out all after the word "buildings" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "upon the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such temporary buildings as may be erected in pursuance hereof at a total cost not to exceed $10,000 during the year; $660,898"; and the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
WM. J. BROWNING,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

C. S. PAGE,
MILES POINDEXTER,
FREDERICK HALE,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
J. WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5608) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and submitted by the accompanying report on the amendments of the Senate, namely:

Of the Senate amendments agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, the following are merely changes of totals, to wit, 64, 66, 70, 77, 79, 87, and 91.

Of the amendments of the Senate agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, the following involve changes of language, grammar, etc., and do not involve any material change of the substance of the bill, to wit, 7, 14, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 46, 74, and 95.

On amendment No. 1: Restores the clause covering traveling expenses of civilian employees, which was inadvertently omitted by the House when amending the clause covering traveling expenses of midshipmen; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 2: Increases the limitation in the appropriation for clerical, inspection, and messenger service at navy yards and stations under "Pay, miscellaneous," from $400,000 to $450,000; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 3: Provides for an investigation of fuel oil and gasoline adapted to naval requirements; and the House recedes with an amendment reducing the appropriation from $60,000 to $30,000.

On amendment No. 4: Applies to the annual appropriation "Aviation," and the House recedes reducing the Senate amendment from $35,000,000 to $25,000,000, and itemizes the expenditure of the entire amount.

On amendment No. 5: Requires the Secretary of the Navy to report to Congress as to all adjustments made by him of claims for damages to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 6: Appropriates $40,000 to be expended in the discretion of the governor of Guam to aid the island in becoming self-sustaining and to protect it against loss of surplus crops and seeds in time of storms; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 8: Increases the appropriation for "Recreation for enlisted men" from $400,000 to $600,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 9: Grants uniform gratuity to officers of the Naval Reserve force transferred from the National Naval Volunteers in the same manner as granted to members of the Naval Reserve force who enrolled therein directly; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 10: Provides for a reappropriation of $500,000 of unobligated moneys for training and instructing recruits; and the House recedes with an amendment whereby the expenses incurred at special schools and colleges may be settled and such special places of instruction closed.

On amendments Nos. 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16: These amendments are on account of maintenance of the naval training stations at California, Great Lakes, and Hampton Roads; and the Senate recedes in view of the provision elsewhere in the bill providing that the appropriations "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks" and "Repairs and preservation" shall be available for the maintenance of naval training stations where the regular appropriations for the maintenance thereof are found to be insufficient.

On amendment No. 17: Provides for expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve force; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 18: Provides for maintenance of naval detention training camp at naval barracks, Wissahickon, N. J.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 19: Provides for the maintenance of receiving barracks; and the House recedes with an amendment limiting expenditures on this account to a period of six months and reducing the appropriation from $250,000 to $100,000.

On amendments Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26: Provides for increased activities at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I.; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Provides an enlisted force of 191,000 during the period from October 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, instead of 191,000 men for the period from October 1, 1919, to December 31, 1919, and 170,000 men for the period from January 1, 1920, to June 30, 1920. On the former the Senate recedes and on amendment numbered 28 the House recedes with an amendment granting to the President authority, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy during the period from December 31, 1919, to June 30, 1920, to 191,000 men.

On amendments Nos. 29 and 36: Provide for the continuation of nurses of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 37 and 38: Provide 90 instead of 30 days for transferring female members of the Naval Reserve Force to inactive duty; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 39: Reduces amount for compensating members of the Naval Reserve Force transferred to inactive duty and retained as civilian employees because of their proposed retention as reserves for a longer period than the House had provided; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Make it permissible to employ members of the Naval Reserve Force transferred to inactive duty and civilians who may qualify as expert technicists, not exceeding 24 in number, at rates of pay ranging from $2,000 to $4,000 per annum; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 42 and 43: Extends the period during which enlisted men may be construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war from April 7, 1917, to February 1, 1917; and the House recedes with an amendment making the commencing date February 3, 1917.

On amendment No. 44: Extends provisions of bill relating to the discharge of enlisted men to enlisted men of the Army; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 45: Strikes out House provision denying to officers on field duty the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light; and the House

recedes with an amendment limiting such allowances to the period of the war and in no event beyond October 1, 1919.

On amendment No. 47: Makes officers eligible for selection for promotion and for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank in which they served temporarily during the war with the German Government. This amendment ultimately would result in a number of permanent commanders being placed upon the retired list; and the House recedes with an amendment which will not make the retirement of said officers practicable before July 1, 1921.

On amendment No. 48: This amendment gives to bureau chiefs with the permanent rank of rear admiral, who have heretofore served a full term and are now serving as chief of bureau, constructive service of six years to compensate for six years' credit given to line officers who were in the service before 1913 for service at the Naval Academy.

On amendment No. 49: Extends provisions of existing law permitting of the annual appointment of 100 enlisted men to the Naval Academy to members of the Naval Reserve Force on active duty, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 50: Permits members of the Naval Reserve Force and such members thereof who formerly were members of the National Naval Volunteers to be or become members of the Naval Militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and the House recedes with an amendment requiring that such membership in the Naval Militia shall not be permitted to interfere with the discharge of Naval Reserve Force duties.

On amendment No. 51: Authorizes Secretary of the Navy to investigate and settle losses sustained by occupants of certain premises within the naval station at Pensacola, Fla., who were recently required by the Secretary of the Navy to vacate said premises, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 52: Provides for transfer and promotion of William R. Rush from the rank of captain on the retired list of the Navy to the rank of rear admiral on the active list of the Navy, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 53: Provides for the restoration to the Naval Reserve Force, in active service list, of Frank Pulaski, late a lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve Force, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 54: Provides for the appointment of First Sergt. Edgar Hayes, United States Marine Corps, as a first lieutenant in the permanent establishment of the United States Marine Corps, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 55: Provides for promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Renwick John Hartung from the rank of lieutenant commander to the rank of captain.

On amendment No. 56: Provides for the Government sharing equally with the States of Maine and New Hampshire the cost of constructing a bridge connecting the city of Portsmouth, N. H., with the navy yard at Kittery, Me., and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62: Provide or are incident to the provision of additional facilities at certain navy yards, and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 63, 65, and 66: Provide or are incident to the provision of additional facilities at the Philadelphia Navy Yard and the Naval Academy, and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 67: Provides for a machine and electrical shop building, to cost $400,000, at the navy yard, Norfolk, Va.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 68: Provides for a pattern shop and storage building at the navy yard, Norfolk, Va., required in connection with ship construction at that yard; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 69: Provides for the completion of steel and lumber storage facilities at the navy yard, Norfolk, Va., at a cost of $300,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 71 and 72: Are on account of an item of $30,000 to replace two temporary marine barracks at the navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 73: Provides for the construction of a railroad connection between causeway now crossing Mare Island Straits and the South Vallejo railroad yards, at a cost of $165,000; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 75: This provides for new piers, costing $75,000, at the torpedo station, Newport, R. I.; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 78: This provides for an officers' mess building, $50,000, and an incinerator plant, $67,790, at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va.; and the House recedes with an amendment striking out the officers' mess building.

On amendment No. 80: This provides for a site for a naval hospital in Balboa Park in San Diego, Calif., to be accepted by the Federal Government without cost or encumbrance; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 81: This provides for the returning of the sites for the training station and naval hospital at San Diego, Calif., in case the Federal Government does not develop these sites for these purposes; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 82: This provides for an exchange of a small strip of land between the Marine Corps base property and private ownership in another piece of land contiguous to the Marine Corps base without cost to the Government; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 83, 85, 86, and 87 are changes in appropriations resulting in the adoption of the House figures in personnel; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 84: This is a reduction in the appropriation for commutation of quarters by reason of the House provision providing for commutation of officers at sea for a period not longer than October 1, 1919; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 88: This provision grants to captains in the line of the permanent Navy who have been wounded in the line of duty and who are on the active list promotion to the next higher grade on the retired list upon their retirement by reason of their inability to perform duty at sea on the active list.

On amendment No. 89: This is an increase due to the Senate provision for personnel; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 90 and 91: These provide for increased appropriation for maintenance in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts and the increase in limitation of the clerical force provided in said appropriation; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 92: This provides that the naval hospital in the District of Columbia shall be supplied with fuel from the Government fuel yard in the District of Columbia; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 93: This provides an increase of $500,000 in the clerical limitation on the appropriation "Engineering"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 94: This provides an increase of limitation from $30,000 to $32,500 for the purchase of land for a site for a radio shore station at Otter Cliffs, Me.; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 96: This provides that certain practical instructors in the trades at the Naval Academy shall be considered practical instructors of midshipmen in order that they may not be reduced in rating or pay should the force of mechanics which they supervise be reduced; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 97: This provides that the strength of the Marine Corps be not to exceed 27,400 as an average for the year and inserts that this average shall be maintained "so far as practicable"; and the Senate recedes from the amendment striking out the words "so far as practicable."

On amendment No. 98: This provides for an equitable reduction in the number of officers in the various grades by providing reduction symmetrically and also provides for 50 additional warrant officers; and the House recedes with an amendment striking out the additional warrant officers.

On amendment No. 99: This amendment removes any doubt as to the legality of certain promotions in the Marine Corps from the ranks to warrant officers and provides that such promotions shall be construed as legal where such promotion takes place from retired enlisted grades to warrant officers.

On amendment No. 100: This discontinues the services of two civilian clerks in the office of the paymaster of the Marine Corps and provides for the detail of two military pay clerks who, while serving as chief clerks in the office of the paymaster, shall receive the pay and allowances of the next higher grade; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 101 and 102: These are changes in total; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 103: This provides for the repairs to barracks of the Marine Corps; and the House recedes with an amendment providing that the leasing of any buildings in the District of Columbia shall be with the consent of the Public Buildings Commission, and the erection of any temporary buildings outside the District of Columbia are restricted to a total cost not exceeding $10,000 during the next fiscal year.

On amendment No. 105: This provides for reimbursement to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who lose their baggage while traveling under orders of the United States Government; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 106: This is a change of total; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 107: Provides for an investigation and report at the next regular session upon the facts and circumstances relating to losses or delay caused to contractors with the Government by reason of any governmental agencies; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 108: This provides that except for emergency requirements no materials that can be manufactured at reasonable prices in the United States shall be purchased or acquired in any foreign country unless the efficient operation of the Navy necessitates purchase or acquirement abroad.

On amendment No. 109: This provides that when time and facilities permit any article that can be manufactured or produced in a Government navy yard shall be obtained from navy yards provided the price is less than it can be purchased or acquired otherwise; and the House recedes.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
WM. J. BROWNING,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the House permit me to make this one short statement——

Mr. WALSH. What action was taken on amendment No. 103? Is it in the report?

Mr. BUTLER. It is in the report. Will the reading clerk please read the language after the figures "$660,898" in amendment No. 103? The reading clerk did not read quite all of the agreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 103: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of said amendment strike out all after the word "buildings" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "upon the approval of the Secretary of the Navy; such temporary buildings as may be erected in pursuance hereof at a total cost not to exceed $10,000 during the year; $660,898"; and the House agree to the same.

Mr. WALSH. That is all right.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, when the bill passed the House it carried about $600,000,000, or a trifle over that amount. As reported in the Senate, it had something like $645,000,000 or $647,000,000. The bill will now carry, if the conference report is agreed to by both bodies, the sum of $616,096,838, or $14,628,074 more than it contained when passed through the House. The sum of $14,628,074 additional is made up in this way: On the motion of the gentleman from New York in February, 1919, the amount of money to be appropriated for aviation was reduced to $15,000,000. The majority in favor of that sum in the House was a very large one, and therefore the House Committee on Naval Affairs in making up this bill bore that fact in mind and reported to the House $15,000,000 for aviation for next year. The Senate raised the sum for this service to $35,000,000. Your conferees concluded that it was very much better to itemize this sum of money than it should remain a lump sum.

Having in mind the expressed wish of the House, or the expressed views of the House, upon two or three occasions, your conferees tried to get as far as they could from lump-sum appropriations, and proposed to the Senate conferees to itemize the amount that should be increased, or, rather, we were willing to increase the amount in the event the Senate conferees would permit an amendment itemizing the amount. The Senate conferees agreed to it. The amount of the items was something like $22,000,000 or $23,000,000. The Senate conferees requested a larger sum, and we concluded after a good deal of discussion we would ask the House, inasmuch as the lump sum was abandoned and an itemized account had been submitted and substituted in place of the lump sum, to agree to $25,000,000 for aviation next year. At the time we agreed to this we had regard for the fact that the subject of aviation is one that the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House propose to give special attention to, and a subcommittee upon that subject has already been appointed and is now working, and we hope next year when the bill is reported we will report a special paragraph for aviation, and in that paragraph we will write item after item expressing and directing the executive officers how to spend this money and upon what. Now, again, we had a large number of machines heavier than air, or the regular flying machines—4,000, costing $23,000,000—while the Army had 110,000, and remembering the House provision authorizing an interchange of war material with the Army, and if we needed more than 4,000 planes in the Navy during next year we could go to the Army and obtain them out of the 110,000, we did not largely increase the amount for that purpose. We were especially anxious that the experimental part of the estimates should not be in any way interfered with, and therefore we wrote in this report the item for experimentation just exactly as the department requested—about $7,000,000. We have none of the lighter-than-air machines—what I call the balloon machines, dirigibles. I do believe we have a small one of them. The Secretary of the Navy was especially anxious that we should improve this part of the service and that the new supply of machines for this part of the service should be an improvement. The Secretary of the Navy expressed the wish that he might have two and a half million or three million dollars to buy one of these machines abroad that we might use here in experimentation, and therefore we wrote into the report authority for him to buy one from abroad and build another here, to be used, as I understand, largely in the way of experiment. We have therefore authorized him to build one in the next year costing about $3,000,000 and authorized him to put up two hangars costing about a million and a half or two million dollars.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Three million.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, a large sum of money. First of all, the purpose of your House committee, and the purpose of the conferees, is this, to permit this experimentation work to proceed under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, and for that purpose we gave him every dollar he asked, and in order that we might further improve the Aviation Service we would build these lighter-than-air craft in the next two years, so as to take this small step in that direction.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This matter of itemizing is a step in the right direction, and I think the committee is to be highly commended for it. I want to ask the gentleman, since we had no information in the previous consideration of the bill, how it comes that the department needs for instruction one rigid dirigible, $1,500,000, to be built in the United States, and for the purchase abroad of a dirigible of the latest type, $2,500,000? There is a difference of a million dollars between the dirigible to be built in the United States and the one to be bought abroad.

Mr. BUTLER. The difference is, I know, considerable, and we made some inquiry, and find that the difference is this, namely, that our men must be instructed by the men who sail this machine. The expense to bring it across is considerable, and it might cost us more to build it here. And therefore we have limited the amount to $2,500,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Have we not had commissions in the Navy Department going abroad to obtain instruction and information in regard to dirigibles?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not recall that we have. I can not answer my friend's question, because I do not know. But I understood we were largely in the dark with relation to that part of the Air Service, and it was to improve it, to begin to experiment and then develop it, that we agreed to add this sum of money, about $12,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is for the completion and use, if possible, of some such machine as the Zeppelin?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; on that order. Large machines that will carry a number of soldiers and sailors.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They have not proven to be very successful, even under the direction of the Germans?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; they have.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is a disputed question.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not tell my friend, but it is considered by all the nations of the world that are improving their air service that this is a very important part of it, and inasmuch as we have none of them I do hope that the Members of the House will permit us to make a beginning, so that next spring we may know how far we are able to advance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the testimony before the gentleman's committee go to show that it is worth a million dollars more to build a dirigible or purchase one abroad than it is to construct one in the United States?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] will permit, I will call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to the naval hearings.

Capt. Craven said:

Capt. CRAVEN. We hope to construct two and buy one in England. They will cost us $2,000,000 apiece to construct, and we hope to provide $2,500,000 for the one we will buy in England. Our mechanics will gain valuable experience in England in the construction and management of these big ships, and the sum asked will also cover the cost of England's tests and of bringing the ship over to this side. That is the reason we allowed $500,000 more for the one built abroad.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is a million dollars difference in allowance, and I want to know if the gentleman

can explain why it takes that much more to construct one of these dirigibles in England than in the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not answer the gentleman's question. Next spring I will endeavor to give him the information. We are all in the dark on this question of aviation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to know whether this dirigible to be procured abroad is to be used there or brought here?

Mr. BUTLER. It is to be brought here, and we are to study it in the hope of improving the service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do they know more abroad about these matters than we do here?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman from New York is a distinguished aviator, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is a distinguished naval expert, and I asked him the question.

Mr. BUTLER. I think evidently they do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to have my friend explain why an American machine costs $1,000,000, and a British machine of the same sort costs $2,000,000?

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the gentleman that Capt. Craven, who has charge of this particular service, said that this would cost $3,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And we reduced it to $2,000,000 later on.

Mr. BUTLER. In the meantime they asked for $2,500,000 to purchase machines abroad, and then they gave us the reason why they had made the difference in the price. We must send men there for instruction, and the machines and the men must be brought here, and the expense will be considerable. And I will say to the gentleman that we did not know then how to make a reduction in the figure. We were so extremely anxious that the dirigibles be built, in order that we may learn how to compete with other people, how we may improve this Air Service, that we made no particular question of the difference of $500,000, in order that we might have the machines.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do these Britishers charge us a million dollars for educational purposes?

Mr. BUTLER. No, sir. I can not tell my friend how much we will have to pay. We have left that largely to the Secretary of the Navy, and I have no doubt he will be thoroughly economical in regard to it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Capt. Craven stated that it was fully expected the competition would be had abroad before these contracts for the British dirigibles are let. So it is quite possible that the sum actually paid will be much less than this.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the chairman of the committee yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to ask the chairman if the experience with this machine during this war holds out any hope that this sort of a craft is to be used in the warfare of the future? My information, as I gain it from just reading the newspapers, is that this machine did not stand the test of war.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not tell the gentleman what the possibilities are for this machine. We already have learned from the war experts and from the men who do know a good deal of such subjects that it is going to be as important, and more important, to control the air than control the seas, and therefore this is in that direction. My friend from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] might be able to give the gentleman some information.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would like to have some information, because my impression is that the experience of the war has put this sort of a craft in the discard.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman is correct if it is regarded as a fighting machine, but for scout purposes there is really no measure of its value. Admiral Jellicoe in a recent book stated that it is worth two scout cruisers under certain circumstances. He cited the battle of Jutland.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Who uses them?

Mr. OLIVER. Germany used this type to great advantage in the Battle of Jutland. They used this type to great advantage at all times in that part of the war field. They could not, however, use it successfully where they were subject to attack by the small fighting planes. All officers are agreed that the value of these machines can not be overestimated for observation and scouting purposes. A noninflammable gas, such as we now feel can be provided, will give to this type great offensive power. It was because heretofore only an inflammable gas was available that made this type so open to attack and destruction by the fast combat plane.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I see where we are going. This is merely an appropriation and an expenditure of money that demands large appropriations. But it seems to me as a layman that the ordinary airplane, such an airplane as that which can go across the sea, would meet any improvement that you can make in regard to big things like dirigibles.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no comparison between the machines you refer to and the type of machine that this bill seeks to provide for. The reliability of these machines and the fact that they can remain in the air for an indefinite length of time make them most important from a naval standpoint.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make a general statement in regard to the aviation of the Navy. When the conference report on the Army appropriation bill was before the House some statements were made in regard to helium gas, and from the remarks made it seemed to me that some misinformation was conveyed.

We have at Fort Worth, Tex., a plant to manufacture this noninflammable gas. It is owned jointly by the Army and the Navy. That plant has had allotted to it $5,531,000, and it has cost up to date about $4,700,000, as I understand. It is producing this helium gas at a cost of between $80 and $100 per 1,000 cubic feet, and is a commercial plant, beyond the experimental stage.

That gas is of absolutely indispensable value, not only for our balloons but for our dirigibles. From the remarks made by the members of the Committee on Military Affairs it seemed that they thought the only use of that gas would be for balloons. As a matter of fact its greatest future use is in dirigible aircraft, and if our aircraft should be developed, as most of us think it is going to be developed, we must have this helium gas, otherwise our great airships will always be subject to that greatest of all risks—fire.

I want to say a word in regard to these dirigible machines. Some people say the private concerns should do all the experimental work for lighter-than-air craft. My own thought is that private concerns should do a great bulk of the experimental work, but as there is at the present time no market among commercial interests for dirigible machines, the expense of experimentation at present must be borne in large measure by the Federal Government, otherwise these experiments can not be made and we would not progress.

The Navy Department at the present time has before it a proposition by which arrangements with a manufacturer of dirigibles can be made, provided we will take a certain percentage of their product at a certain percentage of cost, and the profit derived from those sales can be turned into a sinking fund to cover any advances that this Government might make, so that we would get the advantage of experimental work at a minimum of cost.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. I notice that both in the Army bill and in the Navy bill large appropriations are made for this aircraft. Does the gentleman believe that more success can be obtained by the Government if all of the Air Service could be put under one head?

Mr. HICKS. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the subject of a joint Air Service is like a red flag to a bull, so far as the Army and Navy are concerned. It is something that must be considered on both sides. As a practical business man, I would be inclined to say that probably a consolidated service would stand for the greatest efficiency; certainly coordination is essential. But I am not prepared to say finally, before we have exhaustive hearings, that I would advocate a united Air Service.

I want to say just one thing further, Mr. Speaker. We can not look upon the Air Service as a military service exclusively. Great Britain to-day is appropriating $250,000,000, as I learn, not merely for war service but for peace service; and France, loaded with debt as France is, standing victorious as France is, with the war behind her, is now spending $200,000,000 for an extension of her air service; and Italy also is following in line. America, the inventor of the airplane, should not be a laggard in developing what is destined to be, in my opinion, the greatest factor in transportation that the world has ever seen. The $25,000,000 appropriated here for the use of the Navy, large though it be, is insignificant in comparison with what England has appropriated, and I for one do not want to see these other nations gain the control of the air and maintain unchallenged that supremacy.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HICKS. I will, gladly.

Mr. DENISON. How does the gentleman interpret these vast expenditures now by England and France and Italy and what is recommended in this country in view of the fact that the league of nations has been accepted by Germany, and we are told that there is to be no more war?

Mr. HICKS. I will say to the gentleman that I tried to make that clear a moment ago.

Mr. DENISON. I was not in the Chamber then.

Mr. HICKS. I stated that a large part of this money is not for military purposes. It is for experimental purposes and to encourage the manufacturers to produce these planes and these ships for commercial purposes, and I believe the greatest future of the Air Service in this country will be along peace lines and not along military lines.

Mr. DENISON. Then do I understand that we are making these appropriations to experiment with dirigibles for commercial purposes?

Mr. HICKS. A large part of it—many millions—is to be used for experimental work, the results of which will benefit both the peace and the war services.

Mr. DENISON. Is that to be in preparation for commerce or for war?

Mr. HICKS. It is for the construction of some machines, so that they can be used for commerce as well as war; $7,000,000 out of $25,000,000 is to be used for development work.

Mr. DENISON. If this is an appropriation in the interest of future commerce, I have no objection to it, but if it is in preparation for war it seems that we are a little bit inconsistent.

Mr. HICKS. I will say to the gentleman, if I still have the time, that here, with our vast seacoast, one of the great fields for aviation in the future will be to patrol the sea, hunt for derelicts and icebergs, protect our great commerce, save lives, and aid navigation generally. We can go out and supply our fishing fleet with medicines and supplies and render succor to ships that may be in need of it. There are many things that the airships can do. There are plans by which we are going to survey parts of our great public domain by means of photographs taken from the air by a process of triangulation, and the Interior Department, I understand, is going to utilize these planes for the location and extinction of forest fires through the use of chemicals dropped from above. The future of aircraft is all before it and no one can predict the benefits that may be derived from an expansion of this service.

Mr. DENISON. I am very glad to get this information. I thought this was preparation for war of some kind.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New York, Mr. HICKS, speaks of $25,000,000 as a mere pittance. I never saw anybody who had $25,000,000, and I never saw anybody who had ever seen anybody else who had $25,000,000. To me it is an enormous sum of money. But this is a tremendous subject, and we had to take it like men and take our chances this year. It will be good for commercial development, of course. We have that in our minds. As my friend from New York has said, we must coordinate these different departments. The Army wants flying machines, the Navy Department insists upon them, the Interior Department wishes them, the Coast Guard wishes them, the Post Office Department wishes them. Now, we want coordination and cooperation. We do not want five different concerns with five different overheads and five different plants running at the same time making these machines. We want, before we are through with this, and we propose to have it if we know how, that there shall be one central place in the United States making the best engine that can be made for this purpose. Whether we will be able to work it out I do not know. I can say to the House that we have a hard fight before us before we accomplish it.

Mr. WALSH. Has not the Department of Agriculture put in any claim for flying machines?

Mr. BUTLER. If it has not done so already, it will do so tomorrow.

Mr. WALSH. I am surprised at their moderation if they have not already put in a claim.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to ask the gentleman if the Employment Bureau had put in a request for aeroplanes?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know, but that will all come later. Now let me resume my statement. I do not want to take all the time here. We yielded $10,000,000. Indeed, we were glad to unite with the Senate and expend $10,000,000. We need these lighter-than-air machines to start that end of aviation. So, therefore, we did not really dispute the $10,000,000. After we had disposed of that we went into the conference with the Senate, and when we were through the House had yielded $4,628,000 and the Senate had yielded $29,371,926. [Applause.] Now we ask you to approve this report. We have done the best we could.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have a motion.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to yield a right that belongs to me under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] have the right to make a motion?

Mr. WALSH. Not in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. He can make a motion if the gentleman from Pennsylvania yields the floor for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that under the rules of the House, by reason of being chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and chairman of the House conference committee, I have one hour's time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has one hour's time, and unless he yields the floor before the expiration of that hour he can move the previous question, if he chooses to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not wish to cut off debate, but do not wish to yield the floor.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania for a question.

Mr. VARE. Amendment No. 60 provides for the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa.: General development for handling guns, armor, turrets, structural steel, $1,000,000; central power plant improvements and distributing systems, $500,000; light machine shop, $400,000; pattern shop and storage, $400,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; about $3,000,000 in all, I will say to my friend.

Mr. VARE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if these items were all eliminated?

Mr. BUTLER. They were all eliminated except one, and I wanted that one eliminated, too. That was for the pattern shop, and we yielded to the Senate.

First of all, I want the House to understand something that maybe the Members have never heard of. The Navy Department, within the last two years, has spent $334,000,000 for navy yards and stations. I want this character of expenditures checked. We have spent at the navy yard in Philadelphia, which is alongside of my district and where I know many of the people, over $17,000,000 in a year and a half, and they want $34,000,000 more to complete it. I do not think it is necessary, and all the members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House agreed that these improvements were not necessary at this time, and that with a total expenditure of $334,000,000 for navy yards and stations the department ought to have at this time all it needs in these navy yards. [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. VARE. I wish to ask my colleague whether he has made any investigation of this matter, personally?

Mr. BUTLER. No, I have not.

Mr. VARE. Does the gentleman know anything about the great efficiency of that navy yard?

Mr. BUTLER. I have been at League Island looking around about three times in 25 years.

Mr. VARE. How recently has the gentleman been there?

Mr. BUTLER. I have not been there for several years, and I am not going for several more unless I can be helpful. [Laughter.]

Mr. VARE. Do I understand the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee to tell the House that notwithstanding the fact that he lives in the adjoining district——

Mr. BUTLER. It is not in my district, but in the district of my colleague [Mr. VARE].

Mr. VARE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that notwithstanding the fact that he lives in the adjoining district he has not visited that yard and has not inspected it during the entire period of the war?

Mr. BUTLER. I have not, and I am not going unless for the purpose above stated. I am not a mechanic.

Mr. VARE. Does the gentleman say he has no knowledge of the great development which this yard has produced?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman can not embarrass me by that question. I voted for these improvements, voted for them before the gentleman was long born [laughter], or at least before

the gentleman became prominent in business and governmental affairs. At that time there was nothing there but a few frame buildings, and I have voted for more than $40,000,000 for improvements to this navy yard, and I will vote for no more until I see that they are absolutely necessary.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman make a visit to that navy yard?

Mr. BUTLER. I will if my colleague will take me.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Move the previous question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask the gentleman to yield some time to me.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to move the previous question without yielding to the gentleman. Can he get along with three minutes?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; give me six minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I will give the gentleman five minutes. I do not want to shut the gentleman off. He is interested in aviation, and I will yield five minutes to him, and then I will move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to this item. We have not given the aviation industry of this country a chance. Assuming for the sake of argument that we are compelled to go to England to buy a dirigible, they provide for purchase abroad of five special types of planes for $100,000. We can build planes in this country, and there is no necessity of buying planes overseas.

Then they ask for $2,500,000 for a dirigible to be purchased abroad and $1,500,000 to build a replica here. It would seem that we might be paying $1,000,000 royalty on that machine. That might be the difference between $2,500,000 and $1,500,000.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman tell who is the builder of that machine?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No.

Mr. MILLER. Has the gentleman ever heard who is going to build it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is already built.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman knows that we have to go abroad to buy a machine.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I know that we can not build a dirigible here, and we ought to be ashamed of ourselves to admit it.

Now, much has been said about the British air fleet. They have an independent air service. It is a success because they have stopped the waste and blundering that we have been guilty of, and they have a separate service.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] brought the question of large appropriations for aviation to the attention of the House when the Army bill was up, and we succeeded in having the amount reduced. It is only fair that we cut both appropriations alike. The Army aviation is larger than that of the Navy, and yet we have reduced the Army to $15,000,000. Now, the Navy, with one-third of the size of the aviation of the Army, asks for $25,000,000; $2,500,000 to buy a dirigible and $1,500,000 to make one here. Let us be fair. You are appropriating $25,000,000 for the Navy, without a chance to go into it, when you have a moment ago cut down the Army to $15,000,000.

What I have been trying to do is to cut down all appropriations until these people stop wasting money, until the Army and the Navy can confer with each other and eliminate the duplication. The Army wants to buy a dirigible, the Navy wants to buy a dirigible. Let us cut this down to $15,000,000, the same as the Army, and between the two they will find money to buy a dirigible. We would in this way appropriate $30,000,000 for the two services. Let us not lose our heads over this. It is true that we have wasted much money already, but that is no reason why we should throw away $10,000,000 more.

They say they must have $6,700,000 for experimental purposes. That may mean anything. Stop and realize that we have spent millions of dollars in experiments in different forms in the Army and the Navy, and yet with all we have spent we have not even blue prints of a dirigible machine. If one is needed as a model we can get one from England, and it should serve to the technical and construction divisions of both the Army and Navy. We do not need to go abroad to buy a plane. We have got planes in this country. That item is $100,000, and we can cut that out. I am going to move to recommit this report with instructions not to accept the Senate amendment, and that will leave the naval aviation $15,000,000, the same as the Army, if the instructions given to the conferees to-day are accepted by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have a motion to recommit. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I served notice when I had the floor that I would move to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not move to recommit now.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report, and upon that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Now the gentleman from New York can move to recommit with instructions.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit with instructions not to agree to Senate amendment No. 4.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAGUARDIA moves to recommit to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to the committee not to agree to the Senate amendment No. 4.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not in order to move to recommit a conference report.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will overrule the point of order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BUTLER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 4226) to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, that report has not been printed yet, has it?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This is the last conference report and has not been printed.

Mr. WALSH. Then how can the gentleman call it up?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the conference report without printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report, notwithstanding the rule respecting printing. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. I object.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, then I present the conference report for printing under the rule.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 45 to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after a full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same.

C. R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5608) entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes."

BRIDGE ACROSS SULPHUR RIVER, ARK.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4631) granting the con-

sent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, at or near Blackmans Point, in said county and State, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 4631, a bridge bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state when this bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. WINGO. Several days ago—on the 25th.

Mr. WALSH. Without amendments?

Mr. WINGO. Without amendments.

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Sulphur River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Blackmans Point, in the county of Miller, in the State of Arkansas, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. WINGO, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4630) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Sulphur River, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in said county and State, which is a companion bill to the one just passed, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 4630. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Miller, State of Arkansas, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Sulphur River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near the Texas & Pacific Railroad bridge, in the county of Miller, in the State of Arkansas, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. WINGO, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SNAKE RIVER, WASH.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the bill (H. R. 1706) authorizing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the Snake River, 3 miles above its confluence with the Columbia River, near Pasco, Wash., with Senate amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, let us have the Senate amendments read.

The Clerk reported the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, these are simply nominal amendments, I presume?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. They are.

Mr. WALSH. And do not affect the purpose of the bill?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The amendments authorize the State of Washington to participate in the construction and operation of the bridge instead of the two counties.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would state that the amendments were referred to our committee and the committee agreed to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an article from the New York World of to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather dangerous to allow insertions of articles from the New York World, in view of its well-known political leanings, without knowing something about what the article is before we consent to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The article is headed "G. O. P. leaders see their party facing disintegration."

Mr. WALSH. Oh, it is a comical article? I have no objection. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

G. O. P. LEADERS SEE THEIR PARTY FACING DISINTEGRATION—REPEATED BLUNDERS IN CONGRESS ALARM OUTSIDE LEADERS, WHO FORESEE DEFEAT FOR LACK OF A PROGRESSIVE PROGRAM—PLAYING "MUTT AND JEFF POLITICS," ONE DECLARES—SENTIMENT IN FAVOR OF A CONFERENCE TO DETERMINE WHAT SHOULD BE DONE TO PREVENT PARTY DISASTER IS GROWING.

(By Louis Seibold.)

Republican leaders throughout the country are pretty well convinced that efficient leadership for their party will not be found in Washington. Consequently they have scratched the National Capitol off their list and are preparing to look elsewhere for a commander in chief.

The repeated blunders of the congressional cabal that has always assumed to select candidates and provide issues for presidential campaigns have justified general disgust among the outsiders. These have completely revised their estimates regarding the capacity for leadership among the chief actors in the halls of Congress.

This fact is fully established by the comments of national leaders who appear in New York every week. Already there is crystallizing pronounced sentiment in favor of a conference of these leaders to determine what can and should be done to prevent the further demoralization of their once great party. That its efficiency has been sadly impaired is admitted by an important group of leaders who believed a month ago that Republican control of Congress would result in the elimination of factional disputes, the subordination of personal intrigues and the rehabilitation of the interests of the whole party on a healthy basis.

PARTY DISINTEGRATING.

The fact that none of these things has eventuated has compelled the outside leaders to turn their faces away from Washington with the sorrowful admission that their party is falling into a conditon of disintegration not dissimilar to that which existed in the Democratic Party following the first nomination of Mr. Bryan by the Democrats 23 years ago.

The essential causes of this state of affairs are held in relative importance to be the personal vanities of half a dozen men in the Senate who are sparring for individual advantage in the presidential handicap; the failure of these men to consolidate the results of the congressional victory last autumn; division over the league of nations project adopted by the peace conference; impotency in fighting the Democratic policies; and the entire lack of anything approximating a program designed to restore the fighting morale of the party.

Three months ago, when Mr. Wilson was fighting an uphill battle with the peace conference in an effort to put through his program, there was the fullest confidence among the Republican leaders in and out of Congress that every development in the international and domestic situation tended to Republican success. It was predicted that when the Republicans organized the two Houses of Congress the Democratic Party would be jockeyed into a hopelessly defensive position from which even so skilled a politician as Mr. Wilson could not extricate it.

But the predictions were shown to be wrong in precept, principle, and execution. The old theory of political strategy that "the Republicans stop and the Democrats start fighting after an election" was completely reversed. The Democrats have had the good sense to clear the decks for the Republicans to stage and enjoy fracas after fracas to their hearts' content.

LEADERS PESSIMISTIC.

Chagrined Republican leaders who have seen their party chances go glimmering are inclined to hold an extremely pessimistic view of the future unless there is a radical change in the puzzling program which their congressional spokesmen are "balling up with every move." It is the opinion of one important expert that "no program is better than the jumble of so-called issues which those fellows in Congress are wasting time over." It is the further opinion of the same authority that "the sooner those noise-makers in the Senate and House tumble to the fact that what the Republican Party needs more than candidates is issues, the sooner we'll get back to our home port."

But the congressional leaders apparently do not share this outside view. At least, that is the construction placed on their conduct by the leaders outside the two Halls of the National Parliament. Under the head of "blunders" the leaders who are clamoring for a new deal in the party management star the resistance to the league of nations scheme, which is held to lack both clarity of expression and undefined motive.

Regardless of Republican senatorial opinion to the contrary, few practical leaders who nominate and elect Senators believe that their

party can capitalize the uncertainties of the league covenant to party advantage, or any other so-called "mistake" made by the Democratic administration in the conduct of the war.

"Forget the war—that's over," is the popular view of the Republican leaders throughout the country, who have almost abandoned hope as far as Washington is concerned. What is needed now, according to the discontented outside leaders, is a constructive and not a destructive program, less alarm over the possibility that Mr. Wilson or any other Executive will be permitted to involve the United States in foreign alliances of any sort, and more initiative and sincerity in preparing for domestic problems to come.

"MUTT AND JEFF POLITICS."

Until the warring elements in Congress are reconciled to a common understanding of these problems and stop playing "Mutt and Jeff politics"—the phrase of an important national leader—little or no help toward healing party breaches is looked for.

The first step in this direction, it is held by the outside leaders, should be to give less thought to candidates for the present and more to catching up with the lessons taught by the war—an appreciation of the fact that the men and women voters of the country will not sanction a return to the reactionary policies that once won for the Republicans, but will insist on the complete abandonment of them.

From every part of the country Republican leaders making New York at frequent intervals bring substantially the same story. The voters in their respective sections want to know what concessions the Republicans are going to make to the demands for sweeping reforms of an industrial, social, and governmental character. Party leaders in touch with their constituents attach much more importance to some of the domestic developments since the signing of the armistice seven months ago than is true of most of the congressional leaders.

They enumerate the problems arising from unsettled industrial conditions, in which the demands of labor must be heeded; the growth in popularity of some very radical reforms successfully promoted by the Farmers' Nonpartisan League in the Northwest; the insistence of the "soldier vote" for recognition; the widespread agitation for a curtailment of individual fortunes, the curbing of profiteering by corporations, and several other propositions designed to change the standards of living and social conditions.

IGNORED IN CONGRESS.

These features of national ambitions have been completely ignored by the congressional leaders, in the judgment of field operatives, with consequent loss of party prestige, for, aside from the league of nations and perhaps unconscious first aid to Democratic policies, the achievements of the Republican Congress are held by the critics to be of small vote-inviting value.

The manner in which the Republicans in the two Houses rushed to the aid of their political opponents in relieving them of the war-time prohibition bag is especially instanced. Up to the organization of Congress by the Republicans, whatever odium—if any—attached to the promotion of that Anti-Saloon League project was charged against the Democrats. It is the opinion of the Republican leaders outside of Congress that the representatives of their party, in obeying the commands of the Anti-Saloon League, rendered the Democrats a tremendous service, that will be reflected when the majority of them come up for reelection.

The chief opposition to prohibition, emergency or permanent, is centered in the Republican States, yet the Members and Senators sent by these Commonwealths lost no time in completing the task which hitherto had been a Democratic partisan obligation. The outside Republican leaders supplement their prediction that the transfer of the prohibition bag is going to cost their party a lot of votes with the statement that nothing else has proved so convincingly the demoralized condition of the organization which men who are privileged to speak for them have built up.

FAILURE OF THE PROGRESSIVES.

Leaders of States which developed the greatest Progressive following at the behest of the late Theodore Roosevelt are even more disappointed at the collapse of their congressional machine than the reactionary element. As a matter of fact, the Progressive view is that the standpat faction has all the best of existing conditions and has tightened its grip on the party machinery to such an extent that, barring accidents, the same old crowd of bosses will name its own men and write the sort of platform best suited to the needs of "big business."

It is of incidental interest that the Progressive feels himself powerless to stay the advance of the once-hated reactionary.

As far as candidates are concerned there is little, if any, interest in the aspirations of half a dozen Senators who are held responsible for the unhappy condition of Republican affairs. If the outside leaders correctly reflect prevailing sentiment in their respective sections, none of the senatorial aspirations is regarded seriously at present. There is said to exist a pronounced and growing sentiment in favor of Gen. Leonard Wood and Gov. Lowden, of Illinois, but it is sporadic and not conclusive of party preferences.

Unless there is a revision of the party program in Congress, the Republican presidential nomination will be of purely speculative value, particularly if the new movement, which is finding favor among the labor and farming elements and would, it is believed, hurt the Republicans more than the Democrats, continue to gain headway.

The chief reason for this belief among outside Republican leaders is that while the Republicans continue to waste time over international "dead ones," President Wilson, having successfully disposed of them, will help his party, of which he is sole leader of influence, to build an up-to-date progressive program dealing with actualities of current importance and political value.

These are some of the reasons for the chagrin existing among Republicans outside of Congress and that have already moved them to seek an efficient leader free from the prejudices and embarrassments of reactionary influences that prevail at the National Capital. So far, the quest has not been successful. But there is the word of one of the best-equipped experts in the Republican Party that it will be continued "until the right man is found or that crowd in Washington wakes up." There is his further assurance that if the Washington crowd don't wake up they'll reelect Woodrow Wilson for a third term—if he wants it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MOONEY was granted indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD some remarks made at Trenton, N. J., a few days ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a reply to the comical article which was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have not read the article.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman from Kansas will read that article, he will find it is not comical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the other day the request was made for this extension. The gentleman is not in the Hall now who objected, and until he is consulted about the matter——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am frank to say that it deals largely with the question of immigration and deportation——

Mr. GARNER. I understand; but the gentleman from Washington is asking unanimous consent to do a thing that the other day was objected to, and unless he has consulted with the gentleman on this side, he is not treating him fairly at this time, and unless he has consulted with him, I shall object and take the responsibility myself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will withdraw the request.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman has consulted with him I will not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not even know who he was.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER POWER.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, the water-power bill, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, to come in after the word "purposes," on line 21, page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 21, after the word "purposes," insert the following: "except that as to projects constructed or to be constructed by States or municipalities primarily designed to provide or improve navigation licenses therefor shall be issued without charge.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could make an agreement as to time. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. MADDEN. All I want is about five minutes to explain what this is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want about two minutes.

Mr. ESCH. I ask that debate close on this in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment shall be closed in 30 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this section of the bill provides that licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by the States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge except to the extent that such power is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes. My amendment would make the proviso read like this:

Provided, That licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by State or municipality shall be issued and enjoyed without charge to the extent such power is used by such States or municipalities for State or municipal purposes except that as to projects constructed or to be constructed by States or municipalities primarily designed to provide or improve navigation licenses therefor shall be issued without charge.

Now, the bill provides——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I have but five minutes, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman's amendment commence with the word "except"?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. The bill provides if States develop more power than they can use for municipal purposes and must sell part of the power they develop for industrial purposes, that as to that sold for industrial purposes a fee may be charged by the commission. My amendment provides that wherever the primary purpose of the project is either to provide navigation or improve it that any power developed and sold as a result of that navigation shall be treated exactly the same as if the power was used for municipal or State purposes. That is the whole story, and my primary interest in this thing is the State of Illinois, although it might apply to every State in the Union. The State of Illinois already has been engaged in the construction of a waterway on which it has decided to expend $20,000,000, and there is bound to be more or less power developed. So far the power developed by the State and owned and controlled by the State is being used for municipal purposes. For example, they light the streets of Chicago, part of them, and the municipalities between Chicago and the point where the power is generated, but it may be that when the power is completed they will develop more power than can be disposed of in these municipalities, and we desire that the power shall be disposed of for the development of industry.

Now, somebody may object that the price charged by the State would be less than the price charged by private corporations selling power, but the answer to that is that no power can be sold in the State of Illinois except upon rates made by the public utilities commission of the State. That applies as well to the power sold by the State as to the power sold by individuals and corporations. So that there can be no chance whatever of the State, in the sale of such power as it may create to industrial institutions, selling it at a lower price than the prevailing price or at a price not fixed by the public utilities commission, which has the same power over the State sale as it would over the sale by a private individual or a corporation. I think that is the whole story, and there can be no doubt about the right and justice of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the committee for five minutes, and I think I can get through with what I have to say in that time.

This amendment is offered to the bill because, as I understand it, it was not called to the attention of the committee when they had the bill under consideration; that is, the particular phase of the question was not called to their attention. I do not anticipate there will be any opposition to it, but I want the members of the committee to understand it thoroughly before it is voted on.

Now, then, the bill is drawn upon this theory in its present form, that where power is developed upon any navigable stream or on any of the waters of the United States those who develop the power have to secure a license and pay the Government for it; and when the power is developed by a State or municipality the State or municipality ought to pay for the power over and above what is needed for municipal purposes.

I think that is a correct principle; but there is an exception that ought to be recognized, and that exception is the one the Members from Illinois are particularly interested in, although, as my colleague [Mr. MADDEN] has said, Members from other States may become interested in it. The exception is this, that where there is no navigable stream and where the State at its own expense makes one for the benefit of the public, and incidental to providing a navigable stream, develops the power, the State ought to have the right free to use that power to finance the project. That is what is going to be done in the State of Illinois.

There has been a highway from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi River since La Salle and Marquette first came to that country, but they had to make a portage from Lake Michigan down to the Des Plaines River or Illinois River for a short distance.

Now, there has already been constructed by the city of Chicago a canal 37 miles long, 200 feet wide, and 20 feet deep, down to Lockport, on the Des Plaines River, which flows into the Illinois River. There is still a gap of 65 miles in length between Lockport and La Salle which is not navigable, and never will be except by canalizing it. Now, the State of Illinois has by a constitutional amendment, upon a vote of the people, decided to canalize the Illinois River, or that gap of 65 miles between the terminus of the present canal and La Salle, so as to make a continuous chain of navigation from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico; and for that purpose we are going to borrow $20,000,000 from the people, and we are going to have to borrow more than that before it is finished. We are going, naturally, to develop some power, and the State of Illinois wants to use that power, without being taxed for it, to raise the money to maintain this canal or the river in a navigable condition and pay the overhead charges and interest on its bonds, and finally retire the bonds.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit, does anybody object to that?

Mr. DENISON. I do not know. Some one indicated the other day that they were going to object, but I hope they will not. I hope it will be accepted unanimously.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] has expired.

Mr. DENISON. I hope this amendment will receive the approval of the committee. Our people and our governor are deeply interested in opening up a waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf. But unless we can be given free the power we develop in connection with the project the State, of course, will abandon the whole thing.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to oppose the amendment, but I do rise to place in the RECORD a situation that ought to be considered in connection with the pending amendment. The power that will be developed by this canalized river between Lockport and La Salle would be supplied very largely through the drainage ditch diverting water from Lake Michigan. Under the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers a certain amount of cubic feet per second is now being allowed to be diverted from Lake Michigan. Query: Should this project which the great State of Illinois hopes to install be successful and a considerable portion of the water power sold to private individuals or corporations for profit, will the State of Illinois come to the Secretary of War and try to secure an increase in the amount of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan? If the gentleman from Illinois can assure us it will not be so, I have no objection to the proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. I would not undertake to make any such assurance. The great city of Chicago, with 2,500,000 people, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit me, and the great Mississippi Valley, with its teeming millions of population, and all the way down, need the water from Lake Michigan to dilute the sewage. And I do not think the gentleman would want the people of that community to commit suicide or have anybody on this floor say to them he would commit suicide for them. I think the public health of a community is vastly more important than anything that may be put into this law or any other law with respect to the flow of water from Lake Michigan.

The lives of millions of people are at stake, and without that water from Lake Michigan these lives would go out of existence. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] knows that. It may be that some day there will have to be some new method for disposing of the sewage there, but everybody knows that you can not do that all at once—to-day or the next day.

Mr. ESCH. I simply want to say if more water is to be taken from Lake Michigan in order to dilute the sewage of Chicago, the city of St. Louis might have some objection. But my main point is that if more water is diverted from Lake Michigan there might be danger of lowering the lake level in Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake Erie, which would entail great expense for dredging the existing harbors along the shores of these lakes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a statement, for just one minute?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I just want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin this, that I do not know anything about the scientific reason for it, but the fact is that since the waters of Lake Michigan have been let into the drainage canal at Chicago the average level of all the lakes has been 5 inches higher than it ever was before. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. If that is true, when this amendment is adopted Chicago is likely to be flooded. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL].

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I would like you to look at the top of the Speaker's desk and imagine that the top of the Speaker's desk is the level of Lake Michigan. The distance from Lake Michigan to the city of Lockport, Ill., is thirty-odd miles. The water of Lake Michigan is held on the level until it reaches Lockport, and there is one of the greatest single-drop locks in the United States, capable of locking boats down from the upper to the lower levels, a drop of thirty-odd feet,

where about 200,000 cubic feet of water runs over the dam or through the turbines every minute. It can be regulated by the touch of a button or the turn of a wheel. The water power developed there lights the streets and the parks of Chicago and all the surrounding cities and villages. Part of the water that enters that canal enters at a place called Wilmette, north of Chicago. Some odd thousand cubic feet of water enters the so-called North Shore Channel there. The electric current generated in the power plant at Lockport is sent on high-tension cables up to Wilmette. The electricity that is generated by the water going over the falls at Lockport lifts the water at Wilmette into the canal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What happens to all this water power if the amendment is not put in the bill?

Mr. JUUL. I will tell the gentleman how it happens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is there some charge or payment from the Government, or how is it to be arranged?

Mr. JUUL. The power at the present time is controlled by an additional municipality existing in Chicago and surrounding country, called the "sanitary district of Chicago." It furnishes all the light and electricity to these cities and towns practically at cost.

Now, I will tell the gentleman that it takes a thirty-odd mile run for this water to reach Lockport, but from Lockport it is 4 to 5 miles to Brandons Road, Joliet, in Will County, and that strip of 4 to 5 miles has in it as great a drop as the thirty-odd miles from Chicago to Lockport, so that another fall of the water can be dammed up with the identical mass of water that we had in the first thirty-odd miles.

Now, you understand that it is impossible for the municipalities to use the water power that is generated, or might be generated, in the daytime. In the evening, when the peak load is on, the municipalities can use all the electricity that can be generated. In the daytime it is necessary to sell that electricity. If that electricity was being sold for the purpose of letting individuals or corporations make money out of it, it would be just and fair probably that a fee should be charged by the United States. But the city of Chicago, in its capacity as the sanitary district of Chicago, has built a $76,000,000 waterway of 22 feet depth, and instead of being dug as the waterway was dug across Suez, through the soft, yielding sands of the desert, this waterway was blasted in the eternal rock of Illinois for a great many miles of its total length.

Now, you can readily see that, with this enormous expenditure that the city of Chicago has already undertaken and the additional expenditure of $20,000,000 recently undertaken by the State of Illinois to create a waterway, we are desirous of being permitted to use the electricity that is generated in the daytime, and for which there is no market and no use in the municipalities. We are desirous of turning that electricity over to commercial institutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That applies to all the States alike, does it not?

Mr. JUUL. Yes. You gentlemen can readily see that the State ought to be permitted to utilize the power generated by the second fall. The first level is Lake Michigan. The second level would be represented by Lockport, and the third level by a place called Brandon Bridge, in Will County. The State desires to use the electricity generated by the fall of the water as it goes downstream.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. What was the flowage there, according to the gentleman's figures?

Mr. JUUL. I should say it runs about 200,000 cubic feet per minute.

Mr. SINNOTT. I wish the gentleman would look up those figures.

Mr. JUUL. I am giving these figures by memory.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is Niagara's flow.

Mr. JUUL. No. The gentleman has seconds in his memory. I am talking minutes.

Mr. SINNOTT. The gentleman is not talking second-feet.

Mr. JUUL. I am talking cubic feet and per minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, let me bring that water just a little farther down the valley. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman ask for?

Mr. JUUL. Three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUUL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentlemen that I was here to-day when everybody else sitting around here was permitted to talk freely. I asked for one minute, and I was denied that one minute, and it took two minutes to deny it to me. [Laughter.] I do not like that kind of procedure. I do not think there is anybody having a copyright on this floor that I am not a sharer in.

Now you gentlemen can readily understand that it is the desire of the municipalities and of the State of Illinois to utilize the power that is developed in the daytime, and the object of the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois, my distinguished friend, Mr. MADDEN, is that we may do that without having taxes and burdens of any character piled on to us, and the amendment we are asking for here is an amendment that will render the same service to you in your States at home.

I thank you, gentlemen, for your attention. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose this amendment. I do not know whether it will do any good to oppose it. But the situation presented here is not at all unusual. Whenever there is a bill of general application introduced, reported, and considered on this floor there are always those who desire to except from the general plan of legislation some particular proposition, and that is exactly the situation that you have here. I do not know that the Illinois proposition does not have merit. Very likely it does have merit; but in that respect it is not in any different position than hundreds of other projects all over the country, and there is no reason on earth why it should receive any different consideration, no reason why any different rule should be applied to it than is applied to other projects where similar conditions exist.

Now, we intentionally gave to the commission very wide discretion in dealing with these matters, because we knew that if you undertook to put into the bill an inflexible rule, or if you undertook to make exceptions covering every case, you would do just as much injustice by the exceptions as you would do by an inflexible rule. So we undertook to give the commission ample authority, ample discretion to deal with all these situations. We did not put in this bill a minimum charge, because we realized that there might be cases in which a minimum charge as against e municipality or even as against a private power company would work a great injustice. We left the whole matter to the commission, as in the case in question here. If it is a case in which there should be a nominal charge only, then a nominal charge will be made, but if the city of Chicago or the State of Illinois succeeds in getting a large diversion of water from the lake, then in that case it might be entirely proper to make a reasonable charge for that water because of the cost resulting therefrom.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether he thinks a State should be treated differently from a private corporation or an individual?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have undertaken to treat States differently, so far as they use the water for their own purposes; but the gentleman seeks to get his proposition placed upon a different basis than is proposed here with respect to States and municipalities.

Mr. MADDEN. The Chief of Engineers insisted that in the passage of legislation there must be included a proviso that the State should maintain the channel, maintain the locks, maintain the dams at its own expense, and in return for that, it seems to me, while we are furnishing navigation free to all the world if they want to use it, there ought not to be a charge for the power that is created.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman can make that showing to this commission—and he unquestionably can—I assume that there will be no charge made; but it seems to me that this House ought not to be called upon to pass on that question. We are undertaking here to pass a general bill covering water powers in navigable streams and on public lands and in the forests, and when we undertake in a general bill such as this to make exceptions we simply put into the bill something which is likely to do injustice to other projects. That is all I have to say about the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were—ayes 46, noes 4.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 14, line 19, strike out the word "of," before "water power," and insert the word "irrigation."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that was the way the bill was originally reported to the House in the last Congress. I think inadvertently or without real consideration the word "irrigation" was eliminated.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the chairman of the committee having this matter in charge in the Senate has introduced a bill, S. 152, and on page 15, in line 5, he makes the same amendment that I am offering here. I call attention to that in order to show the committee that this is an important amendment, and I hope the committee will allow it.

Full consideration of this amendment was had before the special committee on water power. It was voted into the bill in the last Congress because it was believed that it was advisable. The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, I think the Secretary of War, and the expert, Mr. Merrill, who appeared before the committee, and, in fact, all others who testified before the committee and whose attention was specifically called to this feature of the legislation, believed that it should be inserted in the bill so as to avoid any possibility of a doubt. The provision as it would then read would be as follows:

That the project adopted, including the maps, plans, and specifications, shall be such as in the judgment of the commission will be best adapted to a comprehensive scheme.

Of what?

Of improvement and utilization for the purposes—

First—

of navigation—

Second—

irrigation—

Third—

water-power development—

Fourth—

and of other beneficial public uses.

I want to call the attention of the committee to this particular necessity. In many of the localities where the project has been adopted, where the plans have been presented and the maps drawn solely for water power, the question of irrigation would be eliminated, where, as a matter of fact, 90 per cent, if not practically all, of the water could be used for irrigation upon lands below, and all it requires is that in making the plans and specifications and the plats and in adopting the scheme the commission shall require that the overflow, that the outlet, or the place where the water is to be discharged from this reservoir, built and adapted for power purposes, shall be so constructed and located that the water can be used for irrigation below.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. In furtherance of the gentleman's suggestion, I call attention to the fact that the title to this bill includes the words—

For the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto—

Which would indicate that the subject was included here.

Mr. RAKER. I want to call attention to the fact that in my district there was an application for an irrigation project covering some 45,000 acres of land, and an application for a power privilege.

It was investigated and the department held that it was more beneficial in the first instance for a power project, when, as a matter of fact, had the whole details been gone into and the dam located at the proper place, the same amount of power would have been generated and 40,000 acres of land below would have been irrigated from the same dam.

In 90 per cent of the territory there is but one water supply, practically but one place where a dam can be located and a reservoir obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Now, the development of water power is proper. It is important. It is necessary. With the same necessity and the same importance is the development of this water and the use of it for irrigation. Where you have but one water supply, where you have but one stream where you can get the water, where there is practically but one dam that can be built, it is idle, it is extravagant, to allow a dam to be built or a reservoir to be placed there if every effort is not made at the same time so as to utilize all of the water for power purposes and then use it for this most highly beneficial purpose of irrigation. There would be places in the West that would remain barren wastes for years if you allowed a dam to be placed only for power purposes. But if you so construct it that you can have a united purpose, namely, of the development of hydroelectric energy and the irrigation of the land below, you are then utilizing it to the highest extent.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MAYS. Does the gentleman wish to place the irrigation projects in the West under this bill?

Mr. RAKER. I want to place them under this bill where it is necessary, so that there will be no stagnation of the development of the country.

Mr. MAYS. Would the gentleman go so far as to give the Federal Government control of projects of irrigation?

Mr. RAKER. It is under the Federal control now. The right of way, the dam site, the canal, and ditches on public lands are under the control of the Secretary of the Interior. If you want the right to construct a dam or a reservoir site, or to construct a canal, or build ditches on the forest reserve, you have to go to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MAYS. The gentleman does not contend that irrigation projects are under Federal control?

Mr. RAKER. On public lands.

Mr. MAYS. This is not confined to public lands.

Mr. RAKER. Public lands or any other places. All right to obtain canals or reservoir sites upon the public lands is obtained from the Secretary of the Interior. The right to construct a reservoir or canal or ditches upon forest reserves is under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MAYS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. The gentleman understands that this bill is not confined to public lands at all.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose it is not. Suppose the bill applies to some private land or some public land, and here is a splendid water power. Suppose here is a place where a dam can be built whereby you can generate 100,000 horsepower, and at the same time by locating the dam where it ought to be, by placing the reservoir where it ought to be, by having the overflow and discharge in the dam where it ought to be, with the development of the same amount of power you can irrigate 100,000 acres of land. Ought not that to be done? Why, it would be criminal negligence on the part of any board or commission, and they ought to be instructed by law to the end that you might utilize the water, whether on private land or public land, for both power and irrigation.

Mr. MAYS. If the gentleman desires to use the water in his own State, to whom does he apply for that right?

Mr. RAKER. If I am using water——

Mr. MAYS. You can not irrigate without the use of water.

Mr. RAKER (continuing). Everybody knows that the right to dispose of water is in the State, but the right to the use of public lands is in the Federal Government. Without the land or the place to build your dam or the place to retain the water, what does water amount to? That is what we are legislating for here now—to get a basin to hold the water so that you can take it from that basin and utilize it both for hydroelectric energy and irrigation.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that my good friend from California takes a different view of this matter from that taken by practically all the others who have given attention to it. I am sure that when the gentleman offers his amendments inserting the word "irrigation" at two points, I believe——

Mr. RAKER. At one point—line 19.

Mr. MONDELL. He does it, or intends to do it, in the interest of irrigation. I am sure that is his thought and purpose. But I am very sure it would have quite the opposite effect from that which the gentleman intends. Irrigation, fortunately, occupies a favorite status in the matter of right of way. The irrigation right-of-way act grants a perpetual easement on the land. This is a bill providing for power under licenses for a limited term. Now, I am sure the gentleman from California

does not want to take from irrigation development its birthright of a perpetual easement for its right of way and put it under a license for a limited term and with a charge. And yet if the gentleman's amendment has any effect at all that would be the effect, because if the word "irrigation" is written at this point, then this commission, when it takes up a power project, is invited to consider it from the standpoint of irrigation.

After the manner of commissions, always desirous of extending their jurisdiction, they will assume from the fact that the word "irrigation" is in the bill that they have some sort of jurisdiction over the diversion of water, which is the province of the State and not a matter coming within the purview of the Federal Government, and over the granting of rights of way for irrigation, which are now provided for by the act of 1890, under which the right of way is in effect a fee.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Would it not be highly beneficial, when the plans and specifications or plats are filed, that they should file with those what use can be made of this water for irrigation, and, if use can be made, to so direct the construction of dams and all connections that the full benefit of the water can be had, instead of allowing it to be dumped into the river, where it can not be taken up again and the land irrigated?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has made that argument before, and I answer it, as I have answered it before, with some information and knowledge of water diversion and irrigation development. I can not conceive of a situation where the interests of irrigation would be benefited by the consideration of irrigation by the commission under this bill. On the contrary, to invite them to consider the needs of irrigation is to invite them to assert some sort of control over the right to divert water for irrigation, a control which they do not have under the bill unless they might secure it in this way, an invitation, if the amendment were agreed to, to the commission to insist that they have jurisdiction over the question of irrigation rights of way. I am satisfied that my friend from California does not want anything of that sort to occur. So in the interest of navigation, an interest which is as near to his heart as it is to mine, he ought to withdraw his amendment; at least it ought not to be adopted.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I am compelled to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from California [Mr. RAKER], but this is a matter which our special water-power committee, of which I am a member, thrashed out exhaustively. We have considered the subject thoroughly. The gentleman has brought up this amendment time and time again and the committee has as often specifically and emphatically rejected it. The House debated this identical amendment fully when this bill was before the House during the last session and rejected it. I want to say on behalf of 999 people out of every 1,000 throughout the entire arid States of the West, that we emphatically do not want our water rights, our States right, our priority irrigation rights, which are the birthright of our country, placed under a Federal licensing commission. The waters in our nonnavigable streams of the arid West belong to the people of our States, and we do not want anything put in this bill, or any other bill, that will give any Federal bureau here in Washington, 2,000 or 3,000 miles away, or any Federal commission a semblance of authority to supervise or supersede or tax or license or in any way regulate or control our irrigation water rights, or assume any supervisory jurisdiction over our irrigation or domestic water rights. As a matter of fact, the West has been fighting on this floor for 25 years for the preservation of our irrigation water rights which we obtained and specifically reserved to our States by and in the congressional enabling acts by which our States came into this Union. In, I think, nearly all the enabling acts of the Western States it is definitely provided that the waters of the State shall belong exclusively to our people. The Federal Government specifically surrendered all its rights thereto so that we might appropriate and own those waters, and it would be the last thing on earth that any western people would want to have put into a bill, provisions to surrender that birthright, which the irrigation interests the farmers of the West now enjoy. The absolute ownership of the waters of our small streams is a part of our organic acts. I certainly hope that the House will again vote down this amendment. I feel it would be extremely dangerous and iniquitous. It would cause a million lawsuits, or at least violate millions of vested rights. I know my friend from California [Mr. RAKER] is very earnest about this, and he believes it will not invite the trouble or injury or do the things that we think it will, but at the same time my judgment does not coincide with his. It would directly invite a flagrant violation of a solemn and sacred constitutional right. We feel that he is inviting trouble, inviting a hostile, unwarranted, and unwise jurisdiction and supervision that will rise up to plague us if it is ever adopted or permitted. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, subsection E, amend as follows: Strike out all of lines 9 and 10 and the word "commission" in line 11, and insert the following: "That a charge of not less than $1 per horsepower per annum for the first 10-year period after the date of issuance of said license, and $1.50 for the second 10-year period, and $2 for the third 10-year period, and $2.50 for the fourth 10-year period and thereafter shall be levied and collected by the United States on all electric power produced by the licensee for and during said periods or for any and all further time after the expiration of said fourth 10-year period that said project property remains in the possession, use, and control of said licensee or his assignee: *Provided*, That all sums so collected from the licensee by the United States shall be considered and treated as an amortization sinking fund, upon which interest shall be credited to the licensee at the rate of 4 per cent, compounded annually on all sums so paid from date of payment until the sums so paid in, with accumulated compound interest, shall equal the value of all the project property of the licensee except transmission lines and distribution plants. The value of said project property to be determined as provided in this act: *Provided further*, That upon the payment of said sum to the licensee or paid in discharge of any outstanding bonds or other liabilities of said licensee which at such time constitutes a valid, subsisting lien on said property, that all right, title, claim, and interest which the licensee has in and to all said project property, except transmission lines and distribution plants, shall be divested out of said licensee and vested in the United States."

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3184 and had come to no resolution thereon.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill H. R. 6176, making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time, notwithstanding the rule respecting printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa presents the conference report upon the sundry civil appropriation bill and asks unanimous consent that it be considered at this time, although it has not been printed under the rules. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa or the gentleman from Wyoming, either State or both, what is the program for to-night? Are we going to stay here all night or take a recess, get something to eat, and then come back here?

Mr. GOOD. The program now is, if possible, to get unanimous consent to consider the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman is not going to get that unless the District of Columbia bill, that has gone over until to-morrow, and the Army bill, unless some agreement is made about them——

Mr. GOOD. They have not gone over.

Mr. GARNER. The District bill, unless you bring in a rule.

Mr. MONDELL. We will have a rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Can the gentleman dig up the Rules Committee?

Mr. GARNER. That is the question.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we hope to be able very soon to get a rule which will provide for the consideration of the conference report on the District bill.

Mr. GARNER. Let me suggest to the gentleman to bring in a rule, while he is at it, that will embrace each one of these conference reports, because some gentleman could object to each one of them. Now, this is an $800,000,000 bill——

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. GARNER. Well, something near $800,000,000, and there are a lot of amendments there that at least should be considered by the House, and I think the gentleman ought to let it go over until there is a rule or some agreement is made that we are going to get through to-night.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt but what we can get through to-night with all of these bills with the exception of the Army bill.

Mr. GARNER. If we are going to take the Army bill over until to-morrow, let me suggest to the gentleman from Wyoming why not have some intelligent consideration of the sundry civil bill?

Mr. MONDELL. I think we can have an intelligent consideration of the sundry civil bill. The gentleman from Texas is here and other gentlemen in considerable numbers, and I am sure we will have an intelligent consideration of the sundry civil bill.

Mr. GARNER. Until the gentleman has it printed to let us know what is in this conference report——

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman this is a very usual procedure during the short session of Congress. This has been done time and time again.

Mr. GARNER. May I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa it is not a short session of Congress. This bill can be considered by the House of Representatives two days, three days, five days, or six days from now with the same effect as if it were done at this moment.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas this is the shortest session of Congress I can remember where Congress ever attempted to do anything of this kind, inside of such a short space of time to pass these appropriation bills. The gentleman knows it is necessary to pass them.

Mr. GARNER. Let us be candid with each other. Suppose you do not pass this bill until to-morrow or the next day or the next day. Would not the effect be the same? The President is not here to sign it.

Mr. MONDELL. In view of the President's absence? The gentleman suggests in view of the fact that the President is not here the effect would be the same?

Mr. GARNER. Would it not be?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think so, because I understand that the President has arranged with the Secretary of the Treasury that these bills will be approved by wire, and the Secretary intends to recognize that approval. Now, while it may not be legal the gentleman knows that the bills have got to pass.

Mr. WALSH. If any such arrangement is to be made, we had better start a filibuster here now to hold them up until he gets back. The approval of legislation by wire!

Mr. MONDELL. We shall have done our duty whatever may occur, and after we have passed the bills the responsibility then is not ours, but it is his.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman from Iowa contend that the approval of a bill by wireless would authorize the Comptroller or the Auditor of the Treasury Department to pay these appropriations?

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not think so; I will be frank with the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. Then let us not discuss it.

Mr. GOOD. But that is not a legislative proposition. Our duty is to pass these bills before the end of June. Now, if we do not pass them, then the responsibility is with the Congress and not with the President; but after we have passed them and then something arises that prevents the wheels of the Government from turning, why it is not the fault of Congress.

Mr. GARNER. Let me direct the gentleman's attention to this state of affairs in the House of Representatives: The Army bill goes over until to-morrow, and therefore the House must adjourn until to-morrow. Why not let the House have the benefit of the printing of this conference report until to-morrow?

Mr. GOOD. I think there is a difference, as the gentleman will clearly see, between the Army bill when the country is at war and a bill simply carrying appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government.

Mr. GARNER. The trouble with the gentleman is this, that he does not accomplish anything by agreeing to it to-night. If we are compelled to go over until to-morrow, we can not take a recess till next Monday until to-morrow on account of the Army bill.

Now, why not give us a chance? We can agree to this in five minutes to-morrow as easy as we can agree to it in five minutes to-night. Why not let it go over until to-morrow and be printed in the RECORD under the rule?

Mr. GOOD. It will not be agreed to in five minutes. It will take two or three hours. It is a unanimous report.

Mr. GARNER. That is an additional argument for its going over until to-morrow.

Mr. GOOD. All I can say to the gentleman is that if there is objection, of course it will force us to bring in a rule.

Mr. GARNER. I must say that if the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is going to call for a rule for the District of Columbia bill he may just as well call for it for anything else. So I object, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3184, with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. Is there an amendment pending now?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. RAKER. That is open to debate?

The CHAIRMAN. It was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment I have offered is to strike out all of lines 9 and 10 and the word "commission" in line 11. The language is:

That the licensee shall pay to the United States reasonable annual charges in an amount to be fixed by the commission.

The amendment I propose provides a charge of not less than $1 per horsepower per annum for the first 10-year period after the date of the issuance of said license, and $1.50 for the second 10-year period, and $2 for the third 10-year period, and $2.50 for the fourth 10-year period, and thereafter so as to provide for an automatic recapture.

As to the charges proposed, if we compare them with the rates charged by the commission as provided in this bill, they will probably be twice those charged under proper regulation. If we compare them with the charges in Canada, where they have municipal ownership, we find that the charges there are about half what they are in the United States, where the charges are fixed by these State commissions. In Canada, where they have municipal ownership operated under a commission, the charges in 225 municipalities are about half the amount of the charges paid in the United States. In other words, in Canada the charge is $8 per horsepower, while in the United States the charge fixed by the State commissions is $18, and they range from $18 to $104 per horsepower.

If this amendment is adopted, ultimately the Government or the municipalities will own the plant, and according to charges made in Canada the consumers of the power will pay less for the use of the water power than they would under the plan suggested. I trust that the amendment offered may be agreed to. At this late hour I will not take up the time of the committee further in discussing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAYS: Page 17, line 2, after the word "hereof," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(g) That all transmission lines constructed or operated under authority of this act shall be constructed, operated, and maintained as common carriers."

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, heretofore we have been very careful to safeguard all the general grants of our resources against monopoly. In the legislation dealing with our coal resources a provision was carried that only one lease could be secured by any individual or corporation, each holding a lease. In the same way we dealt with oil and gas leases, with phosphates, with sodium, and even with the oil shales of the mountain regions.

I have looked in vain for any provision in this bill that limits the number of leases or licenses that may be issued to one individual or corporation. There is nothing in the bill, so far as I can observe, to prevent existing or future monopolies from securing all the undeveloped power sites yet remaining upon the public domain or along the navigable streams of the country.

One way to curb monopoly would be to provide that transmission lines over which this energy should be transmitted shall be common carriers, as provided in the amendment which I am offering. We have heretofore applied that rule of law to all common carriers, including pipe lines, railroads, and canals.

It has been definitely determined that electricity can be taken on at a given point on a transmission line and carried to another point and stepped off and delivered to the consumer, making proper allowances for energy lost in transit and exacting adequate charge for the service rendered. Railroads are common carriers. Even railroads that are built especially to carry the coal from the mines, that may be owned by operators, to the public are common carriers. By the act of February 4, 1887, creating the Interstate Commerce Commission transportation lines were placed under the jurisdiction of the commission and designated as common carriers. Before that the most hurtful discrimination had been practiced. As the oil industry was developed and extensive pipe lines were constructed it was found essential to make such pipe lines common carriers, and accordingly the act was duly amended in 1906 and 1910.

Under this bill electricity may be produced at various places and in great quantities. Transmission lines are granted, by section 21 of the bill, the right of eminent domain. They may condemn rights of way over private property. They may carry energy equivalent to the total production of many coal mines. Coal is carried on railroads acting as common carriers. It represents heat, light, and power. It may be burned at the mines and transmitted over the lines to the consumer in the form of electricity. Water power is heat, light, and power, minus the ashes and smoke. It serves the public in the same manner as coke and fuel oil. The railroads carrying coal, the pipe lines carrying oil, must operate as common carriers. Manifestly the same rule should apply to transmission lines doing interstate business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. I think this is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAYS. I have had a little experience in the development of some of these enterprises, particularly in the development of the coal industry. Formerly the railroads owned all the coal minese in our section of the country. The people were the victims of that monopoly. The independent producers undertaking to develop mines could not, of course, get adequate service from the railroads because the railroads were in the coal business themselves and did not wish to encourage any competition. I assisted in starting the first independent company to make anything like a success, and we joined as party plaintiff in a suit against 26 railroad companies to compel them to grant routes and rates to a thousand cities, towns, and stations in the West and Northwest. While these railroads were common carriers they evaded their responsibility as much as possible. They had enjoyed a monopoly in the coal business and resisted efforts to compel any performance of their duties as common carriers under the law.

The Interstate Commerce Commission heard the cases and granted the relief. As a result the products of the independent mines are going to every city, town, and station west of the Rocky Mountains.

Finally it was found advisable to build a coal-carrying railroad, especially to accommodate the independent mines in the region. This road, of course, is a common carrier, and many other mines, whose owners could not afford to build a railroad, have been developed along the way.

One corporation engaged in the production and transmission of electrical energy is now exercising a monopoly as obnoxious and oppressive as that formerly exercised by railroads in the production and transportation of coal. The great transmission lines over which the energy is carried extend over several States. Such lines cost approximately as much to construct as railroads, but very much less to operate. Independent producers of power can no better afford to build such transmission lines than the independent coal producers could afford to build a railroad, or the owners of individual oil wells could afford to construct pipe lines. There are some towns in my district that are charged by the power company, by virtue of the monopoly that it exerts, a wholesale rate of $140 per horsepower year. They are sending the power 150 miles farther, where they are in competition with electricity developed through the burning of coal, and selling it at one-fourth the rate. Some heavy consumers of power, able to build independent power plants, are given valuable concessions at the expense of the ordinary consumer. Such discrimination is most hurtful, and steps should be taken to prohibit the same under the operations of this general bill.

Electrical development is in its infancy. It is the cleanest, most efficient form of energy yet discovered by the genius of man. It will turn the spindles and wheels of industry. It will transform the crude mineral resources of the land into implements of use and ornaments of beauty. It will soon drive the transportation system of the Nation. Public means under public supervision must be provided to bring this ceaseless, tireless energy to the general service of mankind.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, there is no need of making transmission lines common carriers to avoid combinations in restraint of trade. We provide against all combinations in restraint of trade by a provision in subsection (h), on page 18 of the bill, to this effect;

That combinations, agreements, arrangements, or understandings, express or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade, or to fix, maintain, or increase prices for electrical energy or service are hereby prohibited.

There is no reason to make transmission lines common carriers on the price that will be charged, because in sections 18 and 19 we give either to the State regulatory body or to the commission created by this bill the power to regulate the rate, so that as to combinations and as to rates there is absolute and complete control. If we made these lines common carriers we would subject them to all the conditions that are applicable to interstate-commerce common carriers under the provisions of the act, and some of those provisions would be burdensome and unnecessary.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. You have the same regulations as to rates on railroads, you have provisions in the bill giving certain utilities commissions the power of controlling the rates on railroads, and yet the railroads are common carriers.

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. MAYS. Why do you make railroads common carriers and why do you make pipe lines common carriers?

Mr. ESCH. We have made both of those common carriers because they entered into interstate commerce. But the theory of this bill is to allow the State regulatory body to have control over the rates, the securities, and other features of the transmission lines and power developments within the State, and it is only where the current is interstate and where the State commissions can not agree, or where there is no commission, that we give this commission the powers that are granted to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MAYS. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 11, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment on page 18, line 11: After the word "deem" insert "it," and after the word "equitable" insert "to waive."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: Page 18, line 11, after the word "deem," insert the word "it," and after the word "equitable" insert the words "to waive."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The purpose of this amendment is to correct a verbal inaccuracy.

Mr. ESCH. I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRIGGS: Page 18, line 5, after the word "prohibited," strike out the period and insert "and any holder of a permit or license under this act who shall be found

guilty of a violation of the provision shall forfeit such license or permit, or both, as the case may be, and in addition be subject to any of the penalties provided by law."

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this provision relating to combinations, agreements, and understandings in restraint of trade, and directed against the increase of prices and against monopolies, is, in my opinion, the most important provision in this bill. But there is no direct penalty attached to a violation of the provision. In my opinion, no stronger penalty could be attached than a forfeiture of the license or permit held by the body seeking to create a monopoly of the water power. Through the instrumentality of licenses, which may run for 50 years, and of permits, by which they may hold preference rights or options for a term, even as long as three years, to acquire such licenses and privileges of water power, and through subsidiary corporations or by dummy persons some combinations of capital may accomplish a monopoly that never could be tolerated in this country.

The first sentence of section 10 (h) of the bill, to which the amendment is offered, provides—

That combinations, agreements, arrangements, or understandings, expressed or implied, to limit the output of electrical energy, to restrain trade, or to fix, maintain, or increase prices for electrical energy or service are hereby prohibited.

The amendment which I offer specifically and clearly provides that violations of this provision by any holder of a permit or license shall forfeit such permit or license, or both, as the case may be.

It is true that under section 6 of the bill it is provided that—

Each such license shall be conditioned upon the acceptance by the licensee of all the terms and conditions of this act and such further conditions, if any, as the commission shall prescribe in conformity with this act, which said terms and conditions and the acceptance thereof shall be expressed in said license. Licenses may be revoked only for the reasons and in the manner prescribed under the provisions of this act, and may be altered only upon mutual agreement between the licensee and the commission after 90 days' public notice.

And under section 26 it is further provided that the Attorney General may on the request of the commission or Secretary of War institute proceedings in equity—

for the purpose of revoking for violation of its terms any license issued hereunder, or for the purpose of remedying or correcting by injunction, mandamus, or other process any act of commission or omission in violation of the provisions of this act or any lawful regulation or order promulgated hereunder.

But neither one of these provisions, in my opinion, declare that violations of the monopoly clause of the bill would constitute a revocation of a permit or license issued under the terms of the act.

It may be plausibly contended that such a forfeiture is implied and would be read into the act by legal construction. But it must be remembered that penalty clauses are strictly and not liberally construed by the courts, and that forfeitures are abhorred.

Referring again to section 6, it will be observed that the bill specifically declares that—

Licenses may be revoked for the reasons and in the manner prescribed under the provisions of this act.

Also section 26 provides that the Attorney General may institute proceedings—

for the purpose of revoking for violation of its terms any license issued hereunder.

But it is to be further carefully noted that nowhere in the bill is it provided that the terms and conditions of any license or any permit shall include a stipulation that violations of the monopoly clause will constitute a forfeiture and revoke such permit or license.

When the incalculable value of the water power of this country is considered, every precaution ought to be observed in order that this great asset of the people should not be appropriated by private interests for selfish ends. It is to be expected that resistance will be met in the effort to impose safeguards around anything so tremendously attractive and desirable to those seeking monopoly of the water power of the United States. If such resources could be acquired, controlled, and dominated by trust masters, the people would be completely at the mercy of such interests.

There is, in my opinion, much merit in this bill; but there is also an element of danger, too. Under its terms licenses may be issued for as long as 50 years—almost a lifetime; and surely no man will say that if the rights and privileges given by such licenses are abused, that the Government should not have the absolute right to revoke the license for such abuse. That it should not be left so indefinite as to invite a construction by some court that the Government in failing to reserve in the law the right of revocation for the violation of certain prohibited acts had thereby lost its right to insist upon any forfeiture of such permit or license.

It must not be forgotten that the amount of water power which can be utilized in this country is almost fabulous. It has been estimated by experts, as reflected on the hearings of this bill before the Committee on Public Lands, that from 20,000,000 to 200,000,000 horsepower could be developed every year from the waterfalls and waterways of the United States. It has been further estimated that the value of such horsepower upon such basis would be from $100,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a year.

In dealing with such a vast possession of the people of this country do you not feel that you can not be too cautious when it comes to providing every safeguard that will keep this vast ocean of energy out of the hands of a Water Power Trust? You may be sure that such a trust will find such a prize worth fighting for. And while development of our great water-power resources ought to be encouraged, so that their tremendous energy, which now runs to waste, can be harnessed and made to serve the needs of the people, it should not be done at a cost which might threaten to completely absorb the very holdings themselves.

This amendment, if adopted, simply attaches a penalty clause to section 10 (h) by saying that holders shall forfeit all permits or licenses that they may have upon conviction of a violation of this provision against monopoly. It also further safeguards the rights of the Government and the people by stating that any such offender shall also be liable for any other penalties that may be provided by law.

I hope that this provision will be adopted by the committee. I do not understand that the chairman of the committee has any objection to it, and I do not find anywhere in the law that this is covered by any penalty provision. I think if you leave it out of the bill you may subject this country to the encroachments of monopolies that will seek every means and agency to control the gigantic and wonderful opportunities that this country now has for giving to its people unlimited water power, and cheapening the cost of fuel, light, and heat, as well as other necessities of life. I sincerely hope, therefore, that this amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is true, as the gentleman from Texas says, that there is no provision in the particular section to which he offers the amendment providing for the forfeiture which he desires to have.

Mr. BRIGGS. I did not say the section. I said the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I know the gentleman said that. I am coming to that. The gentleman is right in his statement that there is no provision in the section, but he is wrong in saying that there is no provision in the bill. If the gentleman had read section 26 he would have found that there is a general provision which takes care not alone of this particular section but takes care of all sections. It is contained in section 26, which reads as follows:

SEC. 26. That the Attorney General may, on request of the commission or of the Secretary of War, institute proceedings in equity in the district court of the United States in the district in which any project or part thereof is situated.

For what?

For the purpose of revoking—

On what grounds?

For violation of its terms.

And here is one of the terms. This is the charter under which they hold their licenses. This is the bill subject to which they hold their licenses, and this provides in express terms that there shall be no combination in restraint of trade, and if there is a combination in restraint of trade it is a violation of the license and of the terms of the license, because this is a part of its terms.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Just one moment and I will.

For the purpose of revoking for violation of its terms any license issued hereunder—

And then it is broader still—

or for the purpose of remedying or correcting by injunction, mandamus, or other process any act of commission or omission in violation of the provisions of this act or of any lawful regulation or order promulgated hereunder.

This is a very carefully prepared act. It has been thought out by preceding Congresses. It has been debated at great length. It has been fully considered by conferees, and you have the result of the ripeness of wisdom which comes from prolonged deliberation, from extended debate, from bringing to bear upon it the thought of great numbers of people who are interested.

This just shows the folly of trying to make such changes on the floor. You do not find the whole act in one section, and because you do not find all the provisions of the law at one place, because you do not find them at one particular point in the bill, you are apt to say, "Why, the bill does not contain it." That means that the Member has not been familiar enough with the bill to comprehend thoroughly all of its provisions, and he does not remember that at some later place there is a general provision which covers the particular point that he has in mind.

Now, this covers the point in the very broadest way. It covers it for violations of the act. It covers it for violations of the license, it covers it by forfeiting the license, and it covers it by mandamus or any other proceedings in a court of equity. This is thought out not alone along the lines of this bill, but it is in accord with provisions generally in bills of this kind. It is the way that such provisions are made in acts of this nature. It is a well-considered and thoroughly adequate provision, and it answers all the objections of the gentleman from Texas. I trust that the bill, in this respect as in all other respects, will be sent back to the Senate and to the conferees as it passed the last House, so that we can with reasonable certainty depend upon an agreement and get a water-power bill, which is what we are trying to do, and what we will be liable to fail in if we keep inserting amendments to every section as we go along. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRIGGS].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BRIGGS. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 18, noes 28.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] desires to offer an amendment to subsection (e) of section 10, on page 16. He is not here. I ask unanimous consent that when we take up this bill again we may return to subsection (e) for the purpose of allowing the gentleman from Kansas to offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3184, for the development of water power, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, presented a conference report on H. R. 6176, the sundry civil appropriation bill, for printing under the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri reserved all points of order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing some correspondence with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, with comments thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing some correspondence with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, with comments thereon. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from the Comptroller of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York whether the letter from the comptroller has any personal application? Does it pertain to any Member of the House? I realize that I am a little late making my inquiry.

Mr. PLATT. Not particularly; it is a letter written to me. It is in regard to some information which I asked of the comptroller in regard to the examination of banks in California.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And it has no reference to any Member of the House particularly?

Mr. PLATT. No; I think every Member of the House has a copy of it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the conference report on the District bill has been presented for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. It has.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Reserving the right to object, what is the idea of meeting at 10 o'clock?

Mr. MONDELL. We will have several conference reports to take up, and the sooner we meet the sooner we will get through with them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1213. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, July 1, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. VOLSTEAD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 91), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GANLY: A bill (H. R. 6901) donating two captured German cannon or field guns and two carriages to the county of Bronx, New York City, N. Y., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 6902) providing for enlarged homesteads in forest reserves and for additional homesteads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 6903) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Garfield, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6904) to provide for the emergency arising out of the demobilization of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the discharge of workers from war industries and other occupations by securing therefor permanent opportunities for profitable employment by means of a national construction service organized for the systematic extension of useful public works and the development of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 6905) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wahjamega, Mich., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 6906) to prohibit importation, exportation, and transportation in interstate commerce of intoxicating liquors, and to prohibit removal of distilled spirits from bond for beverage purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 6907) providing for the reinstatement with seniority rights of Government employees who resigned their positions since April 6, 1917, to enter the service of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6908) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moweaqua, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 6909) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tyrone, Blair County, Pa., one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 6910) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Great Falls, county of Cascade, State of Montana, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in the public park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6911) to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia; to declare such contracts of marriage null and void; to prescribe punishment for violation and attempt to violate its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6912) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and shells, to the village of Alexis, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 6913) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 6914) to amend Title IX of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6948) extending the provisions of the act of April 30, 1908, entitled "An act making appropriation for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 149) calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for a statement of the unpaid war debt of the United States and other information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 150) directing the Federal Trade Commission to make certain investigations regarding the sugar shortage and report its findings to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HASKELL: Resolution (H. Res. 151) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department to sit during the sessions of the House and the recess of the Congress, to compel the attendance of witnesses, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths to witnesses; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 152) to allow the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department a clerk at a salary of $2,000 per annum; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RICKETTS: Resolution (H. Res. 153) for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the conduct of military authorities at Fort Sheridan, Ill.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution (H. Res. 154) to increase the salaries of the two special employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, favoring appropriation for Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 6915) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6916) granting a pension to Sarah Moran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6917) granting a pension to Martha Benefiel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6918) granting an increase of pension to Washington Akester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 6919) granting an increase of pension to James Rush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6920) to grant a gold medal to James F. Walker for conspicuous bravery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 6921) granting a pension to Charles Waide; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6922) granting a pension to Adell J. Squires; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 6923) granting a pension to Lillian Munz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6924) granting a pension to William E. Tucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6925) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Vawter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6926) granting an increase of pension to Joel M. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6927) granting a pension to James C. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6928) granting a pension to Agnes Eugenia Dinsmoor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 6929) granting an increase of pension to George C. Hausmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 6930) granting a pension to Elmer C. Wilcox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6931) granting a pension to Samuel T. H. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6932) for the relief of Edward B. Fox, administrator of the last surviving partner of the firm of Child, Pratt & Fox; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 6933) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6934) granting an increase of pension to William Cunagim; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6935) granting a pension to W. W. Treadway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6936) granting a pension to Ben J. Sprodlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6937) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Kimbler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6938) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Gabbord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 6939) granting a pension to Clint T. Littlefield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6940) granting an increase of pension to George T. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 6941) granting a pension to Edward C. Riseling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 6942) granting a pension to Louis H. Trayser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6943) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Maloney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6944) granting an increase of pension to Florence E. Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 6945) for the relief of Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 6946) granting an increase of pension to Stewart J. Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6947) granting an increase of pension to James T. Page; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6949) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Shinky; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Northampton Silk Co., Florence, Mass., against the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the employees of the Milton Bradley Co., Springfield, Mass., for daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Council of Farms and Markets, Albany, N. Y., asking for appropriation of not less than $500,000 for the extermination of colonies of cone borers

in Massachusetts and New York States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, requesting repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Council of the City of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the war-time law after the war had ended and favoring repeal of the prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of a meeting of lawful and qualified Oneida Indians at Hobart, Brown County, Wis., protesting against the permanent closing of the school known as the Oneida Indian School, and asking that no part of the property shall be disposed of or dispersed by the Indian Office without first a thorough understanding with the Oneida Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the New York State Council of Farms and Markets, Albany, N. Y., asking appropriation of not less than $500,000 for exterminating the corn borer, which have appeared in large colonies in Massachusetts and New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Confectioners' Association of the United States for the revision of tariff on confectionery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Parlor, N. S. G. S., Jung Wing Quong, president, relating to disposition of Chinese territory to Japan in treaty at Paris; to the Committtee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of the people of Geneva, Gene, Ellyer, Hampshire, Elgin, Wilmington, Wheaton, West Chicago, Lockport, and Naperville, all in the State of Illinois, urging the repeal of tax on candy and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition urging that the Italo-Jugo-Slav controversy be settled by plebiscite; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Land Bank of the State of New York, asking exemption from taxation, except inheritance taxes, on the bonds issued by the land bank; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition by Etham Lodge, No. 37, I. O. B. B., of Sacramento, Calif., indorsing the resolutions before Congress condemning the atrocities committed against the Jews of Poland and other Slavic countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of East Bay Local No. 112 of the International Association of Railroad Supervisory Foremen of California, favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of La Crosse Council, Knights of Columbus, relating to the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Sand & Gravel Co., opposing the Poindexter bill to amend the fourth section of the interstate commerce law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of D. J. Stewart & Co., of Rockford, Ill., favoring repeal of the so-called luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. G. Hogland, of Rockford, Ill., opposing continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of 139 citizens of La Salle County, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Petition of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, favoring appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of some measure which will accord citizens who desire to own a home the same inducements now afforded to farmers by Federal statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of the International Order of Good Templars, at Everett, State of Washington, urging full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of Wilbur R. Wyman and Eva C. Bither, of Mattawamkeag, Me., urging national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, representing 75 universities and colleges of the United States, to provide for the continuance of the war emergency United States Employment Service, until a permanent service may be established by law; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the New York and New Jersey branch of the National Metal Trades Association, against any appropriation for United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, requesting additional salaries and appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing passage of Senate bill 7504; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of citizens of several cities in New Jersey, asking repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Newark, N. J., for strong prohibition enforcement act extending to Americans in China and wherever treaties permit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Objections of the flavoring-extract manufacturing industry to prohibition legislation pending in Congress; changes recommended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Kenneweg Co., wholesale grocers, Cumberland, Md., pertaining to the investigation of the big five packers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John H. Dackman & Son, confectionery, Baltimore, Md., for repeal of excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hanline Bros., paint manufacturers, relating to Senate bill 1351, known as naval stores act; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of A. G. Ogden, of Baltimore, Md., relating to the Patent Office; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for immediate repeal of tax on soda water, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of T. J. Foster, chairman board of directors, National Bridge Works, Long Island City, with reference to the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Richards, asking support of Lehlbach retirement bill, H. R. 3149; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the New York State Council of Farms and Markets, Albany, N. Y., relating to the extermination of colonies of European corn borers in Massachusetts and New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Austin, Nichols & Co., New York, N. Y., relating to exemption of fluid flavoring extracts from classification of intoxicating liquors in the enforcement of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Parlor, N. S. G. S., Jung Wing Quong, president, relating to the disposition of Chinese territory to Japan in proposed treaty of Paris; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of citizens of Jacksonville, Ill., favoring Government ownership and operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of White Hall, citizens of Easton, 150 citizens of Jacksonville, and 100 citizens of Winchester, all of Illinois, for repeal of tax on candy, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, offering its facilities and cooperation to the Government; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Jersey County, Ill., favoring repeal of tax on candy, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of National Bridge Works, Long Island City, in reference to Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the New York State Council of Farms and Markets, Albany, N. Y., for the extermination of European corn borer now appearing in colonies in Massachusetts and New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Helen M. Hotchkiss, asking support of Lehlbach retirement bill, H. R. 3149; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Petition of residents of Flathead County, Mont., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of citizens of Walton, Ky., asking for laws to enforce war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of the Minnesota Bankers' Association, favoring the present operating structure of the railroads as laid out by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of citizens of Caldwell, Nampa, and Mountain Home, Idaho, urging the removal of the revenue tax on candy, ice cream, soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of the seventeenth district of Illinois in behalf of Government ownership of railways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of the seventeenth district of Illinois in behalf of the repeal of taxes on candy, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa asking the repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of the council of the city of Pittsburgh, asking that place be made a station stop in Aerial Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of Kampen Lodge, No. 15, and Morning Star Lodge, No. 16, International Order of Good Templars, requesting enactment by Congress of laws providing for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Asheville and Franklin, N. C., for the repeal of the tax on soda water and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petitions of M. E. Rader and 100 other citizens of Granville and vicinity, J. H. Leavy and 28 other residents of Granville, John Mutschler and 28 others of Goodrich, and S. E. Stafford and 28 other citizens of Valley City, all in the State of North Dakota, asking for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.